



**Draft minutes of 1st meeting of the SCCS review Taskforce (TF), 25 April 2019
9:30 - 11:00h CET**

Agenda

1. Introductions team and TF members
2. Briefing on Term of Reference (ToR)
3. Code of Conduct (CoC)
4. Appointment of Chairperson
5. Discuss on timelines and meeting schedule
6. Feedback on first draft
7. AOB

Attendance

Name	Company	Presence
Diana Foong	AOMG	X
Daphne Hameeteman	Wilmar Europe Holdings B.V.	X
Christian Gradert	ICOF Europe GmbH	X
Rina Latar	IOI Global Services Sdn Bhd	X
Nepomuk Wahl	Olenex Holdings B.V.	X
Sherry Anne Lim	Wilmar Europe Holdings B.V.	
Laura de Gruijter	Bunge Limited	X
Eddy Esselink	MVO	X
Subramaniam Pitchay	Musim Mas Holdings Pte. Ltd.	
Gan Lian Tiong	Musim Mas Holdings Pte. Ltd.	
Aprilianto Hari Nugroho	Golden Agri-Resources	
Premalatha Mogan	Pacific Inter-Link Sdn. Bhd.	X
Tobias Zobel	BASF	
Jutta Stute	BASF	X
Robin Hoyanto	Golden Agri	X
Salman Balouch	UTZ/RA	X
Paula den Hartog	UTZ/RA	
Kendra Bishop	SCS	
Suly Ximena Tauta Escobar	Control Union	
Sjoerd Gudden	Control Union	
Renee Mellican	Tree House Foods	X
Mohan Balmoori	Tree House Foods	X
Debora van Boven-Flier	Nepcon	X
Aryo Gustomo	PT SGS Indonesia	
Inke van der Sluijs	RSPO Secretariat (IS)	X
Aminah Ang	RSPO Secretariat (AA)	X
Ruzita Abd Gani	RSPO secretariat (RG)	X
Wan Nur Aimy Nadiah	RSPO secretariat (AN)	X
Lilian Garcia Lledo	RSPO secretariat (LL-minutes)	X



Inke van der Sluijs (IS), Head of the European office of RSPO, is the moderator of this meeting via webex.

There is nothing to add to the agenda. Proceed with the given points.

1. Introductions team and TF members

IS starts the meeting welcoming the team and introducing the Secretariat team and volunteers to join the TF. The table of volunteers to join the TF per stakeholder category is shown in the slides. Individual presentations:

Oil palm grower category:

- ◆ Diane Foong, from AOMG. KL based, company with presence in Indonesia too. Oleochemical industry too. AOMG registered as a grower.
- ◆ Aprilianto Hari Nugroho. Not available. To brief later.
- ◆ Robin Hoyanto – Golde-Agri representative. Grower and also entities in oleochemical industry.

Social NGO category:

- ◆ Salman Balouch -UTZ-RA representative. Service provider of PalmTrace (PT), traceability services and managing the platform for RSPO.

Consumer Good Manufacturer (CGM) category:

- ◆ Mohan Balmoori. Tree house representative. US based. CGMs, brand owners, 3rd party manufacturers and retailers too.
- ◆ Renee Mellican - Tree house representative. US based. Director of regulatory affairs, it includes RSPO matters.

Certification body (CB) category:

It is not an official Stakeholder group, but CBs give good inputs and perspective.

- ◆ Kendra Bishop. Not available. To brief later.
- ◆ Suly Ximena Tauta Escobar. Not available. To brief later.
- ◆ Sjoerd Gudden. Not available. To brief later.
- ◆ Debora- Nepcon, NL based. Program manager RSPO SC.
- ◆ Aryo Gustomo. Not available. To brief later.

Palm oil processors and/or traders (P&T) category:

- ◆ Ahmad Suhaimi Mai. Not available. To brief later.
- ◆ Foo Siew Theng. Not available. To brief later.
- ◆ Daphne Hameeteman. Request of correcting the name of the Wilmar company representing. Wilmar Europe Holdings B.V. representative.
- ◆ Nepomuk Wahl. Olenex representative, Wilmar joint venture. Looking forward for simplification of the SCC.
- ◆ Sherry Anne Lim. Not available. To brief later.



- ◆ Christian Gradert. ICOF Europe representative. Marketing officer for Musim Mas Group. Sustainability system and products in EU.
- ◆ Rina Latar. IOI representative.
- ◆ Laura de Gruijter. Bunge representative. Sustainability Manager EU. Requests to add to the agenda a point to explain about the process, how the revision looks liked.
- ◆ Eddy Esselink. MVO representative, association of The Netherlands on oil and fats, Chairman of T&TSC.
- ◆ Subramaniam Pitchay. Not available. To brief later.
- ◆ Gan Lian Tiong. Not available. To brief later.
- ◆ Premalatha Mogan. Pacific Inter-link representative. Trading company. Sustainability Head, Group membership: refinery, manufactures, trading. Presence in Malaysia and Indonesia. Previous SCC manager of RSPO.
- ◆ Tobias Zobel. Not available. To brief later.
- ◆ Juta Stute- BASF representative. Ingredients personal care and nutritional.

No new people in the line.

1.a. Added point to the agenda: overview and background of the process.

IS informs that RSPO as ISEAL member has a CoC to comply with, which includes a revision of the Standard every 5years. SCC Standard was review in 2014 and minor language changes were done in 2017, but not proper review. Now, the revision has to happen for the Board of Governors (BoG) to approve it by Nov. In the presentation is shown the timeline for meetings and public consult and the deadline to send to the board.

A facilitator is requested for this SCC review process, but not decided yet who will be. However Secretariat decided to kick off this meeting and next meeting the facilitator will be available to work on meetings, minutes, everyone comments addressed, etc.

2. Briefing on Term of Reference (ToR)

IS explains that the ToRs are important to understand how this TF operates. Also to see which related docs to the standard are proposed to be include or kept separated.

In the ToRs we asked a balanced representation of Stakeholders groups. Unfortunately, it is not yet the case, as there is overrepresentation of P&T stakeholders, and also CBs.

The TF is missing representatives of the categories: banks and investors (even if they are not really involved), retailers and environmental NGO need, who need to be included. Please send to Secretariat any suggestion of people keen to join.

Therefore, P&T and CB representatives must have an internal discussion to align and decide on the 2 nominated per category for the voting process. We are thankful to have all interested parties in the calls and meetings, but for decision making it is needed specific voices, and these are the official representatives (2) per stakeholder group.

For the case of the CBs, 2 CBs to be nominated, 1 in EU and 1 in Asia.

Decision making is done by concensus.

Advice to read the ToR. ToRs to be sent after the call.

Action: Send the ToRs to TF members. (Secretariat)



Action: TF members to decide 2 nominated per stakeholder category for the voting process. (TF members)

3. Code of Conduct (CoC)

The CoC can be found in the Annex of the mentioned ToR. Secretariat to send to the members and TF members to send back to Ruzita and Lilian.

Action: Send the CoC to be signed by the TF members. (Secretariat and TF members)

4. Appointment of Chairperson

IS asks for a volunteer and explain the main tasks of the chairperson: chair the meetings (not more time consuming than attend the meeting itself), ensure all the stakeholders groups are consulted and taken into account when it comes about decision making.

No volunteers for now. Inke will continue up to moment someone volunteers to take this position. If interested, please write her/us.

Action: Volunteer for the Chairperson of the TF. (TF members)

5. Discuss on timelines and meeting schedule

IS explains the meetings schedule for 2019. It is difficult to make it suitable for all TF members due to the geographical differences. Nevertheless we are trying to fit in everyone's time zone as much as possible.

Next meetings, second SCC TF meeting on 23rd May at 9.30-11h CET, third one on 20th June time tbc. Then, there will be a sixty (60) days of online public consultation, from July to September, as well as a Face to Face (F2F) public consultation meeting tentative to happen the first week of July in Europe. The reason behind is that most of the certified companies are based in Europe. If other regions are interested, we could consider. The F2F consultation is 1 day session.

Then a fourth SCC TF meeting will take place on 26th September. Draft to be sent to BoG at the beginning of October.

No questions about the process timeline.

6. Feedback on first draft

We have shared draft that was internally reviewed. Mainly changes are on wording and suggestions as the ones shown in the slide "6. Feedback on the first draft".

We propose the integration of 3 documents:

- RSPO Rules for Physical Transition of Oleochemicals and its Derivatives (2016) as an annex. The FAQ section of the Rules will not be integrated, so still there will a separate document with it. Insights?

Juta Stute- BASF representative considers it a very good idea to include in the Standard to clarify how works for oleochemical producers and incorporate it in the Standard during the audit.

IS agrees as it seems that members and auditors are not aware of it.



Nepomuk Wahl-Olenex representative asks to which group is it applicable? IS reinforces the need to clarify the scope.

If only connected with the standard audience, it is a good idea to integrate it, if other actor to who the SCC does not apply to, not good idea to integrate it.

IS and AA agree in make clear the scope of these rules for physical transition. To include a statement as “if you are an Oleochemical industry, comply with Annex X...”

IS included the relevance of the buyers of credits. Need to make clear the target group of the annex.

Action: to make clear in the scope of the SCC document the target group for the Annex X “RSPO Rules for Physical Transition of Oleochemicals and its Derivatives”. (TF members, facilitator)

- RSPO Rules on Market Communications & Claims (2019). To incorporate only the relevant parts applicable to SCC certified members. Still to keep a separate document that applies to all RSPO members as it defines what they can and cannot claim. Form RSPO secretariat it makes sense to include the part applicable to SCC certified members as it seems that members and auditors are not aware and to clarify what they can claim when they do MB, SG and Trademark (TM). So does it make sense to you to include the relevant parts for SCC certified actors in Standard?

Daphne Hameeteman -Wilmar Europe representative does not agree as per the statement that most of P&T do not use that documents but the end producers and manufactures. Keep separate document and clearly make reference in the SCC Standard, if reference needed.

IS asks if the T&P do not claim to their customers and if the P&T know clearly what they can claim.

Laura de Gruijter- Bunge representative states that rules on communications are already specified in the Standard, as for example MB. Explicit reference rather than the inclusion as it will be confusing more than helping.

Out of the document for now but make it clearer in where the reference to rules on communications and claims is.

IS reinforces the concept that claim is not only the TM but any claim to the audience/customer: invoices, website, ACOP, etc. Make sure that members understand the document. Accepted that may not be the best practice to incorporate it in the Standard.

Premalatha Mogan - Pacific Inter-link representative suggests including it as an annex only to highlight the parts against which companies are audited.

It is concluded that is not incorporated in the document for now, but to include clearer references to the rules and work in the option of add only the relevant part for SCC actors it as an annex in the next draft.

Action: Include cleared references to the RSPO Rules on Market Communications & Claims (2019) and add as Annex the relevant part for the SCC actors. (TF members, facilitator)

- Guidance document for RSPO Supply Chain Certification of Food Service Companies (2018). To be integrated in the SCC Standard as an annex. Thoughts?



Daphne Hameeteman -Wilmar Europe representative asks about the scope of the doc. If it is just for end producers it is focused in downstream actors while they are placed upstream.

IS confirms is more downstream oriented and explain the background of it. The case of a restaurant with many different outlets worldwide who wants to make a claim. These restaurant outlets use ingredients as well as end products, so they act as retailers and CGMs. For these cases there is no need to audit every outlet but the central buying office and the procedures because the outlets do not buy themselves and they all comply with the central buying entity procedures. The SCC Standard applies but it has a different audit regime as is not feasible to have audit for all the sites

Premalatha Mogan - Pacific Inter-link representative agrees that the inclusion as an Annex will help.

Action: To add the guidance document for RSPO Supply Chain Certification of Food Service Companies (2018) as an annex in the next draft. (TF members, facilitator)

Nepomuk Wahl -Olenex representative asks about the scope of this review process. If these documents are incorporated, the review includes also the content, or just the addition as an annex?

IS and AA confirm that if a document is incorporated as an annex we should review it.

Nepomuk Wahl - Olenex representative suggests getting representatives of food service companies, not confident to review that document on their behalf. IS agrees with the point, need to be added in the TF.

AA adds just to clarify that these food service companies follow the same modules A,B C, the ICS and how the audit works.

Action: Include food service companies in the TF for the review of Guidance document for RSPO Supply Chain Certification of Food Service Companies (2018). (Secretariat)

- Clarification and inclusion of new definitions.

Please review the document and the suggestions and if questions come back to the Secretariat. The track changes are visible. Daphne Hameeteman -Wilmar Europe representative suggests to do the part of the definitions at the end of the process. IS agrees and mentions that this is a continuous process until the last draft.

- One year certificate instead of 5 years duration.

IS remarks that even if there is a 5 years certificate an annual surveillance audit is required to renew the licence. We received questions asking why there is a 5years certificate if it is not valid. Suggestion to change it to one year certificate.

Rina Latar - IOI representative agrees if not additional cost. IS wonder if the CBs charge less in ASA.

Debora- Nepcon representative states that was surprised about the license and certificates. Ask if it can be just one. IS agrees. The cost are CBs dependent. Agrees in the change.

Juta Stute- BASF representative states a practical problem with the validation of 1 year. To put the doc in the website every year and taking it some weeks, this is not convenient for the customers. Face that put a new document is delayed.

Mohan Balmoori -Tree house representative. Not support the idea of 1 year certificate. It will cause difficulties related to customer inquiries.



Daphne Hameeteman -Wilmar Europe representative explains the origin of it. Initially there was a certificate of 5 years, then the traceability system came, and it was decided for the SCC actors to perform an audit every year. Then, there is not added value of the 5 years certificate because if after one year a company does not comply with SCC Standard the license is not renewed and they can not sell and buy RSPO products anymore. The 5 years was inherit from the mill but not reason behind. Is comfortable but not value because still need annual compliance. Suggestion of get rid of the 5 years certificate and keep the 1 year license concept. The time to upload then needs to be improved, but this is independent to the SCC Standard.

Juta Stute- BASF representative requests to define better integration between audits and upload of the certificate in the website. If the certificate is not there batch is returned.

Daphne Hameeteman -Wilmar Europe states that now that is also the case, if a license expired and there is a gap in time between the expired and the renew license, the certificate does not cover that time gap, it is invalid for that period that non license is valid. Then, the license needs to be renewed right after the previous license expires.

Daphne repeats the same explanation given before. The 5 years certificate set for the P&C, which was first, was copied for the SCC actors. When the traceability system came in place there was an annual license subject to an annual audit with a 5 years certificate given in the initial certification, which is not efficient for SCC actors. Suggests to get rid off the 5 years duration certificate and keep 1 year document valid for SCC actors.

Daphne, Laura, Rina and Mohan agree given that the process is more speedy, synchronized and on time.

Daphne Hameeteman -Wilmar Europe representative states that the company have the certificate with the date of the license given by the CB, regardless is it published in the website, and this can be sent to the customer.

Juta Stute- BASF representative states that it is not practical, we have many clients and we can not send manually to all the clients.

Laura de Gruijter- Bunge representative states that 1 year license is agreed. The challenge is in the process behind approval as CB has to come back to RSPO/PalmTrace (PT), to get online certificate. Request to be done much faster.

AA agrees with integration and coordination of the system. The license request has to be submitted in PT 7 days before the due date of the current license, so the secretariat to review in 7d.

Daphne Hameeteman -Wilmar Europe representative asks if the Oleochemical companies can see the approval of license in PT. AA confirms that they receive an email confirmation from PT, and that oleochemical companies

may be not doing transactions in PT but they can enter PT.

Diana Fong -AOMG representative asks if with one 1 year validity the audits will be different, as now that initial and recertification should be different.

Daphne and Laura answer that in their experience all the years are the same.

AA conclude that the annual audit will have then the same requirements every time. If the TF agree on 1 year certificate validity, we can reword the name of the type of audit to initial and annual, for example.

Robin Hoyanto – Golde-Agri representative adds that for ISCC is based on annual audits, which is simpler. Share with customer yearly. Website RSPO needs to be accommodated for the year request.

AA ask for approval on change to 1 year certificate. No objections raised.

Action: to change to one year SCC certificate instead of 5 years duration.



Action: to improve the coordination between audit, CB license request, Secretariat approval and upload in the website (Secretariat)

IS asks Salman Balouch -UTZ-RA representative as service provider of PalmTrace if there is delay between PT and RSPO website, can members check the status of a supplier license themselves? Salman confirms that through the Members directory this can be checked. Every registered member in PT can check the status of a license, including the validity.

Nepomuk Wahl -Olenex representative asks how PT works in terms of actors who have access to the platform.

Salman Balouch -UTZ-RA representative replies that everyone can register and see the member directory, even if not certified.

Rest assured that all certified and licensed actors (traders and distributors who request a license) have access to PT. The rest, even if they do not need to be registered in PT, they can be and access to the directory.

Mohan Balmoori -Tree house representative asks if retailers are part of the SCC actors and able to get in PT because those are their customers. IS confirms that retailers are exempted from certification, but can register in PT for an account and be able to access the directory to check the status of the license. They will need to be explained. Mohan states that Customers will just ask for the certificate so they would have to send them every year anyway. IS states that the 5 years validity is convenient, but still your customer should realize that without annual surveillance the certificate is not valid.

Nepomuk Wahl - Olenex representative suggests to have a direct link to the member directory from RSPO website, or any other IT solution that simplifies it, as now there are different steps to check the status of a license.

Premalatha Mogan - Pacific Inter-link representative adds how the 1 year validity can affect the multi-site certification, as it is stated that in 5 years all sites must be audited.

AA replies that the formula almost the same, just every year sample different sites. And put a timeline to all the sites to be audited.

Action: For multisite certification, rewording of the formula of sites audited to get aligned with the 1 year certificate validity. (TF members, facilitator)

- Resolution GA15-6b: Requiring members involved in primary procurement to publish third-party supplying mills lists.

We will share the resolution with the TF members. Refineries aware of it.

IS explained that some text has been incorporate in the Standard to make this mandatory.

Better suggestion to incorporate this?

Laura de Gruijter- Bunge representative states that this is already done for almost all the refineries the publish of third-party supplying mills, the challenge is how to incorporated in the Standard.

Daphne Hameeteman -Wilmar Europe representative adds that it is done downstream, but the upstream side is missing. Thinking further than ourselves.

IS gives the background of it. It is known that most of the refineries already do this disclosure already, but the objective is that all the actors do it too. It is also looking for an alignment of mill names and coordinates, because it is important to be aligned and audited.

It is included as 5.4.6. in the draft of the Standard: *“For refineries/traders, the site shall maintain a list of all mills (certified and non-certified) supplying to their site in RSPO IT*



platform. The list shall be updated on six monthly basis and shall be made available in the company's website."

Proponents set 6 months basis because the settings in PT is already 6 months. Interested in the public declaration in the website, and auditors to verify that the information is correct.

Laura de Gruijter- Bunge representative states that this is a challenge if it is organize in the same way that the declaration of conventional sources. The timing is not in line with most of the refineries times to publish those mills. 6 months basis is not done by themselves, it is done quarterly basis. Also 1 month, after the expiration of the 6 months, is too short to declare the precious 6 months sources. Challenge the upload to the RSPO IT platform. They do not use PT as a source to publish. Use a separate system. Declaration of conventional mills is volunteer, most companies do not do it. Maybe to look first at that point before including more. Need to discuss further this in more details..

IS confirms that doing it more frequent is not a problem.

Daphne Hameeteman -Wilmar Europe representative adds they are open to publish in their website, but to integrate in PT is not an option because the current process that they have is more accurate that the PT, for conventional mills.

Robin Hoyanto – Golde-Agri representative states that it is a challenge to key in manually in the RSPO IT system all the information. Suggest to use the dashboard already used by the companies, how publish every semester or annually. Daphne agrees with the idea, to put the link in PT of each company to check directly company data.

Salman Balouch -UTZ-RA representative suggests how improve the process. If companies have their own inventory, they could extract and upload it in PT, given a template. It simplifies the process of uploading and also gives the feasibility to have that data in PT because we are verifying the mills for a reason. Assigning to the mills an unique ID.

Daphne: add that then the list have to be done every quarter. Example of them in Rotterdam: 800 mills, 4 refinery that has inter supply. Also the challenges on names, slighting different spellings that in PT that will cause an error. Rather refuse to put in PT because these administration challenges.

Nepomuk Wahl - Olenex representative adds that the resolution is not a chain of custody related resolution, and the review relates of chain of custody of RSPO, it does not fit. Suggests to put the resolution in somewhere else, like in the ACOP, instead of part of SCC, as it is not something that the auditor can effectively audit, not able to check.

IS proposes to have a separate call to discuss this with P&Ts, given all the comments given to find a more constructive way and approach.

Action: P&T stakeholders to have a separate discussion on the Resolution inclusion. (TF members)

- Registration of transactions timeline.

Rewording. Main objective to tight when the transactions have to be registered. When the license expires, there is the risk that transactions are registered once the license is renewed and this is a risk for the credibility of RSPO. When the SOP of a company states that they register their transaction on annual basis, is a risk for RSPO, so it is proposed monthly registration.

Salman Balouch -UTZ-RA representative adds that this is highly recommended. It will reduce the options of transactions in the system if the company is not doing it in a correct manner.



Rina Latar. IOI representative asks the reason of 1 month for transactions. IS replies that 1 month is a reasonable timeframe and not too loose to risk any transaction backdating.

Laura de Gruijter- Bunge representative adds that trace is done only if there is a request. So, if it has to be done in 1 month period, it has to be a trace number and trace request to do so.

Daphne Hameeteman -Wilmar Europe representative recommends for the trace transaction a period of 6 months. Customers come back late. Need some time before we can give the trace..

Laura de Gruijter- Bunge representative adds that also it needs to be added “upon request of the customer”

IS agrees to review the wording in the requirement.

Nepomuk Wahl - Olenex representative adds that trace is not really relevant for the chain of custody. Agrees to shorten the times for announcements but for trace and remove to keep them annual.

Action: review the wording of the trace transaction (TF members, facilitator)

- Sharing of trace document to become mandatory.

Daphne Hameeteman -Wilmar Europe representative states that the end producers need to be asked if they want this. We are willing to do it.

IS agrees and remarks the importance of having more representatives of CGM and retailers in the TF for these matters.

Action: to add CGM and retailers in the TF.

- CPO mills modules deleted, included in P&C 2018.

IS explains that the modules have been deleted because they have been integrated in P&C 2018.

AA adds that the SCC component in Principle 3 of the P&C 2018 needs to be checked also. Secretariat to prepare the draft and share with the TF members seeking also your comments.

Independent mills use Module A or C of the SCC Standard.

Proceed.

Action: To share the draft of the SCC component in Principle 3 of the P&C 2018 to be reviewed by the TF.

- Multi-site and Group Certification as annexes.

This section has been moved to the annexes, not controversial.

- Clarification of B&C for independent outgrowers.

It has been mentioned specifically as it is allowed and is happening. More clear visibility in graphics, etc.

Nepomuk Wahl - Olenex representative asks if they are SCC actors, if they play a role in SCCS. IS replied that they are P&C compliant. AA adds that they do not play a role except for selling their credits.



IS states that the requirements of B&C model are in the SCC Standard and that needs to be clear the requirements for the actors selling and buying credits in the B&C module, but they do not play a role in SCC.

Action: Clarify in the B&C module who this applies to as selling and buying parties.

- Clarification B&C audit required once reached 500 credits claimed.

It has been mentioned specifically that the company has to approach the CB once 500 credits are claimed by the buyer.

7. AOB

Nepomuk Wahl - Olenex representative and Daphne ask as a group how to work on the draft, edit or give comments separately?

IS explain that we will work using Google Drive document, making changes in track change. Put comments and suggestions in track changes, then we or facilitator need to be discussed, looking in those controversial, contradictory, etc. Agree?

Nepo: agree. Also from the TF members to share with the facilitator/secretariat main topics to be discussed in the group call. As today has been very effective.

IS: after call we will share docs mentioned: presentation, ToRs, CoC, and minutes.

Action: Share ppt shown in the meeting. (Secretariat)

Laura de Gruijter- Bunge representative volunteers to organize the discussion about the trace and resolution in the STH group and come back with their comment/suggestion.

Action: Call with P&T members to discuss the GA resolution and the trace requirement in the SCCS. (Laura de Gruijter- Bunge representative)

Diana: request to be categorized as “Affiliate membership”. IS mentions that it is not an stakeholder category. Diana is AOMG representative. To be changed to P&T category.

Action: Correct the TF members companies and category. (Secretariat)

IS thanks everyone to join and contribute to the TF. Anything to share, please contact us.

Summary of actions

- a) Action: Send the ToRs to TF members. (Secretariat)
- b) Action: TF members to decide 2 nominated per stakeholder category for the voting process. (TF members)
- c) Action: Send the CoC to be signed by the TF members. (Secretariat and TF members)
- d) Action: Volunteer for the Chairperson of the TF. (TF members)



- e) Action: to make clear in the scope of the SCC document the target group for the Annex X “RSPO Rules for Physical Transition of Oleochemicals and its Derivatives”. (TF members, facilitator)
- f) Action: Include cleared references to the RSPO Rules on Market Communications & Claims (2019) and add as Annex the relevant part for the SCC actors. (TF members, facilitator)
- g) Action: To add the guidance document for RSPO Supply Chain Certification of Food Service Companies (2018) as an annex in the next draft. (TF members, facilitator)
- h) Action: Include food service companies in the TF for the review of Guidance document for RSPO Supply Chain Certification of Food Service Companies (2018). (Secretariat)
- i) Action: to change to one year SCC certificate instead of 5 years duration.
- j) Action: to improve the coordination between audit, CB license request, Secretariat approval and upload in the website (Secretariat)
- k) Action: For multisite certification, rewording of the formula of sites audited to get aligned with the 1 year certificate validity. (TF members, facilitator)
- l) Action: P&T stakeholders to have a separate discussion on the Resolution inclusion. (TF members) SEE ACTION R
- m) Action: review the wording of the trace transaction (TF members, facilitator) SEE ACTION R
- n) Action: to add CGM and retailers in the TF.
- o) Action: To share the draft of the SCC component in Principle 3 of the P&C 2018 to be reviewed by the TF.
- p) Action: Clarify in the B&C module who this applies to as selling and buying parties.
- q) Action: Share ppt shown in the meeting. (Secretariat)
- r) Action: Call with P&T members to discuss the GA resolution and the trace requirement in the SCCS. (Laura de Gruijter- Bunge representative)
- s) Action: Correct the TF members companies and category. (Secretariat)

Note: Special thanks to the TF members in US, where the call took place at their night time.