

**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**RSPO CTF2 hybrid meeting at the VE Hotel & Residence (24-25 July 2023)**

**Attendance:**

<p><b><u>Members and Alternates</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Harjinder Kler (HUTAN)</li> <li>2. Lee Swee Yin (SDP)</li> <li>3. Ambang Wijaya (GAR)</li> <li>4. Eleanor Spencer (ZSL)</li> <li>5. Ahmad Furqon (WWF)</li> <li>6. Cahyo Nugroho (FFI)</li> <li>7. Lanash Thanda (BCI)</li> <li>8. Dayang Norwana (BCI)</li> <li>9. Lim Sian Choo (Bumitama)</li> <li>10. Sander Van den Ende (SIPEF)</li> <li>11. Olivier Tichit (Musim Mas)</li> <li>12. Kalindi Lorenzo (Planting Naturals)</li> <li>13. Anne Rosenbarger (WRI)</li> <li>14. Vivi Anita (Musim Mas)</li> <li>15. Mahendra Primajati (FFI)</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Absent with apologies</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Benjamin Loh (WWF)</li> <li>2. Arnina Hussin (SDP)</li> <li>3. Quentin Meunier (OLAM)</li> <li>4. Bukti Bagja (WRI)</li> <li>5. Chin Sing Yun (Wilmar)</li> <li>6. Syahrial Anhar (Wilmar)</li> <li>7. Michelle Desilets (OLT)</li> <li>8. Sally Chen Sieng Yin (SEPA)</li> <li>9. David Wong Su Yung (SEPA)</li> <li>10. Ahmad Yudana (GAR)</li> <li>11. Martin Mach (Bumitama)</li> </ol>	<p><b><u>RSPO Secretariat</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lee Jin Min</li> <li>2. Kaw Kar Mun</li> <li>3. Oi Soo Chin</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Facilitator</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ginny Ng</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Invited Guest</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ruth Silva (HCVN)</li> <li>2. Daneetha Muniandy (HCSA)</li> <li>3. Adrian Choo (HCSA)</li> <li>4. Glen Reynolds (SEARRP)</li> <li>5. Jennifer Lucey (SEARRP)</li> </ol>
--	--

**Meeting Agenda:**

**Day 1**

<b>Agenda</b>	<b>PIC</b>
1. Opening and welcoming remarks	Co-chairs
2. Confirmation of previous minutes of meeting	Co-chairs
3. Updates from various CTF2 subgroups	Facilitator
4. Review of draft RaCP v2 document	Facilitator
5. Session with RSPO Membership Unit	Facilitator

6. End of meeting	Co-chairs
-------------------	-----------

## Day 2

AGENDA	PIC
1. Recap of Day 1	Facilitator
2. Review of draft RaCP v2 document	Facilitator
3. End of meeting	Co-chairs

No.	Details	Action
<b>DAY 1</b>		
1.	<p><b><u>Opening and welcoming remarks</u></b></p> <p>a. All members were greeted by the co-chairs in attending the hybrid meeting of CTF2.</p> <p>b. The RSPO Secretariat presented the RSPO antitrust policy statement, consensus-based decision-making in the CTF2 session and members to declare any conflict of interest, if any.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The facilitator declared her conflict of interest.</li> </ul> <p>c. The co-chairs welcomed 2 new members to the CTF2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lanash Thanda (BCI)</li> <li>- Dayang Norwana (BCI)</li> </ul> <p>d. The following invited guests for the CTF2 meeting were welcomed to the meeting by the co-chairs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adrian Choo and Daneetha Muniandy (HCSA)</li> <li>- Ruth Silva (HCVN)</li> <li>- Glen Reynolds and Jennifer Lucey (SEARRP)</li> </ul> <p>e. Co-chairs informed that this would be the last meeting of the CTF2 before the 30-day public consultation of the RaCP version 2 (v2) document. However, due to no quorum, the finalised draft would be emailed to CTF2 members for endorsement.</p>	
2.	<p><b><u>Confirmation of previous minutes of meeting</u></b></p> <p>a. The RSPO Secretariat presented the previous CTF2 minutes of meetings on 11-13 April 2023.</p> <p>b. A question was raised regarding Item 1b (Final check on the documents) of the meeting on Day 3: whether those sections that were marked as completed indicated no further discussion was required and only needed to focus on the rest of the sections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarification was provided whereby all the sections in the draft RaCP v2 would be gone through again on Day 1 of the CTF2 meeting (24 July 2023) to refresh everyone's memory, as not everyone would have been immersed in the document.</li> </ul> <p>c. The minutes were proposed and confirmed by Harjinder Kler and seconded by Ambang Wijaya.</p>	

3.	<p><b><u>Updates from various CTF2 subgroups</u></b></p> <p>a. The RSPO Secretariat presented the updates from the meetings with various subgroups, e.g., social subgroup, peat subgroup, and smallholder subgroup.</p> <p>b. The presented updates were incorporated in the draft RaCP v2 for CTF2 members to go through.</p> <p>c. In addition, the RSPO Secretariat presented the timeline for the draft RaCP v2 to be endorsed by the BHCVWG and prepared for the 30-day public consultation, targeted to start on 21 August 2023 and end on 21 September 2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Before the public consultation, the endorsed document would be translated into Bahasa Indonesia, Malay, French, Spanish and Thai.</li> <li>- Webinars will also be held during this period.</li> <li>- After the end of the public consultation period, the RSPO Secretariat would finalise the comments received and present the document to BHCVWG for further discussion and endorsement in early October 2023.</li> <li>- After which, the document would be tabled to the SSC for approval at the end of October 2023 and ready for GA in November 2023.</li> </ul> <p>d. Due to the lack of quorum from the growers in this meeting, it was proposed that the finalised draft RaCP v2 would be circulated via email to the BHCVWG members for endorsement before the public consultation period.</p>	RSPO Secretariat to email BHCVWG members.
4	<p><b><u>Review of draft RaCP v2 document</u></b></p> <p>a. Before diving into the draft RaCP v2 document, a question related to how the reprieve of scheme smallholders could fit into the timeline presented for the RaCP v2 document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The first part of the study to identify what would be the procedures that would be under reprieve was completed.</li> <li>- The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the second part of the study to determine what type of scheme smallholders (cases) would be eligible for the reprieve was tabled to the members.</li> <li>- The ToR would be shared with the members to deliberate, comment, and provide suggestions.</li> <li>- The second part of the study would not be able to be completed within 30 days as it needed to go through the tender process and find the organization or the person to deliver this.</li> <li>- It was suggested that the result from the first part of the study could be mentioned in the draft RaCP v2, while further discussion for the second part of the study was needed as the members were reviewing the draft RaCP v2.</li> </ul> <p>b. There was a need to check the consistency of the usage of HCV and HCV-HCSA throughout the document.</p> <p>c. There was feedback to indicate 'version 2' or put a date to the draft RaCP on the cover page.</p>	RSPO Secretariat to share the ToR on 24 July 2023.

	<p>d. Another concern was raised on the different definitions of the smallholders/scheme smallholders in the P&amp;C 2018, ISH standard (2019), RSPO certification system document (2020), and website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a need to streamline the agreed formal definition by cross-checking all those documents. (Currently, the draft RaCP v2 was referencing the definitions in P&amp;C 2018).</li> </ul> <p>e. It was suggested to also standardize the definition of affected communities, local communities, indigenous communities, and affected stakeholders.</p> <p>f. Section 3.1 Applicability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For clarity purposes, it was suggested to highlight that the document is applicable to corporate land clearing.</li> <li>- The facilitator clarified that the applicability of this document was mentioned but not within the applicability part. But this suggestion was noted and will be looked into.</li> <li>- Paragraph 3 was highlighted and commented to include information related to the temporary reprieve and would be re-visited.</li> <li>- To avoid confusion to the readers, paragraph 4 was amended to “The procedure is also currently not applicable to RSPO Jurisdictional Certification initiative. A customised RaCP may be developed as and when applicable.”</li> </ul> <p>g. Section 3.2 Cases Relevant to this Procedure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The sentence in paragraph 2 was revised to the following: “However, there may be exceptional cases where HCV-HCSA assessments were conducted prior to land clearance and where identified HCVs and/or HCSAs sustained accidental <i>and</i> limited damage during land clearance and/or subsequent operations, which was self-disclosed will not be treated as Complaints.”</li> <li>- A point to take note of: resubmission of the procedural note on the finalised text of “accidental <i>and</i> limited” to the Standard Revision 2022-2023 Task Force to maintain consistency.</li> <li>- Further discussion was needed on the cases that were eligible for exceptional cases. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The suggestion was that a guidance to the compensation panel would be developed and annexed to the RaCP v2 document.</li> <li>▪ However, there was also a proposal to provide all related definitions of what exceptional cases would be in the footnote instead of an annex because these cases were mentioned in the submitted Standard Revision Procedural Notes. Along with this proposal, it was suggested that accidental could be defined as: the land clearance should not be part of the company’s operational plan and budget.</li> <li>▪ A question was raised regarding whom to decide whether the cases would be assigned to the Compensation Panel or Complaints Panel.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Secretariat to check internally.</p> <p>Secretariat to check.</p>
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The RSPO Secretariat would be the one to assign these cases based on the data on the disclosure form and LUCA submitted by the company previously against the newly submitted disclosure form.</li> <li>▪ It was also proposed to retain the word limited in Section 3.2 since the document acknowledged “...there is past land clearance that may have been the result of a wide range of causes...” in Section 1 (purpose). Then, the meaning of ‘limited’ could be provided in the footnote. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There were extensive discussions on how to define ‘limited’, but no decision was made.</li> <li>○ Further examination and in-depth discussion were needed in subsequent CTF2 meetings to define ‘limited’ before the finalisation of the document. CTF2 requested the RSPO Secretariat to prepare the data (number of cases) related to exceptional cases as a support to the discussion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Referring to footnote 6, point 3, there was a suggestion to add a reference for the remediation and restoration in the Concept Note Section and Compensation Plan Section of the document.</li> <li>- Footnote 6 (descriptions related to exceptional cases) would be moved to the text of the document to ensure all 5 conditions were captured clearly and fulfilled to be eligible as exceptional cases.</li> <li>- A concern was raised regarding the gap that this document did not provide specific reference for the protection of RTE species that were not identified in the HCV assessment done previously (referring to the indicator 7.12.6 of P&amp;C 2018). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ This was outside of the scope of the discussion for the draft RaCP v2 as the concern raised was looking forward to the future to improve the HCV (or even HCV-HCS) management of a particular area. Whereas this document referred to the past where past qualities of HCV prior to the ALS system were not done very well which resulted in the area being cleared and planted with oil palm now.</li> <li>▪ However, this concern was noted for future discussion at the BHCVWG on HCV management and monitoring systems. It was also suggested that the HCV and HCV-HCS assessments’ baseline should be updated to capture the changes that happened over time.</li> </ul> </li> <li>h. Section 4 Responsibilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was suggested to include the responsibility of the grower to report annually against the progress of off-site compensation in the Grower Section and also the monitoring work by the Certification Body (CB) in the CB Section.</li> <li>- Referring to Section 4.5, there was a concern raised about the turnaround time to review the submitted documentation.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Secretariat to check with the Integrity Unit.</p>
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Previously, the Integrity Unit provided updates on the statistics and showed there was an improvement in the turnaround time in reviewing the RaCP cases.</li> <li>▪ The attempt to spell out the required number of turnaround days was good to ensure everyone was clear and understood the expected time frame for each party beginning from the submission of documentation and resubmission(s) to the endorsement of the Compensation Panel.</li> <li>▪ A flow chart would be included to reflect the point above and any additional resubmission (aside from initial submission and two resubmissions) would be subjected to a different rate.</li> <li>▪ There was a suggestion to strengthen the text in this Section to reflect the in-house review possibility, aside from external evaluation.</li> <li>▪ On the suggestion to have an in-house review of the remediation and compensation plan by the RSPO Secretariat, further discussion would be needed at the BHCV Working Group level.</li> </ul> <p>i. Section 7 Key Requisites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a need to revise the text in bullet point one of the liability assessment, i.e. “Land Use Change (LUC) analysis since November 2005.” for better clarity and alignment with the text in Annex 3a (LUCA reporting template). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There were extensive discussions on this text for accuracy.</li> <li>▪ The text was revised to: “Land Use Change (LUC) analysis since November 2005. The point where LUC analysis ends is further detailed in the Annex 3.” Different scenarios would be presented within Annex 3.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>j. Section 7.1 Summary of Procedural Steps and Decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The flow chart would be updated and re-inserted to the document.</li> </ul>	
5	<p><b><u>Session with RSPO Membership Unit</u></b></p> <p>a. The Acting Head of the Membership Unit from the RSPO Secretariat, Oi Soo Chin was invited to speak at the CTF2 meeting.</p> <p>b. The objectives of her presentation were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To share knowledge and learnings from the implementation of the RaCP into the membership application process.</li> <li>- To share challenges faced from the implementation of Group Membership requirements perspective and how it has affected the RaCP and membership processing, certification and complaints.</li> <li>- To consider recommendations from the Membership Unit to address the above issues.</li> </ul> <p>c. There were 3 scenarios in the membership application and group membership consolidation that were tied to the RaCP process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scenario 1: First-time application for membership and the applicant had no related entities that were having RSPO</li> </ul>	

	<p>membership. RaCP requirement was designed for this scenario.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scenario 2: Group membership consolidation when a parent company and its subsidiary(s) have separate memberships. In this case, both memberships could be consolidated without having to restart the RaCP process again. Members could just continue with the RaCP process after the consolidation.</li> <li>- Scenario 3: Group membership consolidation where the parent company was not a member of the RSPO, but its subsidiary(s) had RSPO membership. In such a case, the parent company had to submit a membership application.</li> </ul> <p>d. The recommendations that were put forth for the CTF2 members to consider and advise were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recommendation 1: To allow the parent company from Scenario 3 to be consolidated once disclosure was completed, as an interim measure until the completion of RaCP v2.</li> <li>- Recommendation 2: To consider if disclosure was sufficient to grant the membership to the first-time applicant. Currently, the requirement is to have LUCA approved to become an RSPO member (Scenario 1).</li> </ul> <p>e. Concern was raised on how the recommendations would help RSPO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was clarified that Recommendation 1 would help in handling the complaints that were received by the Membership Unit. Currently, the complaints received against the entity(s) related to this scenario were dismissed because the entity(s) had not been consolidated in the group membership due to the ongoing LUCA process.</li> <li>- Another reason is that it would allow units that have zero non-compliance land clearing to proceed with certification.</li> </ul> <p>f. For Recommendation 1,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a question on the number of cases and the raw liability that the CTF2 members were looking at. It was clarified that currently there are two cases from Indonesia*.</li> </ul> <p><i>*Correction: Upon further checking after the meeting, it was verified that the two cases consist of one company in Indonesia and one company in Malaysia.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was concern about what was foreseen to happen if this was granted as an interim measure or otherwise.</li> <li>- There was no objection to the Recommendation 1 during the meeting. However, no decision was made because the meeting was lack of quorum.</li> </ul> <p>g. For Recommendation 2,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a concern that the new members might not consider the RaCP as a priority if their membership application were being accepted via the completion of the disclosure step.</li> <li>- Another comment was that the applicants for the RSPO membership should know their final conservation liability that they needed to remediate and compensate (through</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>LUCA) before accepting the membership and giving their commitments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was suggested to retain the current process, i.e. the new applicants of RSPO membership would need to get their LUCA approved before they are granted as members. This is to avoid the company from leaving the RSPO without completing the LUCA exercise and benefiting from the short-lived RSPO membership.</li> </ul> <p>h. Due to a lack of quorum, an email would be circulated to the CTF2 members to seek their approval for these 2 recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The information as to how quickly the LUCA process approval could be done for group membership consolidation would be shared with the members.</li> <li>- It was highlighted that the unconsolidated companies and their subsidiary(s) were in violation of group membership rules.</li> </ul>	<p>The Secretariat to send an email.</p>
6	<p><b><u>End of meeting</u></b></p>	
<p><b>Day 2</b></p>		
1	<p><b><u>Recap of Day 1</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. ToR to identify the types of scheme smallholders eligible for the reprieve.</li> <li>b. Definition for smallholders – to double-check with the Smallholder Working Group.</li> <li>c. Consistency on texts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Affected, indigenous and local communities,</li> <li>- HCV-HCS integrated assessment throughout the document.</li> </ul> </li> <li>d. Section 3.1 Applicability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To specify the applicability to corporate land clearing,</li> <li>- To add text into the draft RaCP v2 that the reprieve was a temporary measure.</li> </ul> </li> <li>e. Section 3.2 Cases Relevant to this Procedure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exceptional cases: defined accidental as not found within the management plan and budget of a company,</li> <li>- Limited: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To remain as the text for the purpose of 30 days of public consultation,</li> <li>▪ CTF2 would further define the meaning of limited.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- To import footnote 6 into the main text of the document and all the conditions (5 points) must be fulfilled for the case to be considered as exceptional.</li> </ul> </li> <li>f. Section 4 Responsibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To include the responsibility of the grower to report annually against the progress of off-site compensation in the Grower Section and the monitoring work by the Certification Body (CB) in the CB Section.</li> </ul> </li> <li>g. Section 4.5 Independent Evaluators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Worded to enable the possibility of in-house evaluators.</li> </ul> </li> <li>h. Section 7 Key Requisites</li> </ul>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For liability assessment, a reference to Annex 3 is to be made in the document and would add various scenarios in Annex 3 of RaCP.</li> <li>i. Membership presentation (No quorum but for consideration) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To allow the Parent company from Group Membership (Scenario 3) to be consolidated once the disclosure was completed (an interim measure until the completion of RaCP revision).</li> <li>- To allow new membership to be granted upon the completion of the disclosure of non-compliant land clearing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
2	<p><b><u>Review of draft RaCP v2 document (cont.)</u></b></p> <p>a. Section 7 Key Requisites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Following up on the discussion on Day 1, the text in the first bullet point of the liability assessment was revised to, i.e. “Land Use Change (LUC) analysis since November 2005. The point where LUC analysis ends is further detailed in the Annex 3.”</li> <li>- It was proposed that the end date for the LUCA would be when the HCV-HCS assessment began (as in contract was signed with the HCV-HCS assessor). This proposal would be put in the text in the document or in Annex 3.</li> </ul> <p>b. Section 8.1.3 Identification of Social Liability for the Loss of HCVs 4, 5 &amp; 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “The grower is required to document evidence (e.g., SIA, EIA, HCV assessment, participatory maps) to be incorporated into the SAM (self-assessment matrix)...” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Referring to the sentence above, there was a question if there was a requirement related to the age of the documentation.</li> <li>▪ It was clarified that there was no requirement as the documents/assessments the company had at the point in time were to help trace back the history of land use.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>c. Section 8.2.1 Land Use Change (LUC) Analysis since November 2005 (Table 1 - Vegetation coefficient value assignment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was an extensive discussion on the grassland (maybe to also include other various ecosystems that exist outside of Southeast Asia). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It was suggested that this topic to be discussed further in the next BHCVWG meeting.</li> <li>▪ Also, suggested commissioning a subgroup to look at this topic specifically and technically by studying and analysing the satellite imagery, and also the available data. Glen Reynolds, Eleanor Spencer and Ruth Silva were proposed to be part of the subgroup members.</li> <li>▪ It was proposed to add grassland under coefficient 0.4 for now to get feedback from the 30-day public consultation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Meanwhile, conversation could be started at the RSPO-Monash Joint Symposium in September 2023 with the researchers and experts.</li> </ul>	To talk to Research Unit.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For clarity purposes, it was suggested to retain 4 columns with the table headers of coefficient, vegetation category, description of land type (November 2005 to November 2018), and description of land type, with the inclusion of HCSA (after November 2018).</li> <li>- Under the column of “description of land type, with the inclusion of HCSA (after November 2018)”, the description would include the text, i.e., structurally complex forest or simplified degraded forest will be calculated as coefficient 1 and to include the example of gallery forest.</li> <li>- The example of the Mauritia swamp (for the Latin America region) would be included in the note under Table 1.</li> </ul> <p>d. Section 8.2.2 Identifying Areas Requiring Environmental Remediation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Referring to the peat table, the RSPO Secretariat to check if the other National Interpretations (NIs) are mentioned on peat specifically (other than ones stated in the table, i.e., Indonesia, Malaysia, and Papua New Guinea).</li> <li>- In addition, the RSPO Secretariat to also check if the 100 ha was cumulative or otherwise.</li> <li>- For better clarity, the peat table would need to be improved and suggested to present it pictorially. There was a suggestion to present it in a decision tree flow chart with yes and no decision pathways based on a set of questions asked (could refer to the example in Annex 5 – Interpretation of Indicator 7.12.2).</li> </ul> <p>e. Section 8.3.1 Negotiation and Agreement of a Social Remediation Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was proposed to put in the text to reference the FPIC process and also indicate the date of reference, i.e., 2007 as per the P&amp;C requirement.</li> <li>- For clarity purposes, the last sentence of the last paragraph of this section was revised to “Where remedial plans cannot be mutually agreed, efforts should be made to resolve differences through facilitated bilateral engagement or mediation or company’s own grievance mechanisms.”</li> </ul> <p>f. Table 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Footnote 15 to be checked and proposed to include reference to International Law, e.g., the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).</li> <li>- It was suggested to add participatory mapping to the assessment (Step 2 of Table 3) explicitly.</li> <li>- There was a question on Step 5 of Table 3, i.e., who was responsible for conducting periodic reviews of progress and adapting if necessary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It was clarified that growers would be the ones to monitor the progress of the plan.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>g. Section 8.3.2.1 Environmental Remediation for Smallholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The sentence in paragraph 4 was revised for consistency, i.e., “In cases where there are new plantings on peat by</li> </ul>	<p>Secretariat to check.</p> <p>Secretariat to check.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>independent smallholders after November 2019, these areas will not be eligible for certification.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Also, a footnote would be added to refer to the Independent Smallholder Standard.</li> <li>- To check the text under this section and align it with the whole document.</li> </ul> <p>h. Section 8.3.3 Compensation Options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The figure of USD 2,500 might be revisited at the time as deemed appropriate by the BHCVWG.</li> </ul> <p>i. Section 9.3 Remediation and Compensation Concept Note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In paragraph 2, the thirty-day turnaround time would be revised to a maximum of three rounds.</li> </ul> <p>j. Section 9.4 Remediation and Compensation Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In paragraph 5, the thirty-day turnaround time would be revised to a maximum of three rounds.</li> </ul> <p>k. Section 9.5 Review Decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In paragraph 1, the forty-day turnaround time would be revised to a maximum of three rounds.</li> </ul> <p>l. Section 9.6 Monitoring of Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a need to check the titles and sub-titles of the sections in the documents as there were some sections named as “Monitoring of Implementation”. For example, Sections 8.3.1.2 and 8.3.4.1.</li> <li>- Also, to cross-check with the RaCP (2015) if there were any missed out texts in the sections mentioned above.</li> </ul>	
3	<b><u>End of meeting</u></b>	