

Minutes of the Meeting

Subject : 4th Greenhouse Gas Task Force (GHGTF) Meeting
 Date : 19th March 2025, Wednesday at 3:12 - 5:06pm (MYT)
 Venue : Zoom meeting (Virtual)

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

The objective of the meeting was to follow up on the pending decisions and action points from the physical 2-day 3rd GHGTF meeting to finalise PalmGHG V5 Pilot Testing feedback responses to be sent out to respondents and the PalmGHG V5 calculator to update for Agridence's development. Moreover, the Secretariat provided brief updates on the PalmGHG V5 guidance document. This meeting minute should be read in conjunction with the "RSPO GHGTF 4th Meeting_v1_19 March 2025_post" deck, which is for GHGTF use only.

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
March 19th, 2025, Wednesday				
1.0	Opening Remarks Refer to the deck from slides 1-3.	<p>The Secretariat and the Chair welcomed the GHGTF members into the meeting, the Secretariat introduced the virtual participants who couldn't join in the last meeting to the new eNGO GHGTF member, and informed who couldn't join this meeting</p> <p>The Secretariat informed the GHGTF members that there are 2 GHGTF alternate members left to sign the CoCs, and this would be followed up by the Secretariat.</p>	Secretariat to follow up on the 2 GHGTF members to sign the CoCs.	Pending 2 to sign as of 24 March 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.	<p>The Secretariat outlined the agenda for the meeting and informed the members on:</p> <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 3rd GHGTF meeting ("3rd MoM") were reviewed for adoption. The Secretariat highlighted all of the addressed and pending action points from the 3rd GHGTF meeting and summarised the pending action points on the following topics: Mill Fuel, POME and Land Use Change.</p>	The review of the 3rd GHGTF MoM was proposed by World Wildlife Fund and seconded by BASF.	
3.1	Discussion on pending issues of PalmGHG V5 calculator: Mill Fuel Refer to the deck from slides 9-17.	<p>The Secretariat recapped the GHGTF members' decision to change the stationary combustion default value for mill fuel from "Residential and Agricultural/ Forestry/ Fishing Farms" to "Energy Industries" and "Manufacturing Industries and Construction" based on IPCC.</p> <p>The pending decision was between using IPCC or DEFRA emission factors. The Secretariat provided a comparison, noting that IPCC is referenced from 2006, while DEFRA is updated annually, including stationary combustion, Well-To-Tank (WTT), and biogenic default values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A GHGTF member inquired about how the emission factors were derived. The Secretariat explained that DEFRA is referenced from the UK government and is used by the UNFCCC's GHG Calculator. 	<p>Secretariat to remain the mill fuel default value with IPCC.</p> <p>Secretariat to add an option for users to declare mobile combustion; if not selected, default to the conservative emission factor.</p>	<p>Done.</p> <p>Done.</p>

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
March 19 th , 2025, Wednesday				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A GHGTF member suggested using DEFRA, as this provides the same reference source for all the scopes 1 to 3, which allows for better reporting compliance compared to following the IPCC, as the WTT emission factor was from a separate reference. • The GHGTF members discussed that IPCC as this was more internationally recognised and DEFRA is mostly used for UK operations, and the emission factor would not need to be updated yearly, but a GHGTF member expressed concerns that the reference would be outdated. • After reviewing and comparing the emission factors, the GHGTF members agreed to use IPCC as the default reference. <p>The Secretariat presented the update on mobile combustion, including the proposal to classify contractor trucks under Scope 3. The Secretariat clarified that this update was agreed upon based on feedback received at the PK Crusher.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A GHGTF member highlighted that the inclusion of mobile combustion would depend on how users manage their data. • The Secretariat and GHGTF members discussed the distinction between on-road and off-road vehicles, noting that on-road trucks transport Fresh Fruit Bunches (FFB) to the mill, while off-road vehicles include forklifts and excavators used within the plantation and mill. • A GHGTF member inquired about differences in emission values. The Secretariat explained that methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions are higher in off-road vehicles than on-road trucks. • The GHGTF members discussed the approach for users without detailed activity data on mobile combustion. It was suggested and agreed that users should default to the conservative default value. Additionally, the member recommended including an option for users to declare whether they have mobile combustion, with the conservative default value used (if mobile combustion is not selected). • The Secretariat and GHGTF members further discussed emissions from 3rd party contractor trucks, agreeing they should be classified under Scope 3. The default values based on distance will apply. There were no objections to this approach. 	Secretariat to include 3rd party FFB contractor trucks under Scope 3, with distance-based default value.	Done.

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
March 19 th , 2025, Wednesday				
3.2	<p>Discussion on pending issues of PalmGHG V5 calculator: POME</p> <p>Refer to the deck from slides 18-21.</p>	<p>The Secretariat presented the Belt Filter Press journal article findings, explaining that the system pretreats sludge with flocculant to separate it into filtrate and a solid press cake. The Secretariat proposed not including it in PalmGHG V5, as members had previously decided to exclude sludge from POME accounting, refer to 15th GHGWG2 Meeting Minutes_final.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat clarified that the Belt Filter Press system would replace sludge treatment and presented a process diagram showing that Belt Filter Press treatment occurs after the first anaerobic pond. • The GHGTF members discussed how this system could be integrated into Scenario 2 methodology, noting that it would need to be positioned between the anaerobic pond treatment and noted that the Methane Correction Factor (MCF) value for Belt Filter Press would be needed. • A GHGTF member noted that if sludge treatment occurs 4–5 years later, the sludge may spread over time, potentially resulting in no emissions. • In conclusion, the GHGTF members agreed to proceed without incorporating the Belt Filter Press System in PalmGHG V5 as the Belt Filter Press system can be reflected by the Chemical Oxygen Demand input values in the anaerobic pond system. 	Secretariat to respond to the feedback on the Belt Filter Press proposal, whereby sludge treatment is not included in PalmGHG V5 and can be incorporated in Scenario 2 directly.	Done.
3.3	<p>Discussion on pending issues of PalmGHG V5 calculator: 3rd Party/ Estate data</p> <p>Refer to the deck from slides 22-25.</p>	<p>The Secretariat reconfirmed and provided updates from the 3rd GHGTF meeting regarding the revamped methodology for 3rd party FFB. The Secretariat presented a proposal to amend the calculator structure, suggesting the removal of the “Estate” tab and its integration into the “FFB” tab to streamline navigation and reduce the number of clicks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To illustrate the changes, the Secretariat referred to the PalmGHG V4 system, providing clarification on how the updated structure would appear. • In conclusion, the GHGTF members agreed with the proposal. 	Secretariat to include the proposal in combining FFB and Estate data tab in PalmGHG V5 <i>prisma</i> .	Done.
3.4	<p>Discussion on pending issues of PalmGHG V5 calculator: Land Use Change (LUC)</p> <p>Refer to the deck from slides 26-42.</p>	<p>The Secretariat presented decisions made on LUC discussions and pending matters for clarification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat reconfirmed with the GHGTF members that the results of RSPO LUCA can be used as guidance for demarcating the Unit of Certification, with no objections raised. 	Secretariat to include in the guidance on the demarcation of land cover type with differentiation of	Ongoing.

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
March 19 th , 2025, Wednesday				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A GHGTF member inquired whether a user-defined land cover type could be added, given that the IPCC-defined land cover types were already covered. Another member clarified that some user-defined land cover types do not fully match IPCC classifications. ○ The GHGTF members discussed and agreed that any user-defined land cover type must be supported by a reputable source, such as HCV-HCS assessment. ● A GHGTF member explained that the LUCA report is based on HCV-HCS assessments and clarified the difference between LUCA and RaCP. The RaCP assessment is conducted to compensate and remediate non-compliant past land clearing, while LUCA determines the optimal LUC clearance for the future. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The member suggested drafting this distinction into the PalmGHG V5 guidance and keeping the feedback response generic, allowing participants to follow up with further questions if needed. ● The Secretariat reconfirmed that the assessment period of 25 years and equal discounting were selected, and no objections were raised by the GHGTF members. ● The Secretariat recapped that GHGTF members had agreed to include Land Management, but no decision had been made on whether crop-related land cover should be separated from the Land Use Change methodology. ● The Secretariat presented a summary of carbon pools in land management and confirmed that the methodology for Soil Carbon Stock had been covered. Under Tier 1, Dead Organic Matter is assumed to have no net change, and biomass is not accounted for. No objections were raised by the GHGTF. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Secretariat also presented IPCC's Land Management methodology for biomass, explaining that the gain-loss method is used, where the annual carbon stock removed (removal or harvest) is deducted from the annual growth of perennial wood biomass. The Secretariat noted that only Tier 1 default values exist for tropical, wet climates, without separation by crop land cover type. ○ The GHGTF members discussed and agreed to continue using the Land Use Change methodology to account for Land Management. 	<p>RSPO assessments i.e. LUCA and RaCP.</p> <p>Secretariat to respond to the feedback with issues in demarcation in a general manner.</p> <p>Secretariat to separate crop land cover type from LUC methodology to Land Management emissions, whilst retaining the LUC methodology.</p> <p>Secretariat to remain in Central America with the IPCC reference.</p> <p>Secretariat to include a separate tab for "Sequestration from Standing Oil Palm", and to share the extrapolated graph to the GHGTF members.</p>	<p>Done.</p> <p>Done.</p> <p>Done.</p> <p>Done.</p>

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
March 19 th , 2025, Wednesday				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A GHGTF member inquired whether there would be baseline monitoring, mentioning that the media had discussed the relationship between deforestation, food security, and land management. The Secretariat responded that PalmGHG V5 will identify emission risks but will not track reduction-related activities. • The Secretariat presented the applicable scope of non-carbon land management in PalmGHG V5, including liming and managed soils, with the respective equations already accounted for under the fertiliser component. No objections were raised by the GHGTF. • The Secretariat followed up with the IPCC references to Central America, confirming that above-ground biomass and Root-to-Shoot ratio default values for Primary, Old Secondary, and Young Secondary forests were categorised under "North and South America" in IPCC. Additionally, Tree Crops and Shrubland were classified under the "Americas" continent. No objections were raised by the GHGTF members. • The Secretariat presented an analysis and extrapolation of data up to 27 years based on a journal article shared by the GHGTF Chair to account for crop sequestration beyond the 25-year assessment period. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GHGTF Chair informed the members that he had contacted MPOB's research department to conduct research on developing a default sequestration value. ○ The GHGTF members and the Secretariat discussed adding a data input field for "Sequestration from Standing Oil Palm" as a separate tab to avoid confusion if included under conservation. The default value will be user-defined and audited. No objections were raised, and it was agreed to be added. ○ The GHGTF Chair requested the Secretariat to share the data extrapolation graphs with members. 		

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
March 19th, 2025, Wednesday				
3.5	<p>Discussion on pending issues of PalmGHG V5 calculator: Estate Summary</p> <p>Refer to the deck from slides 43-44.</p>	<p>The Secretariat recapped the feedback on accounting for crop residue and presented a proposal to use the kg N₂O-N per ha per year default value derived from IPCC. The Secretariat mentioned that they were unable to locate the specific reference but suggested that it was likely sourced from the direct N₂O emission factor for managed soils.</p> <p>The Secretariat asked the GHGTF members whether the proposed action to email and seek clarification was still necessary, given that Empty Fruit Bunch (EFB) had already been accounted for. The GHGTF members confirmed that no further action was required and agreed there was no need to contact the participant.</p>	For your information.	
4.0	<p>Closing of PalmGHG V5 Pilot Testing</p> <p>Refer to the deck from slides 45-53.</p>	<p>The Secretariat recapped the PalmGHG V5 Pilot Testing, noting that 28% of responses came from a spread across South East Asia, Africa, Latin America, Oceania, the Middle East and Europe. To increase African representation, the pilot testing timeline was extended by one month, resulting in two additional responses from the seven newly added participants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat reported that 77 comments were received for the mill and 106 comments for the estate. Most responses came from growers, followed by Processors & Traders, Consulting, and Certification Bodies. <p>The Secretariat informed the GHGTF members that the PalmGHG V5 pilot testing spreadsheet had been updated based on previous decisions and requested members to review the document before sending it out to participants. Moreover, an email draft was presented, as the responses would be emailed to pilot test respondents with an appreciation message and details on the next steps, including the User Acceptance Test (UAT) and expected launch date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat asked whether participant names and organisations should be removed from the feedback form. The GHGTF members agreed that personal information should be excluded. A GHGTF member suggested repeated feedback and common questions from the pilot testing could be used as training materials. 	<p>GHGTF members to review the PalmGHG V5 pilot testing responses for Secretariat to send out to the pilot testing respondents.</p> <p>Secretariat to incorporate repeated feedback as a training material.</p>	<p>Done.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p>

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
March 19th, 2025, Wednesday				
5.0	Update on PalmGHG V5 Guidance document Refer to the deck from slides 54-57.	The Secretariat recapped the feedback from the 3rd GHGTF meeting and pilot test and mentioned this would be revised for Draft 2; there were no further comments made by the GHGTF members.	The Secretariat to update and revise the PalmGHG V5 guidance document accordingly.	Ongoing.
6.1	AoB: Peat and Conservation Refer to the deck from slides 58-62.	The Secretariat mentioned that there has been a proposal from the biodiversity team to account for peat emissions and the default values for conservation, which would be shared in the next meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GHGTF Chair suggested inviting the Global Environment Centre (GEC) as a technical expert for peat. 	Secretariat to invite GEC as a technical expert in GHGTF. Secretariat to share the proposal in the next meeting.	Ongoing.
6.2	AoB: Approach to streamlining PalmGHG in <i>prisma</i> Refer to the deck from slides 63-67.	The Secretariat recapped updates from the previous meeting, noting that the PalmGHG V5 calculator's supply base definition and Entity Management differ. As a result, reassignment will be required in PalmGHG V5 within <i>prisma</i> , with an accompanying explanation in the PalmGHG V5 guidance document. Additionally, the Secretariat acknowledged and appreciated the efforts in consolidating the ACOP guidance related to GHG emission intensity questions and confirmed that the necessary changes had been made.	Secretariat to continue the desktop and interviews for streamlining PalmGHG in <i>prisma</i> .	Ongoing.
6.3	AoB: <i>prisma</i> Update by Agridence Refer to the deck from slides 68-70.	The Secretariat recapped the updated timeline from the 3rd GHGTF meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The User Acceptance Test has been postponed to May 2025; the Secretariat foresees this may be a physical meeting, but will confirm at a later date. The GHGTF Chair expressed concerns that the Q3 2025 launch may be too slow, making it impossible to present during RT25. 	Secretariat to update the GHGTF members on the meeting mode for UAT 1.	Ongoing.
6.4	AoB: RSPO GHG Assessment Procedure for New Development and Simplified GHG Assessment Procedure	The Secretariat recapped the necessary updates for the GHG Assessment for New Development tool, noting that it would be aligned with the PalmGHG calculator,	Secretariat to provide the updates needed for RSPO GHG-related	Ongoing.

No	Agenda	Main Discussion Points	Action Points	Progress Update
March 19 th , 2025, Wednesday				
	for New Development (Reference Tool for Smallholders). Refer to the deck from slides 71-73.	making the update process straightforward. The Secretariat mentioned this would be brought up in the next meeting.	assessments and tools in the next meeting.	
6.5	AoB: Potential Collaboration Refer to the deck from slides 74-75.	<p>The Secretariat recapped that Matt Ramlow from World Resources Institute declined to join the GHGTF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GHGTF Chair inquired whether GHG Protocol would still be referenced in PalmGHG V5. The Secretariat confirmed yes and suggested following up with GHG Protocol to ensure alignment, which GHGTF members agreed to. <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 which the Secretariat would follow up on. 	Secretariat to follow up with GHG Protocol and WRI's technical note.	Ongoing.
7.0	Closing and Next Step Refer to the deck on slide 76-77.	The Secretariat adjourned the meeting and shared the proposed agenda on the PalmGHG V5 calculator update, if any, guidance documents, progress update on PalmGHG V5 development in <i>prisma</i> , streamlining <i>prisma</i> modules with PalmGHG and GHG assessments to NPP.	Secretariat to keep GHGTF updated on the next meeting.	Ongoing.

Meeting adjourned at 5:06pm MYT.