



Soy Export Sustainability, LLC

Governance Structure

**SOYBEAN SUSTAINABILITY ASSURANCE
PROTOCOL/RENEWABLE ENERGY DIRECTIVE**

SSAP/RED

(‘SSAP/RED Protocol’)

Document to be used by SSAP/RED system users

November 2018

Table of Contents

Table of Contents **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

- 1. Introduction 3
- 2. Scope 3
- 3. Mission and role of SES 3
- 4. Self-Assessment 4
- 5. Verification Process 6
- 6. Scheme Documents and Public Consultation..... 8
- 7. Reporting to European Commission 9
- 8. Conflict Management 10
- 9. Non-conformities, observations and consequences 11
- 10. Transparency on other voluntary schemes participation by economic operators.....14
- 11. Approval procedure for 3rd Party Certification bodies 13

1. Introduction

Soy Export Sustainability, LLC ('SES') is a U.S. based standard setting organization operating and managing the Soybean Sustainability Assurance Protocol/RED ('SSAP/RED').

The SSAP/RED system covers the cultivation of soybeans in the U.S. and it is designed to be applied through the supply chain, from farmer to soy exporter tracking soybean volumes exchanged under the SSAP/RED. The certification scheme is based on the U.S. national version of the Soy Sustainability Assurance Protocol ('SSAP') which only applies for the US market, and therefore requires its users to be registered and fully compliant under the U.S. national SSAP scheme.

The SSAP/RED Protocol describes the regulations, processes and management practices that ensure sustainable soybean cultivation and is centered on four core pillars. The four pillars address biodiversity and carbon stock, land use, health and labor conditions, production control measures, environmental protection measures and continuous improvement of production practices.

SES is responsible for the development, monitoring, and revision of the SSAP/RED while following a continuous improvement process. SES has adopted the Credibility Principles of the ISEAL Alliance to ensure a consistent and reliable implementation of the SSAP/RED. This refers in particular to verification of data, planning and execution of audits, sampling methodology, monitoring and reporting.

Verification of compliance with the SSAP/RED requirements and the issuance of compliance certificates are performed by independent third-party Certification Bodies (CBs) recognized by SES. While compliance with U.S. national SSAP scheme is verified through the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) audit process, compliance with SSAP/RED is performed independently by the CBs and stands fully apart from the NRCS audit procedure.

2. Scope

This document is considered an implementation framework for the SSAP/RED intended to provide executional structure that promotes consistency for all activities related to the SSAP/RED. The governance structure applies to SES as an organization, and its position in relation with SSAP/RED users, recognized CBs and other stakeholders of SES.

This framework specifies the goal and internal structure of SES while defining the relationship between SES and its stakeholders.

3. Mission and role of SES

It is SES's aim to promote the sustainable production of U.S. soybeans while adhering to the rules and requirements of the European Union's **Renewable Energy Directive (RED)** and its pertaining regulations and communications. This will allow international actors of the biofuel industry who are subject to the European RED to also trade with soybeans produced in the U.S.

SES is an independent organization comprised of different stakeholders of the U.S. soy market, including soybean producers and processors, traders, logistics providers as well as NGOs and scientific research institutes. SES operates through a Board of Managers, (Board), an Advisory Committee (Committee) and a Secretary which is responsible for the day to day operations.

The Board consists of seven members with equal voting rights, representing both a diverse set of skills and experiences as well as the different stakeholders. The board is appointed for a period of three years. It is inter alia the responsibility of the Board to

- ensure the integrity of the SSAP/RED Protocol,
- monitor the implementation process,
- guide the continuous improvement process, and
- communicate with stakeholders, including the European Commission.

The Board has the freedom to delegate tasks to the Secretary.

The Management Board will appoint the Secretary. The secretary could be a comprised of different natural persons or be represented by one single person.

4. Self-Assessment and internal audit

Farmers

The SSAP/RED can only be applied by farmers participating in the U.S. national SSAP program and maintaining the qualification for the program, in the respective year of applying for the SSAP/RED.

The participating farmer will duly execute a self-assessment and fill in the self-declaration and present this document to the requesting First Gathering Point ('FGP'). Subsequently the Certification Body will verify whether the submitted data are correct or not. Therefore, a two staged process will apply.

Initially, the CB will conduct a risk assessment to evaluate the potential level of compliance, i.e. based on available information (satellite imagery starting 1 January 2008, USDA/NRCS data, other publicly available data etc.). The CB evaluates the risk that the farmers within the sourcing region of the FGP are not compliant with the requirements of the SSAP/RED.

As a second stage, based on the outcome of the risk assessment, the CB will decide on the sampling size and whether it is sufficient to conduct a remote verification or whether on site visits of soy farmers are required.

First Gathering Points (FGPs)

FGPs have the following obligations in order to prove they manage compliance to sustainability requirements of the SSAP/RED:

Before accepting a farmer as an SSAP/RED compliant supplier, the FGP shall check if the farmer provided a self-declaration, signed latest on the date of physical dispatch of the soy and confirm correctness of the declaration, for which satellite imagery starting 1 January 2008 from the USDA and NRCS may be used.

The FGP shall have a monitoring system in place that includes at least one self-assessment (internal audit) per year. This self-assessment shall check if the FGP, the elevators used and the supplying farmers all comply to the SSAP/RED Protocol. The assessment shall include:

Check on availability and validity of contracts and self-declarations;

Check on correct implementation of “SSAP RED Requirements for elevators operating under the scope of certified FGPs”

Check on availability, correctness and completeness of delivery notes and sustainability declarations, and if reported amounts on these two documents match with each other;

Check if mass-balance calculation rules are followed in line with chapter 3 of the protocol;

Check if all other requirements of their internal management system related to SSAP/RED compliance are implemented accordingly.

Traders

Traders have the following obligations in order to proof they manage compliance to sustainability requirements of the SSAP/RED:

- Before accepting a batch as SSAP/RED compliant the FGP shall check
 - if the supplier (FGP or other trader) had a valid SSAP/RED certificate on the date of physical dispatch of the soy;
 - if the delivery note and the sustainability declaration are available, correct and complete.
- The Trader shall have a monitoring system in place that includes at least one self-assessment (internal audit) per year. This self-assessment shall check if the trader and the storage locations used all comply to the SSAP/RED Protocol. The assessment shall include:
 - Check on availability and validity of contracts and sustainability declarations;
 - Check on availability, correctness and completeness of delivery notes and sustainability declarations, and if reported amounts on these two documents match with each other;
 - Check if mass-balance calculation rules are followed in line with chapter 3 of the protocol;
 - Check if all other requirements of their internal management system related to SSAP/RED compliance are implemented accordingly.

5. Verification Process

The verification process for compliance against the SSAP/RED is focused on companies that buy the soybeans from the farmers and facilitate the export to the EU. These companies are referred to as First Gathering Points (FGPs) and Traders. The procedures in this chapter apply to initial certification audits as well as annual recertification audits, which cover retrospective auditing of claims made under SSAP/RED. FGPs are responsible for compliance against the SSAP/RED Protocol, which includes coordinating the execution of farmers' self-assessment on sustainability requirements, receiving their signed self-declarations and checking on correctness of those. They shall also assure compliance with all the traceability and GHG emission requirements in the protocol. Compliance will be verified by an independent CB. The following steps are required:

- **Risk management/Limited assurance level**

As part of any certification audit, auditors must carry out a risk assessment at the supply chain parts subject to the audit. The result of the risk assessment will be reflected in the audit intensity and influences the sample size as described in the next section on execution of a risk assessment. It shall be assured that a "limited assurance level" is established during the audit, taking the nature and complexity of the activities of the Certified Main Entity. This implies a reduction of risk to an acceptable level as the basis for a negative form of expression by the auditor (Source: ISAE 3000).

- **Execution of a risk assessment prior to the audit, taking into account**

- Information on the location of the suppliers and regional compliance to SSAP/RED sustainability requirements, to be provided by the Certified Main Entity.
- Quality of the land-use data available.
- Consideration of farmers' potential weaknesses through the FGP internal monitoring process or the review of other relevant documented evidence (with consideration to the presence of protected areas designated under U.S. law, forested areas, wetlands or peatlands.
- If available: reports on previous verifications on SSAP/RED or other assessments related to RED compliance.
- Compliance level to all points listed in chapter 4 of the SSAP/RED Protocol with specific consideration given to identified non-compliance on previous audits.
- Other aspects, including: quality of the management system (structure and documentation, completeness of records), information relating to the FGP's internal audits, and other aspects as determined by the auditors.
- Clarity on ownership structure of participating elevators and implementation on relevant requirements, laid down in "**SSAP/RED Requirements for elevators operating under the scope of certified FGPs**"

The risk assessment shall result in a risk classification:

- **Reduced risk**

The Certified Main Entity has proven to have a supply base that has compliance with the SSAP/RED sustainability requirements, there is a reduced risk to find major or critical major non-conformities. Companies with reduced risk classification are likely to have a shorter onsite audit as the external auditor may rely more on the internal management system of the Certified Main Entity. Traceability data on deliveries from the farmers and inventories of elevators/storage locations may be cross-checked remotely when information can be provided in digital format effectively. In the FGP audit, a

square root (rounded up) of the farmers' documents need to be checked by the auditor (e.g. delivery documents and self-declarations). Furthermore, the auditor has to confirm that the FGP acceptance and monitoring process for its supplying farmers indeed assures farmer compliance. When necessary the auditor might perform parallel checks for additional assurance. The quantities listed on the documents need to be cross checked with the amount of soy actually supplied and the amount of soy in the mass balance documentation of the FGP. The same procedure applies for a square root (rounded up) of all elevator/storage locations that applies to all Certified Main Entities. The auditor needs to check their inventory lists for a cross check with mass balance books of the Certified Main Entity.

- **Medium risk**

In case the information provided by the Certified Main Entity prior to the audit is not fully clear or complete, or a limited number of points from chapter 4 of the SSAP/RED Protocol could not be checked prior to or at the moment of the onsite audit, this will result in a medium risk classification. The onsite audit of the Certified Main Entity is likely to take longer as clarification on incomplete information from the assessment have to be clarified. Chain of custody data on deliveries from the farmers and inventories of elevators/storage locations need to be cross-checked on-site on those locations on a sample basis but including a full month of deliveries. A square root (rounded up) of the farmers need to be visited to confirm compliance with the sustainability requirements and to cross-check feasibility of the amount of soy production area with delivery documents. Next to that, a cross-check has to be made between amounts of soy supplied versus amount of soy in the mass balance documentation of the FGP. A square root (rounded up) of all elevators need to be visited to confirm inventory administration as a cross check with mass balance books of the Certified Main Entity.

- **High risk**

In case the information provided by the Certified Main Entity prior to the audit is not clear or not available (timely), assurance of compliance to sustainability requirements is limited, and if multiple points of chapter 4 of the SSAP/RED Protocol could not be checked prior to or at the moment of the onsite audit, this will result in a high risk classification. Companies with high risk classification require an onsite audit at the operational location of the Certified Main Entity with a full document check. For companies already certified, documentation of all batches has to be checked, which very likely will result in a significantly longer audit process. Traceability data on deliveries from the farmers and inventories of elevators/storage locations need to be cross-checked on-site on those locations. A square root (rounded up) multiplied by a factor of at least 2 of the farmers need to be visited to confirm compliance with the sustainability requirements and to cross-check feasibility of the amount of soy production area with delivery documents. Next to that, a cross-check has to be made between amounts of soybean supplied versus amount of soybean in the mass balance documentation of the FGP. A square root multiplied by 2 (rounded up) of all elevators/storage locations need to be visited to confirm inventory administration as a cross check with mass balance books of the Certified Main Entity.

- **Sampling procedure**

For all above risk classifications, remote or onsite sampling in the supply chain is required to cross-check accuracy of documentation available at the Certified Main Entity. Depending on the risk classification, sampling can be done remote or onsite, and sample size is square root or square root multiplied by 2. Table 1 gives further clarification. When the results of the risk assessment result in compliance doubts for specific farmers or storage locations, samples shall be chosen with a risk based approach to be able to confirm compliance on soy production and/or handling from the specific sites where risks were identified. For the reduced risk classification, remote sampling can be selected randomly.

Table 1: Sample method per risk classification

Risk classification	Sample size locations	Remote or onsite	Sample size delivery documents
Reduced risk	Square root	Remote	Square root
Medium risk	Square root	Onsite	Square root + full month
High risk	Square root*2	Onsite	Full check of all documents

- **Execution of the audit**

After a successful initial audit, the Certified Main Entity receives a SSAP/RED scope certificate, which provides the right to export soy with a SSAP/RED compliant claim. The scope certificate will have a validity of one year. Annual re-certification audits will take place to monitor compliance with the SSAP/RED requirements. When compliance is proven, the certificate will be renewed for another year. Chapter 9 of this document gives further explanation in the case of occurrence of non-conformities. During the onsite audit at the Certified Main Entity, the auditor will check if the management system meets the requirements and all requirements are implemented correctly. The auditor needs at a minimum confirmation that all supplying farmers have a filed self-declaration, and that all applicable deliveries have sustainability documents. Checking completeness of the documents will be done based on the above explained sampling procedure.

- **Issuance of the SSAP/RED scope certificate**

After a successful audit and internal review process from the CB, a SSAP/RED scope certificate will be issued. The scope certificate gives the Certified Main Entity the possibility to make claims on outgoing soy batches from the validity start date of the certificate until the expiry date. This means the Certified Main Entity is enabled to issue a sustainability declaration to the receiver proving compliance with SSAP/RED and providing all relevant data for all SSAP/RED compliant batches.

6. Scheme Documents and Public Consultation

The SSAP/RED system consists of scheme documents that contain all general requirements, processes and guidelines applicable. The SSAP/RED Protocol is considered the backbone of these documents, explaining the requirements and processes such as dealing with sustainability requirements, GHG calculation and claims, compliance and non-conformities. The protocol is supported by the farmers' self-assessment document and the requirement overview of sustainability requirements for Certified Main Entities.

Abovementioned documents are subject to changes, that can be incorporated at any time. Changes will always be communicated to all stakeholders by the SES secretariat, which is also open for feedback. To be able to conduct the audits, the SSAP/RED Protocol is transformed in an audit procedure, consisting of a report template with a checklist where findings of compliance and non-compliance can be included. This checklist will be the base to be able to take certification decisions of scope certificates of Certified Main Entities.

7. Reporting to the European Commission

SES needs to provide annual reporting to the European Commission (EC) on its activities and the status of the SSAP/RED scheme. With reference to the RED 2009/28/EC requirements on this topic, reporting to the EC includes the following subjects:

- a) audit independence, modality and frequency, both in relation to what is stated on those aspects in the scheme documents, at the time the scheme concerned was approved by the Commission, and in relation to industry best practices;
- b) non-compliances that occurred, with specific reference to dealing with situations or allegations of serious fraud on the part of members of the scheme;
- c) the SSAP/RED scheme transparency and accessibility, the availability of translations in the applicable languages of the countries and regions from which soybeans originate, the accessibility of a list of certified operators and relevant certificates, and the accessibility of auditor reports;
- d) stakeholder involvement, with specific reference to their consultation prior to decision making during the drafting and reviewing of the scheme;
- e) the diligence of the scheme, particularly in light of rules on the accreditation, qualification and independence of auditors and relevant scheme bodies;
- f) market updates of the scheme, the amount of soybean certified, by U.S. state of origin and the number of participants;
- g) implementation of the scheme, with specific attention to methods to track the proofs of compliance with the sustainability criteria that the scheme gives to its stakeholders, such a system intended to serve as a means of preventing fraudulent activity, and how such activities are found, including data that quantifies cases of fraud and other critical findings.;
- h) criteria for the recognition or accreditation of CBs;
- i) rules on how the monitoring of the CBs is to be conducted;
- j) ways to facilitate or improve the promotion of best practices.

The information from all above points, together with all aspects of section 11e on internal monitoring is compiled into an annual monitoring report by SES. This annual report is submitted by 30 April each year covering the previous calendar year to the European Commission. The received market data will be submitted to the Commission in the format specified on the Commission Voluntary Scheme website (<https://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/topics/renewableenergy/biofuels/voluntary-schemes>).

8. Conflict Management

Attention for potential conflicts in a certification scheme is an important base for its reliability, continuous improvement mechanism and transparency to its users and stakeholders. Conflict Management should always be executed as close to the source of conflict as possible and with participation of the parties involved in and affected by the conflict. Before using this formal procedure, involved parties in a conflict should attempt to find a solution between each other by dialogue. If dialogue between the conflicting parties does not lead to a result, a formal procedure in accordance with the principles specified in this section can be used. Conflicts can occur on different levels, respectively between different stakeholders, organisations or individuals in relation to the procedures of the SSAP/RED voluntary scheme:

- Conflicts between a CB and SSAP/RED certificate holders should generally be resolved between the system user and the CB. (Such conflicts could occur when assessments results are, in the opinion of the CB, not resulting in granting a certificate, or result in withdrawing a certificate).
- Conflicts that arise from decisions and procedures of SES or parties/individuals appointed by SES.
- Conflicts brought up by stakeholders when they are affected by activities performed by SSAP/RED certificate holders, including those related to non-compliances with requirements and obligations of certificate holders, CBs, SES, or other related parties are resolved as described below.

Complaints and appeals will be filed with SES when they meet the following criteria:

- The reason for the complaint or appeal is a substantial and non-negligible risk of non-compliance of an SSAP/RED system user, recognised CB, or addresses gaps in the effectiveness of the SSAP Protocol and/or governance, with clear reference to the parties or documents involved.
- The text of the complaint or appeal is addressed to the SES Management Board and secretary.

Complaints submission and processing

- Complaints and appeals need to be submitted in writing addressing the SES secretariat and must contain basic information about the parties involved, including names of the organisations. In case the complaint is submitted anonymous a reasonable explanation should be given to justify this. The SES secretariat will acknowledge the complaint within 10 working days (e.g. confirming the complainant of reception of the complaint). The complaint resolution will be proposed within 60 working days after the acknowledgement date, unless the Secretariat has justified a longer assessment process (such as requesting response of other involved or affected parties).
- The complaint or appeal submitted must include documents that explain the situation and give supportive evidence in a way that any independent person or party can get a clear idea and form a judgement on the situation.
- Complaints and appeals are considered unacceptable under the provisions laid down in this chapter, if they meet one of the following criteria:

- The above requirements on form and content are not (fully) taken into account. For example, when complaints and appeals are not sufficiently supported by necessary evidence to get a clear idea and form a judgement on the situation.
- The complaint or appeal aims for adjustments of the recognised SSAP/RED Protocol and related documents.
- The reason for the complaint or appeal does not clearly relate to SES or to activities conducted within the SSAP/RED voluntary scheme.

Complaints follow-up

When complaints have met previously mentioned criteria, the SES secretariat will investigate the issue at hand, which includes hearing all parties involved (the party submitting the complaint and the party/parties causing or might have been affected by the complaint). After approval of the conclusions from the SES secretariat by the SES management board, the following aspects shall be taken into account:

- The parties causing the complaint to arise shall be informed on the complaint and the decision from SES on its resolution.
 - Resolutions of complaints addressing system users could be informing the CB to check the subject specifically in the upcoming recertification audit, or the need of an extra onsite surveillance audit to assure the integrity of the SSAP/RED system, or in severe cases, the suspension of their scope certificate.
 - Resolutions of complaints of a CB at least includes proof that the CB registers the complaint in their own complaint registration system and implements the resolution according to the decision of the SES board, or in severe cases, the suspension of the CB for executing SSAP/RED certification services.
- The party filing the complaint shall be informed on the investigation process and the conclusions from the SES management board.

9. Non-conformities, observations and consequences

9.1 Non-conformity grading

During the SSAP/RED verification process, findings of discrepancy with the requirements can be detected in four grades, as defined below:

- Observations are findings that do not affect the performance yet, but may result in errors that result in a future non-conformity. Follow up is not mandatory, but recommended;
- Minor non-conformities are findings that do not adversely affect the performance, reliability and integrity of compliance with SSAP/RED and which can be corrected without any effect on further incorrectness in the supply chain;
- Major non-conformities are findings that may significantly affect the performance, reliability and integrity of compliance with SSAP/RED, which can no longer be corrected after the assessment and are not critical. This would include errors in claims made on sustainability declarations, which therefore effect correctness of claims downstream in the supply chain without risk that non-sustainable material entered in the supply chain;
- Critical major non-conformities are findings that result in a critical aspects of the scheme, and a clear risk to the integrity of SSAP/RED and the core essence of its requirements that cannot be corrected. Examples could be violation with sustainability requirements of the land where the soy is produced, or proof of intentional fraud by the audited Certified Main Entity.

9.2 Non-conformity resolution timelines

- Observations do not necessarily need to be solved as there is no impact on performance detected yet.
- Minor non-conformities need to be resolved within 60 days or before expiry of the scope certificate (if that date is earlier) but without a detailed corrective and preventive action plan, as there was no effect on further incorrectness in the supply chain. Effectiveness on preventing the same error will be checked in next year's audit.
- Major non-conformities need to be resolved within 60 days or before expiry of the scope certificate (if that date is earlier) and including a detailed corrective and preventive action plan. The corrective action plan should include information of the mistake to all effected buyers of the sustainable material, who need to be informed in due course of the correction in order to maximise the possibilities to limit repetition of the mistake downstream in the supply chain. The preventive action plan should include measures to prevent the same error to happen again, for example by updating procedures, the management system and to provide further training of responsible staff. The auditor has to approve both corrective and preventive action plans and measures before the non-conformity can be closed. Depending on speed and accuracy of the resolution of the non-conformity by the Certified Main Entity, the closing decision might include an increase of the risk level for next recertification audit. Effectiveness on preventing the same error will be checked in the next recertification audit. When the system user does not close the non-conformity timely and still has a valid certificate after 60 days, the certificate will be suspended.
- After detecting a critical major non-conformity at a currently certified SSAP/RED system user, their certificate will be suspended until the non-conformity is closed, meaning the company cannot sell any other material with a SSAP/RED sustainability claim. Resolving critical non-conformities has to be done within 30 days after detection. For initial certification audits, critical major non-conformities related to sustainability requirements can only be solved by limiting the sourcing area (e.g. excluding non-compliant farmers). In case of detection of intentional fraud this will result in a suspension period of the company and in the worst case exclusion of further participation in the SSAP/RED scheme. The resolution process needs to be finished within 60 days, otherwise the certificate will be withdrawn with a suspension period. For all other aspects, the resolution procedure is the same as described for major non-conformities.

Certificates can only be issued after closure of all non-conformities. In case of major or critical major non-conformities occur with SSAP/RED system users that are already certified, a consequence could be to withdraw the scope certificate. Re-issuing scope certificates can only be done when the finding is fully solved and re-occurrence of the finding is proven to be prevented. In case of critical major non-conformities, a suspension period can be defined up to 5 years depending on severity of the findings. The suspension period is proposed by the CB to the SES secretariat, who makes the final decisions on the suspension period. Re-issuance of the scope certificate is only likely when uncompliant sourcing areas are excluded, or when clear measures have been taken to prevent fraudulence acting.

If an operator participates in EU recognized RED voluntary schemes and is found to be in major non-compliance, prior to re-certification, the SSAP/RED CB who detected these audit findings will share them with all other voluntary schemes in which the operator is participating.

10. Transparency on other voluntary scheme participation by economic operators

The SSAP/RED scheme recognizes importance of transparency with other RED voluntary schemes, to prevent system users from hopping between schemes with the aim to prevent detection or consequences of major and critical major non-conformities. Therefore, SSAP/RED system users are obliged to declare current and past participation in all other voluntary schemes and to share their most recent audit details. In case of failed audits with other schemes, a SSAP/RED scope certificate can only be issued after informing the relevant other voluntary schemes. More specific requirements can be found in chapter 4 of the SSAP/RED Protocol.

11. Approval procedure for 3rd Party Certification bodies

a. Requirements for CBs

The CB must ensure appropriate expertise and experience, both in the relevant fields of activity and for the types of auditing tasks to be executed for SSAP/RED. The CB must be independent of the activities being audited and free of any conflict of interest. To assure this, the CB should be conducting, for instance, in conformity with or according to the principles of:

- ISO/IEC 17065 establishing requirements for product certification or
- ISO/IEC 17021 establishing requirements for management system certification.
- Standard ISO 19011 establishing guidelines for quality and/or environmental management systems auditing.
- Standard ISO/IEC Guide 60 establishing good practices for conformity assessments.
- Standard ISO 14065 establishing requirements for greenhouse gas validation and verification bodies for use in accreditation or other forms of recognition.
- Standard ISO 14064-3 establishing specification with guidance for the validation and verification of greenhouse gas assertions.
- Other voluntary schemes based on RED 2009/28/EC.

Chapter 6 of this documents gives guidance to the CB on how to use the SSAP/RED system documents in assuring comprehensive audit execution.

b. Auditor requirements and competences

The CB must assure the following requirements to the auditors:

- Independence of the auditor towards the activities to be audited
- Assurance of absence of conflict of interest

The CB must maintain appropriate records of the education, training, skills and experience of each auditor that is working for the CB to execute assessments for SSAP/RED. Prior to the audits, the auditors will receive training specific to the requirements of the RED, and specific scheme requirements of the SSAP/RED Protocol. It is allowed to align these competence records with systems in place for other RED voluntary schemes. Training and competence records have to include:

- Proven understanding and experience in implementing the audit process as specified in ISO 19011;
- Proven training and experiences in agricultural and/or forestry related industries;
- Proven training and experience in auditing;
- Specific reference to training on (changes within) the SSAP/RED Protocol;

- All SSAP/RED auditors are required to adhere to specific auditor trainings and updates from SES.

c. Accreditation

Accreditation must be performed by a national accreditation body which is a member of the International Accreditation Forum (IAF), by the bodies referred to in Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No. 765/2008, by bodies having a bilateral agreement with the European co-operation for Accreditation (EA), or by an accreditation body which is a member (full or associate) of ISEAL.

To assure the competences of the CB as an organization, the recognition of a CB must be performed by a competent national public authority which are officially responsible for the recognition of CBs in the framework of the RED.

d. Recognition

CBs must be recognized by a competent national public authority which are officially responsible for the recognition of CBs in the framework of the Renewable Energy Directive 2009/28/EC amended through Directive (EU) 2015/1513 (RED) and Fuel Quality Directive 2009/30/EC amended through Directive (EU) 2015/1513 (FQD)² and according to the regulatory framework of the national transposition of the EU Directives in a Member State. Alternatively, to recognition by a competent national public authority, the CB must be accredited against ISO/IEC 17065 establishing requirements for bodies operating product certification systems, done by an accreditation body as per point (c).

The CB is obliged to inform SES immediately if the accreditation or recognition is suspended, withdrawn or terminated by the accreditation body or by the competent national public authority.

e. Review/Internal monitoring

SES takes responsibility to review and monitor the process and documents of SSAP/RED certificate holders and CBs executing the audits and issuing the certificates. The monitoring program consists of the following items:

- I. For each participating CB, SES is responsible to review the certification documents of the square root of audited companies on an annual basis. The review will include a consistency check on information in the certification documents, assuring that the answers given indeed confirm compliance of the corresponding requirement and a feasibility check (amount of hectares of soy in the scope vs. volume supplied). In case SES finds any issues or discrepancies, the reports will be pushed back to the CB, which will have to clarify within 15 working days. Delays in answering and/or providing incomplete answers in this timeframe can lead to suspension.
- II. CBs are required to issue an evaluation report to SES on an annual basis. This report needs to include an internal evaluation of the CB related to all audits and certification decision taken, and should include an overview of all the NCs given to new and existing SSAP/RED certificate holders. SES will use this report and overview of findings as a cross check with their own monitoring of the respective CB.
- III. Complaint registrations and information received from external parties (market data) concerning the integrity of the program is collected by SES.
- IV. SES reserves the right to take action in case monitoring obligations listed in above points I to III are not met. Consequently, SES reserves the right to include internal audits at

participating CBs and certificate holders. Results of such internal audits may, in case of proven poor performance, impact the certification status of certificate holders and the recognition status of the CB. SES reserves the right to suspend or exclude CBs or certificate holders in cases of proven violation of SSAP/RED requirements.

The information distilled from all above points shall be part of the annual monitoring report by SES. This annual report is submitted by 30 April each year covering the previous calendar year to the European Commission, as described in chapter 7.