



## MEETING SUMMARY

### SAC Stakeholder Forum

<b>Agenda</b>	SAC Stakeholder Forum – Socialization of preliminary findings from the SFMP 2.0 assurance process	
<b>Location</b>	Mulia Room 10, Hotel Premiere 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor, Pekanbaru, Riau	
<b>Date</b>	16 July 2018	
<b>Time</b>	13.30 – 16.00 West Indonesia Time	
	<b>NGO Participants</b>	
	1. Dede Kunaifi (Kujano) 2. Linda Veronika (TAPAK) 3. Desriandi (PASA) 4. Miswadi (ISEC) 5. Fatra Budianto (Rumah Pohon) 6. Priyo Anggoro (FKKM Riau)	7. M. Rawa Elmady (Scale Up) 8. Istiqomah Marfuah (Scale Up) 9. Rendra Yusti (LPAD) 10. Rafli (Yayasan Hutan Riau) 11. Nur Aisyah Aminy (Hutan Riau) 12. Teddy Hardiansyah (Kabut Riau)
	<b>Academics</b>	
	1. Azharuddin M. Amin (UIR)	2. Zarkasih (UIN Suska Riau)
	<b>Government Representatives</b>	
	1. M. Putrappor (KPHK Kerumutan) 2. Eko Brahmananto (BPKH XIX)	3. Rahmad Dani (KPH Giam Siak Kecil)
	<b>Other Stakeholders</b>	
	1. Arpi Marzuki (APINDO)	2. B.S. Sujarwo (APHI)
	<b>SAC and KMPG PRI</b>	
	1. Joe Lawson (Chair, SAC) 2. Al Azhar (SAC) 3. Erna Witoelar (SAC) 4. Jeff Sayer (SAC)	5. Neil Byron (SAC) 6. Christopher Ridley-Thomas (KPMG PRI) 7. Yudi Iskandarsyah (Assurance Process Team Member)
	<b>APRIL</b>	
	1. Addriyanus Tantra 2. Anggoro Hadi Putranto 3. Marina Garcia Valls	4. Natasha Gabriella 5. Susilo Sudarman
<b>OPENING AND DISCUSSION TOPICS</b>		
<b>1. Al Azhar (Facilitator)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opened the SAC Stakeholder Forum by thanking the SAC, KPMG PRI, and stakeholders for their attendance.</li> <li>Explained the purpose of this forum, which is to receive advice and comments from stakeholders regarding the preliminary findings of the 2018 SFMP 2.0 assurance process.</li> </ul>		
<b>2. Joe Lawson, Chairman of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the attendees and requested them to give suggestions and feedback on the preliminary findings of the SFMP 2.0 assurance process.</li> <li>Introduced the members of the SAC.</li> </ul>		



- Described the background of the SAC, which was established in 2014 to provide independent oversight and recommendations for APRIL's sustainability performance.
- Explained that the SAC appointed KPMG PRI to provide independent assurance over the fulfilment of SFMP 2.0 commitments by APRIL.

### **3. Yudi Iskandarsyah (Assurance Process Team Member)**

- Stated that KPMG PRI has been appointed by the SAC to conduct verification of APRIL's performance against its SFMP 2.0 commitments.
- Noted that KPMG PRI reports directly to the SAC in its capacity as independent committee.
- Explained that the verification process is an important component of the performance assessment, thus support from suppliers during site visits contributes to determine the success of the SFMP 2.0 assurance process.
- Briefly presented the different phases of the assurance process, which starts with document review, site visits, followed by determination of findings (non-conformances and opportunities for improvement), and the development of action plans by APRIL.
- Clarified that the site visits for the 2018 assurance process were conducted in 2 PT RAPP, 4 supply partners' and 2 open market suppliers' concession areas.
- Outlined the key observations: 2 non-conformances and 12 opportunities for improvement.
- Stated that support from suppliers is of utmost importance to develop the action plans addressing the assurance findings.

### **4. Azharuddin M. Amin (Assurance Process Observer)**

- Noted that the description of KPMG PRI's sampling method was not made explicit. Explained that the sampling process influences data consistency.
- Perceived a lack of readiness of Estate teams for the assurance process. It was observed that some documents for verification were not easily available.
- Noted low awareness of field staff regarding Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). This was seen during interviews with staff, who were unsure about certain SOPs.
- Noted that there are no boundary marks between conservation areas and community lands in certain locations and is of the opinion that this could be a cause of land encroachment.
- Recommended that APRIL conduct a cost-benefit analysis comparing different alternatives of land encroachment resolution as a basis for decision-making.
- Stated that the impacts of community development programs have not been equally spread across suppliers. In addition, he considers that support provided has not been tailored optimally to meet communities' needs (lost potential), noting that communities keep putting forth proposals for support.
- Suggested to conduct a focused and effective analysis to develop more targeted and impactful community development programs.
- Similar findings across several suppliers indicate a lack of communication with suppliers on assurance process indicators.
- Suggested that the indicators of the assurance process should be more focused on assessing the impacts of SFMP 2.0 implementation.

**5. Linda Veronika (Assurance Process Observer)**

- Suggested that assurance process interviews should be conducted not only with heads of village but also with villagers, so that the findings become more representative.
- Noted that some villages that are likely to be directly affected by forest fires are not yet part of the Livelihood Plantation program.
- Commented that observed community development programs are mostly in the form of events. Recommended that these programs focus on community empowerment to help improve the economic welfare of communities.
- Observed that communities in some villages were not aware of the grievance mechanism due to a lack of socialization.
- Noted the lack of preparedness of suppliers during the assurance process, which could be observed from incomplete provision of supporting data as well as staff's responses during interviews.

**6. Feedback from KPMG PRI on observers' findings**

- Welcomed and thanked the observers for their comments.
- Stated that they would ensure observers' findings are incorporated into the assurance report.
- Invited the observers to communicate with KPMG PRI should they need further clarification.
- Explained that the list of site visits as well as assurance process indicators had been circulated to all selected concessions prior to the commencement of the assurance process.
- Stated that they would have further discussion with the SAC regarding how to improve suppliers' readiness for the assurance process.
- Noted that those suppliers who had been previously part of the assurance process performed better than those visited for the first time.
- Explained that the current indicators of assurance process refer to the implementation of the SFMP 2.0. However, KPMG PRI is considering developing impact indicators.

**QUESTION & ANSWER SESSION WITH FEEDBACK AND SUGGESTIONS**

Dede Kunaifi (Rumah Pohon)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commented on the opportunity for improvement regarding the grievance mechanism. The community seems to not understand the procedure for raising grievances and the company/Estate teams are insufficiently socializing the grievance mechanism.</li> <li>• Questioned the level of understanding of Estate teams of the grievance mechanism.</li> </ul>
Al Azhar (SAC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commented that the low rate of usage of the grievance mechanism might be due to the fact that communities do not feel comfortable raising their grievances through the written form.</li> </ul>
Christopher Ridley-Thomas (KPMG PRI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commented that communities might need assistance for submitting their grievance using the written form.</li> </ul>

Priyo Anggoro (FKKM Riau)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that so far NGOs have been assisting communities for raising their grievances to the company.</li> </ul>
Istiqomah Marfuah (Scale Up)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presented Scale Up's experience in assisting fishermen groups in the RER to raise their grievance. In this case, the representative from RER management delivered their responses directly to the community as well as to the NGO as the mediator.</li> </ul>
Erna Witoelar (SAC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appreciated the work of NGO colleagues who position themselves as the mediators between company and communities.</li> <li>Stated that as a mediator, it is crucial for NGOs to ensure that the grievance is delivered to the company and that the response from the company is also delivered back to the community.</li> <li>Asked suggestions from stakeholders for improving the grievance mechanism.</li> </ul>
Priyo Anggoro (FKKM Riau)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommended the use of mobile phone application as an alternative to the paper-based grievance mechanism.</li> </ul>
Rafli (Yayasan Hutan Riau)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested that concession maps should be available on APRIL website or distributed to the community and government. These maps are helpful for the government in developing a spatial plan as well as to avoid overlaps between company's concession areas and community lands.</li> </ul>
M. Putraper (KPHK Kerumutan)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested that APRIL and its suppliers conduct identification and monitoring of biodiversity, including presence, behavior, patterns of fauna and potential threats, as well as, if necessary, developing management plans.</li> </ul>
Priyo Anggoro (FKKM Riau)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that based on the findings of the assurance process, there is a lack of synchronization between the company (APRIL) and the suppliers in terms of policies. For example, the grievance mechanism has not yet been socialized to all communities in the landscape.</li> <li>Suggested that the next assurance process should continue to involve observers to help improve the findings on implementation of SFMP 2.0.</li> <li>Asked when the responses to the questions and inputs given during the forum would be received by participant stakeholders.</li> </ul>
Joe Lawson (SAC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that the discussion would be summarized into a meeting report, and that this report would be circulated to participant stakeholders before the finalization and publication on APRIL's website, to give an opportunity to add feedback and suggestions.</li> </ul>
Jeff Sayer (SAC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asked whether there is a local NGO that would have the capacity to facilitate a meeting with any KPH (Government Forest Management Units) representatives in the future.</li> </ul>
Priyo Anggoro (FKKM Riau)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responded that FKKM collaborates with 8 KPHs in Riau.</li> <li>Suggested hosting a forum between KPHs and the company.</li> </ul>
<b>CONCLUSION AND CLOSING</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joe Lawson thanked participants for their attendance and suggestions.</li> </ul>	