

Date: 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> November 2014

Venue: Aloft Sentral, Kuala Lumpur

Dr Gan, Faizal (Co-chair)

Name	Organisation	Status
(Present on 14 <sup>th</sup> and 15 <sup>th</sup> Nov)		
Gan Lian Tiong (co-chair)	Musim Mas	Substantive
Faizal Parish (co-chair)	GEC	Substantive
Lim Sian Choo	Bumitama Gunajaya Agro	Alternate
Foo Siew Theng	Wilmar	Substantive
Arina Schrier	Wetlands International	Alternate
Lee Kuan Yee	KLK	Observer
Jason Foong	KLK	Alternate
Henry King	Unilever	Substantive
Sophie Persey	REA	Substantive
Jose Montenegro	Agrocaribe	Secretariat
Bremen Yong	Bumitama Gunajaya Agro	
Audrey Lee	Olam	
Olivier Desmet	Olam	Alternate
Melissa Chin	RSPO Secretariat	Secretariat
Inke van der Sluijs	RSPO Secretariat	
Joshua Matthews	Bumitama Gunajaya Agro	
(Present on 14 <sup>th</sup> Nov)		
Eileen Chiang	Secretariat	
(Present on 15 <sup>th</sup> Nov)		
Julia Lo	GEC	
Absent with apologies:		
Derk Byvanck		
Marcel Silvius		
Shahrakbah Yacob		
Norazam bin Abdul Hameed		

(File 22 and File 23)

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
1.	Updates to the WG line up	<p>Changes in ROW grower representation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Audrey Lee joined the ERWG representing Olam and replacing Alexandra Booth</li> <li>• Jose Montenegro from AgroCaribe replaced Felipe Guerrero from Daabon</li> <li>• Due to staff turnover and constraints, WWF Indonesia has declined to continue participation in the ERWG</li> </ul>	Secretariat to check with WWF if they are still interested to retain the ENGO seat in the ERWG. Otherwise, an invitation will be sent out to all ENGO members to nominate a new representative
2.	Review of last meeting's minutes	<p>Matters arising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Acceptance of CoC which was handed out and signed. It was suggested as good practice to remind members at the start of the meeting to abide by the conditions of the CoC.</li> <li>- Reconfirmation of additional subgroup members – Henry Cai (Musim Mas) and Dr. Joshua Mathews (Bumitama)</li> <li>- Decision on implementation date of C7.8 to be 1<sup>st</sup> Jan 2015 uploaded on RSPO website</li> <li>- Africa outreach programme originally planned for September 2014 was postponed and decision on the future date is still pending.</li> <li>- RSPO reached out to potential carbon assessors</li> </ul>	Secretariat to check on email blast to all growers to ensure that the implementation date is clear.
3.	Budget review	Spending more or less on track except for the fund that was set aside for the carbon assessment tool. It was earlier anticipated that the money could be used for pilot projects in collaboration with companies. However this did not materialise. Nevertheless, the funds can be used for peer review of reports, training and outreach activities.	
4.	Presentation of case studies on the usage of PalmGHG for C7.8	A comparison study done on one of a company's estates using IPCC, ISCC and PalmGHG V2 was presented to the working group. A	Subgroup 7.8 to review the SNI7724/2011

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<p>summary of the same case study was going to be presented at the GHG prep cluster at RT12.</p> <p>It was proposed during the discussion that the working group will need to review the SNI7724/2011 which is a document on GHG assessment methodology published by the Indonesian government. The document has been referred to in the Indonesian NI.</p>	
5.	<p>Subgroup discussions</p> <p>-</p>	<p>PalmGHG subgroup (Sophie, Cecile, Henry K, Siew Theng, Kuan Yee, Bremen and <i>Melissa</i>)</p> <p>Matters arising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- User requirements and any revisions in default values or equations need to be reviewed and finalised for V3 by Q1 of 2015.</li> <li>- Composting considerations – leave as status quo due to lack of information on the reduction of GHG resulting from composting. Companies can have the option of submitting calculations from composting outside of PalmGHG.</li> <li>- Crop sequestration – use of static vs dynamic growth models. It was agreed that for the purpose of C7.8, it was better to use static growth for crop sequestration. This will be reflected in the simplified spreadsheet for C7.8. However decision on PalmGHG for 5.6 will be deferred to next meeting. It was also recognised, that there are pros and cons to either option. Status quo to PalmGHG V2 for C5.6 in this regard.</li> <li>- 2 versions of PalmGHG – simplified excel spreadsheet for C7.8 and the PalmGHG V2 for C5.6</li> <li>- Crop cycle length to be standardised at 25 years</li> </ul> <p>Peat subgroup (Arina, Faizal, Joshua Mathews, Jason and <i>Inke</i>)</p>	

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<p>Matters arising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Refinement of text related to peat emissions in the GHG assessment procedure</li> <li>- Mineral soil carbon – discussion on whether or not to include mineral soil carbon as well as carbon from other organic soil (non-peat). Deferred for now however the WG recognised that the HCS study will be including carbon from non-peat soils in their scope of work and will refer to their findings when they become available. Based on a paper by Joshua Mathews there is actually an increase in the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation palm oil plantation compared to the 1<sup>st</sup> generation.</li> <li>- Emissions from peat over time – should there be a cut-off date for when emissions from peat will no longer be considered because all the peat has been lost? It was proposed that there should be a stepwise reduction for peat oxidation (at the moment, peat emission is constant in PalmGHG)</li> </ul> <p>C7.8 (Sian Choo, Dr Gan, Audrey, Olivier, Jose , Julia and Eileen)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Checking and refinement of text and annexes</li> </ul>	
6.	Emissions from peat	<p>It was discussed whether the emissions from peat should be regarded as constant regardless of when the plantation was established. It was argued that the emissions from peat oxidation should eventually decrease over time. However the rate of decrease is difficult to estimate as there will be several influencing factors.</p> <p>The paper prepared by Dr. Carlson did suggest that the emissions from peat oxidation would be highest during land preparation and in the early years of cultivation. The paper suggested a multiplying factor for the first few years of planting but acknowledged that the</p>	Discussion on the emissions from peat over time in old plantations is not closed but should be continued by the peat subgroup.

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<p>value is still highly uncertain and more studies would be needed. The decision from the last meeting was to defer any decision to adopt recommendations in the paper until it was peer reviewed for journal publication. At the time of the meeting, this was still pending.</p> <p>There were some discussions on establishing an equation in PalmGHG to account for a decrease in the peat emissions over time due to peat loss.</p> <p>At the moment, the PalmGHG uses only one equation, assuming that the carbon content in the peat and the peat layer itself will remain constant over time. However further discussions and decisions on this matter was deferred as it was felt that such a significant change should be introduced at this stage without further data and research, especially when there is still high uncertainty.</p> <p>Comments were also raised that the WG needs to be clear on the level of simplicity or complication that they want to see in PalmGHG bearing in mind the purpose and usability of the calculator.</p> <p>Question was raised on whether or not carbon assessments need to be conducted on peat areas where companies have already decided to set aside as conservation areas. Option of using default values to estimate the carbon in peat was proposed and included in the revised GHG Assessment Procedure for New Plantings.</p>	
7.	Finalisation of RSPO carbon assessment tool	Name changed to RSPO GHG Assessment Procedure for New Plantings. Edits were made as a group to the document in preparation for online upload after RT12.	Cecile to prepare simplified spreadsheet

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<p>It was discussed and agreed that a simplified PalmGHG excel spreadsheet is developed using a static model for crop sequestration for the purpose of C7.8. It was recognised that PalmGHG V2.1.1 is more suited for existing plantations and would be not be appropriate for new plantings where a mill has not yet been built.</p> <p>There will be a 3 month transition period for the usage of the GHG Assessment Procedure for New Plantings (December 2014), i.e. all submissions from 1st April 2015 must refer to this December version. Submissions from 1st January till 31st March 2015 may refer to either the older June 2014 version or the newly released December 2014 version.</p> <p>The WG also requested that a note should be made to members to provide their feedback on their usage of this procedure during the implementation period to the ERWG. Written feedback can be submitted together with the submission on C7.8 to the RSPO Secretariat at the same time of NPP submission.</p>	<p>KLK to help refine as finalise maps for use as illustration</p> <p>Charts, figures and tables used as illustrations need to be corrected and refined</p> <p>Secretariat to clean up the document and circulate to group for final comments. The materials should be available for download after RT12 but before year end.</p> <p>Secretariat to send out email blast once documents are available online</p>
8.	Presentation by Consultant on the progress of the consultancy on carbon sequestration in conservation areas	<p>Presentation and discussion was interrupted many times due to poor internet connection.</p> <p>General comments resulting from the discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More guidance (default factors) should be provided on how to account for the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Natural regeneration – dependent on starting point, region and climate</li> <li>- Enhanced regeneration</li> <li>- Peat rewetting and rehabilitation</li> <li>- Clearing</li> <li>- Encroachment</li> <li>- Fire</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	Secretariat to forward comments from WG to Consultant and to arrange a physical presentation in the next meeting

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<p>Is there enough material from VCS standards and REDD+ on the above?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Not to focus on avoided deforestation. The concern is with potential double-counting. Growers already count the avoided deforestation at the beginning in their management plan by accounting for the emissions from the area that they do clear. This will be a lot higher if they also considered the areas that they have chosen to set aside.</li> <li>3. The issue of legality. While from the REDD+ it is understood on the point of additionality. However, on the ground with plantations even legal areas fall prey to encroachment without constant active management.</li> </ol>	
9.	RT 12 panel discussion	<p>Some background and updates were given on the work of the HCS study group under the Sustainable Palm Oil Manifesto and the HCS Approach Steering group as well as the objectives of the panel discussion.</p> <p>It was generally agreed that the ERWG will keep open channels of communications with the HCS approach group as well as the HCS study group. Faizal as a representative of RSPO and the ERWG at the panel will give an overview of the work, progress and direction of the ERWG.</p> <p>It will also be communicated that the ERWG will review and include findings and outputs of both groups should they be relevant to RSPO and the work of the ERWG.</p>	
10.	RT 12 GHG workshop for growers and auditors (17 <sup>th</sup> Nov)	<p>The purpose of this workshop is to brief the auditors and growers what is expected of them during this period.</p> <p>As it is only a one day workshop, an overview will be given on PalmGHG and the newly finalised GHG assessment procedure</p>	

No.	Description	Main discussion points	Action items
		<p>document. Secretariat will also brief on the audit requirements for C5.6 and C7.8 as discussed and determined by the ERWG.</p> <p>Aside from the Secretariat, the workshop will also be attended by Henry, Cecile, Marcel, Arina and Jason to provide support in the discussion and presentation.</p>	
11.	Next meeting	Decided to be either last week of February or 1 <sup>st</sup> week of March.	Secretariat to send out a Doodle poll