
**The BHCVWG response to the
recommendations from the
Independent Review of the RSPO
Remediation and Compensation
Procedure (RaCP) 2015**

Document Title : The BHCVWG response to the recommendations from the Independent
Review of the RSPO Remediation and Compensation Procedure (RaCP)
2015

RSPO contact : rspocompensation@rspo.org



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	5
Introduction	6
Response to the Independent Review	7



ACRONYMS

BHCV	Biodiversity and HCV
FCL	Final conservation liability
FPIC	Free, prior, and informed consent
HCV	High Conservation Value
LUCA	Land Use Change Analysis
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
RaCP	Remediation and Compensation Procedure
RSPO	Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil

Acknowledgements

The review was undertaken by Dr. Helen Newing, an independent consultant with over twenty-five years' experience in international environment and development issues, particularly in relation to tropical forests. The BHCVWG would like to thank Dr. Helen Newing for providing an objective assessment and examining the issues around the implementation carefully; and express gratitude to the stakeholders who were interviewed in the process and contributed to the review.

Introduction

In November 2015, the Board of Governors of the RSPO endorsed a Remediation and Compensation Procedure (RaCP) related to land clearance since 2005 without prior High Conservation Value (HCV) assessment. By means of the Procedure growers should calculate social and environmental liability and then develop and implement a plan for appropriate remediation and compensation. The implementation of the RaCP is overseen by the RSPO Biodiversity and High Conservation Values Working Group (BHCVWG), a multi-stakeholder committee, which has set up Compensation Panels to provide oversight of companies' implementation of the RaCP.

When the RaCP was adopted in 2015, it was agreed that an Implementation Review should be carried out. This decision was affirmed by the Board of Governors in 2015¹ and reaffirmed in a members Resolution at the General Assembly in 2016².

The BHCVWG commissioned an independent review of the RSPO Remediation and Compensation Procedure (2015) (RaCP) implementation in 2020. The overall scope of the review was to provide an objective assessment of its implementation, evaluate progress, assess effectiveness of the procedure, and develop recommendations on how RaCP can be further improved.

The review has the four main objectives of:

1. Independently checking the status of RaCP implementation and identifying the reasons for delays and shortcomings,
2. Assess the two-existing approved RaCP projects and those in the pipeline,
3. Identifying stakeholder concerns with the process and review the effectiveness of the procedure in the light of these concerns, and
4. Making recommendations on how to improve the process, bearing in mind the 2018 P&C and RSPO's mission and objectives.

The review should assess the extent to which the RaCP and associated requirements is:

- Preventing members from further clearing of land without HCV assessment(s).
- Disincentivizing non-members of clearing in the future and paying compensation.
- Ensuring the quality of conservation projects coming forward and assessing whether they are sufficient to deliver compensation required for both social & environmental liabilities.
- Enhancing the credibility of RSPO/CSPO and assessing whether RSPO's mission and objectives have been weakened or strengthened by the adoption and implementation of the RaCP.
- Monitoring whether the conservation liability of US\$ 2,500 per hectare, is adequate for achieving the required additionality and long-term conservation or otherwise.

The review report provided findings and recommendations addressing the above.

The BHCVWG and the RSPO Secretariat have already started working on some of the recommendations prior and during the review. A systematic and structured work plan has been developed by the Secretariat based on the recommendations that have been reviewed and discussed by the BHCVWG.

¹ <https://rspo.org/publications/download/8e35b921d2226b2>

² <https://ga.rspo.org/ga13/Resolutions/ResolutionGA13-6d.pdf>

Response to the Independent Review

The Review provided a roadmap for the improvements and revision to the RaCP. The roadmap is divided into 3 stages. The specific responses to the recommendations are provided in the following pages (indicated in blue font). For Stage 1.1, the indicative timelines for the priority action listing is explained in the box below:

Priority action indicative timelines

High – Actions to be undertaken in the timespan of Q2 to Q3 of 2021 (calendar year)³

Medium – Actions to be initiated in Q3 2021

Low – Actions that would be undertaken after publication of the revised Procedure and/or after the High and Medium actions have been initiated or completed.

Note: Feasibility studies would be conducted in phases, and may run concurrently with some of the high and medium priority action items listed in Stage 1.1.

Stage 1

1.1 Implementation of stopgap measures: These recommendations relate to measures that would address some immediate weaknesses in current procedures while a more substantial overhaul is undertaken. Most are minor administrative tasks. There are also slightly more substantial recommendations relating to monitoring and social liability (the two aspects of the RaCP that are weakest) and these have been marked as priorities.

The following measures are currently in process and need to be continued / completed:

Measures	Description	Response	Priority
Staffing at RSPO Secretariat	Monitoring and adjustment of staffing levels in order to catch up with the backlog of cases, improve turnaround times for new submissions, complete the population of the RaCP database and publish case summaries in order to introduce a degree of transparency	<p>The scope and scale of RSPO's work has expanded considerably since its inception in 2004. However, resourcing of staff headcount occurred at a much slower pace. At the end of 2020, the RSPO Secretariat has undergone a review and restructuring process under the purview of the new CEO.</p> <p>The RSPO Secretariat has developed a 5-year operational plan (2021 – 2025) that would look at scaling up the Secretariat capacity to meet the demands of servicing its members.</p> <p>The RSPO Secretariat has also been working to enhance the database management system and will launch an improved reporting page on</p>	High

³ The capital investment in headcounts and onboarding process for new hires may take longer than projected due to Covid-19 restrictions.

Measures	Description	Response	Priority
		RSPO.org to display case summaries by March 2021.	
Data management	Development of procedures to enable efficient data management, including cross-referencing within the RaCP database and between the RaCP and other RSPO processes.	<p>Ahead of the review, the RSPO Secretariat has started developing a digitised database management system since September 2019 (refer to report finding on footnote 2 page 11).</p> <p>It is agreed that there needs to be more efficient and integrated data management within RSPO.</p> <p>The RSPO Secretariat will continue its work on identifying data management gaps, digitising information, improving back-end systems and integrating data systems where possible.</p>	Ongoing work by the Secretariat

Additional potential stopgap measures are as follows

Measures	Description	Response	Priority
Documentation and information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Edit the disclosure note template (a draft is included in Annex 3 to this report). Introduce a cover page to the disclosure note requiring details of subsidiary companies, mills, management units and estates that are included. A draft is included in Annex 3 to this report. 	<p>The RSPO Secretariat started requesting for the information on subsidiary companies, mills, management units, and estates during the disclosure stage on an ad hoc basis ahead of the review, and more systematically during the improvement of the database management systems in 2020. In addition, the Secretariat has also launched an online submission functionality for the disclosure form that requests for the information in a more systematic manner.</p> <p>The draft disclosure note provided in Annex 3 of the review report would be reviewed and improvements to the template would be made.</p>	Ongoing work by the Secretariat
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove outdated guidance on the LUCA from the main annexes to the RaCP and revise titles of remaining LUCA-related annex so that it is immediately obviously what each one is for. 	<p>The revision of the RSPO RaCP (2015) and its ancillary documents / templates would be guided by the recommendations of the review.</p> <p>The work on revising the Procedure would resume mid-2021 (subject to the RSPO restructuring and transition process) and the drafts of</p>	Medium

Measures	Description	Response	Priority
		the revised Procedure and ancillary documents/templates would be subject to public consultation. Once subsequently approved by the RSPO Standards Standing Committee and/or the RSPO Board of Governors, revised versions will be made publicly accessible through RSPO.org.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add information on the fee for the Plan to a prominent position on the RaCP web page. 	The RSPO Secretariat would review and improve the content on RSPO.org in Q2 of 2021.	High
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that all social liability reports undergo quality assurance 	Protocols to check future submission of the social liability of HCVs 4 to 6 to be developed. The RSPO Secretariat would work with a focused group from the BHCVWG to develop the protocol. Independent expert advice would be sought (where necessary). The development of the protocol would also be cross-referenced to the RSPO FPIC guide.	High
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Send a reminder to growers and auditors of the requirements related to timing of remediation measures in relation to planting cycles. Send a reminder to growers that environmental remediation is to do with measures that are needed in order to restore the site to a condition that meets the standard RSPO P&C and cannot be included as part of conservation compensation (although the two may also involve similar ecological restoration measures). Set up an FAQ page on the website where these two reminders can be posted for ongoing reference, along with future points as they arise. 	The RSPO Secretariat would review and improve the content on RSPO.org in Q2 of 2021.	High

Compensation panels and review process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Give compensation panel members and external reviewers access to full documentation of each case they review. 	<p>The RSPO Secretariat will continue to provide the access to the documentations required for the review of the cases. The Secretariat will reach out to growers should more information be required.</p> <p>The RSPO Secretariat currently checks that the key information such as the Final Conservation Liability (FCL) and the environmental remediation areas from the LUCA review reports tallies with the concept note, compensation and remediation plan prior to preparing the review package.</p>	Ongoing work by the Secretariat
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide induction training to new compensation panel members. 	<p>The RSPO Secretariat will work with the BHCVWG to develop an induction mechanism for new Compensation Panel members.</p> <p>In addition, there will be consideration to develop means to document and share a consolidated record of the decisions made for the review of concept notes, which can be made readily accessible to all Panels to ensure consistency and acts as a frame of reference for future decisions.</p>	Medium
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruit social experts to compensation panels and as external reviewers. 	<p>The recruitment of more social experts to join RSPO is an organisational priority.</p>	High
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce a basic screening step by the Secretariat to ensure that all the necessary documents are attached before sending to reviewers. 	<p>The RSPO Secretariat currently checks that all documentations are available and that key information such as the Final Conservation Liability (FCL) and the environmental remediation areas from the LUCA review reports tallies with the concept note, compensation and remediation plan prior to preparing the review package.</p> <p>The RSPO Secretariat is undertaking an interim measure to provide technical review support to check on completeness and content accuracy.</p>	Ongoing work by the Secretariat
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the revision process will take more than a year, introduce supplementary fees and reviewer 	<p>The BHCVWG acknowledge this feedback and the challenges of the evaluation process whereby there are subsequent multiple revisions</p>	Refer to action to revise the Procedure.

	payments for resubmissions.	<p>with major changes submitted for evaluation until the plan is satisfactory, and/or protracted time between submission of revisions, which may incur more man-days than prescribed.</p> <p>This recommendation would be discussed in more depth as part of the revision of the Procedure to improve the mechanism.</p> <p>There are several interim measures taken by the RSPO Secretariat at the moment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide technical review support to check on completeness and content accuracy • Provide follow-up reminders to the companies. 	
Monitoring reports	Call for monitoring reports on implementation of all approved Plans to be submitted within the next six months.	<p>The BHCVWG agrees with the need to call for monitoring reports on implementation of all approved Plans to be submitted within the next six months.</p> <p>The current reporting deadline is based on the annual project activity year, with the start date of when the plan is approved by the RSPO. There is no established single reporting deadline at the moment, and compensation plans that have been approved would be at various stages of implementation, with some projects just starting out and some projects have been implemented for a longer period.</p> <p>In view of the above, the BHCVWG will consider the following in the immediate reporting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a simpler template for the projects that have yet to reach the one year implementation with the aim to provide updates on progress (focusing on operations/ administration of the project); • Projects that have run over 1 year implementation to submit 	High

		<p>reports using the Annex 9 reporting template.</p> <p>The BHCVWG and the RSPO Secretariat would conduct feasibility into introducing a single reporting deadline with the goal of creating a more effective and efficient avenue of tracking progress over time. The study would look into the potential impact introducing a single reporting deadline, potential annual deadlines, and the practical and resource implications for members and the Secretariat.</p>	Medium
--	--	---	--------

1.2 Revision and rationalisation of the overall procedure

- Undertake a feasibility study on the economic implications of moving all technical aspects of the RaCP (both environmental and social) in-house to the Secretariat.

In the current workflow of the RaCP, the Secretariat provides the secretarial support managing administrative duties such as processing case submissions, answering queries, coordinating reviews with LUCA reviewers, Compensation Panel members and the Compensation Plan evaluators. The more complex technical work are backfilled by LUCA reviewers with specialist remote sensing and GIS expertise, and the Compensation Panel and Compensation Plan evaluators who have industry, environmental and/or social knowledge to assess environmental remediation and compensation project proposals⁴.

Both the BHCVWG and RSPO Secretariat have taken some steps towards addressing bottlenecks within the RaCP as reported in the review findings and have contributed to the increased rate of completed RaCP cases. The steps included moving the responsibility for the review of the LUCAs to the Secretariat. In relation to compensation panels, a quorum system is used in which only a minimum number of members including at least one NGO and one grower are required to comment on a case, provided there are no objections to the feedback, before comments are returned to the grower. In addition, the Secretariat has started providing technical review support to check on completeness and content accuracy before submitting the submission to reviewers.

The BHCVWG agrees to the recommendation to undertake a feasibility study to determine the economic and technical implication of moving the aspects of technical reviews in-house to the Secretariat. The feasibility study shall include the following considerations:

- Examine roles of the Secretariat and the parties involved in technical reviews
- Evaluate which roles can be shifted to the Secretariat and/or retained outside the Secretariat (assurance of quality and independence).
- Assess the technical and resource implications (e.g. cost-benefit analyses of recruiting technical expertise – remote sensing/GIS, environmental and social - and the creation of

⁴ Unlike the LUCA reviewers and Compensation Plan evaluators, the Compensation Panel members work purely on voluntary basis and would have to sift through documentations to conduct reviews (refer to the review report page 13)

new roles required to avoid future backlogs where new activities are added to the regular work of current capacity)

- Develop a new outline of the procedural steps. If technical aspects can be moved in-house, the procedure could be simplified as in the box below. If not, a less substantial revision of the overall procedure will be possible.

Some recommendations for new outline procedure if technical aspects can be moved in-house to the RSPO Secretariat

- The grower submits a disclosure note containing only information that is essential in order for the Secretariat to proceed with the LUCA and make a call on whether a full social liability assessment is required.
- The Secretariat carries out the LUCA and notifies the company of the results. The company can then either accept the results or provide comments and clarifications.
- The company then completes a social liability report (if required), based on community engagement and an FPIC process. The report outlines social liability. It may be an option also to report agreed social remediation and compensation measures at this stage where evidence can be provided of FPIC. Effective, practical guidance needs to be developed for this process and its evaluation.
- In cases where the final conservation liability is below a threshold value and there is no outstanding social liability, the remaining steps may be waived or involve only a light-touch approach (setting out measures for environmental remediation).
- The company submits a simplified concept note briefly outlining the proposed environmental remediation, outstanding social remediation and compensation, and conservation compensation measures. Companies who have already successfully completed the RaCP could have the option to bypass this step.
- The concept note is evaluated by Secretariat staff, who provide guidance if it does not meet a set of basic requirements.
- The full Remediation and Compensation Plan is then submitted for evaluation by Secretariat technical staff and then by Compensation Panels.
- In cases where the final conservation liability is below a threshold value, there is no outstanding social liability following completion of the social liability report, or where conservation payment is by means of payment to an RaCP-approved project, a simplified Plan will be sufficient.

Improvement of RSPO Secretariat staffing is a high priority to ensure that the administrative tasks are adequately resourced to address current backlogged cases and to prevent future backlog. The recommendation above would be reviewed subsequently in the feasibility study to determine the economic and technical implication of moving the aspects of technical reviews in-house to the Secretariat have been conducted and during the work on revising the Procedure would resume mid-2021 (subject to the RSPO restructuring and transition process). Drafts of the revised Procedure and ancillary documents / templates would be subject to public consultation. Once subsequently approved by the RSPO Standards Standing Committee and/or the RSPO Board of Governors, revised versions will be made publicly accessible through RSPO.org

The BHCVWG acknowledges the review findings that none of the steps in the Procedure are redundant but there is considerable potential for simplification and improvement of all steps and several gaps and weaknesses in continuity need to be addressed, especially in relation to social liability.

1.3 Development of clear, practical guidance on social liability, remediation and compensation.

Clear guidance and protocols on social aspects of the RaCP is needed as a matter of urgency and I am recommending that it be developed in parallel with the above steps. It will involve the following:

- Development of guidance on social liability assessments
- Revision of the social liability report template and development of a protocol for its evaluation
- Recommendations for full and effective integration of measures on social liability into the overall Procedure, including in relation to conservation compensation projects

As outlined in the response of Section 1.1, the BHCVWG and the RSPO Secretariat would work on reviewing and revising the social liability report template and developing the necessary protocols to check future submission of the social liability of HCVs 4 to 6. The RSPO Secretariat would work with a focused group from the BHCVWG to develop the protocol and/or guidance on social liability assessments. Independent expert advice would be sought (where necessary). The development of the protocol would also be cross-referenced to the RSPO FPIC guide.

1.4 Development of a mechanism to invite conservation project proposals from external organisations and build up a portfolio of approved projects. Companies could then choose to make liability payments to one of the approved projects rather than setting up or seeking a project independently.

The mechanism could be similar process to that used by many Foundations, involving a set application form, a technical review of proposals and then approval or non-approval by the Working Group. The workload and technical requirements for growers would be greatly reduced, because they could simply name the recipient project, state the amount to be donated, and include a schedule of payments. The project itself would need to confirm these arrangements and could provide monitoring reports either to the company or directly to the RaCP (corresponding to all donations received, which may be from multiple companies). However, the Secretariat and / or Working Group would need to assess the projects rigorously prior to their inclusion in the portfolio. One key question is whether this would involve more or less work for the Secretariat / Working Group than assessing projects for each RaCP case separately.

The BHCVWG sees the merit in this recommendation particularly for the smaller FCLs that would create better impact if consolidated into a larger project. The revision of the Procedure would explore this recommendation more in-depth and assess the potential threshold FCL that can be established for this pathway.

This recommendation has regulatory implications and the operations of the RSPO Secretariat. Thus, a feasibility study into evaluating the risks, resourcing and regulatory implications of the Secretariat to set up and operate the proposed mechanism would be necessary.

Stage 2 Detailed revision of procedures and guidance

2.1 Revision of detailed criteria, requirements and procedures. Recommendations are made for revisions related to the different steps and topics covered by the RaCP, to be decided upon once the overall outline for the revised procedure is agreed upon. Recommendations are also made for measures to improve overall timeliness and in relation to potential negative impacts of the RaCP on the RSPO membership and mission. I have indicated which of these require a policy decision by the Working Group, which involve administrative tasks that can be carried out by the Secretariat alone, and which involve both. In this section, items are marked as requiring policy decisions, purely administrative revisions, or both. They are not in any particular order.

Items	Description	Type of Revision
Conservation liability matrix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce a threshold value below which liability is either waived or else standardised at a fixed minimum payment. • Combine the middle two vegetation coefficients (0.4 and 0.7), or else introduce a default option to use the higher figure where there are difficulties in distinguishing between them. • Consider removing the different liability rates for members and non-members, which appears to be acting as a disincentive for RSPO membership. • Introduce a set of graduated sanctions in place of immediate expulsion of RSPO members who have cleared forest without an HCV assessment since 2014. Suggested sanctions included fines, formal warnings with time limits for attaining compliance; 'red flag' indications on the RSPO website, and expulsion as a last resort. • Set a timetable for review of the US\$2,500/ha liability rate, to be preceded by a desk-based study of the available literature on area-based costs of conservation. 	Policy decision
Land Use Change Analysis (LUCA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce a limit on the level of resolution that is required in LUCAs (in other words a minimum size for patches that need to be identified where satellite images are unclear). • If LUCAs are to be conducted in-house [by the RSPO Secretariat], define what information needs to be included in the disclosure note by the company and what information should be included in the LUCA report prepared by the Secretariat. 	Policy decision
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design templates accordingly and develop procedure for company acceptance or appeal. 	Administrative
Environmental remediation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the guidance and relevant templates state explicitly that environmental remediation is to do with measures that are needed in order to restore the site to a condition that meets the standard RSPO P&C and cannot be included as part of conservation compensation (although the two may also involve similar ecological restoration measures). 	Administrative – RSPO Secretariat
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add guidance on the relationship between environmental remediation and FPIC (especially in relation to smallholders). 	Policy decision / Administrative
Conservation compensation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split the table on environmental remediation and social liability into its two component parts in order to ensure that each is addressed in its own right. • Provide different templates for on-site and off-site compensation projects. 	Administrative

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For on-site projects, consider adding text giving guidance on landscape connectivity 	Policy decision / Administrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add an option for growers to fulfil conservation compensation requirements by donating to an RaCP-approved project. They could then submit a simplified Plan. 	Policy decision
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to the criteria for compensation projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add measures on leakage to the criteria for additionality. Clarify the criteria for ‘knowledge-based’ to make it clearer exactly what is required. Revise the guidance on equity and prioritise this criterion in socialisation and training. Consider broadening the criteria to include non-area-based conservation compensation projects (for example, those that focus principally on addressing drivers of forest loss and HCV destruction). 	Policy decision / Administrative
Measures to improve overall timeliness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publish target turnaround times for processing of all submissions by the RSPO Secretariat. Monitor performance and adjust staffing and procedures as necessary. 	Policy decision / Administrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce target turnaround times and cut-off dates for submission of documents by growers, and also default procedures and / or sanctions to be applied where these are not met. Introduce a set policy on the transition time between notification of changes to procedures and full mandatory compliance. For major changes, where appropriate, include provision for staged implementation that allows minor adjustments to be made after an initial trial period. 	Policy decision
Impact of the RaCP on RSPO membership and on the RSPO mission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the requirements on the stage at which RaCP growers are eligible for new membership, for auditing and for certification 	Policy decision
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If it is not already in place, develop a simple exit questionnaire for members who leave the RSPO, and a follow-up questionnaire to growers who enquire about membership but don’t decide to join. 	Administrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce mechanisms to ensure consistency and transparency in decision-making across Compensation Panels, and to produce a consolidated record of decisions made that is readily accessible to members can act as a frame of reference for future decisions 	Administrative – BHCVWG / RSPO Secretariat
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seek to further increase the number of social NGOs who participate in the Biodiversity and HCV Working Group and Compensation Panels 	Policy decision / Administrative

2.2 Development of new, integrated guidance. This is presented as a separate step, which will involve checking through the various documents and revisions to ensure consistency and efficiency.

The BHCVWG acknowledges the recommendations provided by the review on Stage 2. Some of the administrative actions can be undertaken in tandem with measures listed in Stage 1.1., while some of the items outlined to be discussed during the work on revising the Procedure would resume mid-2021 (subject to the RSPO restructuring and transition process). Drafts of the revised Procedure and ancillary documents / templates would be subject to public consultation. Once subsequently approved by the RSPO Standards Standing Committee and/or the RSPO Board of Governors, revised versions will be made publicly accessible through RSPO.org

The BHCVWG wishes to highlight the following with regards to some of the review recommendations

- Conservation liability matrix - Introduce a threshold value below where liability is either waived or else standardised at a fixed minimum payment.

The current Procedure has outlined two (2) options for the calculation of liability (page 10, RaCP (2015)):

- Compensate the total cleared area using coefficient 1 (see Table 1) without conducting a LUC analysis; or
 - Conduct a LUC analysis relating to all individual cases of land clearance since November 2005 without prior HCV assessment.
- Conservation liability matrix - Combine the middle two vegetation coefficients (0.4 and 0.7), or else introduce a default option to use the higher figure where there are difficulties in distinguishing between them.

The current Procedure has also provided the guidance related to this matter (page 11, RaCP (2015)):

- Classification of the vegetation into the coefficient categories will be based on satellite imagery analysis and supplementary documentary evidence. Where such evidence is not available and the satellite imagery is not distinctive, the higher coefficient category is to be selected, in line with the precautionary principle.
- Conservation liability matrix – Set a timetable for the review of the US\$2,500/ha liability rate, to be preceded by a desk-based study of the available literature on area-based costs of conservation.

There are currently two options for meeting conservation liability available for growers (page 18, RaCP (2015)):

- Option 1: An area of land equal to the final conservation liability is managed primarily to conserve biodiversity by the company and/or by a third party within or outside areas managed by the company.
- Option 2: The company provides funding to a third party for projects or programmes contributing to achieving conservation objectives outside the areas managed by the company. The total amount of funding equals the final conservation liability in hectares multiplied by USD2,500.

The monetary value for Option 2 was one of the key matters that was intensely deliberated by the Compensation Task Force (CTF) and was agreed during the 8th Meeting of the RSPO CTF

meeting (June 2013)⁵. There is merit in reviewing this, but would need more projects for impact evaluation before considering the change of the parameters of USD2,500/hectare.

Stage 3: Socialisation, training and technical support

Once the new guidance is completed, a training and socialisation programme will be needed to upscale awareness and capacity of all actors. The RSPO should also seek ways to provide technical support to growers and others during implementation.

The BHCVWG and RSPO Secretariat have organised socialisation, workshops and outreach programmes on RaCP since the adoption of the Procedure. The RSPO Secretariat has also developed the modules on RaCP on the RSPO Sustainability College (<https://sustainability-college.rspo.org/courses#allcourses>) that is freely accessible to all members of the public.

The BHCVWG acknowledges the review findings that there are still gaps in understanding the requirements of the Procedure and the variability of capacity of all actors to meet the requirements. Thus, the recommendation to ensure that adequate training and socialisation programmes in multiple languages to upscale awareness and capacity of all actors will be important once the revised Procedure has been adopted. In the meantime, depending on the availability of resourcing at the RSPO Secretariat, targeted training will continue as ongoing work.

⁵ ERE studies commissioned by the CTF: The average cost of restoration in six case studies pertaining to reforestation/rehabilitation of dipterocarp forests varied from approximately USD120/ha to USD3,300/ha. Based on various considerations including yield returns, cost for HCV assessment, HCV management and forest restoration, an indicative figure (USD 2,500-USD 3,000/ha/25 years) was suggested and accepted by the Compensation Task Force until the next revision of the Compensation Procedures.

The RSPO is an international non-profit organisation formed in 2004 with the objective to promote the growth and use of sustainable oil palm products through credible global standards and engagement of stakeholders.

www.rspo.org



Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil

Unit 13A-1, Level 13A, Menara Etiqa,
No 3, Jalan Bangsar Utama 1,
59000 Kuala Lumpur

T +603 2302 1500

F +603 2302 1543

Other Offices:

Jakarta, Indonesia
London, United Kingdom
Beijing, China
Bogota, Colombia
New York, USA
Zoetermeer, Netherlands

 rspo@rspo.org