

**Minutes T&T Teleconference, 13 March 2018****10.00-12.00 CET**

1. Approval agenda
2. Approval of T&T Minutes, 27 November 2017 (Appendix 1)
3. Secretariat Announcements
  - P&C Review
  - RSPO RED
  - EURT 2018
4. Updates on PalmTrace by UTZ / RA
5. Supply Chain Actors Selling RSPO CSPK Credits
6. Proposal on Food Service Companies Guidance Document (Appendix 2)
7. Next Meeting
8. AOB

- |                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1. Aditya Mishra             | WWF India (AD)                              |
| 2. Alasdair McGregor         | Exova BM Trada (AM)                         |
| 3. Alien ten Kleij           | Control Union Certification (AK)            |
| 4. Aminah Ang                | RSPO Secretariat (AA)                       |
| 5. Belinda Howell            | Retailers Palm Oil Group (BH)               |
| 6. Bob Norman                | AAK (BN)                                    |
| 7. Carmen Schmidt            | Control Union (CS)                          |
| 8. Caroline Westerik-Sikking | AAK (CW)                                    |
| 9. Christian Gradert         | Musim Mas (CG)                              |
| 10. Dan Strechay             | RSPO Secretariat (DS)                       |
| 11. Ed McPhillimy            | Oriflame (EM)                               |
| 12. Eddy Esselink            | MVO (chair - EE)                            |
| 13. Felix Konsemüller        | GFA Certification GmbH (FK)                 |
| 14. Helen Scholey            | Shell Oil Company (HS)                      |
| 15. Inke van der Sluijs      | RSPO Secretariat (IS)                       |
| 16. James de Caluwe          | Oleon (JC)                                  |
| 17. Jenny Walther-Thoss      | WWF (JW)                                    |
| 18. Joshua Lim               | Wilmar (JL)                                 |
| 19. Loic Fresne              | Oriflame (LF)                               |
| 20. Marieke Leegwater        | Solidaridad Network (ML)                    |
| 21. Paula den Hartog         | UTZ / RA (PH)                               |
| 22. Petra Meekers            | Musim Mas (PE)                              |
| 23. Premalatha Mogan         | RSPO Secretariat (minutes - PM)             |
| 24. Qua Kiat Seng            | ASEAN Oleochemical Manufacturers Group (QS) |
| 25. Rina Rahayu              | IOI Group (RR)                              |
| 26. Robbert Kessels          | SIPEF (RK)                                  |
| 27. Ronald van Marissing     | UTZ / RA (RM)                               |
| 28. Sietse Buisman           | Cargill (SB)                                |
| 29. Siti Rosemina Bux        | Emery Oleochemicals (SR)                    |

## 1. Approval agenda

EE opens the meeting and checks if the agenda can be approved. RK requested for a discussion on the supply chain actors selling RSPO CSPK credits. EE agreed to discuss this topic after the updates on PalmTrace by UTZ. The agenda was adapted accordingly.

## 2. Minutes

The T&T SC adopts the minutes (Appendix 1) without any changes.  
EE then went through each action points. Following are the updates;

Page 3: On the trends of CSPO and CSPK

Action Point: RSPO Secretariat to analyze and provide the trends for MB and IP over the years on volume of CSPO and CSPK in the next meeting.

PM updated that the Secretariat have already published a graph showing the sales of CSPO by supply chain modules on the RSPO website. The trends for MB and IP over the years for CSPO can be seen here for the year 2013 up to January 2018. However, the sales of CSPK volume by supply chain modules will be on the website next week.

EE requested PM to send the link for these graphs on the website together with the email.

Page 4: On numbers of new registrations in PalmTrace

Action Point: UTZ and RSPO Secretariat to check if the newly registered mills are MB certified and report back during the next telcon.

PH updated that she will go through this and provide update in her presentation later.

Page 4: On high volume of traced transactions

Action Point: UTZ to investigate the trace transactions in February.

PM clarified that the high traced volume for that particular month is not a mistake. The Secretariat found out that there is one particular member, who traced almost 900,000 MT in February and that the Secretariat cannot share the name of the member but they had to trace in one go because they had too much of stocks in their possession.

Page 4: On integration between PalmTrace, Salesforce and Website

Action Point: RSPO Secretariat will look at the potential risk and possible ways to avoid these certificates from being forged. The Secretariat will update the meeting and propose solutions if there are any in the next telcon.

PM updated the Meeting that the Secretariat looked at potential risk and found that the risk will still be there even if RSPO does not publish the certificates. At least by publishing these certificates, stakeholders can check on the details of the certificates that they have seen or received. If it is not on our website, then they can write to further check with Secretariat on the authenticity of the certificate. The certificates published is also useful for non-members to carry out checks before giving out tenders.

Page 5: On Mass Balance Multisite

Action Point: Comments on proposal to be shared to SB. Proponents to revisit the proposal based on the feedbacks received and table to the meeting with suggestions.

EE informed the Meeting that this is not in the agenda for today and the Secretariat will see if the proponents wants to bring it up in the next T&T.

Page 10: On PKO Strategy Update:

Action Point: The meeting hopes the PKO TF will be able to monitor and provide solutions to increase the production and uptake of certified PKO in the upcoming T&T meeting.

EE informed that this too is not in the agenda for today and hopefully, there will be some discuss on this in the coming T&T meeting.

Page 11: On proposal for the Food Service Companies

The meeting agreed for the Secretariat to draft and propose Module H in the next meeting.

Action Point: RSPO Secretariat to table the proposed Module H for Food Service Companies in the coming T&T meeting for consideration.

PM highlighted that this will be discussed in today's agenda.

Page 12: On AOB

The meeting agreed to provide timeline up to Q1 of 2018 for the Secretariat to compile data and update.

Action Point: RSPO Secretariat will be collecting these data for Q1 and present the analyzed data during the next T&T meeting.

PM informed the Meeting that there is some delay in analyzing the data. The Secretariat request for more time to carry out these analyses and present to members. Hopefully will be available in the next meeting.

BH brought to the attention of the Meeting that this discussion has been brought up in the BOG discussion last week and the BOG is really waiting in anticipation to receive these figures. These figures however, needs to be presented to the T&T before being presented to the BOG and therefore she hopes that there can be a sense of urgency, to prioritize this analysis and to present it to the BOG.

### **3. Announcements RSPO Secretariat**

See slides (RSPO Slides T&T meeting 130318.pdf)

PM introduces AA as the new RSPO Head of Certification replacing Jan van Driel.

AA updated the meeting on **RSPO P&C review;**

The Task Force (TF) on P&C review was held from 27 Feb to 1 March 2018, in Malaysia. There were side meetings of three sub-groups, held on 26 February - No deforestation, restructuring and smallholder interim group (SHIG). One of the key points that were discussed in the restructuring sub group was that there will be development of "core requirements" as part of the shared responsibility of the supply chain actors. The TF agreed that the "core requirements" will be applicable to everyone and will be part of the supply chain requirements. However, the TF has not finalized the core requirements. The TF also discussed on the comments received on the previous P&C draft. The timeline for the P&C review have to be adjusted. The fifth Task Force meeting will be taking place in May 2018 and the public consultation will be conducted in June/July 2018. Two months period has been accommodated for this purpose.

IS updated the meeting on **RSPO RED;**

RSPO Secretariat is still working on the renewal of approval from the EU Commission on the RSPO RED since beginning of 2017. It has been over a year now. We are now at the 4<sup>th</sup> round of approval and with issues on palm oil and the RSPO being a palm oil scheme, there is a delay. The current approval RSPO RED has lapsed since Nov 2017. Extension is possible for individual member state, in which RSPO has extended for the Netherlands members as the Dutch authorities has reached out to us. We have informed the TF to

raise to us if there are members of other states that also would like the Secretariat to apply for individual member state extension but we have not received such request. We are expecting that the final approval will be done in three months and we will be updated in the next meeting.

IS also updated the meeting on **EURT**;

The 6<sup>th</sup> EURT will be held from 25 to 26 June 2018 in Le Palais des Congrès de Paris, France. Since it is a sensitive market, the RSPO Secretariat is working together with the French Alliance of Sustainability to make sure we address it correctly. This year the EURT theme is “Inclusivity from production to consumption”. Now that the public consultation on the draft P&C has been postponed, the RSPO is taking opportunity to carry out the public consultation on 25 June, morning and later in the evening followed by two parallel workshops on Jurisdictional Approach (JA) & Human Right. The smallholder workshop will be combined with the public consultation of the P&C draft. Initially the physical T&T meeting was supposed to be held on the same day, 25 June but now with this new development and agenda, the Secretariat suggest that the next physical T&T meeting to be held as teleconference weeks before or after the EURT. HS requested if the Secretariat can try not to have meetings on Monday as it is not favorable for most countries?

IS clarified that the Secretariat are having time constraint and had no option to move it to any other days. On Wednesday, there is the RSPO BOG meeting and also the meeting of the Signatories of the Amsterdam Declaration with their stakeholders and she assumes that most of the T&T members will be invited for that, and therefore we can't do it on Wednesday and had to opt for the Monday.

QS questioned to get clarity that the T&T will not be having its physical meeting during EURT.

To which IS replied that the Secretariat is proposing not to have the T&T physical meeting during EURT as the schedule is too tight and to replace it with a teleconference. But if there is a better suggestion to have the physical meeting on some other event where most of us will be present, IS requested T&T members to suggest at the end of the meeting today when we set the next meeting date.

IS continued that on the main day of the EURT is on the 26 June. In the morning, there will be key notes, sessions on sustainable development goals, shared values for those involved in sustainable palm oil production, P&C review for all our stakeholders to be informed of the changes. In the afternoon, breakout sessions on different topics, one on human rights, a session organized by the French Alliance of Sustainability on biodiversity and great apes, session on zoos and one collaborative approach driving market demands and last session on reflections to way forward leading up to the Amsterdam Declaration. An announcement on the programme agenda will be made on the EURT website.

#### **4. Updates on PalmTrace by UTZ / RA**

See slides (RSPO PalmTrace T&T March 2018.pdf)

PH shared to the meeting all on-going developments that they have been working on with the RSPO Secretariat – in streamlining the traceability system, all memberships information on the Salesforce will be linked to the certified units stored in PalmTrace and then this will be pushed to the website with less errors and more efficiently. It is now at development stage and there will be testing before going into production level and once all this is done, UTZ/RA will provide training especially to CBs that will be using the platform.

PH then updated the meeting on the universal mills list as some T&T members have been asking for its availability. These mills are not certified and verification needs to be carried out with WRI and also double check with the list of conventional sources. Before sharing, there is a need to align with WRI on communication and this process will take time as this is the first time. PH apologises for the delay and assures T&T members that UTZ will share it once it is ready.

PH goes through the presentation on data from PalmTrace and provided an update on the action point to determine whether the volume for MB was increasing because there is an increase of MB mills.

PH agreed indeed, that was the reason as there was an increase in MB mills. Overall for the year 2017, there were 32 newly certified mills, with 23 mills being MB certified and only 8 mills as IP certified. So, the ratio of mills being MB certified was definitely higher and that caused the increase in MB volume.

EM questioned what is the difference in volume if there was a comparison with previous years' sales for Book and Claim?

IS responded that these are already available on our website (<https://rspo.org/about/impacts>). To view the sales, one has to go to the impacts of RSPO and you will be able to see sales volume by supply chain model per year and if you hover over the graph, you can see the Book and Claim volumes. IS further commented that the Secretariat saw an increase in 2015, decrease in 2016 and further decrease in 2017 and that we have not recovered from the move away from Book and Claim by certain companies.

ML brought to the attention of the meeting that in her past discussion with Ashwin, they have agreed to make the PalmTrace website more insightful on how to buy and what does it mean to buy to purchase Independent Smallholders credits, IS-CSPO and IS-CSPKO. She asked if this is still on the agenda for the Secretariat?

IS responded that the Secretariat is working internally to make this available on our RSPO website. That we have also launched a separate RSPO Credits website at RSPO RT in Bali but it wasn't properly advertised due to the natural crisis that took place during RT15. IS informed that she will share the link with ML and that she will request for the news to be published in the next RSPO eGazette (<http://rspocredits.org/>).

ML thanked IS and she further checks if her other discussion with Ashwin is also in the pipeline. The price and amount of credits is not published on the RSPO website since RSPO Credit trade is in PalmTrace. The Secretariat is looking into this. ML asks for a review of the sales and the business rules after one year. IS replied that this is not in our plan and thanked ML for flagging it. The Secretariat is not sure how to discuss issues on pricing because we had issues doing this on the past. IS suggested for ML and herself to have this discussion offline and see if they can build a story on fair price to inform buyers better.

EM highlighted to the Meeting that a month ago, a company made a press release that they are able to trace back all their palm oil transactions back to the source. He then asks PH if PalmTrace is now providing that platform for the company to trace all their transactions or they are making this claim on some other basis.

PH responded that in PalmTrace there is the conventional declarations tab with list of universal mills and their verified locations, whereby RSPO users can declare and identify their conventional suppliers for mass balance. UTZ / RA also uses this functionality in a service they provide to the company in identifying which mills are in their supply base and indeed the company then publishes these mills that we identify for them online.

EM further questions if UTZ/RA is already tracing sustainable palm oil, that means they can also trace unsustainable palm oil. He then mentioned that it will be interesting to see the percentage of sustainable versus unsustainable and requested if this can be shared?

PH clarifies that the declaration is not by volume, but it is for a period of six months and the percentage (of the total) of conventional material that originates from these mills. She then mentioned that she will look at it and see if they can share the information at an aggregated level.

RK then question if UTZ / RA is giving these free services to companies, to which PH responded, no.

RK raised his next question on what happens to the money gained from this exercise as the information used are from RSPO.

PH clarified that those are not RSPO information instead they dive into the company's supply chain to understand their sources. To which RK reminded that UTZ / RA is using information supplied by RSPO members in PalmTrace.

PH further clarified that it is only after getting approval from these members and it is only relevant to those that are in the said company's supply chain that they use the data. RK then highlighted to the meeting that the company declare almost 1,400 mills and that he was never asked to give any approval.

PH explains that they ask the company's suppliers to provide their sourcing information. Ultimately, the mills that show up in the list are declared by their suppliers.

RK then reminded the Secretariat to consider and look at whether this is a source of an income for the RSPO.

PH again clarified that this is an extra service they provide to this member to which RK again pointed out that the information is owned by the RSPO. To this PH clarified that the information comes from the suppliers themselves. The list in PalmTrace was created originally in a joint effort from RSPO and WRI. UTZ/RA further worked on verifying the mills they received from suppliers and on the list with WRI.

EE requested PH to share background how is the global oil mill list is developed? IS explains that it is not only about the list, but trade. UTZ works with the company's suppliers to get this information and it is the suppliers that is the intermediate between you, as a producer and the company as the consumer goods manufacturer. UTZ is getting all these information from the intermediate suppliers.

RK still believes that it is RSPO information and that RSPO should be paid and not a service provider. IS continued to explain that there are two separate things. For RSPO trades, we have PalmTrace and traceability. For RSPO members, they can trace back their RSPO trades by using PalmTrace and if it is conventional trades out of PalmTrace, members will not be able to trace back. It is the suppliers' information to share their own conventional trade and conventional sources in Mass Balance. That kind of information are not from RSPO. RSPO only holds information that traces back if it is sustainable.

EM agrees with RK that a few years back there was a resolution that RSPO needs a trace functionality to check whether the palm oil is sustainable or conventional. Since RSPO has mandate, the platform has been setup to accommodate it and now we just want to know whether this is beneficial to the RSPO and can we have a visibility of it at an aggregated level?

Since we were already on the topic, BN also questions PH about the universal list verified by WRI and her plans to publish it. If this is the same list that was given to the company, then why is it still not published here?

PH continued to clarify that there are a few separate things here. The first, indeed, a few years ago there was a resolution and RSPO has mandated that as part of the MB traceability it should be possible to also trace MB volume to conventional mills and a functionality was set up in PalmTrace to allow users to enter where they are sourcing their conventional sources. Members can already look at it in PalmTrace with

unique code, GPS coordinates and members can share this list with their clients. UTZ / RA says members to use this functionality as we know most companies will be interested to use this functionality in the traceability exercise. The conventional mill list came from various sources, from RSPO members whom want to contribute to it, from RSPO, from WRI whom have been working on this for years to get all the mills in the world and pinpoint with correct GPS coordinates. At the same time, UTZ / RA provide the company service to understand which mills are in their supply base and we look into their supply chain and gather the information from their suppliers and whom are they sourcing from and look at it in detail. We then share that separate list with the company and only this list was shared online publicly by them. EE requested the meeting members to end this discussion here as PH has already cleared where the universal mill list is developed from. If there are any other pending questions, please drop an email. The meeting also took note that UTZ / RA do provide extra services for companies with a fee if they would like to dive in better and understand their own supply chain.

CW alerted that she has one last point to highlight. Last week at the BOG meeting, it was noticed that the production of non-certified palm oil is growing faster than the production of certified palm oil. CW believes that it is important for us to look at the total number of mills that are certified against the total number of uncertified mills. I'm not sure if this is the responsibility of UTZ / the Secretariat but if this is happening it will be an issue for the RSPO.

Action Point: RSPO Secretariat and UTZ to look into the total number of mills that are certified and the total number of mills that are conventional.

EM brought up one last question to PH on her presentation. He questions on the largest group of license holder since he couldn't recognize the group. PH replied that it is the end buyers of palm products and that it consists of consumer goods manufacturer.

## **5. Supply Chain Actors Selling RSPO CSPK Credits**

RK raised his concerns on crushers selling CSPKO RSPO Credits. Only in the last meeting in Bali did he realize that a certified mill is not allowed to sell CSPKO credits, which was allowed before. He thinks that it has not been brought up before because there was a good physical demand for it. But then end of last year, a huge consumer goods manufacturer group moved away from purchasing physical CSPKO. He feels that it is totally wrong for growers as the producer CSPK, the mill is not able to sell the CSPK as credits and only the crusher is allowed to sell credits for CSPKO. He strongly states his opinion that this decision should have been approved by the T&T and that he has checked with several T&T members but none of them can recall of such discussion. Further digging he found out that it was discussed once in the IT WG on October 2015 followed by T&T in November 2015 but not mentioned in the minutes. And on 20 November, it was stated in the T&T SC that the BOG has approved it. RK continued that this should not have happened and it is completely incorrect. This procedure should have been brought up for discussion in the T&T SC and approved before being brought to the BOG.

EE recalls that there was some history related to this issue and it has been on the table of T&T SC. He requests IS to comment from her involvement.

RK informs that he has checked all the minutes and it has been discussed in the ITWG by Jan van Driel and that a colleague of his has brought up that this topic should not only be discussed in the ITWG but in T&T SC and that was not done, it was never brought to the T&T SC.

IS replies that she has not had the chance to check the minutes but she remembers this discussion vividly as there have been an extensive discussion in the ITWG and the T&T SC. She reminds that in one of the T&T physical meeting in 2016, the new PalmTrace video was played where it clearly shows that CSPK must be sold physically by the mill to the crusher and only the crusher is able to sell the CSPKO credits.

RK reiterates his statement that the concern is that it was approved by the BOG in 2015 and there was no discussion in the T&T SC to which IS commented that she will need to look through the minutes. She was sure that it was discussed in the ITWG and that they would have brought it for discussion in the T&T SC.

RK convinces that he had gone through all the minutes and there were no minutes on this discussion. Giving it is an important topic, it should have been discussed in the T&T SC. Even if it has been discussed in the ITWG and brought to the BOG for approval, he thinks that it is not the correct thing to do and it shows that certain powerful people in the Secretariat has choose to bypass the T&T SC and make their own decision.

IS reminded RK that in the ITWG, there was a representative from his organization to which RK agrees and points out that his colleague did mention that this should not be decided in the ITWG but needs to bring up to the T&T SC, this is stated in the minutes but it was not done.

IS then agrees that we should go back to the procedures and the Secretariat will look into the minutes.

RK then further commented that it not only procedure that he thinks is wrong, but also the fact that certified mills aren't allowed to sell CSPKO credits. It is a complete wrong thing to have been approved because a crusher is now bidding far less for physical CSPK than CSPKO Credits simply because they have the power. RK questions if that is the right thing to do? He has been looking at it for a couple of months now and he has not got any response from the T&T members.

EE assures RK that this is definitely something we need to dive in and he proposed for the Secretariat to go through the minutes and discussion that we had from 2015 and try to come up with procedure followed and what kind of actions and decisions has been taken and based on what we find, who made the decisions and how it is being made. If the findings make RK feels uncomfortable, then we should re-look at the decisions made.

RK commented that indeed he felt very uncomfortable as the decision was made without any discussion within the T&T SC and that the decisions were made single handedly.

IS clarifies the reasoning why only the crusher can sell the CSPKO credits because the crusher actually produces the CSPKO and CSPKE and not the mill. In the last meeting, the sales data on CSPKO was also presented and we observed that there was a huge demand for physical oil and we want to continue to stimulate the production of physical CSPKO.

RK replied that clearly, the Secretariat are not updated about the demand in 2017 and the current demand. The market has shown decreased demand for physical CSPKO and they have dropped it altogether. He then redirects the question back to T&T members whether they think that it is the right thing for a certified producer and its supply base not allowed to sell its product?

BN joins in to remind the T&T members that the RSPO should be supporting all the supply chain models and not only physical. He states his agreement with RK, that a certified mill under P&C should be allowed to sell their own CSPK as credits and again RSPO should be supporting all the supply chain models.

EE concludes the discussion that the T&T SC will have a review on what happened in the past and we will identify which group, who made that decision and at which specific date. He informed RK that his point is



well noted and if there is a need, they can opt to have this discussion offline and if there is a valid point then they can bring this back to the T&T SC. EE further commented that there is a possibility to review what was decided in the past if there is a need and taking into account any new developments. He then requested for the Secretariat to come up with an overview of the history.

Action Point: RSPO Secretariat to look into past minutes, history and report back to the T&T SC.

## **6. Proposal on Food Service Companies Guidance Document (Appendix 2)**

DS presented to the T&T SC the draft proposal on food service companies guidance document. He explained that in the last meeting this was presented as a Module but then we realize that Food Service is actually expansion of the multisite certification with centralized control over smaller sites spreading over the globe. The current draft (Appendix 2) is rather a Guidance Document for members that are within the Food Service Companies that are interested in getting themselves supply chain certified and for certification bodies to carry out audit against this food service companies.

AK questions if the Secretariat can expand this guidance document for group certification instead of limiting them just for single and multisite certification. To this DS replied that we did not include it and that is something we can look into and revise if needed. In group certification, we need to ensure that they can demonstrate that level of internal oversight, and he is not sure if the companies can do that. IS agrees with DS and further adds that we are referring to big companies and they will not be eligible to go for group certification. IS suggested that if there are such cases and we need to come up with such module then please write to us, IS and Premalatha, and we will look if this is possible.

AK understands that this document is for the big companies but she still thinks that there are smaller caterers or restaurants owners that also wants to be part of certification and if they don't do more than 500mt then they can form group membership. To this argument, IS agrees to make necessary amendment and include group certification.

AM questions the status of this document, whether it will be published as a guidance document supporting the standard or will it be integrated into the standard and carry out public consultation? To which DS responded that the intention is to publish it as a guidance document not integrated into the standard and in the future, we will look at possibility of revisiting this decision and incorporating the guidance document into the standards. For now, it is designed as a Guidance Document and not part of the RSPO Supply Chain Certification Standard, therefore the standard will not go through public consultation.

AM raises another question, in the case whereby this food service company includes large scope of business and if there are some unique circumstances that doesn't meet the definition stated in the guidance document, can we be flexible? Have this also agreed with the ASI?

IS thanked AM for this question and informed that we will involve ASI on this proposal as we have yet to do it. We will go through it with them. And for companies that does not meet the description, IS suggested AM to write to the Secretariat and we will review it case by case.

AM seeks for clarification if such cases arises and there are particular decision or changes made, then it will be shared among the CBs. IS replied that yes, the Secretariat will do so in the platform.

JL checks if the Secretariat have asked for feedback from McDonalds or big companies?

DS replies that yes; the Secretariat have done consultation with several large food service companies and visited corporate owned sites and learned from them. We got inputs from them and then we created this

guidance based on their SOPs. In fact, this was brought to us by them, we socialized with them before coming up with this guidance.

EE wraps up that there are two topics, to address on group certification and to get feedback from ASI. He then checks how should this document be treated from there? Do we bring it back to this table?

IS proposed for the Secretariat to make amendment on group certification, share it with ASI for review and then share it with T&T SC. Then the Secretariat will publish it on the RSPO website without going through another round of approval from the T&T SC unless there are lots of changes.

EE agrees and suggest for the Secretariat to inform the T&T SC if there are any respond from ASI and the wording of the group certification and it can be considered effective without another round of approval.

Action Point: RSPO Secretariat to make necessary insertion on group certification and share with ASI for their review. Once that is done and if no much changes, the guidance document can be made effective, there is no need for further approval from the T&T SC.

## **7. Next Meeting**

EE brings back the Meeting to earlier discussion that there will be a clash of dates with the already planned T&T SC physical meeting with the P&C public consultation during the EURT on 25 June 2018, therefore there is a proposal to cancel the T&T SC physical meeting and carry on only with a teleconference.

Action Point: RSPO Secretariat will send out a doodle poll to all T&T SC members to check on availability of the next meeting date.

## **8. AOB**

EM bids farewell as he will be leaving Oriflame and introduced Loic Fresne, his replacement from Oriflame in the T&T.

EE thanked EM for all his input given over the couple of years especially from downstream of the industry to the T&T SC and wished EM all the best on behalf of the T&T SC.

JL highlighted that since Daphne is no longer in the T&T, he has promised to bring up again to the meeting the topic on uptake figures. If Jan is already looking at it, then JL informs that he will withdraw this point but if not, he really would appreciate if this can be captured in the minute for an action.

EE ensures JL that this is already in the minutes as an action point.

Since Jan was mentioned, RK questions Jan's whereabouts and if he is still attached with the Secretariat?

IS responded and updated the meeting that Jan has retired from the RSPO Secretariat and Aminah who joined us today is his replacement as the Head of Certification. However, Jan will be involved in three projects via RSPO – data analysis / gathering on the uptake, P&C review and incorporating changes in the checklist and salesforce integration project.

RK then brings back the Meeting to the data that UTZ is providing as a service to a company and questioned how is RSPO protecting the data and who has the authority to use the data?

IS replies that the Secretariat only publishes aggregated volume from members in our website and the rest are kept confidential to which RK wonders if it is really confidential or it is being used by service provider to share data. RK reiterates that he doesn't feel there is a clear separation and since we are living in a data crunching environment, data hold a lot of value and he thinks RSPO should protect its data and if it being used at least make sure it has value to the RSPO.

IS ensures that the Secretariat will look into it and provide update on the service provider.

Action Point: RSPO Secretariat to look into documented statuses / contracts with UTZ and share it with the T&T SC.

BH brought up an issue related to moving members into group membership and there are delays for this groups to register their subsidiaries. She then questions who in RSPO is responsible in updating members? IS updates that the RSPO have a platform called MyRSPO that members can use to register their subsidiaries. This will be the fastest route to update their subsidiaries as they can log in and insert the list by themselves and the Secretariat will check on it afterwards. In the case the members send it to the membership helpdesk, then the Secretariat will go through the documents first before updating the website.

EE thanks the Meeting for joining the teleconference and closes the meeting officially.