

PLAN  VIVO

PV Climate

Request for Proposals: Methodology Approval Panel (MAP) Review of the Harvested Woody Products Tool

Version 1.0

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Methodology Overview	4
2.1	Documents for Review	4
3	Scope of Work	5
4	Expertise Requirements	6
5	Proposal Requirements	6
6	Submission and Selection	7
	Annex 1 – Methodology Approval Panel Review Support Terms of Reference	8

1 Introduction

Plan Vivo is a charity, registered in Scotland, that administers the Plan Vivo Climate Standard (PV Climate), a robust and widely applied framework for community-led land-use projects that deliver measurable climate, environmental, and livelihood benefits.

Projects registered under PV Climate may issue Plan Vivo Certificates (PVCs), representing past or future (depending on certificate type) greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions or removals achieved through project interventions.

Version 5 of PV Climate requires that projects apply approved methodologies to quantify emission reductions and removals (collectively referred to as carbon benefits). To support this, Plan Vivo has developed a set of Methodology Requirements, which define the minimum criteria that all methodologies, modules, and tools must meet¹.

All methodologies submitted for use under PV Climate undergo a public consultation process followed by a multi-stage internal technical review². The final stage of technical review is conducted by a Methodology Approval Panel (MAP) convened by Plan Vivo.

Plan Vivo is seeking 3-4 technical experts to form a Methodology Approval Panel (MAP) to review the **Estimation of Baseline and Project Emissions and Removals from Harvested Woody Products Tool V1.0** (hereafter referred to as the **Harvested Woody Products Tool**).

The **Harvested Woody Products Tool** has been developed by Klaus Geiger, Professional Forester, to support the quantification of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and removals associated with harvested woody products within PV Climate projects.

The MAP will review the **Harvested Woody Products Tool** and proposed updates to the Agriculture and Forestry Carbon Benefit Assessment Methodology (**PM001**), the Estimation of Baseline and Project GHG Removals by Carbon Pools in Plan Vivo Projects module (**PU001**), and the Estimation of Baseline and Project GHG Emissions from Carbon Pools in Plan Vivo Projects module (**PU002**). The proposed updates incorporate procedures and parameters from the **Harvested**

¹ Available at <https://www.planvivo.org/pv-climate-documentation>

² Please refer to Section 3 of the Procedures Manual, which can be found at <https://www.planvivo.org/projects/certify-a-project/pvclimate/documents>

Woody Products Tool and are intended to ensure a consistent approach to accounting for emissions and removals associated with harvested woody products within PV Climate projects.

2 Methodology Overview

PM001 and supporting modules provide procedures for accounting for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and removals across a range of carbon pools within PV Climate projects. These documents recognise that harvested woody products may contribute to project carbon benefits and include parameters for estimating emissions and removals associated with woody products.

However, the existing provisions do not provide an approved methodology for estimating these values. While both **PU001** and **PU002** reference the conceptual framework described in Winjum et al. (1998)³ as the basis for estimating emissions and removals associated with harvested woody products, neither module currently provides procedures for implementing this approach within PV Climate projects.

The **Harvested Woody Products Tool** has been developed to address this gap by providing a dedicated set of procedures for estimating greenhouse gas emissions and removals associated with harvested woody products under baseline and project scenarios. The tool is applicable to project areas where timber, bamboo, or other woody resources are harvested for use in long-lived woody products, defined as products with an expected lifespan exceeding 50 years.

The tool is based on the conceptual framework presented in Winjum et al. (1998)³ and prioritises the use of regional or project-specific data where available to improve the accuracy and relevance of estimates. It provides procedures for estimating net GHG removals and emissions associated with harvested woody products and generates parameter values that can be used directly within **PM001** to quantify carbon benefits under PV Climate projects.

To facilitate adoption of the tool, proposed updates to **PM001**, **PU001** and **PU002** have also been developed. These updates replace the existing references to modelling approaches based on Winjum et al. (1998) with direct references to the **Harvested Woody Products Tool** and align the relevant emissions and removals parameters across **PM001** and its supporting modules.

2.1 Documents for Review

³ <https://academic.oup.com/forestscience/article-abstract/44/2/272/4626952?redirectedFrom=fulltext>

The review covers the following suite of documents⁴:

- **Methodology:**
 - Agriculture and Forestry Carbon Benefit Assessment Methodology, Version 1.1
- **Module:**
 - Estimation of Baseline and Project GHG Removals by Carbon Pools in Plan Vivo Projects, Version 1.2
 - Estimation of Baseline and Project GHG Emissions from Carbon Pools in Plan Vivo projects, Version 1.1
- **Tool:**
 - Estimation of Baseline and Project Emissions and Removals from Harvested Woody Products, Version 1.0

3 Scope of Work

The appointed MAP is required to conduct an independent technical review of the **Harvested Woody Products Tool** and associated documentation listed in Section 2.1.

The key tasks and deliverables of the MAP include:

- Assess the **Harvested Woody Products Tool** for compliance with the Methodology Requirements, and for consistency with **PM001**, **PU001** and **PU002**.
- Review and verify the adequacy of the methodology developer's responses to all feedback received during the public consultation period, including whether comments have been appropriately addressed within the revised documents.
- Assess the proposed updates to **PM001**, **PU001** and **PU002**, including the incorporation of the **Harvested Woody Products Tool** and associated revisions to harvested woody products emissions and removals parameters.
- Complete a consolidated final technical assessment using the Methodology Approval Report Template, providing a clear, evidence-based recommendation for approval or rejection of the Harvested Woody Products Tool and associated methodology updates.

Full details on review procedures, roles and responsibilities, and expectations for MAP members are provided in the Methodology Approval Panel Review Support Terms of Reference (Annex 1).

⁴ Available at <https://www.planvivo.org/projects/certify-a-project/pvclimate/methodologies/pipeline>

4 Expertise Requirements

To be eligible for appointment to the MAP, experts must demonstrate technical expertise relevant to the **Harvested Woody Products Tool**.

In accordance with the Methodology Approval Panel Review Support Terms of Reference (Annex 1), applicants should demonstrate expertise relevant to harvested woody product accounting, greenhouse gas quantification, or AFOLU methodology development and assessment, sufficient to independently assess the Harvested Woody Products Tool against the Methodology Requirements.

Relevant expertise may be evidenced through prior professional experience, methodological work, validation or verification activities, or applied research. This may include, but is not limited to:

- Prior experience in developing, assessing, validating, or verifying GHG accounting methodologies or projects in the AFOLU sector, particularly forestry, agroforestry, community forestry, or other land-use systems involving harvesting of woody biomass.
- Familiarity with methodologies and approaches for estimating carbon storage, emissions and removals associated with harvested woody products.
- Experience applying, interpreting or assessing IPCC guidance relating to harvested woody products, carbon stock changes, and AFOLU GHG accounting.
- A documented track record of work or research in one or more of the following areas:
 - Forest carbon accounting and modelling;
 - Harvested woody products and wood product carbon storage;
 - Biomass assessment and carbon stock estimation;
 - AFOLU greenhouse gas inventories and reporting;
 - Application of IPCC AFOLU guidance and conservative carbon accounting principles;

MAP members must be able to demonstrate independence and objectivity and must disclose any actual or potential conflicts of interest related to the development of the **Harvested Woody Products Tool** or associated Plan Vivo methodology documentation.

5 Proposal Requirements

Interested experts who meet the eligibility criteria outlined in Section 4 are invited to submit a proposal to serve on the MAP for the review of the **Harvested Woody Products Tool**.

Proposals must include the following elements:

- Written confirmation of acceptance of the fixed remunerated rate of **USD 450 per 7.5-hour day (pro rata)**, in accordance with the Methodology Approval Panel Review Support Terms of Reference (Annex 1).
- A CV or résumé highlighting relevant experience in GHG accounting, forestry, agroforestry, harvested woody products, AFOLU methodologies, carbon stock estimation, or related fields.
- A brief statement of interest (maximum one page) describing the applicant's relevant technical expertise and experience, and how this qualifies them to review the **Harvested Woody Products Tool**.
- A statement declaring any actual or potential conflicts of interest, including details of any past or current services provided to the developer of the **Harvested Woody Product Tool** or associated Plan Vivo methodology documentation.

6 Submission and Selection

Proposals should be submitted by email to hamish@planvivofoundation.org by 31st August 2026.

Short-listed proposals will be assessed by the Plan Vivo Secretariat for technical relevance, demonstrated expertise, and overall balance of expertise across the MAP. Final selection and appointment of MAP members will be made by Plan Vivo. All applicants will be informed of the outcome of the selection process.

Annex 1 – Methodology Approval Panel

Review Support Terms of Reference

1 Introduction

Projects registered under the Plan Vivo Climate Standard (PV Climate) may receive Plan Vivo Certificates (PVCs) representing a past or future (depending on certificate type) reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or removal of GHGs from the atmosphere resulting from Project interventions⁵.

Version 5 of PV Climate requires projects to apply approved methodologies to quantify emission reductions and removals (hereafter referred to as *carbon benefits*)⁶. Under PV Climate, methodologies may take one of the following forms:

- **Stand-alone methodology:** A single document that includes all information necessary to meet the **Methodology Requirements** without reference to other methodological elements.
- **Modular methodology:** A methodology that references other methodological elements, whether internal or external to Plan Vivo, to meet the **Methodology Requirements**.

Within PV Climate, methodological elements may be defined as either **Modules** or **Tools**, where:

- **Module:** A methodological element that describes the procedures, data, and parameters required to estimate one or more parameter values in an approved methodology.
- **Tool:** A methodological element that describes procedures for performing a specific analysis applied within an approved methodology or module.

While stand-alone methodologies are generally simpler for projects to apply, modular methodologies can offer advantages by minimising the proliferation of methodological elements.

⁵ <https://www.planvivo.org/Pages/Category/projects?Take=30>

⁶ <https://www.planvivo.org/projects/certify-a-project/pvclimate/methodologies>

This approach can reduce the risk of errors or inconsistencies across methodologies and facilitate more efficient updates to maintain alignment with best practice.

2 Purpose

Upon submission of a new methodology, module, or tool, an initial screening process is conducted by Plan Vivo. This process is led by the Secretariat and may include support from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), where necessary. The purpose of the screening is to confirm that submissions are complete and suitable to proceed to full technical review.

Following successful screening, the submission enters the full review process. At this stage, a Methodology Approval Panel (MAP) is convened and tasked with conducting a comprehensive technical assessment of the submitted methodology, module, and/or tool (hereafter referred to as "the submission") in accordance with the latest version of the **Methodology Requirements**.

These **Terms of Reference (ToR)** define the scope of work, roles and responsibilities, composition, timelines, and remuneration arrangements for MAPs convened by Plan Vivo.

2.1 Review Document Framework

The MAP review process is supported by a hierarchy of documents, each serving a distinct purpose. The **Methodology Requirements** define the criteria against which submissions are assessed. The MAP Terms of Reference establish the governance arrangements and review process. The **MAP Reviewer Guidance Note** provides practical guidance on conducting reviews, drafting review findings, and feedback consolidation. The **Methodology Review Report** and **Methodology Approval Report** templates provide the mechanisms for documenting review findings, their resolution, and the MAP's recommendation. Where inconsistencies arise between review documents, precedence shall apply in the order shown in **Figure 1**.



Figure 1. Methodology Review Framework

3 Objectives

The primary objectives of a MAP are to ensure the validity, practical applicability, and compliance of submissions presented for approval under PV Climate.

For new submissions, the MAP's objectives include:

- Conducting a comprehensive assessment to confirm that the submission fully complies with the **Methodology Requirements** relevant to its stated scope.
- Evaluating the scientific basis, methodological approach, and calculations within the submission to confirm their validity, conservativeness, and appropriateness for the intended application through a **Methodology Review Report**.
- Assessing the clarity, completeness, and internal consistency of the submission to ensure it can be practically and consistently applied at the project level.
- Providing a clear, transparent, and justified recommendation to Plan Vivo regarding approval of the submission, documented through a **Methodology Approval Report**.

For existing submissions presented as a Major Revision⁷, the MAP's objectives include:

⁷ Defined in Section 11.2.1 of the PV Climate Procedures Manual V3.6 as those that "involve significant changes to the Methodology's scope, applicability, or any alteration that could materially affect the estimated Carbon Benefits. Major revisions may also include the integration of new Modules or Tools, and

- Evaluating all proposed changes within the submission to determine their impact on scope, applicability, and calculations.
- Verifying that the revised submission continues to meet all current **Methodology Requirements** relevant to its scope through a **Methodology Review Report**.
- Assessing how the submission has addressed any previous New Information Requests (NIRs) or Corrective Action Requests (CARs) arising from earlier reviews (e.g. Concept Note review or prior MAP assessments).
- Confirming that the proposed updates maintain or improve scientific validity, conservativeness, verifiability, and practical implementability.
- Delivering a clear and justified recommendation to Plan Vivo regarding approval of the revised submission through a **Methodology Approval Report**.

Where a MAP review covers both cases (for example, a Major Revision that integrates new Modules or Tools into an existing methodology), the MAP shall address the relevant objectives from both categories.

4 MAP Composition and Scope of Work

The MAP for a given review comprises experts selected for their technical expertise relevant to the scope and content of the submission. MAP members may be drawn from the following categories:

- **Plan Vivo Internal Technical Representatives:** At least one representative from the PV Climate TAC, providing institutional knowledge and supporting alignment with approved PV Climate methodologies.
- **Core Methodology Experts (type-specific):** A minimum of two TAC and/or Technical Review Panel (TRP) members whose primary expertise aligns with the subject matter of the submission. This may include expertise in areas such as:
 - Forest carbon (e.g. REDD+, ARR, improved forest management);
 - Soil carbon (e.g. soil organic carbon modelling, agricultural land management);
 - Blue carbon (e.g. coastal and marine ecosystems, hydrology);
 - General greenhouse gas accounting principles.

any changes to associated models that significantly alter their output, core logic, underlying assumptions, or the scientific principles upon which they are based. For the purpose of this definition, a material alteration is considered a cumulative change of 5% or more in calculated Carbon Benefits.”

- **Additional Technical Experts (as required by the submission):** One or more experts with specialised technical expertise relevant to the submission, who may be TAC or TRP members or qualified external experts. Depending on scope, this may include:
 - Remote sensing and GIS specialists;
 - Process-based or empirical modelling experts.

A **Lead Reviewer** shall be appointed by Plan Vivo from among the MAP members based on their technical expertise, experience, and suitability for the scope and complexity of the submission under review. The Lead Reviewer shall chair the MAP for the duration of the review, coordinate the review process, facilitate technical discussions, and be responsible for drafting the final **Methodology Review Report**.

Within the assigned MAP, reviewers shall:

- Conduct an independent desk review of the submission content against the relevant **Methodology Requirements** and raise any associated observations, NIRs, or CARs relevant to their area of expertise, in accordance with the **MAP Reviewer Guidance Note**.
- Participate in internal MAP meetings and follow-up discussions to consolidate and resolve review findings.
- Conduct a follow-up desk review of any revised versions of the submission to confirm that agreed findings and requests have been adequately addressed.

5 Qualifications

To review a submission as part of a MAP, experts must demonstrate expert knowledge of the procedures applied in the submission. This can be evidenced by:

- Prior experience in developing or assessing similar Methodologies.
- Previous involvement in the development, implementation, or validation/verification of Projects applying similar Methodologies.
- A track record of scientific research relevant to the scope of the Methodology.

MAP members must be able to conduct their review independently and impartially and comply with the conflict of interest requirements set out in Section 11. Experts shall not review a submission where they have an actual or potential conflict of interest.

6 Review Process

6.1 Communication and Reporting

Upon appointment, all MAP members shall sign a **Code of Conduct** and a **Conflict of Interest Declaration**. Any actual or potential conflicts of interest must be declared promptly and may result in exclusion from the review of the submission.

Plan Vivo shall provide MAP members with relevant documentation, templates, and procedural guidance to support consistent and structured reviews. All formal review outputs, including New Information Requests (NIRs), Corrective Action Requests (CARs), and consolidated assessment materials, shall be communicated to the methodology developer via Plan Vivo.

Direct communication between MAP members and the methodology developer should normally be coordinated through Plan Vivo to ensure transparency and consistency of the review process. Where direct technical engagement is considered beneficial (for example, to clarify specific methodological questions), such communication may be arranged with the knowledge and agreement of Plan Vivo and the Lead Reviewer. Any substantive clarifications or outcomes arising from such exchanges shall be documented and reflected in the **Methodology Review Report**.

MAP members shall coordinate their review activities through the Lead Reviewer and Plan Vivo. All individual and consolidated review outputs shall be submitted to Plan Vivo for record-keeping and process management.

6.2 Technical Review and Feedback Consolidation

6.2.1 Technical Review

Each MAP member shall conduct an independent, in-depth assessment of their assigned section of the submission against the relevant **Methodology Requirements**. All review findings should be supported by reference to the applicable requirement(s) and documented using the **Methodology Review Report** template.

MAP members should conduct their review in accordance with the latest version of the **MAP Reviewer Guidance Note**, which provides additional guidance on the review process, the classification and drafting of review findings, and the application of the review and feedback consolidation procedures described in these **ToR**.

6.2.2 Review Findings

Review findings should be proportionate to the issue identified and should focus on demonstrating compliance or non-compliance with the relevant **Methodology Requirements**. Findings should avoid prescribing particular formats, structures, presentation styles, or

methodological design choices unless explicitly required by the applicable Methodology Requirement.

Review findings shall be categorised as Corrective Action Requests (CARs), New Information Requests (NIRs), or Observations in accordance with the **MAP Reviewer Guidance Note**.

- **Corrective Action Requests (CARs)**, which represent:
 - A failure to meet one or more **Methodology Requirements**;
 - A material risk that carbon benefits cannot be credibly monitored or calculated;
 - An inappropriate or incorrect dependency on, or reference to, another methodological element; or
 - Material duplication or overlap with approved methodologies, modules, or tools.
- **New Information Requests (NIRs)**, which represent:
 - Insufficient or unclear information that prevents a determination of whether the **Methodology Requirements** are met; or
 - The need for further explanation or evidence to confirm that referenced methodologies, modules, or tools are being applied appropriately.
- **Observations**, which represent:
 - Recommendations or opportunities for improvement relating to clarity, presentation, usability, implementation, or future development, where compliance with the **Methodology Requirements** is not affected. Observations shall not be framed as requirements for approval.

6.2.3 Feedback Consolidation

The Lead Reviewer shall compile, synthesise, and consolidate all individual review findings together with relevant public consultation feedback into a draft consolidated set of review findings.

The draft consolidated review outcomes shall be circulated to MAP members for review and comment. MAP members shall be provided with a two-week review period in which to comment on the consolidated findings, propose amendments, or identify any material concerns.

Where material issues remain unresolved following the review period, the Lead Reviewer may convene a MAP discussion to facilitate clarification, achieve consensus, and agree the final set of review findings. Where consensus cannot be reached, the MAP shall follow the disagreement resolution process set out Section 6.5, including majority voting where necessary. Any material dissenting views that cannot be reconciled should be documented in the **Methodology Approval Report**.

Where no substantive concerns are raised within the review period, the consolidated review findings may be considered accepted by the MAP and issued to the methodology developer.

The objective of the consolidation process is to produce a clear, proportionate, evidence-based, and requirement-led set of review findings for methodology developer response.

6.3 Revision and Feedback Closure

The methodology developer shall revise the submission in response to CARs, NIRs, and relevant public consultation comments. The MAP shall then conduct a follow-up review of the revised submission to confirm that all review findings have been adequately addressed.

Review iterations may continue until all CARs and NIRs are closed to the satisfaction of the MAP. If unresolved CARs or NIRs remain after three rounds of review, the methodology developer may be required to pay an additional review fee for further rounds of assessment, or the submission may be recommended for rejection.

6.4 Report Approval and Recommendations

The principal output of the MAP shall be a **Methodology Approval Report**, drafted by the Lead Reviewer and approved by the MAP. The report shall include:

- The scope and version of the submission reviewed;
- A list of MAP members, including areas of expertise and contributions;
- A summary of key review findings;
- All CARs and NIRs issued and a summary of how they were addressed;
- A summary of public comments received and the MAP's response;
- The MAP's recommendation for approval or rejection, with justification; and
- A clear statement on compliance with the **Methodology Requirements** and suitability for use in PV Climate projects.

The **Methodology Approval Report** and final version of the submission shall be submitted to Plan Vivo for formal approval. Upon approval, both documents shall be published on the Plan Vivo website.

6.5 Disagreement Resolution

The MAP shall seek consensus wherever possible. Where consensus cannot be reached after deliberation, the Lead Reviewer shall facilitate further discussion. If consensus remains unattainable, a majority vote shall determine the MAP's recommendation. The final

recommendation shall reflect the MAP's collective assessment of compliance against the **Methodology Requirements** rather than a simple aggregation of individual reviewer comments. Any material dissenting views shall be briefly documented in the **Methodology Approval Report** to ensure transparency.

7 Deliverables and Indicative Timeframes

The key stages of the review process, associated outputs, and indicative timeframes are outlined below. Timeframes are approximate and may be adjusted by Plan Vivo depending on the scope and complexity of the submission.

Review Stage	Indicative Timeframe	Description and Key Outputs
Public Consultation Period	4 weeks	The submission is published for public consultation to solicit stakeholder input and initial feedback. Output: Public consultation comments log.
MAP Technical Review and Initial Deliberation (Round 1)	4 weeks	MAP members conduct independent desk reviews of assigned components, followed by internal deliberation to consolidate findings. Outputs include a consolidated set of CARs, NIRs, and Observations, informed by public consultation feedback. Output: Consolidated Methodology Review Report (iterative working version).
MAP Review of Developer Revisions (Round 2)	3 weeks	Assessment of the methodology developer's response to Round 1 CARs and NIRs, culminating in further

		consolidated feedback where required. Output: Updated Methodology Review Report reflecting closure or continuation of findings.
Optional: MAP Review of Further Revisions (Round 3)	2 weeks	If necessary, a final review round to assess responses to Round 2 feedback. Submissions with unresolved CARs after three review rounds may be recommended for rejection or require a new review cycle. Output: Final iterative Methodology Review Report.
Finalisation of Methodology Approval Report	2 weeks	Final MAP input to confirm that all CARs and NIRs have been appropriately closed, withdrawn, reclassified, or otherwise resolved, and to complete and endorse the Methodology Approval Report, including the MAP's recommendation for approval or rejection. Output: Methodology Approval Report

8 Compensation

MAP members shall be remunerated at a fixed rate of **USD 450 per day**, calculated on the basis of a **7.5-hour working day**, in accordance with these **ToR**.

Remunerable review activities may include independent desk review of the submission and supporting documents, participation in MAP meetings and follow-up discussions, review of revised submission versions, contribution to the closure of CARs and NIRs, input to the **Methodology Review Report** and **Methodology Approval Report**, and reasonable administrative time directly associated with the review.

MAP members shall be responsible for recording the time spent on review activities covered by these **ToR**. Submitted time records shall be subject to review and approval by Plan Vivo prior to payment. Activities outside the agreed scope of work, or time exceeding the indicative level agreed with Plan Vivo, shall require prior approval to be eligible for remuneration.

9 Confidentiality

All non-public information shared by Plan Vivo or the methodology developer in relation to the submission, including draft documents, reviewer comments, and internal deliberations, shall be treated as confidential. MAP members shall not disclose such information to third parties without prior written consent from Plan Vivo.

This obligation shall not apply to materials that are made publicly available by Plan Vivo, including approved methodologies and final **Methodology Review Reports**.

10 Review Quality and Member Conduct

Plan Vivo may raise concerns regarding the quality, accuracy, impartiality, professionalism, timeliness, or completeness of work undertaken by a MAP member. Such concerns may relate to individual review comments, participation in MAP discussions, responsiveness to agreed timelines, adherence to these **ToR**, or conduct that may affect the integrity or efficiency of the review process.

Where concerns arise, Plan Vivo shall seek to address them proportionately and, where appropriate, through dialogue with the MAP member. Plan Vivo may seek input from the Lead Reviewer or other suitably qualified experts to inform its assessment. If a concern is substantiated and cannot be adequately resolved, Plan Vivo may limit or terminate the MAP member's participation in the review. In cases of serious, unresolved, or repeated non-compliance with these **ToR**, remuneration may be withheld for review activities that are materially incomplete, unsuitable for use, or not delivered in accordance with the agreed scope of work.

11 Conflicts of Interest

MAP members must disclose any actual or potential conflicts of interest that could reasonably be perceived to affect their independence or impartiality. MAP members shall be excluded from review of a submission if they, or an organisation that employs them, have been involved in its development.

12 Contact Information

For questions relating to these ToR, or to register interest in participation as a MAP member, please contact hamish@planvivofoundation.org.