TOPIC 1 | REHEARSAL NOTES

Farmers & Shared Value

> The supplied Drive file is an 11-page image-based PDF, not a video. These drafts use Khun Nuch’s actual class deck, with page references. No spoken transcript or timestamps exist in the shared folders. Confirm the chosen example against what she said in class before presenting.

Project the slide | PowerPoint | Slide PDF | Cheat card | Cheat PDF | Plain script | Timed audio rehearsal

414 spoken words. Target 138.0 words per minute for 3:00. Timing marks are targets; rehearse aloud. Measured local eSpeak NG rehearsal: 3:01 (180.532 seconds). This is synthetic audio, not Tarn speaking.

0:00–0:30 | Example

What stood out to me is that TEGH supports farmers as part of running the business, not just as a separate donation. Its class slides show support for certification and additional income from sustainable rubber and oil palm farming. The farmer wellbeing figure shown is 135.65 million baht. I would keep that figure separate from TEGH's own sales or profit. The point is shared value, not a company donation total.

0:30–1:30 | The 3Rs

I see 3 connections. First, risk. If farmers cannot make a living or meet sourcing requirements, TEGH has a supply problem too. Buying at the lowest price today does not solve that. Second, resilience. Training, support and a longer relationship can help farmers adapt

and keep supplying. TEGH's slides connect farmer support with better income, knowledge and stronger resilience. Third, revenue. Farmers can benefit from selling compliant materials, while TEGH can supply customers who need those materials. That is a route to business value, but I would not claim a profit increase that the slides do not show. The farmer and the company have different benefits. For the farmer, it is a stronger livelihood. For TEGH, it is a supply base that can keep meeting customer needs. Both sides need a reason to stay in the relationship.

1:30–2:30 | Key lesson

My key lesson is simple: build stronger suppliers, not just cheaper supply. In my own work, I would start by asking which supplier problem could become our problem next month. Is it skills, cash flow, quality or the ability to meet a standard? Then I would pick one issue where support helps both sides. I would also agree how to check the result. For example, I would look at whether farmers actually receive the extra income and whether the supply relationship becomes more reliable. Those are my suggested checks, not results reported by TEGH. I would not measure success only by the number of people who attended training. Attendance tells us that an activity happened. It does not tell us whether the farmer is better off, or whether the business is more secure. The support has to work in daily operations.

2:30–3:00 | Close and buffer

So my close is this: supporting farmers is not outside the business model when the business depends on them. It can be part of protecting the business itself. TEGH gives us a useful example of linking farmer wellbeing to the supply chain. The test is whether both sides gain something real, and whether that benefit lasts beyond one project. Stronger suppliers can make a stronger business.

Pronunciation

TEGH: ที อี จี เอช (tee ee jee aitch). Biogas: ไบโอแก๊ส. Traceability: trace-a-bil-i-ty. For EUDR, say each letter: E U D R. Say the full company name once only if needed.

2-minute feedback preparation

Is 135.65 million baht TEGH profit?

No. The class slide labels it farmer wellbeing and additional income. The 2025 report p75 describes farmer premium income. It is not company profit.

Why would a farmer stay with TEGH?

The deck names knowledge, support and better income. Those are reasons for a lasting relationship, not proof that every farmer stays.

What would you measure?

My proposed measures are farmer net income, participation costs and repeat supply. These are suggested checks, not claimed TEGH results.

Five points to remember

1. Support farmer certification and additional income.
2. 135.65 Million Baht: Additional farmer income shown in the class deck
3. Unstable farmer income can weaken raw material supply.
4. Training and stronger livelihoods support lasting supply.

5. Farmers earn more; TEGH can protect access to customers.

One-sentence close

Build stronger suppliers, not just cheaper supply.

Source notes and limits

The supplied Drive file is an 11-page image-based PDF, not a video. These drafts use Khun Nuch’s actual class deck, with page references. No spoken transcript or timestamps exist in the shared folders. Confirm the chosen example against what she said in class before presenting.

Class deck: Khun Nuch’s supplied PDF, PDF pages 4, 5, 9. Exact deck wording:

> The company promotes additional income generation for farmers through sustainable rubber and oil palm plantations model.

The class slide gives no period for 135.65 Million Baht. The 2025 report p75 calls this premium income from certified and compliant materials; it is not TEGH revenue or profit. Do not mix it with the narrower project figures on report p81.

Optional outside check: TEGH Sustainability Report 2025, printed pages 75, 80, 81. Every 3Rs causal link and proposed management check is our analysis, not a verbatim claim by the speaker. Only the deck wording above is quoted. No talk timestamp is available.

TOPIC 2 | REHEARSAL NOTES

Traceability & Trust

> The supplied Drive file is an 11-page image-based PDF, not a video. These drafts use Khun Nuch’s actual class deck, with page references. No spoken transcript or timestamps exist in the shared folders. Confirm the chosen example against what she said in class before presenting.

Project the slide | PowerPoint | Slide PDF | Cheat card | Cheat PDF | Plain script | Timed audio rehearsal

411 spoken words. Target 137.0 words per minute for 3:00. Timing marks are targets; rehearse aloud. Measured local eSpeak NG rehearsal: 3:01 (180.767 seconds). This is synthetic audio, not Tarn speaking.

0:00–0:30 | Example

The example I chose is TEGH's use of digital traceability and geolocation in rubber sourcing. Its class slide puts those tools beside supplier assessment, due diligence and data integrity. What stood out to me is that knowing the source is not just useful for TEGH. It is part of what the customer is buying. The customer needs material, but also needs evidence about where that material came from.

0:30–1:30 | The 3Rs

For risk, an unknown source creates questions that a buyer may not be able to answer. Was the land use responsible? Can the supplier support the sourcing claim? TEGH's deck links traceability with deforestation requirements and responsible sourcing. For resilience, records that connect a material to its source give the business

something it can check when a question comes up. That makes the supply relationship easier to manage than relying on a general promise. For revenue, TEGH presents reliable, traceable supply and compliance assurance as value for customers. My reading is that this can help protect access to customers and their markets. I would not say that traceability automatically increases the selling price. The first benefit may simply be staying eligible to supply. That is still a business benefit, even when it does not appear as a separate line of revenue.

1:30–2:30 | Key lesson

My key lesson is to make the evidence travel with the product. I would start with one product and follow its records from the supplier to the customer. At each handover, I would ask what information is kept, who checks it and what happens if something is missing. Those are my proposed checks, not a claim about TEGH's internal system. I also would not confuse a location pin with complete proof. A location can tell us where something is, but the sourcing claim still needs the right checks and records behind it. That distinction matters because a system can look impressive without helping a buyer make a decision. The goal is not to collect the most data. It is to provide evidence the customer can use, and to be honest about any gaps. Trust should come from what can be checked.

2:30–3:00 | Close and buffer

So why do customers want to know the source? Because they carry risks beyond the purchase price. TEGH's example shows how

sourcing information can become part of the offer, not just a back office task. My closing point is simple: if a customer has to defend the product, help them defend its origin too. Make the evidence travel with the product.

Pronunciation

TEGH: ที อี จี เอช (tee ee jee aitch). Biogas: ไบโอแก๊ส. Traceability: trace-a-bil-i-ty. For EUDR, say each letter: E U D R. Say the full company name once only if needed.

2-minute feedback preparation

Does a GPS pin prove no deforestation?

No. The deck pairs geolocation with supplier assessment and due diligence. A location is only one part of the evidence.

Does traceability guarantee a premium?

No. The deck supports customer value and compliance assurance, not a quantified selling-price premium.

What if the records are incomplete?

My recommendation is to flag the gap and check the source before making the claim. Do not turn missing evidence into certainty.

Five points to remember

1. Link raw materials to their source through digital traceability and geolocation.
2. Know the source: Digital traceability, geolocation and supplier assessment
3. Unknown origins create sourcing and compliance risk.
4. Reliable source records make supply easier to check.
5. Verified sourcing can help protect customer market access.

One-sentence close

Make the evidence travel with the product.

Source notes and limits

The supplied Drive file is an 11-page image-based PDF, not a video. These drafts use Khun Nuch’s actual class deck, with page references. No spoken transcript or timestamps exist in the shared folders. Confirm the chosen example against what she said in class before presenting.

Class deck: Khun Nuch’s supplied PDF, PDF pages 3, 4, 5, 6. Exact deck wording:

> Digital traceability and geolocation

This is the class deck, not a talk transcript. Digital traceability alone is not proof of no deforestation. Do not repeat the regulatory timeline as current legal advice; no implementation date is needed here.

Optional outside check: TEGH Sustainability Report 2025, printed pages 6, 72, 73. Every 3Rs causal link and proposed management check is our analysis, not a verbatim claim by the speaker. Only the deck wording above is quoted. No talk timestamp is available.

YOUR TOPIC | GROUP 2 | TEGH

Waste to Energy

Slide | Editable PowerPoint | Slide PDF | Script and Q&A PDF | Cheat card | Cheat PDF | Two-page workshop PDF | Plain script | Rehearsal audio

412 spoken words. 3:00 measured synthetic rehearsal (180.114 seconds). Timing marks are targets. Rehearse your own voice; do not race to match the synthesiser.

0:00 / 3:00

0:00-0:35 | One example

I'm Tarn from Group Two. Our topic is waste to energy, using Thai Eastern Group Holdings, or TEGH. What stood out in Khun Nuch's deck was the connection between organic waste, biogas and the factories using that energy. I checked this against the TEGH study she co-authored with Sasin researchers, including Professor Nophea Sasaki. The example I want to focus on is simple: waste from production becomes fuel for production, instead of remaining only a disposal problem.

0:35-1:20 | Risk and resilience

For risk, this tackles two problems together. The business has organic waste and wastewater to manage, and it also needs energy. Capturing biogas can reduce unmanaged methane and replace some purchased energy. That reduces exposure to fossil-fuel prices, but it doesn't remove operating risk. The plant still needs reliable feedstock, maintenance and safe gas handling. For resilience, the paper reports

that biogas supplied roughly thirty-five to forty percent of total energy demand across rubber and palm operations in twenty twenty-four. That's a meaningful internal energy source, not complete energy independence. The remaining digestate and biosludge are reused as soil conditioners for farmers, so the system also has an outlet for what's left after digestion.

1:20-2:05 | Revenue, without overclaiming

For revenue, I'd start with the cost we don't have to pay. In twenty twenty-four, TEGH generated forty-three gigawatt-hours of electricity. The paper values that at more than one hundred and eighty million baht in avoided electricity costs, using prevailing industrial tariffs. That's avoided power purchases, not net profit, and not a claim that all that electricity was sold. The study also reports an estimated renewable-energy investment payback of about four point eight years. Fertiliser provides another useful outlet, but the paper doesn't give us a separate fertiliser sales figure. I wouldn't invent one or attribute the group's entire profit increase to biogas.

2:05-3:00 | Our decision and key lesson

My key lesson is: use waste to replace a real cost before chasing new income. In my own business, I'd first measure the waste stream, match it to an energy need, and test the economics under lower feedstock and different electricity prices. I'd want an owner for the operating data and an outlet for the residue before approving investment. This is one company case, partly based on company-reported data, not a guaranteed result elsewhere. The paper also notes that absolute

emissions rose after capacity expansion in the later reporting period. So I'd track both emissions per unit and total emissions. For me, the value is making waste part of the operating plan, with savings we can actually check.

Spoken-number source map

35-40%: study p. 9, Section 4.2.3. 43 GWh and more than THB 180m: p. 7, Table 1 and Section 4.1. About 4.8 years: p. 7, Section 4.1. Later absolute-emission increase: p. 9. Number words are expanded for natural delivery.

2-minute feedback preparation

Choose the question asked; give the short answer, then stop. These are prepared prompts, not a prediction of faculty comments.

Is the saving from waste or just electricity prices?

The electricity comes from the biogas system, but its monetary value uses prevailing industrial tariffs. The paper does not isolate a price effect. Treat THB 180m+ as avoided purchase cost, not audited net saving. Study p. 7, Table 1 and text.

What is the payback?

About 4.8 years for renewable-energy investments, estimated from company-reported performance. The paper does not publish a full project cash-flow model or capex breakdown. Tariffs, feedstock and regulation can change payback. Study pp. 7, 14, Table 5.

What if feedstock falls?

The model depends on available organic residues and wastewater. Less or poorer feedstock can reduce gas output and utilisation. Before investing, I would stress-test supply and retain backup energy. That recommendation is our analysis, not a measured scenario. Study pp. 13-14, 18.

Does this work outside palm and rubber?

The paper proposes cautious transfer to comparable agro-industrial and food-processing clusters. Check waste quality, energy demand, proximity, infrastructure, governance and regulation. It does not prove that every business needs its own digester. Study pp. 13, 17-18.

What happened to absolute emissions after expansion?

Study-period inventory totals fell from 84,478 to 75,851 tCO2e in 2022-2024. The paper says supplementary 2025 disclosure shows absolute emissions rising with capacity expansion. Track totals alongside intensity; do not claim emissions always fall. Study pp. 8-9, Table 2.

How reliable are company-reported numbers?

Selected indicators were cross-checked or independently verified, but that does not assure every economic claim. Two authors work for TEGH and disclose the potential conflict. It remains a single case without strong causal inference. Study pp. 5, 13, 19.

Where is the new income?

The strongest quantified evidence here is avoided power purchases. Digestate-based fertiliser creates a residual-biomass outlet and supports farmers; the study gives no separate fertiliser sales or profit figure. Do not call THB 180m+ sales revenue. Study pp. 3-4, 7, 9.

Is biogas the same as burning mixed rubbish?

No. This example is anaerobic digestion of palm oil mill effluent, rubber sludge and organic residues. Gas is used for drying and electricity; digestate is reused. It is not evidence about municipal mixed-waste incineration. Study pp. 3-4.

Why does the deck say 76.1%, not 35-40%?

Deck p. 9 reports LPG-to-bio-energy substitution of 76.1%. Study p. 9 reports biogas supplying 35-40% of total energy demand across rubber and palm in 2024. Different denominators and reporting contexts; neither should replace the other.

Why does the deck show 321,452 tCO2e, not 19,271?

Deck p. 9 shows 321,452 tonCO2e reduction, without a directly comparable period and boundary established here. Study pp. 1, 4 report estimated 19,271 tCO2e reduction in

2024. Present separately; do not add or equate them.

Does 43 GWh mean all the biogas became electricity?

No. The system uses biogas for thermal drying as well as electricity. The study reports roughly 23 million Nm3 annual biogas alongside 43 GWh electricity, without allocating the whole gas volume to power. Study pp. 3, 7-8, Table 1.

What should we measure before approving it?

My proposed checks are feedstock volume and quality, usable energy, avoided purchases, operating and maintenance costs, methane leakage and residue outlets. Track absolute and per-unit emissions. The paper supports integrated monitoring, but does not publish a complete investment checklist. Study pp. 8, 13, 17-18.

If I do not know

I don't have a verified figure for that. The study doesn't break it out, so I wouldn't guess. I'd check the underlying operating records or ask Khun Nuch before making that claim.

Honest limits

- Single company case; associations are not proof that symbiosis caused all financial improvement (pp. 7, 13).
- Partly company-reported data. Selected third-party checks do not assure every number (p. 5). Two authors are TEGH employees and disclose a potential conflict (p. 19).
- Cradle-to-gate boundary excludes downstream logistics, product use and some Scope 3 categories (pp. 6, 13).
- Supplementary 2025 reporting says absolute emissions rose with capacity expansion. It is not part of the formal 2022-2024 dataset (pp. 5, 9, 13).
- Payback depends on tariffs, feedstock, infrastructure and regulation. THB 180m+ is avoided power cost, not net profit (pp. 7, 14).
- Deck 76.1% LPG substitution is not the same metric as study 35-40% total-energy share. Deck 321,452 tCO2e and study 19,271 tCO2e lack matched boundaries here (deck p. 9; study pp. 4, 9).
- Table 5 reports about 350 kg CO2e avoided per tonne waste, but its relationship to the 19,271 tCO2e annual reduction and waste totals is not reconciled in the paper.

Do not combine or extrapolate those figures (pp. 4, 9, 14).

- Study p. 9 mentions 100% renewable energy by 2030 and renewable electricity by 2040; Table 4 specifies carbon neutrality for Scopes 1-2 in 2030 and renewable electricity in 2040. Clarify the target definitions before quoting them.

Which source supports what?

Khun Nuch's 11-page class deck, pp. 7-8, supplies the single organic-waste-to-biogas example; p. 9 reports 76.1% LPG-to-bio-energy substitution. The TEGH research paper supplies the 2024 power, avoided-cost and estimated-payback figures on p. 7, and the total-energy share on p. 9. These numbers are not all in the talk deck. No recording is available here, so this is not a verbatim transcript or a claim about what was spoken.

Kokanutaporn, S.; Rachuratchata, L.; Aung, E.D.; Sasaki, N. (2026). Industrial Symbiosis as a Carbon-Centered Operational Strategy: Evidence from Thailand's Eastern Economic Corridor. *Sustainability* 18, 5547. doi:10.3390/su18115547. Sasin affiliations are on paper p. 1. PDF page numbers are printed paper pages.

Measure	Exact value	PDF page	Location
Direct organic waste	More than 420,000 t/year	4, 9	Sections 2.3, 4.2.2
Waste including upstream residues	Approximately 628,000 t/year; p. 4 says more than 600,000	4, 9	Sections 2.3, 4.2.2
Biogas	23.0 million Nm3 in 2024	7	Table 1
Electricity generated	43.0 GWh in 2024	7	Table 1
Avoided electricity cost	More than THB 180 million in 2024	7	Table 1 and Section 4.1
Renewable-energy asset payback	Estimated about 4.8 years	7, 14	Section 4.1; Table 5
Biogas share of total energy demand	Roughly 35-40% across rubber and palm in 2024	9	Section 4.2.3
Estimated avoided GHG emissions	19,271 tCO2e in 2024	1, 4	Abstract; Section 2.3

Measure	Exact value	PDF page	Location
Biogas utilisation	About 98%	9, 14	Section 4.2.4; Table 5
GHG intensity	0.285 in 2022; 0.2471 tCO2e/t output in 2024	8	Table 2
Inventory total	84,478 in 2022; 75,851 tCO2e in 2024	8	Table 2
Group revenue / net profit	THB 10,227m / 206m in 2022; THB 16,552m / 818m in 2024	7	Table 1; association only
LPG-to-bio-energy substitution	76.1%	Deck 9	Class deck, renewable-energy panel
Deck carbon-emission reduction	321,452 tonCO2e; unmatched period/boundary	Deck 9	Class deck, decarbonisation panel

Previous version

Original deck-only notes | Original slide PPTX. Kept for comparison, not the current assigned presentation.

TOPIC 4 | REHEARSAL NOTES

Water & Resilience

> The supplied Drive file is an 11-page image-based PDF, not a video. These drafts use Khun Nuch's actual class deck, with page references. No spoken transcript or timestamps exist in the shared folders. Confirm the chosen example against what she said in class before presenting.

Project the slide | PowerPoint | Slide PDF | Cheat card | Cheat PDF | Plain script | Timed audio rehearsal

419 spoken words. Target 139.7 words per minute for 3:00. Timing marks are targets; rehearse aloud. Measured local eSpeak NG rehearsal: 3:01 (180.558 seconds). This is synthetic audio, not Tarn speaking.

0:00–0:30 | Example

The example I chose is TEGH combining water reuse with its own reservoir. Its class slide shows an 18 month water security figure, and a separate figure of 1.416 million cubic metres for water reuse. The public report describes supply security of up to 18 months. What stood out to me is that this is not only about using less water. It is also about keeping the business operating.

0:30–1:30 | The 3Rs

For risk, a factory can have customers, people and equipment ready, but still be unable to produce if a critical resource is missing. Water shortage is that kind of problem. For resilience, storage and reuse do different jobs. Storage provides a buffer when supply is limited. Reuse reduces the need for fresh water in processes where reused water is

suitable. TEGH's deck brings both into its shared resource model. For revenue, my reading is that keeping production running can protect sales and help avoid interruption costs. That is a business logic, not a savings figure reported in the slide. I would not add the 2 water figures together or call 18 months a guarantee under every condition. The actual protection depends on demand, available water and operating conditions. A useful resilience plan needs those limits to be clear, not hidden behind a headline.

1:30–2:30 | Key lesson

My key lesson is to plan for the day a critical resource is not available. I would begin by asking what could stop our service or production, even if demand is strong. Then I would look at both sides: how to secure more of that resource, and how to need less of it. That is the practical value of combining storage with reuse. I would also test the plan rather than relying only on installed capacity. How much usable water is actually available? Which processes can accept reused water? Who checks the quality? These are my proposed questions, not additional facts from TEGH. The same way of thinking can apply to other essential inputs. The point is not to copy a reservoir into every business. It is to identify the resource that our business cannot operate without and prepare before the shortage happens.

2:30–3:00 | Close and buffer

So my close is this: efficiency and resilience are connected, but they are not identical. Reuse helps the business need less fresh water.

Storage helps it cope when supply is limited. TEGH puts both in the same operating system. The lesson I would take back to my own work is simple: prepare for the missing resource before it becomes the reason the business stops.

Pronunciation

TEGH: ที อี จี เอช (tee ee jee aitch). Biogas: ไบโอแก๊ส. Traceability: trace-a-bil-i-ty. For EUDR, say each letter: E U D R. Say the full company name once only if needed.

2-minute feedback preparation

Is 18 months guaranteed in any drought?

No. The class slide gives no assumptions. The public report p53 says up to 18 months. Demand and operating conditions matter.

Does all reused water go into every process?

The slide does not say that. My recommendation is to match water quality to each process requirement.

What is the financial return?

No project return is stated in the deck. Avoided interruption and protected sales are proposed value routes, not quantified results.

Five points to remember

1. Combine water reuse with an owned reservoir.
2. 18 months: Water security figure shown beside TEGH’s own reservoir
3. Drought and water shortages can interrupt production.
4. Reuse reduces fresh demand; storage provides a buffer.
5. Keeping production running can protect sales and avoid costs.

One-sentence close

Plan for the day a critical resource is not available.

Source notes and limits

The supplied Drive file is an 11-page image-based PDF, not a video. These drafts use Khun Nuch’s actual class deck, with page references. No spoken transcript or timestamps exist in the shared folders. Confirm the chosen example against what she said in class before presenting.

Class deck: Khun Nuch’s supplied PDF, PDF pages 7, 8, 9. Exact deck wording:

> TEGH creates own water reservoir to secure water consumption.

Slide9 shows 18 months and water reuse of 1.416 Million m3 without a period or operating assumptions. Report p53 says up to 18 months and 1,416,308 m3/year reused. Use up to 18 months, not an unconditional guarantee or an extra 18 months from reuse.

Optional outside check: TEGH Sustainability Report 2025, printed pages 53. Every 3Rs causal link and proposed management check is our analysis, not a verbatim claim by the speaker. Only the deck wording above is quoted. No talk timestamp is available.

TOPIC 5 | REHEARSAL NOTES

Carbon Claims & Trust

> The supplied Drive file is an 11-page image-based PDF, not a video. These drafts use Khun Nuch's actual class deck, with page references. No spoken transcript or timestamps exist in the shared folders. Confirm the chosen example against what she said in class before presenting.

Project the slide | PowerPoint | Slide PDF | Cheat card | Cheat PDF | Plain script | Timed audio rehearsal

417 spoken words. Target 139.0 words per minute for 3:00. Timing marks are targets; rehearse aloud. Measured local eSpeak NG rehearsal: 3:00 (180.114 seconds). This is synthetic audio, not Tarn speaking.

0:00–0:30 | Example

The example I chose is TEGH connecting traceability with carbon accounting at the plantation. Its class slide calls this moving from traceability to carbon transparency. That stood out to me because a customer cannot check a carbon claim from a slogan alone. The customer needs to understand what was measured and what evidence supports it. For me, the useful example is the move towards evidence, not just a stronger marketing claim.

0:30–1:30 | The 3Rs

For risk, an unclear claim can create a trust problem. Lower carbon compared with what? For which product, which period and which part of the supply chain? The class deck presents carbon accounting and standards as part of its response. For resilience, evidence that can be

checked helps the business answer questions when a customer challenges the claim. For revenue, credible evidence can support qualification with customers who need it. That is a possible commercial benefit, not proof of a price premium. I would also separate a lower carbon product from lower total company emissions. They are different claims. TEGH's public report says its total emissions increased in 2025 during expansion. That does not, by itself, settle a product comparison either way. It means we should be precise about what each number actually describes before using it to persuade a customer.

1:30–2:30 | Key lesson

My key lesson is to make the claim only as strong as the evidence. If I were presenting a lower carbon product, I would put the comparison, period, measurement boundary and verification status in the supporting notes. Those are my recommended checks, not a claim that I have independently verified TEGH's carbon calculations. I would also separate reductions from offsets. A customer should not have to guess which one is being discussed. If a figure is not fully explained, I would say what is missing rather than fill the gap with confidence. This is important for my own businesses too. When we sell something based on data, the evidence is part of the product. A claim that is slightly smaller but clear is more useful than a claim that sounds impressive and falls apart when someone asks one practical question about it.

2:30–3:00 | Close and buffer

So what would help customers trust TEGH's claims? Clear measurements, a clear comparison and evidence they can check, with independent verification where the claim needs it. The class deck gives us the direction: move from traceability to carbon transparency. My closing point is simple. Do not ask the customer to trust a bigger promise. Give them a clearer reason to trust the claim.

Pronunciation

TEGH: ที อี จี เอช (tee ee jee aitch). Biogas: ไบโอแก๊ส. Traceability: trace-a-bil-i-ty. For EUDR, say each letter: E U D R. Say the full company name once only if needed.

2-minute feedback preparation

Can we call TEGH carbon negative?

The deck lists Carbon Negative Natural Rubber as an offer. That is not evidence that the whole company is net negative. We have not independently verified the product calculation.

What about the 321,452 figure?

Slide9 labels a comparison with industry standard but does not show the method or boundary. I leave it out of the slide rather than describe it as audited.

What evidence would you request?

My recommended checks: product and period, baseline, included emissions, method, independent verification, and a clear separation between reductions and offsets.

Five points to remember

1. Connect traceability to carbon accounting at the plantation.
2. Show the proof: Traceability, carbon accounting and clear claim boundaries
3. A carbon claim without clear evidence can damage trust.

4. Checkable data helps the business answer customer questions.
5. Credible product evidence can support customer qualification.

One-sentence close

Make the claim only as strong as the evidence.

Source notes and limits

The supplied Drive file is an 11-page image-based PDF, not a video. These drafts use Khun Nuch’s actual class deck, with page references. No spoken transcript or timestamps exist in the shared folders. Confirm the chosen example against what she said in class before presenting.

Class deck: Khun Nuch’s supplied PDF, PDF pages 3, 5, 6, 9. Exact deck wording:

> FROM TRACEABILITY TO CARBON TRANSPARENCY

Carbon Accounting Plantation and Carbon Negative Natural Rubber appear as offers on slide5, not independently verified outcome data. Slide9 claims 321,452 tonCO2e versus industry standard without a visible method/boundary. Do not repeat this as an audited total, annual footprint, offset or net-negative result. Company report p47 separately says total emissions rose in 2025; product intensity and total emissions are different measures.

Optional outside check: TEGH Sustainability Report 2025, printed pages 1, 47. Every 3Rs causal link and proposed management check is our analysis, not a verbatim claim by the speaker. Only the deck wording above is quoted. No talk timestamp is available.

TOPIC 6 | REHEARSAL NOTES

Customers & Revenue

> The supplied Drive file is an 11-page image-based PDF, not a video. These drafts use Khun Nuch’s actual class deck, with page references. No spoken transcript or timestamps exist in the shared folders. Confirm the chosen example against what she said in class before presenting.

Project the slide | PowerPoint | Slide PDF | Cheat card | Cheat PDF | Plain script | Timed audio rehearsal

420 spoken words. Target 140.0 words per minute for 3:00. Timing marks are targets; rehearse aloud. Measured local eSpeak NG rehearsal: 3:01 (180.872 seconds). This is synthetic audio, not Tarn speaking.

0:00–0:30 | Example

The example I chose is the customer value list in TEGH's class deck. It names reliable and traceable supply, a lower carbon footprint, risk management and compliance assurance. What stood out to me is that these are customer problems, not just environmental messages. The offer is not simply that TEGH is sustainable. It is that TEGH can help make the customer's purchase easier to justify and easier to manage.

0:30–1:30 | The 3Rs

For risk, customers face pressures around sourcing, carbon and compliance. TEGH's own pain point slide includes customer pressure and regulatory pressure. For resilience, a supplier that understands those needs can build a longer partnership and adapt its offer as requirements change. The deck explicitly connects its supply chain

with long term customer partnerships. For revenue, meeting buyer requirements can help a supplier compete for orders and remain useful to existing customers. That is the business logic I take from the slide. It is not evidence that sustainability alone caused a particular sales increase. I would not promise a premium just because a product has an ESG label. Sometimes the value is winning an order. Sometimes it is keeping an order that could otherwise be at risk. We should ask which customer decision the sustainability work actually changes, rather than assume every activity creates revenue.

1:30–2:30 | Key lesson

My key lesson is to sell the customer's problem solved, not an ESG label. In my own work, I would first ask the customer what decision is difficult. Is it checking the source? Getting reliable supply? Explaining a carbon claim? Then I would connect our offer to that specific problem and show the evidence behind it. Those are my suggested actions, not extra results reported by TEGH. I would also keep price and quality in the conversation. Sustainability does not make those basic requirements disappear. The stronger offer combines them with something the customer needs and can check. To test whether it works, I would track the reason for winning or losing an order, and ask existing customers what would make them stay. That would help separate a useful commercial offer from a message that people agree with but do not buy.

2:30–3:00 | Close and buffer

So my close is this: sustainability can support revenue when it creates value for a real buyer. TEGH's example is useful because the deck names that value in business terms, including reliability, traceability and compliance assurance. My lesson is not to add more green language to the sales pitch. It is to understand the customer's risk, solve it and make the proof easy to check.

Pronunciation

TEGH: ที อี จี เอช (tee ee jee aitch). Biogas: ไบโอแก๊ส. Traceability: trace-a-bil-i-ty. For EUDR, say each letter: E U D R. Say the full company name once only if needed.

2-minute feedback preparation

Does sustainability guarantee a higher price?

No. This deck does not prove a premium. It can support qualification, retention or differentiation, which need separate commercial measurement.

What about price-sensitive customers?

Price and quality still matter. My recommendation is to identify which sustainability requirements are essential to that buyer rather than assume all buyers value the same offer.

How would you prove revenue impact?

My proposed checks are order win/loss reasons, repeat orders and margin after compliance costs. They are not reported TEGH results.

Five points to remember

1. Offer reliable, traceable supply with lower carbon footprint and compliance assurance.
2. A safer purchase: Customer value named in the class deck, not a price premium

3. Customers face sourcing, carbon and compliance pressures.
4. Partnerships can align supply with changing buyer needs.
5. Meeting buyer requirements can help win and retain orders.

One-sentence close

Sell the customer’s problem solved, not an ESG label.

Source notes and limits

The supplied Drive file is an 11-page image-based PDF, not a video. These drafts use Khun Nuch’s actual class deck, with page references. No spoken transcript or timestamps exist in the shared folders. Confirm the chosen example against what she said in class before presenting.

Class deck: Khun Nuch’s supplied PDF, PDF pages 2, 4, 5, 6. Exact deck wording:

> Reliable & traceable supply

The customer-value list is a stated offer, not measured retention, revenue growth or a guaranteed premium. No customer win rate or retention percentage is available in this class deck.

Optional outside check: TEGH Sustainability Report 2025, printed pages 6, 13. Every 3Rs causal link and proposed management check is our analysis, not a verbatim claim by the speaker. Only the deck wording above is quoted. No talk timestamp is available.