

Minutes of the Meeting

Subject : 2nd Greenhouse Gas Task Force (GHGTF) Meeting
 Date : 20th January 2025, Monday with the respective time at 3:09-5:10pm (MYT)
 Venue : Zoom meeting (Virtual)

Name	Organisation	Status
William Siow	IOI	Substantive
Foo Siew Theng	Wilmar International	Substantive
Hadi Susanto	Musim Mas	Substantive
Derrick Jovannus	Musim Mas	Alternate
Henry Cai	Permata Hijau Group	Substantive
Elaine Chan	SD Guthrie	Substantive
Lynette Tan	BASF SE	Substantive
Rifki Noor	Golden Agri Resources (GAR)	Substantive
Yen Hun Sung	RSPO Secretariat	Secretariat
Ashton Lim Suelee	RSPO Secretariat	Secretariat
Wong Yi Jin	RSPO Secretariat	Secretariat
Lydia Tan	RSPO Secretariat	Secretariat
Absent with apologies:		
<i>Aloysius Suratin</i>	<i>RSPO Secretariat</i>	<i>Secretariat</i>
<i>Akmal Arif Razali</i>	<i>RSPO Secretariat</i>	<i>Secretariat</i>
<i>Gregor Pasda</i>	<i>BASF SE</i>	<i>Alternate</i>
<i>Goetz Martin</i>	<i>Golden Agri Resources (GAR)</i>	<i>Alternate</i>
<i>Lai Wei Shoon</i>	<i>IOI</i>	<i>Substantive</i>
<i>Low Sim Loo</i>	<i>IOI</i>	<i>Alternate</i>
<i>Muhamad Zaim Azfar Nordin</i>	<i>World Wildlife Fund (WWF)</i>	<i>Substantive</i>
<i>Ahmad Furqon</i>	<i>World Wildlife Fund (WWF)</i>	<i>Alternate</i>
<i>Azizul bin Rahman</i>	<i>Wilmar International</i>	<i>Alternate</i>

The objective of the meeting was to present an overview of the high-level feedback analysis from the PalmGHG V5 Pilot Testing, which concluded on 15th January 2024. It also aimed to discuss feedback provided by the GHGTF on the external and internal PalmGHG V5 guidance documents. Additionally, the Secretariat shared updates on the

prisma modules linked to the PalmGHG V5 calculator and the revised timeline for its integration into prisma. Lastly, the Secretariat proposed an extension of the Terms of Reference (ToR) to include the RSPO GHG Assessment Procedure for New Development and the Simplified GHG Assessment Procedure for New Development, in line with the adoption of the RSPO Principles & Criteria in November 2024. This meeting minute should be read in conjunction with the “RSPO GHGTF 1st Meeting_v1_8Jan 2025_post” deck, which is for GHGTF use only.

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
January 20th, 2024, Wednesday				
1.0	Opening Remarks Refer to the deck from slides 1-3.	The Secretariat and the Chair welcomed the GHGTF members into the meeting, the Secretariat announced two new GHGTF members representing the Environmental Non-Government Organisation (eNGO) from WWF have joined, but were unable to attend. The Secretariat reminded there are 5 Code of Conducts (CoCs) that have yet to be signed by the GHGTF members which were due before this meeting.	The 5 GHGTF members to sign the CoCs.	Pending 2 to sign as of 27 Jan 2025.
2.0	Overview of the agenda, review, and approval of the previous meeting's minutes (MOM), and action progress Refer to the deck from slides 4-8.	The Secretariat outlined the agenda for the meeting and informed the members on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● RSPO Antitrust Statement ● RSPO Consensus-based Decision-Making Clause ● RSPO Declaration of Conflict of Interest <p>The meeting minutes from the 1st GHGTF meeting ("1st MoM") were reviewed for adoption. The Secretariat highlighted all of the action points pertaining to the PalmGHG V5 Pilot Testing and the deadline to receive the feedback was closed on Wednesday, 15th January 2025.</p>	The review of the 1st MoM was proposed by Wilmar International and seconded by SD Guthrie.	
3.0	Update on PalmGHG V5 Pilot Testing Refer to the deck from slides 9-16.	<u>Topic 1. Screening & Responses</u> The Secretariat presented the overview of the PalmGHG V5 Pilot Testing participants whereby a total of PalmGHG V5 Pilot Testing materials sent out was 69 participants (51 companies) but the total percentage of feedback received was 29%. From the previous update to the GHGTF meeting, there have been 2 participants who are added in due their interest, there was no objection from the GHGTF members. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● From the last meeting outcome, the extended invitation to Dr. Jannick Schmidt, WWF and WRI was given, and Dr. Jannick Schmidt has provided feedback. Moreover, with a new GHGTF member representing eNGO from WWF, the member mentioned they will be participating in the PalmGHG V5 Pilot Test. 	<u>Topic 1.</u> The Secretariat to proceed to invite the 2 additional participants in the PalmGHG V5 Pilot testing. Secretariat to reach out to Socfin, Olam and SIPEF to extend the PalmGHG V5	Done. Ongoing.

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
January 20 th , 2024, Wednesday				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Secretariat provided an overview of the sector and geographic representation of the responses given from the PalmGHG V5 participants. The response rate followed a descending order: Growers had the highest response, followed by Processors & Traders, and then Consulting and Certification Bodies. Additionally, there was a stronger representation from Southeast Asia. ● The Secretariat presented a concern on the low feedback rate and the lack of geographic representation for Africa and suggested if the deadline can be extended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GHGTF members asked the importance of Africa representation as some members or participants who have operations in both Malaysia and Africa would have included comments for Africa. The Secretariat responded the landscape in Africa may be different, and this also allows it to comply with ISEAL Code of Good Practice for Setting Social and Environmental Standards. ○ The GHGTF members discussed and agreed to extend the deadline for only targeted responses as all the members had the chance to volunteer and the initial deadline had already been extended before. ○ The Secretariat suggested targeting Socfin, Olam and SIPEF for Africa geographic representation and no objections were raised from the GHGTF members. <p><u>Topic 2. Feedback Analysis</u> <u>General</u> The Secretariat presented the overview of the feedback given from the general questions in the PalmGHG V5 feedback form with the Secretariat’s initial analysis to address the feedback in the current phase or next phase. The essence of the questions from left to right is to inquire about the scope, gaps in being user-friendly and if the PalmGHG V5 calculator addressed the needs and priorities from the organisation’s reporting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Secretariat and GHGTF agreed and discussed the need to have training to ensure the PalmGHG V5 would bridge the gaps in being user friendly. ● There was feedback given to standardised the default values with a single Life Cycle Inventory database and to account for variations from different regions. 	<p>invitation with an extended deadline.</p> <p><u>Topic 2. General</u> The Secretariat to organise a physical meeting in February 2025 to review the calculator based on the feedback received.</p> <p>The Secretariat to host training sessions using the PalmGHG calculator for Growers, Processors & Traders and Certified Bodies in the pipeline.</p> <p><u>Mill</u> The Secretariat to find methane % in incomplete flaring for biogas.</p> <p>The Secretariat to reach out to the participant to ask for their supplementary</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p>

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
January 20 th , 2024, Wednesday				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The GHGTF members agreed to address the feedback in the next meeting and agreed to meet up physically. <p>Mill The Secretariat presented the PalmGHG V5 Feedback analysis on calculator (Mill) which received a total of 64 comments. The majority of the feedback given is due to the data linking between tabs in the excel, thus are not major issues for <i>prisma</i>. The Secretariat pointed out in descending order the feedback categorised as majority issue received are POME, Mill Fuel, Biomass Export and Mill summary.</p> <p>The Chair inquired about the high volume of feedback received regarding POME, the Secretariat replied, summarising the feedback raised to POME.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Secretariat replied the key feedbacks centered on issues with Data Input and Default value, specifically the need for new data input and user-defined default values in POME, however due to time constraint the Secretariat proposed to discuss further in a physical meeting in February. ● The GHGTF Chair agreed and suggested the GHGTF members look into the information and request coming in, i.e. the Belt Press paper published by ISCC, before the next meeting. ● The GHGTF Chair sought clarification on the default value for methane content in incomplete flaring as referenced in the PalmGHG V5 calculator, the Secretariat responded this is specifically for the methane content in a biogas and asked if a standard value exists. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GHGTF Chair and GHGTF members discussed this is dependent on the biogas plant efficiency and the model. ● The Secretariat also brought up there was a feedback given to ask for a user-defined Methane Correction Factor (MCF) and methane lost to atmosphere, a GHGTF member raised the original intent of having the default value measure how much is the avoidance emission in biogas. The GHGTF members discussed if a paper showing the technique can be considered. Moreover, if the investment was made then a baseline would be there for calculation and operationally the emissions will fluctuate annually, thus the lowest value of efficiency should be used. 	<p>documents for the user-defined MCF and methane lost to the atmosphere.</p> <p>The GHGTF members to review RSPO member's published papers on the POME technologies, i.e. belt press.</p> <p>Estate The Secretariat to find the latest paper published by Dr. Jannick to derive the 3rd Party FFB Supply default value.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p>

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
January 20 th , 2024, Wednesday				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A GHGTF member mentioned a generic percentage is around 50-60% and suggested using half of the default number i.e. 25%. The Secretariat mentioned that they will try to find a paper having a default value. The Chair suggested reaching out to the participant to supply the supporting documents. ● The Secretariat mentioned there is a growing interest from financial institutions in incentivising low emission operations, a financial institution is considering having a scenario builder on pathways to reduction or net zero by adjusting productivity. <p>No conclusion was made by the GHGTF members and will be discussed in detail in the 3rd GHGTF meeting.</p> <p><u>Estate</u></p> <p>The Secretariat presented the PalmGHG V5 Feedback analysis on calculator (Estate) which received a total of 92 comments. Land Use Change and Fertiliser had the highest major issues followed by Estate Summary which had the highest editorial which are minor issues.</p> <p>The Secretariat walk-throughed the feedback received for the estate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Secretariat acknowledged that the derivation of the default 3rd Party FFB Supplier default value requires revision, as raised by a few GHGTF members during the PalmGHG V5 Pilot Testing. The Secretariat verified and confirmed an error in the formula and pointed out the correct default value was too high (98.47%) to be used based on the offline conversation with the few GHGTF members. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A GHGTF member brought up the paper derived from Dr. Jannick as the latest as there was a mention there would be an updated paper and suggested the Secretariat to relook into the methodology with the latest paper. ○ A GHGTF member commented that the current default value calculation does not take into account Land Use Change (LUC) emissions, the Secretariat presented the calculation whereby if LUC was accounted for the percentage would be lower (68.42%). The 		

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
January 20th, 2024, Wednesday				
		<p style="text-align: center;">GHGTF members commented this would be too high and asked the Secretariat to relook into the formula.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Secretariat proceeded to present the feedback received for LUC and peat, there was no comments raised from the GHGTF members. ● The Secretariat highlighted there was enhancement was needed on the definition of forest under conservation as there was a regional case given. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GHGTF Chair pointed out the definition of forest should not be defined by GHGTF members but by RSPO Principle & Criteria, the Secretariat agreed and this should be based on National Interpretation for regional definition of forest. ● The Secretariat highlighted feedback regarding the PalmGHG V5 not accounting for micronutrients, such as Borax. The GHGTF members clarified that Borax does not contain nitrogen, and since the fertiliser section in PalmGHG V5 focuses on nitrogen-related emissions, micronutrients are not included. After discussion, the GHGTF members agreed to proceed without accounting for micronutrients and only account for macronutrients, as their emissions are negligible. ● The Secretariat mentioned there was a feedback to include scope 1 (own trucks) and scope 3 (3rd party trucks) for field fuel and to include more types of biodiesel i.e. B30, B40. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GHGTF members discussed and mentioned that the mixture in biofuels can be calculated independently. Hence, to keep it as pure biodiesel. ○ The GHGTF members discussed the challenges in getting the data from fuel consumed from trucks contracted and and highlighted the scope of boundary for 3rd party would need to be enhanced. The Secretariat proposed to put this in the next meeting agenda, and the GHGTF members agreed. 		
4.0	Update on PalmGHG V5 Guidance Document	<p><u>Topic 1. External PalmGHG V5 Guidance Document</u></p> <p>The Secretariat presented the feedback received from GHGTF members and confirmed that editorial feedback has been addressed.</p>	<p><u>Topic 1.</u> The Secretariat addresses the acknowledgements by</p>	Ongoing.

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
January 20 th , 2024, Wednesday				
	Refer to the deck from slides 17-19.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Secretariat asked if the PalmGHG V5 calculator should have materials for 2 different audiences i.e. higher level or user. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GHGTF Chair clarified with the Secretariat on the difference and the Secretariat explained that the high-level materials would focus on reporting side aspects, while user-level guidance is operational. ○ The Secretariat further mentioned that PalmGHG reporting would be audited in a standardised format via the audit module in <i>prisma</i>, ensuring uniform information display for members. Hence, the Secretariat proposed to keep the external guidance document to a user-level first, and whether or not to have another section for executive stakeholders (to be further discussed), which the GHGTF members supported with no objections. ● The Secretariat inquired whether acknowledgments for External Guidance and PalmGHG V5 Pilot Testing should include the company name only or the full name. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GHGTF Chair suggested using the company's full name for acknowledgment, and no objections were raised by members. ● The Secretariat asked GHGTF members to review the exclusion scope. A feedback query from pilot testing questioned whether biogas-generated electricity credits sent to workers' housing should be accounted for if the gen-set for workers' housing electricity was excluded. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A GHGTF member emphasised that both aspects should either be included or excluded, as selective accounting is not feasible. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A GHGTF member clarified if this was initially excluded in PalmGHG V4, the Secretariat replied and mentioned this was excluded due to wanting to include operational boundaries only. ■ The GHGTF member recalled and mentioned she did include it inside electricity consumption due to having challenges in separating it out. ○ A GHGTF member pointed out this does not have to be correlated as this separates into 2 questions, first is to address the boundary as being operational and the second is the credit. 	<p>full name and company.</p> <p>The Secretariat to remove "electricity for workers housing" from the list of exclusions in the scope section of the guidance document.</p> <p>The Secretariat to discuss internally to standardise "estate" or "plantation" and update GHGTF members.</p> <p>The Secretariat to include non-certified PK crusher emission in the next meeting agenda.</p> <p><u>Topic 2.</u> The Secretariat to check Secondary Forest default value for tropical rainforest and to update GHGTF members.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p>

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
January 20 th , 2024, Wednesday				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A GHGTF replied if this is the case then the wording would need to be changed e.g. the amount of electricity generated without mentioning the purpose. ■ In conclusion, the GHGTF members agreed to remove “electricity for workers housing”. ● The Secretariat discussed amongst themselves and mentioned the standardised term of either “plantation” and “estate” would be discussed internally first before proposing as there has been extensive discussion on the standardised term for <i>prisma</i>. The Secretariat asked if there was a different interpretation for “estate” and “plantation”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GHGTF members expressed that the terms “estate” and “plantation” are used interchangeably with the same interpretation. ○ A Secretariat mentioned in <i>prisma</i> this would be known as “estate” or “plantation” would be known as “supply base” and asked if the word “supply base” is used. ○ The GHGTF members replied “supply base” is a RSPO term, but acknowledged PalmGHG calculator is owned by RSPO, and mentioned a definition should be mentioned in the guidance document. ○ In conclusion, the Secretariat will check internally on the term and update GHGTF members. ● The Secretariat asked if non-certified PK crusher emission should be accounted for in a similar methodology to 3rd party FFB suppliers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A GHGTF member vaguely recalled that reporting for non-certified PK crushers is not mandatory under P&C certification, the Secretariat clarified the P&C requires reporting certified PK and not on PK crusher complying to P&C standard. ○ The GHGTF members discussed and mentioned this may have been brought up due to having an integrated mill with PK crusher, thus existing in the operational boundary. ○ The GHGTF questioned if PK crusher should be taken down for downstream calculators, the Secretariat proposed to keep this as PalmGHG V4 has this and to wait for the Supply Chain Certification to be revised. 	<p>The GHGTF members to review the PalmGHG V5 internal guidance for the next meeting.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p>

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
January 20 th , 2024, Wednesday				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A GHGTF member noted if this was an integrated mill with PK crusher, the PK tends to be owned and have less volume to be sourced from 3rd party. ○ In conclusion, the GHGTF members agreed to defer this matter for further discussion. <p><u>Topic 2. Internal PalmGHG V5 Guidance Document</u></p> <p>The Secretariat presented feedback received from GHGTF members for PalmGHG V5 internal guidance (in presentation format).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The GHGTF Chair asked if the level of detail in the internal guidance document would match that of the external guidance, such as justifications and documented changes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Secretariat clarified that the internal guidance document would remain within the internal team and would not include the same level of detail as the external guidance. ● The GHGTF Chair noted that the total biomass values for shrubland and secondary forest (<20 years) under LUC are similar. The Chair questioned if both secondary forest categories (<20 years and >20 years) are necessary, particularly in the Malaysian and Indonesian context, where forests are typically established within 20 years. Thus, proposed consolidating secondary forest into a single category. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GHGTF members tried to recall why 2 categories were needed and the Secretariat asked if the number of years was measured operationally. ○ A GHGTF member mentioned the 2 categories under secondary forest are dependent on how much the PalmGHG calculator would be aligned to IPCC. The GHGTF Chair mentioned that if the secondary forest is broken down then the shrubland should be broken into open and closed shrubland. ○ The Secretariat questioned the accuracy of the default values, asking if they were derived from tropical rather than temperate contexts. ○ In conclusion, the Secretariat will reconfirm the secondary forest default value to ensure it reflects a tropical context, and to update 		

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
January 20 th , 2024, Wednesday				
		GHGTF members for the next meeting. Aside from this, the Secretariat asked the GHGTF members to review the internal guidance to provide comments in the next meeting.		
5.0	<p>Update on PalmGHG on <i>prisma</i></p> <p>Refer to the deck from slides 20-25.</p>	<p><u>Topic 1. Timeline & Progress with Agridence</u></p> <p>The Secretariat updated the PalmGHG V5 Development timeline and presented a detailed timeline, whereby the development in <i>prisma</i> has been postponed 2 months later .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Secretariat summarised the key milestones: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ User Acceptance Testing (UAT) 1: Scheduled for the end of March 2025. Feedback from this phase will be addressed to minimise updates required for UAT 2. ○ UAT 2 & Training Manual: Scheduled for May 2025, preparation for the official launch for June 2025. The Secretariat highlighted the timeline for these activities may be tight. ○ The delay has provided additional time to address feedback, revise the guidance document, and prepare materials for socialisation and training, to be undertaken between January and March 2025. ○ Final preparations, including adjustments to the calculator and guidance materials, will take place from April to May 2025. ● The GHGTF Chair inquired about the transition process, the Secretariat mentioned the RSPO P&C does not mandate a specific version of PalmGHG calculator. The PalmGHG V5 launch in June 2025 coincides with the audit module launch, which may require time for a full transition. This alignment is expected to improve data efficiency by allowing data copying between systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GHGTF Chair emphasised growers' concerns about proper training, engagement, and an adequate transition period for all PalmGHG users. The GHGTF members and Secretariat discussed on the trainings which would be done after the launch. ○ The Secretariat proposed to have an option to a 3-month window following the launch or until P&C 2024 effective date to allow appropriate transition. Additionally, the Secretariat suggested that the 	<p><u>Topic 1.</u> The Secretariat to update the development timeline to include the transition period.</p> <p>The Secretariat to schedule trainings after PalmGHG V5 calculator launch.</p> <p><u>Topic 2.</u> The Secretariat to align the audit P&C and PalmGHG timeline for the streamlining of PalmGHG calculator to <i>prisma</i> modules.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p>

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
January 20 th , 2024, Wednesday				
		<p>Standard Steering Committee could issue a mandate for using PalmGHG V5 for audits starting from a specified date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In conclusion, the GHGTF members agreed with the proposed transition period options. The Secretariat will incorporate these options into the transition plan and ensure proper planning for training, engagement, and support during the transition. <p><u>Topic 2. Streamlining other modules with PalmGHG</u></p> <p>The Secretariat presented the current status of the desktop research done whereby Disclosure, excluding New Planting Procedure and Remediation and Compensation Plan (RaCP), Entity Management and Audit modules has been covered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A high-level gap analysis was shared: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Table format: Showed modules yet to be developed within the <i>prisma</i> framework and the status of the desktop review. ○ Map: Highlighted potential data flow between <i>prisma</i> modules and PalmGHG. ● Secretariat suggested data from Entity Management such as certification, list of supply base and volume of product can be flowed to PalmGHG Mill tab. Moreover, data from Disclosure can flow to PalmGHG estate. The Secretariat highlighted this has not been validated by interviews yet. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A GHGTF member raised concerns regarding the mismatch between PalmGHG’s calendar year reporting and RSPO audits. Specifically, if an audit is in January, the data provided would be from the previous December, causing a potential misalignment. The Secretariat acknowledged and understood the GHGTF member’s concern and will check on RSPO’s assessment’s audit respective timeline. ○ A GHGTF member mentioned this would be challenging as she uses PalmGHG calculator for Annual Communication of Progress (ACOP) which needs to be submitted in May, thus the PalmGHG assessment would be prepared by February. The GHGTF Chair mentioned their PalmGHG assessments following the audit certification period. 		

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
January 20th, 2024, Wednesday				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A GHGTF member suggested aligning PalmGHG reporting to the financial year rather than the certification period for better consistency in group reporting. ○ In conclusion, the Secretariat will internally review and align RSPO assessments and certification timelines to present the GHGTF members. 		
6.0	<p>AoB</p> <p>Refer to the deck from slides 26-30.</p>	<p><u>Topic 1. Collaboration updates</u></p> <p>The Secretariat updated the Greenhouse Gas Protocol (GHG Protocol) collaboration to the GHGTF members and mentioned there has not been any reply since November 2024 and proposed to have Matt Ramlow from World Resources Institute to join GHGTF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There were no objections from the GHGTF members but shared concern on the timezone. The Secretariat mentioned they can reach out to Matt Ramlow to recommend his colleagues for a friendlier timezone. <p>The Secretariat updated WRI Indonesia, whereby the NDA has been sent and is currently being reviewed by WRI Indonesia’s legal team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Secretariat mentioned WRI Indonesia would be publishing a technical note in Q1 2025. ● A GHGTF member mentioned they were invited and did a pilot testing but has not received any feedback since. <p><u>Topic 2. RSPO Revised Research Agenda</u></p> <p>The Secretariat presented a final reminder for the GHGTF members to provide feedback on the RSPO Revised Research Agenda, with the deadline on 31 Jan 2025.</p> <p><u>Topic 3. Extension of ToR: RSPO GHG Assessment Procedure for New Development and Simplified GHG Assessment Procedure for New Development (Reference Tool for Smallholders).</u></p>	<p><u>Topic 1.</u></p> <p>The Secretariat to invite Matt Ramlow to GHGTF.</p> <p>RSPO to keep GHGTF updated on WRI Indonesia and its technical guidance publishing in Jan 2025.</p> <p><u>Topic 2.</u></p> <p>The GHGTF members to provide feedback on the RSPO Research Agenda.</p> <p><u>Topic 3.</u></p> <p>The Secretariat to extend the ToR for SSC’s endorsement to cover the GHG assessments for new development.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p>

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
January 20 th , 2024, Wednesday				
		<p>The Secretariat proposed to extend the GHGTF's ToR to include the update and revision of RSPO GHG Assessment Procedure for New Development and Simplified GHG Assessment Procedure for New Development (Reference Tool for Smallholders) as these tools are required to be updated for RSPO P&C 2024.</p> <p>The Secretariat provided an introduction and presented the update required for these tools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The calculation parameters for RSPO GHG Assessment Procedure for New Development is similar to PalmGHG calculator, thus would require more and similar update to PalmGHG calculator as compared to Simplified GHG Assessment which only needs peat and conservation to be updated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A GHGTF member mentioned a research similar to Hooijer et al. 2010 would be updated soon and clarified if this can be updated for PalmGHG V5 calculator. The Secretariat responded that this would require interim measures if the changes made are made after the launch, this process would be similar to the annual default value update for PalmGHG calculator. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The GHGTF Chair sought for clarification on the tasks needed to be done and the difference, the Secretariat replied the update on RSPO GHG Assessment Procedure for New Development would be similar to PalmGHG calculator except the purpose of the tool is different which requires to be done before new planting. The GHGTF Chair mentioned the RSPO GHG Assessment Procedure would not be significantly important as there would not be experience in deforestation and development on peat. ■ The GHGTF Chair noted the current RSPO GHG Assessment only accounts for peat emission and not mineral and peat carbon stock, thus this component needs to be updated. 		

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
January 20th, 2024, Wednesday				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Secretariat noted there has been discussion on bringing existing elements from High Carbon Stock to <i>prisma</i> i.e. estimating carbon stock using remote satellite with available LIDAR data. ○ The Secretariat mentioned that GHG-related components in guidance documents and tools associated with new planting procedures may be done in collaboration with BHCVWG. In conclusion, there was no objection from the GHGTF members to extend the ToR and the Secretariat would proceed to update the ToR for the Standard Steering Committee's (SSC) endorsement 		
7.0	<p>Closing and Next Step</p> <p>Refer to the deck on slide 31.</p>	<p>The Secretariat adjourned the meeting on time and the third GHGTF meeting would be physical, held during the week of 24th February. The GHGTF Chair offered to host the physical meeting in which the Secretariat expressed their appreciation.</p> <p>The Secretariat shared the proposed agenda which is similar for this meeting but with more time given for the next physical meeting that was agreed by the GHGTF members. This includes the PalmGHG V5 Pilot Testing, guidance documents, progress update on PalmGHG V5 development in <i>prisma</i>, streamlining <i>prisma</i> modules with PalmGHG and extension of ToR.</p>	Secretariat to arrange logistics for the 3rd GHGTF meeting.	Ongoing.

Meeting adjourned at 5:10pm MYT.