

NPP issues for which credible assurance can be given: a personal interpretation.

To provide assurance for compliance with the NPP, the grower could demonstrate the following:

- assessment of the site, the surroundings, and their HC values were adequate; 2) the process and output is acceptable for RSPO stakeholders; 3) if growers really have, or will have the capacity to undertake prescribed management; 4) stakeholders will be able to cope with the changes that will take place; and 5) there is a credible plan that will ensure the *values* to be conserved will be enhanced.
- This would include information on the following:

The subject		The parties		The considerations		The complications			
item	Object	Driver	stakeholders	indicators	evidence	Institutional arrangements for E&G, and others	technical	HR	stakeholders issues
1) Define area proposed for development;  Rights of occupation.  The issues and their landscape context.  Irreversible changes.	1.1.) cadastral documents	E,G	LA	1.1.1) Documents. land titles from land authority, qualified survey plans, monuments, GIS data, etc.	Documents genuine and verified; maps viewed, soft copies given for modeling. Site and boundaries verified on site.	Transparency and communication s established. Site selection rational clarified.	survey, mapping resolution and GIS quality	understanding of capacity and training needs	opportunities for self enrichment
	1.2) landuse planning	E,G	LA, AR	1.2.1) Site) planning commitment to landuse from government at national and regional level;	E&G are of published landuse plans.	awareness and support of local authorities for higher level plans.	Map projections	local and personal cultures for creative interpretation and negotiable solutions.	Cultural propensity for self enrichment
				1.2.2) Sites surrounding the project area	satellite imagery to qualify adherence to plan in the region.	history and traditions of land conversion may not follow higher level planning			LC approach to land take and clearance - traditions of use of fire.
1.3) settlement maps	E,G	LC,G, A	1,3,1) People. settlements and census data for site and surrounding region.	historical records for settlement; local economic landuse practices;	policies vary on release of data and map information	quality and availability		community population change, dispersal and economics	

A-assessors; CB-certification body; E- Enterprise; G- grower; LA-line agencies/admin; LC-local community; R-RSPO; S-general stakeholders; T- technical knowledge

The subject		The parties		The considerations		The complications			
item	Object	Driver	stakeholders	indicators	evidence	Institutional arrangements for E&G, and others	technical	HR	stakeholders issues
	1.4) topography	E,G	AR	1.4.1) topographical themes -bio-geophysical and social, map models to screen & scope.	thematic data and maps	Policies & plans, ability to respond to updated data and map information	quality, scale, accessibility and availability, date	enterprise staff availability & capacity to collect and use data	Agencies that hold data.
	1.5) Historical map data	E,G	G,AR, A	1.5.1) Satellite imagery & historical map data, map models of land use history	Models for landuse; assumed and recognised privilege of LC	See 1.4	haze, cloud cover, resolution, projection,	stratification	See 1.4
2) Engage stakeholders. Social systems Understanding of outcomes from change.	2.1. register of communities	E,G	LA,AR ,LC,S	2.1.1) On-going process to update and/or gather data on community population & distribution.	mechanism for engagement and discussion	respect for communities	creating workable and acceptable procedures	capacities and transparency variable, training may not be adequate.	Willingness to engage in a multi-stakeholder exercise.
	2.2) FPIC process	E,G	G,A,LC	2.2.1) register of parties & customs, records of communications & discussions, agreements and reports on progress; disbursement of funds; release of land for development;	record of representatives, activities and outcomes	patience for iterative engagement	Determine LAC	training	Stamina to maintain positive engagement through process; willingness to pursue altruism,
	2.3) Representation	LC	G	2.3.1) register of LC representatives	Endorsement by LC with qualification on the extent of the authority of reps.	Communication and recording mechanism with LC reps	Ensuring level of agreed transparency	training	Transparent interests and positions

A-assessors; CB-certification body; E- Enterprise; G- grower; LA-line agencies/admin; LC-local community; R-RSPO; S-general stakeholders; T- technical knowledge

The subject		The parties		The considerations		The complications			
item	Object	Driver	stakeholders	indicators	evidence	Institutional arrangements for E&G, and others	technical	HR	stakeholders issues
	2.4) identify potential for LC/E conflict if any	E,G	G,A,L C,S	2.4.1) register of conflicts, mechanism of discussion, participatory maps and agreements	Historical mechanisms to approaches conflict resolution	Position of LA	LAC mapped	training	Define limits for negotiations
				2.4.2) ongoing intra LC issues,	Register of potential issues between communities	Position of LA	See 2.4.1	training	Capacity for inclusion of other stakeholder interests
				2.4.1) mutual respect between communities; stakeholders aware of limits of tolerance to change of other stakeholders	acceptance and willingness to comply with other HCV interests	seldom addressed	See 2.4.1		See 2.4.2
3) Conduct assessment according to regional and site requirements.	3.1) SEIA	A	G,LC, A	3.1.1) 3rd party assessment where needed, records of participation of LC,	legal compliance if needed.	Build bridges communication s with E&G. Transparency	Acceptable methods for 2-way engagement	training & cultural acceptance	Prepare rural communities to understand agricultural wage work.
	3.2)HCV- what are the values?	A	G,LC, A	3.2.1) understanding of HCV at regional level; role of HCVs locally to support regional efforts, HCV areas identified and management plan prescribed. Understanding of stresses and source of threats. Plan to	eligibility of assessors; quality control of report; capacity and competence to execute plan. Management resources in place or planned.	RSPO secretariat needs to be active promoting current HCV management activities in certified sites in the project region. Source	Mainstream methods into field management. Instruments of, and mechanism for	Cultural acceptance at all strata of E & G	LC demonstrate respect for HCV interests of others

A-assessors; CB-certification body; E- Enterprise; G- grower; LA-line agencies/admin; LC-local community; R-RSPO; S-general stakeholders; T- technical knowledge

The subject		The parties		The considerations		The complications			
item	Object	Driver	stakeholders	indicators	evidence	Institutional arrangements for E&G, and others	technical	HR	stakeholders issues
				build management capacity.		of stress seldom addressed.	commitment by E.		
				3.2.2) HCV 1-3 'primary' forest/ late succession; stratification; diversity	diversity models; minimal viable populations; genetic movement, source to sinks; local extinctions/in-migration	internal: ability to secure LC agreement to support HCV 1-4. Sourcing expert HCV1-4 support	Realistic objectives; dynamics of late succession ; IPM	shortage of support with model building skills, field assessors; training needs	External S cultural rather than theory based. Internal S ability to except exclusive preservation approach? Building willingness for constructive engagement.
				3.2.3) HCV 4: environmental goods & services	Soils, nutrients, solid/gas exchange; streams and water table management		Mainstream into operations	Skill development and training	
				3.2.4) HCV 5&6, economic & cultural issues	Map & acceptance of HCV 5&6		Mainstream into operations	Skill development and training	
	3.3)establishing a baseline for future monitoring	A	G,LC, A,T	3.3.1) Records of baseline data for monitoring HCV collected and in place for future monitoring	framework to support monitoring in place, monitoring resources	baseline measures needed to monitor management effectiveness	essential baseline metrics for HCV management monitoring	need training for management and system to review and revise management plans	mechanism to be kept informed.

A-assessors; CB-certification body; E- Enterprise; G- grower; LA-line agencies/admin; LC-local community; R-RSPO; S-general stakeholders; T- technical knowledge

The subject		The parties		The considerations		The complications			
item	Object	Driver	stakeholders	indicators	evidence	Institutional arrangements for E&G, and others	technical	HR	stakeholders issues
	3.4) LUC	A	G,LC,A,T	3.4.1) historical forest succession map	map and satellite information.	classes not always useful, no standard for interpretation, map and image coverage not complete	data source availability . Strata. Succession .	experience and training. External expertise.	community memory selective.
	3.5) Soil & hydrology,	A	G,A,T	3.5.1) constraints for slope, fragile soils, hydrology. Soil and water quality conservation management plan	field data and resulting maps. Stream historical models.	model for soil irreversible impact on needed	differentiate soil class risks. Hydrology missing. Stream/silt dynamic. FW ecology.	experience and training. External expertise.	focus on water supply.
				3.5.2) Peat - changes usually non-reversible.	map models, water models, risks and source of stress.	policy for legal compliance	hydrology management	experience and training	seldom local, exclusively external
	3.6) GHG	A	G,A,T	3.6.1) carbon model maps; attenuation model and management plan.	field data and resulting maps.	needs peer discussion,	use stand data/biomass rather than derivatives .	experience and training	external interests
							Respiration min; late succession higher net than mid-succession	experience and training	external issues given priority

A-assessors; CB-certification body; E- Enterprise; G- grower; LA-line agencies/admin; LC-local community; R-RSPO; S-general stakeholders; T- technical knowledge

The subject		The parties		The considerations		The complications			
item	Object	Driver	stakeholders	indicators	evidence	Institutional arrangements for E&G, and others	technical	HR	stakeholders issues
4) Develop management plans	4.1) specific & time bound plan with phase maps,	A	E,G,A, T	4.1.1) Plan workable	Policy at Enterprise level to support HCV and reporting system between E & G	Responsibility to drive HCV management	Communication system	Supervision and support system	Mechanism to keep stakeholders informed, and receive input.
				4.1.2) capacity building for resource management	Management weakness identified and capacity building addressed. implementation by capable staff.	Capacity building needs addressed	system to identify gaps and acquire capacity in place	Responsibilities assigned and reporting system in place	Technical support accessible where needed
				4.1.3) SOPs	SOPs tested and ready for implementation.	System in place to identify needs, develop or acquire SOPs	Performance indicators set	HR identified for or trained	Stakeholders kept informed of capacity building progress
				4.1.4) baseline HCV map model for: production; qualified production/protection & dedicated protection identified.	HCV model with management objectives	Commitment to QMS for HCV management.. (usually benign neglect approach.)	GIS map model	Map circulated to field staff. Familiarisation & workshop done.	Stakeholders kept informed of capacity building progress
	4.2) monitoring	A	G,T	4.2.1) indicators set; data on indicators collected, mechanism for review.	data records. Review mechanism in place.	mechanism to support RSPO 8 seldom addressed. Review team appointed and functional.	Schedule for field data collection in place	Data collected assigned and trained for SOP	Mechanism to publish management outcomes in place. Publish statement on monitoring.

A-assessors; CB-certification body; E- Enterprise; G- grower; LA-line agencies/admin; LC-local community; R-RSPO; S-general stakeholders; T- technical knowledge

The subject		The parties		The considerations		The complications			
item	Object	Driver	stakeholders	indicators	evidence	Institutional arrangements for E&G, and others	technical	HR	stakeholders issues
				4.2.2) Stakeholder response; stress on HCV areas	Field reports, up-to-date satellite images, 3 <sup>rd</sup> party reports	HCV sites not supported by operations.	Objectives not realisable; SOP suitability to meet HCV objectives	Insufficient for management. Training quality	Continued stress on HCV. Land and/or resource take in HCV areas.
5) Report and verification	5.1) Review and validate	G&A	G,CB	5.1.1) The drafts for the report	ownership & rights, study quality, FPIC, procedure followed.	Competence of CB resources not always consistent.	Incomplete understanding among CBs possible	HR with growers not always able to understand or defend draft	Seldom seek notices on availability of documents.
6) Public notification and comment	6.1) Inform & communicate	E,	CB,S,R	6.1.1) formation submitted by CB; published; draft accepted,	The report, summaries, notices	E to make available to public	Mechanism to present and receive comment in place		G should inform interested stakeholders when draft is available.
7) Resolution and completion	7.1) start preparing fields for planting	E,G,S,R		7.1.1) NPP accepted, clearing & planting commences	Confirmation from field. Dated satellite images	Seldom able to delay hold back start date to suit NPP schedule	Mechanism in place. 4.1 incorporated into clearance plan	Training and capacity building as required by 4.1	Acceptance given to project as documented. Acceptance of management plan for HCV areas surrendered. See 4.2.2.

A-assessors; CB-certification body; E- Enterprise; G- grower; LA-line agencies/admin; LC-local community; R-RSPO; S-general stakeholders; T- technical knowledge

The subject		The parties		The considerations		The complications			
item	Object	Driver	stakeholders	indicators	evidence	Institutional arrangements for E&G, and others	technical	HR	stakeholders issues
8) external issues that threaten the NPP outcome.	8.1) Programme to build technical capacity of assessors, and local consultancy support	RSPO & ALS licencer	E,G,A,S	Public comment on published reports. Effect on project site	The reports, & register of comments	Closed shop – ALS approval required without establishing competence of ALS to give approval.	No rubric for assessors or consultant. No recommended source for support material	Self training, Courses on NPP requirements hard to find.	Cultural inability to see beyond immediate self-interest.
	8.2) Secure support from G for unplanted HCV land in area intended for development	G & land administrators	RSPO, LA,	Repossession or invasion of unplanted land	Follow-up monitoring reports	Unfulfilled expectation of land authority, LC of land for planting	laws, and enforcement may have no local standing.	Reluctance or non-capacity to 'defend' unplanted HCV land	
	8.3) Building support from LC for greater HCV objectives	RSPO	all	NPP treated as irrelevant to site development	Loss and conflict over HCV between G, LA, and LC.	Communications with stakeholders are constrained, and seldom effective.			
	8.4) access to landscape information	RSPO	A, CB, LAI	Omissions in landscape assessment	HCV3 needs & initiatives Lack of reference to neighbouring efforts	No leadership or 3 <sup>rd</sup> party support body	No standard references or model methods	No training opportunities	No support

A-assessors; CB-certification body; E- Enterprise; G- grower; LA-line agencies/admin; LC-local community; R-RSPO; S-general stakeholders; T- technical knowledge