



APRIL STAKEHOLDER FORUM ON FSC REMEDY FULL FORUM REPORT

June 19-20, 2024
IPB Convention Center, Bogor, Indonesia

Hosted by:
APRIL Group in collaboration with FSC International
and in cooperation with
WWF Indonesia and Forest Peoples Programme

Contents

Summary of the APRIL Stakeholder Forum on FSC Remedy	2
Overview of the Forum	5
The FSC Remedy Process	8
Status of the APRIL Group's FSC Remedy Process	10
Challenges and opportunities highlighted by Participants	13
Closing reflections from APRIL, FSC, FPP and WWF-Indonesia	20
Appendices	23
Social Remedy Group Notes	23
Reports of Forum Breakout Groups	26

Summary of the APRIL Stakeholder Forum on FSC Remedy

The APRIL Stakeholder Forum was hosted by APRIL Group in Bogor, Indonesia, on June 19-20, 2024. The Forum was designed to support open and constructive dialogue between stakeholders about the APRIL remedy process to end disassociation from FSC. APRIL is the first company globally to implement the FSC remedy process, many details of which have yet to be defined. WWF Indonesia and Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) contributed to the design of the Forum with leadership from both organizations and FSC International joining in person. The Forum was developed based on the approach utilized by The Forests Dialogue focused on building shared understanding about the APRIL remedy process, encouraging awareness about the opportunities for positive outcomes, and gathering inputs from all the participants to strengthen the process.

About 90 people joined the Forum, which included in-depth plenary presentations by APRIL and by FSC, panel discussions led by WWF Indonesia and by FPP, as well as breakout discussions to gather feedback, with lively question, answer, and reflection sessions. Over 60 percent of participants were from communities and local NGOs, based in the provinces where APRIL, and related entities, operate, with most of the rest from national Indonesian organizations and universities. The meeting was facilitated by Gary Dunning of Yale University's School of the Environment and Rulita Wijayaningdyah of the Indonesian forest workers' trades union, Kahutindo.

The Director General of FSC, the world's leading forest certification system, provided an in-depth look at how the FSC Remedy Framework is designed to achieve major social, environmental, and business outcomes. FSC is committed to work with APRIL on its remedy process and recognizes the company is committed at the highest levels of management to transforming the way it has operated and providing remedy



ABOUT **90 PEOPLE**
JOINED THE FORUM



60 PERCENT OF
PARTICIPANTS WERE
FROM COMMUNITIES
AND LOCAL NGOs

for past harm from unacceptable activities during the period 1994-2020. The remedy process is a learning journey and FSC attended the Forum in this spirit to listen carefully to all the participants.

APRIL's Director of Sustainability and External Affairs and other senior staff emphasized the company's commitment to FSC reassociation which they believe will be good for the communities, the environment, the company, and Indonesia's economic development, with the goal of a collective win-win. They explained how the company has built a detailed roadmap to implement the process and provided an update on progress to date. APRIL is still in the early stages of the process with baseline independent assessments ongoing to collect information about past social and environmental harms. Participants provided rich, constructive feedback, advice, and requests. Overall, there was strong support for the approach presented by FSC and for the implementation by APRIL to achieve environmental and social remedy.

Participants provided rich, constructive feedback, advice, and requests. Overall, there was strong support for the approach presented by FSC and for the implementation by APRIL to achieve environmental and social remedy.

Participants called for more support from FSC and APRIL to build capacity in communities and local NGOs so that they can participate more effectively in the remedy process. FSC and APRIL both acknowledged this need and committed to support capacity building of local NGOs and communities.

Several participants expressed a desire for more transparency in the remedy process from both APRIL and FSC, including regular, detailed public updates. APRIL reiterated its commitment to transparency and will share more documentation, including the methods used for the independent assessments.

Concerns were expressed about the ongoing independent social and environmental assessments, including what some participants consider to be weaknesses in the implementation of required free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) procedures. Some community representatives called for more time to be taken by the assessors through field visits with more comprehensive and inclusive consultations in their communities, including more engagement with women and with marginalized economic groups. FSC and APRIL noted these concerns and agreed that it is important that this work is done as well as possible, with the potential for more time and resources to be made available to support the work of the independent assessors.

Some concerns were raised about possible conflicts of interest of the independent assessors as well as allegations of hidden company ownerships. FSC is investigating the allegations while APRIL unequivocally refuted all allegations of links to hidden companies and unacceptable practices.

Some participants recommending greater engagement by FSC with the Government of Indonesia, suggesting this will be important to help ensure overall success in remedy implementation. FSC reiterated its commitment to seek further discussions with the Government.

There was strong support for the dialogue process to be taken into the provinces where APRIL operates, which APRIL welcomed and will consider as a follow up to this Forum.

In closing, WWF Indonesia expressed appreciation for the care, attention, and willingness of participants to be part of the remedy process and shared optimism and hope for better environmental and social outcomes. FPP noted that there has been an important convergence of understanding and will continue to be engaged and to support the remedy process so that affected rightsholders get remedy for harm experienced from violations due to unacceptable activities.

The leadership of both APRIL and FSC welcomed the open, candid inputs provided at the Forum. FSC reiterated its willingness to learn from the APRIL remedy process and to integrate these learnings in its systems and normative framework.

APRIL emphasized its commitment to the remedy process to achieve the milestone of ending FSC disassociation reiterating that the company sees this as an opportunity for important environmental, social, and economic outcomes for communities, Indigenous Peoples, and for Indonesia as a whole.

Overview of the Forum

HOST AND COOPERATING ORGANIZATIONS

The APRIL Stakeholder Forum on FSC Remedy was organized and hosted by APRIL in collaboration with [FSC International](#) and in cooperation with [WWF Indonesia](#) and [Forest Peoples Programme](#). Senior staff of these organizations participated throughout the Forum and helped to facilitate the breakout sessions. The Forum was co-facilitated by Gary Dunning, Executive Director of The Forest School at Yale University's School of the Environment and of The Forests Dialogue, and Rulita Widjayaningdyah, General Secretary of Kahutindo, an Indonesian labor rights organization affiliated with Building and Woodworkers International.

CONTEXT

APRIL is the first company globally to advance the FSC remedy process following adoption by the FSC board of directors of the FSC Remedy Framework in 2023. APRIL was disassociated from FSC in 2013 and re-engaged in dialogue with FSC in 2016. Environmental and social baselines were developed as a pilot by FSC for APRIL in 2020 and a memorandum of understanding was agreed between APRIL and FSC in 2023 launching the remedy process. If APRIL successfully completes the remedy process, then the company and other companies in the corporate group will be eligible for reassociation with FSC, which then affords those companies the opportunity to apply for FSC certification.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Forum were as follows:

- » **Facilitate shared understanding** among stakeholders of the APRIL remedy process.
- » **Encourage awareness of the opportunities for positive outcomes** that could result from the remedy process for rightsholders, stakeholders and more broadly for Indonesia's forest conservation and social development.
- » **Gather input from participants to strengthen the APRIL remedy process** and the achievement of important environmental and social remedy.

PARTICIPANTS

About 90 participants confirmed and registered for the Forum with 60 percent being community, Indigenous, and NGO leaders from Riau, North Sumatra, East and North Kalimantan. Representatives of many national and international NGOs, academic experts, FSC independent assessors, and youth representatives also joined the Forum. *(Please see Appendix for full participant list).*

Rulita Widjayaningdyah and **Gary Dunning**, as co-facilitators, encouraged an open dialogue approach similar to the process developed over the last 25 years by The Forests Dialogue, emphasizing active listening and proactive engagement, building toward shared understanding and outcomes. The participants agreed to follow these and other simple ground rules developed by the facilitators.

Patrick Anderson with Forest Peoples Programme, a UK-based human-rights organization, working to support collective rights of forest peoples in 22 countries, and in Indonesia since the 1990s, cooperated with APRIL to design the Forum. FFP's priorities include that remedy is provided for all violations of human rights and customary rights in the period 1994-2020 associated with deforestation, and that this is properly informed and supported through FPIC, with remedy provided by the whole corporate group, as identified by FSC. Patrick stressed that FFP helped organize the Forum because they see this as a key first step, a chance for the participants, including many community representatives, to share ideas, express concerns and improve outcomes.

Aditya "Dito" Bayunanda, CEO of WWF Indonesia, which also helped to organize the Forum, noted that WWF was one of the first supporters of FSC when it was established in 1993. WWF, with other Indonesian NGOs including Jikalahari and WALHI, have been monitoring the plantation sectors in Riau for many years. WWF also began working in 2011 to update FSC's 1994 cutoff dates for deforestation. In 2022, at the FSC General Assembly in Bali, this major change was adopted as part of the FSC Remedy Policy. WWF called for the remedy process to be transparent, involve all responsible parties, for NGOs to have responsibility to monitor progress and to help determine harm together with communities. Remedy needs to go beyond the APRIL concessions to include the wider affected landscapes, engaging with NGOs, communities, and local government. They stressed that social and environmental remediation need to go hand in hand. WWF recognized the serious commitment APRIL has made to be the first to go through this process and that this is especially significant for Sumatra, home to many endangered flagship species. They encouraged all parties to be open to discussion and dialogue to achieve the objectives of saving the environment and forests and improving the wellbeing of communities.

Participants all introduced themselves and shared expectations.

Below are a few quotes from those introductions:

“This process is not complete if government is not included.”

“I appreciate APRIL’s openness and commitment, and I hope we can build trust and align perceptions.”

“The remedy framework needs to be turned into a practical process to get beyond confusion about what it is.”

“I experienced human rights violations firsthand. I hope we can come up with solutions.”

“We can but regret the past; best is to change direction through remediation. This is a big first step in realizing a remedy framework so that Indonesia can be a good forestry country.”

“I’m old, and I want this to also cover culture, such as honey collection mantras and this is also related to social matters.”

“This will take time because power relations need time to be considered.”

“I was recently elected village head and I am grateful to APRIL for inviting me. It took days to reach this place from my community. We really hope companies can continue to operate generating jobs, while also to have more benefits for the surrounding ecosystem, nature, and people. We hope APRIL can empower the people.”

“Many people put a lot of work into this and have high expectations it will achieve something for harmed communities and forests. I have major concerns about the process and would like those to be heard and addressed.”

“I hope this review can include voices that are not pro-company and ensure APRIL listens and hears these voices and ensures the rights are respected. APRIL policies are okay on paper but in the field a lot needs to be discussed.”

The FSC Remedy Process

Kim Carstensen, FSC's Director General, and Salem Jones, FSC's Program Manager for Dispute Resolution and Remedy, introduced FSC and gave an overview of the FSC remedy process. *(Please see Appendix for the FSC presentation).*

FSC is the world's leading forest certification system working in 90 countries with 1,200 members, including almost 40 in Indonesia, and 60,000 certifications worldwide. FSC develops and provides forest stewardship standards to enable responsible sourcing, conservation in certified areas, and restoration of forests. The organization is built on democracy and equality, with environmental, social, and business interests balanced.

The FSC remedy process was recently adopted and has been effective since 2023. FSC stressed how important it is to listen and learn at this Forum, especially considering this is a new process and APRIL is the first company to embark on the remedy process.

FSC's objective is to achieve high-quality and meaningful environmental and social benefits, defining a pathway to reassociation. Remedy is all encompassing, covering restoration, conservation, restitution, and compensation to communities that have suffered harm through conversion and unacceptable activities the period 1994-2020.

The environmental and social baselines are being worked on to assess social and environmental harms resulting from unacceptable practices during the period 1994-2020. (The independent assessors, contracted by FSC, also joined the Forum).

FSC welcomes the opportunity to work with APRIL on the remedy process, seeing the company as committed at the leadership level to changing the way it is operating and providing remedy for past harm.

“We are at the learning stage of the FSC remedy process with a long road ahead.”

**Kim Carstensen,
Director General, FSC.**

WHAT IS THE FSC REMEDY FRAMEWORK?

The FSC Remedy Framework is designed to allow land converted between 1994 and 2020 to be eligible for improvement, bringing remedy for people and nature. The Framework defines processes to be followed by companies to reassociate with FSC and for the land to be certified. APRIL cannot currently have any land certified or sell certified products due to its disassociation but by providing remedy the company could become eligible for reassociation with FSC, and for certification.

Remedy activities consist of forest conservation and restoration, as well as restitution and adoption of human rights principles.

Remedy is a major process. It first requires identification of the affected parties and the harm they have suffered due to unacceptable activities over the period 1994-2020. Then remedy actions are proposed and must be agreed upon and implemented sufficiently to get to the FSC association threshold, after which eligibility is assessed and the process completed.

FSC sees remedy as a process of healing and regeneration with positive impacts at the landscape scale.

Remedy by APRIL can also help to meet the Government of Indonesia's goals for climate change, biodiversity, and sustainable development.

WHAT ARE THE ROLES OF APRIL AND FSC IN THE REMEDY PROCESS?

APRIL's role is to implement the remedy process, ensuring provisions, such as stakeholder engagement requirements, are met, and outcomes are validated. FSC requires that APRIL show good will and engage in high quality efforts with an open exchange on challenges, recognizing that perfection will not be possible while working together to find constructive solutions.

FSC's role is to set the remedy process rules and standards and to facilitate implementation of the process, including building the pool of independent assessors and third-party verifiers, as well as managing a data portal to share updates and implementation reports from third party verifiers. Crucially, FSC also ensures there is no greenwashing.

FSC encourages and expects stakeholders to participate actively in the process and make sure remedy happens on the ground.

WHAT'S AT STAKE?

Learning is crucial since this is the first remedy process globally to be implemented under FSC's new policies. It could result in large areas of forest and ecosystem services being restored, with FPIC and social restitution. Success criteria include capturing learnings, improving future remedy processes, environmental and social benefits, and increased trust in APRIL (and FSC) based on these outcomes.

Status of the APRIL Group's FSC Remedy Process

APRIL Group's Director for Sustainability and External Affairs, Lucita Jasmin, gave an overview of the APRIL Group highlighting their contribution to the national economy with 260,000 jobs created, and their commitment to no deforestation since 2015. APRIL Group's sustainability policy, and specifically the Sustainable Forest Management Policy enshrine this approach, and the company has achieved 80 percent of its "1:1 commitment" to conserve one hectare of forest for each hectare of forestry plantation. The APRIL 2030 framework includes commitments across climate, nature, people, and sustainable growth. APRIL plans to supply the expanded demand of its manufacturing facilities by increasing fiber productivity by 50 percent in existing plantations.

APRIL is committed to FSC reassociation and remedy for several important reasons. The company believes Indonesia deserves to be recognized globally as among the best and largest in plantation forestry and manufacturing. Fair market access is aided by gaining FSC association and certification and as such past negative impacts must be addressed, with systems and processes put in place in the company to prevent the possibility of unacceptable activities happening again.

Environmentally significant forest conservation and restoration, collaboration across landscapes, support to national parks and partnerships with conservation NGOs on ecosystem restoration concessions and species conservation are all likely to be part of APRIL's FSC remedy process.

Social benefits of remedy could include improved access to land and forest resources for communities, capacity building, community and social forestry, and new partnerships in agroforestry and sustainable agriculture, as well as improved land dispute resolution.

"APRIL sees FSC remedy as the opportunity for a collective win-win."

Lucita Jasmin, Director of Sustainability and External Affairs, APRIL Group.

For the Indonesian Government, these efforts would contribute to meeting important national and international climate, nature, and economic development targets.

For APRIL Group itself, the remedy process is already helping to drive transformation internally to resolve historical issues, improve systems and practices, build engagement and communication, as well as expand partnerships and trust.

Inviting and listening to inputs is central to strengthening the APRIL FSC remedy work as an ongoing learning process since this is being implemented for the first time globally and depends deeply on support and constructive engagement from many others.

APRIL's Christopher Burchmore presented how the FSC Remedy Framework is being applied by APRIL. *(Please see Resources Page of the APRIL Remedy Microsite for the APRIL presentation or click [here](#)).*

APPLICATION OF THE FSC REMEDY FRAMEWORK TO APRIL GROUP AND THE WIDER CORPORATE GROUP

The APRIL remedy process involves three chapters of process and actions. Chapters 1 and 2 apply to the entire corporate group and cover policy, risk, foundational systems, and trust, with the potential to be transformational for the group's companies in Indonesia, China, Brazil, and beyond. Important new policies have already been developed and are now being adopted across the whole corporate group on human rights, sourcing, integrity, and ethics.

Chapter 3 goes further, with seven steps that the APRIL Group itself must implement, further broken down into 36 building blocks. The APRIL Group is currently in the second of these seven steps, developing the baselines through the work of the independent assessors.

The three impact areas covered in the APRIL remedy process are APRIL-managed concessions in Riau, TPL concessions in North Sumatra, as well as Adindo Hutan Lestari and Itci Hutan Manunggal concessions in North and East Kalimantan.

APRIL developed the methods now being applied by the independent assessors. The assessment involves determining conditions prior to unacceptable activities, then looking at the current state, and gathering documentation and information through site visits, interviews, historical analysis, by independent assessors including consultations with rights holders. For Riau and Kalimantan, the work of the independent assessors has been paused to consider possible adaptive management of the approach before continuing.

STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION AND DIALOGUE

APRIL welcomes and encourages input on what can be done better in the remedy process, and this stakeholder forum is a key step in communicating this message. A dialogue system with “core dialogue groups” for each impact area (provinces) is a key requirement of the FSC Remedy Framework, to convene, agree and facilitate remedy of harm, with representation from APRIL and a diversity of impacted rightsholders, as well as advisors to the rightsholders subject to the latter’s written consent. Interested stakeholders and experts may also be included with consent from the rightsholders.

SUMMARY OF THE APRIL REMEDY PROCESS

The remedy process overall has four phases:

1. Identification of harm (APRIL is in this first phase currently).
2. Remedy planning, with core dialogue groups established to support consultation and engagement.
3. Implementation of remedy.
4. Ending disassociation with FSC.

A grievance mechanism has been set up by APRIL specifically for the remedy process and Chris shared several links and channels for participants seeking further information and communication with APRIL.

Challenges and Opportunities Highlighted by Participants

Participants engaged APRIL and FSC in extensive questions and answers, provided feedback and raised concerns. There were also breakout sessions and plenary discussions and reflections. Several major topics emerged. The discussions and perspectives on each are summarized below.

THE APRIL REMEDY PROCESS IS WELCOMED BY MOST PARTICIPANTS – THEY WANT IT TO SUCCEED.

Throughout the Forum participants welcomed the adoption by FSC of its remedy framework and process. They expressed strong support to APRIL for committing to go through the process and implement environmental and social remedy. Both FSC and APRIL repeatedly stressed that this is a learning process and has never been attempted before. They urged participants to provide candid feedback through the various channels available both directly to FSC and to the company.



Lukas Nai, a village head from East Kalimantan, expressed hope that his relatively small village, which has few economic opportunities, can work with APRIL on the remedy process as they continue to live from their land.



Dirsa, a college student studying forestry, was grateful to APRIL and FSC for the opportunity to participate, with the expectation that the Forum will be followed by further consultations.

FSC and APRIL should help address shortcomings in capacity to participate in the remedy process in local communities and NGOs and more work is needed to build deeper understanding about the process by stakeholders and rightsholders.

The FSC remedy process is complex and for many participants this Forum was the first time they had the opportunity for a detailed firsthand overview and discussion with FSC and APRIL. It was stressed that it is very important that all parties understand the remedy process. Several commented that more explanation about the remedy process is needed, and there is insufficient understanding about who has the right to receive remedy, how they are identified, and how they will be included in the process.



Patrick Anderson of Forest Peoples Programme talked about the need for funding to build community and local NGO capacity and urged FSC to address this need. He also called for this Forum to be replicated in the impacted provinces and encouraged development of pilots to share learnings to help speed up the process.



Harry Oktavian, Director of the NGO Bahtera Alam, based in Pekanbaru, Riau, described how his group has designed materials for communities to help them engage in the FSC remedy process. He stressed that communities need training on FSC, preparation for negotiations, and for FPIC processes.

Other participants stressed that this Forum was very useful, with more funding needed for capacity building and training. Both FSC and APRIL acknowledged the need for support for capacity building and committed to providing more support to local NGOs and communities.

MORE TRANSPARENCY IS NEEDED IN THE REMEDY PROCESS

Several participants expressed the need for greater transparency in some aspects of the process including the methods being used by the independent assessors and the agreement between FSC and APRIL. Regular and more detailed updates on progress were requested. As one participant noted, “Trust between all parties is needed and for this we need transparency throughout the process, including a mechanism to update all parties on progress.” Another urged, “Equality, transparency, and participatory dialogue are important throughout the process.”

APRIL thanked participants for questions on methods and definitions, as well as on transparency. They reiterated commitment to transparency and will have the methods used by the independent assessors made available to the participants.

There were concerns about the baseline assessments and the work of the independent assessors including whether the right to FPIC was being respected

“APRIL appreciates requests for the independent assessment methods to be more transparent and will make them available.”

Chris Burchmore, APRIL.

Comments and concerns were raised about the important early step in the FSC remedy process of conducting baseline assessments to identify environmental and social harm that is within the scope of the process. Points raised by participants included the following:



ALL COMMUNITY RIGHTS SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED, INCLUDING LAND OWNERSHIP AND ACCESS TO LAND AND RESOURCES.



THERE SHOULD BE A STRONGER PROCESS TO IDENTIFY THE IMPACTED COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THIS REMEDY PROCESS.



SINCE THE SITUATION IS COMPLEX IT IS IMPORTANT FOR INDEPENDENT ASSESSORS TO SPEND MORE TIME ON THE GROUND IN THE COMMUNITIES, AND THEY NEED TO ENGAGE WITH A WIDE RANGE OF PEOPLE INCLUDING YOUTH AND WOMEN.



BASELINE ASSESSMENTS NEED ROBUST METHODS WITH MUTUAL SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS



THE INVOLVEMENT OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND OTHER LOCAL COMMUNITIES IN THE REMEDY PROCESS IS IMPORTANT.

THE IMPORTANCE OF LISTENING TO VOICES OF PEOPLE WHO LOST THEIR LAND, AND OTHER MARGINALIZED GROUPS SUCH AS WOMEN AND YOUTH, AND NOT ONLY APPROACHING VILLAGE ELITES FOR CONSULTATIONS.



PROPER IDENTIFICATION AND VERIFICATION OF WHICH COMMUNITIES HAVE SUFFERED HARM AND IN WHICH WAYS IS IMPORTANT.



SECURING LONG-TERM SOCIAL REMEDY WILL REQUIRE LEGAL SECURITY OF TENURE FOR LOCAL COMMUNITIES, WHICH ONLY THE GOVERNMENT OF INDONESIA CAN PROVIDE.



Rudiansyah, Coordinator of the NGO *Yayasan Kehutanan Masyarakat Lestari*, reiterated concern about the practical challenge of conducting assessments of harm in hundreds of impacted villages over a short period of time.



Martha Doq, Director of the *Perkumpulan Nurani Perumpuan* an Indigenous Women's Group in East Kalimantan, called for assessors and auditors working with FSC to engage much more with women's groups since women often see impact directly, such as when water sources are damaged or when they lose access to herbs and traditional medicines on the forest. She stressed that Indigenous Peoples have a personal attachment to the forest, it is their life, and they will sacrifice anything to protect the forest. They ask for just one thing: to be recognized as an Indigenous community, and they want to find a way forward with APRIL, if the company respects the community.

Several participants called for more rigorous FPIC implementation to help ensure that there are no further rights violations during the remedy process itself.



Mahir Takaka with PUG, independent consultants, hoped there will be brave and bold steps from FSC to capture best practices with Indigenous Peoples who successfully manage their forests.



Isnadi Esman, village head (*kepala desa*), Pulau Padang, Riau, described how he has encouraged participatory mapping with support from government agencies, working with all families in his village to explore the conditions of the rivers, forest, and each family's needs. They reached agreement and signed an MOU with APRIL with significant positive gains including establishing a sago plantation and becoming eligible for increased government funding.

FSC took careful note of the concerns about the quality of the independent assessments stressing that the Forum has been helpful and timely for sharing these concerns.

APRIL reminded participants that the company is not yet in the remedy phase of the process and that not all rightsholders have been identified. They stressed that they understand that this needs to be done correctly.

APRIL also agreed that FPIC – and verification of FPIC – are important parts of the process, especially with affected rightsholders. APRIL noted that the independent assessors have not yet reached the point of going back to affected rightsholders with results of their assessments, which will happen in due course.

“Thank you for the valuable feedback, as independent assessors we are committed to doing the best possible job.”

Dwi Rahmad Muhtuman,
Director, Re-Mark Asia.

FSC clarified that on FPIC, the FSC Remedy Framework includes “verified FPIC gates” and the FPIC process specified is adapted from FSC FPIC guidance and the FSC forest management system. FSC is also developing indicators for verification of FPIC with experts and advisors who are Indigenous Peoples. This should be complete by the end of 2024 with a webinar planned to share the outputs and to which all participants in this Forum will be invited.

In response to questions about how “Indigenous Peoples” is defined, FSC noted that the FSC Remedy Framework recognizes the UN DRIP definitions and that this is part of the basis for defining affected rightsholders. Indigenous representative at the Forum welcomed this approach.



Dwi Rahmad Muhtuman, Director of Re-Mark, one of the independent assessors, said that FSC took a very important step in developing the remedy framework. He thanked the participants for the feedback to help improve their work and encouraged them to contact him to give more input. He thanked FSC and APRIL for trusting Re-Mark to become part of the process.

Some participants believe that the independent assessors may have conflicts of interest and that this must be addressed.

Concerns about conflicts of interest of the independent assessors were raised based on the history that these service providers have working on other contracts with APRIL. **Greenpeace’s Grant Rosoman** urged FSC to disclose the justification for the approval of Re-Mark Asia and Hatfield as independent assessors. FSC acknowledged the possible conflicts of interest of the independent assessors and was mindful of this in the selection process.

Some participants allege that the APRIL Group may have hidden ownership of companies engaging in deforestation and raised specific grievances about a police case filed against a community member over alleged encroachment in the PT Adindo concession area, which resulted in the arrest and ongoing imprisonment of the community member.

Some participants raised specific concerns about allegations of hidden ownership by entities related to APRIL of companies engaged in ongoing unacceptable practices of deforestation. Others were concerned about the recent arrest and ongoing imprisonment of a community member over alleged encroachment in the PT Adindo concession area.

FSC noted that the “corporate group” has been determined by FSC for the APRIL remedy process and is available online with all the APRIL-related companies listed

FSC stated that it is investigating specific allegations from some NGOs about hidden ownership or control by entities related to APRIL of companies that have engaged in unacceptable practices after 2020. APRIL and RGE have repeatedly refuted these allegations.

APRIL noted the concerns and stressed that this is partly why the remedy process is in place, to gather this information and then implement remedy, with strong policies across the whole group. In the specific case of PT Adindo, APRIL informed participants that it is looking into the situation and aims to resolve it in a way that does not involve a judicial process.

In response to a specific question, APRIL explained that if the APRIL remedy process with FSC is suspended for whatever reason then the enabling conditions for remedy would change. The incentive of FSC certification and the leverage in the wider corporate group would no longer be available. Meanwhile, important regulatory developments such as the European Union Deforestation-free Regulation could provide an alternative pathway for market access.

FSC also noted that if APRIL regains association with FSC and its land is certified, then this land would have to continue to be managed in accordance with FSC's standards with annual audits.

LANDSCAPE SCALE AND LONG-TERM THINKING IS IMPORTANT IF THE FSC REMEDY PROCESS IS TO SUCCEED

A landscape-scale approach was endorsed by some participants with remedy extending beyond directly affected areas to wider landscapes and stakeholder consultations at the landscape level. They noted that the social landscape is complex with many different claims. Social justice, economic and environmental needs should be balanced, and consensus based and it is important to allow time for the process to proceed, recognizing it is time consuming and complex.

WWF Indonesia facilitated a panel discussion with comments from **Prof. Agus Setyarso** of Gajah Mada University and **Dr. Muhammad Ali Imron**, WWF's Director of Forests and Wildlife. They explored various aspects of the APRIL FSC remedy process including definitions, external validity, and implementation opportunities and challenges with a case study of landscape scale elephant conservation in Sumatra..

“FSC must investigate with urgency common control of PT Mayawana Persada and PT Asia Forestama Raya by RGE Group, and if found to be, suspend the roadmap and remedy process with APRIL.”

Grant Rosomon,
Greenpeace.

“APRIL has repeatedly and unequivocally refuted allegations of links to hidden companies and unacceptable practices.”

Lucita Jasmin, Director of
Sustainability and External
Affairs, APRIL Group.

ENGAGEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF INDONESIA IS IMPORTANT

Several participants, including **Made Ali with Jikalahari**, expressed the need to engage and gain support from the Government of Indonesia for the remedy process. Harmonization between government, NGOs, academics, and companies would help to ensure a smooth process. Meanwhile, the Government could change regulations affecting the remedy process and play a helpful role in dispute resolution.

FSC stated that it plans to be in touch with the Government of Indonesia and to engage them in the process. FSC will also explore using terms preferred by the Government of Indonesia, while not necessarily being able to fully adopt that language.

Closing Reflections from APRIL, FSC, FPP and WWF-Indonesia

WWF INDONESIA'S
ADITYA BAYUNANDA:

“I am more optimistic now and WWF Indonesia’s commitment is to continue to support the remedy process in the hope of better environmental and social outcomes.”

Aditya Bayunanda, CEO, WWF Indonesia.

“There is deep care, attention, and willingness to be part of this remedy process, evidenced by the level of participation including from those who have been consistently critical of APRIL. These critics being at the Forum says a lot, including that the remedy process is widely supported by communities, NGOs, academics, and other companies. We appreciated APRIL’s and the FSC Director General’s presence, thanked the independent assessors for listening carefully, and noted it is not too late for the independent assessors to improve their work. Similar forums are needed in the impacted landscapes, provinces, and districts. I am more optimistic now and WWF Indonesia’s commitment is to continue to support the remedy process in the hope of better environmental and social outcomes.”

FPP'S
MARCUS COLCHESTER:

“There has been a convergence of understanding, which is very important.”

Marcus Colchester,
Senior Advisor, Forest Peoples

“Thank you APRIL and participants for a very useful meeting. There has been a convergence of understanding, which is very important. It is great that APRIL clarified their approach, that FSC staff were present and able to explain their vision and role, and especially that community voices were here and heard, and that we all learned a lot. Next, we need to hear more from the independent assessors about their approach. We need to start with sharing more information and have more engagement, so we are better informed about roles and expectations. Time has been lost by starting the impact assessment before rightsholders were prepared to engage in a proper FPIC process. I hope we have more trust so we can travel the road ahead in friendship. Thank you everyone for the commitment and positive spirit, and count on FPP to stay engaged and support the process.”

FSC'S
KIM CARSTENSEN:

“We see this as a major opportunity for real impact on the ground.”

Kim Carstensen,
Director General, FSC.

“Thanks for an extraordinarily rich day. We came here to learn and to achieve results and move together with a win-win for the environment, society, business, and Indonesia. We see this as a major opportunity for real impact on the ground. FSC is happy to see real understanding of the challenges, complexity, and need for support for communities, for rightsholders to engage in a proper way, and for transparency and government engagement. For FSC this is truly important, we are putting a lot of resources into developing the remedy framework. It is important to continue the conversation at the landscape level about real issues and real situations. Our commitment is there to provide guidance, tools, solutions, and input, and we are keen to move this to success.”

APRIL'S
LUCITA JASMIN:

“APRIL is fully committed to the FSC remedy process and sees this as a very important opportunity for collective wins, for communities, the environment, Indigenous Peoples, and for Indonesia as a whole.”

Lucita Jasmin,
Director of Sustainability and External Affairs, APRIL.

as host of the Forum, closed the meeting: “Much thanks to FSC, WWF Indonesia and FPP for joining at the leadership level, without them we could not have had such diverse participants and so rich an agenda. APRIL thanks the facilitators and most importantly expresses heartfelt gratitude to all participants for two days of meaningful, credible, constructive inputs.

“APRIL clearly heard input from participants calling for more transparency and improved consultation, being much more inclusive and involving those most impacted. APRIL will discuss with FSC how to strengthen the independent assessments. APRIL is open to discuss with local NGOs and communities support to address their capacity-building needs. Specific grievances, for example about PT Adindo, will be taken back to colleagues and addressed.

“On next steps, APRIL will carefully consider the opportunity and need to organize forums at local and landscape levels, as many participants recommended.

In closing, APRIL is fully committed to the FSC remedy process and sees this as a very important opportunity for collective wins, for communities, the environment, Indigenous Peoples, and for Indonesia as a whole.”

Appendices

SOCIAL REMEDY GROUP NOTES

Nineteen people joined this breakout group on day 1, facilitated by Forest Peoples Programme (FPP), which FPP summarized as follows:

BENEFITS OF REMEDY FRAMEWORK

- » The Remedy Framework offers major opportunities to communities if it applied correctly as stated in the FSC policy.
- » Achieving the right enabling conditions first is therefore crucial to successful implementation.

TRAINING AND AWARENESS RAISING

- » The process must be transparent and accountable, which means that communities need to be informed in advance of roll out of the Remedy Framework.
- » Without proper information and representation communities are too easily manipulated or confused and Remedy Framework implementation will not be effective.
- » Capacity building and awareness raising steps need to be carried out first. Local NGOs and activist academics can help with this.
- » Community training in FPIC is vital and also in negotiation and conflict resolution.
- » Funding for all this is needed and the long proposed 'Blind Trust' needs establishing urgently.

SELF-REPRESENTATION

- » Measures must put in place early to allow community representation to be inclusive and self-chosen – communities are often horizontally and vertically divided. This process cannot be rushed.
- » If independent assessors talk only to village elites and village heads then decisions will still be top-down from the point of view of the wider community.

ONGOING PROBLEMS

- » Criminalization of people for using their customary lands continues (for example, PT Adindo).
- » HTI projects often bring in outside labor, sometimes as Transmigrants, and this becomes a problem for indigenous communities as they don't respect customary lands and livelihoods and use Indigenous Peoples' resources.
- » There are more severe problems with suppliers to APRIL, even though they provide 100 percent of their timber to APRIL's mills they don't work to the same standard.
- » Independent assessors are not operating in line with the Remedy Framework. There is not self-representation. Instead, the assessors are talking to a few village elite members. Assessors are not visiting the villages but just relying on secondary data and newspaper articles. There is concern that signed attendance lists are being taken as FPIC agreements.
- » Assessors are making the assumption that if a village site is not in a HTI they are not impacted. The question should be the other way around: do the HTIs overlap villages (or customary) lands?
- » Assessors need to spend longer in the villages and interview people about their history, land use and land tenure.
- » Currently assessors are not able to be objective but are coming in with too many assumptions and their own subjective ideas: only deeper consultation with the communities will correct this.
- » Baselines which are developed on this basis will fail to resolve conflicts. Identifying harms and negotiating agreed solutions through proper FPIC is needed.
- » Using an audit approach, as used for certification, for carrying out the assessment will not work.
- » It is essential there are no conflicts of interest and that assessors, third party verifiers, and mediators are independent and objective.

LAND RIGHTS NEED CLARIFYING FIRST

- » Quick surveys will not identify the extent of customary rights as most are not registered or recognized by the government.
- » In many areas, notably Toba Batak, rights and claims to customary rights overlap among numerous patrilineal clans; this needs participatory engagement with the communities and cannot be understood let alone verified in a couple of hours or days.
- » Participatory mapping with the communities through inclusive processes are needed and then findings need to be triangulated through multiple proofs and sources.

FPIC IS KEY

- » There are too many examples of faked consent processes which result in people become victims again.
- » FPIC process must carefully align with self-determination by the people.
- » Self-representation is not apparently understood by companies or independent assessors.
- » Assessors, third party verifiers, and company personnel all need training in FPIC to aligned with FSC requirements.

RESTITUTION

- » Landscapes have been radically transformed and people have been moved or migrated and changed their ways of life, so remediation cannot mean actually restoring what was there before but finding solution suited to current conditions and aspirations.

GROUP 1

BALLROOM 1A

Facilitator: Patrick Anderson

Rapporteur: Rudiansyah

Please highlight 3 top messages from the group to be emphasized in the report back to plenary:

1. A deeper explanation is needed regarding the FSC Remedy process, the definition of remedy must have further explanation, especially in relation to who has the rights (identification of Impacted Rights holder, Affected Rights Holder).
2. There is always good and ongoing progress for the future work of APRIL FSC Remedy.
3. It requires the involvement of customs and culture in every remedy process
4. Social and labor programs

To Question #1:

Based on the morning presentations, what did you learn and what concerns and questions do you have?

- » Community hopes that they can work together better in the future.
- » APRIL can develop community businesses with non-timber forest products.
- » APRIL must be able to support and develop culture (education of local content in schools and knowledge for generations)
- » Strengthening and involving Indigenous and cultural institutions
- » Needs further explanation in the Remedy process, the definition of remedy needs to be further explained.
- » The pattern of approach and communication to the community is carried out through the village head and traditional leaders carried out by the Company, this is the procedure carried out.
- » Questions regarding the Rights of Indigenous Peoples need further classification and explanation, for example in Riau there are differences in the sea, coast and land.
- » APRIL's good intentions to carry out and realize this environmental and social remedy commitment must be welcomed.
- » The Remedy process must be carried out in a reasonable manner, both Social and Environmental.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Hope that all parties can support the success of the Remedy FSC process carried out by APRIL. » The APRIL FSC remedy process has already been carried out, this needs to be verified. » Remedy FSC raises many questions and new understandings, this is important to clarify and must also be implemented and workable. » Implementation of Remedy must be in accordance with the real needs and desires of the community. » An understanding and capacity building regarding Remedy FSC to the community should be held in the villages?
<p>To Question #2: What would you like to see as a result of this remedy process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » What the company wants is that it can always work sustainably and the community can also be prosperous, both from an economic, natural and cultural perspective in the community. » There is a balance between everything: economic, natural and social. » There is comfort for all parties, both in the community and in the company. » The process continues to be carried out through the involvement of traditional institutions. » APRIL can always support matters regarding customs, culture, social and economic matters in society. » Stop disputes between the Company and the Community. » There are always ongoing developments for Remedy's future work processes. » The Company's commitment to always grow and develop together with the community. » The Company's commitment remains to always take an intensive and better community approach in the future.
<p>To Question #3: What is needed to see those results?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Social programs must have a significant impact and enjoyed by the community. » The community hopes that the Company can prioritize workers from the local community. » The company hopes to resolve the issue of the status of land rights, so that there will be no disputes between communities or other parties in the field in the future, certainty about the owner of the rights and boundaries must be important. » In the future, if there are social programs, those should not be provided in the form of cash.

Any other remarks or recommendations:

Environmental aspect of social forestry or where communities are can also be remedy/restoration area.

GROUP 2

Facilitator: Marcus Colchester

Rapporteur: Lan Mei

Please highlight 3 top messages from the group to be emphasized in the report back to plenary:

1. Most members of our breakout group reported that this forum helped them gain a deeper understanding of the FSC Remedy Framework, but that they still need more time to do a deeper dive on this process. In fact, this Forum has been very useful, but it has caused some confusion that although there has not in fact been much work to support capacity building yet around the Remedy Framework process, the process of baseline assessments has already commenced. There was a concern that although it is clear local NGOs have an important role to play in supporting communities to better understand the process and to exercise their rights in this process, there is a serious lack of and need for funding to support this work.
2. There was agreement that the situation in Indonesia on the ground is complex; some communities want their lands returned, some welcome the company's activities as a means of improving their local economy. There are also many different indigenous peoples with different customs and cultures. It is important for the independent assessors to spend more time in communities to better understand the situation on the ground, and they need to make sure they are speaking with a representative range of actors, including youth and women, and not only the village leaders. This is critically important for achieving remedy effectively as well – must respect the participation and FPIC rights of the communities (not just elites) as understood under international law; must find out what communities actually want as remedy and must talk to all members of communities.
3. 3. Many group members expressed that in order for this Remedy Framework process to work, there must be trust between all parties. This means having transparency throughout the process, for example, a mechanism that can transparently update all parties on the progress of implementation of the Remedy Framework. This also means that all parties should be involved in deciding and agreeing upon the activities that should be undertaken as part of this process. There was a suggestion for us to develop a practical guide that independent assessors, third party verifiers, and communities can use in this process. There was also a suggestion to work on a communication mechanism to improve and facilitate communication between all parties on this process. Eventually, there will need to be trust to enable effective negotiations to reach agreement upon remedy.
4. Group members hoped that the result of the process would be that community members' rights are recognized – that their ownership over their lands and forests

is recognized, and that they can have secure livelihoods. This means not just being able to get jobs with the company, but having access to their lands and resources to engage in their own customary livelihood activities. It is important that the company also work with the government to enable recognition of indigenous peoples' land rights.

To Question #1:

Based on the morning presentations, what did you learn and what concerns and questions do you have?

- » We have a better understanding of the FSC Remedy Framework
- » We still need time for a deeper dive to understand this [RF] in detail
- » Perspective from IA: have received inputs from participants regarding what we need to improve in assessment process. Already started the social and environmental baseline in PT TPL area in North Sumatra, which is complicated area with 12 districts and over 150 villages.
- » Perspective from indigenous peoples' organization: always concerned with ensuring communities can participate. We expect that indigenous communities are involved and engaged. We're worried that only the elites are involved. We want to make sure all members, including females (who experience specific impacts), are included. Indigenous communities, if they have the chance, want to revamp the area; for example, to reclaim sacred forest. Those sites are hard to identify but we have to try to give it back to them. For areas not yet deforested, we have to maintain and protect them. Hopefully we can follow up on implementation of UNDRIP (government process for recognizing IPs is complicated).
- » Perspective from academic: we need to have an agreement about looking at impacted society. Before 2000, there were two types of villages - natural village following riverside, and also territorial village which is developed since 1960s because of transmigration from cities. The migration villages were based on sketches. There are also villages outside those, which are rural villages, which we call indigenous communities, and later we called them traditional communities; now we call them rural indigenous communities. Sometimes government ignores them. From this context, we need to decide who the targets are. Many villages do not have access to speak out, so we need to go to the village. We need to be careful in defining the village and what we want to do there in the remedy process. Sometimes community members sell land to outsiders. We need to take a qualitative approach, and stay in village to understand their culture. Appreciate the company for trying.

<p>To Question #1: Based on the morning presentations, what did you learn and what concerns and questions do you have?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Now understand that there is an FSC Remedy Framework to certify wood being sold outside country. Can see that there are actions that need to be taken by the company, and there are things they cannot do anymore. Tenurial conflicts have been around for a long time. After community members sell the land to a company, it can be sold again and it's not economical from company to buy same piece of land several times. Haven't learned enough to say how we can solve these problems. Some communities have not experienced change in quality of life from the existence of companies (e.g., Adindo in North Kalimantan) operating there, so they reject the remedy framework because they had not experienced any changes. » Have a lot of new knowledge about Remedy Framework. Concerned with what has happened so far and what we need to do. We expect life of communities located in area of business activities and their rights can be improved. Hope that existence of companies can contribute positively to society. » Banoa Baru - their life is poor, it's different from the transmigration village near them, living paycheck to paycheck. Hopefully assessors do not discuss with local leaders only, have to get into the community to talk to young people, women. Some communities are divided. » Have a more complete understanding regarding the FSC Remedy Framework. What was delivered was more detailed than the remediation procedure for palm oil. If FPIC is not granted, how can they achieve the threshold of association for initial implementation? » Feeling that APRIL's sustainability team is serious. But sees that in reality there is a long delay on capacity building aspect, training (on what is FSC, Remedy Framework, role of IAs). This hasn't started but the IA activities have already started, and there's already been problems, so this is also causing confusion around procedures. It would be good to pause the process in Riau and KalTim to clarify the procedure.
<p>To Question #2: What would you like to see as a result of this remedy process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » [question about RSPO remediation procedure and how that works] » RSPO RaCP has two aspects – one allows for remediation in other areas; there's also one to allow for remedy for human rights violations and establishment of HCV 4-6 areas in areas that were affected – up until now, there are some companies that only following one mechanism » AMAN does not agree with that option, which is like carbon trading. Restoration of areas that were damaged is good. Indigenous communities and organizations, when they support carbon program, don't get good response from others. Need to collaborate with indigenous peoples to see which areas they want to restore and what they want. » 3 expectations: need to trust each other, between company, communities, civil society, academics, consultants. Hopefully this process helps build trust. Second, need transparent mechanism to see the progress of the remedy framework. Third, implementation process that is sufficient. » Variety of indigenous communities can contribute to different understandings, so first step is to create trust. Trust will lead to openness, socialization, and then framework can be applied. » We need to align what company is doing with government programs.

<p>To Question #2: What would you like to see as a result of this remedy process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Communities need areas for their own livelihoods so they don't have to be employed by company (where they will earn little money and have low positions) » Want to have remedy framework to improve wealth of society/communities. We need to involve stakeholders and talk about it all together. » Businesses are important for welfare of society. Need collaboration between stakeholders, FSC, APRIL, communities, to achieve fair agreement and decent resolution. » Hopes that company can restore the forest and areas that communities lost be returned to a state that allows for agroforestry. Hope that there can be a clear procedure that allows for land rights in concession areas. Hope that companies can work together with government to recognize community land rights, such as hutan adat, hutan desa. Company must not only respect the rights but work with government so that the rights can be recognized
<p>To Question #3: What is needed to see those results?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Communities have to lower ego so remedy can be achieved. If both parties do not compromise, there will be deadlock and no agreement. APRIL can spend longer time with communities to have stronger connection which will help with negotiation. » Need collaboration from companies, communities, all stakeholders. Need to work together, so there won't be any arguments about why we're doing X or Y, but actions are taken by agreement from all. » Have to respect community ownership of forests and collaborate together to improve economy of communities. » APRIL has to identify the right stakeholders, and after that, identify who can help facilitate and mediate between communities and company. » We need to involve and engage all elements of communities, because this is for welfare of community. Need to see what kind of remedy they want to have, from all parts of community. Second, have to learn from other companies who have failed. » We need to work hard, be serious, be open and trust each other. There are lots of hopes and expectations, so we cannot go back, need to see what we need to discuss and ask communities what they actually need. » Make a communication mechanism between stakeholders, we can explore different types of forums, digital platforms to build and improve communication. Second, we can make a practical technical guideline, which is relevant for independent assessors, third party verifiers, and communities. This will be a reference for us that we agree upon. » If we want NGOs in Indonesia to support communities in this process, we need funding. FSC hopes that training and capacity building is supported by NGOs. This has already been brought up to FSC, but there's no result yet. Companies also said they can contribute to this, but no results yet. This is important if we want NGOs to have a role in this process.

Any other remarks or recommendations:

Any additional specific reflections from the facilitator and rapporteur:

GROUP 3

Facilitator : Cindy Cheng

Rapporteur : Michelle Chan

Please highlight 3 top messages from the group to be emphasized in the report back to plenary:

1. The primary emphasis is on the complexity of the social landscape and different communities in Indonesia, many different claims of indigenous land. The main takeaway is the desire to end all continued social conflicts. Remedy presents an opportunity but currently the system is not sufficient or does not go far enough in terms of independent assessment, and there are concerns that, without a clear and detailed process, the Remedy process will create more problems despite good intentions.
2. Proper identification and verification is key. Need to properly identify the relevant communities as there are major concerns regarding which communities or indigenous peoples that have suffered harm. Proper verification includes a formulation of what constitutes a community, and from whom data is collected. This includes a factual assessment of not just impacted stakeholders as a whole but also different types, status and those who hold different amount of resources. Addressing only village heads is not sufficient, need to consider all the different layers of communities for true participation of other villages.
3. The last key takeaway is the need for government engagement. The government issues licenses and permits for concessions or recognizes indigenous communities, and are a key player in conflict resolution. There is also concern if government regulations change, the remedy process would be impacted. The government also has power to facilitate and needs to be engaged.

<p>To Question #1: Based on the morning presentations, what did you learn and what concerns and questions do you have?</p>	<p>» The primary concern is the continued social conflicts between communities. There are concerns of land encroachment, as some communities claim to be indigenous communities or claim to have suffered human rights violations but are rejecting companies from replanting forests or committing violations themselves. This is exacerbated by government licenses for indigenous peoples, which do not pinpoint exact area or location. It is important that there is proper verification of the actual owner of land in the area, those who hold rights, those who suffered harm.</p>
<p>To Question #2: What would you like to see as a result of this remedy process?</p>	<p>» Out of this Remedy process, everyone wants social conflicts to end. Also, Remedy needs to be implemented for different sectors, including palm oil.</p>
<p>To Question #3: What is needed to see those results?</p>	<p>» To see those results, we need a strong will to end all social conflicts and the next generation will suffer the same consequences. Also, increased engagement with government and better mapping of stakeholders, and it needs to include a community layer. We cannot address only village heads, but also take into account social layers. Prepare better system of methodology, independent assessment and FPIC.</p>

Any other remarks or recommendations:

What I understand from this meeting is that this forum will take inventory of planning to do Remedy in the concession areas. The problem is that there is no formulation yet from APRIL, FSC, WWF and FPP to not eliminate the rights of other peoples. Not seen from the Remedy process in protecting rights.

Q: To what extent is the verification that FSC did that APRIL in accommodating a group of people that claimed they lost their rights in the concessions but actually it is not true. Hope that the Remedy process will not create new problems with communities. Right now there are communities fighting for their rights but also not protecting the rights of others and the blame goes to the company. In our area, Simalungun district, there is a group of people who claim that they are suffering discrimination, their human rights are being violated, but in practice they are violating other people's rights. If this kind of event happens, if an IA came and this case arose, we need objectivity of the IAs to perform the verification of who are the actual groups suffering from this, need to look at all the other communities in the neighbouring areas, do not want some people claiming to be indigenous peoples but they are not.

Village head of Tapanuli Utara: The case is also similar. One example is located within concession area of TPL. The problem is that the neighbouring village who is not within the concession area, they claim on behalf of the indigenous areas that the land is their indigenous land. Meanwhile my village has been there for hundreds of years, 9 generations in this village, but these neighbouring villages are claiming and reject the company to replant because the area is their indigenous land. We have no interjections of the concession area. We need to identify who is the actual owner of the area.

Morlan S: Indigenous person, satisfied in the forum of getting answers.

Q: the government in this case are giving the licenses and the permits, and they need to be involved in this process. Our village has license and recognized as a customary village from 2022. But there are still conflicts. Why are there still conflicts? There is already acknowledgement from the government. The government does not point down the exact area and location of the license. Our ancestors living there for 14 generations, people who came afterwards for 2 generations seem to have more rights to claim the customary land than us. People that are coming with them have influence and claim false rights.

Hotman S.: If FSC comes to the field, and if they can get actual data, sure that there would be a good resolution. In this case, APRIL has been supportive. However, a concern is how to facilitate conflicts between company and communities. Without government, we cannot achieve resolution of social conflicts. Maybe FSC does not want to invite the government, so that all in conflict can sit together? **Q:** Are there any efforts from the government to acknowledge this? **What he expects from this Remedy:** results will never betray the process. When the process is done well, then the result will be good. To achieve this, we need a strong will to end all of these conflicts. The current government supports this by issuing the permits but what about the next government. We need to all work together in a serious manner, and everyone to have good intentions.

The company is always the one to blame, but the one causing the problems has never been blamed. Simple request: to find the people who really caused the problem. In my area, there was a conflict resolution area, signed by a community representative. We need to prosecute the ones who caused the problem because the ones who are suffering are the people at large. Previously already disputed the conflict, but it keeps recurring in other areas.

Two things: 1) appreciation that we can discuss and the intention of APRIL and FSC to make remedy plan, but we need to know how this remedy plan is being constructed and applied by APRIL. Draft concept for remedy not only be applied by APRIL who indeed have the resources, but FSC can also do some kind of trial to the communities. We have affected stakeholders, other than what APRIL is

currently doing. The community has their own limitations, maybe FSC can facilitate the process. We do not know who is going to do the trial, even from a community perspective. 2) If developing remedy for harm, we need to be clear according to whom the harm is. Which parties feel harmed? FSC classification types of affected stakeholders, affected rightsholders, are here. But what is important is that these classifications need to be equipped with one more layer: community layer. The community also needs to be formulated. Different types and status, also do not forget about the social layers (village heads and the ones below them, the ones that we address are the highest layers). This would help the company to map their community other than these 4 types.

We have discussed the Remedy Framework, is the RF robust? Methodology-wise, it is not yet appropriate, including about FPIC. FPIC process being skipped. Salem mentioned that FSC is developing indicators for FPIC. There should be a slow trial to the community and in phases if we are talking about standards at FSC. The IA should also be based on those assessors, talking about indigenous peoples. In terms of sociology, need upper and lower layers. Also agrees with lack of government engagement. FSC's entry is not only about process and enabling APRIL to get premium markets for their products. Government regulation to acknowledge indigenous peoples. Why does it need to be a conflict first? If we want FSC to run well, prepare funds for assessor trying to get certifications? Similar situations with palm oil plantations. Certification is only for products to enter European markets. For palm oil industry, those palm oil business players are afraid now. Human rights and do no harm: is it already implemented down below? Are there monitoring frameworks- no response from Chris? FSC is not a luxury label; if there is a change in 5 years, does it mean FSC is going to be cancelled? If FSC wants to do this, the first point is to prepare the funds.

Juanda P. from APRIL TPL: even though our tribes fight, we are still brothers. I need to be the bigger person to accept the brotherhood. Remedy is related to environment and social, need government engagement. Please do this in a detailed way. There are many claims of indigenous land. Criminalization and permits. If we do not report this to the government, if there is any deforestation that we need to report to the Ministry of Forests, otherwise license would be revoked but no one ever informed the indigenous peoples. Supreme Court Decree 35. FSC must be very detailed in the process. We do not want the intention to remedy things to create new problems. We appreciate APRIL and its subsidiaries of trying to do something about it. If we do not put the right foundation, then everything will fail.

Dani S. APRIL TPL: Currently we are in the process of FSC Remedy. From what I have heard from all of the stakeholders especially surrounding communities of TPL concession we agree with involvement of government in this process. What we have learned that we need to return the area claimed by the community taken out of their concession. This is impossible directly because this is not the company land; the power belongs to the government. Also asking questions to FSC Remedy in identification and discussing environmental or social harms, we want to say that in 1994-2020 there are compensations for conflict resolutions, this does not mean that the company has not had a process for conflict resolution. Commitment from high management to do restoration and improve environment and social. Core Dialogue Groups - monitor the implementations, invite several stakeholders to help formulate the action plan for remedy, and from the evaluations we can create another action plan. This is the first Remedy process being done in the world.

Input to FSC: ensure effective remediation plan. Not only impacted stakeholders, impacted rights holders, etc. Not only these 4 groups. But within each of these groups, there will be upper layers, middle layers or lower layers in terms of resources, such as land size. To get full representation, we need to identify high layer, medium layer and lower layers to give remedy suggestions to them.

Just want to clarify: the ones being interviewed only from the upper layer. What happens is like this: all this time, the lower layer of people are given an understanding that they are the right owner of this land even if that is not the case. They blame the company. FSC must do factual verification to do a group of people to act as if they are discriminated but they are the discriminators of other communities. This is a long process, and suddenly Indonesian government changes. Q: What are the guarantees that this will still continue?

Importance of gathering the data from the right people.

Any additional specific reflections from the facilitator and rapporteur:

GROUP 4

BALLROOM 1B

Facilitator : Dian Novarina

Rapporteur : Vina Surya

Please highlight 3 top messages from the group to be emphasized in the report back to plenary:

1. Support APRIL - FSC remedy but emphasize that the rights of the community must be upheld.
2. The implementation in the field must be thoroughly carried out.

<p>To Question #1: Based on the morning presentations, what did you learn and what concerns and questions do you have?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Gain insights into the social, cultural, and environmental remedy process of FSC - APRIL. » Support the existence of the company. » Hope that the community's expectations can align with the company's expectations and that they can coexist harmoniously, with program alignment between the company and the surrounding community. » Desire to preserve community wisdom in accordance with Law No. 50, and to protect the rights of legal indigenous communities. » Inadequate discussion on labor rights, welfare, and social security. Concerns that practices are not in line with the Omnibus Law.
<p>To Question #2: What would you like to see as a result of this remedy process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Moving forward. » One example of community expectation: to conduct conservation as a living laboratory for the community and future generations. » The remedy program should be thoroughly implemented in the field. » There should be no more employment relationships that violate the Omnibus Law, wages below the minimum wage, and all employees must be enrolled in BPJS Social Security and Healthcare. » There should be no more river pollution that disrupts the livelihoods of the community.

To Question #3:

What is needed to see those results?

- » The company must be open and care about the community.
- » Work together on river stewardship, formalized in a partnership to ensure mutual responsibility.
- » Sit together to unify the vision for the future, with support and training from the company for the community's welfare.
- » Solid cooperation between the company and the community for river stewardship to prevent pollution and for environmental conservation.
- » Good communication and coordination between the government, the company, and the community.
- » Adhere to labor regulations in accordance with the Omnibus Law and foster good cooperation in the future.
- » Establish good communication and cooperation between the company and labor unions.

Any other remarks or recommendations:

Clarity from the government regarding the status of community land in forested areas.

Any additional specific reflections from the facilitator and rapporteur:

GROUP 5

BALLROOM 3A

Facilitator : Aditya Bayunanda

Rapporteur : Kokok Yulianto

Please highlight 3 top messages from the group to be emphasized in the report back to plenary:

1. Justice for social, economic & environmental need to be balanced.
2. The Additional remedy area must be beyond mandatory.
3. Process stakeholder consultations must be also in landscape level (eg: more deep on technical Harm, loss, also on FPIC implementations).

To Question #1:

Based on the morning presentations, what did you learn and what concerns and questions do you have?

A: Canakya:

- » Success criteria must be mutually beneficial.
- » Affected parties are not sufficiently involved.
- » FPIC (Free, Prior, and Informed Consent) has not been fully implemented.

B: Dejan

- » From the presentation, it is evident that there are many things that need to be done, fortunately, the timeline is available.
- » FPIC can start from the beginning for greater transparency.
- » How will the company prepare for its implementation?
- » In terms of the environment, there is a focus on conservation and restoration.
- » AB: There is a difference in weight for conservation and restoration.
- » AB: For example, elephant habitats do not require 100% intact forest, but varied habitats are always part of the elephant's habitat.

C: Hairul

- » Justice for social, economic, and environmental aspects must have balance.

<p>To Question #1: Based on the morning presentations, what did you learn and what concerns and questions do you have?</p>	<p>D: Petrus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » What does the FSC version of remedy entail? Is it 1:1? What is its value? Or should one apply for an RE permit up to a 1:1 ratio? » AB: For social aspects, as long as FPIC is used fairly and correctly, the results should mutually benefit. » AB: For environmental aspects, the RACP scheme from RSPO cannot be adopted, as what will be assessed is the success in restoring the environmental value reduced by the company, and additionally must also go beyond mandatory requirements <p>E: Darwis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » APRIL is reported to not rush the remedy process, but the reality on the ground suggests that APRIL appears to be rushing by not conducting field visits due to time constraints. » AB: If the IA is hired by FSC with a set deadline, the point is that APRIL should not be rushing. » Petrus: Not rushing but also not delaying unnecessarily. It can take time if there are reasonable justifications within the timeline and if the company has adequate economic capacity for this. <p>F: Mawar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » The IA is targeted to receive a 3-month contract, with the possibility of extension based on field developments. » The FPIC process must be implemented. » What will be the continuity of the IA's third-party verifier baseline?
<p>To Question #2: What would you like to see as a result of this remedy process?</p>	<p>Hairul:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » The strategy for achieving remedy goals in different places should consider the characteristics of each location and cannot be standardized. <p>Petrus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » This is to address the shortcomings of the government in protecting forests/habitats (e.g., Tesso Nilo NP). » Who should receive the benefits? For example, forest-planting communities. <p>Canakya:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » FPIC should involve further concern for the affected communities to seek mutual benefits. » Why not do more if possible? Why settle for a 1:1 ratio if a 1:2 ratio could be achieved?

To Question #3:
What is needed to see those results?

Hairul:

- » Welfare can only be achieved if there is balance in economic, social, and environmental aspects.

Petrus:

- » Favoring the company to obtain benefits to continue the remedy process.

Dejan:

- » If the baseline can be determined as accurately as possible, future steps will be easier.

Any other remarks or recommendations:

Any additional specific reflections from the facilitator and rapporteur:

Stakeholder (interested, affected, impacted) need more capacity building on knowledge on how remedy framework process work

GROUP 6

BALLROOM 3B

Facilitator : Muhammad Ali Imron

Rapporteur : Dito Akbar

Please highlight 3 top messages from the group to be emphasized in the report back to plenary:

1. Environmental and social baseline should be developed with robust methodology therefore mutual benefit for environment and community can be assured to be restored.
2. Ensuring everyone understands the remedy process.
3. There is harmonization between government, NGOs, academics, companies and other sectors with purpose for the betterment of the environmental area.

<p>To Question #1: Should there be advocacy by FSC to describe in the use of a project regarding benefits from the project?</p>	<p>» There should be an advocacy by FSC on the project or remedy, with an objective of clarity from financial aspect and else.</p>
<p>To Question #2: How far APRIL and FSC can find license holder in granting the permit to conduct the process? And how far can it be done for the area and activity?</p>	<p>» Conservation does not count existence of community within the forest area. This is because if we explain activity related to the environment, it is relatively easy to remedy. But, in social context will be pretty difficult to define the scope what can be gained or need to be done to contribute to prosperity.</p> <p>» Location for remedy implementation in where past activities has resulted negative impacts.</p>
<p>To Question #3: To whom the mandate should be given?</p>	<p>» Mandate for communication or discussion with the government is held by FSC Indonesia as the representative of FSC Global.</p>
<p>To Question #4: How can we open the opportunity to work together with the government?</p>	<p>» Different perception/view is usually causing dispute, then government would like to have credit when there is environmental remediation.</p>

<p>To Question #5: What are the issues on government acceptance?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Limited engagement from external party to the government therefore there is little information and references. Then there is also hunger of power and support from donor that affect certification. This will require the government to resolve this.
<p>To Question #6: What is the situation and documents that can be the reference but cannot be identified for remedy of year 1994 or other years?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » If applied baseline is interview then the data can be in doubt, this is because different generations that have lived in the area. » However, can use the ancestors' heritage in the area that functions as register. » The changes in the area can result uncertainties in terms of the remedy.
<p>To Question #7: How is the treatment to customary community because of the lost document?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Can see the baseline that covers public utility, environment, or utilization e.g. looking at surrounding ecology that support the life. » Lands rights and utilization rights are in fact the fundamental rights of the community. » For wildlife, can use their roaming range and further research.
<p>To Question #8: How is the implementation of policy for remedy in the area of village for community? What indicators are used for these remedy?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » When it has provided benefits to the community then the community must be able to contribute to the environment from the benefit they have earned. » Relation between business and government with direct benefits for right holders community and the environment. Also must ensure there is no party intentionally take advantage of this.

Any other remarks or recommendations:

LIST OF MESSAGES/ OPINIONS FOR QUESTIONS NO.1:

Baseline context:

1. Baseline development that is not using HCV because considered outside the baseline, but in the presentation and according to my opinion HCV should be used.
2. If applied baseline is interview then the data can be in doubt, this is because different generations that have lived in the area.
3. However, can use the ancestors' heritage in the area that functions as register.
4. The changes in the area can result uncertainties in terms of the remedy.
5. Can see the baseline that covers public utility, environment, or utilization e.g. looking at surrounding ecology that support the life.

Location context:

1. Remedy within National Park can be considered as additionality, for the reason less benefit or objectives for National Park.
2. Remedy is conducted in the area that gives impact to the environment and social between 1994 – 2020, therefore can be voluntary and can also be part of acceptance from the government in the initiative.
3. There should be no organization or company that take advantage with objective for self-benefit.
4. APRIL must implement the remedy in its own area or in other area considering connectivity, or can also be in National Park.
5. Global Forest World discloses a data that peatland development in Riau is 1 million hectares, but not yet being conducted comprehensively and integrated.

Remedy context:

1. FSC Remedy Framework can be considered as a living document or can be updated. Remedy must not only providing the financial but must also involved in the activity or remedy action.
2. Mandate for communication or discussion with the government is held by FSC Indonesia as the representative of FSC Global.
3. Limited engagement from external party to the government therefore there is little information and references. Then there is also hunger of power and support from donor that affect certification. This will require the government to resolve this.
4. Company has a principle to generate profit and therefore when doing environmental remedy it is imperative the government must be included because they are part of the cause of the negative impact.
5. When granting a license, there should be clarity on the ecosystem within the area as well as social aspect and the community within.

Government context:

1. Government or state role is required in the remedy process, because forest area in Indonesia is forest owned by the state.
2. Acceptance from government is needed, sometimes government has different points and understanding.
3. One of important concerns is how to work together with the government of Indonesia, as the highest authority in a state.
4. Other issue is about 'pride' from several parties, one of them is government that has a view when there is already a standard like SVLK the there is no need for FSC.
5. During the New Order, uncertainty and status quo in management are continued with the principles of the Old Order. This is because those studied abroad were not returning to Indonesia due to the changes in political situation.
6. The remedy should not overlap with the program by government.

Community and Social context:

1. Can see the baseline that covers public utility, environment, or utilization e.g. looking at surrounding ecology that support the life.
2. The management of village forest must be seen as the forest and community who manages it, with one agreement from the community when they want the remedy.

LIST OF MESSAGES/ OPINIONS FOR QUESTIONS NO.2 & NO.3:

1. There is harmonization between government, NGOs, academics, companies and other sectors with purpose for the betterment of environmental area.
2. There is clarity in the process with the willingness of corporate then the utility then common. This is one of the fundamentals in doing the process.
3. There are negative sentiments because of information and news on market rejection from other countries that making us creating barrier with foreign countries through certification.
4. Relation between business and government with direct benefits for right holders community and the environment. Also must ensure there is no party intentionally take advantage of this.
5. Government acceptance in the remedy conducted by private sector.
6. When it has provided benefits to the community then the community must be able to contribute to the environment from the benefit they have earned.
7. All parties understand what is remedy process to avoid misunderstanding.

Any additional specific reflections from the facilitator and rapporteur:

Discussion went well, but more time was spent in discussing first question.

GROUP 7

MEETING ROOM C

Facilitator : Salem Jones

Rapporteur : Daneetha Muniandy

Please highlight 3 top messages from the group to be emphasized in the report back to plenary:

1. The entire remedy process should be transparent where the information on the entire flow of the process as well as the substance within the process flow is made available to all.
2. There is a practice of equality, transparency and participative dialogue throughout the entire remedy process.

To Question #1:

Based on the morning presentations, what did you learn and what concerns and questions do you have?

LEARN

- » The involvement of multi stakeholders before and until the certification process is complete.
- » There is opportunity for an open dialogue which can be both accommodative and confrontative.
- » APRIL needs to take in the learnings from the multistakeholder forum.
- » The understanding of the stakeholders on the remedy framework has clearly increased and the outlook towards the process has changed positively.
- » The dialogue that is held with the stakeholders especially with the community should use simpler terms that can be easily understood.
- » FSC and APRIL have expressed the activities that they will be conducting as part of the RF. However, there is no clarity how far has APRIL reached implementing the RF?
- » There are some questions from the NGOs that have not been addressed by FSC.

CONCERN

- » There needs to be openness in receiving new approaches that can smoothen the process completion.
- » Revision on the SOPs or the current principles.
- » APRIL must provide a quick response to the complaints from all stakeholders.
- » The report of the independent assessor

<p>To Question #1: Based on the morning presentations, what did you learn and what concerns and questions do you have?</p>	<p>QUESTIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » There needs to be a fair and justified process to remedy the loss of the local communities as well as the indigenous people that have been affected. » All stakeholders receive the same updates on the remedy process that is taking place. » The remedy process to be transparent and open. » Information that is given by APRIL is their commitment and how far they have reached in the RF, however, there is no clarity on the involvement of the independent assessor in the process. » How can the Independent Assessor or FSC determine when the social analysis is conducted or when the affected stakeholders are identified. » What if the report submitted by APRIL by the independent assessor shows that only 70% of the affected stakeholders agree with the RF and the remaining are not ready to be part of the RF. Would FSC accept this report or would FSC require the agreement of the remaining 30% of the affected stakeholders.
<p>To Question #2: What would you like to see as a result of this remedy process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » The entire RF implementation and process should be transparent. » APRIL has not made the information on all their suppliers transparent. This is important information as there are several suppliers of APRIL who are involved in deforestation. » The hopes towards the IA that they should be open to the information from various parties around the identified villages / community areas. The information by all the parties should also be verified by the IA. » When the Remedy Plan has been agreed, the agreed outcome should be materialized. » There needs to be annual milestones that are reviewed. » There is a multistakeholder forum / meeting in the districts facilitated by a third party (not FSC or APRIL).
<p>To Question #3: What is needed to see those results?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Transparency: APRIL to provide a publicly accessible platform especially for the affected stakeholders. APRIL also needs to have an SOP to provide a response, should there be questions coming from stakeholder via this publicly accessible platform. All updates and information on the remedy process should be available on this publicly accessible platform. » Remedy Plan: To strategically plan and arrange the annual milestones. » Dialogue: Who will the Third-Party to conduct the multistakeholder meeting / forum in the district? A right party will need to be identified.

Any other remarks or recommendations:

Any additional specific reflections from the facilitator and rapporteur:

GROUP 8

MEETING ROOM E

Facilitator : Christopher Burchmore

Rapporteur : Gamma Galudra

Please highlight 3 top messages from the group to be emphasized in the report back to plenary:

1. Hope to collaborate and inclusive between all stakeholders, particularly government on remedy framework
2. Alignment of understanding and communication with capacity building (all levels)
3. We need to allow time for the remedy process to take place. We recognize it is very time consuming and complex.

To Question #1:

Based on the morning presentations, what did you learn and what concerns and questions do you have?

- » There is no common understanding of the FSC framework yet. The parties have different understandings; There is still a gap between the framework and government policy. There are still differences for indigenous communities, both formal and recognized.
- » Reflections on how to resolve land rights. Need to develop a tool to measure whether it is successful or not. APRIL already has an example and needs to be replicated in other places depending on the local context. How everyone is informed. How can communities negotiate land rights. The assessor must have the ability to understand local issues; acceptance of the assessor's conclusions by the community and the decision-making process of how the assessor is involved in the process.
- » Consultation cannot be done only once, especially on representation and legality of participation; appreciation for APRIL to be ready to be open to improvement; the challenge is implementation, especially social acceptance; whether restoration should be as it was, is debatable; Each assessor can have a different understanding of the problem; assessor results need to be consulted and agreed upon; ensuring restoration of rights and agreements. Independent assessors cannot do discussions only once.
- » Understanding of this remedy must be the same; These experiences create a remedy methodology; more emphasis on the remedy approach; assistance must be provided; ensure that the subject and object must be clear as individual, group and village remedies.

<p>To Question #1: Based on the morning presentations, what did you learn and what concerns and questions do you have?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Understanding of remedy different; indigenous people learn, people learn about the remedy framework thru comics » Understanding of remedy mixed up from FSC standards, remedy framework, FPIC, IPs, local communities, and village social systems such as royal and customary structures. If you mix things up, you will repeat the mistakes of past experiences. There is community assistance and empowerment, maintained and transformed; The participants involved can complement each other in the remedy framework, as an example, theoretical experts can help with practice, capacity building to facilitate mapping, conflict and negotiation. » Understanding of the affected communities, limited knowledge about the remedy framework among the community. Are these results used to revise the remedy framework document or just for notes; Much of the independent assessor's work is done by desk reviews, whether consultations were carried out/what kind of methodology because there are so many villages » The threshold when social and environmental conditions are suitable for progressing towards certification must be clear. how institutions can be assigned as independent assessors or verifiers; How is this remedy framework process aligned with government policy?
<p>To Question #2: What would you like to see as a result of this remedy process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » HTI and restoration areas do not increase and there are consequences for restored lands, 7.7 million ha to be restored; forest cover could increase and targets for emissions reduction; social conflicts exist in each location and RF is useful for resolving them; RF changes BAU patterns » RF can be a collective win-win; RF for restoration land will not be a problem in the future. » Restoration of social rights, especially returning traditional rights to earn a living as before, access to rivers and land for food, companies must be responsible for the cultivation they take; Broken traditional institutions must be strengthened; the public economy can participate in regenerative forests; Cultural sites can be taken care of again. » RF is like a road map, can be an end road for forest and people » No deforestation of natural forests, harmonization of good relations between communities and companies, government intervention to be involved in improving harmonization, natural forests within concessions are protected and managed by communities and companies » Locations for restoration in conservation and RE areas. How many new PS areas can be developed? One way to increase restoration is through PS. Whether the RF for social is enough to be made into a national RF, requires technical guidance, especially for assessors. » Hope for environmental and social Remedy. How hope are realized and there needs to be negotiation in understanding the problem. IA has a common understanding about Indigenous peoples and need a long process and how to resolve it at the beginning. Environmental expectations, graph of forest cover rising and deforestation falling and adopted by companies. It is hoped that it will meet the government's targets. Strengthening the capacity of Social Forestry (SF) management communities is needed, there is a lack of assistance resources. Remedy focuses on SF.

<p>To Question #2: What would you like to see as a result of this remedy process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Binding enthusiasm and commitment to maintain the dignity of Indonesia so we have the same vision. The permit holder has a mandate to manage it and the government has a mandate to maintain it. Realizing sustainable forest management. Harmony between parties to maintain national honor.
<p>To Question #3: What is needed to see those results?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Communication is needed » Who will cover the costs, who will facilitate the remedy process, including assistance » Collaboration, adaptive, open-minded, transparent » Dialogue to synchronize perceptions and win-win solutions; alignment between FSC, government policy and local wisdom; joint synergy in PHL » Trust but it's not easy to build. Tested through joint collaboration » Creating preconditions such as collaborating with the government. FSC is considered a competitor and FSC prepared a position paper from an Indonesian perspective. What incentives are proposed for companies to support government targets? » The public must know developments in the RF » A clear framework that accommodates all parties, different frameworks for traditional and local communities, must be designed together.

Any other remarks or recommendations:

Government need to give incentive to parties restoring environmental and social condition; form of appreciation from FSC to parties committing to the RF

Any additional specific reflections from the facilitator and rapporteur:

