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Overview of ISCC PLUS System Document Public Consultation

- ISCC multi stakeholder approach:
  - Promoting Public Consultation (PC) of ISCC PLUS system document
  - In events (e.g. ISCC stakeholder meetings, conferences), trainings, mailings (e.g. System Update), website
  - ISCC invited all interested parties to send comments and feedback
  - PC period of 60 days

- Very active participation. PC with highest number of comment received by ISCC so far

THANK YOU to all participants!
Six main topics for discussion can be identified

- ISCC PLUS material categories: bio-based/renewable/circular
- Provision of information regarding country of origin and type of raw material
- Mutual recognition of other certification schemes
- Credit transfer boundaries
- Certification of brand owners/licensing*
- Proportional attribution*

*Will be dealt with in separate presentations in this TC
### ISCC PLUS material categories: bio-based/ renewable / circular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Today</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bio-based</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin agricultural raw materials (e.g. corn)</td>
<td>Virgin agricultural raw materials (e.g. corn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio waste (e.g. UCO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circular</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossil waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed origin where bio content is unknown (e.g. mixed plastic waste)</td>
<td>Fossil-circular (e.g. MPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-biological origin using renewable energy sources (e.g. electricity)</td>
<td>Non-biological origin using renewable energy sources (e.g. electricity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provision of information regarding country of origin and type of raw material

**Today**
- Information on country of origin of first raw material (e.g. palm, UCO) mandatory to be provided through the entire supply chain
- Additional differentiation bio, circular, renewable
- **PROS**
  - Transparent, detailed and clear transfer of information
- **CONS**
  - Country of origin and type of feedstock increase effort to conduct mass balances
  - Unpractical for currently still rather small amounts of certified material
  - Some clients do not request this information

**Proposal**
- Should it be voluntary to provide this information throughout the supply chain?
- Differentiation bio, circular, renewable would still be mandatory
- **PROS**
  - Less effort and documentation
  - Provision of more information still possible on a voluntary basis
- **CONS**
  - Potential claims from NGOs, future clients or other stakeholders as lack of transparency and credibility
  - Less specific claims as lack of information (e.g. „deforestation-free palm“ not possible)
Mutual recognition of other certification schemes

- Under ISCC PLUS currently no other certification schemes are recognized
- Core components of credible certification scheme according to WWF Document “WWF Principles to actively endorse and recognize effective and credible standards and certification schemes“
  - Governance (e.g. global multi-stakeholder approach)
  - Monitoring and evaluation system (e.g. impact measurement based on ISEAL code procedures)
  - Accessible complaint and appeal mechanism
  - High requirements for ecological and social positive impacts
  - Transparent public reporting (e.g. audit procedures, certification reports)
  - Credible logos and claims guidelines (e.g. reflecting chosen chain of custody option)
- ISCC is heavily involved in lots of effort into harmonization of e.g. mass balance approach
- Thus supporting practical certification solutions and scaling up circular and bio economy
Credit transfer boundaries

**Today**

- Sites must be located within national borders, or within neighbouring countries (sharing an inland border)
- Many stakeholders do not want multi-site credit transfer and would like to exclude this via a respective information on sustainability declaration
- Global multi-site credit transfer may increase complexity of mass balance and respective verification for auditors
- It could also compromise credibility and trust in sustainability certification schemes by giving up physical link between input and output

**Request from PC**

- Global approach with no limitations
- Geographical approach
  - Allowing international transfer of credits to multi-country regions
  - Limitations to certain km ranges (e.g. 2000km – 5000 km)
Thanks for your attention!