

## **Survey inputs:**

Stakeholder perception of APP's Forest Conservation Policy implementation

Bruno Rebelle

TRANSITIONS

# Participation to the survey

“ 4 topics addressed:

- General perception of the FCP
- FCP implementation process
- FCP monitoring and reporting
- Role of the SAF

“ Participants:

- 54 % Indonesian and local NGOs
- 32 % international institutions and international NGOs
- 14 % companies representative and think tank




# Perception of the FCP

## General understanding of the FCP

- 60%: pretty good knowledge of the FCP
- 30%: know APP commits to Zero deforestation but can't say more
- 10%: have a rough idea of what the FCP is

## Perception of achievements → Balanced



# FCP implementation process

“ Main **progress** perceived

1. Supply chain transparency
2. Support to local communities
3. Progress report / monitoring

“ Main **weaknesses** identified

1. Actual reduction of deforestation rate around APP's concessions
2. Secure sustainable supply to match production capacities
3. Progress on social and land conflicts resolution & FPIC

“ Main **expectations and challenges** for the future

Sustainable management of pulpwood plantation on peat

Support to communities: reducing tensions and engaging in sustainable practices

Effective restoration and wildlife protection in both short and long terms



# Collaboration with APP in the FCP implementation

**81% willing to develop collaboration with APP**

**Examples of type of collaboration suggested by the participants:**

- “ Partnership for the implementation of landscape approach and coordination of landscape programs
- “ Support on community development; conflict resolutions, education, handlings of complaints, livelihood development
- “ Strategic overview, communication support and monitoring




# FCP Monitoring

## “ Access to information on FCP implementation:

- . 2/3 of the participants: access to information is available and relatively good
- . 1/3 of the participants: access could be optimized

## “ Perception of the FCP monitoring:



Monitoring is well detailed

Monitoring could be improved

Monitoring is ok (neutral)


I can't make any comment





# Stakeholder dialogue

“ Is the SAF a positive initiative ?




“ Perceived role of the SAF:

- 1) Raise issues that are not being sufficiently considered
- 2) Draw recommendation to further improve the FCP and its implementation
- 3) Flag difficulties related to FCP implementation



# Topics of interest for discussion in Breakout Sessions





Thank you  
Terima kasih

