

MINUTES OF MEETING **6th JA-BHCV SUBGROUP MEETING (VIRTUAL)**

Date : 06 November 2023 (Friday) 4:00pm to 5:30pm (MYT)

<p><u>Attendance:</u></p> <p><u>Subgroup members (JA)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Marcus Colchester (FPP) 2. Silvia Irawan (Kaleka) 3. Lee Kuan Chun (P&G) <p><u>Subgroup members (BHCV)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Michelle Desilets (Orangutan Land Trust) 5. Lim Sian Choo (Bumitama) <p><u>RSPO Secretariat</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Daniel Liew 7. Lydia Tan 8. Javin Tan <p><u>Invitees</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Neville Kemp (HCVN) 	<p><u>Absent with Apologies</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eleanor Spencer (Zoological Society London) 2. Rob Nicholls (Musim Mas) 3. Sander van den Ende (SIPEF) 4. Max Donysius (WWF Malaysia)
---	--

Agenda

6th JA-BHCV subgroup meeting

Date - 06 November 2023, Monday

Venue - Video-conferencing

Item	Time (MYT)	Duration (minutes)	Agenda	P.I.C
1 - Subgroup admin matters	1600 - 1605	5	1.1 - Opening and admin matters	Daniel HCVN HCVN
2 - Jurisdictional HCV-HCS screening tool	1605 - 1610	5	2.1 - Intro and recap from October meeting	
	1610 - 1640	30	2.2 - Screening methodology options	
	1640 - 1700	20	2.3 - Q & A	
	1700 - 1710	10	2.4 - Next steps	
3 - Others	1710 - 1715	5	3.1 - Any other business	

Minutes of Meeting:

Item	Description	Action
1	<p>Opening and admin matters</p> <p>The meeting started at 4:09 pm Malaysian time, the Secretariat welcomed back subgroup members.</p> <p>The Secretariat ran through the RSPO anti-trust guidelines and Chatham House Rules. With there being no conflict of interests declared by members, the meeting continued.</p> <p>The Secretariat shared subgroup meeting minutes of Oct 2022, it was adopted by the members.</p> <p>For the minutes of meeting on 06 Oct 2023, a member pointed out that the paragraph in page 3 relating to the applicability in NPP of HCV-HCS map from the proposed HCVN process is misleading. It could be misunderstood that “indicative” HCV-HCS maps could be used for NPP when in fact a full detailed assessment is needed.</p> <p>HCVN explained that to be used in NPP, the HCV-HCS maps do need to have gone through field validation and quality evaluation process (tier-2 of the process flow diagram).</p> <p>The Secretariat would revised the minutes of the Oct 2023 meeting to be tabled for adoption in next subgroup meeting.</p>	
2	<p>Recap of Oct23 meeting</p> <p>The Secretariat recapped the following points discussed in Oct23 :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCV-HCS screening and quality evaluation process • Targeted field validation and QE process • Different levels of field work based on priority of areas and quality of data • Use of the field validated and quality evaluated HCV-HCS data for spatial planning and identification of NO-GO zone • Practicality of jurisdictional screening for HCV5-6, if it can be done at all <p>Screening methodology</p> <p>The explanation / discussion started with the process flow diagram. HCVN explained that HCV-HCS screening will produce priority maps. The priority maps would show where and what needs to be done for targeted field validation of HCV-HCS data.</p> <p>It is possible to conduct targeted field validation at sub-jurisdiction level. The validated HCV-HCS data has to go through quality evaluation process. Field validated and quality assured HCV-HCS data could then be used as the HCV-HCS maps for the area which the field validation covers.</p>	

	<p>HCVN is agreeable to field validation being conducted at sub-jurisdictional level (smaller, more manageable areas) as it is the jurisdiction's right to do so. However, it HCVN recommends conducting it for cluster of villages or at sub-district level ("kecamatan" in Indonesia).</p> <p>The Secretariat added that although disaggregation of different HCV categories is possible, but the field validation work for ALL HCV categories 1 to 6 and HCS must be completed and quality assured before a jurisdiction could use the HCV-HCS maps, possibly covering only sub-jurisdiction, for integrated conservation and development planning.</p> <p>The discussion then focused on NPP. A subgroup member was of the opinion that completion of tier-2 of the process flow diagram only establishes No-Go areas (HCV-HCS areas), it does not say anything about the Go areas which is what NPP is about. It is only after completing tier-4 (i.e. Step 3 – Implementation of the Stepwise Approach) would a jurisdiction have sufficient information for implementing NPP and know where to plan / develop.</p> <p>HCVN, on the other hand, felt that as a company it does not require jurisdictional spatial planning before it can develop. Jurisdictional spatial planning is only required for long term protection for the jurisdiction.</p> <p>Both the subgroup member and HCVN agreed that HCVN's involvement stops at tier-2 of the process flow, after HCV-HCS areas are established for a jurisdiction.</p> <p>Another member asked about the applicability of HCV4-6 which would be at high level screening and that with quality evaluation (tier-2 in the process flow), are we accepting the high level HCV4-6 data and the resultant "indicative" HCV-HCS maps for decision making process ?</p> <p>HCVN explained that a jurisdiction can initiate a jurisdictional HCV-HCS screening process, the resultant screening data would guide subsequent targeted field validation work (the "where" and "level of effort"). The field validated HCV-HCS data that has been quality evaluated could be used as the HCV-HCS map for the jurisdiction, or for sub-jurisdiction, if the jurisdiction decides to carve itself into smaller more manageable units for field validation.</p> <p>The jurisdiction can sub-divide itself based on its own decision or based on individual companies' plan / interests to develop.</p> <p>The member added that based on the proposed process flow, four types of maps would be produced : screening ,ap, indicative, quality assured HCV-HCS maps and one that is by the government. He felt that the process is complicated and needs to be simplified.</p> <p>HCVN explained that the screening data is necessary to help focus targeted validation efforts. Field level assessment is still needed, and the level of effort needed is based on the quality of screening data.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>A member pointed out the need to consider funding of the screening / mapping exercise, whether it would be funded by govt and if govt could afford to do so. She is concerned that adding layers of processes would add on to the costs, versus the normal mapping process at grower's level.</p> <p>HCVN explained that screening is useful as a planning tool to give information to jurisdiction on the scale that they could tackle – resources vs work to be done.</p> <p>HCVN highlighted that the work of HCV-HCS process finishes at tier-2 of the process flow. Other considerations like protection of non-HCV-HCS areas, developments of national importance are beyond the scope of HCV-HCS and any loss resulting from those other considerations might go into an RaCP process.</p> <p>HCVN also stressed that spatial planning (tier-4 of process flow) is completely out of HCVN's hands. Its only role in this is to provide the basic No-Go data that informs the development of spatial plan for jurisdictions.</p> <p>A member brought up the scenario of areas that have been mostly developed in the context of mapping. HCVN explained that in such scenario screening data would likely show absence of HCV1-4 and additional work needed would only be to determine remnants of HCV5-6 in the areas (if any) for protection. In this case, work could be relatively easy for jurisdictions concerned.</p> <p>The Secretariat asked about where LUCA and RaCP and where in the process flow will fit in. HCVN explained that information from the field validated and quality assured HCV-HCS map (at the completion of tier-2) could be used for the LUCA and RaCP processes.</p> <p>To the question about persons responsible for conducting the screening quality assurance (tier-1), HCVN replied that few options are provided in the proposed manual which includes HCVN, HCSA, associate professionals of HCVN and HCSA, technical organisations within JE that have been trained etc (details in proposed manual).</p> <p>HCVN also added that once the jurisdiction's (or sub-jurisdiction's) field validated data has been quality assured, new development / certification by companies / producers could proceed with LUCA or NPP processes without having to do another management unit level ALS assessment.</p> <p>A subgroup member pointed out his concerns that even with targeted field validation (tier-2), it would still be sampling and would not provide the full information needed for decision on conversion (the "Go" zone). In response, HCVN clarified that targeted validation does not mean sampling. And depending on the priority and quality of screening data, it could still require a full assessment of HCVs, especially more likely for HCV4-6 and HCS.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>HCVN reiterated that the SOP was intended to direct the JE towards necessary detailed field work, based on quality evaluated screening data from previous process.</p> <p>A member also commented that while he does not disagree with the process, the naming of the maps at different stages of the process flow must be improved to clearly represent the quality and coverage of those maps.</p> <p>In order to finalise the direction of the proposed jurisdictional screening tool for HCVN to continue with its development, the Secretariat suggested the members send in questions and feedback which could be addressed by HCVN and the Secretariat. A member also suggested, if possible, field testing for procedures as proposed in the first draft to check its applicability on the ground.</p> <p>A member commented that the work to get details at jurisdictional scale, especially for HCV4-6, would be overwhelming for jurisdictions. He suggested that the work be focused on getting the indicative map to identify the No-Go areas. And if there's any development interests in the Go areas, a full assessment should then be conducted. This is consistent with the original concept in the RSPO Piloting Framework document.</p> <p>The Secretariat reminded members of the sub-jurisdiction / bite-size areas discussed with HCVN that are more manageable for detailed field work and the member pointed out that, in essence, would be similar to management unit scale as mentioned in the point above.</p> <p>The member added that despite going back to the existing system of management unit level detailed assessment for HCV4-6, the screening process is still useful as it would have identify No-Go areas and thereby significantly reduce areas needing detailed assessment.</p> <p>The meeting adjourned at 5:42 pm Malaysia time.</p>	