

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.

MINUTES OF MEETING 11th Peatland Working Group 2 (PLWG-2) Meeting

Date : 14th April 2020 Venue : Virtual Meeting

SECTOR	SUBSTANTIVE MEMBERS	ALTERNATIVE MEMBERS
GROWERS (MALAYSIA)	Jason Foong (KLK)Joshua Mathews (IOI)	Arif Sugandi (AAR KLK)William Siow (IOI)
GROWERS (INDONESIA)	Lim Sian Choo (BGA)Gotz Martin (GAR)	Fanny Roussel (SIPEF)Desti Hertanti (GAR)
GROWERS (REST OF THE WORLD)	Ian Orrel (NBPOL)Shahrakbah (Sime Darby)	Sim Choon Cheak (SD)
SOCIAL NGO	 Jason Hon (WWF) Wida Nindita (Sawit Watch)	Riza Harizajudin (Sawit Watch)
ENVIRONMENTAL NGO	Faizal Parish (GEC)Dato Kheizrul Abdullah (Wetlands International)	Mohd.Faizuddin (GEC)Almo Pradana (WRI)
PALM OIL PROCESSOR AND TRADERS	Chin Kaixiang (Bunge Loders Croklaan)Julia Lo (Musim Mas)	 Rianto Sitanggang (Bunge Loders Croklaan) Feber Antarisu/Surya Purnama (Wilmar International)

^{*}Bolded name indicates absence with apologies



NO	ITEM DESCRIPTION	MAIN DISCUSSION POINTS	ACTION POINTS	PROGRESS UPDATE
14th	April 2020 (Tuesday)			,
1	Review of previous minutes of meeting	The Secretariat shared the update from the previous meeting. There are 2 proposals received to be Trainer for RSPO Drainability Assessment (DA) Procedure. Based on vote from each representative, Wetlands International Malaysia was selected to be the Trainer. FR offered assistance should the Secretariat require help on the translation of the peat factsheet in French language.	 Secretariat is to provide the peat factsheet to FR. Secretariat is to amend and upload the final minutes on the RSPO website. 	Done. Peat fact sheet has been translated into all languages except for Thailand, yet to receive from translator. Done
2	Updates on Resolution GA16 -6E and peat inventory monitoring	Timeline for the Peat Inventory Submission: RSPO Growers and P&T Members are required to submit the Peat Inventory for both Certified and non-certified plantation before 30th March 2020, together with the peat maps and shapefile. Submissions of shapefile for uncertified units can be submitted separately before 31st May 2020. Updates on Peat Inventory Submission The Secretariat is currently monitoring 132 members in total in terms of peat inventory submission. This consists of: • 113 Oil Palm Growers		 On-going. Secretariat sent a last reminder for



clarifications with growers.



<u>Total Unplanted area on Peat (in accordance to Peat Inventory</u> submission)

Indonesia: -

- Conservation (HCV, HCS): 51,320.16 ha
- Peat Rehabilitation area: 3,046.59 ha
- Others (Infrastructure, buildings, etc.): 39,353.45 ha

Malaysia: -

- Conservation (HCV, HCS): 2,960.73 ha
- Peat Rehabilitation area: 31.83 ha
- Others (Infrastructure, buildings, etc.): 192.26 ha

PNG: -

- Conservation (HCV, HCS): 718.76 ha
- Peat Rehabilitation area: 0.00 ha
- Others (Infrastructure, buildings, etc.): 8.25 ha

The PLWG members commented that the figure for "others" is unusually high. RSPO members may have incorrect understanding on the classification of the unplanted areas on peat. All unplanted peat should be considered as a conservation area after November 2018.

The Secretariat clarified that the peat rehabilitation area may come from the results of Complaints cases or rehabilitation done by the company other than the DA.

<u>Year of 1st Planting on Peat (in accordance to Peat Inventory submission)</u>

Total planted area on peat: 340,907.36 ha

• 1990 – 2000: 44.50%

 Secretariat to review the figures on the unplanted area on peat (others) and seek clarification from members. Secretariat have sent clarification email to companies with high figure on 'Other' areas. On-going clarifications with growers.



• 2001 – 2005: 11.60%

• 2006 – 2010: 30.49%

2011 – 2015: 9.45%

Challenges faced on the peat inventory submission:

- Incomplete submission
 - No submission of peat inventory by members.
 - o Incomplete peat maps or shapefiles
 - Common reason for incomplete shapefile is due to uncertain legality status and clearance (mainly Indonesian plantation)
 - *Proposed solution: To provide a list of non-submitting members to CBs for further action.
- Inaccurate disclosure of data by members:
 - Discrepancies in the data provided in the peat inventory submitted
 - *Proposed solution: To be verified by CBs during Audit.

The PLWG members disagreed with the proposal to allow the CB to check the information during the audit as members may question the Secretariat on the confidentiality issue of sharing the information to the CB.

- Delays on submission due to COVID-19
 - 3 members requested an extension on the submission of peat inventory for the uncertified unit.
 - Limited access and mobility to assess the peat inventory.

WG explained that the peat maps available (especially in Indonesia) are usually indicative maps. Hence, members will face difficulty in

- Secretariat to follow up with members to clarify / confirm the information provided in peat inventory.
- Secretariat to provide peat ha in terms of % against mineral for concession with peat
- Secretariat to make a projection of peat replanting

- On-going clarification with growers.
- To be updated during working group meeting.
- To be updated during working group meeting.

- Secretariat is to draft a formal announcement to provide
- RSPO's PDPA policy https://rspo.org/about/priva



fear of its publication to the public domain (website). The shapefile submitted in RSPO will only be used internally within RSPO. Review on ISH Peat BMP development Review on ISH Peat BMP development The sub-group is still in the process of populating the necessary information based on the content that has been agreed previously. After the content has been finalized, the next phase is to ensure the	entiality nitted by
The sub-group is still in the process of populating the necessary information based on the content that has been agreed previously.	
content and language are modified appropriately to cater for the use of smallholders. The Secretariat presented the draft ISH Peat BMP. The content structure of the document are as follows: -	



cater for the use of the individual smallholders.

	Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil		
	 RSPO's definition on Peat Measuring and identify peat depth Type of peat, etc. Chapter 2: Water management 		
Su	To include smallholders in the review process: - To include smallholders in the review process: - The Secretariat explained that the draft is currently reviewed internally by the Smallholder unit. There is a plan to bring the smallholder into the review process during the pilot testing of the BMP. To generate 2 separate documents for the group manager and the individual smallholders: - The Secretariat explained that the current focus is to develop a document for the group managers. However, as suggested, a simpler template can be generated for some chapters to	 Secretariat to separate BMPs 	Work in progress with the Smallholder Unit.



- There are no chapters touching on on social and environmental aspect (e.g.: riparian buffer, etc.) and suggested for it to be included in the BMP: -
 - O FP explained that the draft of the document is predominantly guided by the criteria related specifically to peat in the smallholder standard. Hence, the other social and environmental aspects were not discussed previously.
 - Pursuant to the above-mentioned statement, FP seek for Secretariats clarification should the smallholder units are developing an overall guidance for the smallholder standard.
- There are still too many words and too technical.
 - The Secretariat takes note of the comment. The draft BMP will be further simplified to cater to the smallholder.

Discussion on Chapter 2: Water management

The sub-group is facing difficulty in developing the content on the sub topic of flooding risk assessment (Sub-section 2.4).

Comment by PLWG members on the flooding risk assessment: -

- To conduct a flooding risk assessment in a smallholder land is impractical due to small land size. Despite being applied at a group level, the smallholder's lands are not adjacent to each other.
- An understanding of the whole river basin is required in order to conduct the flooding risk assessment. Hence, the smallholder will not be able to assess the flood risk nor prevent the flood from happening.

Suggestions from PLWG members:

• Smallholder to provide historical data on flooding in the

- To add these chapters in ISH BMP
- Secretariat to check with the smallholder unit should there be any development of a broader guidance for smallholder standard.
- Content is being developed internally by RSPO Biodiversity and Social Unit
- Yes, there is an overall guidance provided in ISH Standard, from page 55 onwards.



Roundlable on Sustamable Paint On		
 plantation area. To include alternative livelihood options in the BMP document to help smallholders should their plantation be permanently waterlogged due to flooding. To include the risk/implication of peat subsidence and waterlogged within oil palm plantation (upon replanting on peat) towards the smallholders' livelihood to encourage smallholders to turn into a more sustainable plantation on peat such as paludiculture, etc. (Can be included in a different section of the BMP) 		
The sub-group shall proceed to draft the content for subsection 2.1 to 2.3. The sub-group may refer to the existing BMP manual to develop these sections.	 Sub-group to proceed on drafting the content for subsection 2.1 to 2.3. 	To be discussed over working group meeting.
Confirmation on CB audit checklist for RISS		
The Secretariat presented the proposed audit checklist and comments.	To update RSPO Smallholder Unit with the latest updates on audit checklist	• Done
Comments by PLWG members:		
 Criteria 4.4 MS B (Q4): How are the smallholders monitoring subsidence rate for existing plantings on peat? It is not practical for each smallholder to measure the subsidence rate. Proposed amendment: "How is the group as a whole monitoring the subsidence rate for existing plantings on peat?" 		
 Criteria 4.5 MS A (Q5): What are the identified risks associated with subsidence? The risk assessment training has to be worked out 	 The Secretariat to check with smallholder unit should the 	 Yes, this is mentioned as part of Group Manager's



		 separately prior on providing this question. Criteria 4.5 MS A (Q7): Is the group manager aware of the replanting activities by group members? The PLWG members suggested for this requirement to remain in milestone A (link to the training). Criteria 4.5 MS B (Q7): Is the group manager aware of the replanting activities by group members? To amend the question to "is the group manager aware of the future plan of replanting activities by group members?" Proposed to move the above question to MS A 	smallholders are required to disclose basic information of the area for replanting as part of the requirement in the eligibility phase (4.5 E)	role under the Group Manager's guidance where "GM needs to collect and store information from group members on replanting plans and members with plantings on peat soils".
4	Sustainability College	Secretariat updated that Wetlands International, the consultant to develop script for BMP on peat has provided content for Volume 2 based on the latest version of the BMP. The scripts have been circulated for comments among the WG members. Secretariat also explained that this project is currently not being monitored by any unit internally which means that there is no budget allocated for video production moving next financial year for the time being. WG suggested that the Volume 1 of the latest BMP to be prepared in power point slide format instead of video format.	 WG to review the content of scripts for Volume 2. Secretariat to remove the current videos from Sustainability College since the content are outdated. To prepare power point slides based on Volume 1 of the 	On-going review.Done.On-going work.
5	Updates on Drainability Assessment monitoring	Current status & breakdown of the Drainability Assessment Procedures (DAP) review Status of report: - On-going review: 13 Assessment based on RSPO methodology; Assessment based on non-RSPO methodology;	latest BMP.	



- Report submitted to request for approval of new methodology.
- Approved: 1
 - Kuala Lumpur Kepong Berhad

Submission of DA review by country:

- Indonesia: 9
- Malaysia: 5

Experience and lesson learn

- Most submissions are incomplete:
 - o Incomplete attachment/maps/etc.;
 - O Caused a lot of back and forth communication
- Misunderstanding and/or lack of clarity on the requirement to conduct RSPO DAP
- Apparent "Lack of understanding" on the requirements for DAP report submission which causes more delays.
- Apparent "confusion between RSPO DAP's requirement against local regulation's requirement.

Bottleneck and challenges

- Lack of data (DEM, subsidence etc.)
- Time consuming for the review process. SOP target:
 - o Preliminary review by Secretariat: 7 Working days
 - Methodology review: 30 Working days
- Most applications incomplete and did not follow the methodology



	Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil			
lmr,	More than half of last year's submission did not use the RSPO methodology which causes further delay. Uncertainty for growers who have conduct DA using other methods There are 2 other methods submitted by members Most of the methodology submitted for review is incomplete. Request for training from growers Indonesian translation for RSPO DAP is still being finalised (Review of the technical term) There are cases of misinterpretation by Indonesian grower members on the technical aspect of the DAP due to translation issues. There are also apparent misunderstandings by the Indonesian grower members who mistakenly presume that complying with national regulation will be sufficient for the DAP. The PLWG member reiterated that the national regulation did not cover the aspects and requirements of the DAP (to be included in the FAQ)		PLWG members and Secretariat to finalise the review of the technical term in the Indonesian translation DAP.	On-going work
•	Introducing grower checklist which will be submitted along with their DAP report to encourage complete report submission To develop a procedure for growers who would like to submit	•	To develop grower checklist for DA	On-going review
	 non-RSPO DAP methodology for review by RSPO to determine equivalent. Proposal should include comparison between the findings of the drainability assessment conducted using their proposed methodology and findings through the RSPO DAP. This proposal is for members to demonstrate equivalence in 	•	To develop a procedure for growers who would like to submit non-RSPO DAP methodology for review by RSPO to determine equivalent.	On-going review



- both methods and justify the added value of the alternate method.
- The PLWG endorsement shall be required prior to implementing the procedure.

<u>Discussion on the requirement to provide information (e.g. maps)</u> of the whole planted area (including non-peat area): -

Basic information of the whole planted area (including non-peat area) is required in order to help the reviewer to understand the whole overview of the plantation in respect to the peat area subjected to DAP. The drainage system in the plantation may also be integrated between peat area and non-peat area. Hence, information of the whole plantation is essential in order to have a comprehensive understanding on the drainage system of the plantation affecting the peat area (e.g.: in terms of how the water to be drained from the plantation)

Should information of the whole concession be required, only basic information such as the hectarage can be made available to RSPO and the reviewer. Members may not be able to provide the maps of the entire concession due to confidentiality issues.

Should the total concession area be vastly bigger compared to the peat area subjected to the DAP, members may provide information (including maps) of the whole planted area (peat area and non-peat area) of the specific estate subjected to the DAP. Despite members having to provide information of non-peat areas adjacent to the peat area subjected to DAP, the restriction of replanting will only be

- Revising the current DAP reviewer form
- Expanding pool of reviewers and nominal fee for reviewers
- Preparing FAQ on RSPO DAP
- To include examples of case studies to show the steps of the DAP in a plantation.
- Secretariat is to reach out to Dipa to review the technical terminology in the Indonesian translation of the DAP.

- Done by Pak Arif
- Announcement will be posted on website.
- On-going work
- Examples for Tier 1 will be given by IOI, waiting for confirmation from grower to use their DA as example for Tier 2.
- WI has taken this up as part of training material preparation for DA training



affected in the planted area on peat

Example of the above-mentioned issue is to be included in the case study of the DAP. Secretariat is to incorporate the above-mentioned information on the requirement of the map submission into the checklist.

<u>Discussion on the requirement for members to demonstrate the</u> <u>equivalence between the non-RSPO methodology conducted and</u> <u>the RSPO methodology:</u> -

Since the RSPO methodology is not made available right after the endorsement of the P&C 2018, a transition period has been provided prior to the development of the RSPO methodology: -

- P&C 2018 requires all members to conduct a drainability assessment prior to replanting.
- Since the RSPO methodology is not available, some companies have started using alternative methodology which could only be acceptable up until November 2019 provided that the methodology is submitted to RSPO and subjected for review.
- After November 2019, RSPO members must follow RSPO methodology unless any new methodology has been approved by RSPO as equivalent.
- The new methodology should be able to demonstrate the same principle of results, fundamentals and intention of the DAP.

<u>Discussion on the expansion of the pool of reviewers and nominal</u> fee for reviewers: -

Proposal by the Secretariat:

- To have an external reviewer only for the new methodology
- To have an external reviewer to review all the DA



 Alternatively, should the review be done internally, the Secretariat may reach out to the external party to come out with a comprehensive checklist to be used by the Secretariat for the review of RSPO methodology.

The Secretariat raised concern on the following issues:

- Low budget
 - The Secretariat has set aside RM50,000 in the budget for the review process.
- Low number of pool of reviewers which may cause backlogs on the DA review.

Suggestions and comments from PLWG members:

- The initial process of reviewing the new methodology will take significantly more time.
- The Secretariat may hire external reviewers to conduct the review for the 2 proposed new methodology submitted by members.
- After the new methodology has been approved and established, the review process will be easier as the companies have familiarized themselves with the methodology. The DA can also be conducted internally by the Secretariat provided that the checklist is developed.
- To identify and calculate the approximate hectarage of peat area in 1 year that may be subjected to replanting / drainability assessment based on the data collected in the peat inventory.
- To differentiate members that conduct the DA years in advance prior to replanting with members that intend to do immediate replanting. Members is to capture the information in the DA report submitted.
- In respect to the 13 outstanding cases, PLWG to prioritize the DA review for members that intend to conduct the replanting

- Secretariat is to generate forecast data on the hectarage of peat that may be subjected to replanting / drainability assessment.
- Secretariat is to segment the 13 outstanding cases with Members that intend to immediately replant and members who conduct the DAP 5 years in advance.

• Will be updated in meeting

• Done, review on progress



		immediately.	Secretariat to prioritize review of the backlogs	Done, urgent reports will be flagged to reviewers for review
6	Plans for ending of 1- year transition period for RSPO Drainability Assessment	The 1-year transition period will end on the 08.06.2020. The PLWG members and the Secretariat are to improve the effort on clearing the backlogs of the DAP review in order to gain more lessons learned. If necessary, The PLWG shall need to look into possible modification or amendment of the DAP / checklist / etc. The Secretariat clarified the review of the current DAP will be initiated after the 1-year transition period ends (After 08.06.2020). The suggested deadline for the completion of the review is in August 2020 to give 3 months to incorporate the necessary amendments and update to the DAP.		
		 Training Schedule for the Drainability assessment There were 2 organizations submitting proposals on training in Drainability assessment: - Upon the review by the Secretariat, one of the organizations did not obtain the necessary skills. The PLWG endorsed Wetlands International to conduct the training. Wetlands International proposed to conduct 3 training in Indonesia and 1 training in Malaysia. The training proposal provided by Wetlands international is in accordance with the scope of work. However, due to budget constraints, the organization was asked to provide more 		



options on the training proposals. Initially, each training conducted (in Malaysia and Indonesia) will consist of a 3-day module (2 days in a classroom; 1 day in the field). Due to budget constraint, the organization proposed an alternative option of a 2-day module (1 day in a classroom; 1 day in the field). The PLWG and the Secretariat agreed to the 2-day module proposal (1 day in a classroom; 1 day in the field) 3 Session in Indonesia • 1 Session in Malaysia Wetlands International is currently in the process of developing the format and materials for the training which may require approximately 2 months. The Secretariat agreed with the timeline. Wetlands International to · Will be done during meeting update the training plan and Suggestions from PLWG members: material in Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, an alternative plan or timeline are required should the issue persist for a longer period of time. Should the training material come into fruition in 2 months' time, the training may also be conducted via webinar session. This proposal may allow the organisation to conduct more sessions than what has been proposed. • It was suggested for development of the Indonesian training material (In Indonesian language) to be developed first in order to aid the review of the technical terminology of the Indonesian translation DAP.



Factsheet on RSPO Drainability Assessment The Secretariat has circulated the factsheet to the PLWG members for review and comments. The factsheet will be further translated to Indonesian language. Next Meeting	 The PLWG members to review the factsheet. 	 DAP FAQ has been circulated
The next WG meeting shall be conducted in June 2020. The Secretariat is to check should there be any other working group meetings in June and send the PLWG members the proposed date options to be considered.	 Secretariat is to send the proposed date options for the next meeting to the PLWG members for consideration. 	• Done