

MINUTES OF MEETING

12th Peatland Working Group 2 (PLWG-2) Meeting

Date : 16th June 2020
 Venue : Virtual Meeting

Attendees List

SECTOR	SUBSTANTIVE MEMBERS	ALTERNATIVE MEMBERS
<i>GROWERS (MALAYSIA)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Jason Foong (KLK)</i> ● <i>Joshua Mathews (IOI)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Arif Sugandi (AAR KLK)</i>
<i>GROWERS (INDONESIA)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Lim Sian Choo (BGA)</i> ● <i>Gotz Martin (GAR)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Desti Hertanti (GAR)</i>
<i>GROWERS (REST OF THE WORLD)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>William Unsworth (NBPOL)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Sim Choon Cheak (SD)</i>
<i>SOCIAL NGO</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Jason Hon (WWF)</i> ● <i>Wida Nindita (Sawit Watch)</i> 	
<i>ENVIRONMENTAL NGO</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Faizal Parish (GEC)</i> ● <i>Dato Kheizrul Abdullah (Wetlands International)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Mohd.Faizuddin (GEC)</i> ● <i>Almo Pradana (WRI)</i>
<i>PALM OIL PROCESSOR AND TRADERS</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Chin Kaixiang (Bunge Loders Crokiaan)</i> ● <i>Julia Lo (Musim Mas)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Feber Antarisu/Surya Purnama (Wilmar International)</i>

NO	ITEM DESCRIPTION	MAIN DISCUSSION POINTS	ACTION POINTS	PROGRESS UPDATE
16th June 2020 (Tuesday)				
1	Review of previous minutes of meeting	<p>Secretariat went through the agenda for this meeting. This was followed by walkthrough of action items and progress from previous meeting.</p> <p>New member to PLWG was welcomed, Ian Orrell (NBPOL) was replaced by Willam Unsworth (NBPOL).</p> <p>WG suggested to have a separate list on action items alone.</p>		
2	Updates on Resolution GA16 -6E and peat inventory monitoring	<p>Secretariat gave a breakdown of submission from previous update and the total area (planted & unplanted).</p> <p>Follow up with growers of incomplete submission and clarifications are still on-going.</p> <p>From the last meeting, Secretariat have reached out the companies identified to have exceptionally high area on peat that is unplanted to understand what this area constitutes or if there was a potential mistake in keying in the figures. Based on the clarifications received from 3 companies, the 3 major breakdown for unplanted area are conservation area, peat rehabilitation area and others (infrastructure, buildings etc). The clarifications on this will continue.</p> <p>WG commented that there could also be potential enclave area coming from community areas, it will be good to check if there are any.</p> <p>Secretariat also did a projection on drainability assessment based on first year of planting. This was done by looking at the first year of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To continue with follow-up and clarification from grower and P&T members. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current completion of the peat inventory submissions at 63% of 132 members (95% of members identified in Gunarso study) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 28 complete submissions, 2 certified only, 7 clarification required (total: 37 submissions) 46 no peat declarations 47 non-submitting members (9 Indonesia, 7 Msia, 20 LatAm, 10 Africa, 2 Thailand, 1 Cambodia) For non-submitting members, Secretariat has sent the list of the RSPO

		planting that was disclosed and assuming the peat was replanted after every 20 years (as crop cycle). The timeline to carry out the drainability assessment was based on 15 th years.		members to be circulated to all CBs for their further action. (circulated to CBs 25th August 2020).
3	Updates and discussion on Drainability Assessment monitoring	<p>Secretariat gave a status update on Drainability Assessment Review as shown in Appendix 2. There are 18 DA reports consisting of 3 that has been approved and the balance 15 is being reviewed. This is a progress compared to previous meeting where only 1 report that was approved.</p> <p>The 15 reports that are being reviewed consist of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 reports are being pre-reviewed which takes 7 working days • 5 reports are being fully-reviewed which takes 30 working days • 3 DA reports submitted using other than RSPO method, waiting for grower’s feedback, • 3 reports sent in requesting for approval using non RSPO DA methodology. <p>There was a suggestion to outsource the review which will be discussed later. Secretariat will be releasing TOR for new reviewers and also introduce the grower’s checklist in attempt to reduce the duration taken for review.</p> <p>Slide on issues/challenges faced so far on DA review and the improvements are attached in Appendix 2. While discussing on the list of improvements, the idea on discharge outlet was further explained by co-chairs. So, there are multiple outlets but it is not clear which distance should be selected for example is the case of dome peat where there can be multiple outlets for the water to flow. The straight-line approach is easy while using GIS but this underestimates the actual distance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To add mitigation measures to avoid exposing acid sulphate soil • To share a content on methods of using GPS for elevation data • TOR for DA review to add on timeline (compensation panel) • DA reviewer’s service agreement to mention the duration for review, consent to conduct review, declare conflict of interest. Allocation of job will be by case by case (ref: compensation panel’s role) • RSPO to come up with official letter for all current reviewers to confirm if they can continue reviewing DA • DA Review panel to come up with a flow chart 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements discussed was added as part of the in-revision DAP. • ToR calling for new DA reviewer was shared in RSPO’s website. No potential profile was received. • All current reviewers were sent the service agreement. • The new DA report review system will go by 2 levels of review in order to accommodate for new reviewers that will potentially come on-board. This will not affect the 30 working days for full review. • Grower’s checklist will be updated based on the new DAP. • FAQ was re-circulated based on new questions from DAP webinar.

	<p>WG also raised that the methodology should be updated by progress via public consultation since growers are struggling with the as is method. Co-chairs explained that this is a review process post the 1-year implementation period to discuss existing issues. So further meeting will follow up to accommodate to this revision as this will not be an immediate implementation. The procedure will be further discussed among the working group.</p> <p>WG also added that it should be clear on the plot size for replanting that way it is easier during audit as well to explain to the auditor. Whereas for fragmented plot (less patch of 10h or 15ha) doesn't require DA. So, points like this are missing in the procedure which needs to be included. There will be flexibility given where companies can bundle up peat that are nearing 15 years to aggregate to a larger area for assessment.</p> <p>On calculating the number of years taken for mineral years to be exposed, this is needed to ensure the calculation of drainage base is done correctly. The conclusion of reports where $Ddb > Dp$, they will conclude the reports as DA is not applicable provided the other information are given to ensure the calculation was done correctly.</p> <p>On source of data for elevation, as long as the water level in outlet and drainability area is referenced to the same source then it should be acceptable especially in the case of Indonesia where this is can be challenging to get this data. This should be averaged from 12 months data.</p> <p>WG raised scenarios where companies that would like to replant this year and doesn't have 12 months data. Over the implementation period, this is where the transition period comes in. There is an alternative approach by taking mean water level based on available data or based on rain fall curve this can be used as a conservative mean water level. If it's the dry season then maximum flood level will</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peat audit checklist (minor review) • Grower DA checklist (grower will sign this checklist) • To add discussed question and re-circulate the FAQ • DA review subgroup to look at the guidance for alternative method 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance for alternative methods have been put on-hold since there are no new request and companies with existing request have turned into using the RSPO DA method.
--	--	---	--

		<p>be needed.</p> <p>There were several other challenges raised such as if GPS reading can be used for elevation. WG explained that GPS error can be huge. The vertical error can be quite high depending on the vegetation cover as well. So, GPS will not be an accurate elevation to be used. However, there are few processing that can be done to increase the accuracy.</p> <p>It was also recommended that DTM must be given instead of DEM and DSM. There is also new technology available for cross checking of data, called GIDI for surface elevation.</p> <p>DAP list of improvements to be added in the procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review panel to look into content for selection of water outlet as revision for DAP. • To add content on DA to be conducted for significant area, patches less than 15 - 20 ha not needed to do DA • To come up with a summary table in English for DA in Indonesian language. • To include a survey benchmark when using government data and for fields data need at least 12 months data • Interim measure for companies without complete 12 months data • Input on how to do calibration for better accuracy • Content/procedure for DA that are conducted for palms of 15years old. 		
4	<p>Updates on RSPO DA Training by Wetlands International (WI)</p>	<p>Dato Keizrul gave an update on the training modules development. The breakdown of the modules as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st module: Introduction RSPO certification requirement, explanation/definition, impact of drainage, movement of water through soil, drainage base, drainage limit time 		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd module: Drainability Assessment Procedure Drainability Process, design philosophy, DA, assessment procedure (Tier 1 & Tier 2) • 3rd module: Step by step procedure using Tier 1 & Tier 2 • 4th module: Annex 3 and Annex 4 • 5th module: Field work • 6th module: Tutorial <p>WG was checking if both classroom and field work can be done via zoom due to Covid travel restriction. Dato Keizrul explained that this is possible.</p>		
5	Discussion on ISH BMP Chapter 2: Water Management	<p>Secretariat showed the current approach suggested for Independent Smallholders (ISH) to conduct a flooding risk management. The concept to conduct flooding risk are there however the steps to carry out the assessment has not been designed yet.</p> <p>The WG suggested to have this assessment against a risk matrix. Faiz, Pak Arif and Jason will be looking at developing this matrix and discuss this with the ISH PLWG subgroup.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input on how to create a risk assessment table for ISH peat BMP • Picture of collection drain to be adjusted to SH scenarios • To add the importance of ISH to work with other group for the purpose of water management • To have an example of how a simple flood risk assessment can be done • Flood risk to be similar to risk matrix in terms of color coding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faiz have shared input on how to carry out flooding risk assessment and the risk matrix chart. • Discussion on this chapter is on-going and to potentially come up with a flood risk assessment template.
7	Updates on Sustainability College	<p>Secretariat have circulated BMP Volume 2 to all however to make the review easier, WG members were volunteered with few chapters that they are familiar.</p> <p>Secretariat will be working on developing BMP Volume 1 into a slide</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of BMP Vol 2, send by Secretariat and WG M1: Sian Choo M2, M3: All 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All reviews have been received. Improvements based on review is on-going. • Secretariat circulated BMP Volume 1 (ppt) for

		format and circulate this for review.	M4, M5: Will M6: Julia M7: Dato Keizrul M8, M9: Gotz M10, M11: GEC M12: Jason Hon	comments. • Both Vol 1 and Vol 2 of the BMP in Bahasa Indonesia has been received and is currently being reviewed by RRO, target for completion is before RT.
6	AOB and next meeting	<p>Updates on communication materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainability Assessment Factsheet All correction and comments have been reflected and transitional arrangement was also included in the factsheet. • Terms of Reference (ToR) for Drainability Assessment Reviewer Secretariat showed the TOR for DA reviewers which will be used to expand the current pool of reviewers. WG commented that its best to keep the timeline to annual duration, that way the service agreement will also be subjected to annual review. WG suggested to take up similar approach for LUCA reviewer. Reviewers will also need to declare if there are potential conflict of interest. The final version to be recirculated among WG members. • Peat Audit Checklist in Bahasa Indonesia • Guidance for approval on Non-RSPO Drainability Assessment (DA) Methodology The DA subgroup will be reviewing this guidance separately while comments from WG are also welcomed. • Grower’s Checklist for RSPO DA This checklist will come in effect with the revised DAP. Few comments were received from WG that was included in this 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peat Audit checklist will be sent to Pak Arif, Almo and Pak Arya for the minor clarification. The overall checklist will be reviewed again to align with the updated DAP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factsheet will be revisited upon completion of revised DAP. • The peat audit checklist post review was sent to Secretariat on 19th June.

		checklist. The checklist was also recirculated among WG members.		
--	--	--	--	--

12th PLWG-2 meeting

Meeting via Zoom

Date of meeting: 16th June 2020

Time (MYT)	Agenda
9.00 am – 9.30 am	1. Updates on action items from previous meeting and introduction of new member
9.30 am – 10.00 am	2. Updates on peat inventory monitoring
10.00 am – 10.45 am	3. Updates on Drainability Assessment monitoring 4. Discussion on Drainability Assessment Procedure
10.45 am – 11.00 am	Break
11.00 am – 11.45 am	5. Updates RSPO DA Training by Wetlands International
11.45 am – 12.30 pm	6. Discussion on ISH BMP Chapter 2: Water Management
12.30 pm – 1.00 pm	7. AOB and next meeting

RSPO Drainability Assessment (DA) Progress Update

As of 15th June 2020



Current status of DA review

Status of Report	Number of Report/s
On-going review	16
Approved (using RSPO's DAP)	3
Total Reports	19

Status of review of all reports	Indonesia	Malaysia
Approved	2	1
On-going	11	5
Total	13	6

Breakdown of 'On-going' DA review

There are 15 reports with 'on-going' DA review, which are grouped as below:

Stage of review	Status of Report	Number of Report/s
Pre-review with RSPO Secretariat *DA using RSPO DAP	Incomplete DA report submitted (Awaiting Secretariat's review/grower's feedback)	5
Full-review with Review Panel *DA using RSPO DAP	Complete DA submitted (Awaiting review from review panel/grower's feedback)	5
Pre-review with RSPO Secretariat *DA using non-RSPO method	These reports were submitted before 15 th November using other than RSPO DAP method. Awaiting grower's feedback.	3
Approval seeking for alternate DA method	Pending consideration as alternate methodology	2
	Total Reports	15

Issues

1. There is no standard language mentioned which should be used for DA reporting. Growers are currently submitting in both English and Bahasa Indonesia.
2. Current calculation for elevation measurement is a straight line between the field and outlet. In some plantation this 'straight line' is a much longer route eg when the land is hilly.
3. Some Companies are conducting DA for relatively small area (10 – 20ha) if the planted area for the target year is small.
4. Companies are giving summary of findings without details of data measurement and calculation for assessment that results in $D_{db} > D_p$ since DA is not applicable.
5. The procedure do not have a standard term to describe the number of years left before reaching mineral layer. This is to be used for fields that does not apply DLT and NRI.
6. Reports lack baseline reference points for terrain elevation study.
7. The significance of non-approval of DA reports which have been submitted for palms that are more than 15 years old/more than 5 years before replanting should be clarified.

Improvements for revision of RSPO DAP



1. The DAP needs to be specific on which discharge outlet should be selected (should be the one where water from the replanting site is discharged). Suggest to include:
 - Map showing location of the outlet and the route that the water takes (ie map of drainage system with arrows showing flow direction) when flowing to this outlet
 - Require the distance to the outlet to be measured as the actual distance flowed along the drainage system (not the straight line as currently).
2. Need to include that DA is advised to be conducted for significant area of at least several hundred ha if necessary by including fields with ages less than 15 years after replanting. This would ensure that the company does not have to prepare reports every years for small areas.
3. For area where DA is not applicable ($D_{db} > D_p$), growers need to indicate the number of years until the mineral layer is exposed (D_p 's), which is currently not mentioned in the procedure.
4. DAP reports should be in English or at minimum with an English summary. A summary Datasheet should be placed at the beginning
5. If elevation is determined in reference to a government or other survey marker the location and details need to be included in the report.