

MINUTES OF MEETING OF RSPO

16th RSPO CTF MEETING

Date: 4-5th August 2015

Start Time: 0830

Venue: Aloft Hotel, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Attendance:

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Members and Alternates</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adam Harrison (AH, WWF INT) 2. Agus Purnomo (AP, GAR) 3. Anders Lindhe (AL, HCVRN) 4. Anne Rosenbarger (AR, WRI) 5. Audrey Lee Mei Fong (ALMF, OLAM) 6. Dickens Mambu (DkM, WWF MY) 7. Dwi Muhtaman (DwM, Remark Asia) 8. Leoni Lawrence (LL, ZSL) 9. Gan Lian Tiong (GLT, MM) 10. Glen Reynolds (GR, SEARRP) 11. Ginny Ng Siew Ling (GN, WILMAR) 12. Harjinder Kler (HK, HUTAN) 13. Henry Barlow (HB, Independent) 14. John Payne (JP, BORA) 15. Lanash Tanda (LT, SEPA) 16. Lee Swee Yin (LSY, SIME) 17. Melissa Yeoh (MY, FGV) 18. Michal Zrust (MZ, Daemeter) 19. NorAzam Abd Hameed (NaH, FGV) 20. Olivier Tichit (OT, SIPEF) 21. Richard Kan (RK, GAR) 22. Simon Siburat (SiS, WILMAR) 23. Sophie Persey (SP, REA) 24. Tang Men Kon (TMK, SIME) | <p><u>RSPO Advisors</u></p> <p><u>Secretariat Staff</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oi Soo Chin (OSC, RSPO) 2. Dillon Sarim (DS, RSPO) <p><u>Facilitator</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Karen Edwards (KE, Daemeter) 2. Leony Aurora (LA, Daemeter) |
|---|---|

AGENDA

Contents

- 1.0 Opening meeting by co-chairs.....3
- 2.0 Update on previous budget and new budget3
- 3.0 Review of document section by section.....3
- Section 1 (Preamble)4
- Section 2 (Introduction).....4
- Section 3 (Key Requirement and Guiding Principles)4
- Section 4 (Disclosure of Non-Compliant Land Clearance)4
- Section 5 (Approved Changes of SOP)4
- Section 6 LUC Analysis and Workshop Outcome.....4
- Section 9 Remediation and Compensation for the social impacts of the list of HCV 4, 5, & 65
- Section 7 Calculating conservation liability (including Annex 6)5
- Section 8 Compensation Panel6
- Presentation to support discussion on section 10, options for implementation of compensation.....6
- Section 10 Options for implementation of compensation6
- Section 11 Designing compensatory biodiversity projects.....7
- Section 12 Approval of remediation and compensation plans7
- Section 13 Monitoring of Implementation8
 - 4.0 Revisiting timeline8
 - 5.0 Special meeting with SHWG to discuss about compensation8
 - 6.0 Closing of Meeting.....9

| Item | Description | Point Person |
|---|--|---|
| <p>1.0</p> <p>1.0.1</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>1.1.1</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>1.2.1</p> <p>1.2.2</p> <p>1.3</p> | <p>1.0 Opening meeting by co-chairs</p> <p>OT opened the 16th RSPO CTF meeting by welcoming members and participants. He informed all members that the 16th CTF meeting will be facilitated by Daemeter.</p> <p>Signing code of conduct (CoC)</p> <p>OT requested CTF members to sign the new CoC before the meeting proceeded further. Changes made to the CoC were presented to members.</p> <p>Approval of previous meeting notes</p> <p>OSC presented the 15th RSPO CTF minutes and sought comments from members. CTF members requested some changes on the meeting notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>i)</u> OT requested to add more information to section 7 for the benefit of readers who are not members of the TF. <u>ii)</u> On section 14, ALMF requested to replace ‘no social...’ to ‘insufficient social...’ as there were participation from social NGOs, however it was not sufficient. <u>iii)</u> ALMF & RK requested RSPO to provide updated list of suspended members on the RSPO website. <p>The minutes was endorsed by CTF members and OSC informed members that it will be uploaded onto the RSPO website.</p> <p>Action points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To upload meeting minutes on to the RSPO website. 2. To update list of suspended members on the RSPO website. | <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p>OSC</p> <p>OSC</p> |
| <p>2.0</p> <p>2.0.1</p> <p>2.1</p> | <p>2.0 Update on previous budget and new budget</p> <p>OSC presented the spending for CTF and INA HCV TF for financial year July 2014 to June 2015. She also updated the TF with the new budget.</p> <p>Action points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To add ‘Grand Total’ to the budget. 2. To prepare comparative figures for last year for the budget | <p></p> <p></p> <p>OSC</p> <p>OSC</p> |
| <p>3.0</p> <p>3.0.1</p> | <p>3.0 Review of document section by section</p> <p>KE from Daemeter introduced herself and LA to the TF. She then took over the meeting and proceeded with the review of the document, section by section.</p> | <p></p> |

| Item | Description | Point Person |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------|
| <p>3.1 3.1.1</p> | <p>Section 1 (Preamble) The TF raised the importance of expanding the definition of growers in the compensation procedures. This will help clarify the responsibility of integrated companies, which own and manage oil palm plantations. AH commented that the preamble section should clarify that the procedure is applicable for HCV requirements under Criteria 7.3 in the RSPO P&C and also New Planting Procedures (NPP). SP suggested removing ‘<i>non-compliant</i>’ from the original text. OT reminded everyone not to re-discuss items which have agreed been previously.</p> | |
| <p>3.2 3.2.1</p> | <p>Section 2 (Introduction) The term ‘Executive Board’ should be changed to ‘Board of Governors (BOG)’ throughout the document.</p> | |
| <p>3.3 3.3.1</p> | <p>Section 3 (Key Requirement and Guiding Principles) AH recommended to add fragile soils into the 2nd bullet point in section 3.1 and TF agreed to change the sentence to “calculating conservation liability” and “identify social liability” in the last bullet point. TF also agreed to add separate bullet point for identifying areas prohibited by the RSPO and further clarification that these areas should comply with RSPO P&C. MZ recommended to remove the titles ‘voluntary’ and ‘mandatory’.</p> | |
| <p>3.4 3.4.1</p> | <p>Section 4 (Disclosure of Non-Compliant Land Clearance) TF agreed that notes from BHCVWG to the Complaints Panel should be attached as Annex. Sophie and Ginny to refine the last two paragraphs in section 4, which explains how companies enter a compensation process, that is via complaints and also during the voluntary period. TF also agreed to change the title to ‘liability assessment with LUCA’ as the first bullet point.</p> | |
| <p>3.5 3.5.1</p> | <p>Section 5 (Approved Changes of SOP) There were no SOP submitted during the staged implementation period. AH highlighted that it is important to understand the cause of non-conformant land clearing and why companies failed to comply with the requirement. KE recommended to post the question and get feedback on request to submit relevant SOP to RSPO during public consultation and the TF agreed. TF also agreed to use the term <i>grower</i> consistently in the document.</p> | |
| <p>3.6 3.6.1</p> | <p>Section 6 LUC Analysis and Workshop Outcome AR highlighted the key findings of the LUC Guidance workshop held in June 2015. The workshop participants highlighted the challenges of the current vegetation coefficient, which does not cater for special ecosystem, and coefficient 0.4 was difficult to identify. There was also a suggestion to have a binary option for vegetation coefficients from the workshop. The current definition of coefficients is considered to be from an ecological perspective rather than geospatial.</p> | |

| Item | Description | Point Person |
|-------|--|--------------|
| 3.6.2 | The TF agreed that the vegetation coefficients should not be changed and proposed to refine the definition based on geospatial terms. The reason was because the coefficients are not only being used in compensation mechanism but also New Planting Procedures (NPP). DM suggested providing an explanatory during public consultation for the vegetation coefficients. | |
| 3.6.3 | The TF decided to get help from experts to solve the fundamental issues related to the vegetation coefficients and that the LUC section should be technically improved. | |
| 3.6.4 | JP, AR and AH (Jenny from WWF) volunteered to go through the work of experts hired to improve the LUC. | |
| 3.6.5 | <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. OSC to seek experts to improve the LUC section. <p>See Annex 2 for detailed action plan.</p> | OSC |
| 3.7 | Section 9 Remediation and Compensation for the social impacts of the list of HCV 4, 5, & 6 | |
| 3.7.1 | The TF went through the document prepared by MC for identification loss of social HCVs. The TF suggested that the interpretation/definition of participatory mapping should be made referenced to the definition available at that time. DM explained that for Indonesia, the definition of FPIC has not changed since 1990s, however implementation of FPIC is different. He then suggested this be clarified in the text. | |
| 3.7.2 | <p>The TF perused the guidance document prepared by MC for remediation and compensation for social impacts of loss of HCV 4, 5 & 6. KE suggested volunteers to work on the document and check how the text could be inserted into the procedures and the TF agreed. AR and DM volunteered to assimilate the social guidance document to the core document.</p> <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR and DM to assimilate social guidance document into the procedures. | AR and DM |
| 3.7 | Section 7 Calculating conservation liability (including Annex 6) | |
| 3.7.1 | DS presented the latest updated statistics from the staged implementation period. The TF proposed to post the question on whether the results of LUC analysis submitted by companies should be made publicly available during public consultation. | |

| Item | Description | Point Person |
|-------------|---|--------------|
| 3.7.2 | The TF raised concerns over acquisition of RSPO member companies, which have not complied with HCV requirements. These companies may fall into the expulsion box of the liability matrix, which could be an issue for the new owner. | |
| 3.8 | Section 8 Compensation Panel | |
| 3.8.1 | The facilitator asked TF members whether were any objections especially in relation to revising the compensation panel composition and timeline to assigning a panel. AR explained that the objection is mostly related to conflict of interest. | |
| 3.8.2 | The TF agreed that there is a possibility of inviting experts to support the compensation panel if there is a lack of expertise within the BHCVWG/RSPO. The invited experts will not have decision making authority. However, if experts were invited to support the compensation panel, they would be required to sign the Code of Conduct or Non-Disclosure Agreement. SY reminded the TF that for non-members' participation, they would need to sign the confidentiality agreement. | |
| 3.8.3 | GN reminded the TF that there is a TOR for the compensation panel and suggested that the discussion earlier could be incorporated into the TOR. | |
| 3.9 | Presentation to support discussion on section 10, options for implementation of compensation | |
| 3.9.1 | MZ presented the Ecosystem Restoration Concession (ERC) to the TF. OT, CT and TMK shared their experiences on the cost of restoration study with members. The presentation aims to provide TF members on costs involved in restoration projects undertaken by respective companies in different regions and served to prepare TF for future discussions on compensation options. | |
| 3.10 | Section 10 Options for implementation of compensation | |
| 3.10.1 | Members were asked of their opinion on the compensation option proposed by MZ. TF agreed that the option proposed by MZ should not be option 3 but can be included in section 11 of the procedures as examples of compensation projects where companies with liabilities can combine their resources. SP explained that each company would still need to finalise their own liability and combining resources should be covered in section 11. The TF agreed to edit option 1 by adding "and manage" after set aside. | |
| 3.10.2 | The TF concluded that monetary options should not be indicative in the revised draft and it should be proposed as a final figure (USD2,500/ha) when presenting the draft for public consultation. The justification for the proposed final figure is important to be provided in the explanatory notes and detailed outcome of the | |

| Item | Description | Point Person |
|--------|--|---|
| 3.10.3 | <p>staged implementation period could also be provided to allow stakeholders to be informed of the proposal.</p> <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GR, GN and SiS to work on drafting scenarios of compensation options as an examples to be included in the explanatory notes. AH, MY and SiS to draft justification for the proposed monetary figure and co-chairs will review the draft. | <p>GR, GN & SiS</p> <p>AH, MY & SiS</p> |
| 3.11 | <p>Section 11 Designing compensatory biodiversity projects</p> <p>OSC informed members that the knowledge based and equitable criteria have been approved by the CTF at a meeting in June 2015. The additionality criteria was edited after the meeting in June 2015 and approval was needed from the CTF. The long lasting criteria was presented the first time to the TF for endorsement.</p> | |
| 3.11.1 | | |
| 3.11.2 | <p>For the long lasting criteria, the TF propose to maintain the minimum years for implementation of compensation projects as 25 years and explanation should be provided in the explanatory notes. The TF also proposed a question on change of ownership in relation to long lasting criteria and who should be responsible for the liability. Concerns over sale of companies were raised and how liabilities will affect the current and new owners. AH suggested that examples of sale of companies be provided in the explanatory notes.</p> | |
| 3.11.3 | <p>TF agreed to place the additional guidance as annexes supporting the compensation procedures. MY and RK volunteered to draft the text for sale of companies in the context of compensation and OT to review the text.</p> | |
| 3.11.4 | <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> MY and RK to draft text for sale of companies and OT to review text. | MY, RK & OT |
| 3.12 | <p>Section 12 Approval of remediation and compensation plans</p> | |
| 3.12.1 | <p>The flowchart in the procedures does not show when a concept note is required. The TF recommended to add another step between step 4 and step 5 for the submission of a concept note.</p> | |
| 3.12.2 | <p>GN highlighted that guidance for concept notes would be helpful for grower members and presented draft concept notes. OSC and DS explained that many companies involved in compensation asked for guidance on how to develop concept note.</p> | |
| 3.12.3 | <p>DW reminded the TF that the Secretariat would be compiling data collected via compensation mechanism into the current internal database (e.g. final conservation liability), feeding back to the membership account for each company and any information requested should be compatible to the current database format.</p> | |

| Item | Description | Point Person |
|---|--|------------------|
| <p>3.12.4</p> <p>3.12.5</p> <p>3.12.6</p> <p>3.13</p> <p>3.13.1</p> | <p>ALMF highlighted that consistent use of terms is important, for example, some section refer to the compensation panel and some BHCVWG.</p> <p>The TF agreed that guidance for remediation plan should be provided. AH and GR volunteered to work on the format.</p> <p>Action points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AH and GR to work on remediation plan. <p>Section 13 Monitoring of Implementation</p> <p>The TF edited the monitoring and implementation section for clarity. The TF maintained that the CB will need to monitor implementation of compensation for certified unit.</p> | <p>AH and GR</p> |
| <p>4.0</p> <p>4.0.1</p> <p>4.0.2</p> | <p>4.0 Revisiting timeline</p> <p>The TF revisited timeline for compensation procedures. The proposed public consultation period for the revised procedure is from August to October of 2015. The TF agreed to organise public consultation workshops in Cartagena, Accra, Kuala Lumpur and Jakarta in the month of September and the dates were set. The locations for Cartagena and Accra were decided to tag along with international conferences and forums held in the region.</p> <p>The next CTF meeting was proposed for after the public consultation in early November 2015. The TF aimed to improved and revised procedures before presenting to the BoG for endorsement before RT13.</p> | |
| <p>5.0</p> <p>5.0.1</p> <p>5.0.2</p> <p>5.0.3</p> | <p>5.0 Special meeting with SHWG to discuss about compensation</p> <p>The SHWG called for a meeting with the CTF to discuss compensation procedures and smallholders. The CTF co-chairs provided update on the revised procedures in relation to smallholders. The SHWG co-chairs explained the challenges faced by smallholders in terms of compensation.</p> <p>CTF acknowledged the challenges faced by independent smallholders to undertake compensation and agreed that the current procedures will not apply to independent smallholders.</p> <p>It was suggested that a simplified compensation approach be developed for independent smallholders. A baseline map for 2005 developed by the RSPO was recommended to determine the land use cover/land use change for independent smallholders. With the information, the CTF will be able to understand the extent of non-</p> | |

| Item | Description | Point Person |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| <p>5.0.4</p> <p>5.1</p> | <p>compliance and perhaps develop a different liability matrix for independent smallholders.</p> <p>A sub-group comprised of co-chairs from SHWG and CTF/BHCVWG was formed to find a solution for smallholders compensation.</p> <p>Action points: The following have been suggested as next steps to move forward.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RSPO to develop 2005 land cover/land use baseline map for independent smallholders. 2. SHWG to provide coordinates and initial priority area to determine land use cover/change of independent smallholders oil palm plantation. 3. SHWG-CTF TF to define what they would like to achieve this year. 4. RSPO to check with GHG WG the cost of Gunarso's work. | <p>RSPO</p> <p>Julia Majail</p> <p>SHWG-CTF TF</p> <p>OSC</p> |
| <p>6.0</p> <p>6.0.1</p> | <p>6.0 Closing of Meeting</p> <p>OT closed the meeting and thanked members for their participation. The next CTF/BHCVWG meeting is scheduled for 9-12 Nov 2015.</p> | |

ANNEX 1

RSPO

Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil

The RSPO is an international non-profit organization formed in 2004 with the objective to promote the growth and use of sustainable oil palm products through credible global standards and engagement of stakeholders.

16th Meeting of RSPO CTF
4th & 5th August 2015
Aloft Hotel, Kuala Lumpur

| # | Name | Organisation | Signature (CTF – 4 th) | Signature (CTF – 5 th) |
|----|---------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | Adam Harrison | WWF Int | | |
| 2 | Agus Purnomo | GAR | | |
| 3 | Anders Lindhe | HCV RN | | |
| 4 | Anne Rosenbarger | WRI | | |
| 5 | Audrey Lee | OLAM | | |
| 6 | Cahyo Nugroho | Fauna and Flora International | - | |
| 7 | Cecep Saepulloh | Remark Asia | - | |
| 8 | Darmawan Liswanto | Fauna and Flora International | - | |
| 9 | Dickens Mambu | WWF MY | | |
| 10 | Dr. Ruslan Abdullah | MPOA | | |
| 11 | Dwi Muhtaman | Remark Asia | | |
| 12 | Gan Lian Tiong | Musim Mas | | |
| 13 | Ginny Ng Siew Ling | WILMAR | | |
| 14 | Glen Reynolds | SEARRP | | |
| 15 | Harjinder Kler | HUTAN | | |
| 16 | Henry Barlow | Independent | | |
| 17 | John Payne | BORA | | |
| 18 | Lanash Thanda | SEPA | | |
| 19 | Lee Swee Yin | SIME | | |
| 20 | Leonine Lawrence | ZSL | | |
| 21 | Marcus Colchester | FPP | - | |

| # | Name | Organisation | Signature (CTF – 4 th) | Signature (CTF – 5 th) |
|----|--------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 22 | Michael Brady | IFC | — | |
| 23 | Norazam Abd Hameed | FGV | | |
| 24 | Melissa Yeoh | FGV | | |
| 25 | Olivier Tichit | SIPEF | | |
| 26 | Richard Kan | GAR | | |
| 27 | Simon Siburat | WILMAR | | |
| 28 | Sophie Persey | REA | | |
| 29 | Tang Men Kon | SIME | | |
| 30 | MICHAEL ZRUST | DAQMETER | | |
| 31 | X DWI R M | Remark Az | | |
| 32 | | | | |
| 33 | | | | |
| 34 | | | | |
| 35 | | | | |

ANNEX 2

Action Plan for CTF Public Consultation

Notes

- Please send all drafts specifying in the Subject line the Section you're referring to by 14 August. Send to RSPO, cc-ing Daemeter (kedwds@me.com, leony.aurora@daemeter.org).
- Daemeter will circulate a revised draft of the whole package by 21 August. Translation can start (English docs will be used as primary reference).
- If you have any objection to the revised package, you can draft questions for the public consultation to send to RSPO cc-ing Daemeter by 28 August. We will accept no proposed changes to text.

Key Milestones

| No | Milestones | Deadline |
|----|--|---------------|
| 1 | Drafts of revised/new sections/documents received from CTF members | 14 Aug 2015 |
| 2 | Revised documents package sent to CTF members | 21 Aug 2015 |
| 3 | Documents go for translation into Indonesian, Spanish, and French (?) | 21 Aug 2015 |
| 4 | Questions from CTF members for public consultation based on revised documents | 28 Aug 2015 |
| 5 | Core document for consultation to be launched online (to meet ISEL guidelines) | 31 Aug 2015 |
| 6 | End of online consultation | 30 Oct 2015 |
| 7 | Next CTF meeting | 9-12 Nov 2015 |

Face-to-Face Public Consultation Dates

| No | Date | City | CTF Members to Attend |
|----|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| 1 | 10 September 2015 (tbc) | Kuala Lumpur | Olivier, Ginny, Glenn, Dwi, Tan, Dickens |
| 2 | 14 September 2015 | Jakarta | Olivier, Dwi, Michal |
| 3 | 18 or 20 September 2015 | Latin America | Anne, Sophie |
| 4 | 28 September | Accra | Anne, Michal |

Work Plan

| No | Topic | Place | Deadline | PiC and note |
|---|---|-------|------------------|--|
| Core Procedure Document, Guidance, Templates | | | | |
| 1 | Definition of top asset | | Done | <u>Adam</u> |
| 2 | Last two para Section 4 | S. 4 | Done | <u>Sophie</u> and Ginny |
| 3 | Revisions from LUC workshop inputs to core text, including coefficients definitions from geospatial perspective | S. 6 | 14 Aug. | <u>Anne</u> , John |
| 4 | Improving LUC supporting documents based on LUC workshop inputs, including sample imagery etc. | | Nov. CTF meeting | Soo Chin to hire GIS analyst responsible for producing final supporting docs. Anne, Jenny (tbc) to review. |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| 5 | Acquisition clause (in reference to responsible RSPO growers buying non-certified RSPO growers) | New | 14 Aug | <u>Melissa</u> , Olivier, Richard |
| 6 | Strengthen details of monitoring section in core doc | S. 14 | Nov. CTF meeting | Mike, Ginny, Leonie, Olivier, Anne (from Compensation Plan Format). Not for PC |
| 7 | Simplify Compensation Concept Note Template | | 14 Aug | <u>Ginny</u> and Glenn |
| 8 | Compensation Plan Template | | | |
| 9 | Assimilate text in social guidance to core doc | S. 9 | 14 Aug | <u>Anne</u> , Dwi, Marcus |
| 10 | Draft section on remediation plan | After S. 11 | 14 Aug | <u>Adam</u> , Glenn |
| 11 | Update history of CTF and staged implementation | | 14 Aug | <u>Daemeter</u> |
| 12 | Draft para on the relevance of the procedure to smallholders (scheme and independent) | Before Preamble | 14 Aug | <u>Adam</u> |
| Explanatory notes | | | | |
| 1 | Scenario/example of options for meeting conservation liability | Exp. Notes | 14 Aug | <u>Simon</u> , Glenn, and Ginny |
| 2 | Justifications for USD2,500/ha | Exp. Notes | 14 Aug | <u>Adam to draft</u> , <u>Melissa</u> , <u>Simon</u> , co-chairs to review |
| 3 | Provide example of mechanism in foreseeable conditions of a sale of liability (in reference to Long-lasting guidance) | Exp. Notes | 14 Aug | Olivier. This is an unresolved. |
| 4 | Justification for coefficient | Exp. Notes | 14 Aug | <u>Anne</u> , John |
| 5 | Liability matrix: decision of time period, stages of company at that time, whether commercial and non-commercial. | Exp. Notes | 14 Aug | Daemeter to draft from existing document |
| 6 | Inclusion and presentation of First stage LUC analysis' results | | 14 Aug | Anne, Mike, Glenn, Dwi, Adam, Sophie |
| Public Consultation | | | | |
| 1 | Question on whether summary of LUC analysis should be made public | | 14 Aug | <u>Adam</u> |
| 2 | Revise and prepare final package | | 28 Aug | Daemeter |
| 3 | Design of process for online and physical public consultation, including template for inputs | | 21 Aug | Daemeter |
| 4 | Draft presentation for the compensation procedures at public consultation | | 28 Aug for KL, Jakarta 10 Sept for Latin America, Accra | <u>Olivier</u> (KL, Jakarta) and <u>Anne</u> (Latin America, Accra) and attending CTF members. This was not discussed in the meeting, but we need to see the presentation to give |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | feedback and link to overall process. |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|