

Date: 10th March 2016 -11th March 2016

Venue: Capri Hotel, Bangsar South, Kuala Lumpur

Name	Organisation	Status
Faizal Parish (Chair)	GEC	Substantive
Gan Lian Tiong (co-chair)	Musim Mas	Substantive
Lim Sian Choo	Bumitama Gunajaya Agro	Substantive
Audrey Lee	Olam	Substantive
Foo Siew Theng	Wilmar	Substantive
Melissa Yeoh (11 th March 2016 only)	FGV Felda	Substantive
Joseph Hutabarat	Rainforest Alliance	Substantive
Marcel Silvius	Wetlands International	Substantive
Phubalan Karunakaran	WWF-Malaysia	Alternate
Julia Lo	GEC	Alternate
Arina Schrier	Wetlands International	Alternate
Jason Foong	KLK	Alternate
Lee Kuan Yee	KLK	Alternate
Henry Cai	Musim Mas	Alternate
Mukesh Sharma	Asian Agri	Alternate
Cecile Bessou	CIRAD	Technical advisor
Melissa Chin	RSPO Secretariat	Secretariat
Devaladevi Sivaceyon	RSPO Secretariat	Secretariat
Javin Tan		Observer
Absent with apologies		
Jose Roberto Montenegro	AgroCaribe	Substantive
Shahrakbah Yacob	Sime Darby	Substantive
Olivier Tichit	SIPEF	Alternate

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
1.	Updates from Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melissa informed the WG that the vacancies for GHG Executive and GHG Manager have been filled. Devaladevi Sivaceyon was introduced as the new GHG Executive and Javin Tan as the incoming GHG Manager. Javin will only formally join RSPO in April but is invited to participate as an observer to expedite the handover process. • Olivier Tichit from SIPEF will be joining the ERWG as an alternate member for ROW growers. • All three presentation proposals to ICOPE have been accepted. The ICOPE organisers have designated a panel session for the PalmGHG presentations. The three presentations for ICOPE will cover the following topics. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The development and technical background of PalmGHG – presented by Cecile ii) Implementation of PalmGHG in RSPO and submission of PalmGHG reports – presented by Melissa iii) Comparison of PalmGHG, ISCC and ISPO GHG calculator – presented by Dr. Gan 	
2.	Review of meeting minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The previous minutes of meeting was reviewed and endorsed 	
3.	Comparison paper of ISCC, ISPO and RSPO calculators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Gan presented his paper for ICOPE 2016 to the WG in order to share the findings and gather feedback. 	
4.	GHG Assessment Procedure for New Plantings – Summary from Sub Group on C7.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The C7.8 Sub group met on 9th March to discuss an action plan for the review and update of the GHG Assessment Procedure. • The WG has agreed on the below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The change of the structure of GHG Assessment Procedure for new planting. • To expand RSPO default land use type for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Shrubs: i) Old Shrub and ii) New Shrub 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat to follow up and send reminders in accordance with the action plan (Annex 1)

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Secondary Forest, SF: i) Good SF; ii) Moderate SF; iii) Degraded SF ● To include carbon stock default value for the above break-down of land use type in accordance to IPCC 2006 Good Practice Guidance ● However, there is concern over the consistency of land use types use within Palm GHG, where there is no reference to secondary forest. Two forest types captured within Palm GHG are: i) undisturbed forest and ii) disturbed forest. Action needed (refer Annex 1). ● To re-iterate the usage of 'existing data' HCV data for verification of land use types in respect of guidance provided within NPP with refers to RSPO New Planting Procedure on HCV assessment report older than 3 years must be reviewed. ● To provide more guidance on map requirement in addition to guidance provided within New Planting Procedure. ● To include more map illustration to provide informed clarity and example. ● To include more guidance on peat sampling; drainability assessment and management recommendations for peat; and off-site impacts. ● To include more clarity and guidance on scenario testing and projection. ● Due to the list of tasks that need to be accomplished, concerns were raised that the original timeline of completing the revision by June 2016 may not be feasible. A new timeline was proposed and an action plan was drawn up by the WG (please see Annex 1). The target is to have the revised version available in English by mid-August and in other languages by mid-September 2016 	

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
5.	PalmGHG Subgroup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PalmGHG subgroup met on 9th March. The objective of the meeting is to revisit and reconfirm the main calculation parameters of PalmGHG and the corresponding default factors to ensure there is consensus within the group as V3 needs to be finalised. • Allocation – After some deliberation, it was decided to revert to the original method of system expansion to deal with the sale of PKS and EFB for electricity generation. This means that the PKS and EFB sold for electricity generation will be considered a credit. However, it needs to be made clear that the grower will need to show that the PKS is sold for electricity generation. Instead of the automatic assumption that the PKS sold will directly displace coal, the national electricity mix of the country will be used instead to calculate the credit. • Consensus yet reached on types of LUC to be included into Palm GHG accounting for emissions. It is understood that emissions from LUC directly related to production; e.g. mill, roads, ditches, research facilities should be included. While infrastructure built for social consideration (i.e. worker housing and amenities like schools and recreational facilities) are to be excluded. There is concern over what is defined as production-related LUC and the consistency it could maintained with Palm GHG, as Nursery is yet to be included. • Emission from transport of fertilisers – It was recommended that the sea transport emission be retained but a default of 5000km be provided for. Companies can still use their own values for sea distance if they have the data. Clarity should also be given that in the case of road transport, “local port” is to be defined as the local port closest to the plantation • Carbon sequestered in oil palm – As a follow up from the last meeting, it was suggested that the Secretariat approached Ian Henson to update his growth model. Based on a research paper, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat to circulate paper on LUC emissions for comments and feedback as soon as possible. • Secretariat to ensure that the confirmed changes are reflected in V3 • Secretariat to check the RFA report for other regional/national values for electricity generation and to also check for more updated values.

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<p>AGB of OP is about 60-70tC/ha (assume 25 yrs). The inclusion of carbon from reproductive growth will add on average another 5tC/ha. The time average C stock is found to be about 30 – 35tC/ha.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on previous WG discussions, there were concerns that the use of the dynamic growth model will create a bias towards operations with high proportion of young palms. It will be difficult to communicate the fluctuation in emissions that will be heavily influenced by plantation age. Moving to a static model will reduce the need to update the growth model which can require quite extensive work. Therefore, the WG has suggested 3 options to deal with the issue: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adopt IPCC tier one approach – 76tC/ha over 25 years = 3.1tC/ha/yr 2. Use the Henson model but average the yearly palm growth evenly over 25 years = 2.3 tC/ha/yr (recommended). Note that this value will also be adjusted to use the biomass to carbon ratio of 0.5 (IPCC) rather than 0.45. 3. Use the accepted time average carbon = 35tC/ha over 25 yrs = 1.4tC/ha/yr • The WG has agreed to adopt Option 2 as recommended by the PalmGHG subgroup • N₂O emission from peat soil - The PalmGHG currently uses the IPCC 2006 value of 16kgN₂O-N/ha.yr. However, the latest IPCC 2013 Supplement for Wetlands gives 1.2 kgN₂O-N/ha.yr. The huge variance between the two figures is not well understood. A review of the reference sources used by IPCC as well as other sources need to be conducted before the WG considers to adopt this new value. If the 2013 supplement is followed, the methane 	

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<p>emissions from ditches should also be added in as the supplement provides for it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field application of POME – it should be made more evident that PalmGHG assumes that treated POME is used in the fields as organic fertiliser. • Electricity emission factors – It was suggested that the list of emission factors be expanded to take into account regional and national differences as the data may be quite readily available. At the moment an average of values taken from Malaysia and Indonesia is used. It was felt that the values can be separated. 	
6.	PalmGHG V3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A work in progress PalmGHG V3 was presented. However, based on the recommendations from the PalmGHG subgroup (9th March meeting) more work and amendments will still be required. • Another matter of concern is the size of PalmGHG which has grown too big. This will hamper accessibility by members in more remote locations. • Depending on the decision with regards to LUC emission, clear instruction on how all other land use associated with operation will be included (and areas exempted) needs to be provided. • The updating of default values can easily be done but the key concern here is confirming all the necessary changes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat to confirm all the necessary changes arising from the PalmGHG subgroup discussions and relay it to the programmer for execution.
7.	Overview of submissions from C5.6 and C7.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As of mid-February, the secretariat has received close to 180 submissions (including several submissions that were made using other methods/tools). • However, there has been some delay in processing the submissions due to Melissa's long leave of absence as well as a delay in staff replacement at the Secretariat. With the positions being filled, the Secretariat will now prioritise in clearing the backlog. The RSPO will also follow up with companies that have 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat to create shared dropbox folder for C7.8 Submissions

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<p>submitted reports using other methodologies on their plan to transition to PalmGHG and on interim submissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The issue on reporting weaknesses in C7.8 reports received by the Secretariat remains –on scenario setting and selection, methodology, maps and management plan. • The secretariat is also planning to strengthen the auditor capacity to review the submissions for content against the reporting framework provided in the GHG assessment procedure now that C7.8 is included in the NPP. The outreach on this matter will be via CB workshops throughout the year. • Secretariat will create a dropbox folder to park all the submissions for ERWG access. Previously, only volunteer reviewers will go through the reports but it was decided that this option will provide access to all that may be interested. For those without drop box access, reports can be requested from the Secretariat. An updated list will be sent around to inform members on the dropbox contents. 	
11th March 2016			
8.	Presentation by Forest Carbon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gabriel Eickhoff from Forest Carbon gave an overview on the design of a proposed Sustainable Commodity Compensation Fund. A similar presentation will also be given to the BHCVWG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat to distribute slides to the whole WG for reference
9.	Planning for the Incentives Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat gave an update on the progress of the planning for the Incentives Workshop which had been slow. Initial plans to hold it in March to tie in with ICOPE was abandoned due in part to time limitation as well as the view that ICOPE attracted mostly participants from around the region who will be able to attend the Incentives Workshop even if held at a different time. A draft agenda has been circulated but the Secretariat is still awaiting feedback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WG to provide feedback on agenda • Workshop is tentatively set for last week of April or 1st week of May subject to inputs from the BHCVWG. Secretariat to finalise and then proceed to engage a

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The secretariat recommended that an external facilitator be hired to moderate the group discussions at the workshop as this will help ensure that the discussion is kept on track. The facilitator will also assist in setting the agenda and flow of the workshop as well as provide a report at the end. • It was also recommended that the Smallholder Working Group is kept in the loop and invited to the workshop • Preferred venue is Jakarta (2nd option Kuala Lumpur). Tentative dates – last week of April or 1st week of May • The workshop will be for 2 days 	<p>facilitator (subject to availability)</p>
10.	Communication and outreach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat presented an overview of confirmed and proposed events for 2016. It was anticipated that the RSPO secretariat will conduct a series of CB workshops and member roadshows throughout 2016 to communicate new documents such as NPP, RSPO Next, Smallholder Group certification document and the new IT trading system. In conjunction with these activities, sessions on PalmGHG and the GHG assessment procedure will also be held to improve outreach. Proforest has indicated an interest to include a session on PalmGHG in their grower training module. This will also be extended to their Lead Auditor training module. Proforest is in contact with the Secretariat on the design of the training module and has indicated that they will be testing the module in their training sessions in Africa in April. Secretariat has also asked ERWG members for support in outreach events held in countries where ERWG members operate but do not have representation from the Secretariat. For instance, the Secretariat has reached out to Jose Montenegro, ERWG member in Guatemala, to assist with the outreach activities there during the Latin America Sustainable Palm Oil Conference scheduled to be held in August this year in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat to list down the training materials that will be needed and draw up a work plan to start developing new or update existing ones • Secretariat to develop a ToR for a consultant to produce a fresh compilation of BMPs for reducing emissions • Secretariat to re-look into Outreach materials, including a standardised training module and related materials on Palm GHG (i.e. FAQ for Palm GHG; Palm GHG Manual)

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<p>Guatemala. Having native speakers will be more effective than relying on translation especially on technical matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several national elections in the African region is expected to take place this year. Secretariat was advised to take note when planning outreach there. • The Secretariat also informed of RSPO's plans to build an online training platform (RSPO Sustainability College). This project will be led by RSPO's new Strategic Projects Director, Johannes Izmi Ryan. This means that training modules and content need to be developed as a next step. The WG suggested that some of the in person training sessions can be professionally recorded and the video used as part of the online training. • The WG also requested that the Secretariat improve the communication materials and ensure that there are translated versions as well, i.e. PalmGHG leaflet, manual, technical report, etc. • The WG also pointed out that a compilation of case studies should be conducted to highlight best management practices by companies in reducing GHG emissions. The secretariat informed that this was attempted in 2013 but the consultant that was engaged had problems in obtaining certain information due to concerns over confidentiality. It was generally felt that this initiative can be revived as companies may be more willing to share and showcase their experience with the implementation of PalmGHG and the new emission requirements in P&C 2013. The Secretariat will look into the possibility of putting together a new compilation of case studies. • A focus discussion and outreach with Thailand is essential, especially in the outreach of recently endorsed Group Certification 	

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
11.	4 th EU-RT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft EU-RT programmes discussed and the WG gave some feedback on the session on “Climate Smart Palm Oil” • Some concerns were raised over the term “climate smart palm oil” as it has a wider meaning which also includes climate change adaptation. If taken within the UN FAO context of "climate smart agriculture", mitigation actually takes a backstage compared to adaptation which is very much the core focus. Climate change adaptation for the oil palm industry may not be a discussion that RSPO is ready to have at this moment as we are still more focused on the mitigation aspects. • RSPO should also be careful not to frame the discussion in a way that puts all the spotlight on RSPO Next as the solution to concerns regarding peat, deforestation, fires, etc. at the expense of the P&C 2013. The improvements that RSPO P&C 2013 has made over the 2007 version in addressing GHG emissions should be highlighted with RSPO Next as the add on that pushes a company to go further. • Other points that were raised that could add value to the panel are <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Situation of RSPO within the broader “business as usual” oil palm sector 2. Jurisdictional approach – progress and commitments and how this can really be a game changer in the context of addressing climate change (fires, peat, deforestation) because of the landscape approach 3. Progress on ERWG’s work on C5.6 and C7.8 – This would ideally be presented by one of the co-chairs but it was also highlighted that it is likely that both co-chairs will not be available to do so. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat to revert to the EU-RT organising committee on the feedback from the ERWG • The Secretariat to check on other members who was not in the meeting on their possible attendance to EU-RT in case there is avenue to present updates from ERWG.
12.	RT 14 planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RT 14 will be held in Bangkok on the week of the 7th of November. As per the last RT, the WG felt that a training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat to identify possible topics (paper) in

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<p>workshop should be held for PalmGHG and the GHG Assessment Procedure. Secretariat should plan for a prep cluster session that covers examples of implementation. It was also suggested that some focus should be given to smallholders in this session.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat should look into the possibility of a plenary to allow the reporting back of the ERWG progress and next steps as the main ToR for the WG is expected to complete by end 2016. • There is also propose consideration of having a prep cluster showcasing (potentially in training mode) the approved GHG Assessment Procedure and Palm GHG V3. • Proposing of potential showcasing of some results of ‘real’ emission reduction from plantation, of the results of the use of Palm GHG in reporting, monitoring and reducing GHG emissions. • Scheme smallholders – to include within the prep cluster mentioned above on the case study of the application of 5.6 and 7.8(if there is any); including the perspective of scheme smallholders and challenges it faces applying 5.6 & 7.8. 	<p>relation to challenges; good examples and lesson learned from the past three years of piloting the Palm GHG.</p>
13.	Update on smallholder’s guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat presented the draft ToR for developing a smallholder guidance for the GHG assessment procedure with a modified timeline to September 2016 for delivery due to the delay in the finalisation of the Smallholder Group Certification documents. • The Secretariat also informed that the Board recommendation to the Secretariat to conduct an assessment on the potential resource and capacity limitations of outgrowers (51-500ha) in complying with full P&C has yet to start. • Many questions were raised about how smallholder groups were organised and what is the magnitude and frequency of expansion. From the scenarios highlighted by the Secretariat (independent smallholders would have already established their 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat to feedback the contents of this discussion to SHWG to seek their input. • Secretariat to also plan for consultation workshops with group managers after discussion with SHWG • Secretariat to consult with other schemes

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<p>farm prior to being organised into groups to apply for RSPO membership and prepare for RSPO certification)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was felt that perhaps developing a guidance is premature until more information on how it applies to smallholders can be obtained. Furthermore, the priority should be a guidance on C5.6 rather than C7.8. • The Secretariat recommended that the ToR can be put aside for now but the planned consultation workshops with group managers should go ahead in order to gather data and understand the knowledge gaps. From there, then the appropriate guidance can be developed. The SHWG should also be consulted on this. • It is also recommended that the Secretariat refer to other schemes that have a programme for smallholders. • It was also acknowledged that some of the challenges faced by smallholders on GHG emissions and carbon stock assessment would be similar for HCV and NPP requirements. Therefore some alignment of approaches is needed. For example – how is HCV assessment conducted for new plantings by an independent smallholder group? The ERWG may also need to refer to the BHCVWG on how smallholders are addressed. 	
14.	AOB – Feedback from WI on the “Peat Workshop for Oil Palm Growers” held in Bogor in December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response for the workshop exceeded expectations. Due to limited seats, the organisers could not accommodate everyone that registered. Overall the feedback from the workshop has been encouraging whereby some participants highlighted the need to have more similar workshops. It was also acknowledged that workshops for growers and auditors would be different as they have different knowledge needs. A proposal has been submitted to RSPO to look at future support for similar training and the development of training modules to cater to both the growers and auditors. 	

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
15.	AOB – RSPO Next	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first RSPO Next training will be held in April at the CB workshop. A guidance is supposed to be developed for RSPO Next and overseen by a small taskforce which has not been formed yet. The WG requested that any guidance relating to deforestation, fire, peat land and GHG should be provided to WG members for comments and review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secretariat to follow up on the guidance for RSPO Next and update the ERWG accordingly.
16.	AOB - HCS+ and HCSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the last discussion during RT involving HCSA and HCS+ together with RSPO, all sides were optimistic on moving forward on collaboration and convergence. However, since then the RSPO Secretariat has not been involved in the discussions surrounding the progress of convergence. The HCSA steering committee and working groups are having their meetings in Singapore at the end of March. Invitations have been sent to the RSPO for selected sessions. It was also highlighted that a meeting on the convergence process will be held during that time. In the interim the HCS+ study group have also met to wrap up their study outputs. Another meeting will be convened to focus on next steps on pilots, convergence as well as establishing a secretariat. How RSPO will deal with this issue remains as status quo. Submissions using either method will be accepted pending convergence. However, all additional steps in the GHG assessment procedure will need to be complied with. This will be highlighted in the C7.8 FAQ. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RSPO secretariat and affected WG members will keep a watching brief on developments from HCS+ and HCSA and update the WG accordingly.
17.	Meeting end	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat proposed that the ERWG should meet in June and again in September. It is advised not to have any big pending matters for the ERWG meeting in November (RT). Due to schedule clashes of some of the WG members and also taking 	The Secretariat will send a Doodle poll to fix the date for the next ERWG meeting

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<p>into account the month of Ramadan. It was agreed that a meeting in June is not feasible. Two time slots were proposed. 13th – 15th July and 1st – 3rd August. Subsequent meeting will be towards the end of September.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Secretariat will plan for one day of subgroup meetings followed by two days of WG meeting.	

Annex 1: Action plan for the revision of the GHG Assessment Procedure

	Tasks	Responsibility	Timeline
1	Map guidance (beyond what is available in NPP) 1:50,000 A4, A3 Border - -coordinate and scale bar	Joseph, Audrey	11 th March
2	Improve illustration of maps – examples of stratification, scenario setting	Secretariat, Joseph	15 th April
3	Guidance for off-site impacts - peat	Arina, Marcel and peat subgroup Dr. Mukesh, Dr. Shahrakbah, Faizal, Joshua Mathews - email	15 th April – proposal 15 th May – finalize by subgroup Next ERWG meeting (June) - finalize
4	Specific discussion – peat rewetting, set aside forested peat area	Arina, Marcel, Dr. Mukesh, Dr. Shahrakbah, Faizal, Joshua Mathews	TBD
5	Drainability assessments prior to replanting	Arina, Marcel, Dr. Mukesh, Dr. Shahrakbah, Faizal, Joshua Mathews	TBD
6	a) Expand the list of land cover categories including definitions and defaults (build on IPCC) b) Default value for conservation sequestration c) Improve classification of peat forest and defaults (beyond IPCC ref)	Secretariat, Audrey, Dr. Mukesh, Henry, Cecile, Joseph, Faizal, AP: Check with Olivier	15 th April
7	Guidance for peat sampling	Mukesh, Arina, Joseph	18 th March
8	structure and content of report	Secretariat	11 th March
9	Expand guidance on methodology – preparation of map, strata and estimation of stock	Secretariat, Joseph, Sian Choo, Henry	15 th April
10	Expand guidance on projection and scenario setting	Secretariat, Joseph, Sian Choo, Henry	30 th April
11	Preparing the final draft for WG comments	Secretariat and consultant, co-chairs	15 th June
12	Finalised by WG		15 th July
13	Release in English		15 th August 15 th September (other languages)