

Minutes of Meeting

Subject : 2nd Peatlands Working Group 2 (PLWG-2) Meeting

Date : June 15 & 16, 2017

Venue : Aloft, KL Sentral, Kuala Lumpur

Name	Organisation	Status
Faizal Parish	GEC	Substantive
Dr. Joshua Mathews	Bumitama Gunajaya Agro	Substantive
Dr. Shahrakbah Yacob	Sime Darby	Substantive
Jason Foong	KLK	Substantive
Chin Kai Xiang	IOI Loders Croklaan	Substantive
Jason Hon	WWF	Substantive
Julia Lo	GEC	Alternate
Dr. Arina Schrier	Wetlands International	Alternate
Javin Tan	RSPO Secretariat	Secretariat
Devaladevi Sivaceyon	RSPO Secretariat	Secretariat
Sara Cowling (only on 16 th June)	RSPO Secretariat	Secretariat
<i>Absent with apologies:</i>		
Dr. Mukesh Sharma	Asian Agri	Substantive
Lim Sian Choo	Bumitama Gunajaya Agro	Alternate
Dickens Mambu	IOI Loders Croklaan	Alternate

No.	Item Descriptions	Main Discussion Points	Action Points
June 15, 2017 (Thursday)			
1.	Introduction of new member	CoChair begun the meeting with a round of introduction for new member. Secretariat informed the Working Group (WG) that Dr. Mukesh, Asian Agri, is leaving the WG. There is a need to consider replacement for his seat, representing Indonesian growers. More members required ensuring the balance composition of the WG as per the ToR.	
2.	Review of previous meeting minutes	Suggestion to call for representative from Sarawak Oil Palm Plantation Owners Association, SOPPOA (Dato Hamid Sapawi).	

		<p>GAR/PT Smart Plantation (Indonesia) was suggested and another suggestion was perhaps for an alternate to Dr. Shah, from Sime Darby (Indonesia). Given with RSPO is moving for single membership, there may be challenges in balancing the existing composition of the WG.</p> <p>Suggestion to call-in an alternate from WWF.</p> <p>However, the WG feels that the group should be opened to all (whoever have plantation and specific planting on peatlands), with the bottom-line and key is to get inputs to the group and process.</p> <p>RSPO and Wetlands have signed agreement and started working on Drainability assessment. RSPO has made announcement calling for members to share their experience but so far no one has turned up.</p> <p>On regional peat definition, refer to item No.4 of this minutes.</p> <p>Regarding communication materials, RSPO Outreach and Engagement (O&E) representative will be joining the WG meeting the following day, further on this refer to item No.8 of this minutes.</p>	<p>Secretariat to work on inviting identified RSPO members to be on-board the WG.</p>
3.	Working group workplan and budget	<p>Secretariat presented on workplan (circulated with 1st PLWG-2 Meeting of Minutes) and budgeting for July 2017- June 2018 financial year (Annex 2).</p> <p>WG informed that peat maps with reasonable details especially for Malaysia (state by state) can be purchased from government. Hence suggestion from WG was to add RM10,000 to obtain peat maps from government bodies.</p> <p>Cost related to trainings will be parked under the said budget code but the description is kept general to provide flexibility in using this code for any training and materials related expenses.</p> <p>To ensure proper allocation of budgets, Chair suggested to go through working group workplan. Members were informed that labelling of work priority as 'High' (H), 'Medium' (M), and 'Low' (L) was collectively done by WG during the 1st PLWG-2 meeting based on urgency of work and budget allocation.</p> <p>Discussions that took place is numbered according to workplan: 1) Secretariat informed that the current development for online BMP module is parked under the allocation for Sustainability College which is supervised of Yohanes Izmi,</p>	

		<p>Strategic Project Director (RSPO Secretariat). As for trainings, given the practise has been to have it along with GHG trainings hence the total cost incurred will be shared accordingly. Secretariat informed that there is a plan to have 3 more GHG trainings and peat trainings may potentially held along as the usual practise. However, WG are open to ideas on how future trainings can be conducted. As for communication materials, future plans are to have simplified guidance for smallholder which will also be used as part of 'train-the-trainer' module. The idea is there, yet to be discussed in depth since the scope of module development will be focused more for trainers. There will be a slot on peat during RT-15 which is not budgeted within this WG's budget as it will fall under the RT budget.</p> <p>2) For work relating to monitoring trends for cultivation of oil palm on peatlands, WG suggested to extract maps from annual audit summary report. Given the maps are given in pdf format, Secretariat suggested to come up with a TOR hence outsource the task which will mainly require digitalising these maps. Also suggested was to obtain the shape file from growers if there are any concerns with confidentiality.</p> <p>3) As for guidance in relation to peat with supply chain process which is ranked as 'low' (L), currently no budget is allocated since there isn't any commencement of work yet. Suggestion from WG to promote this task to M-medium given the demand from upstream to know if the source of oil palm is from peat cultivation needs to be answered. Secretariat viewpoint was this scope should best fit under the FFB Legality and Traceability Task Force since it involves tracking down of the FFB supplies.</p> <p>4) Comments with regards to P&C review has been completed during the previous meeting.</p> <p>5)& 6) Works will commence based on RSPO NEXT's uptake.</p> <p>7) Refer item 7 of this minutes.</p> <p>8) & 9) Refer item 9 of this minutes.</p> <p>10) & 11) Refer item 5 of this minutes.</p> <p>13) Refer item 4 if this minutes.</p> <p>14) Secretariat asked for suggestion from WG on how government engagement can be done, any potential project from government/national level or any projects that can be funded by</p>	<p>WG to consider the need for training, communication materials.</p> <p>Item 3 in the PLWG workplan was promoted from L-low to M-medium priority.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>RSPO for the projects to be carried out. Currently, the one and only indirect engagement from RSPO is with NTU and Badan Restorasi Gambut (BRG) on 'Spatial prioritization framework for peatland restoration' project.</p> <p>Suggestion from WG for RSPO to engage with Sarawak Tropical Peat Research Institute to ensure their direction headed is realistic. WG also advised potential approach for communication which is through Ministry of Urban Development and Natural Resources.</p> <p>Suggestion from Chair to check if currently there are any engagement with ministry/government where peat matters can be brought in and Secretariat explained that for now none of such engagement including for MSPO and ISPO. Secretariat also made a point that having a strategic relationship is something that should be considered.</p> <p>Chair also suggested the WG should be made aware and learn about MSPO and ISPO requirement relating to peat especially given government has made mandatory MSPO certification for all oil palm plantation and smallholders by December 2019. Chair shared one of his experience which proofed that there is still negative perception about RSPO which is a clear sign that there is a need for proper dialogue to smooth things out. Also suggested to invite representative from MPOB, MSPO and ISPO during workshop conducted relating to BMP module to hear their opinion.</p>	
4.	Regional definition on peat	<p>As a follow-up from last meeting, Dr. Joshua presented to the group organic soil depth to be classified as peat. Based on FAO soil classification, peat soil is '<i>Organic soil (Histosols) with more than half of the upper 80cm of soil is organic</i>', which is a minimum 40cm of the upper soil is organic. USDA soil taxonomy follows the same minimum value. Malaysia and Indonesia's classification requires minimum depth of 50cm organic soil layer.</p> <p>To ensure better management of plantation, Chair suggested to have conservative recognition for scenarios with organic soil layer (first 50cm of the soil) with a potential for acid sulphate soil.</p> <p>WG discussed on definition given from HCS + Study – Practical guidance on locating and delineating peatlands and other organic soils in the tropics, Annex 3 of this minute.</p> <p>WG proposed RSPO to adopt a global definition to identify peat soil following Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) definition which is soils with 40cm organic soil in the top soil layer. The proposed change in definition will be included as part of the revised BMP.</p>	<p>Include the new proposed global definition for peat within the BMP module that is being revised.</p> <p>Secretariat to come up with proper wording for the proposed definition.</p>

<p>5.</p>	<p>Progress on Drainability assessment</p>	<p>Under Criteria 4.3.5 of RSPO P&C 2013, there is a requirement to do drainability assessment to which no guidance is available. Hence the task was put up for potential consultancy work in which Wetlands International was contracted on 2nd of May 2017 till the end of 2017 as to allow for field testing.</p> <p>Arina presented on updates for qualitative and quantitative guidelines for drainability assessment. The task is currently at Stage 1 where search on existing studies and models mostly relating to quantitative assessment has been done. Based on the search, proposal and way forward was discussed with the WG.</p> <p>June'17 to October'17 will be the period for comments from WG and RSPO, to develop the guideline, concept version while also testing the guidelines with growers potentially from WG.</p> <p>October'17 to December'17 will be the last stage to finalise these guidelines.</p> <p>From the presentation, WG raised concern over getting data for Digital Terrain Model (DTM) from growers given the resulting costing and accuracy of the data. Suggestion was to develop guideline for growers to measure DTM as the data is very useful to develop drainability assessment.</p> <p>WG feels that there is a need to clarify 'water level' as its dependant on season. Arina explained that it's the average water level from the nearest body level (either mean sea level or river).</p> <p>Discussion also revolved around the fate of lands assessed not suitable for replanting and precautionary steps such as alternate crop and other viable rehabilitation measure that should be considered.</p> <p>Secretariat asked for advice with regards to proposal from Wetlands International (WI) on development of a landscape level drainage limit mapping as to why only a certain a model is preferred over the rest and requested the WG should give their consensus on the need for this mapping.</p> <p>The WG was consulted if they should consider doing the qualitative assessment and have the guidelines ready for growers meanwhile developing the quantitative guidance for now. Chair worries that having 2 guidance within 6 months may stir confusions given that the final guidance is targeted to be completed by end of this year.</p>	<p>Rewording of 'tide' from qualitative assessment to a more suitable term addressing the wet season flow from inland area.</p> <p>'Serious flooding' in the P&C to be defined as flooding referring to flood for more than 1 month.</p> <p>WG was asked for appropriate illustrations that can be used as part of this guideline development.</p> <p>Arina to discuss with Sime Darby for potential field testing. Arina to come up with proper proposal on what needs to be tested.</p> <p>Chair will check with Asian Pulp & Paper on their LIDAR mapping.</p> <p>Arina to specify the information needed and prepare the protocol to make a mail blast to growers with a 1-month timeline else the work will commence based on default values.</p>
-----------	--	---	--

		<p>It was clarified that for the quantitative assessment it will need to be ground tested and for this neither WI nor RSPO Secretariat will be present physically. Only when further guidance is needed they can be in contact. Companies will be given the methodology for test run on their own.</p> <p>After considering the time frame for work completion by December 2017, the WG decided to do field test with not necessarily RSPO member and with/without peat area (not necessarily looking at replanting) and make an announcement calling for participation.</p>	
6.	ToR for Peatland mapping	<p>Secretariat presented the draft TOR to WG for collective development of this TOR.</p> <p>WG decided to take the baseline from reports produced by GHG Workstream 2. Secretariat has shared this report in 'Dropbox' titled 'Full reports from the Technical Panel of 2nd Greenhouse Gas Working Group'.</p> <p>Drafted TOR as Annex 5 of this meeting minutes.</p> <p>Secretariat to check on TOR for Peat Map from GHG Workstream 2.</p> <p>Secretariat to shortlist members with cultivation on peat and communicate out the required information.</p>	<p>Secretariat to check with the team/consultant that produced this report to take up this work.</p> <p>Secretariat to check internally for shape file.</p>
7.	Review of BMP Manuals	<p>Secretariat informed that so far, no feedback was heard from growers on with the current BMP module. Plus, most of the BMPs mentioned is already in practise in plantations. Just that several items were raised during training seeking for specific guidance such as for water management and drainability assessment.</p> <p>WG feels that there needs to be a survey or calling of experience from growers to hear their experience so far. Secretariat informed that this has been done, unfortunately we have not gotten any response.</p> <p>Suggestion from WG to conduct workshop with member companies to gain feedbacks on grower's experience (planting on peat, restoration and rehabilitation of conservation area, fire prevention on peat etc). Some of the suggestion to site visit are to United Plantation, Selangor (Rehabilitation Plan) Riau and Kalimantan. Chair suggested that the WG can also take proactive measure to brainstorm new ideas for this module based on literatures from industry.</p>	

		<p>WG suggested the upcoming module to be growers and smallholder's friendly as the current edition seem to fit more for agronomist or researchers. Secretariat confirmed that this is part of the workplan.</p> <p>Chair suggested to go through the audit summary report to check NC raised and what was the measure taken to close to get a new idea. Secretariat explained that this will be very exhaustive to be done. Chair then explained that the idea is to reach out to the Certification Body to obtain feedback on challenges in auditing relating to BMPs.</p> <p>Jason Hon volunteered to check with his colleague for recommendation on any potential site at Indonesia.</p> <p>Chair informed the WG on the target for adoption of this reviewed manual is by November 2018. Targeted duration for drafting and reviewing will be 9 months which is beginning February 2018.</p> <p>Chair suggested if during RT we should have a side meeting to receive feedbacks and gather information. Secretariat mentioned that Sara from RSPO O&E department will be joining tomorrow hence may suggest if there are any upcoming roadshows to serve this purpose.</p>	<p>Chair will share information relating to NC.</p> <p>Suggestion to add in BMP on how wildlife encroachment is handled.</p>
No.	Item Descriptions	Main Discussion Points	Action Points
8.	Communication and Outreach (Training, material, train the trainer)	<p>Representative from RSPO O&E Department, Sara Cowling attended the 2nd day of the meeting to brief on O&E's plan. She requested for inputs from WG in terms of developing training materials especially for the Sustainability College.</p> <p>Stakeholder mapping is an effort taken by RSPO Secretariat to identify key opinion leaders (KOL) who are not necessarily RSPO members but are in working with peat matters.</p> <p>Chair suggested WG can provide comments by section on the O&E workplan. There is a clear need for government's engagement, smallholder and 3rd party supplier to publicise the BMP module. For engagement with government, PLWG has identified MPOB and MSPO.</p> <p>Secretariat explained that Sustainability College is a platform to learn about RSPO which will be on a module basis and interactive manner (videos). Several questions raised by WG are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the course be developed to cater different background of user (grower, managers etc)? • Are users entitled for a recognition (certificate etc) upon completing these courses? 	<p>Secretariat to internally ensure the contact details from Salesforce is updated to ensure the mail blast is effectively sent.</p> <p>Secretariat and WG requested Sara to provide inputs on the key topic frequently thrown at RSPO (especially in peat) from the last 3</p>

		<p>Sara explained that the courses developed are for knowledge learning aspect and for now is not considering a college setup.</p> <p>WG are in opinion that the Sustainability College can be made of better use by using this platform for ‘training for sustainability related training’ as part of Criteria 4.8. Suggestion to also have acknowledgment for completion of each module/task.</p> <p>Sara informed that e-gazette is a monthly newsletter shared with all stakeholders, WG members are welcomed to provide their input with no limitation to single scope of information.</p> <p>WG suggested that the technical inputs from the WG should be churned into layman terms to accommodate the general reader.</p> <p>WG asked for the effectiveness for reading the e-gazette as a channel to circulate information. It was clarified as the email and website is more effective communication medium in contrast to e-gazette.</p> <p>WG was seeking clarification about peat social media group, which is a pool of experts in relation to peat but currently there is <u>none</u>. Sara explained that this should come together with the stakeholders mapping.</p> <p>WG would like to know if the communication is multi lingual. Sara clarified that currently it’s in English. Indonesia and Latin America do have e-gazette in respective language. WG feels that there is a need to have multi-language especially for some of the key information.</p> <p>WG are in opinion that the social media platform (Facebook, WhatsApp etc) may not be an ideal platform to reach out given that anyone can provide inputs.</p> <p>Suggestion from Chair to have FAQ on Peat. WG also suggested RSPO to have a statistician to proof with facts and figures on how many companies has pledged to stay away from peat, how many areas are planted on peat by the sector versus RSPO certified members.</p>	<p>years to know how we can tackle in future.</p>
9.	<p>Online module for BMPs on existing cultivation on peat</p>	<p>Arina presented on updates on BMP module for existing plantation on peat.</p> <p>This ‘working draft’ was presented for collective comments from the WG. Comments will be consolidated by Arina and further communicated via email.</p>	<p>WG to revert with comments by 23rd June 2017 and illustrations by July 2017.</p>

10.	AOB	Chair presented on 'National and regional projects on peatland management with support from IFAD and GEF'.	<p>Slide to be shared in the common dropbox folder.</p> <p>Secretariat to decide if they would like to participate as part of this process.</p>
11.	Next Meeting	<p>WG proposed to have the next meeting as a half day workshop cum site visit – 3 days meeting either early to mid-September.</p> <p>Potential site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • United Plantation (Kuala Selangor) 	Secretariat to send out information for the next meeting.

Annex 1. Revised Meeting Agenda

2nd PLWG meeting

Date: 15th & 16th June 2017 (Thursday and Friday)

Venue: Aloft Hotel, Kuala Lumpur

Meeting Agenda

15th June 2017 (Thursday)

Time	Agenda
9.00am – 9.30am	1. Introduction of new members 2. Review of previous meeting's minutes and progress on actions
9.30am – 10.30am	3. WG members? 4. WG Workplan and Budget
10.30am – 11.00am	Tea Break
11.00am – 12.30pm	5. Regional definition(s) of peat 6. Progress on 'Drainability Assessment'
12.30pm – 1.30pm	Lunch
1.30pm – 3.00pm	7. ToR for peatlands mapping?
3.00pm – 3.30pm	Break
3.30pm – 5.00pm	8. Review of the BMP Manuals

16th June 2017 (Friday)

Time	Agenda
9.00am – 11.30am	9. Communication & Outreach (training, materials, train-the-trainer) 10. Online module for BMPs on existing cultivation on peat
	Break
11.30am – 12.30pm	11. Spatial prioritization framework for peatland restoration project by NTU 12. AOB (upcoming national and regional projects on peatland management with support from IFAD and GEF) 13. Date for next meeting
12.30pm – 1.30pm	Lunch

*The session by NTU was cancelled last minute

Annex 2: Financial budget for PLWG-2 (July 2017 – June 2018)

	Total Budget for PLWG-2	RM 350,000.00
PL001	Peatland Working Group 2 (sub-total)	40,000.00
	i) PLWG-2 meeting	20,000.00
	ii) PLWG-2 field visit (or workshop)	15,000.00
	iii) Government engagement	5,000.00
<hr/>		
PL002	Update of BMPs & Training (sub-total)	310,000.00
	i) Peat BMPs training & materials	60,000.00
	ii) Drainability assessment	90,000.00
	iii) Study on extent of peatlands (cultivated and conserved) by RSPO members	100,000.00
	iv) Update and review of peat BMPs	60,000.00

Section 2: Organic soils and Peatlands: Concepts, Definitions and Local Terms

In soil science, organic and mineral soils are differentiated on the basis of a) the content of organic material in the substrate and b) the minimum depth and position of the organic layer(s). The most common definition for organic soils is that of 'Histosol' (FAO 1998, 2006/7). The rather complex definition of 'Histosol' refers not only to the thickness of the soil layers and their organic content but also to their origin, underlying material, clay content and annual period of water saturation (see box below). The Australian Soil Classification, which has been extensively applied in Papua New Guinea, uses the term 'Organosol' as a synonym for 'Histosol'.

FAO (2006/7) definition of organic soils (Histosol):
*Soils having organic material, either:

1. 10 cm or more thick starting at the soil surface and immediately overlying ice, continuous rock, or fragmental materials, the interstices of which are filled with organic material; or
2. cumulatively within 100 cm of the soil surface either 60 cm or more thick if 75% (by volume) or more of the material consists of mass fibres; or 40 cm or more thick in other materials; and starting within 40 cm of the soil surface.

*Organic material has one or both of the following:

1. 20 percent or more organic carbon in the fine earth (by mass); or
2. if saturated with water for 30 consecutive days or more in most years (unless drained), one or both of the following:
 - a. $(12 + [\text{clay percentage of the mineral fraction} \times 0.1])\%$ or more organic carbon in the fine earth (by mass); or
 - b. 18 % or more organic carbon in the fine earth (by mass).

In its definition of organic soils the IPCC (2003, 2006, 2014) follows the definition of FAO, but leaves out the thickness criterion to allow for country specific approaches, whereas also no differentiation is made for the type of organic material (see box below).

The IPCC (2003, 2006) definition of organic soils.
*Organic soils are identified on the basis of criteria 1 and 2, or 1 and 3 listed below (FAO 1998):

1. Thickness of organic horizon greater than or equal to 10 cm. A horizon of less than 20 cm must have 12 percent or more organic carbon when mixed to a depth of 20 cm.
2. Soils that are never saturated with water for more than a few days must contain more than 20 percent organic carbon by weight (i.e., about 35 percent organic matter).
3. Soils are subject to water saturation episodes and has either:
 - a. At least 12 percent organic carbon by weight (i.e., about 20 percent organic matter) if the soil has no clay; or
 - b. At least 18 percent organic carbon by weight (i.e., about 30 percent organic matter) if the soil has 60% or more clay; or
 - c. An intermediate, proportional amount of organic carbon for intermediate amounts of clay.

The border between organic and mineral soils lies in most national classification systems somewhere between 20-35 % OM (~ 2-20 % organic carbon; cf. Wüst et al. 2003). In contrast, the World Reference Base for soil resources (WRB 2014)² uses a minimum of 20 % organic carbon (~ 35 % OM) to qualify as an organic layer.

If the surface layer of organic material is too shallow (but thicker than 10 cm) to qualify the soil as a Histosol, the term 'Histic' is added to the prevailing soil type. A 'Histic Andosol' is thus a soil formed in volcanic tephra (Andosol) with a shallow surface layer of organic material ('Histic').

¹ http://www.cse.csiro.au/ac/ep/asc_re_on_line/en/organols.htm

² <http://www.fao.org/3/a-43794a.pdf>

Annex 4: Proposed wording for global definition

RSPO Organic(Peat) Soil Classification

For the purpose of the RSPO, peat is defined as an

‘organic soil where more than half (40cm) of the upper 80cm of soil is organic material containing 35% or more organic matter by dry weight (~18% or more organic carbon) ’.

This classification has been derived from the global definition of Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) and United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).. In countries which have a National Interpretation (NI) it may include a nationally accepted definition.

The adoption of global classification will come into force on the 1st November 2017.

Terms of Reference
Monitoring of Land Use Change for Oil Palm

1. Objective

- a. To provide an update on the overall trend of oil palm cultivation on peat compared to the 2010 baseline (*by GHG WG2*) in Malaysia
- b. To map the area of peatlands within the operating unit (including estate or group of estate/ land title/ concession) of RSPO member companies which either has been planted or set-aside/conserved

2. Background

Development and management of oil palm plantations on peatlands remains one of the most significant contributors of GHG emissions from the oil palm sector. It also leads to long term impacts related to land subsidence and flooding and contributes to increased risk of fires and associated smoke haze.

RSPO Peatland Working Group (PLWG) 2 reconvened early of year 2017, to i) update two of RSPO existing Manuals on Best Management Practices (BMPs) relating to cultivation, management and rehabilitation of peatlands; and ii) to provide relevant guidance relating to peatlands of RSPO Principle & Criteria. One of the specific tasks of the PLWG-2 is to monitor trends in oil palm cultivation on peatlands, determining the impact of RSPO P&C, calling for avoiding extensive planting on peatlands, and implementation of BMPs for oil palm cultivations on peatland.

Similar analysis on oil palm and land use change in Indonesia, Malaysia and Papua New Guinea was conducted through Workstream 2 of RSPO Green House Gas Working Group (GHG WG) with results published in November 2013. Building upon the results, the PLWG-2 feels that the analysis should be updated to provide analysis of the trend till year 2017, specifically to include monitoring of oil palm developments on peatlands of RSPO members.

3. Expected Outputs

- a. Maps of the extent of peatland within the operating unit (including estate or group of estate/ land title/ concession) of RSPO member companies cultivated with oil palm.
- b. Maps of the extent of peatland within the operating unit (including estate or group of estate/land title/concession) of RSPO member companies' set-aside for conservation.
- c. Maps of the extent of peatland cultivated with oil palm (country level – including non RSPO members).
- d. Draft and final report on analysis of:
 - Trends in new oil palm developments on peatland in the period of 2010 to 2017;
 - Trends in land use on peatlands in the period of 2010 to 2017 (including rehabilitation or conservation) of RSPO members; and
 - Comparison of the extent (areas) and percentage of oil palm planted on peatland between RSPO members and the sector.

4. Timeline

Expected output *a*, *b*, and *c* to be completed 6 months upon commencement of contract.

Expected output *d* 1 months upon completions of expected output *a*, *b*, and *c*.