



Verifier and Inspector Guidance Update

Update Number 16.0 – September 2022

Dear Verifiers and Inspectors,

This document summarizes the changes made in existing program documents.

Contents

1. C.A.F.E. Practices Verifier and Inspector Operations Manual, Version 5.5	1
2. C.A.F.E. Practices Verification Organization Approval Procedure, Version 2.4	4
3. C.A.F.E. Practices Verifier and Inspector Indicator Guidance Reference of Scorecard V3.4, Version 1.2... ..	6
4. C.A.F.E. Practices Field Notes of Scorecard V3.4, Version 1.2.	13
5. C.A.F.E. Practice Verifier Reporting System Verifier and Inspector User Manual, Version 3.0	13
6. C.A.F.E. Practices List of Indicators that Require Documentation of Scorecard V3.4, Version 1.1	13

1. C.A.F.E. Practices Verifier and Inspector Operations Manual, Version 5.5

Throughout the document the term “warehouse(s)” has been added where needed to provide more clarity on the increased alignment between dry mills and warehouses. References to in-harvest verifications have been deleted, as all supply chains now need to be verified in harvest, except for warehouse-only applications.

Any reference to “Draft client reports” was replaced with “Verification report.”

2.0 Reference Documents

Three documents were added/updated in the Program Document Overview:

2.9. **ZTCAP Manual Reference** was updated to indicate latest version of this document, which now explains the process for suppliers as well.

2.10. **Roles and Responsibilities of Observers in C.A.F.E. Practices Verifications and Audits:**

Provides observers with instructions and explanations around expected behavior during C.A.F.E. Practices Verifications and Audits.

2.11. **C.A.F.E. Practices Terms and Conditions:** Provides suppliers with the terms and conditions for supply chains to participate in the C.A.F.E. Practices program and receive validity.

3.0 C.A.F.E. Practices Program Terminology

The following terms were updated:

Standalone Mills: The definition was updated to include dried cherry.

Verification: The definition was updated to clarify that a ZTCAP check is a type of verification as well.

The following terms were added:

Application type: A supplier's application is classified as either "New" or "Re-verification" depending on the entities included in it and their history in the program.

New: An application in which less than 75% of farms have participated in the program previously.

Re-verification: An application in which 75% or more of farms have participated in the program previously.

Secondary Forest: A secondary forest (or second-growth forest) is a forest or woodland area in which significant human interventions were absent for a time period sufficient for mature forest ecosystem characteristics, such as complexity, structure and biological diversity, including soil characteristics, flora and fauna, to become established.

Work Plan: This definition was added to allow easier reference to the term "Work Plan" even though the definition is the same as the one for "Corrective Action Plan."

5.2.3 Entities to be verified. The section was re-organized to be more concise and reduce overlap with other sections of the document. Sampling requirements and in-harvest definitions for the individual entities have been deleted from this section.

It was also added that both mills and warehouses that have already been inspected during the previous or the same harvest period do not need to be re-inspected.

The definition of a warehouse was updated to: "Warehouses are to be included within the scope of C.A.F.E. Practices verifications as a distinct entity if they are in a separate location from a processor AND the entity employs workers different than those that work for the processor."

5.2.4 Timing and Frequency of Verifications, Validity of Supply Chains. This entire section was revised to align with the newest version of the Terms and Conditions, issued by Starbucks and its scope reduced to focus on information relevant to verifiers and inspectors.

5.2.5 Standards, Legal Norms and Document Translations (now "Standards and Document Translations"). The following sentence was deleted: "Should any of the C.A.F.E. Practice indicators contradict local and/or national laws, these laws will take precedence."

5.4 C.A.F.E. Practices Verification Record Keeping. This Section was removed from the Operations Manual and integrated into section 4.3 "Record Keeping" in the Approval Procedure.

6.2.7 Use of Interpreters. The term "translator" has been replaced with the term "interpreter", as this section refers to the need for oral translation.

6.2.9 Subcontracted Labor. This paragraph has been updated to align with the new definition of subcontracted labor as issued in VGU 15 which encompasses informal ways of subcontracting. It has also been clarified that verifiers are required to confirm the existence of a subcontracted workforce prior to the inspection and that documentation for Social Responsibility indicators needs to be available.

6.3 Conducting document review. A paragraph has been added to clarify that required documents include both informational documents and records and expectations for the review of documentation off and onsite.

6.4.1 Preparing the Verification and Inspection Plans. The table with recommendations for time spent on-site has been revised and further clarification added on factors that influence the appropriate time to be spent per entity.

6.4.2 Determining Harvest Requirements. This entire section was revised based on the new in-harvest requirements for all supply chains, except for warehouse-only applications.

6.4.3 Determining Sample Size. More guidance has been added for cases in which inspectors are not able to meet the required sample and what to do in cases where more entities were visited than required.

6.4.4.1 Determining Farms to Visit: Re-verifications. This paragraph has been updated to align with the new Terms and Conditions which define a “re-verification” when 75% or more of the farms included in the application have previously been included in the program. The program is also no longer referring to the legacy application as the “most recent one” anymore but extends to all previous applications.

6.4.6 Supply Chain Discrepancies. The following clarification was added: “Note that entities that have been inspected and have been evaluated with ZTNC(s) cannot be removed from the application through the supply chain discrepancy process and will need to have a full report written including the ZTNC(s) found.”

6.4.7 Farms included in Multiple Applications. The paragraph has been updated to clarify that inspections of farms should be completed while moving forward with reporting this instance as a discrepancy.

6.5.3 Roles and Responsibilities of Guides and Observers. The entire section has been revised and includes now several sub-sections to outline the expectations for inspectors in training; verifiers and lead inspectors conducting internal witness/shadow audits; interpreters; and representatives of inspected entities.

6.6.4 Volume Reporting and Confirmation. The first part of this section has been updated to reflect the changes in how volumes will be recorded for mills and warehouses.

6.6.7 Additional Coversheet Fields for Farms and Processors. The following sentences were deleted: “If handling or processing of additional products is encountered at a mill, verifiers should contact SCS immediately in case additional specific guidance is required.” “The VRS has been updated accordingly and includes these questions for applications claimed after July 18, 2019.”

6.7.2.4 Approach (for evaluating Social Responsibility Indicators). Additional guidance on how to best conduct worker interviews has been added.

6.7.3.3 Identifying High Risk Areas (for evaluating Environmental Leadership - Coffee Growing). The scope has been increased and the paragraph now includes taking a risk-based approach for farms with multiple plots.

6.7.4.1 Scope (of Environmental Leadership - Coffee Processing). Guidance has been provided on how to evaluate dry processors that operate without electrical energy.

An additional requirement has been added: “The scope of processors’ inspections includes the entire facility, even if a specific supply chain only uses part of the operation to process C.A.F.E. Practices coffee (e.g., a C.A.F.E. Practices supplier only requires the dry mill operations of a wet/dry mill).”

6.7.6 Closing Meeting. The requirement to conduct an additional check on the reported volumes was added to the Entity Closing Meeting and that a supply chain discrepancy may be required.

6.8.1. Early ZT notification. This paragraph has been revised to include more precise language. A clarification was added that for entities that are shared between multiple applications, the verifier must include the ZTNC evidence and submit an Early ZT Notification under the application where the entity report will be written.

6.8.3.1 Internal Review of Verification Reports. The following sentence was added: “If any clarifications or changes are needed in the entity report, the verifier or lead inspector shall return the report to the inspector to make the necessary modifications.”

6.8.3.2 Deadline for Completing Verification Reports. The following sentence was added: “Once an extension has been approved by SCS, verifiers must contact the client to notify them of the new reporting timeline and request that Starbucks be notified in the case that any shipments will be impacted by the new reporting timeline.”

7.1 Appeals Submitted During Early ZT Notification and Verification Report Review Period. The following additional item was added to the list of items to include in the appeal and dispute resolution form: “Date appeal response was sent to the client.”

7.3 Disputes between Verification Organizations and SCS. Information about appeals and disputes between verification organizations and SCS was removed from the Operations Manual and added to the Approval Procedure.

9.0 Zero Tolerance Corrective Action Plan (ZT-CAP). The scope of this section has been reduced as SCS will issue a separate document about the ZTCAP process soon.

Appendices:

- The Pre-Onsite Planning Checklist was updated to reflect program updates.
- The appendix that included the WHO list has been removed.
- The appendix listing “Evidence Requirements for Zero Tolerance Indicators” was updated to reflect the most recent version of the Indicator Guidance Reference document (V1.2 of Scorecard version 3.4).

2. C.A.F.E. Practices Verification Organization Approval Procedure, Version 2.4

3.2 Limited Approval. SCS will audit the first three verifications conducted by the verification organization under limited and/or provisional approval.

3.4 Full Approval. In order to receive and maintain full approval, organizations must demonstrate sufficient capacity.

3.6 New section: Audit Requirements.

SCS monitors and evaluates the work of approved verification organizations through three primary activities: office audits, field audits (check and shadow), and reviews of reports submitted in the VRS (VRS reviews). The first three verifications conducted by a newly approved verification organization will be audited by SCS through a field audit and/or VRS review. Thereafter, SCS conducts at a minimum four annual audits for each approved verification organization:

- Office audit
- Shadow audit

- Check audit
- VRS review (desk audit)

SCS may require additional or fewer audits, based on the following conditions:

- For verification organizations that work in multiple regions, SCS will conduct and track audits in each region separately, with the exception of office audits.
- The C.A.F.E. Practices program defines the following as distinct regions: Central America, South America, Brazil, Africa, and Asia.
- Few verifications may result in less audits.
- High risk, as established by SCS, will result in additional audits, or expanded audit scope. These criteria can include, but are not limited to:
- High numbers of new personnel, approval status extension, or scope expansion to a new country of operation.
- Sudden changes in the number or verifications conducted by a verification organization.
- Evidence that a verification organization raises unusually few ZTNCs over a length of time or number of verifications (e.g., in a certain region, or for certain types or sizes of supply chains, in comparison to SCS' risk assessments and expectations).
- Evidence that causes SCS to question the correctness of how a verification was conducted and the evidence reported.
- Major NCs issued to the verification organization.
- Changes in program requirements.
- Disputes or incidents that lead SCS to question an organization's performance.
- Negative publicity about an organization or supply chain that may be related to the relevant organization's accreditation.
- Stakeholder concerns.
- Direct request by Starbucks

3.8 Restriction. This section has been amplified to add detail on approval restriction. If SCS determines that a verification organization is unable to adequately manage the number of verifications contracted or determines that the issue is isolated to one country or inspector, SCS may limit the number of applications that an organization can verify and/or the regions where the organization is permitted to conduct verifications. The intent of limiting areas and/or volume of work is to allow a verification organization the opportunity to improve its procedures and resolve any major issues before committing to a larger amount of verification work in the program.

4.3 Record Keeping. This section was updated to integrate the information in the Record Keeping Section of the Operations Manual, which was removed. No major updates were made.

5.2 Organizational capacity. A minimum of one verifier and two inspectors per approved organization to receive limited and provisional approval. SCS requires an additional, secondary verifier to receive before full approval can be granted.

5.3 Quality Management Systems. An appeals and disputes procedure has been added to the minimum topics of a QMS.

5.5 Internal training. This section has been updated to clarify that internal introductory trainings are required for all new inspectors and verifiers, as well as internal trainings based on the most recent

SCS-led annual training. To maintain adequate qualifications within the organization, SCS now requires organizations to implement an annual internal training plan, including a review of the inspector's field performances and report writing, for new and continuing inspectors, in order to identify any weaknesses and aspects to be improved in the organization's C.A.F.E. Practices personnel. The results of the organization's annual audits by SCS and other feedback from SCS shall be addressed during such trainings. In addition, as part of an organization's quality monitoring and evaluation system, each approved inspector in the program must undergo an internal observation by a verifier or lead inspector during a verification for at least one full day of inspections, once every three years.

5.6 SCS-Led Trainings. This section notes that verifiers are responsible for ensuring the ongoing training for inspectors, including on C.A.F.E. Practices standards updates. For additional information related to trainings, please see the C.A.F.E. Practices Auditing and Training Manual.

5.8 Adherence to Deadlines. This section now includes a reference to extension requests for non-conformity responses, and a reference to the Operations Manual for additional information on extension requests.

5.9 Appeals and disputes resolution. Verification organization's written procedures must also include timelines for the resolution of complaints and appeals.

6.1 Requirements for verifiers. a minimum of two verifiers are required to receive and maintain full approval.

6.5 SCS Approval of New Personnel for Existing Approved Verification Organizations. This section has been modified to:

- Clarify that inspectors in training must sign a confidentiality agreement before observing verifications,
- Clarify that approval requirements apply for both inspectors and verifiers, and
- Add a timeline for submitting an internal observation report and the aspects the report should include as a minimum.

6.6 New Section: SCS Approval of New Personnel for Newly Approved Verification Organizations. This section specifies the requirements of approving personnel for new verification organizations.

7.2 Conflict of Interest. If suppliers request the services of the verification organization for pre-verification assessment or trainings on the program, verification organizations must refer them to Starbucks' Farmer Support Center.

8.0 Appeals and Disputes Between Verification Organizations and SCS. Information about appeals and disputes between verification organizations and SCS was removed from the Operations Manual and added to the Approval Procedure.

3. C.A.F.E. Practices Verifier and Inspector Indicator Guidance Reference of Scorecard V3.4, Version 1.2

An updated version of the C.A.F.E. Practices Verifier and Inspector Indicator Guidance Reference of Scorecard V3.4 has been released and includes the following updates:

A new chapter in the document on General Guidance was added after the introduction, providing an overview of guidance that is applicable to various indicators. The information provided in this section has been removed from individual indicators.

Social Responsibility

SR-HP1.17	<u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Labor intermediaries are only used where legally permissible. Legal status of the intermediary can be demonstrated at the time of inspection. All necessary documentation from the labor intermediary is made available at the time of the inspection to support evaluation of relevant Social Responsibility indicators.
------------------	---

Updated Minimum evidence required: Confirmation of whether all documentation *related to the legal status of the intermediary* was provided, and if not, which documentation was missing.

SR-HP2.2	Workers are able to talk about workplace grievances with management or employer with no fear of reprisal.
-----------------	---

New Guidance: Grievances include issues with other workers, issues related to work environment or conditions, among others.

SR-HP2.4	A workers' association or committee has been formed and governed by the employees, independent of management influence except where prohibited by law.
-----------------	--

Deleted guidance: [...] or a specific number is required by law to form any type of workers' association.

SR-HP4.1	<u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Employer does not directly or indirectly employ any persons who are under the age of 14 or the legal working age (ILO Conventions 10 and 138).
-----------------	--

New or updated minimum evidence required for Non-Comply evaluation:

- Age(s) of worker(s), *or children assisting family members*, under 14 or the legal working age;
- Reference to the legal working age; (no change)
- Activities conducted by workers under 14 or legal working age; (no change)
- Schedule of when children under 14 or the legal working age work and/or are present at the entity; (no change)
- If applicable, payment system for work done by children under 14 or legal working age, including whether payment is direct to the child or indirect (e.g., through parents or other person or organization);
- Information about whether children are accompanied by a parent or legal guardian;
- When applicable, the school calendar including holidays in the country of inspection;
- Any additional circumstances as to why the children are working and what the circumstances are (e.g., whether work is voluntary, how many hours children work, how long has this been occurring); and,
- Any additional references to relevant national legislation.

Updated Guidance: For additional guidance, please review the C.A.F.E. Practices Manual and Guidance on the Evaluation of Child Labor (SR-HP 4.1).

SR-HP4.2	<u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Employment of authorized minors of age 14 or older follows all legal requirements, including, but not limited to, work hours, wages, education, working conditions, and does not conflict with or limit their access to education (ILO Convention 10).
-----------------	---

New Guidance: Since SR-HP4.1 covers the general aspect of minors working, if there is no employment of *authorized* minors, the correct evaluation for SR-HP4.2 is Not Applicable.

SR-HP4.3	<u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Employer enforces a policy of prohibiting discrimination on the basis of gender, race, ethnicity, age or religion (ILO Convention 111). <i>Written policy required for large/medium farms, mills, and warehouses with more than 5 employees.</i>
-----------------	---

Added minimum evidence required: Confirmation that work environment is absent of any type of discrimination

New Guidance: [...] however workers also need to confirm during interviews that the policy is practiced and respected

SR-HP4.4	<u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Employer enforces a policy that prohibits the use of forced, bonded, indentured, convict or trafficked labor (ILO Conventions 29, 97, 105 and 143). <i>Written policy required for large/medium farms, mills, and warehouses with more than 5 employees.</i>
-----------------	---

New Requirement: Confirmation of absence of forced, bonded, indentured, convict or trafficked labor.

New Guidance: [...] however workers also need to confirm during interviews that the policy is practiced and respected.

Indications for forced labor:

- Abuse of vulnerability
- Restriction of movement
- Physical and sexual violence
- Retention of identity papers
- Debt bondage
- Excessive overtime
- Deception
- Isolation
- Intimidation and threats
- Withholding wages
- Abusive living and working conditions

SR-WC1.2	Employer provides workers with convenient access to safe drinking water.
-----------------	--

New Question: In cases where workers bring their own water to the entity, is it simply because of personal preference?

SR-WC1.5	Garbage from housing and facilities provided by employer is removed either to a municipal waste dump or to a waste site located at least 25 meters from any worker housing.
-----------------	---

New Guidance: Examples for facilities include warehouses, mills, offices, stores, etc.

SR-WC2.4	<u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Employer supports local schools with either in-kind donations or financial support
-----------------	--

New Guidance: In the case of on-time donations, this needs to have occurred after the previous inspection of the entity, where applicable.

SR-WC3.3	<u>EXTRA POINT:</u> If there is convenient and accessible medical care , employer supports these facilities with either in-kind donations or financial support.
-----------------	--

New Guidance: In the case of one-time donations, this needs to have occurred after the previous inspection of the entity, where applicable.

SR-WC4.1	Employer provides appropriate Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) to all applicable workers at no cost. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For farms: respirators with filters, goggles, rubber boots, water-proof gloves, impermeable clothing • For dry mills: goggles, ear plugs, masks
-----------------	--

New Guidance: Where available, Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) should also be reviewed. [...] If the PPE is provided by the cooperative, for the farm the indicator should be evaluated as Comply.

SR-MS1.1	<u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Entity provides transparency into their operations, policies, processes, and relevant records to Starbucks or its designated third party. Payroll records and time cards provided by management are true and accurate.
-----------------	---

Deleted Guidance: SR-MS1.1 may be sensitive to report during the closing meeting. In some exceptional cases, the inspector may not want to report this as a finding in the closing meeting. If a potential Not Comply evaluation for SR-MS1.1 is evaluated during an inspection, verification organizations are requested to contact SCS prior to the closing meeting. If this is not possible due to connectivity issues, inspectors are advised to use their best judgement, and notify SCS as soon as possible.

SR-MS1.2	<u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Money and/or gifts of any type are not offered to Starbucks or its designated third party.
-----------------	---

New Guidance: Inspectors should be aware of the local culture and recognize the difference between a bribe and a symbolic gesture of hospitality and follow guidance given by their organizations regarding anti-corruption practices and bribery.

Coffee Processing

CP-MT1.2	<u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Mill has a system and is tracking C.A.F.E. Practices coffee from initial purchase or intake through final sale or output.
-----------------	---

New Minimum evidence required:

- Description of intake procedure
- Comparison of information recorded at the intake with the information given at the sampled farms and whether it aligns
- For supply chains in which a collector or other intermediary is used to aggregate coffee from producers prior to delivering to the mill, information about their traceability practices should be included in the evidence. For smallholder networks, this step in the supply chain should be evaluated within the scope of PS-MT1.1.

CP-RM1.4	<u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Milling operation demonstrates innovation in energy sourcing through either the on-site production of renewable energy or purchase of offsets, or both (e.g., solar, wind, water, geothermal, biomass) beyond any locally available conventional source.
-----------------	---

New Guidance: If the entity produces renewable energy on site, inspectors should see the installation. [...] Offset purchase must be supported through documentation, *but documentation is not required for onsite production.*

CP-MT1.1	<u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Entity has a system and is tracking C.A.F.E. Practices coffee from initial purchase through point of export.
-----------------	--

New Minimum evidence required:

- Description of intake procedure
- For supply chains in which a collector or other intermediary is used to aggregate coffee from producers prior to delivering to the mill, information about their traceability practices should be included in the evidence. For smallholder networks, this step in the supply chain should be evaluated within the scope of PS-MT1.1.

Deleted evidence required: “Information about ALL entities in the C.A.F.E. Practices supply chain, including farms and mills, as well as any other entity that handles coffee (e.g., collectors or farmer delegates that may collect coffee from farms and deliver it to wet mills)”

Updated Guidance: To assess the tracking indicators, there should be documented ~~and verbal evidence~~ and/or visual evidence of this type of the tracking system, *and the entity representative should be able to verbally explain the tracking process system.* If an inspector sees receiving documents that show coffee coming from different wet mills or farms into the mill being inspected, but does not see that the mill tracks the lots from C.A.F.E. Practices verified and unverified sources uniquely (e.g., through lot numbers or physical segregation), then either a supply chain discrepancy procedure should be followed to report that either a farm or wet mill is potentially missing from the application ~~and/or~~ OR the entity should be given a Not Comply evaluation

Producer Support Organization

PS-MT1.2	<u>ZERO TOLERANCE:</u> Organization has an annually updated list of producers participating in the C.A.F.E. Practices program.
-----------------	---

New Guidance: Differences between the **full** cooperative list and list of C.A.F.E. Practices members does not mean automatic Not Comply – *but the application must contain all C.A.F.E. Practices members of the cooperative.* The cooperative should ~~also~~ have a specific C.A.F.E. Practices *producer* list and understand who is participating. If it is different than the *general* cooperative list, the cooperative should be tracking this coffee separately through collection and milling.

The list of producers participating in the program should be updated before the start of the verification *and, at a minimum, annually afterwards.* If the list of producers is not accurate *at the time of the verification* and it was confirmed that it was not updated *before the application was submitted to Starbucks (referencing the date of the First Response Letter if needed),* then this indicator should be evaluated as Not Comply.

PS-MT1.5	Producer Support Organization keeps C.A.F.E. Practices farm verification reports from previous verifications documenting status of compliance of each farm accompanied by a farm map and description.
-----------------	---

Deleted Guidance: [...] since no inspection reports would be available for review. In the course of a re-verification of a supply chain, inspectors should observe that the PSO maintains past inspection reports on file.

PS-SR2.3	Producer Support Organization has developed and is implementing its soil and/or foliar analysis plan every two years.
-----------------	---

New Guidance: This indicator can only be evaluated as Comply if PS-SR1.1 and/or PS-SR1.2 are evaluated as Comply, and the PSO's soil management plan is updated every other year based on new analysis results.

PS-CB3.1	Producer Support Organization has facilitated an assessment of and discussion with the farmer groups about areas of high conservation and ecological value (e.g., areas with significant intact forest, primary forest canopy cover, rare flora and fauna communities, important habitat elements, critical watershed values, importance to local communities' traditional cultural identity).
-----------------	--

Updated Guidance: The intent of this indicator is to assign *the* PSO the role of assessing areas of high conservation *and* ecological value *in the region of supported farmers* and increase producer awareness of *areas of high conservation surrounding their farms.*

PS-EM1.2	Producer Support Organization keeps records of all purchases, distribution or sales of pesticides, including: dates, product name, product formulation, active ingredients, quantity, purchase and sales prices.
-----------------	--

New Guidance: Product formulation refers to its form: liquid, powder, gas. Records should include the producers who receive these products and inspectors should confirm this during their interviews with them.

PS-EM1.6	If coffee pest (e.g., coffee berry borer) infestation exists, Producer Support Organization facilitates the distribution of biological control agents or traps for more than 10% of affected producers in network.
PS-EM1.7	If coffee pest (e.g., coffee berry borer) infestation exists, Producer Support Organization facilitates the distribution of biological control agents or traps for more than 25% of affected producers in network.
PS-EM1.8	<u>EXTRA POINT:</u> If coffee pest (e.g., coffee berry borer) infestation exists, the Producer Support Organization facilitates the distribution of biological control agents or traps for more than 50% of affected producers in network.

New Guidance: These indicators may be evaluated as not applicable if the PSO and producers deem the infestation below the economic threshold where it must be targeted. This evaluation must be confirmed during producer interviews, and it is enough for a few producers to have a significant level of infestation to make these indicators applicable.

There needs to be documented proof that the PSO actually provided the biological control to the farmers, or that the farmers actually use the discount provided. If the PSO provides the discount but no one uses it, this indicator cannot be evaluated as Comply. The documentation should support the calculation of percentage of producers receiving biological control agents or traps.

PS-EM2.2	Producer Support Organization implements a farm monitoring program to track farm activities and improvements in C.A.F.E. Practices for more than 5% of the producers in its network.
PS-EM2.3	Producer Support Organization implements a farm monitoring program to track farm activities and improvements in C.A.F.E. Practices for more than 15% of the producers in its network.
PS-EM2.4	<u>EXTRA POINT:</u> Producer Support Organization implements a farm monitoring program to track farm activities and improvements in C.A.F.E. Practices for more than 25% of the producers in its network.

New Guidance: This monitoring program needs to track all subject areas related to the program: Social Responsibility, Environmental Leadership, and Economic Accountability.

PS-EM2.5	Producer Support Organization holds at least one annual planning meeting(s) to develop a written annual work plan which details which C.A.F.E. Practices activities are to be done in the coming year.
-----------------	--

New Guidance: For new supply chains: the PSO should have had a meeting and developed a plan related to C.A.F.E. Practices to prepare for the verification, in order for this indicator to be evaluated as Comply.

PS-EM2.6	Producer Support Organization has created a complete set of materials used for training network members on: health and safety including use of personal protective equipment (PPE); shade management; integrated pest control and disease management including correct pesticide container disposal; pruning, weeding and general agricultural practices; coffee processing and drying.
-----------------	---

New Guidance: If the PSO did not create these materials themselves but has compiled a complete set of materials from an external source, the indicator can be evaluated as Comply.

PS-CC1.1	Producer Support Organization keeps written records of climate change risks and impacts on coffee production (e.g., change in temperature, rainfall).
-----------------	---

New Guidance: The PSO should be able to demonstrate that they are tracking changes in climatic conditions (e.g., temperature, rainfall, length of rainy season, etc.) and recording how such changes have been or may affect their production in the future.

4. C.A.F.E. Practices Field Notes of Scorecard V3.4, Version 1.2.

The following updates to the Field Notes have been made:

- Coversheet changes in the field notes include:
 - Title change: i.e., Field Notes for Producer Support Organizations (PSO) – **Version 1.2**
 - Number of **smallholder** farms supported (PSO only)
 - New coffee varieties were added: Marsellesa, centroamerica, milenio
 - RA/UTZ as a certification was combined
- Closing and Opening Meeting checklists now include ZTCAP procedure and Volume Review.
- Indicators that now require documentation now include the “Document required” sentence in the evidence box and changes to applicability of indicators were updated as well.
- Field notes for mills and warehouses now include a new table to record volumes.

5. C.A.F.E. Practice Verifier Reporting System Verifier and Inspector User Manual, Version 3.0

This document has been updated according to the most recent VRS version, including the updated inspector interface. The document includes the most recent procedures related to VRS actions, including relevant screenshots and step by step instructions.

6. C.A.F.E. Practices List of Indicators that Require Documentation of Scorecard V3.4, Version 1.1

The document was updated to note that documentation is required for a Comply evaluation for the following indicators:

- CG-CB1.3
- PS-SR2.3
- PS-EM1.6 – 1.8

There was also an error removed, noting that documentation is not required for CP-EC1.3 for Medium and Large Farms.