

Minutes of the RSPO Emission Reduction Working Group Meeting
 16th & 17th November 2013
 Santika Premier Dyandra Hotel & Convention, Medan, Indonesia

Attendance

Name	Organisation	
Alexandra Booth	Olam International	Substantive (co-chair)
Faizal Parish	GEC	Substantive (co-chair)
Felipe Guerrero	Daabon	Substantive
Henry King	Unilever	Substantive
Johan Verburg	Oxfam	Substantive
Marcel Silvius	Wetlands International	Substantive
Rizal Ahmad Nazim M. Abd Raof	MPOA	Substantive
Shahrakbah Yacob	MPOA	Substantive
Tim Killeen	WWF-US	Substantive
Arina Schrier	Wetlands International	Alternate
Adam Harrison (present on 16 th Nov only)	WWF	Observer
Aprianto Masjhur	Wetlands International	Observer
Calen May-Tobin	UCS	Observer
Cecile Bessou (present on 16 th Nov only)	CIRAD	Observer
Kimberly Carlson	University of Minnesota	Observer
Sabarinah Marzuky	MPOA	Observer
Melissa Chin	RSPO Secretariat	
Salahudin Yaacob	RSPO Secretariat	
Absent with apologies:		
Asrini Subrata	Asian Agri	Substantive
Bambang Dwilaksono	First Resources	Substantive

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action point	Timeline
1. Selection of co chairs	2 co chairs selected <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alexandra Booth 2. Faizal Parish 		
2. Review of ToR	ToR amended for better clarity on scope, responsibilities and deliverables and included in ANNEX 1		
Work plan	A workplan was developed as in ANNEX 2		
3. An improved, updated and user-friendly version of PalmGHG to be used for public reporting from 1 st January 2017 onwards.	<p>Process</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback from Working group at this meeting 2. Identification of companies for pilots 3. Compilation of feedback from pilot companies and further adjustments 4. Adjust and make PalmGHG tool available to all growers 5. Growers start using the tool/equivalent 6. Feedback from growers on the use of the tool/equivalent 7. Report to the secretariat on use of the tool/equivalent <p>Decision: Updated version of PalmGHG will be made available in February 2014. This will be followed by some pilots with selected growers and the results from the pilot will be compiled by June 2014.</p> <p>A summary of changes and improvements required for the February 2014 release is included in ANNEX 3</p>	1. RSPO Secretariat to work with the service provider for Palm GHG to ensure the timely release of updated PalmGHG for use during pilots	February 2014
4. Process for review of default emission factors, activities and timelines	<p><u>Principles</u></p> <p>5 principles were proposed to guide the process</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proper scientific review 2. Degree of contribution of emission factors on final result 3. Significance for management decision making 4. Level of scientific uncertainty of those numbers 5. Set values to be conservative to drive the corrective management actions as well as an incentive for companies to gather specific data <p><u>Process for Review</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Secretariat to provide a proper working document (table) and list priority default emission factors and its references according to the sensitivity analyses conducted by 	2. Secretariat to Submit working document on	15 th December 2013

	<p>Cecile. To also include updating requirements, timeline and frequency, whom and how.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Response from WG 3. Implement necessary immediate actions if any 4. Revised paper for decision by the WG <p><u>Issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some defaults to be conservative to give incentive to get actual values. These should focus on the ones that are currently measureable - Focus on figures that inform on decision making and that are most sensitive (gives the most significant impact to the results) - Focus on process to review the emission factors and when the values need to be updated. A process is also needed to capture the requests for change coming from users. - Land use defaults to be expanded (take into consideration the work of the CTF) to cover more categories particularly those relevant to Africa and Latin America - Need to have a wider range of references and not focus on a small number of sources - The 2013 IPCC figures for peat will not be adopted into the PalmGHG as it does not take into account water management and because it was not prepared in a proper and transparent manner. The working group will determine its own review process on the peat emission factors used. - PalmGHG should allow for better data inputs on peat drainage levels allowing for inputs on different drainage depth from various estates. - Standard Crop cycle length defaults to be included <p>Urgent action in time for release of next version of PalmGHG (February release)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide the range for user input values - Review amount of POME produced per tonne FFB and methane produced per tonne POME - Peat drainage depth per estate input should be made available - Others will stay as it is until the completion of the new pilot phase (ending June 2014) <p>Other matters (KIV): Grandfathering</p>	<p>emission factors to WG</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. WG to provide feedback to RSPO on emission factors document 4. EF paper to be revised 5. Revised paper submitted for decision by WG 6. Secretariat to facilitate process to update values 	<p>15th Jan 2014</p> <p>May 2014</p> <p>End June 2014</p> <p>February 2014</p>
<p>5. Development of a reporting framework for the usage of PalmGHG (or an</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Format of the report to be finalised by 15th December (refer to pdf of report example for further information) • Companies can decide on whether the reporting is on Financial year/calendar year • Reporting period should be reflected in the report 	<p>7. Programmer to amend current report layout and provide copy for circulation</p>	<p>15th December 2013</p>

<p>endorsed equivalent) during the implementation phase</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation phase – within 6 months • For very large certified companies, a phased approach with selected mills is allowed. • Encourage uncertified growers with a mill to conduct the assessment on one supply unit during the implementation phase. <p>KIV for next meeting discussion: Future development of tool to allow group level assessment for large companies</p>		
<p>6. Areas within PalmGHG that require further clarity or guidance</p>	<p><u>Conservation area (input sheet is currently provided but not included in final calculations)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not take away the incentive to obtain credit from carbon sequestration in conservation areas as conservation of peat area can lead to significant emission savings • Need to look at existing carbon stock rather than just annual sequestration. • Existing carbon stock could be recorded separately. • Undertake a study on how to address the issue of carbon stock, sequestration and also emission (from poor management of conservation areas) • Need to look at how offsite emissions can be addressed. PalmGHG currently does not include emissions from offsite activities. Further work will be required. Revisit in June 2014. <p>Decision: To phase in the inclusion of carbon in conservation areas. Will not be available in February release</p>	<p>8. Develop ToR for study for approval in Feb 14 meeting</p>	<p>Jan 2014</p>
	<p><u>Smallholder/outgrower data</u></p> <p>Emission figures for smallholders thought by some to be lower than large plantations as a result of lower fertiliser use. However, it was pointed out that in Colombia the opposite is true due to excessive fertiliser use.</p> <p>System should not exclude smallholders from the supply base but rather included in the data collection. There should be incentives for the mill to support the smallholders to reduce the carbon footprint (if relevant)</p> <p>Study needed on smallholder data</p> <p>Decision: Companies can assume the same emission figures for smallholders as their own operations but will need to come up with a Time bound plan to come out with more accurate data</p> <p>Take emissions from estate – convert to FFB value and use for outgrowers</p> <p>Take the weighted average for certified area/FFB volume to be used for outgrowers and independent smallholders</p>	<p>9. Amend application to allow input of a default for smallholder FFB into PalmGHG</p>	<p>In time for February release</p>

	(calculation may have to be done outside of PalmGHG)		
	<u>Incorporating FFB from other estates owned by the company but lie outside the mill's standard supply base</u> Provide guidance on usage and test outcomes in pilot	10. Guidance to be developed and included in Palm GHG system	Feb 2014
	<u>Use of "modified" version of PalmGHG</u> Reporting to RSPO does not require the result with the land use change data but agreed users should have option to report results with or without LUC. If land clearing is not accounted for, crop sequestration is not included either. Current application needs to be tweaked to remove the calculations for land clearing and crop sequestration from the final calculation and overall summary results Include note in PalmGHG that if LUC is not included, emissions can increase when LUC is included come Jan 2017. Include note on the minimum use in the P&C. The note and explanation should appear on the first entry page of PalmGHG	11. Amend PalmGHG – to add option to exclude LUC 12. To develop a note and guidance on the usage of the 2 options (Nov 2005 cut off and LUC exclusion) in PalmGHG	In time for Feb release Next WG meeting
	<u>Use of 3 year mean vs 1 year data</u> Maintain the 3 year running mean which is currently used in PalmGHG		
7. Criteria and process to determine equivalence to PalmGHG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Companies interested in having equivalence determined will need to submit documentation demonstrating equivalence to PalmGHG based on the criteria set by RSPO Company will have to submit the datasets that have been tested in both calculators so a comparison of the results generated can be seen RSPO will have a demonstration dummy dataset which will be used by the company to run through both calculators An expert will be appointed to review the request for equivalency and the cost will be charged to the company (applicant) 	13. WG members to review set of criteria as discussed during the meeting and submit their feedback 14. Criteria to be finalised in time for submissions by companies of equivalent tools. 15. Secretariat to Identify experts and determine cost of review	15 th Dec 2013 February 2014 February 2014

<p>8. To allow for additional fuel types i.e. bioethanol and biodiesel</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional study needed to get the various defaults of biofuels • Must be careful to add only emission factors from the further production steps between CPO and biofuel production <p>Decision: to revisit at next meeting.</p>		
<p>9. Inclusion of experts as resource persons in meeting</p>	<p>Secretariat to work out the budget requirements to accommodate this</p>	<p>16. Secretariat to adjust budget to include experts</p>	<p>January 2014</p>
<p>10. Training and outreach on PalmGHG</p>	<p>Secretariat to develop a list of criteria for suitable trainers and training Have to consider outreach to Africa and Latin America – translation of PalmGHG to other languages (Bahasa Indonesia, Spanish and French) Explore e-training methods Look at the various options and cost implications combination of physical and electronic training Upload training materials online</p>	<p>17. Secretariat to develop formal paper on training for circulation with potential costs for the various options and timeline</p> <p>18. Create a timetable to prioritise when the different training/outreach activities should be rolled out</p> <p>19. Develop info sheet on PalmGHG</p>	<p>For discussion at next meeting</p> <p>February 2014</p> <p>Feb 2014</p>
<p>11. Pilot for PalmGHG</p>	<p>Issues that pilot should shed light on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nature of FFB flow between sister mills 2. Software glitches and bugs 3. Functionality and user friendliness 4. Translation 5. Tidy up the English terms in PalmGHG 6. Data collection 7. February version should already be working well enough that there will not be a need for fundamental changes <p>Release version to all in June 2014 – certified companies are requested to submit a plan as to how and when they can start sending in their report to the WG during the implementation period.</p> <p>Implications of the grandfathering (e.g. Nov 2005 cut off and the exclusion of LUC emissions)</p>	<p>20. Secretariat to develop a list of what the pilots should cover</p> <p>21. Secretariat to send emails to all previous participants on possibility of joining pilot</p> <p>22. Secretariat to Check</p>	<p>January 2014</p> <p>January 2014</p> <p>Decision required</p>

	<p>will be examined in the implementation period</p> <p>Communication on PalmGHG needs to be clear</p> <p>New version in 2015 – learning from experiences of cases in 2014. Final version for use in from 1st Jan 2017 must be ready by 2016.</p>	<p>with S&C SC on who should be checking for compliance with the P&C with regards to meeting 5.6</p> <p>23. Create information document – data entry sheet.</p> <p>24. Draft communication strategy on what is the information required for PalmGHG and a rollout plan (training, pilot, etc.)</p>	<p>before Feb 2014</p> <p>Ready in Feb 2014 and put online</p> <p>Jan 2014</p>
12. Carbon assessment tool	<p>The shrubland AGC (above ground carbon) default provided in the science panel paper, Agus <i>et al.</i> 2013, should be used with caution. Growers may need to validate with field measurements and remote sensing rather than taking the default.</p> <p>A comprehensive paper on methodologies to assess carbon in peatlands is now available (Schrier & Anshari 2013) as part of the technical papers released by RSPO. This has to be incorporated into the findings with the report on the carbon assessment tool.</p> <p>Adopt land use categories in Agus <i>et al.</i> 2013 into PalmGHG and carbon assessment tool</p> <p>Tool looks at existing map and existing materials. Acquiring images for carbon assessment is not a problem but ground verification can be problematic</p> <p>The level of detail required in the ground survey is not specified but left to the user to decide.</p> <p>Review of the carbon assessment tool (Steps 1 – 5 relevant also for PalmGHG)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess option to replace categories in PalmGHG and the carbon assessment tool by those in the Science Panel paper (Agus <i>et al.</i> 2013) 2. Literature review and feedback from companies during the pilot to understand how the categories can be used by growers 3. Users from outside the SEA region can use their own regional values 4. Address issue of plantation type in February release 5. Develop a table with age variations 6. Reasonable set of equations to include below ground biomass should be ready in time for the February release 	<p>25. Review values from litter – develop simple paper listing the pros and cons of including litter into the assessment</p> <p>26. Further comments from WG members on carbon assessment tool to be submitted to Secretariat</p> <p>27. Approach Surin to update document, link to P&C and other out of date information – to include other impacts as specified in P&C</p> <p>28. Recommend allometric equations</p>	<p>In time for next meeting (Feb 2014)</p> <p>15th Dec 2013</p> <p>Jan 2014</p> <p>Jan 2014</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Take into account litter from forest 8. Recommend an allometric equation for use 9. 2 versions of report – one that is simplified to explain concept and process and one detailed manual for users. 10. Specific link to P&C needs to be addressed 11. Further clarification required on the step “Decide whether or not to proceed with new planting” – To replace with “Decide not to proceed / Proceed with further surveys” <p>PalmGHG or the RSPO endorse equivalent can be the tool to feed the numbers into and there can be flexibility in the methodologies used to assess carbon stock in the land prior to cultivation</p> <p>Guidance should specify what is mandatory and what is optional</p> <p>Review flexibility of methodologies at the time of the development of the manual</p> <p>Manual to include annex of the best available methodologies and best practices</p>	<p>29. Develop a ToR to produce a detailed guidance/manual for comments by WG</p>	<p>June 2014</p>
<p>13. Piloting of carbon assessment tool</p>	<p>Refer to new planting procedure and new planting announcements</p> <p>Identify 3 – 5 companies (different geographical locations)</p> <p>Aim for pilots to start after June 2014 with the request to go out around Jan/Feb.</p> <p>Target companies who will be embarking on NP in July 2014 – Jun 2015</p>	<p>30. Communicate to members and HCV assessors on the pilot initiative</p>	
<p>14. Demonstrating compliance with C7.8 during the implementation phase</p>	<p>Compliance to C7.8 can be checked by the CB as part of the NPP process</p> <p>NPP needs to be revised to take into consideration the changes in P&C 2013.</p> <p>Note to secretariat: revive the NPP WG.</p> <p>Make recommendation to S&C SC that the NPP WG needs to be formed and incorporate the provisions of C7.8 into the NPP</p> <p>The WG needs to provide an input paper to NPP WG for the revision of the NPP</p> <p>Guidance and recommendations (agreed on consensus by the WG) must be put forward to the S&C SC for endorsement.</p> <p>If no consensus is reached then it is submitted to the BoG (Board of Governors) with options for solutions.</p> <p>The CB needs to be clear on the implementation period and check on the plan. Details are separated from public report but compiled and sent to the WG.</p> <p>Simpler guidance to be provided for schemed smallholders on carbon assessment as part of NPP (limit for 500 ha)</p> <p>Need to test out if PalmGHG is the right tool for scenario testing or a simplified tool needs to</p>	<p>31. Communicate to SHWG about how C5.6 and C7.8 is going to be addressed at the schemed SH level</p> <p>32. Decision by WG in February on whether PalmGHG is a suitable tool or a simplified one is required.</p> <p>If simplified one is required, a prototype has to be developed by June 2014 for testing</p>	<p>Jan 2014</p> <p>Feb 2014</p>

	<p>be made available</p> <p>Option 1 - existing tool, fill it with proxy values so only the LU data needs to be filled in</p> <p>Option 2 – revisit the PalmGHG and consider amending the tool to be suitable to account for new planting development</p>		
15. Reporting framework on C7.8	<p>It has been agreed to use the NPP reporting framework as the basis for reporting on C7.8. Results of the carbon assessment will be included as an annex to the NPP report. The annex will not be made public.</p> <p>The carbon assessment is required as and when new planting occurs.</p> <p>Should apply to all companies required to follow the NPP (independent SH excluded)</p>	33. Secretariat to prepare notification with consultation as necessary with NPP WG	
16. Training and outreach on carbon assessment tool	<p>A simple leaflet (2 pages) to describe the carbon assessment tool needs to be developed and communicated.</p> <p>Trainers and training approach can draw on the experiences from the previous PalmGHG training</p> <p>The carbon assessment tool training can be integrated with the training on PalmGHG</p> <p>Consider to integrate social and HCV elements in the overall training module</p> <p>A roadshow on the tool for growers will need to be organised and it should include technical experts and CBs</p> <p>Growers should have some simple tools available for pre-screening</p> <p>In depth training based on the carbon assessment tool manual can be designed once the manual is available</p>	34. Secretariat to develop leaflet	Mar 2014
AOB			
17. Review of other relevant elements in the P&C which may relate to GHG	<p>Other criteria in the P&C such as 7.1, 7.2, 4.3,5.5,5.4, 8.1,3.1,1.2 were identified as having links to GHG</p> <p>Secretariat needs to prepare a discussion paper identifying the cross linking elements and check if there is any action required by the WG</p>	35. Secretariat to prepare a simple table for discussion on the cross linking elements	In time for next meeting
18. Process on determining the appropriate emission factor for peat	<p>WG needs to look into the justification of using the peat emission factor currently in PalmGHG</p> <p>A review is required on new materials that have come out since then including the RSPO Science Panel papers</p> <p>The best approach is to have a 3rd party to do a review, supported by the WG. Results of the review should be ready in time for the February release of PalmGHG.</p> <p>In case an agreement on the emission factor for peat cannot be achieved by February,</p>	<p>36. Summary of peer reviewed literature</p> <p>37. WG to provide references that are not on the list</p>	In time for next meeting

	<p>consensus must be reached by June, at the end of the pilots.</p> <p>Agreed that observer from the University of Minnesota (UM) to take the lead to compile the necessary data for the review. The review can include methane and N₂O emissions. The WG members agreed that this should be ready in January 2014.</p> <p>A list of references will be provided to the WG and WG members can also submit their own literature to UM and UCS.</p> <p>Outcome of the science review should be deliberated by the WG members</p>		
19. Emissions from POME	<p>There is a need to check that the correct figures are being used for the volume of POME generated at the mill and the associated methane emissions. This will fluctuate by region and technology.</p> <p>A subgroup comprising of the grower representatives of the WG will look into this.</p>	38. Subgroup to recommend the appropriate figures to the WG	In time for Feb release of PalmGHG
20. Meetings	<p>One meeting in February – week of 11th-12th, 17th – 21st (Note: ICOPE is on 13th and 14th Feb)</p> <p>One meeting in June – possibly in Paris at the time of the RSPO European Summit</p> <p>Meeting in September (optional)</p> <p>Use RT for outreach on the WG activities and outputs – 18th – 21st of November</p>	39. Secretariat to send out a doodle poll to confirm the dates and venue.	December 15 2013
21. Budget		40. Secretariat to propose a budget till June 2015 for discussion	In time for next meeting
22. WG name	Members agreed to name the WG as Emission reduction WG (ERWG)		