

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF RSPO**  
**32<sup>nd</sup> RSPO BHCVWG MEETING**

**Date: 26<sup>th</sup> & 27<sup>th</sup> July 2016**

**Start Time: 9.00 am**

**Venue: Capri by Fraser Hotel, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia**

**Attendance:**

<p><b><u>Members and Alternates</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adam Harrison (AH, WWF INT)</li> <li>2. Benjamin Loh (BL, WWFMY)</li> <li>3. Alindra Gerald Sintik (AS, WWFMY)</li> <li>4. Anne Rosenbarger (AR, WRI)</li> <li>5. Audrey Lee (ALMF, OLAM)</li> <li>6. Azmariah Muhamed (AM, FGV)</li> <li>7. Cahyo Nugraho (CN, FFI)</li> <li>8. Eleanor Slader (ES, SEARRP)</li> <li>9. Ginny Ng (GN, WILMAR)</li> <li>10. Glen Reynolds (GR, SEARRP)</li> <li>11. Harjinder Kler (HK, Hutan)</li> <li>12. Jennifer Lucey (JL, SEARRP)</li> <li>13. John Payne (JP, BORA)</li> <li>14. Lanash Thanda (LT, SEPA)</li> <li>15. Lee Swee Yin (LSY, SIME)</li> <li>16. Michal Zrust (MZ, Daemeter)*</li> <li>17. Norazam Abd Hameed (NaH, FGV)</li> <li>18. Paulina Villapando (PV, HCVRN)</li> <li>19. Richard Kan (RK, GAR)</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Absent with Apologies</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20. Agus Purnomo (AP, GAR)</li> <li>21. Gan Lian Tiong (GLT, MM)</li> <li>22. Marcus Colchester (MC, FFP)</li> <li>23. Michael Brady (MB, IFC)</li> <li>24. Olivier Tichit (OT, SIPEF)</li> </ol> <p>*attended only on Day 1 **attended only on Day 2 ***skype call</p>	<p><b><u>RSPO Advisors</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Secretariat Staff</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dillon Sarim (DS)</li> <li>2. Julia Majail (JM)*</li> <li>3. Oi Soo Chin (OSC)**</li> <li>4. William Siow (WS)</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Observer</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. -</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Invited speaker</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mike Senior (MS, Proforest)***</li> <li>2. Perpetua George (PG, WILMAR)*</li> <li>3. Tey Yeong Sheng (TYS, UM)**</li> </ol>
---	---

AGENDA

- 1.0 Opening meeting .....3
- 2.0 Update on LUCA & Social Liability Submissions .....3
- 3.0 Discussion on compensation plan and LUCA issues .....4
- 4.0 The Sustainable Commodities Compensation Fund (CCF) .....6
- 5.0 Update on LUCA guidance document .....7
- 8.0 HCV assessments for smallholders expansion situation .....10
- 9.0 Briefing from SENSOR: Smallholders, Soil Erosion and Nutrient Cycling .....10
- 10.0 Discussion on appointment of compensation plan evaluator .....11
- 11.0 HCVRN Update .....12
- 12.0 NPP Comments.....13
- 13.0 RT 14.....13
- 14.0 INA HCV Management & Monitoring.....13
- 16.0 Joint Incentive Workshop Update .....14
- 17.0 RSPO M&E .....14
- 19.0 Project 1 Proposal .....14
- 19.0 AOB and closing meeting .....15



Item	Description	Point Person
	<p>reviewed. DS clarified that the reported FCL figure was based on the figures reported by the company. The analysis can be done if requested.</p> <p>AR added that, in the initial phases of the review process, there could be substantial difference between the FCL figure reported by the company and the review findings. GR noted on AR's remarks.</p> <p>WS updated the WG that, in addition to the four current reviewers, the secretariat is contracting three more LUCA reviewers to speed up to process. The secretariat has also hired an individual who will be pre-reviewing the LUCA before it get submitted to the reviewers for the review process. At this moment, the secretariat has two pre-reviewers, one is based in the secretariat office and another consultant who is based in Latin America.</p> <p>Action point:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DS to check with the membership department in the RSPO on the status of the conditional approved members which have failed to submit the disclosure of non-compliant land clearing.</li> </ol>	DS
3.0	<p><b>3.0 Discussion on compensation plan and LUCA issues</b></p> <p>WS provided and update on the discussion on using HCS areas for compensation. The co-chairs of the ERWG and BHCVWG met in June 2016 to discuss on the additionality of using set aside HCS areas for compensation. He presented the outcome of the discussion to the WG as requested by the Compensation Panel (CP) assigned to this case.</p> <p>TMK requested a clarification on point (3): <i>The hectare value must remained as originally proposed</i> of the decision made. This has already been clarified by GN in the original document that this will be considered as ha-to-ha compensation value but the additional criteria is to be met with the additional activities that will be implemented by the company.</p> <p>PV, and on behalf of AL, proposed to have a checklist of list of requirements needed to be tackled in order to use HCS areas for compensation to ensure that the additionality criterion is met. The checklist can help the CP to decide if the HCS areas can be used for compensation.</p> <p>MZ agreed that the checklist will help with the decision making. He also pointed that, at the last meeting, there were concerns on the quality of the HCV assessment at the assessment failed to identify mangroves as HCVs. Potentially, MZ added that there could be problems related to legality as the Indonesian government does not recognize the set aside areas. He is concern on the security of these areas for over 25 years, hence stressing that the long-lasting criterion should also be well explained by the company.</p> <p>On the issue of additionality, MZ disagreed having the activities evaluated for in order to be considered additional. The additionality also needs to be weighed up against the RSPO NEXT. The fact that HCV, HCS and HCS+ are converging, the long term maintenance of this area is significant. He conclude his comments by stressing that the concept note should be written more comprehensively.</p>	

Item	Description	Point Person
	<p>GR commented that, since the additionality is based on enhancing the biodiversity and carbon stocks, it will be a challenge to measure this. Since there were already concerns on the adequacy of the HCV and HCS assessments, the outcomes of the enhancement may not be robust.</p> <p>JL responded that to make this project additional, a robust explanation on how the company plans to enhance and measure these enhancement is needed.</p> <p>GN advised that the WG should come up with a reply to the company involved. ALMF suggested to have the checklist developed and be sent together with the WG's reply to the company. GN agreed. The checklist is to be developed by PV, MZ, JL AR and GR.</p> <p>On a separate note, TMK requested both the Secretariat and the CP to speed up the review of the concept note.</p> <p>JL suggested to have a document documenting all the decisions made by the CPs and WG. This document can be used for future reference by the CPs. ALMF mentioned that this could be an FAQ sheet similar to what the ERWG has. The Secretariat would list all the frequently asked questions and the CPs decisions in that FAQ sheet. This sheet is to be updated from time to time. The WG agreed.</p> <p><u>Checklist for using HCS areas for compensation</u></p> <p>PV, GR and JL have worked on the checklist for using HCS areas for compensation. They proposed two possible scenarios:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Ideal:</b> Area is undeveloped (new site). Both HCV and HCS assessments need to be done.</li> <li>2. <b>Not ideal:</b> HCV and HCS assessments have taken place. We don't know if the quality is good.</li> </ol> <p>The WG has mixed opinions on the current checklist, particularly on the requirement of redoing HCV assessments which require the HCV ALS licensed assessor.</p> <p>PV commented that, based on the checklist, the use of HCS areas for compensation should only be considered if the conditions are ideal. The reason why undeveloped area is preferred is to ensure the quality of the HCV and HCS assessment.</p> <p>AH commented that, for existing areas, if the company has sufficient evidence that both the HCS and HCV assessment are adequate, the WG should accept the proposal to use the HCS areas for compensation.</p> <p>ALMF commented that there will be issue of governance for the 'ideal situation'. Companies cannot guarantee if they can even get hold of the undeveloped area, thus, making this very challenging. A more ideal situation would be when the company has</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Management control over the undeveloped area</li> <li>2. Commitment to safe guard HCV and HCS.</li> </ol>	

Item	Description	Point Person
	<p>The WG should allow the set aside HCS areas to be used for compensation. However, the quality of the HCV assessment needs to be considered and this can be done via the HCV ALS review process (assessments older than three years need to be reviewed by an HCV ALS assessor, as pointed by AH and PV).</p> <p>The group agreed that the checklist needs to be revised further based on the comments received. PV volunteer to revise the checklist.</p> <p>DS informed the group that the company has waited for at least eight months to get their concept note approved. He request the WG to come up with a response to the company.</p> <p>Collectively, the WG has agreed to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The RSPO is allowing the HCS set aside areas to be used for compensation but with the caveat that the additionality will come from the activities the company will undertake to enhance values in the area.</li> <li>2. In addition to the above, the HCS areas must not overlapped with identified HCVs. In the event where HCS and HCV overlap, these areas need to be excluded from being used for compensation.</li> <li>3. To ensure the above, the panel will be advising the company to send their HCV assessments for peer review.</li> </ol> <p>The WG also agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The CP will further discuss this via email and come with the final recommendation to the company.</li> <li>2. The revised checklist will be discussed further at the next BHCVWG meeting.</li> </ol> <p>Action Points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PV to revise the checklist</li> <li>2. WG members to provide comments on the checklist to PV</li> <li>3. Secretariat to develop an FAQ on the compensation panel discussions.</li> </ol>	<p>PV WG Secretariat</p>
<p><b>4.0</b></p>	<p><b>4.0 The Sustainable Commodities Compensation Fund (CCF)</b></p> <p>MZ presented the update on the CCF by Forest Carbon. Currently, they are working with a company on a concept note to be submitted to the RSPO using the mechanism. The group is also hopeful to get more participations from other companies as they aimed to have lessons-learned by November 2016 and possibly present this at the RT14.</p> <p>GN commented that the governance structure is currently not highlighted in the mechanism. This is important to ensure credibility of the mechanism. According to MZ, the group is currently working on this and the draft governance structure is already available but has not been finalised. The composition of the Board members will be made up of Daemeter and Forest Carbon, as well as few other NGOs.</p> <p>AR requested for a clarification on using this for RSPO compensation option 2. Will there be a way to integrate some sort of criteria for monitoring biodiversity values within the mechanism? In response to AR’s question, MZ is wondering</p>	

Item	Description	Point Person
	<p>whether the current vegetation coefficient proxy can be used for estimating carbon as well.</p> <p>AH suggested to the WG that, although carbon compensation is an interesting idea, the WG should avoid initiating a discussion on carbon compensation to decide the value of a carbon in 1Ha etc. He raised another observational question, will there be enough potential clients for this mechanism taking into consideration that the provisional figure of the FCL is being relatively too small for the mechanism? MZ acknowledged the concern raised by AH. However, he pointed out that this is certainly the best time to introduce this mechanism to the companies involved in compensation.</p> <p>TMK commented that this is really practical at this moment but shared the same concern with AH. AR asked the WG if they are ready to accept concept notes developed using this mechanism.</p> <p>Decision made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The WG and CPs will consider concept note and compensation plan developed using this mechanism.</li> </ol> <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MZ to present the governance structure, types of project financial flow and lessons-learned of the mechanism at the next BHCVWG.</li> </ol>	MZ (Secretariat to follow up)
5.0	<p><b>5.0 Update on LUCA guidance document</b></p> <p>WS presented the update on the LUCA guidance document by AKSENTA. The comments received from both the WG members and GIS practitioners were incorporated into the final guidance document by AKSENTA.</p> <p>DS brought forward the recommendation by AKSENTA to replace the term LUCA (Land Use Change Analysis) to LCCA (Land Cover Change Analysis). In the spirit of Principle 8 of Continuous Improvement in the RSPO P&amp;C, it is about time to WG to take actions to use the correct term for the analysis.</p> <p>RK suggested the term LUCA to be corrected after the P&amp;C has been revised to use the correct term, LCCA. The WG agreed as changing the term now will create confusions among the members.</p> <p>Decision made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The BHCVWG to propose to change the term LUCA to LCCA at the next P&amp;C revision.</li> <li>2. The LUCA term stays as it is, until the P&amp;C has been revised to use the term LCCA.</li> </ol> <p>On the revised version, PV highlighted that there are still many typos and comments not addressed. AR agreed and requested the secretariat to screen through the revised version before sharing it to the WG.</p>	

Item	Description	Point Person
	<p>On the reporting template, GN highlighted that the template is still complicated and potentially confusing to members. Earlier, PV had recommended to AKSENTA to have an online form to fill in.</p> <p>GN suggested to have the existing reviewers to review revised template and compared it with the existing template. The reviewer will have to recommend to the WG whether the revised guidance/template has managed to address the gaps identified on the current versions. A basic TOR is required for this. GN, ALMF and TMK will work on the TOR.</p> <p>Action point:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PV to provide list of typos to the secretariat</li> <li>2. Secretariat to check on the document to make sure all comments have been addressed.</li> <li>3. GN, ALMF and TMK to work on the short TOR.</li> </ol>	<p>Secretariat</p> <p>PV Secretariat</p> <p>GN, ALMF, TMK</p>
<p>6.0</p>	<p><b>6.0 Riparian Management Guidelines for Approval</b></p> <p>WS presented the revised version of the riparian management guideline based on the comments received from the WG members. The Secretariat had only received one comment and this has been reflected in the final version of the guideline.</p> <p>HK highlighted that they have submitted some comments, but it appears that their comments were not reflected in the final version of the guideline.</p> <p>The WG members have 2 weeks (by 9<sup>th</sup> of August 2016) to provide their final comments on the guidelines.</p> <p>Upon revision, the secretariat will circulate the changes to the WG members (via email) for final approval. The WG provisionally endorsed the guidelines.</p> <p>The WG will come up with a shorter, field guide, version of the guideline. The production of the short field guide will be led by SEARPP. The WG agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The field guide to be of maximum 10 pages long</li> <li>2. The cost of translation and design will be on the RSPO. SEARPP will facilitate the whole process.</li> <li>3. The expected timeline for completion is one-month after the signing of contract.</li> </ol> <p>GR requested a clarification from the secretariat whether attaching contributors' logos in the field guide is acceptable. The secretariat will confirm on this matter.</p> <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The secretariat to look for the comments made by Hutan and incorporate the comments into the guidelines.</li> <li>2. Secretariat to circulate the changes to the WG via email by</li> <li>3. SEARPP to send their proposal for the production of the short guideline by 5<sup>th</sup> of August 2016. The proposal will cover the cost involved.</li> <li>4. Secretariat to send the style guide to SEARPP for the design.</li> </ol>	<p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat GR, JL</p> <p>Secretariat</p>

Item	Description	Point Person
	<p>5. Secretariat to check whether it is possible to include logos of the contributors in the field guide.</p>	Secretariat
7.0	<p><b>7.0 Update on SHWG meeting</b></p> <p>WS presented the update on SHWG meeting on the compensation procedure for independent smallholders. PG, the co-chair of the SHWG was present at the session to brief the WG on the SHWG recommendations on the same.</p> <p>The WG has agreed to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disclosure of non-compliant land clearance and Land Use Change Analysis are required at the point of membership application. Secretariat will provide necessary support to the independent smallholders to meet this requirement.</li> <li>2. The purpose of the disclosure and LUCA is to collect data on the extent of independent smallholder’s impacts on deforestation.</li> </ol> <p>The WG has agreed to start conducting LUCAs for independent smallholders who are supported by the RSSF.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Independent smallholders who have developed land for oil palm between November 2005 to 2016 will be allowed to proceed with certification, with reference to C7.3, and these areas is certifiable, recognizing as well other requirements in the P&amp;C.</li> </ol> <p>AH agreed that the independent smallholders can be allowed to proceed with certification even if they have reported non-compliant land clearance. However, the liability identified from the LUCA on independent smallholder’s areas should not be ignored and the RSPO should discuss how to address these. GN agreed and proposed a formation of a small group to come up with a strategy on how to address the identified liability for the independent smallholder’s areas (floating liability).</p> <p>PG highlighted that the involvement of the BoG is important as the responsibility of ensuring this is implemented lies in the BoG. The WG agreed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Any identified liabilities will need to have compensation resolved through another process, to be mandated by the BoG, under the jurisdiction of the BHCVWG, which will involve opportunities for how end market users can participate in these compensations (a decision paper is required).</li> <li>5. A Task Force will be set up to decide how to accommodate Land Clearance post-2016 by independent smallholders. The Task Force consists of : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SH Grower – Rukaiyah Rafiq</li> <li>• SH ENGO – Cahyo Nugroho</li> <li>• BHCVWG Co-chairs – Ginny Ng (P&amp;T) and John Payne (ENGO)</li> <li>• SHWG Co-chairs – Marieke Leegwater (SNGO) and Perpetua George (P&amp;T)</li> <li>• Rest of the World – Ian Orell</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

Item	Description	Point Person
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BHCV Growers – Audrey Lee and Richard Kan</li> </ul> <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Secretariat to clarify to the CBs that, for independent smallholders, if there is any identified compensation liability, it will not preclude them from getting certified.</li> <li>2. Secretariat to prepare a decision paper to get the BoG’s mandate on a strategy to address the ‘floating liability’.</li> <li>3. Secretariat to send a formal notification to the members of the task force and prepare for the first meeting. There needs to be a split of online communication and physical meeting to accommodate everyone’s availability.</li> </ol> <p>On a related matter, ALMF requested for a clarification on the announcement made by the RSPO secretariat informing the members and CBs that an independent smallholder groups that do not have HCV assessments prior to the clearance need to go through the RaCP. The WG agreed that this will and have already caused confusions among members and CBs, and should be clarified.</p> <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Secretariat to clarify that independent smallholder groups that do not have HCV assessment prior to the clearance are not required to go through the RaCP up to the LUC analysis stage.</li> </ol>	<p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p>
<p><b>8.0</b></p>	<p><b>8.0 HCV assessments for smallholders expansion situation</b></p> <p>MS presented on HCV assessments for smallholder expansion to the WG.</p> <p>The tool needs to be adaptive enough recognizing the dynamic of independent smallholders. For example, in cases when the number of SH decrease or increase between the period of getting certified, how would the tool be used to address this scenario? MS responded that at network is currently looking at how to deal with scenarios such as these. They are thinking to put up an FAQ to compile the information.</p> <p>MS requested for the participation of two people from both the SHWG and BHCVWG. He recommended to have representatives from the grower’s side. AM and RK volunteered to represent the BHCVWG in the taskforce.</p>	
<p><b>9.0</b></p>	<p><b>9.0 Briefing from SENSOR: Smallholders, Soil Erosion and Nutrient Cycling</b></p> <p>At the last BHCVWG meeting, SEnSOR was requested to present their findings on studies related to soil erosion. JL presented SEnSOR’s findings on soil related studies which would be useful baseline to develop the tender for the soil management practices.</p> <p>In addition, ES presented a presentation of ‘Preserving Biodiversity-Ecosystem Functioning Relationships in Oil Palm Dominated Landscapes’.</p>	

Item	Description	Point Person
	<p>PV highlighted that, the findings to the studies are very useful, especially for the Latin American growers. ES mentioned that, at the moment, the studies are going through reviews and have not been published. Both SEnSOR and LOMBOK are planning to write a policy briefing document which incorporate the studies. The WG is looking at translating the document into several languages.</p> <p>GN raised a concern on the applicability of the studies as the data collection were mostly done in the SEA region. GR responded that some aspects of the studies are applicable globally.</p> <p>The WG will be considering to publish the studies in SPOTT, SEnSOR, or RSPO website and possibly in 'The Planters'. GN suggested to SEnSOR that they should come up with a summary of the studies and utilise these as recommendations for the revision of the P&amp;C.</p>	
10.0	<p><b>10.0 Discussion on appointment of compensation plan evaluator</b></p> <p>GN refreshed the WG members that at the last meeting, it was decided that there will be a pool of individual evaluators to minimise conflict of interest. The compensation panel will have to appoint the evaluator from the pool of evaluators for the compensation cases assigned to them.</p> <p>In addition to that, the TOR needs to be cleaned up. GN proposed to have a small group comprises of GR, JP, and LL to clean up the TOR.</p> <p><u>Term of Reference</u></p> <p>JP presented the revised version of the TOR. The TOR was revised to be shorter and referenced to the main procedure document. The objectives and scopes were revised based on the requirement stated in the current RaCP. In terms of expertise required, the small group has decided to include experience with Social HCVs and environmental economics.</p> <p>On Annex 1, the group proposes to translate this into a template. The template would allow the evaluator to provide comments on the items that they are evaluating. The comments should be no more than 150 words.</p> <p>LL and ALMF commented that the compensation plan template can be used as a reference to developing the compensation plan review template.</p> <p>PV and RK volunteered to help developing template.</p> <p>It is also highlighted by the small group that should the compensation plan is inconsistent with the concept note, the compensation plan will need to be sent back to the company for improvement.</p> <p>GN suggested for the WG members to review the TOR and provide comments (if any) to the small groups.</p>	

Item	Description	Point Person
	<p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The WG members to review the TOR and provide comments to the small group</li> <li>2. The small group to work on developing the template and report back to the WG by 27<sup>th</sup> August 2016.</li> </ol> <p>AR suggested to have this approved via email instead of presenting this at the next WG meeting for approval. The WG agreed, if any of the WG members did not reply within the specified timeline, it will be considered as consent from the members.</p> <p>Decision made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The endorsement of the template will be done via email.</li> </ol>	<p>WG</p> <p>JP, GR, LL</p>
<p><b>11.0</b></p>	<p><b>11.0 HCVRN Update</b></p> <p>PV provided an update on the HCVRN activities. On HCV ALS, the HCVRN is looking at merging the quality panel review and peer review for quality control. In addition to that, the HCVRN is planning to reduce the number of documents the assessors need to refer to, translating relevant documents, and improve the website to be more user friendly.</p> <p>At the moment, the HCVRN is concern with HCV assessments that are not satisfactory. PV requested for inputs from the WG on how to go about companies with failed HCV assessments.</p> <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. WG members to provide inputs on how to go about companies with failed HCV assessments in two weeks.</li> </ol> <p>PV informed the WG that the network is monitoring the quality of its licensed assessors and is removing assessors who could not deliver. ALMF is concern on how this removal process would affect the HCV assessment delivery. As the group is aware, there is a limited number of licensed assessors and the removing process would be affecting the delivery of the HCV assessments, especially in places like Latin America.</p> <p>PV responded that, at the moment, this is not a problem as the network has more assessors than needed. However, she stressed that, to be licensed, the applicant must complete an HCV training.</p> <p>The network is also looking at using the information on HCV areas from the submitted NPP and map these areas for monitoring purposes. The network will be extending this to map other existing areas that was identified before the existence of the HCV ALS.</p>	

Item	Description	Point Person
12.0	<p><b>12.0 NPP Comments</b></p> <p>GN presented on NPP comments which were the outcomes of the discussion among the grower members in the WG at the last BHCVWG.</p> <p>AR commented that the NPP comment period has already been closed and the BHCVWG meeting is not the right platform to discuss these comments. AH agreed and pointed out that the WG should only be commenting on biodiversity related issue in the NPP. The WG agreed to address the comments through another platform.</p>	
13.0	<p><b>13.0 RT 14</b></p> <p>WS presented an update on the RT14.</p> <p>The proposed theme for RT14 is ‘Learning to Live Together: From Vision to Transition’. There will be a prep-cluster for biodiversity in the RT 14. The title for the prep-cluster is still undecided.</p> <p>The WG has proposed the following topics (and speakers) to be discussed at RT 14:</p> <p>Moderator: John Payne  Topic 1: Sensor and Impacts by Jen Lucey  Topic 2: Riparian management guidelines and launching of the field guide document by Sarah Luke  Topic 3: HCV assessments for smallholders expansion by Mike Senior  Topic 4: Latin America experience (TBA)  Topic 5: Compensation Plan implementation by Olivier Tichit (KIV)</p> <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Secretariat to contact OT on topic 5.</li> </ol>	Secretariat
14.0	<p><b>14.0 INA HCV Management &amp; Monitoring</b></p> <p>GN informed the WG that this document was commission in 2008 and was completed in 2014 which was developed based on the Indonesian HCV toolkit (2008).</p> <p>The WG suggest that this document needs to be revised based on the latest Indonesia HCV toolkit. The WG also suggest for the secretariat to get the HCVRN to review this to make sure it reflects the same management and monitoring guidelines at a global level.</p>	
15.0	<p><b>15.0 SEIA Guidance</b></p> <p>WS presented on the SEIA guidance to the WG. The WG commented that the section on HCV is irrelevant and should be removed.</p> <p>The WG noted that there were minimal communications among the consultants and advise the RSPO to assist with the communication.</p>	

Item	Description	Point Person
	<p>There was a request to get Aidenvironment to present this at the next BHCVWG.</p> <p>Decision made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To get Aidenvironment to discuss their work with HCV RN to better align this piece of work with the smallholders HCV assessment work.</li> <li>2. To get Aidenvironment to be at the next BHCVWG to present the guidance</li> </ol> <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Secretariat to assist with the communications among the consultants, as well as getting the consultants to speak to HCVRN.</li> </ol>	Secretariat
16.0	<p><b>16.0 Joint Incentive Workshop Update</b></p> <p>GN presented on the joint incentive workshop update. There were still some work needed around the TOR and the group agreed to have a small task force to come up with the revised TOR.</p> <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The small task force (PV, AR, LL, OT) to come out with revised version of the TOR on the 10<sup>th</sup> of August 2016</li> <li>2. Secretariat to check with OT, MZ, DL (now CN) and FP if they are still interested to contribute to the task force</li> </ol>	PV, AR, LL, OT Secretariat
17.0	<p><b>17.0 RSPO M&amp;E</b></p> <p>OSC informed the WG that the RSPO is developing its own M&amp;E and are requesting the participation of RSPO members in completing a survey which was sent by a consultant hired by RSPO.</p> <p>OSC is also requesting the involvement of the BHCVWG members in the workshop that they are planning to have. The date is not confirmed yet, and OSC will send out a doodle poll to the confirmed participants.</p> <p>Decision made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. BL, AR (tentatively), CN, TMK and NaH will represent the BHCVWG in the M&amp;E workshop.</li> </ol> <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. OSC to send out a doodle pole on the date of the workshop to all participants.</li> </ol>	OSC
19.0	<p><b>19.0 Project 1 Proposal</b></p> <p>GN informed the WG that they have received the full proposal on Project 1. She requested for the WG members to look at it and provide some comments before endorsing it.</p>	

Item	Description	Point Person
	<p>ALMF commented that the project should also include medium sized companies instead of focusing only on big companies. The WG group agreed and proposed that the consortium should cover growers from the rest of the world as well.</p> <p>Since some of the members listed in the proposal are no longer representing their respective organisations, the WG requested the consortium to update their team composition.</p> <p>In addition to that, the timeline for delivery needs to be revised.</p> <p>On Section 3.2, ALMF highlighted that, instead of developing BMP, the consortium should look at developing and recommending solutions.</p> <p>The WG approved the project and requested the secretariat to proceed with the signing of the proposal after the above corrections have been made.</p> <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Secretariat to communicate the WG’s decision to the consortium</li> <li>2. Secretariat to proceed with the contract signing once the consortium has made the corrections to the proposal.</li> </ol>	<p>Secretariat Secretariat</p>
19.0	<p><b>19.0 AOB and closing meeting</b></p> <p>The next BHCVWG meeting will be on the 6<sup>th</sup> November 2016 (one day).</p> <p>The co-chairs thanked everyone for their contribution at this meeting.</p>	

ANNEX 1

**32<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of RSPO BHCVWG  
26<sup>th</sup> – 27<sup>th</sup> July 2016  
Capri by Fraser, Kuala Lumpur**

#	Name	Organisation	Signature (BHCV WG –26 <sup>th</sup> )	Signature (BHCV WG –27 <sup>th</sup> )
1	Adam Harrison	WWF Int		
2	Agus Purnomo	GAR		
3	Anders Lindhe Pawina Villalpando	HCV RN		
4	Anne Rosenbarger	WRI		
5	Audrey Lee	OLAM		
6	Cahyo Nugroho	Fauna and Flora International		
7	Cecep Saepulloh	Remark Asia		
8	Alindra Sintik	WWF MY		
9	Dwi Muhtaman	Remark Asia		
10	Gan Lian Tiong	Musim Mas		
11	Ginny Ng Siew Ling	WILMAR		
12	Glen Reynolds	SEARRP		
13	Harjinder Kler	HUTAN		
14	Henry Barlow	Independent		
15	John Payne	BORA		
16	Lanash Thanda	SEPA		
17	Lee Swee Yin	SIME		
18	Leonie Lawrance	ZSL		
19	Marcus Colchester	FPP		
20	Michael Brady	IFC		
21	Norazam Abd Hameed	FGV		
22	Olivier Tichit	SIPEF		

#	Name	Organisation	Signature (BHCV WG –26 <sup>th</sup> )	Signature (BHCV WG –27 <sup>th</sup> )
23	Richard Kan	GAR		
24	Simon Siburat	WILMAR		
25	Tang Men Kon	SIME		
26	Azmariah muhamad	FGV		
27	MICHAEL ZRUST	DAEMETEN		
28	Benjamin Loh	WWF- Malaysia		
29	ELEANOR SLADE	SEARRP		
30	Jean Lucery	SEARRP		
31	Qi Soo Chin	RSPO		