

Certification Evaluation Report

Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials

Agrisoma Biosciences Inc.

SCS Certificate Code-SCS-RSB/PC-0026

Suite 300, 200 Rue Montcalm
Gatineau, QC, J8Y 3B5 Canada
Mejda B. Lortie, PhD
<http://agrisoma.com/>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
November 16, 2016	November 15, 2021

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
September 26-29, 2016
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
November 17, 2016

SCS Contact:

Neil Mendenhall | Manager
Environmental Certification Services
+1.510.452.8018
nmendenhall@scsglobalservices.com

SCS global
SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA
+1.510.452.8000 main | +1.510.452.8001 fax
www.SCSglobalServices.com

FOREWORD

SCS Global Services (SCS) is a certification body accredited by the Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials (RSB) to conduct evaluations of biofuel operators. Under the RSB/SCS certification system, participating operators meeting international standards of biofuel production can be certified as “sustainable,” thereby permitting the Operator’s use of the RSB endorsement and logo in the marketplace subject to regular RSB/SCS oversight.

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams of natural resource specialists and other experts all over the world to conduct evaluations of biofuel operations. SCS evaluation teams collect and analyze written materials, conduct interviews with Participating Operator’s staff and key stakeholders, and complete field and office audits of the operation(s) identified in the certification scope. Upon completion of the fact-finding phase of all evaluations, SCS teams determine compliance to the RSB Principles and Criteria.

Please Note: An RSB certificate itself does not constitute evidence that a particular product supplied by the certificate holder is certified to RSB standards. Products offered, shipped or sold by the certificate holder can only be considered covered by the scope of this certificate when the required RSB claim is clearly stated on-product. For more information about the RSB, visit their website at www.rsb.org.

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs, and policies applied to the Participating Operator, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the RSB Participating Operators Database (<http://rsb.org/certification/participating-operators/>). Section B contains more detailed results and information for use by the Participating Operator.

CONTENTS

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	4
1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION.....	4
1.1 Operator Information	4
1.1.1 Name and Contact Information	4
1.1.2 Additional Parties Involved (Can be moved to appendix if certain information is confidential)	4
1.2 Scope of Certificate.....	4
1.3 Standards Used	9
1.3.1 Applicable RSB-Accredited Standards.....	9
2.0 EVALUATION PLANNING & PROCESS.....	10
2.1 Documentation Submitted by Operator	10
2.2 Audit Type and Determination	10
2.3 Audit Team.....	10
2.3.1 Determination of Audit Team.....	10
2.3.2 Audit Team.....	11
2.4 Evaluation Schedule and Extent of Audit.....	11
2.4.1 Determination of Extent of Audit	11
2.4.2 Evaluation Itinerary and Activities	12
2.5 Evaluation of Management System	14
2.5.1 Methodology and Strategies Employed.....	14
2.5.2 Capacity of the participating operator to implement its management systems.....	14
2.5.3 Evaluation of RSB compliance claims and use of RSB trademarks	15
2.6 Stakeholder Consultation Process	15
2.6.1 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable	16
3.0 RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS.....	17
4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION	17
4.1 Equivalence between the Audit Team Evaluation and the Operator Self Evaluation	17
4.2 Process of Determining Compliance.....	18
4.2.1 Structure of Standard and Degrees of Non-Compliance	18

4.2.2 Interpretations of Major and Minor Non-compliances	18
4.2.3 Major Non-compliances.....	18
4.2.4 Non-compliances and Current Status	19
5.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION.....	21

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Operator Information

1.1.1 Name and Contact Information

Organization name	Agrisoma Biosciences Inc.		
Operator Number	9239		
Contact person	Mejda Lortie, PhD		
Address	Suite 300	Telephone	(613) 491-2170
	200 Rue Montcalm	Fax	(819) 205-9675
	Gatineau, QC, J8Y 3B5	e-mail	mlortie@agrisoma.com
	Canada	Website	agrisoma.com

1.1.2 Additional Parties Involved

Organization name	Canterra Seeds		
Contact person	Duane Ransome		
Address	Canterra Seeds	Telephone	(204) 988-9762
	201—1475 Chevrier Blvd	Fax	
	Winnipeg, MB	e-mail	d.ransome@canterra.com
		Website	http://canterra.com/
Nature of Involvement:			
Certified seed producer.			

Organization name	Paterson Grain and PGF Biofuels, both divisions of Paterson Global Foods		
Contact person	Jonathan Patterson		
Address	Paterson Global Foods	Telephone	(204) 956-2090
	22nd Floor - 333 Main Street	Fax	(204) 926-9572
	Winnipeg, MB,	e-mail	jpatterson@pgfi.ca
	Canada R3C 4E2	Website	http://www.patersonglobalfoods.com/

Nature of Involvement:			
PGF Biofuels is responsible for producer contracting and logistics programs to end use customers. Paterson Grain provides crop grading services.			

1.2 Scope of Certificate

Please choose one:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RSB EU RED	<input type="checkbox"/> RSB Global
The scope assessment agrees with the scope under which the operator applied	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If no, please explain:		
<i>Note: If the scope is different, please contact SCS.</i>		

SITE INFORMATION FOR AGRICULTURAL SITES OR FEEDSTOCK PRODUCTION SITES	
Site Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry <input type="checkbox"/> Biomass Production <input type="checkbox"/> Other:
Feedstock Produced:	Brassica carinata
Current Land Use	Prior Land Use
<input type="checkbox"/> Biomass Production	<input type="checkbox"/> Biomass Production
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
Current Employment on Site	Prior Employment on Site
<input type="checkbox"/> Negligible	<input type="checkbox"/> Negligible
<input type="checkbox"/> Local Average	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Average
<input type="checkbox"/> Above Local Average	<input type="checkbox"/> Above Local Average
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full
Total workers covered by scope of certification:	Approximately 100, not including approximately 30 seasonal.
Owned/Controlled by:	Family farms
Location/City:	Alabama: Brewton, Columbia, Foley, Montgomery Florida: Altha, Jasper, Jay, Jennings, Lake City, Madison, Walnut Hill, Wellborne

Total farms included in certification scope	13			
Geographic location:	Farm/Entity	Location (Lat. - Long.)	Area (ha)	Area Planted (ha)
	Bell	31.210258 – 87.28048 and 31.20249 – -87.276686	14.16	1.62 11.74
	Davis	30.787605 – -87.516362 and 30.851864 – -87.46516 and 30.839587 – -87.469021	1667.31	54.63 13.35 96.72
	Dollar	30.98963 – -84.902034	1618.75	50.59
	Forrester	30.914058 – -85.027917 and 30.898589 – -85.038336 and 30.912492 – -85.060119 and 30.913473 – -85.062164 and 30.912819 – -85.068052 and 30.905974 – -85.04591 and 30.906807 – -85.047726	728.44	20.23 60.70 76.89 26.30 24.28 28.33 16.19

	Godwin	30.893856 – -87.210336	384.45	23.88
	Goodson	31.241459 – -85.169086	32.37	18.21
	Griffiths	30.405513 – -87.805938 and 30.451625 – -87.699704	1133.12	81.75 12.14
	Jones	30.428239 – -83.161432 and 30.461818 – -83.098066 and 30.486881 – -83.088836	404.69	21.85 17.00 17.40
	Murphy	30.507802 – -83.165321 and 30.521629 – -83.17751 and 30.52913 – -83.125494 and 30.527251 – -83.112002	1214.06	64.75 17.00 28.33 12.14
	Rogers (Madison Farm)	30.360962 – -83.490933 and 30.400166 – -83.475924 and 30.458435 – -83.445629 and 30.457423 –	647.50	30.35 14.16 30.35 10.52

		-83.430019 and 30.596876 – -83.49456 and 30.595989 – -83.498263 and 30.618784 – -83.469917		49.37
	Stansel	30.012928 – -82.941286	404.69	25.50
	Tillman	30.573396 – -85.110663	343.98	8.09
	Wynn	30.504888 -83.127354	364.22	16.19
Totals			8,957.73	828.62
Total Planted Area (ha) in RSB scope	828.62 ha			
Total Area (ha) of participating farms	8,957.73 ha			
Total area set aside for conservation purposes (ha) by participating farms	386.08 ha			
Annual Feedstock Production Volume from planted area in scope (please specify unit of measurement)	1,009.07 metric tons			
Amount sold as RSB certified in last calendar year (tons)	0			

INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	
Name	1. Dollar Farm Products, Bainbridge, GA 2. Escambia Grain Corp., Walnut Hill, FL 3. Columbia Grain & Ingredients, Lake City, FL
Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Milling and/or Fermentation <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetable oil Extraction <input type="checkbox"/> Biofuel Production and/or Distribution <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Storage or Distribution <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please explain here:

Location/City	See list above
Geographic location (<i>Latitude & Longitude</i>)	Columbia Grain & Ingredients: 30.220281 – -82.753267 Dollar Farm Products: 30.914494 – -84.587961 Escambia Grain Corp.: 30.887908 – -87.492411
Number of processing steps	1 (storage)
Annual throughput of previous 12 months	
Feedstock Input (Metric Ton)	1,009.07 metric tons
Final/Primary Product Output (Metric Ton)	993.93 metric tons
Intermediate/by-product Output (Metric Ton)	0
% output yield compared to input material (total output/ total input)	98.5% (1.5% lost in transfers)
Amount sold as RSB certified (tons)	0
Description of Production/Processing Activities: Storage and distribution	

1.3 Standards Used

1.3.1 Applicable RSB-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
RSB-STD-11-001-01-001 Consolidated RSB EU RED Principles & Criteria	2.1	May 2011
RSB-STD-11-001-20-001 EU RED Chain of Custody	3.5	August 2016
RSB-STD-11-001-30-001 EU RED Participating Operators	3.2	June 2016
RSB-STD-11-001-60-001 EU RED Standard for Risk Management	3.2	August 2016
RSB-PRO-11-001-50-001 EU RED Procedure on communication and claims	3.2	August 2016
RSB-STD-11-001 Standard for EU market access	3.0	August 2016

All standards employed are available on the websites of the Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials (<http://rsb.org/sustainability/rsb-sustainability-standards/>). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services (<http://www.scsglobalservices.com/>).

2.0 EVALUATION PLANNING & PROCESS

2.1 Documentation Submitted by Operator

RSB Application	RSB Screening Tool
RSB Questionnaire for Self-Risk Assessment	Environmental and Social Management Plan
Agrisoma Procedures on Communications and Claims	BioGrace-I Excel tool - version 4d_13F_with transport_final
Carinata Product Transfer Information (template)	Grain Handling Agreement
Carinata Production Contract	Agrisoma Chain of Custody Procedures

2.2 Audit Type and Determination

The following table summarizes the audit types for RSB Audits:

	Low risk class	Medium risk class	High risk class
Certificate validity	5 years	3 years	2 year
Main audit	Every 5 years	Every 3 years	Every 2 year
Surveillance audit	Annual	Annual	Annual

2.3 Audit Team

2.3.1 Determination of Audit Team

- Desk audits shall always be conducted by at minimum one (1) international lead auditor. The lead auditor appointed may include additional auditors and/or technical experts in the audit team if this is required by the extent of the audit.
- Field audits shall always be led by one (1) international lead auditor.
- The lead auditor appointed shall include at minimum one (1) local auditor in the audit team. The lead auditor appointed may include additional auditors and/or technical experts in the audit team if this is required by the extent of the audit.
- For field audits of participating operators in High Risk class shall always the lead auditor appointed shall appoint at minimum
 - one (1) local auditor and

- one (1) technical expert on social issues to evaluate compliance with social requirements and the risk of non-compliance due to social issues and
- one (1) technical expert on environmental issues to evaluate compliance with environmental requirements and the risk of non-compliance due to environmental issues.
- The lead auditor appointed may include additional auditors and/or technical experts in the audit team if this is required by the extent of the audit.

2.3.2 Audit Team

Auditor Name:	John Shideler	Auditor role:	Lead Auditor
<p>Qualifications: Mr. John Shideler is an environmental professional with 18 years’ experience auditing management systems and greenhouse gas assertions for a number of accredited certification bodies. He is currently certified as a greenhouse gas lead verifier by the California Air Resources Board. He is an experienced ISO 14001/OHSAS 18001 lead auditor and previously held lead auditor certification for auditing Responsible Care management systems for members and partners in the chemical manufacturing industry. As a US expert, he has contributed to the writing of several greenhouse gas standards (ISO 14064-3, ISO 14065, ISO 14066, ISO 14067, and ISO 14069). He is the current chair of ISO Technical Committee 207 Subcommittee 4 on Environmental Performance Evaluation. He served as ISO TC207 liaison to ISO Project Committee 248 which published ISO 13065, Sustainability criteria for bioenergy. He earned a PhD degree in history at the University of California, Berkeley. As a high-school student, Mr. Shideler successfully completed a year-long elective class in Agriculture.</p>			

2.4 Evaluation Schedule and Extent of Audit

2.4.1 Determination of Extent of Audit

Total number of subsidiaries, branch offices, affiliated entities, external third parties contracted or otherwise engaged, operational structures, sites, facilities, processing and production units, and supply chain structures	1 head office, 3 grain elevators, 13 contracted growers of brassica carinata.
Participating Operator Risk Class	Low
Disputes or prior Non-compliances	None
Changes in scope since last evaluation	Not applicable
Total number of compliance claims	None

2.4.2 Evaluation Itinerary and Activities

Date: September 26, 2016	
Operation(s)/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
Escambia grain elevator in Walnut Hill, FL	Review seed storage practices and results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tour of facility - Licensed and bonded - Scale tickets and conversion - Monthly reports to regulatory authorities - Calibration of scales and measures - Review records of received and shipped brassica carinata from area farmers
J. Davis’s farm in Jay, FL	Review cultivation practices and results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review soil type, condition, moisture, soil carbon - Conservation practices and erosion controls - Application of fertilizers and pesticides - Water resource management - State or federally protected areas or endangered species - Energy use and associated calculations and record keeping - Management of hired personnel - Site visit
S. Godwin’s farm in Jay, FL	Review cultivation practices and results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review soil type, condition, moisture, soil carbon - Conservation practices and erosion controls - Application of fertilizers and pesticides - Water resource management - State or federally protected areas or endangered species - Energy use and associated calculations and record keeping - Management of hired personnel - Site visit
Date: September 27, 2016	
Operation(s)/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
A. Forrester’s farm in Jackson County, FL	Review cultivation practices and results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review soil type, condition, moisture, soil carbon - Conservation practices and erosion controls - Application of fertilizers and pesticides - Water resource management - State or federally protected areas or endangered species - Energy use and associated calculations and record keeping - Management of hired personnel - Site visit

<p>Dollar Farm Products grain elevator in Bainbridge, GA</p>	<p>Review seed storage practices and results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tour of facility - Licensed and bonded - Scale tickets and conversion - Monthly reports to regulatory authorities - Calibration of scales and measures - Review records of received and shipped brassica carinata from area farmers
<p>Date: September 28, 2016</p>	
<p>Operation(s)/ sites visited</p>	<p>Activities/ notes</p>
<p>J. Murphy's farm in Jennings, FL</p>	<p>Review cultivation practices and results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review soil type, condition, moisture, soil carbon - Conservation practices and erosion controls - Application of fertilizers and pesticides - Water resource management - State or federally protected areas or endangered species - Energy use and associated calculations and record keeping - Management of hired personnel - Site visit
<p>S. Jones's farm in Jasper, FL</p>	<p>Review cultivation practices and results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review soil type, condition, moisture, soil carbon - Conservation practices and erosion controls - Application of fertilizers and pesticides - Water resource management - State or federally protected areas or endangered species - Energy use and associated calculations and record keeping - Management of hired personnel - Site visit
<p>Date: September 29, 2016</p>	
<p>Operation(s)/ sites visited</p>	<p>Activities/ notes</p>
<p>Agrisoma Biosciences HQ</p>	<p>Review Agrisoma management system element</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Processes for adhering to RSB requirements - Risk management approach including ESMP review - Compliance with Principles & Criteria <p>Review GHG data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Processes and results of GHG monitoring and reporting <p>Review contracts and chain of custody</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Processes and results for tracing certified feedstock <p>Communication of claims</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Verify adherence to RSB communications requirements

2.5 Evaluation of Management System

2.5.1 Methodology and Strategies Employed

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in agriculture, ecology, forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess an Operator's compliance to RSB standards and policies. Evaluation methods include document and record review, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of site and facility types, observation of implementation of management plans and policies, and stakeholder analysis. When there is more than one team member, team members may review parts of the standards based on their background and expertise. On the final day of an evaluation, team members convene to deliberate the findings of the assessment jointly. This involves an analysis of all relevant site observations, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus between team members cannot be achieved due to lack of evidence, conflicting evidence or differences of interpretation of the standards, the team is instructed to report these in the certification decision section.

The SCS audit team held an opening meeting on September 26, 2016, in Atmore, AL, with Christine Bliss, Regional Agronomist of Agrisoma Biosciences, to provide an orientation to the audit process. The audit team then visited five farms in north Florida and grain handling facilities in Florida and Georgia. On the fourth day the audit team visited the headquarters of Agrisoma Biosciences in Gatineau, Quebec to complete the gathering of evidence of conformity with requirements and to hold a closing meeting.

2.5.2 Capacity of the participating operator to implement its management systems

The audit team sampled five of thirteen Alabama and Florida growers of *brassica carinata* who were contracted by Agrisoma Biosciences to deliver harvested crop to the grain handlers. The audit team also sampled two Agrisoma Biosciences–contracted grain handlers, one in Florida and the other in Georgia, to collect information about conformity with RSB principles and criteria. The audit team visited fields at each of the sampled farms where *brassica carinata* had been grown and saw the residues that the harvested crop had left on the ground. The audit team found the agricultural practices to be consistent with RSB requirements in each case and conforming to the contractual requirements defined by Agrisoma Biosciences.

The Agrisoma Biosciences management system was assessed and found to be appropriate for operations performed at headquarters. Company policies are described in the Employee Handbook. The document provides employees with a brief summary of Agrisoma's operating policies, guidelines and standards. Employees are directed to contact their supervisor for additional information when required. Policies and expectations for conformity with RSB standards are communicated to growers in a

“Carinata Production Contract”. Requirements for grain handlers are communicated in a separate “Grain Handling Agreement”.

The Agrisoma employee handbook contains information on employee relations and conduct, employee practices and benefits, and safety and security policies. In particular, the employee handbook contains the following information:

- Confidentiality: Any communication of confidential information outside the company requires prior approval of management and/or confidential agreements may be required.
- Conflict resolution: Agrisoma has a dispute resolution process for investigating, documenting and recommending solutions in dispute situations.
- Safety: Agrisoma follows the National Research Council guidelines for safety. All accidents and injuries at work, no matter how minor, must be reported to the Supervisor. Agrisoma has dedicated First Aide Attendants on site.
- Emergency policies: Agrisoma follows the emergency and biohazardous procedures set out by the safety committee of the National Research Council Plant Biotechnology Institute.

Agrisoma is managed by seed and transportation industry veterans. Executive leadership is comprised of a chief executive officer, four vice presidents, two department directors, and a business development manager. Top management reports to a board of directors.

2.5.3 Evaluation of RSB compliance claims and use of RSB trademarks

Type (compliance claim, trademark use)	Description	Findings
No RSB compliance claims made.		

2.6 Stakeholder Consultation Process

In accordance with SCS and RSB protocols, consultation with key stakeholders is an integral component of the evaluation process. Stakeholder consultation takes place prior to, concurrent with, and following field evaluations. The primary purpose of such consultation is to solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the Participating Operator’s management system and operations, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon the certification scope of the participating operator.

Stakeholder consultation activities are organized according to the requirements of the RSB. The table below summarizes the major comments received from stakeholders and the assessment team’s response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

2.6.1 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable

Stakeholder Comments	SCS Response
Economic Concerns	
Growing an oilseed crop like carinata can help the US military meet its objectives for increased availability of biofuels.	First two seasons had disappointing harvests, due to a freeze in 2014-2015 and to excessive rain (el Niño) in 2015-2016.
Economic benefit to farmers from growing an additional cash crop, potentially \$150/acre.	The five farmers sampled during this certification audit had planted varying amounts of carinata, with moderate yields in most cases.
Social Concerns	
No social concerns were raised.	
Environmental Concerns	
Carinata has not presented any disease or pest issues.	Experience has shown that the crop is compatible with growing of cotton and peanuts during the primary growing season.
Growing varieties of brassica help retain nutrients in the soil and prevent migration of nitrates into the groundwater.	The environmental benefits to soil and water from planting this crop are positive.
Whether raising carinata depletes water resources	Northwest Florida Water Management District resource manager stated that there were no concerns associated with carinata growing because it is grown during the winter which is typically more wet, and because the crop does not have a high demand for water.
Whether growing carinata helps fix nitrogen in the soil.	Northwest Florida Water Management District resource manager stated that that the crop could provide this benefit; however, growing the crop also results in the addition of nitrogen to the soil, so the question of net additions to the water table is difficult to assess.
Concern about whether brassica carinata could become an invasive species.	An USDA APHIS study examined this issue and concluded that there is a minimal risk of brassica carinata becoming an invasive species.

3.0 RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS

SCS Risk Assessment Results	Deviations from Operator Risk Assessment Results	Risk Factor Difference
Low	None	None

Due to the results of the Risk Assessment, the evaluation did not need to be rescheduled.

4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

4.1 Equivalence between the Audit Team Evaluation and the Operator Self Evaluation

Principle/ Subject Area	Summary of Audit Team Findings	Comparison to Operator Self Evaluation (Equivalence)	Added Risk (Yes/No)
P1: Legality	In compliance	In agreement	No
P2: Planning, Monitoring & Continuous Improvement	In compliance	In agreement	No
P3: Greenhouse Gases	In compliance	In agreement	No
P4: Human and Labor Rights	In compliance	In agreement	No
P5: Rural & Local Development	Not applicable	In agreement	No
P6: Food Security	Not applicable	In agreement	No
P7: Conservation	In compliance	In agreement	No
P8: Soil	In compliance	In agreement	No
P9: Water	In compliance	In agreement	No
P10: Air	In compliance	In agreement	No
P11: Technology	In compliance	In agreement	No
P12: Land Rights	In compliance	In agreement	No
FINAL RISK CLASS	Low		

4.2 Process of Determining Compliance

4.2.1 Structure of Standard and Degrees of Non-Compliance

RSB-accredited biofuel standards consist of a three-level hierarchy: the principle, the criteria that correspond to that principle, and then the performance indicators that elaborate upon each criterion. Consistent with SCS Sustainable Biofuels Program evaluation protocols, the team collectively determines whether or not the subject operation is in compliance with every applicable indicator of the relevant sustainable biofuel standard. Each non-compliance must be evaluated to determine whether it constitutes a major or minor non-compliance at the level of the associated criterion or sub-criterion. Not all indicators are equally important, and there is no simple numerical formula to determine whether an operation is in non-compliance. The team therefore must use their collective judgment to assess each criterion and determine if the Operator is in compliance. If the Operator is determined to be in non-compliance at the criterion level, then at least one of the applicable indicators must be in major non-compliance.

4.2.2 Interpretations of Major and Minor Non-compliances

Major Non-compliances, either alone or in combination with non-compliances of other applicable indicators, result (or are likely to result) in a fundamental failure to achieve the objectives of the relevant RSB Criterion. These non-compliances must be resolved or closed out before a certificate can be awarded. If Major NCs arise after an operation is certified, the timeframe for correcting these non-compliances is typically no more than three months. Certification is contingent on the certified FME’s response to the NCs within the stipulated time frame.

Minor Non-compliances are typically limited in scale or can be characterized as an unusual lapse in the system. Most minor NCs are the result of a non-conformance at the indicator-level. Non-compliances must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the certificate.

4.2.3 Major Non-compliances

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No major NCs were issued to the Operator during the evaluation. Any minor CARs from previous surveillance audits have been reviewed and closed prior to the issuance of a certificate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major NCs were issued to the Operator during the evaluation, which have all been closed to the satisfaction of the audit team and meet the requirements of the standards. Any minor CARs from previous surveillance audits have been reviewed and closed prior to the issuance of a certificate.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Major NCs were issued to the Operator during the evaluation and the Operator has not yet satisfactorily closed all major NCs.
--------------------------	---

4.2.4 Non-compliances and Current Status

Instructions:

- Initial certification audit: list all Non-conformities and Opportunities for Improvement issued during this audit.
- Surveillance/Recertification: list status of minor NCs that were not closed in previous audit, then list new NCs/OFIs issued during this audit.

Summary of Non-compliances and Current Status				
Non-compliance Number	Type of Non-compliance	Relevant RSB Standard & Indicator No.	Summary of Finding and Evidence Collected	Status of Non-compliance (Open/Closed)
1	Minor	RSB-STD 11-001-30-001 v.3.2, 1.4.1	Contracts with growers and grain handlers did not fully meet the requirements of paragraph 1.4.1: Grain handler’s contract did not “specifically refer to the commitment of the groups, people and structures listed in 1.3.2 above to put in place and comply with RSB standards and procedures”.	Open
2	Minor	RSB-STD-11-001-01-001 v. 2.1, 9.b.1	A water management plan was not developed, implemented, and integrated into the ESMP.	Closed
3	Minor	RSB-STD-11-001-01-001 v. 2.1, 10.a.1	An air emissions control plan was not included as part of the ESMP.	Closed
4	OFI	RSB-STD 11-001-30-001 v.3.2, 1.5	An opportunity for improvement may exist for Agrisoma to strengthen its management systems (quality management, risk management) by augmenting controls relating to its compliance with RSB standards and requirements.	Open

5	Minor	RSB-STD-11-001-20-001 v. 3.2	Agrisoma had not limited its GHG emissions calculation to its scope of certification as required by the traceability standard.	Closed
6	Minor	RSB-STD-11-001 Standard for EU market access V 3.0	A 2007 study by Gasol et al. and a 2016 Canadian National Research Council LCA Report have been provided as the basis for an emissions saving credit from soil carbon accumulation. While this has been accepted as preliminary evidence Agrisoma will need to have growers conduct soil carbon testing of fields that have planted the crop to ensure that the extent of carbon fixation in the soil is as claimed.	Open

5.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION

Certification Recommendation		
Operator to be awarded RSB certification subject to the minor non-compliances stated in Section 4.2.5.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
The SCS evaluation team makes the above recommendation for certification based on the full and proper execution of the SCS Responsible Biofuels Program evaluation protocols. If certification is recommended, the Operator has satisfactorily demonstrated the following without exception:		
Operator has addressed any Major NC(s) assigned during the evaluation.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Operator has demonstrated that their system of management is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the applicable standards are met over the sites and facilities covered by the scope of the evaluation.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Operator has demonstrated that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the sites and facilities covered by the scope of the certificate.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Comments and/or details of any issue which was difficult and/or impossible to evaluate:	None identified.	
To be completed by Certification Decision-Making Entity	Certification decision by:	Neil Mendenhall
	Date of decision: For initial or continued certification	November 16, 2016
	Surveillance schedule:	Annual Surveillance
	Notes:	

Sub Certificate Codes (if applicable)

Legal Entity/Operational Site	Sub-Certificate Code