



TERMS OF REFERENCE

Reviewer for Drainability Assessment

1. Background

The RSPO Drainability Assessment (DA) procedure developed by the Peatland Working Group 2 (PLWG2) is applicable to all RSPO members with existing and/or future acquisitions of existing Oil Palm (OP) plantations on peat.

In line with the requirements of Indicator 7.7.5 of the 2018 Principles and Criteria (P&C) and the corresponding indicator(s) in future revisions of the standard, this procedure is to be conducted five (5) years prior to the replanting of existing oil palm planted peat area and will provide companies with the estimated time remaining (in years) before the drainage base (ground water level) is reached. The objective of this method is to provide companies with sufficient time to improve their peat management and/or phase out oil palm planting on peat. Apart from RSPO's methodology, companies can use other methods to conduct the DA, provided that the method has been reviewed and approved by the RSPO DA Review Panel and PLWG2 prior to conducting the drainability assessment.

2. Scope of Work

To conduct a desktop review of the RSPO member's DA report prepared using RSPO's DA procedure by providing recommendations on the report in compliance with Indicator 7.7.5 of the 2018 RSPO P&C and the corresponding indicator(s) in future revisions of the standard.

This service shall continue as long as interested by the reviewer or based on performance review (if needed) by the PLWG2.

3. Expected Outputs

- a. To share findings from the desktop review following RSPO's DA review template, which the RSPO Secretariat will provide along with the DA report. The reviewer(s) are expected to be capable of determining the following:
 - whether replanting is allowed or not based on the DLT calculations.
 - If additional paludiculture or rehabilitation plans are needed.
- b. To share findings from the desktop review within 30 working days of receiving the DA report.

4. Role of RSPO Secretariat

The RSPO Secretariat will conduct a pre-review of the DA report to ensure the data/information that is required to undertake a full review is available in the DA report before sending it to the reviewer(s).

5. Reviewer's requirements

- Knowledgeable in survey, GIS and mapping technologies relating to oil palm plantations, particularly associated with peat soil.
- Proficient in hydrology and drainage engineering, and peatland ecology in oil palm plantations.
- Ability to assess the following:
 - Accuracy and sufficiency of field measurements.
 - Quality of peat thickness, elevation, and water level data.
 - Appropriateness of default values vs field-collected data.
 - Correct application of safeguard thresholds (e.g. 40 years before reaching Natural Drainage Limit).
- Good understanding of the RSPO Drainability Assessment Procedure, including calculation of Drainage Limit Time (DLT), estimating peat subsidence rates, measuring water elevation at final outlets, and the delineating drainage zones and replanting areas.
- Knowledge and experiences of other RSPO requirements, especially on the RSPO Principles & Criteria and the RSPO Best Management Practices (BMPs) for peatland management and rehabilitation, will be helpful but not necessary.

6. Nominal Fee

Each pair of reviewers will be handling one case of the DA report, in which each case may have more than one cycle of review between the grower and reviewer. A nominal fee, determined by the RSPO Secretariat, will be provided to the reviewer upon completion of the review, on a per-case basis.

7. Avoiding conflict of Interest

- I. Prior to each evaluation, the reviewer will need to assure the RSPO Secretariat that they are independent and have no conflicts of interest (including no commercial relations in the past 3 years) with the RSPO member who submitted the DA report(s).
- II. The evaluator is required to report any attempts of contact made by the grower who submitted the report.

8. Timeline

The service shall be performed on a case-by-case basis which is valid from the time of signing the disclosure of conflict of interest between the grower's company and the reviewer until the completion of the review unless agreed otherwise among the review panel.