

12th ERWG

Aloft, Kuala Lumpur

18th – 19th May 2017

Name	Organisation	Member Status
Faizal Parish (Chair)	GEC	Substantive
Gan Lian Tiong (Co-chair)	PT Musim Mas	Substantive
Lim Sian Choo	Bumitama Gunajaya Agro	Substantive
Foo Siew Theng	Wilmar	Substantive
Henry King	Unilever	Substantive
Joseph Hutabarat	Rainforest Alliance	Substantive
Shylaja Devi	Sime Darby	Substantive
Olivier Tichit	SIPEF	Substantive
Julia Lo	GEC	Alternate
Arina Schrier	Wetlands International	Alternate
Jason Foong	KLK	Alternate
Lee Kuan Yee	KLK	Alternate
Henry Cai	PT Musim Mas	Alternate
Laila Wilfred (Representing Audrey Lee)	Olam	Substantive
Javin Tan	RSPO Secretariat	Secretariat
Devaladevi Sivaceyon	RSPO Secretariat	Secretariat
Absent		
Jose Roberto Montenegro	AgroCaribe	Substantive
Marcel Silvius	Wetlands International	Substantive
Azmariah Muhamed	Felda	Substantive
Phubalan Karunakaran	WWF Malaysia	Alternate
Mukesh Sharma	Asian Agri	Alternate
Cecille Bessou	CIRAD	Technical Advisor

No.	Main Discussion Point	Description	Action Items
Thursday, 18th May 2017			
1.	Review of previous meeting minutes and progress updates	<p>Secretariat started the meeting with short brief on the location and other logistics.</p> <p>The meeting agenda for both days was briefed to all WG members. For the first day of the meeting, Salahuddin Yaacob pitched in replacing Javin Tan who attended ONLY the 2nd day of meeting.</p> <p>Chair commented on the timeline to circulate meeting minutes to be within 1-2 weeks post meeting along with the relevant meeting materials.</p> <p>Arina informed the working group (WG) that Marcel will be leaving Wetlands International along with other roles in the WG. Arina had discussed with Marcel and agreed to continue any deliverables from his side.</p> <p>Secretariat went through the previous meeting minutes along with progress updates. WG commented on the missing names from list of attendance and to also have relevant documents annexed to minutes.</p> <p>Chair sought for clarification on endorsement for RSPO NEXT guidance document. Suggestion was to have updates and the latest status of the document to be posted in RSPO's website. Secretariat explained that guidance document does not require endorsement from BOG. Secretariat also took note on the recommendation to have proper procedure outlined on who has the authority to amend the document and potential setup for WG of Task Force for RSPO Next.</p> <p>For Item no.5 of the previous meeting minutes on NC issued under C7.8 for existing mills, WG requested for re-wording of the minutes to add better clarity. Salahuddin felt the need for more scenario example on this should be given when communicating to Certification Bodies (CBs).</p>	<p>Secretariat to take note.</p> <p>Arina/Marcel to formally write to RSPO Secretariat on the transition and replacement as substantive.</p> <p>Secretariat re-circulated the previous meeting with amendments. Starting the next meeting, attendance sig-up sheet will be needed.</p>

		<p>Chair wanted clarification on the delay with signing contract with Winrock for BMP module and Wetlands International for guidance for drainability assessment. This was clarified on the morning of 2nd day of meeting that delay was mainly from the negotiation between RSPO and consultants on the clauses of RSPO Standard ToR and with the new Malaysian regulation on Withholding Tax.</p> <p>Chair requested for prospective outreach and engagement training with the estimated budget. This was presented on the 2nd day of the meeting, refer minutes item 9.</p>	
2.	P&C review	<p>Secretariat presented a working document with criteria and guidance relating to GHG. WG advised and gave their recommendation for the upcoming P&C review.</p> <p>Secretariat informed WG that the P&C Task Force (TF) will be having their meeting from 23rd to 25th May 2017 where Draft 0 will be used. After the 1st TF meeting, Draft 1 will be produced for public consultation, outreach and F2F meeting with various stakeholders.</p> <p>From that, the consolidated comments will form Draft 2 to be discussed in TF 2. After TF 2, Draft 3 will be produced and open for 30 days public consultation to produce Draft 4. Draft 4 will then be brought to the BOG for endorsement.</p>	
3.	Updates from C 5.6 subgroup discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Web based PalmGHG calculator <p>Secretariat updated the WG on latest development for desktop application where 'locking' of default values and standardisation terms used within the calculator has been done. The current patch file that is still in pending will be the installer with pdf generator. Meanwhile Secretariat also sought for proposal to make palmGHG an online based application versus the current desktop based application since this will resolve the challenge faced with software compatibility issue whilst creating an integrated submission monitoring system.</p> <p>From the proposal received, the online based application can be developed with integration to Salesforce (RSPO's data repository) or Independent from Salesforce. Integration with Salesforce has high cost implication (fee chargeable per log-in by user).</p>	<p>Secretariat to explore other proposal for the development of web-based PalmGHG Calculator and continuously improved existing desktop-based calculator to cater five different languages and the Summary Report printing as pdf.</p>

	<p>The C 5.6 subgroup recommended to have online PalmGHG as this will ensure reporting are up to date and ease users with report submission. Updating and changes to PalmGHG tool can be done and still ensure the consistency in all users using the latest updated version. This will resolve most of the compatibility issue currently faced by users. That Secretariat will also own the source code for the online tool to ensure continuous delivery and maintenance. The tool will also be 'light' as user can surf the net and use it rather than to have a large size system operating from their laptop.</p> <p>There was a confusion if user will be charged and Secretariat clarified that user will not be charged for using PalmGHG.</p> <p>WG considered several development options as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Only desktop application II. Only online application III. Or both application <p>Consensus was made to move PalmGHG online with 'offline interphase' and auto-save mode. As for integration with Salesforce, Secretariat are to evaluate the costing and guaranteed service in terms of data storing, back up and security.</p> <p>Along with the online application, the desktop application will also be continuously maintained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Default values for Smallholder (SH) – Fertiliser road transport distance and fuel consumption <p>For fertiliser road transport distance, Secretariat informed the WG that data from 162 mills was taken. WG agreed to the proposed figure is 300km with the flexibility for user to use their custom value.</p> <p>For fuel consumption, referring to ISCC methodology, WG agreed to the proposed figure of 5.18L of diesel per tonne FFB per round trip.</p>	
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAQ for C 5.6 <p>Secretariat presented the draft FAQ to WG with several items brought up during the subgroup meeting for discussion. Items discussed was:</p> <p>I. Conservation for non-HCV area. The discussion was on the potential to claim sequestration for non-HCV area and the example discussed was a previous shrubland or burned grassy area, when rehabilitated into a forest should be eligible for claim for sequestration. The wording for regional definition given for 'forested' in PalmGHG was also discussed since it's specifically looking at certain types of forest.</p> <p>Chair then assigned Arina and Joseph to look into the definition and come with a propose definition on the next day of the meeting. The decision made on the next day of the meeting was generalize regional definition for forested as captured in the FAQ until more credible definition can be found.</p> <p>II. PalmGHG 12 months data period</p> <p>2 intervals for data collection was discussed which are from January to December (calendar year) or July to June. The idea of having the two timeline options is to allow for better data analysis such as by looking at major environmental phenomena during these two intervals. The proposed intervals were agreed by WG as from January to December (calendar year) or July to June.</p> <p>These two options for data collection will be added in PalmGHG manual.</p> <p>III. Claiming of emission reduction from areas supported through remediation and compensation procedure.</p> <p>Subgroup's suggested that area being managed (including ex-situ area) should be registered in PalmGHG as a way to monitor the management of this area to which Chair explained that monitoring of this area will be under annual audit report and the scope is not confined to only GHG monitoring rather more to conservation value.</p>	<p>Secretariat to upload English version of FAQ in RSPO's website by end of May and the translated version to be uploaded by August 2017.</p> <p>Secretariat to include this into existing Manual</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>From the perspective of compensation mechanism which mentions on not using this area for other benefits, decision made as the claiming is not allowed and the wording in FAQ document to be maintained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEnSOR Paper on PalmGHG <p>Secretariat reported to the WG on the status of this report in terms of removing RSPO’s logo or the statement of ‘Funded by RSPO’ can’t be undone. SEnSOR replied as the best they can do is not to promote the report.</p> <p>Chair commented that RSPO should have a standard disclaimer to all their fund receivers in future that the findings are solely from SEnSOR and does not imply that the finding is agreed by RSPO.</p> <p>Secretariat prepared a list of all the reference that was commented in this report. The subgroup reviewed these list with more importance given to the source of references labelled as ‘low confidence’. The references labelled as such were sourced from personal communication which explains lack of credibility. However, there are sources from IPCC and CDM labelled as low confidence source as well.</p> <p>Subgroup decision and as agreed by WG is to write to SEnSOR seeking for justification for labelling IPCC and CDM reference as low confidence and to write to PalmGHG’s developer team (Ian Henson and Cecille) to clarify on the sources listed as personal communication.</p> <p>Secretariat also informed the WG on the current projects (Annex 1) that RSPO is funding SEnSOR. WG requested to have a look at the finding from Project 3 before it will be published.</p> <p>WG highly recommends RSPO to consider adding a disclaimer statement as part of the upcoming report.</p>	<p>Secretariat to communicate back to SEnSOR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) to include disclaimer statement within the softcopy of the publication or release an erratum. 2) to inform that references from ‘personal communication’ is being verified for improvement on the reference used. 3) to clarify why IPCC, CDM methodology and reference for fertiliser is listed as low confidence. 4) [Project 3] which methodology is being used to assess vegetation structure and carbon stock (soil carbon or above ground carbon). <p>Secretariat to verify the source of reference used to obtain emission default for FFB to POME.</p> <p>Refer to minutes item 6 on the actions of this minutes.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome from smallholder pilot testing for ‘No-Mill’ PalmGHG Secretariat gave a brief on how the piloting was done and presented the outcome from pilot testing at Indonesia, Thailand, Latin America and Ghana. The discussed went on looking into feasibility of getting PalmGHG in multiple language and the challenges faced till date, suggestion for default for emission per tonne FFB and the ultimate objective of having smallholders reporting their emission given the significance of their emission. <p>Upon checking the Group Certification Document, WG decided that smallholders are in fact not required to use PalmGHG for certification against Group Certification as there isn’t such requirement. Hence, decision from ERWG is PalmGHG will not be applicable to smallholders under Criteria 5.6.3 of the Group Certification.</p> <p>Additionally, there were also issue found on guidelines for auditors for C 7.8 under Group Certification document that was highlighted. WG then drafted their recommendation (Annex 2) for amendments and requested Secretariat to escalate this matter to chair and co-chair of Smallholder Working Group (SHWG) for advice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PalmGHG report submission monitoring Secretariat presented on the submission for C 5.6 in comparison to the last update given in January 2017 (Annex 3) and C 7.8 submission (Annex 4). As for 2015’s submission, 57 mills identified to be audited against Indonesian National Interpretation (NI) – May 2008 and 58 mills (all from Sime Darby) were exempted from reporting to allow them to transition to PalmGHG as agreed by ERWG back in 2015. <p>As of April 2017, there are 16 more reports pending for 2015 and 47 more reports pending for 2016.</p> <p>Chair commented that the 57 mills reported to be reported against INA NI should in fact follow the generic P&C 2013 in accordance to Annex 2 of RSPO P&C 2013 which states that in the absence of NI, audits should follow the latest generic P&C available.</p>	<p>Secretariat to verify and check if there was any announcement made for this.</p> <p>The secretariat to share all reports with subgroup to carry out the analysis. Suggestion to share reports using google drive instead of dropbox. The subgroup will be led by Arina.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Secretariat explained that when P&C 2013 came in, growers were given 1 year implementation period to adopt the new P&C 2013. The CBs were given an option to carry out audits using P&C 2007 or generic P&C 2013 in which those audited against P&C 2007 are required to go for another request against P&C 2013 prior to May 2015.</p> <p>Chair also requested for submission figure received by Secretariat for the year 2017 either directly to Secretariat or through audit summary report. Secretariat also informed that PalmGHG submission to Secretariat beginning 2017 is only on a voluntary basis and compulsory reporting is via audit report.</p> <p>Secretariat presented figure for C 7.8 reporting with several items (clarified on the 2nd day of the meeting). Clarification and discussion notes as follow.</p> <p>All 11 reports are pending since the assessments were done by IPB and additionally there are issues on HCV which the growers are planning to resolve first. Secretariat informed the WG that NPP submitted will only be posted into RSPO Website with all assessments done in accordance to relevant guidance. In some NPP submission, GHG assessment completed with pending clarification on HCV assessment.</p> <p>The WG requested for future presentation on the GHG assessment and NPP status to be clearly stated the carry-forward and new assessment of the year; to use the term 'not accepted' instead of 'rejected' for NPP not accepted due to various reasons.</p> <p>C 7.8 subgroup is required to look in to analysis from submissions received. To analyse if there is any trend in emissions (minimised) with different practices or approaches through all GHG assessment submitted. Focus on: 1) POME treatment (with and without methane capture facility); 2) any new plantings on peatlands and its associated emissions from water management (drainage); and 3) emissions from plantings on different vegetation cover.</p>	
--	--	---	--

No.	Main Discussion Point	Description	Action Items
Friday, 19th May 2017			
4.	Updates from Winrock International on BMP module for emission reduction	<p>WG had a video call with Sarah Walker from Winrock</p> <p>Presented was an overview/introductory phase of works with Winrock wherein WG was expecting for an inception report as an update which was not available during the meeting.</p> <p>Winrock agreed to revert after internal checking to make the inception report available for comments from WG.</p>	Secretariat to circulate the inception report for WG review once received.
5.	Simplified GHG Assessment Procedure for New Plantings (Resolution 6f)	<p>Secretariat has circulated the draft for comments prior to the meeting and following several items raised by WG the simplified procedure was revised accordingly.</p> <p>The updated draft with additional input provided from the working group will be circulated by Secretariat for further comments.</p> <p>Additionally, WG agreed to use new term of GHG Assessment Procedure for New Development (previously known as GHG Assessment Procedure for New Plantings).</p> <p>WG suggested to check the NPP 2015 document if the term 'Development' carries a specific definition.</p>	Secretariat to circulate the update procedure with WG.
6.	Clarification on requirement under Group Certification for smallholders to use palmGHG	<p>Based on discussion, WG concluded that the are misstatements from the Group Certification documents for Criteria 7.8 may have resulted from confusion with Criteria 5.6.</p> <p>WG are in opinion that the setup of smallholders is already abridging the group certification requirement by limiting joining of new member and only allowing those with oil palm planted to join the group.</p> <p>Decision was also made for online application for PalmGHG will only be developed for Mill user.</p>	<p>Secretariat to communicate with SHWG, the decision ERWG made regarding 'No-Mill' palmGHG.</p> <p>Secretariat to escalate the recommended changes (Annex 2) from ERWG in Group Certification to both cochair of SHWG, cc cochair of ERWG and RSPO Director.</p>

7.	RSPO NEXT	<p>Secretariat updated the WG that there aren't any updates/changes on the RSPO NEXT guidance document after the last update from January 2017's ERWG meeting. Based on clarification from RSPO Secretariat's Certification Unit, only the standards (RSPO NEXT Standard and Guidance document) requires BOG's endorsement. The eligibility document (RSPO NEXT – eligibility and application framework) doesn't require BOG's endorsement.</p> <p>Some of the comments from the ERWG has been adopted in the Clarification on the RSPO NEXT eligibility document. But comments on drainability assessment was not adopted.</p> <p>RSPO Secretariat (based in USA) has done a market survey to check the demand for RSPO NEXT certification and reported back that aspect on GHG accounting is indeed a concern to companies. Companies were seeking for more clarification and the reporting requirement such as 2005 baseline which may not be feasible based on their operation.</p> <p>WG then heard from Henry Cai who raised several items in relation to supply chain emission monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of comparisons on proposed changes from working group and the changes that was incorporated in RSPO NEXT was not circulated by secretariat. Secretariat explained that this will be a challenging information extraction to be done and upon seeking for assistance none replied. Alternatively, Henry King will be giving insight for downstream ghg accounting. • GHG calculation for downstream operations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ From previous minutes, suggestion was raised for downstream calculator to be adopted from GHG Protocol. Concern raised on how do we address the difference between the two methodologies since PalmGHG is product based life cycle assessment while GHG Protocol is actor based carbon foot printing tool. ○ Guidance relating to reporting of organization GHG calculation result in RSPO NEXT 	Working group suggested to make recommendation to remove 2005 as baseline from the eligibility document.
----	-----------	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If an organization has a number of management units and different unit has different benchmark year due to the different start of operations. How do we aggregate the GHG trend? How do we aggregate the GHG target? <p>Given the gaps and thus clear need for guidance, WG has decided to provide inputs for the guidance document in which after all will be developed by Secretariat without the need for BOG endorsement.</p> <p>Henry King presented remotely on product and organisational reporting and shared Unilever’s experience thus far in reporting downstream GHG emission.</p> <p>Presentation begun with a general introduction. GHG Protocol uses scope by approach – Scope 1, 2 and 3 depending on where the organisation belongs in the value chain. Life cycle assessment considers input, output and emission value.</p> <p>Also shared was about Quantis - a life cycle analysis consultant. They were approached by some members asking to try and test out methodology to account for deforestation and land use change. The initiative was not well explained on whether will it be a guidance, methodology or best practice and this should be done during the draft launch for pilot testing in July 2017.</p> <p>The pilot testing has 14 recommendations, such as linear allocation for 20 or 35 years of amortisation and inclusion of indirect land use change(iLUC) emission.</p> <p>WG discussed on methodology to calculate both upstream and downstream emission given PalmGHG can’t be used for downstream monitoring. Options to use absolute figure from PalmGHG and adding it up to downstream monitoring done using GHG Protocol was discussed but was not fully applicable given the discrepancies in both methodology.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>It was also pointed to have a pragmatic approach and ensure the consistency on reporting rather than a new approach with frequent changes.</p> <p>Referring to Annex 4, Chair mentioned that public reporting on own website and RSPO's website would require a monitoring system in place. Touching on year 2005 to be the baseline for GHG emission, it was pointed that emission reduction should in fact work based on a future target rather than back calculating/retrospective calculation approach.</p> <p>With the confusion in the document, WG would like to make recommendation and preferably to bring this issue to the attention of BOG. Proposed was to add more clarity in terms of emission reduction to be from 'year-to-year' or against future target in contrast to backtracking the emission from the past.</p> <p>In terms of 'measuring GHG as a total company basis' Chair expressed that monitoring for Scope 1 and 2 seem more practical than Scope 3.</p> <p>Carbon Disclosure Project was suggested as potential guidance to add more clarity on downstream emission monitoring.</p> <p>WG also discussed issues relating to public reporting on RSPO's website in terms of the potential confidentiality issue with the companies, how RSPO is planning to publish the reports in their website – via link or the report itself. It was confirmed that it's a usual practice for companies to make the reports public hence this will not lead to any confidentiality issue.</p>	<p>Henry King to suggest the WG on other available guidance and standards on this.</p>
8.	Updates from HCS convergence process (HCS Toolkit Version 2)	Secretariat has circulated Version 2 of the HCS toolkit (8 th of May 2017) which was launched with minimal changes compared to the previous version.	Secretariat to remove reference to HCS+ study from the GHG Assessment Procedure.

		<p>Additionalities were chapter on carbon, Young Regeneration Forest (YRF) with carbon stock ranging between 35-75tC. Development on YRF can be conducted given patch analysis is carried out. Further to this also discussed was on the 'swapping' method – a 'give and take' way to identify a HCS area low carbon stock are for potential development.</p> <p>The concern from Secretariat was starting 1st July 2017 only an integrated HCS-HCV assessment will be allowed, HCS assessment by itself will not be allowed. The manual for integrated HCS-HCV assessment will be developed, the toolkit for this is not available for now.</p> <p>With the HCS-HCV integrated assessment, grower's burden to conduct two assessments in the future is reduced. However, this would then mean RSPO and ERWG need to re-look into the current GHG Assessment procedure. On top of this under RSPO NEXT the 'No-deforestation' requirement would then need the WG to consider possible adoption of HCS convergence.</p> <p>If the HCS-HCV integrated assessment is confirmed to be adopted, the field assessment can be done together but the management plans will still be different.</p> <p>Growers who used HCS Approach methodology can still use RSPO GHG Assessment Procedure.</p> <p>Concern raised as doing HCSA and HCV together will be complicated and should not be taken up as part of RSPO's procedure for that fact. Interference with FPIC matters will also make the matters a hurdle during the HCV assessment stage.</p> <p>Several items that are still on hold from the HCS Steering Group are definition of high forest cover landscape, how the smallholders will use HCS assessment and how will FPIC be integrated in the combined assessment with any potential incentive for better protection of the conservation area.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Secretariat discussed with the WG on the option for RSPO to be an official member in the steering group hence be able to comment and provide inputs. WG advised that there are currently 4 members from ERWG involved with the HCS Steering Group hence they could then be the channel to escalate comments to the steering group with RSPO Secretariat remaining as observer.</p>	
9.	RSPO Outreach and Training (Annex 5)	<p>Secretariat presented a timeframe for the prospective outreach and trainings. During EU-RT there will not be any items on GHG, there will be a topic on No Deforestation policy.</p> <p>WG raised a concern that RSPO own participation was lacking in the EU-RT and suggested to prepare a note of concern.</p> <p>The WG to discuss the need for GHG related outreach during up-coming RT15 in Bali, Indonesia.</p>	<p>Working group to prepare a note of concern addressing that lack of RSPO's voice by giving the forum to independent organisation during EU-RT.</p>

Annex 1: Current SEnSOR Projects funded by RSPO

SEnSOR year 2 (2016-17) programme summary

The goals of the SEnSOR programme in year two are to utilise the evidence base we established in year 1 to develop and execute three substantial research projects to test the impact of RSPO. These projects will collect new field data and conduct new analysis to test the impact of RSPO in the areas of biodiversity, carbon storage and smallholder livelihoods.

SEnSOR management and governance:

The programme will continue to be directed by a steering committee comprising Dr Glen Reynolds (SEARRP, Programme Director) Prof Jane Hill (University of York, UK Research Director), Dr Peter van der Meer (Van Haal Larenstein University, Netherlands Research Director) and Dr Jennifer Lucey (University of Oxford, programme manager). Jennifer will act as programme manager, and will be responsible for the day to day running of the programme. She will also lead on knowledge exchange and dissemination of the outputs of the programme. A key activity for 2017 is to relaunch the website to improve usability and in particular, access to resources and outputs from the project which will go live in May 2017. SEnSOR will also plan dissemination activities at the RT in November.

Project 1: Testing the impact of HCVs on retaining suitable habitat and connectivity for biodiversity in RSPO plantations (HCV Modelling Project)

Objectives: The project will (1) map HCV areas to quantify size and location of HCV areas within RSPO plantations. We will use this information to (2) assess the quality of forested areas within RSPO plantations, (3) examine the connectivity of these HCV areas 4) determine the impact of HCVs on biodiversity in the landscape. This research will be supported by a local researcher collecting new biodiversity data for a sub-set of HCV areas identified during the project (see project 3). The project focuses on Borneo where there is a range of NPP and older sites available for comparison.

Activities: The project will involve collating and digitising maps of HCVs and forest quality in RSPO plantations, developing and running computer models to simulate dispersal of species across the landscape, and new statistical analysis to test the ability of HCVs to enhance connectivity for biodiversity.

Personnel:

- Principal Investigator: Prof Jane Hill, University of York
- Lead researcher: Dr Sarah Scriven, University of York.
- Co- investigator: Dr Kimberly Carlson, University of Hawaii
- Collaborators:
 - Dr Jennifer Lucey, University of Oxford
 - Dr Jenny Hodgson, University of Sheffield
 - Dr Robert Heilmayr, University of California
 - Dr Colin McClean, University of York

Deliverables: A full technical report will be released in **August 2017**. This will be followed by a science-for-policy paper which will present the key policy relevant information in lay form to be delivered in **September 2017**.

Project 2: Testing impact of RSPO certification on smallholders' land management and livelihoods (Smallholders Project)

Objectives: 1) to investigate current livelihood status and land use and management of smallholders in the vicinity of HCV areas and forests, (2) to assess why and when different groups of smallholders expand or intensify production, and to use this information in a role playing game to (3) simulate the impact of RSPO on smallholder oil palm expansion. This will allow for measuring and further modelling impact of RSPO certification on smallholders' livelihoods, land use and management in year 3 and 4. It will also lead to advice to RSPO and certification implementing partners on key entry points to spur intensification of smallholder production rather than expansion into forests and HCV areas.

Activities: The project will involve the development of a survey protocol and role- playing game to assess the decision-making process for smallholder expansion at sites in Malaysia and Indonesia. The project will include a substantial fieldwork component to collect new social data, followed by analysis of the findings.

Personnel:

- Principal Investigator: Dr Maja Slingerland, University of Wageningen
- Lead researcher: Petra Reitberg, University of Wageningen
- Collaborators:
 - Annemarie van Paassen, Wageningen University
 - Lotte Woittiez, Wageningen University
 - Hans Smit, SHARRP/ Proforest
 - Reza Azmi, Wild Asia
 - Marieke Leegwater, Solidaridad

Deliverables: A full technical report will be released in **December 2017**, followed by a science for policy paper which will present the key policy relevant information in lay form to be delivered in **January 2018**. In years 3 and 4 this project will re-survey to investigate improvements over time as a result of RSPO certification.

Project 3: Testing the impact of RSPO HCV areas in retaining biodiversity and carbon in the oil palm landscape (HCV fieldwork project)

Objectives: The project will determine the impact of RSPO on avoiding biodiversity losses and retaining carbon stocks in oil palm plantations pre- and post-implementation of the New Plantings Procedure by 1) assessing the levels of biodiversity retained in HCV areas within RSPO plantations 2) assessing the vegetation structure and carbon stocks of HCVs in RSPO plantations.

Activities: The project will establish field survey sites in HCVs across a range of RSPO estate plantations in Indonesia and will collect new field data on carbon, vegetation structure (a proxy for forest quality) and biodiversity in HCVs 1-4. These data will be added to existing data sets for HCVs in Sabah. These data will be used to analyse the impact of RSPO in retaining biodiversity in the oil palm landscape.

Personnel:

- Principal Investigator: Dr Peter Van Der Meer, Van Hall Larenstein University
- Lead Researcher: Aritta Suwarno, Wageningen University/ Van Haal Larenstein University
- Collaborators:
 - Dr Jennifer Lucey, University of Oxford
 - Dr Jane Hill, University of York
 - Dr Keith Hamer, Leeds University
 - Dr Glen Reynolds, SEARRP

Deliverables: A report of the preliminary results will be delivered in **December 2017**. This research will continue into year 3 with sampling of further components of biodiversity, plus soil and water studies and potential expansion of the number of field sites.

Annex 2: Proposed amendments from ERWG to SHWG in relation to C 7.8 of Group Certification document.

P&C Indicator	Requirement for Individual Member with up to 50ha	Requirement for Group Manager	Guidance for Group Managers	Guidance for Auditors
Criterion 7.8 New plantation developments are designed to minimise net greenhouse gas emissions.				
Note on smallholder context: The RSPO Emissions Reduction Working Group (ERWG) and the RSPO SHWG agree that there should be a simplified mechanism for smallholders for compliance on the GHG matters and that smallholders should not be overburdened due to their limited capacity. Further details will be developed.				
<p>7.8.1 (M) The carbon stock of the proposed development area and major potential sources of emissions that may result directly from the development shall be identified and estimated.</p> <p>7.8.2 There shall be a plan to minimise net GHG emissions which takes into account avoidance of land areas with high carbon stocks and/or sequestration options</p>	<p>Individual members shall be able to explain how you know where not to plant.</p>	<p><u>Maps:</u> The use of maps shall be expected which highlight the avoidance of peat areas and primary forests and where possible mineral soils have been selected for planting.</p> <p><u>Reporting:</u> Demonstrate to a third party that new plantings which occurred after April 2013 have where possible been designed to minimise GHG emissions.</p> <p>Groups will need to report confidentially to the RSPO on actions taken to mitigate GHG emissions. to minimise net GHG emission from new plantation development</p> <p>After 31. December 2016 these documents will need to be publically available and linked to 1.2</p> <p><u>Training:</u> The Group Manager shall provide training in relation to this indicator and its relevance for individual members (e.g. peat, high carbon stocks) and record this training.</p>	<p>The Group Manager should carry out the GHG assessment. according to the relevant procedure (more than 500ha full ghg assessment procedure, less than 500ha use simplified ghg assessment procedure).</p> <p>map requirement is given within the procedure.</p> <p>Link to 1.2 and 7.1.</p> <p>A high carbon stock assessment can be linked to HCV assessments (7.3) Group Manager.</p> <p>For small groups the maps can be hand drawn – use descriptions to differentiate areas e.g. Land use types.</p> <p>For larger Groups the use of GPS to construct adequate maps should be expected.</p> <p>If the Group Manager is a mill, then mitigation strategies to reduce GHG emissions should be documented.</p>	<p>See 7.1</p> <p>Assessing Group Manager Check if the documentation and maps are adequate for the scale of operations.</p> <p>Have all significant aspects which could affect GHG emission been identified?</p> <p>Check the document is updated when new members are added to the Group. Check the GHG reporting to RSPO and whether it is publically available (after 31. December 2016).</p> <p>Check that training to individual members has been provided.</p> <p>Assessing Individual Members Check a selection of members to see whether they have had training and understand the relevance for their operations.</p>

Updates on palmGHG report submission tracking

- Cut-off date to track late submission: April 30th, 2017

Submission figures reported in January 2017

	2015	2016
Certified Mill	301	331
Total Submissions	142 (47%)	234 (71%)
Compliance Submission	129 (43%)	215 (65%)
Non-compliance Submission	13	19
PalmGHG Submission	128 (90%)	230 (98%)
With LUC	74 (58%)	167 (73%)
With Peat	46 (36%)	80 (35%)

Submission figures as of April 2017

	2015	2016
Certified Mill	301	331
(Excluding 2 exemptions)	186	
Total Submissions	170 (91%)	284 (86%)
Compliance submission	164 (88%)	271 (82%)
Non-compliance submission	6	13
PalmGHG submission	155 (83%)	273 (82%)
Audited against INA NI	57	
Sime Darby exemption from 2015 reporting	58	

C7.8 Submissions

- ❖ Submission cut-off date: Dec 31, 2016
- ❖ Base on 2016 submissions,
 - Without MC: ~13.46tCO₂e/ha with STDEV of 3.27tCo₂e/ha (18 samples)
 - With MC: ~1.23tCO₂e/ha with STDEV of 15.19tCo₂e/ha (only 3 samples)

	Dec-15	Dec-16	Apr-17	
Total Submissions	15	45	13	* new: 2
Indonesia	14	36	10	*rejected: 8
Malaysia	1	2	0	
Latin America	0	3	1	
Africa	0	4	2	
Pending Clarification	5	11	12	
Presence of Peat	0	6	6	
Development on Peat	0	*1	*1	
Use of HCSA/HCS+	1	8	1	
Internal Assessment	9	11	0	
External Assessment	6	34	13	
With Methane Capture	0	4	1	
Without Methane Capture	15	41	12	

Annex 4: Shown below, item discussed from the Clarification on the eligibility and application framework of RSPO NEXT documents

Clarifications on the Eligibility and Application Framework RSPO NEXT

Minimum Threshold for P&C members

- If, for any reason, the number of P&C certified units falls below the 60 % threshold, the certification of RSPO NEXT will be suspended until such a time that the 60 % minimum has been restored (with the exception of new acquisitions as noted in the core eligibility document).
- No sales of RSPO NEXT credits will be allowed when a suspension is in place, regardless of the date the credits were issued.

Minimum Threshold for Supply Chain members

- The 100% cover of oil palm products by physical material and/or RSPO credits (until 31st December 2016, GreenPalm certificates) will be verified by the ACOP submissions or by the CB for certified units.
- The progress against the time bound plan to move to 100% physical and/or RSPO Smallholder certificates will be verified through either the ACOP submissions for members not requiring certification or via the CB for members eligible for certification.

- Measuring the GHG emissions will be required on a total company basis for activities which are under direct control of the company.
- The reduction of GHG emissions will be measured as an absolute reduction against the baseline year of 2005 or later if appropriate.
 - 2005 shall be used as the baseline year if the company was in operation at the time.
 - A later date is only acceptable if it is the first year of operations of the company.
- The public reporting shall be on the own website, the RSPO website and submitted in the ACOP, when this is mandatory.

Minimum initial participation for P&C members

- If, for any reason, the number of RSPO NEXT certified units falls below the 30 % threshold, the certification of RSPO NEXT will be suspended until such a time that the 30 % minimum has been restored.
- No sales of RSPO NEXT credits will be permitted when a suspension is in place; regardless of the date the credits were issued.

Outreach & Engagement/ Training

	2017							2018					
	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J
EURT	■												
PLWG	■												
RSPO O&E Event (Asia)			■										
RT15						■							
P&C TF meeting	■					■				■			
P&C Public consultation			■	■	■			■	■				
P&C Piloting & Recommendation											■	■	
BoG Endorsement												■	■
GHG Training (C5.6 & C7.8)			■			■				■			