Recommendations to improve the identification, management and monitoring of High Conservation Values 5 & 6

Workshop Report
April 29th – May 1st, 2014
MJ Grand Hotel, Accra, Ghana
Disclaimer

This report is a summary of the findings of a multi-stakeholder workshop that aimed to identify the challenges and recommendations for improving the identification, management and monitoring of High Conservation Values 5 & 6. The workshop was organized by the High Conservation Value Resource Network Secretariat in coordination with Forest Peoples Programme, Solidaridad Network and The Proforest Initiative, with the financial support from Ecosystem Alliance. The findings expressed in this paper are those of the workshop participants and do not necessarily represent the views of the HCV Resource Network or its Secretariat.
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About the Workshop

A multi-stakeholder workshop that aimed to find some solutions to varied challenges of identification, management and monitoring of HCVs 5 & 6 was held at the MJ Grand Hotel in Accra, Ghana from April 29th to the 1st of May, 2014. The workshop was organized by the HCVRN Secretariat, in coordination with Forest Peoples Programme (FPP), Solidaridad Network and The Proforest Initiative, with financial support from Ecosystem Alliance, a collaboration between the IUCN National Committee of the Netherlands, Both ENDS and Wetlands International and their offices and partners in more than 16 countries.

The workshop involved participants from the public, civil society and private sectors from Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America, who were invited to participate based on interest, their general HCV practical experience and theoretical knowledge, their specific HCV 5&6 knowledge and experience, and their expertise in the implementation of the Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) approach in the context of commodity certification.

The workshop’s main objectives were to:

• Improve participant knowledge on the HCV approach, particularly on how to identify, manage and monitor HCVs 5 and 6;
• Motivate discussions among practitioners who utilize the HCV approach and other approaches such as FPIC on a regular basis;
• Explore the interaction between the HCV approach and other processes relevant to the HCV assessment process, such as FPIC;
• Identify specific guidance and tools that need to be created by the HCVRN Secretariat to improve the identification, management and monitoring of HCVs 5 and 6; and
• Put forth recommendations for concepts, language and definitions that could help strengthen the guidance currently being developed by the HCVRN Secretariat, such as the Common Guidance for HCV Management and Monitoring.

The table below summarizes the stakeholder groups present during the workshop. For the full participant list please see Annex 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic region</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>HCV assessors - consultancies</th>
<th>Civil society</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Certification scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forest Peoples Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Bio Terra</td>
<td></td>
<td>FARN, ProYungas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To encourage openness and information-sharing, the workshop was held following the Chatham House Rule, which may be invoked at meetings to encourage openness and the sharing of information.\(^1\)

\(^1\) See more on [http://www.chathamhouse.org/about/chatham-house-rule](http://www.chathamhouse.org/about/chatham-house-rule)
Background

High Conservation Values

High Conservation Values (HCVs) are biological, ecological, social or cultural values which are considered outstandingly significant or critically important, at the national, regional or global level. HCVs 1 to 4 focus on biodiversity and ecosystems, while HCVs 5 and 6 focus on social and cultural values of importance to local communities and indigenous groups.

Since the HCV approach was first developed, it has proven useful for identifying and managing environmental and social values in production landscapes. HCV is now widely used in certification standards (forestry, agriculture and aquatic systems) and more generally for resource use and conservation planning.\(^2\)

In recent years there has been growing concern amongst members of the HCV Resource Network (HCVRN), practitioners and other interested parties, that the HCV approach has not been applied consistently across different sectors or geographies.

The inconsistent application of the HCV approach occurs throughout the three phases of the HCV process (identification, management and monitoring) and is caused by several reasons. First, the widespread use of HCV has resulted in the increased demand for HCV professionals in regions where HCV is relatively unknown and professionals have little experience using the approach. Second, since HCV is now being increasingly used in contexts other than forestry, there is a need to adapt global guidance and tools so that it is applicable to as many contexts as possible. Third, there is a need to create tools that can help HCV assessors deal with interpreting HCV and that can assist in all three phases of the HCV process and can involve communities and indigenous groups, as well as other stakeholders effectively, which in some cases are not familiar with HCV.

Out of the three phases, the HCV identification phase is potentially one of the most challenging, yet the most crucial to shape management recommendations and adequate monitoring strategies that can guarantee that HCVs are maintained and enhanced in the long term. The inadequate identification of HCVs does not only put the legitimacy of the approach at risk, it can also result in loss of biodiversity and ecosystem values, as well as the destruction of community livelihoods and other important social and cultural values. Field studies by HCVRN Members also suggest that in some cases, HCVs are not being identified at all. In other cases, HCVs that were correctly identified by HCV assessors, were not well managed by companies, hence not maintained.

HCVs 5 & 6

Another important challenge is the tendency for HCV assessors to focus more on the identification of HCVs 1 to 4 than of HCVs 5 and 6. Evidence gathered by HCVRN members during field visits suggests that in some cases, the identification of 5 and 6 has been completely left out of the HCV assessment process.

HCV assessors tend to focus less on the identification, management and monitoring of HCVs 5 & 6 for several reasons. First, social and cultural values need to be identified in coordination with local communities and indigenous groups, a process that inherently requires more time, as well as human and financial resources. Second, the identification of these values requires specific social and cultural expertise, which in some cases is not easily available or is very difficult to access. Third, available guidance that HCV assessors can use tends to be general and applicable to as many geographical and commodity contexts as possible. Although general guidance is always useful as a starting point, the identification of cultural and social values is a process that is based on local and national complexities. Interpreting complexities and making adequate judgements on site require a high degree of theoretical and practical experience with the HCV approach, which not all assessors have.

Promoting HCV assessor competency for improving HCV assessments

To address the issue of lack of competency of HCV assessors highlighted above, the HCV Resource Network Secretariat created the HCV Assessor Licensing Scheme (ALS), a scheme that promotes higher quality and more consistent implementation of the HCV approach through the provision of standard tools and methodologies for improving the quality of HCV assessments, combined with licensing and monitoring of assessors.

The aim of the ALS is to provide a reasonable level of assurance of consistency and quality for those commissioning, conducting and using HCV assessments. This will be achieved through a combination of:

- **Provision of improved tools for assessors** through a new HCV Assessment Manual building on experience and clearly setting out HCV good practice to help assessors work consistently and
effectively, together with standard templates for reporting to ensure that information and results are presented clearly.\(^3\)

- **Assurance of assessor competence** through the licensing system. There will be requirements to be met to become a licensed assessor and ongoing requirements for the maintenance of a licence.

In addition to the guidance being developed as part of the ALS, the HCVRN Secretariat is also working on a series of documents to improve HCV implementation in practice. The Common Guidance for Management and Monitoring and the recently published Common Guidance on HCV Identification are examples of good practice guides for practitioners and auditors. These guides provide an update to previous toolkits and take into account amended global HCV definitions.

Another important aspect that helps improve HCV implementation is the constant feedback from field experiences provided by HCVRN Members. The wide range of knowledge and experiences that are fed back to the HCVRN Secretariat are crucial to update and create HCV guidance and tools, and implement projects that can contribute to better quality HCV assessments in practice.

---

\(^3\) For further information on the new tools for assessors, contact: secretariat@hcvnetwork.org
Workshop Findings

The workshop was structured around three main components: 1) HCV identification, 2) HCV management and monitoring, and 3) interactions between HCV and Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC).

The *first component* focused on bringing forward, through case studies, the challenges of identifying social and cultural values in different geographies and commodity contexts. A selection of participants from different backgrounds presented their perspectives, which were further enriched by discussions during regional breakout groups.

The *second component* focused on presenting examples of management and monitoring of social and cultural values, and analysing the challenges found in practice in different regions and commodity contexts. An overview of the upcoming Common Guidance on HCV Management and Monitoring was provided with the objective of receiving participant feedback during plenary and breakout group discussions.

The *third component* was useful to clarify the differences between FPIC and HCV, identify synergies and understand how they interact and complement each other in practice. Examples from companies were particularly useful.
1. Identification of HCVs 5 & 6

Participant presentations, breakout group and plenary discussions made it clear that the challenges around the identification of social and cultural values are shared across regions and commodity contexts. Challenges were grouped into the following categories, and potential solutions to address these challenges are also provided.

The challenges around the identification of HCVs 5&6 can be summarised into three main areas: 1.1) the need to improve the competence of HCV assessors in regions where certification is expanding, the HCV concept is relatively unknown and there is little guidance on how to write a high quality report and the minimum information that it should include, 1.2) the need to improve the quality of the HCV assessment process, specifically in terms of social and cultural values, and reporting by HCV assessors, 1.3) other HCV 5&6 challenges that are commonly encountered during the assessment process, that even the most experienced assessors struggle with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Summary of challenges</th>
<th>Summary of Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HCV assessor competence and quality of reporting | - There is a lack of practical and theoretical experience in implementing HCV, particularly in regions where HCV is relatively unknown.  
- There is a pressing need for more normative guidance for HCV assessors on how to conduct an HCV assessment and how to adequately report on HCV assessments. | - Licensing HCV assessors  
- Including participatory mapping as a requirement in the HCV Assessment Manual  
- Require HCV assessors to provide evidence of participatory mapping and information on methods used in the HCV assessment report  
A list of suggested methods for identifying social and cultural values will be developed to support assessors. |
| Quality of the HCV assessment process      | - HCV assessors need to engage more effectively with communities and indigenous groups when identifying HCVs 5&6  
- HCV assessors need to carry out adequate stakeholder consultations to identify social and cultural values and effectively report on such consultations | -HCV assessors should engage with local experts and local organizations that are trusted by communities  
- Conducting a census and carrying out social transect walks are effective to identify composition of communities and indigenous groups  
- Assessors should explain the results to companies so that they can adequately monitor and manage social and cultural HCVs |
| Other challenges encountered during assessment | - HCV assessors struggle to identify culturally-sensitive HCVs  
- Historically, farmland or future farmland has not been included in HCV 5, but it is a decision that must be made on a case by case basis with the full participation of the community or group concerned. | -Community land use zoning could be an alternative, as it gives communities the liberty to decide on how to manage their agricultural and pasture land.  
- Whether land is classified as HCV 5 also depends on company policies and the level of involvement of local communities; trade-offs have to be explored through participatory processes  
- The decision to identify agriculture and pasture land as a HCV 5 needs to be based on evidence and must be decided on a case by case basis, based on analysis of |
1.1 HCV assessor competence and quality of HCV assessment reports

1.1.1 Challenge: There is a lack of practical and theoretical experience in implementing HCV, particularly in regions where the HCV approach is relatively unknown. Lack of highly-qualified assessors in those regions can result in the inadequate HCV 5 & 6 identification. There is a need for more normative guidance for HCV assessors on how to conduct HCV assessments and how to adequately write HCV assessment reports that adequately reflect the identified values and provide high quality management recommendations for such values.

Recommendations:

- The creation of a body of licensed HCV assessors will help address the challenge of variability of competence of HCV assessors. The HCV Assessor Licensing Scheme (ALS) will promote assessor competency in conducting HCV assessments, and therefore improve the overall quality and consistency of HCV assessments over time. The ALS will provide a framework for monitoring the performance of HCV assessors globally and will provide assessors with a set of tools, templates and guidance to help them conduct satisfactory HCV assessments.

- To support licensed assessors in the HCV assessment process an HCV Assessment Manual will guide licensed assessors throughout the assessment process and will provide templates, checklists and other useful tools. Participant input during this workshop helped the HCVRN Secretariat draft the following normative language that will be included in the final version of the Manual:

  o Licensed assessors will be required to include in their reports a justification of methods used to identify social and cultural values. Assessors will be required to clearly explain why those methods were chosen and should elaborate on whether those methods were effective or not. A list of suggested methods for identifying social and cultural values will be developed to support assessors.

  o Evidence of participatory mapping must be provided by all licensed assessors in the report. Assessors will be required to provide maps, as well as the methodology used for participatory mapping. Maps provided should include land beyond the assessment area, e.g. plantation, concession, management unit, etc. Community natural resource use areas should be identified in a participatory manner and clearly mapped. It is recommended that neighbours be present during the validation of such maps to avoid border conflicts. It was suggested by workshop participants that companies should not be present during the initial mapping efforts to prevent communities or indigenous groups from feeling intimidated, but should be present during the map validation phase, as it is crucial for companies to understand what has been identified and validated by the community and other stakeholders. Temporary sites (e.g. temporary hunting areas, impact of seasonal/climate changes) should also be mapped.
Mapping should be carried out done prior to ecological/biological surveys to prevent teams from damaging cultural values or offending the local communities.

1.2 Quality of HCV assessment processes

1.2.1 Challenge: There is a lack of adequate engagement with communities and indigenous groups during the HCV assessment process.

HCV assessors often struggle to engage effectively with community members during the identification phase, or struggle to achieve appropriate representation of different community segments.

Recommendations:

- A facilitator trusted by the community or indigenous group can help the HCV assessor engage effectively with different community members. Conducting a census was highlighted by workshop participants as an effective way to understand and characterise the structure of a community or indigenous group.

- Working with local partner organisations and local experts can help the HCV assessor understand community decision-making structures. Acknowledging local and traditional leaders was also brought up as workshop participants as a key element to be taken into account when planning for, and conducting community consultations.

- HCV assessors should know the social and cultural landscape. This can be done through social transect walks and by conducting informal visits to understand the local context. Learning about formal and informal rights to the land can also be useful to sense whether potential conflicts could arise when identifying social and cultural HCVs.

- HCV assessors should explain the results of the assessment process to the company. If possible, company teams could also participate in HCV assessment. It is crucial that such teams understand the HCV 5&6 aspects of the HCV assessment report so that they can give continuity to the agreements with communities or indigenous groups and engagement continues even after the assessment has finalized.

1.2.2 Challenge: Stakeholder consultation.

There are currently no requirements on how stakeholder consultations should be conducted or documented during the HCV identification phase. In some cases, consultation is inadequate. Stakeholder consultation is crucial to guarantee that as many views as possible are considered during the identification phase.

Recommendations:

- Communities should have a role in formulating the list of stakeholders to be consulted by the assessor.

  The purpose of the stakeholder consultation has to be very clear from the start, and community expectations have to be well managed throughout the process

- The HCV Assessment Manual developed by HCVRN Secretariat will include guidance on stakeholder consultation, including a template for documenting consultations.
Participants also generally highlighted that **enough time needs to be allocated** to community consultations. This process should not be rushed and communities and indigenous groups should not be pressured in identifying their social and cultural values.

1.3 **Conflicting values, farmland and culturally-sensitive information encountered during HCV assessments**

1.3.1 **Challenge: Identification of culturally-sensitive information.**
In some cases, the location or even existence of certain cultural values is only known by a limited number of people in a community or indigenous group. ‘Secret’ cultural HCVs could be specific places, waterfalls, lakes, trees or rocks, graves, burial sites, among others. During the workshop, numerous examples of such HCVs were presented, which means this situation is common in different geographical areas and contexts. In practice, HCV assessors are faced with the dilemma of identifying those secret sites and mapping them so that they are not damaged or destroyed during company operations, while maintaining their secrecy. Assessors also struggle to obtain information from communities or indigenous groups regarding the existence and specific location of these sites, as communities are often cautious about sharing such information with strangers. The main challenge regarding ‘secret HCVs’ is that if they are not adequately identified and mapped, they could be excluded from management and monitoring plans, which could place them at risk of destruction or degradation.

**Recommendations:**
- **Privacy:** culturally-sensitive values should be mapped, but maps should not be disclosed beyond the company unless community members agree. Secret HCVs should remain secret, if that is what the community, or community members choose.
- Once identified, assessors should include **precautionary measures** in the HCV assessment report management recommendations. Secret HCVs could be specific markings on a tree, or stone formations, which can be easily damaged during company operations.
- In the case of secret HCVs that could be in conflict with the law, the assessor must refer to **local and national laws**.
- If secret HCVs are located outside the **direct assessment limits**, the HCV assessor should analyse whether the area is irreplaceable and whether it should also be identified as HCV to maintain it, even if it is located outside the limits of the assessment.
- Company managers should always be aware of potential cultural findings during their operations and should **stop operations until findings have been shared with the community** or indigenous group and a decision on the findings has been made.

1.3.2 **Challenge: Consideration of agricultural and pasture land.**
HCV 5 are sites and resources fundamental for satisfying the basic necessities of local communities or indigenous peoples (for livelihoods, health, nutrition, water, etc.), identified through engagement with these communities or indigenous peoples. An example of these areas could be key hunting areas for
communities who depend on hunting for basic protein and/or income needs. In practice, this is one of the most complex values to identify. Historically, farmland or future farmland has not been included in HCV 5, but it is a decision that must be made on a case by case basis with the full participation of the community or group concerned.

**Recommendations:**

- **The decision to identify agriculture and pasture land as a HCV 5 needs to be based on evidence** and must be decided on a case by case basis, based on analysis of the communities resource dependence. Issues such as food access, food security and country tendency to food price fluctuations should be taken into consideration, as well as the implications of considerable reductions in farmland for communities or indigenous groups. Based on stakeholder consultation, the HCV assessor should differentiate between areas of community use and ‘sites and resources fundamental for satisfying the basic necessities of local communities or indigenous peoples’ (HCV 5).

- It was suggested that **a set of guiding questions** are developed by the HCVRN Secretariat to help guide HCV assessors in determining whether agricultural and pasture land should be identified as HCV 5 in different cases.

- **Assessors should carefully analyse the future implications of identifying agriculture and pasture land areas as HCV 5.** Identification of these areas as HCV will require management and monitoring from the company, which might not be what communities need or want. **Community land use zoning** could be an alternative, as it gives communities the liberty to decide on how to manage their agricultural and pasture land.

- **Conducting socio-economic studies** is a good approach towards gathering valuable information regarding community dependence on resources. These studies can provide information regarding community farming methods and systems, tenure (communal land vs. private property) structures, estimates of future land needs and impact over other resources and other HCVs, and inherent cultural values.

- **Population growth** should be considered when setting aside land for future community use, as well as issues such as immigration, and internal displacement in a country, particularly in countries torn by civil conflict.

- The assessor needs to be aware that in some cases, **even if the community or indigenous group has decided to sell or give user rights to land to the company, it might not be the best decision** in the long term. The assessor, when possible, should recommend companies to carefully consider the amount of land set aside for community use.

**1.3.3 Challenge: Conflicting values**

Situations in which HCVs 1-3 overlap with HCVs 5&6 are very common. For example, often fauna and flora identified as HCV 1 can also be sacred to communities or indigenous groups or fundamental to
meet their needs. HCV assessors face the challenge of identifying such values, and coming up with management recommendations that can maintain and enhance overlapping values.

**Recommendations:**
- HCV assessors should be aware that in some cases there will be trade-offs, for example, cases in which community hunting needs are putting pressure over endangered species. **Alternatives to reduce pressure on other HCVs** need to be explored during stakeholder consultations and could include finding alternative sources of protein, or company campaigns to raise awareness in communities and indigenous groups about the need to protect certain species.
- In cases where such conflicting HCVs are illegal (e.g. hallucinogen plants that are forbidden by the law and are also endangered) according to national law or international treaties, HCV assessors should recommend that **the law takes precedence**.
2. Management and monitoring of HCVs 5&6

Participant presentations, breakout group discussions and plenary feedback made it clear that the challenges around the management and monitoring of social and cultural values are shared across regions and commodity contexts. Challenges were grouped into the following categories, and potential solutions to address these challenges are also provided.

The challenges around the identification of HCVs 5&6 can be summarised into three main areas: 2.1) the responsibility of companies in adequately managing and monitoring HCVs 5&6, 2.2) community participation in management and monitoring of social and cultural values, and 2.3) enabling conditions for effective management and monitoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Summary of Challenges</th>
<th>Summary of Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Responsibility of companies | - Management and monitoring plans and strategies need to adapt to changing realities.  
- Companies are challenged with providing adequate compensation or restitution for damaged or destroyed social or cultural values. | - Appropriate indicators are crucial to monitor change.  
- Impact studies need to be repeated regularly  
-HCV assessments need to be carried out after an FPIC process has occurred  
-Compensation options should be explored in a participatory way |
| Community participation in management and monitoring | -Achieving effective co-management and monitoring of social and cultural values is a challenging task to achieve | - Business models that involve communities and indigenous groups and other incentives can be created to achieve shared monitoring and management of HCVs 5 and 6  
-Taking into account traditional knowledge is useful |
| 3.3) Enabling conditions for effective management and monitoring | The establishment of HCV areas often clashes with requirements set by national or local legal frameworks and regulations, impacting management and monitoring, and subsequently the maintenance and enhancement of HCVs. | -Help promote benefits of certification  
-Working with local partners to establish communication with local governments  
-Land use planning is an effective tool to prevent inconsistencies |

2.1 Responsibilities of companies

2.1.1 Challenge: Management and monitoring plans and strategies need to adapt to changing realities.

Company management and monitoring plans need to acknowledge that social and cultural values change over time. Adaptive management and monitoring requires a considerable amount of human and economic resources from companies, and a deep understanding of the needs of communities and indigenous groups.

Recommendations:

- **Impact studies need to be repeated or updated regularly.** Although the initial HCV assessment can provide baseline information for setting up management and monitoring plans and strategies, companies should repeat studies regularly to make sure that
management and monitoring practices reflect current realities. For example, initial socio-economic studies could present information on social groups living in the area, yet, in countries where internal displacement is common, new groups could establish relatively quickly, putting pressure on HCVs, particularly HCV 5.

- **Selecting appropriate indicators** can help companies monitor change and achieve management goals better. Such indicators can be set by conducting socio-economic studies, or as a result of information provided by the HCV assessor.

- **Internal capacity of companies** is crucial to effective management and monitoring. HCV training and capacity building within companies is also recommended.

### 2.1.2 Challenge: Companies are challenged with providing adequate compensation or restitution for damaged or destroyed social or cultural values.

In some cases, company operations could damage or destroy social and cultural values, particularly when operations start before an adequate HCV assessment was carried out. Depending on laws and certification scheme requirements, companies must compensate communities for damaged or destroyed HCVs or resources. Estimating the way in which communities or indigenous groups should be compensated is very complex.

#### Recommendations:

- **Companies should only initiate operations after an adequate FPIC process has occurred and after an adequate HCV assessment has been carried out.** Failure to do so can make it difficult to identify whether the destruction or damage of social and cultural HCVs occurred during company operations or before.

- **Companies should seek advice from community members and from other social and development experts to determine what the best combination of monetary and other forms of compensation** will be in any given case.

- **The creation of guidance on how to address the issue** of compensating for damaged or destroyed HCVs 5&6 could help companies when facing this situation.\(^4\)

### 2.1.3 Challenge: Companies need to find ways of achieving effective and ongoing communication with communities with regards to management and monitoring plans and strategies.

Workshop participants presented successful cases in which communities and indigenous groups were involved in the HCV identification, as well as in management and monitoring plans and strategies. Achieving and maintaining good communication with local communities and indigenous groups can achieve buy-in and result in positive collaborations towards maintaining and enhancing HCVs 5&6.

#### Recommendations:

- **Adequate FPIC and HCV processes lay the foundations for good communication and community buy-in for management and monitoring.** Both processes are crucial to raise

---

\(^4\) The Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) has a special Task Force charged with the development of guidelines on compensation.
community awareness about the project, its impacts and benefits and are the first step towards working together to create strategies that work in favour of both companies and communities or indigenous groups.

- Establishing **regular reviews** with communities and indigenous groups is an effective way of addressing challenges and adapting management and monitoring strategies.

- Communication with communities is most effective when it is done in a **format and language** that is appropriate for them to comprehend. Presenting long, technical reports is typically an ineffective way of engaging communities and achieving buy-in to management and monitoring plans. Alternative methods of communication should always be explored by companies, such as visual aid and interactive materials.

- **Capacity building** of both communities and indigenous groups, as well as company staff should be part of management and monitoring plans and strategies.

- **Partner organizations** could play a key role in helping companies establish long-lasting relationships with communities and indigenous groups and improving communication.

### 2.1.4 Challenge: When conflicting HCVs are identified, companies face the challenge of finding ways to substitute certain values.

A clear example is when communities or indigenous groups use endangered species as a source of protein. Community access to alternative sources of protein should be explored by the company. Establishing the best substitute for a certain social or cultural value is very challenging.

**Recommendations:**

- **Finding substitution alternatives for community needs in a participatory way**, with input from relevant experts (e.g. development NGOs, government), communities and indigenous groups and company teams. After options are explored and agreed, their effectiveness needs to be monitored and adapted if necessary.

---

### 2.2 Community participation in management and monitoring

### 2.2.1 Challenge: Achieving effective co-management and monitoring of social and cultural values is challenging for companies, communities and indigenous groups.

Finding adequate and successful ways of incentivizing community engagement is challenging too.

**Recommendations:**

- **Co-management and monitoring of HCVs 5&6** should result in community empowerment and engagement. Examples from the field suggest that models that involve communities are more successful than models that are implemented solely by the company. Co-monitoring strategies have been explored by HCVRN Members.

- **Business models or other incentives** could be explored for communities or indigenous groups to benefit from the maintenance and enhancement of HCV areas in general, as well as HCVs

---

5&6. Developing innovative approaches towards maintaining and enhancing HCVs could take time, but could be effective in the long run.

- **Traditional knowledge** and traditional ways of managing resources should also be taken into account. In some cases, communities and indigenous peoples have managed resources effectively in the past and this could be valuable for companies.

### 2.3 Enabling conditions for effective management and monitoring

#### 2.3.1 Challenge: The establishment of HCV areas often clashes with requirements set by national or local legal frameworks and regulations, impacting management and monitoring, and subsequently the maintenance and enhancement of HCVs.

In the case of Indonesia, where legal requirements say that agricultural lands need to be developed, HCV areas are often taken from companies by the government and allocated to another company for development. Often these areas contain social and cultural values.

**Recommendations:**

- Companies, NGO’s and other stakeholders play a key role in promoting certification within local and national governments and working towards solutions that prevent inconsistencies between national laws and the requirements of certification schemes.

- **Land use planning is crucial** to maintain social and cultural values, and avoid social conflict. In many cases, the lack of clear land prioritization by governments and lack of clarity around tenure is the root cause for company-community conflict. For example, cases in which companies are allocated land that is needed to meet the needs of local communities or indigenous groups, and has little potential for agricultural development.

- **Working with relevant national and local partners** could help companies establish effective communication with local and national governments, and could also be a channel for communities and indigenous groups to voice concerns to companies regarding management and monitoring activities.
3. Overlaps between HCV and FPIC

The principle of FPIC is included in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), which states that ‘Indigenous peoples shall not be forcibly removed from their lands or territories. No relocation shall take place without the free, prior and informed consent of the indigenous peoples concerned and after agreement on just and fair compensation and, where possible, with the option of return’.

In the context of agricultural development, FPIC implies informed, non-coercive negotiations between investors, companies or governments and indigenous peoples prior to the development and establishment of oil palm projects, timber plantations or other enterprises on their customary lands. Communities have the right to decide whether they will agree to the project or not once they have a full and accurate understanding of the implications of the project on them and their customary land.\(^6\)

In the specific case of commodity certification, the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) standard makes requirements of companies that go beyond the minimum standards required by national statutory law and ratified international treaties. RSPO requires companies to conduct adequate FPIC processes with local communities and indigenous peoples, which involve providing information, carrying out impact assessments, acquiring land, agreeing payments and benefits, settling differences, finding forms of compensation and resolving conflicts or disputes that may arise. FPIC is a process that takes time, and should not be rushed.

During the workshop, participants found it useful to remember that FPIC and HCV processes are separate from each other, although the HCV assessment process can borrow valuable good practice principles from the FPIC approach.

These are some of the main points of discussion regarding FPIC and HCV:

3.1 In some countries, FPIC is not considered in national legal frameworks

3.1.1 Challenge: Often, governments allocate land to companies for development, without the free, prior and informed consent of communities and indigenous groups living on the land. In these cases, companies are challenged with negotiating land development directly with local communities and indigenous groups. Companies often find themselves remediating faults that could have been prevented if an adequate FPIC process had been part of governmental land allocation policies.

Recommendations:

- Companies and certification schemes should work towards collaborating more closely with local and national governments to incentivize good practice in land allocation policies. Companies, as major country investors, can play a crucial role in guaranteeing that an FPIC process is carried out prior to any land allocation and development.

- Useful guidance already exists on how to implement FPIC at a national scale for initiatives such as REDD+. Such guidance could be helpful in the context of agricultural commodity

\(^6\) Free, Prior and Informed Consent, Forest Peoples Programme (FPP):
development. Certification schemes such as Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and RSPO also have develop useful materials to guide FPIC processes.

3.2 General FPIC Challenges

3.2.1 Challenge: Communities regret their decision of ceding land to companies.
Companies face the challenge of handling cases in which communities had initially agree to a development project through an FPIC process and later on, once the impacts of development are evident, communities regret their decision.

Recommendations:
- It is crucial for companies to inform communities and indigenous groups about the positive, and negative impacts that development will have on their land. During the FPIC process communities and indigenous groups should be presented with information in appropriate format so that people understand as much as possible the potential positive and negative impacts of any new development. Examples are visual aids, videos, didactic materials, and perhaps visits to neighbouring developments or meetings with other communities in similar situations.
- Managing expectations of communities is an important consideration for companies. Benefits or impacts should be clearly presented from the start.

3.2.2 Challenge: Handling internal community conflict is a challenge for companies during the FPIC process.
Internal conflict is common, as different groups within the community have different motivations and needs. Boundary problems between neighbouring communities is also a common challenge during the FPIC process.

Recommendations:
- Companies need to ensure that as many internal disputes and conflicts as possible within community members or between neighbouring communities are brought up during the FPIC process.
- In cases in which communities are reluctant to do participatory mapping because of the risk of escalating tensions with neighbouring communities or within the community itself, it is crucial to find mechanisms to achieve that participatory mapping is done. If mapping is not carried out, the FPIC and HCV process will be stalled.

3.2.3 Challenge: Although companies play a key role in promoting local development, they often find themselves addressing issues that lie far from the scope of their operations.
When local infrastructure is poor, and governmental provision of services is weak, communities tend to perceive companies as a mean to solve these challenges. In such cases, community expectations towards a company are very high.

Recommendations:
• **An adequate FPIC process can be very useful to identify such challenges** in advance and explore the needs of communities and ways of meeting such needs.

• Although companies sometimes choose to play an active role in providing services to communities and this could be very beneficial, several **conflicts may still need the participation of local governments or other relevant stakeholders to be fully resolved.** Companies should always seek collaboration with stakeholders that can help resolve conflicts.

• Companies need to acknowledge situations in which local governments are weak and basic provisions are not covered. Although in an ideal scenario, governments should be in charge of providing at least basic services to local communities, this might not be the case. **It is important to consider that community decisions are often based in need.** There have been cases in which communities agree to agricultural development projects because they associate projects with benefits such as roads, health services and other services not currently provided by the government. This situation is challenging, as expectations towards companies are higher when community basic needs are not being met. When possible companies should try to improve local conditions, in collaboration with local partners that can help implement programs.

• In the specific case of companies providing local medical care: it was highlighted during the workshop that companies should contact local governments to make sure that the medical care provided is in line with health and other ministries.

• **Schools and education:** examples of companies relying on private foundations to run schools in the project area were presented during the workshop. In some cases, outsourcing the educational service is an effective way of guaranteeing quality and adding a level of independence from the company.

**Challenge:** Often, people in charge of conducting FPIC processes are not experienced enough to handle complex situations such as protracted conflict within communities, boundary issues, among others.

**Recommendations:**

• Companies should make sure that the team in charge of the FPIC process is composed of experienced people, who can handle the process as neutrally and professionally as possible.

• In cases in which companies carry out their own FPIC processes, **capacity building of company staff is crucial** as FPIC is an ongoing process that will require considerable effort and degrees of social experience.
3.3 General Discussion around the interaction of FPIC and HCV

These are **general recommendations** pointed out by workshop participants:

- **HCV assessors find themselves in situations in which they are hired to conduct an HCV assessment for a company, and find that an inadequate FPIC process, or no process at all, was carried out prior to development.** HCV assessors should always make sure that an FPIC process has been conducted. This information can be obtained through the company prior to the HCV assessment.

- **An adequate FPIC process needs to start before an HCV assessment is carried out.** When the HCV assessor conducts community consultations to identify HCVs, communities should already be aware of the project.

- **HCV assessors are not in charge of carrying out or coordinating the FPIC process, which is the responsibility of the company.** Some principles of FPIC can be used by / be useful for HCV assessors – such as how to enter/engage with a community, how to explain purpose of assessment and ask for permission to conduct mapping or other studies, sharing results, etc.
Conclusions

Two and a half days of discussions are never enough to identify all challenges and recommendations to improve the identification, management and monitoring of HCVs, and the interaction of the HCV process with FPIC. As the HCV use continues to expand, the approach is constantly evolving to adapt to new contexts. However, translating theory into practice is always difficult, and requires collaboration, communication and a deep understanding of local social and cultural realities.

The workshop was successful in bringing together a group of HCV stakeholders that do not normally interact in finding solutions to HCV challenges. Bringing together companies, HCV assessors, community representatives, NGOs and HCV policy-makers was crucial to improve participant knowledge on how HCV is implemented different regions and in finding recommendations that were applicable to many different contexts. Although this report does not intend to provide normative guidance, it does bring forward all these valuable recommendations, which can be useful for anyone working with HCV in practice.

The workshop’s main achievements were to:

- Improve participant knowledge on the HCV approach, particularly on how to identify, manage and monitor HCVs 5 and 6. This was mainly done through fruitful discussions and the exchange of ideas between people coming from different regions and with different levels of experience.

- Motivate discussions among practitioners who utilize the HCV approach and other approaches such as FPIC on a regular basis. Discussions were crucial to identify challenges and recommendations that are shared among regions. Discussions also gave way to creating more structured language that will be included in future guidance documents, such as the HCV Assessment Manual that is being developed under the HCV Assessor Licensing Scheme.

- During the workshop, the linkages between the HCV approach and the FPIC process relevant to the HCV assessment process, such as FPIC was explored. It was interesting to realize that FPIC processes, such a fundamental step towards land allocation, are often flawed or are not carried out at all. This causes deep impacts in the way HCV assessments are conducted, as FPIC usually lays the pathway for subsequent steps in project development.

- Perhaps one of the most important outcomes of the workshop was identifying specific guidance and tools that need to be created to improve the identification, management and monitoring of HCVs 5 & 6. As stated in section 1.1.1, creating checklists and templates are a step forward towards helping HCV assessors during the HCV identification phase.

- In addition to the identification of tools that could be helpful for assessors and other HCV stakeholders, specific language was also drafted to be included in existing and future guidance documents. Feedback received from practitioners helped identify wording that will help improve the following guidance documents:
  - Common Guidance on HCV Identification
  - Common Guidance on HCV Monitoring
  - HCV Assessment Manual
Exploring ways of improving HCV identification, management and monitoring, particularly HCV 5 & 6 will continue to be a priority for the HCV Resource Network. This workshop, along with the work carried out by the project partners and many other stakeholders, has helped spark discussions and identify areas of improvement for HCV.

This workshop was possible thanks to the financial support of Ecosystem Alliance. The HCV Resource Network thanks the project partners and all participants for their effort and valuable inputs during this workshop.

For more information, please contact secretariat@hcvnetwork.org
Annex 1 - Project partners

**HCV Resource Network (HCVRN)**
The HCVRN is a global multi-stakeholder initiative established in 2006 by a group of organisations who use the HCV approach, including environmental and social NGOs, international development agencies, timber and forest product certifiers, suppliers and buyers, and forest managers. The HCVRN aims to encourage collaboration, provide information and support on the evolving usage of HCV, and ensure that a consistent approach to HCV is understood and applied throughout the world. Since 2011, the HCVRN Secretariat has been hosted by The Proforest Initiative, a registered UK Charity.

**The Proforest Initiative**
The Proforest Initiative is an independent charitable organization with a global reach, supporting better management of the world’s natural resources, with a focus on practical solutions. We provide support for the development of sustainability standards, safeguards and initiatives, work on research and policy development, and provide training and capacity building for a wide range of different stakeholders around the world.

The Proforest Initiative team is international and multilingual and with a variety of backgrounds, ranging from industry to academia and NGOs. This allows us to work comfortably with many types of organisations, as well as in a range of cultures. We have in-house knowledge of more than 15 languages, including English, Mandarin, Bahasa Indonesia, French, Spanish and Portuguese.

The Proforest Initiative was set up by Proforest in 2010 to increase the accessibility of expertise and experience to sustainability initiatives, government departments, and non-governmental and civil society organisations and provide a platform for building long-term partnerships with other organizations around shared objectives. As a charity, the Proforest Initiative is registered charity and is overseen by an independent board of trustees.

**Forest Peoples Programme (FPP)**
FPP was founded in 1990 in response to the forest crisis, specifically to support indigenous forest peoples’ struggles to defend their lands and livelihoods. It registered as a non-governmental human rights Dutch Stichting in 1997, and then later, in 2000, as a UK charity, No. 1082158 and a company limited by guarantee (England & Wales) Reg. No. 3868836, with a registered office in the UK.
FPP’s focus, in the beginning, came from the expertise and relationships that the small founding team had with specific communities, primarily in the Guyanas and in South and South East Asia. Forest Peoples Programme has grown into a respected and successful organisation that now operates right around the tropical forest belt where it serves to bridge the gap between policy makers and forest peoples. Through advocacy, practical projects and capacity building, FPP supports forest peoples to deal directly with the outside powers, regionally, nationally, and internationally that shape their lives and futures. Forest Peoples Programme has contributed to, and continues supporting, the growing indigenous peoples’ movement whose voice is gaining influence and attention on the world-wide stage.

**Solidaridad Network**
Solidaridad works on creating sustainable supply chains from the producer to the consumer. This enables producers in developing countries to get a better price for better products and it helps to preserve people’s environment. It helps companies in the marketplace to implement Corporate Social Responsibility and find sustainable suppliers.

Solidaridad has more than 20 years of experience in creating sustainable businesses and certification labels. Today sustainability is on the agenda of many companies: they are taking responsibility for the origin of their products and have started to see sustainability as one of the preconditions for the continuity of their business. Solidaridad supports companies that take corporate social responsibility (CSR), so that sustainable production is becoming mainstream.
## Annex 2 - Workshop agenda

### Day 1. Tuesday 29th of April

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Session Objective / Output</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 9:00</td>
<td>Arrival &amp; Registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:00 – 9:45| **Opening & Introduction**                                                | 1. Clear understanding of the objectives and required outputs of the workshop.  
   2. Get expectations from participants the workshop, including what type of guidance or tools that people sense that are needed.  
   3. Participants are introduced to the topic of the HCV approach (5&6), and the linkages between FPIC, ESIAs, etc. | 1. David (Proforest)  
   2. Paulina (HCVRN Secretariat)  
   3. Katie (Solidaridad)  
   4. David (Proforest) |
| 9:45 – 10:30| **HCV 5 & 6 Case studies by region: examples of good and bad practice from the field** | Participants present short and thought-provoking examples from the ground of good and bad use of HCVs 5&6 in practice. Presentations should aim to show overlaps with FPIC and ESIAs processes and motivate participants for the afternoon session on “challenges”. | Moderator: Sophie (FPP)  
   1. Samuel N.  
   2. Marisol Z.  
   3. Rejani K. |
| 10:30-11:00| Coffee Break                                                              |                                                                                                                                             |                             |
| 11:00-12:00| **Policy and management: private sector and commodity perspectives (15 min each)** | Participants present short and thought-provoking examples from the ground of good and bad use of HCVs 5&6 in practice. Presentations should aim to show overlaps with FPIC and ESIAs processes and motivate participants for the afternoon session on “challenges”. | Moderator: David (Proforest)  
   1. RSPO (palm oil)  
   2. GVL (palm oil)  
   3. FSC (forestry)  
   4. ProYungas (soy) |
<p>| 12.00-12:30| <strong>Discussion around the seven case-studies presented and the issues arising</strong> | Plenary discussion around the seven presentations from the two previous sessions. Provide any additional insights on good and bad practice. | Moderator: Sophie (FPP) |
| 12:30 – 13:30| Lunch                                                                     |                                                                                                                                             |                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Session Objective / Output</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:30-15:00</td>
<td>Challenges and barriers to HCV 5 &amp; 6 in practice: brainstorm by regions</td>
<td>To generate a list of challenges and barriers faced when using HCV 5&amp;6 in practice.</td>
<td>Moderators: Africa A: Katie Africa B: David Latin America: Paulina Asia: Sophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Africa (2 groups)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Latin America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.15</td>
<td>Coffee / Tea break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15 – 16:00</td>
<td>Plenary feedback from regional groups</td>
<td>4 presentations, 10 min each Q&amp;A</td>
<td>Moderator: Paulina (HCVRN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 17:30</td>
<td>Allocate issues raised into three categories: Identification, Management and Monitoring</td>
<td>A deeper understanding of the challenges faced across the different regions under separate headings: identification, management and monitoring (see Table 1 below).</td>
<td>Moderator: Paulina (HCVRN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>Wrap up, house-keeping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Day 2. Wednesday 30th of April

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Session Objective / Output</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8.30 – 8:45  | Summary of day one                                                       | - Recap of workshop objectives  
- Summary of progress and issues identified so far                                                                 | Ana di Pangracio (FARN)                                             |
| 8.45 – 10.45 | Developing best practice for HCV 5&6 Identification:                     | 1. Understand what the HCV Common Guidance is, its content, and how it should be used.  
2. Brainstorm on challenges, “sticky issues”, solutions, and tools and guidance that are needed for improving the Identification of HCVs 5&6, and how it fits with ‘FPIC’. Identify any existing guidance and new guidance that would be more useful. | 1. Presenter: Ellen (Proforest)  
2. Group Moderators: Group A: Katie Group B: Sophie Group C: David |
<p>|              | 1. Presentation on the “Common Guidance for HCV Identification” (15min)   |                                                                                                               |                                                                      |
|              | 2. 3 break out group discussions - groups (1h)                           |                                                                                                               |                                                                      |
|              | 3. Report back to plenary (30min)                                        |                                                                                                               |                                                                      |
| 10:45 – 11:15| Discussion and Summary: recommendations of guidance that could be created for companies, communities and HCV assessors | A deeper understanding of the guidance needed for different stakeholder groups to better identify HCVs 5&amp;6 (see Table 2 below). | Moderator: Ellen (Proforest) |
| 11:15 – 11:45| Coffee Break                                                             |                                                                                                               |                                                                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Session Objective / Output</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11:45 – 13:00 | **Developing best practice for HCV 5&6 Management:**  
1. Presentation on existing guidance on HCV Management (15min)  
2. 3 break out group discussions (by region, institutions, or randomly) (1h) | Brainstorm on challenges, “sticky issues”, solutions, and tools and guidance that are needed for improving the management of HCVs 5&6, and how it fits with ‘FPIC’. Identify any existing guidance and new guidance that would be more useful. | Presenter: Katie (Solidaridad)  
Group Moderators: Group A: Katie  
Group B: Sophie  
Group C: David |
| 13:00-14:00  | Lunch                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                           |
| 14:00-15:00  | **Report back to Plenary** (30min)  
Discussion and Summary: recommendations of guidance for companies, communities and HCV assessors (30min)                                                                                              | A deeper understanding of the guidance needed for different stakeholder groups to better manage HCVs 5&6 (see Table 2 below).                                                                                              | Moderator: Katie (Solidaridad) |
| 15:00-15:30  | Coffee Break                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                           |
| 15:30 – 16:45 | **Developing best practice for HCV 5&6 Monitoring:**  
1. Presentation: HCV 5&6 Monitoring Protocol (15min)  
2. 3 break out group discussions (by region, institutions, or randomly) (1 hr.) | In groups, brainstorm on challenges ("sticky issues") solutions, tools & guidance that is needed for improving the Monitoring of HCVs 5&6 (and how this fits with ‘FPIC’). Any existing guidance? New guidance that would be more useful. | Moderator: David (Proforest)  
1. Presenter: Sophie (FPP) & Michal Zrust (ZSL)  
2. Group Moderators: Group A: Katie  
Group B: Sophie  
Group C: David |
| 16:45-18:00  | **Report back to Plenary** (30min)  
Discussion and Summary: recommendation / guidance for company, community, assessors (30min)                                                                                                        | A deeper understanding of the guidance needed for different stakeholder groups to better monitor HCVs 5&6 (see Table 2 below).                                                                                           | Moderators: FPP/ZSL |
| 18:00        | Wrap up, house-keeping                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                           |

Day 3. Thursday 1st of May
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8.30 – 9:00 | Summary of Day 2         | - Recap of workshop objectives  
- Progress made so far                                                 | Jacques Waouo |
| 9:00-10:00 | Restitution              | **Output** – Identification  
Refine the guidance from day 2; need for tools; clearer definitions / language; input into Common Guidance; need for further actions / next steps (e.g. training) | David (Proforest) |
|           | **Identification**       | **Output** – Identification  
Refine the guidance from day 2; need for tools; clearer definitions / language; input into Common Guidance; need for further actions / next steps (e.g. training) |              |
| 10:00-11:00 | Restitution              | **Output** – Management  
Refine the guidance from day 2; need for tools; clearer definitions / language; input into Common Guidance; need for further actions / next steps (e.g. training, pilot) | Katie (Solidaridad) |
| 11:00-11:30 | Coffee Break             |                                                                         |               |
| 11:30-12:30 | Restitution              | **Output** – Monitoring  
Refine the guidance from day 2; need for tools; clearer definitions / language; input into Common Guidance; need for further actions / next steps (e.g. training, id early adopter) | Sophie (FPP) |
| 12.30-12.45 | CLOSURE                  | Wrap-up, summary, next steps, thanks…                                    | David (Proforest) |
| 13:00     | Lunch                    |                                                                         |               |
| 14:00 – 16:00 | Project Partner Wrap-Up Meeting: | - Core team debriefing, planning next steps etc.  
- Agree roles and responsibilities for write-up, actions, deadlines, etc. | Paulina (HCVRN) |
Annex 3 - List of presentations

Day 1
- “Implementing HCVs 5 and 6 in Africa: Overview of some challenges”, Samuel Nguiffo, Centre for Environment and Development (CED), Cameroon
- “Public Policy, Private Sector and Commodities: Soybean in Argentina”, Lucio R. Malizia, Fundacion ProYungas, Argentina
- “HCV 5 and 6: Experiences in Malaysia”, Rejani Kunjappan, RECOFTC, Thailand
- “Identifying, Managing and Monitoring HCVs 5 and 6”, Flomo Golden Veroleum Liberia, Liberia
- “High Conservation Values 5 and 6 – an introduction to the ‘social HCVs’”, David Hoyle, Proforest, United Kingdom
- “HCVs 5 and 6 in Latin America, Marisol Zumbado”, BioTerra Consultores, Costa Rica

Day 2
- “Identification, Management and Monitoring of HCVs 5 and 6: Case Study from Asia”, Soo Chin Oi, Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil, Malaysia
- “Existing guidance and case study examples on management of HCV 5 & 6 in forestry, palm oil, soy and sugarcane”, Katie Minderhound, Solidaridad Network, Netherlands
- “Management and Monitoring of HCVs 5&6”, Ellen Brown, Proforest, United Kingdom
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<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
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</tr>
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<td>Nature Conservation Research Centre (NCRC) (Ghana)</td>
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<td>HCV Resource Network (UK)</td>
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<td>The Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC) (Thailand)</td>
</tr>
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<td>SWAPP Ghana Manager</td>
<td>Solidaridad Network West Africa (Ghana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Nguiffo</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Center for Environment and Development (CED) (Cameroon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soo Chin Oi</td>
<td>Biodiversity &amp; Conservation Manager</td>
<td>Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) (Malaysia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Chao</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>Forest Peoples Programme (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Awotwe-Pratt</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>Conservation Alliance (Ghana)</td>
</tr>
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