

ANNEX

Response of the control body to the recommendations of report ref. DG(SANTE)/2018-6392-MR of the audit carried out from 24 January 2018 to 01 February 2018 in order to evaluate the implementation of the organic production standards and control measures applied by a recognized control body operating in the Dominican Republic.

Recommendation #1

Ensure that all operators are annually visited and that additional inspections are carried out at least 10% of the operators as established in Chapter 6 of the CB organic certification manual.

Recommendation is based on conclusion No 31

Associated finding: No 26

Action Proposed by the Control Body

Annual inspection of every operation: We now understand that the annual inspection requirement refers to the calendar year. Annually, the inspection manager will develop an inspection plan for the entire year to ensure every operation undergoes an annual inspection even if they have not submitted their renewal paperwork for review prior to inspection. This will be implemented immediately. We will also update our renewal procedures in 2019 to require that certified operations submit their applications 5 months after the effective date of certification. This will ensure that renewal applications are received and reviewed prior to the annual inspection.

Additional inspections: Failure to conduct additional inspections of 10% of our operations in 2017 was an administrative oversight. We did not understand the distinction between additional inspections and unannounced inspections. We also understand that follow-up visits used to verify compliance during certification process do not count as additional inspections. We have updated procedures for "Additional Inspections" for EU certified operations into three types of inspections:

- A) Annual Inspections
 - B) Additional Random Inspections – 10% of certified operations
 - C) Unannounced Inspections – 10% of A + B inspections will be unannounced
- Total Inspections = A + B

The inspection manager has developed the plan for additional inspections to be implemented immediately to ensure that the minimum numbers of additional inspections occur in 2018 and future year.

Control Body's response to the report recommendations received 26 April 2018

Recommendation #2

Ensure that risk assessment applied by the CB serves as an adequate basis to determine the nature and frequency of controls and that for additional visits, operators are selected on a risk basis in line with Chapter 6 of the CB organic certification manual.

Recommendation is based on conclusions No 31

Associated finding: No 25

Action Proposed by the Control Body

Risk assessment worksheets were developed for the 4 different production categories we certify to the EU Standards: Individual growers, Grower Groups, Processors/Handlers, and Aquaculture. During the final review, each operation will be scored on a scale of 0-100 for the risk of noncompliance to the EU organic production requirements. 0 is the lowest possible risk and 100 is the highest possible risk.

Risk will be assessed based on the following factors:

All: Size of operation; number of organic products; risk of commingling or contamination from within the operation; difference in value of organic and conventional products; annual production volume; change in organic production volume since the previous year; change in organic system plan since the previous year; duration of organic certification; nature of nonconformities found during this and previous certification cycles; success of traceability audit during the most recent inspection; and success of mass balance exercise during most recent inspection.

All crop growers: susceptibility of crops to pests/diseases; risk from adjoining land uses.

Grower Group: Number of producer members; similarity of production processes; number of new producers in the last year.

Processor/Handlers: Number of suppliers of organic ingredients.

Aquaculture: Susceptibility to pests or disease; presence of adjacent conventional aquaculture.

The Inspection Manager will collect the risk assessment scores for every certified operation and select operations for additional inspections (primarily unannounced) from the operations with the highest risk scores. Copies of the risk assessment forms are available for your review upon request. The new risk assessment procedure will be implemented in 2018 for the selection of operations for additional inspection in 2019. For 2018, operations selected for additional inspection will be based on the selection of those identified to have the highest risk based on the 2017 inspection and risk assessment criteria used at the time, with the addition of selecting operations with high production volumes. Operators will not be selected at random for additional inspections in 2018.

Control Body's response to the report recommendations received 26 April 2018

Recommendation #3

Ensure that the CB controls carried out on PGs include inspections of a minimum number of PG members in line with the CB grower group inspection policy chapter of the organic certification review procedures.

Recommendation is based in conclusion No 31

Associated finding: No 28

Action Proposed by the Control Body

The CB will update the grower group inspection policy and special instructions to grower group inspectors to make it more clear that:

- The inspection plan developed by the initial reviewer, including the risk analysis and minimum number of units to be inspected cannot be deviated from, except when new entrants are identified by the inspector;
- New entrants identified by the inspector are high-risk and must be added to the list of mandatory sub-units to be inspected;
- If new members are identified during the inspection, the total number of grower group members to be inspected will also be affected, as the percentage (determined by the risk-assessment) will apply to the total number of members.

It is also important to note that, given to the proposed changes to the CB's derogation policies and procedures, grower groups will not be able to add new members that require a derogation without submitting documentation that the operation qualifies for the derogation. See Recommendation #4 for further details.

Additional training for all reviewers and inspectors will be conducted by July 31, 2018 to ensure that procedures are consistently implemented.

Recommendation #4

Ensure that derogations and exceptional production rules are granted based in procedures and line with point 2.1 of the CB organic production standards, Article 17 of Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 and Article 36 of Regulation (EC) No 889/2008.

Recommendation is based on conclusion No 41

Associated findings: No 38, 39, 40 and 59

Action Proposed by the Control Body

1. The CB will update its organic system plan applications to ensure that applicants understand the provisions for derogations, specifically request derogations applicable to their operation, and provide evidence to the CB that the operation meets all applicable requirements before a derogation is granted.
2. The CB will amend the procedure used by producer groups for adding new members to ensure that all members comply with conversion requirements or request and are granted a derogation to the conversion requirement before representing crops as organic. The CB will notify all

producer groups of the updated procedures and applicable sections of the organic system plan application.

3. The CB has updated the form used to document derogations to include a detailed description of how the producer demonstrate that all conditions are met by the operator. The CB will consider granting these derogations with documentary evidence that the operator fulfils the conditions as follows:
 - a. Use of non-organic seeds, vegetative propagating materials or seed potatoes. Seeds may not be chemically treated. (Art. 45(1) R. 889/2008): The producer must demonstrate that organic seed or propagating material were not available in organic form and that the organic seed or propagating material was not treated with plant protection products not authorized under Art. 5(1) R. 889/2008
 - b. Retroactive recognition of a previous period as being part of the conversion period. (Art. 36(2) R. 889/2008): The producer must provide satisfactory proof that the parcel was not treated with products not authorized for organic production for at least three years immediately prior to certification.
Land that was previously a natural area. The producer must submit evidence that the area was not used for agricultural production and confirm in writing that no prohibited substances were applied in the three year period. Land previously used for non-organic agriculture. The producer must have participated in a program implemented pursuant to Regulations (EC) no. 1257/99, (EC) 1698/2005, or in another official program (e.g. food safety program, conservation program, etc.); and provide documentation from the program administrator and provide complete production records to demonstrate that products not authorized for organic production were not used in the three years immediately preceding certification.
 - c. Exceeding 6 kg/ha copper limited in a given year provided that the average quantity actually used over a 5-year period consisting of that year and of the four preceding years does not exceed 6 kg/ha. (ANNEX II R. 889/2008): The producer must specify the crop and 5-year period, and demonstrate that the average quantity of copper used over the 5-year period does not exceed 6 kg/ha by providing:
 - i. application records showing the quantity of copper applied per hectare/year for each of the previous 4 years
 - ii. proposed application rate for the current (5th) year

Recommendation #5

Ensure that the selection of operators for sampling is based on the general evaluation of risk of non-compliance with the organic rules as established in Chapter 9 of the CB organic certification manual and Article 65(2) of Regulation (EC) No 834/2007.

Recommendation is based on conclusion No 51.

Control Body's response to the report recommendations received 26 April 2018

Associated findings: No 44 and 45

Action Proposed by the Control Body

As described in the action proposed in response to recommendation #2, new risk assessment worksheets were developed for the four different production categories we certify to the EU Standards: Individual growers, Grower Groups, Processors/Handlers, and Aquaculture. During the final review, each operation will be scored on a scale of 0-100 for the risk of noncompliance to the EU organic production requirements. 0 is the lowest possible risk and 100 is the highest possible risk.

The Inspection Manager will collect the risk assessment scores for every certified operation and select operations for sampling from the operations with the highest risk scores. Copies of the risk assessment forms are available for your review upon request.

The new risk assessment procedure will be implemented in 2018 for the selection of operations for sampling in 2019. For 2018, operations selected for sampling will be based on the selection of those identified to have the highest risk based on the 2017 inspections and risk assessment criteria used at the time.

Recommendation #6

Ensure that the interpretation of analytical results serves as a good basis to take actions in case of non-compliance in line with point 8.1.3 of the organic standards.

Recommendation is based on conclusion No 51.

Associated findings: No 47 and 48

Action Proposed by the Control Body

The Control Body proposes to update to amend its procedures for interpreting pesticide residue test results to ensure that the interpretation of analytical results serve as a good basis to take actions in the case of non-compliance in line with the organic standards as described below. All staff will be trained on the amended procedures by July 31, 2018.

1. Amend the internal procedure for reviewing pesticide residue test results and investigating the cause of contamination.
 - a. Add deadline to ensure review all pesticide residue test results and notify client of result within 10 working days.
 - b. Eliminate the use of a 50% correction factor when determining residue concentrations.
 - c. Issue a Notice of Noncompliance and "Stop Sale" to ensure products are not represented as organic when pesticide residue test results indicate:
 - i. The presence of substances not authorized in organic production at any concentration;
 - ii. The presence of permitted substances above EU established MRLs for the product;
 - iii. The presence of permitted substances detected above 0.01 ppm on products with no established MRL for the pesticide.

The Noncompliance will provide the operator the opportunity to comment on the cause of contamination.

Control Body's response to the report recommendations received 26 April 2018

d. Investigate the cause of contamination in each scenario described above. 2. Amend the form used to notify clients of results to be consistent with revised procedures. 3. Amend procedure to ensure appropriate action when contamination occurs in accordance with the our EU 834-2007 Organic Certification Requirements manual, Section 8: Non-compliances and Sanctions for Infringements and Irregularities. a. If contamination was the result of direct/intentional application of non-authorized substances or commingling with non-organic products, CB will issue a Proposed Suspension of the entire operation; b. If contamination was unintentional, CB will issue a Notice of Noncompliance to address the cause of the contamination. The operation will have the opportunity to submit a corrective action plan before further sanctions are issued. 4. Amend Sanctions Catalogue to include a Notice of Noncompliance and Stop Sale. 5. Develop a Notice of Noncompliance and Stop Sale template.
--

Recommendation #7
<i>Ensure that the CB has a procedure in place for checking whether the analytical scope of the laboratory used for testing is adequate to detect the use of products not authorised in organic production, in particular, ensure that the scope of the testing is fit for purpose and include substances that can only be detected by single methods.</i> Recommendation is based on conclusion No 51 Associated finding: No 46
Action Proposed by the Control Body The CB proposes to update its policy and procedure with instructions for conducting specific residue testing when there is suspicion that an organic product may be contaminated with a particular non-authorized substance, as follows: All of the substances tested for in the standard multi-residue method are listed in the quality system folder for each laboratory. Additional materials may be requested at the discretion of any reviewer or inspector, including materials that can only be detected by using single-residue methods. Reviewers should specifically request testing for any unauthorized/prohibited substance that was found during a previous inspection or testing conducted by a third-party. If you identify a substance that is not on the standard list of materials tested by the laboratory, notify the Inspection Manager as soon as possible. The inspection manager will work with the laboratory to determine if they can perform the required test. Instruct the inspector to write the additional substance into the standard laboratory instructions to be submitted to the laboratory with the sample. The revised procedure will be implemented and all reviewers will be trained within 30 days of the proposed action's approval. Inspectors will be notified promptly, and the revised procedure will be

included in a 2018 inspector training focusing on the EU organic certification program.

Recommendation #8

Ensure that inspections at operators are effective. In particular, ensure that all requirements of organic production are checked and that the assessment by the CB of controls carried out by PGs is adequate in order to guarantee the effectiveness of such controls and in particular that the timing and nature of the CB inspections to PGs serve as a good tool to evaluate the effectiveness of the ICS.

Recommendation is based on conclusion No 64.

Associated findings: No 58, 59, 60 and 67

Action Proposed by the Control Body

1. Prior to August 1, 2018, the CB will conduct a detailed training with all crop inspectors to ensure all inspections include:
 - a. Evaluation of evidence for decisions to shorten the conversion period
 - b. Evaluation of all adjoining land uses
 - c. Clarification in the written report when buffers are not present or needed because adjoining land is under organic management
 - d. Verification of records that all equipment shared with conventional production is adequately cleaned to prevent contamination, including equipment used by subcontractors.
2. Prior to August 1, 2018 the CB will conduct a detailed training with all grower group inspectors to ensure grower group inspections consistently and adequately assess certification requirements including but not limited to the effectiveness of grower group internal control systems and adding/removing members from the group.
3. The CB will review and revise the grower group inspection checklist report to ensure that all requirements including adjoining land uses, and labelling are adequately assessed. The report will also be updated to collect actual yield data to systemically verify the harvest amount and compare to harvest estimations.
4. The CB will update the grower group organic system plan to include a list of last and next (expected) control visit from the ICS to each grower group member and require the inspector to compare his/her findings with the findings of the internal inspections. Additionally, we will require inspectors to systematically witness the performance of internal inspectors.

Special Instructions to all grower group inspectors will include the following instructions:

- Select at least one sub-unit that has been inspected by the Internal Control System (ICS) in the last three months to evaluate the effectiveness of the ICS. Compare your findings to the ICS report to evaluate the effectiveness of the ICS inspection program. Describe your findings in a narrative response below.
- Include in your inspection the observation of at least one Internal Control System (ICS) annual site visit to a grower group member subunit to determine the effectiveness of the ICS in verifying conformity to the grower group's organic system plan. Include a description of your observations in the inspection checklist report and attach applicable

Control Body's response to the report recommendations received 26 April 2018

documentation.

The Inspection Checklist for grower group inspections will ask:

- Did you visit at least one sub-unit that has been inspected by the Internal Control System (ICS) in the last three months and compare your findings to the ICS report to evaluate the effectiveness of the ICS?
- Did you observe at least one ICS annual site visit to a grower group member sub-unit?

Recommendation #9

Ensure that inspectors verify the labelling of packaged products, to confirm the fulfilment of the requirement of Article 24(1)(a) of Regulation (EC) No 889/2008, which requires that the code of the CB to whom the operator who carried out the most recent processing or preparation operation on the product shall also appear on the labelling.

Recommendation is based on conclusion No 64.

Associated finding: No 61.

Action Proposed by the Control Body

In January 2018, the CB updated all organic system plan applications with guidance on EU labelling requirements, including the use of the CB code. The applications instruct producers to submit all retail and non-retail labels, as applicable, to the CB for reviewer prior to market/export of the product. The inspection report checklists were similarly updated to instruct inspectors to confirm that all labels, including markings on boxes destined for export to the EU have been submitted to and approved by the CB.

The CB proposed to add additional clarification about the requirement to include the code of the CB to whom the operator who carried out the most recent processing or preparation operation on the product on the label.

Recommendation #10

Ensure that physical checks based on risk assessment are carried out on exported consignments as is required in Article 13.4 of Regulation (EC) No 1235/2008.

Recommendation is based on conclusion No 68.

Associated finding: No 66.

Action Proposed by the Control Body

The CB proposed to amend its sampling program to ensure that a minimum of 1/3 of samples are collected from product that is packed and ready for shipment/export. When samples are collected from exporters, they will be collected at port prior to shipping. If they are collected from producers or handlers that do not own the product at the port of export, the samples will be collected at the last point at which the product is owned by the operation we certify. If infringements are suspected or detected, but the CB does not certify the exporter, the CB will notify the certifier of the exporter of the high risk product.

Recommendation #11

Ensure that measures in case of suspicion of infringements and irregularities are taken and are adequate to prevent the fraudulent use of the organic indications in line with point 8 of the CB organic standards. In particular, ensure that adequate actions are taken in all cases when analytical results show the presence of a substance not authorised PPPs in organic production.

Recommendation is based on conclusion No 81. Associated findings: No 69 and 73

Action Proposed by the Control Body

Implement and train staff on these actions no later than June 1, 2018:

1. Amend internal procedures to issue temporary suspension of the product and, if applicable, the operator, to conduct investigation to determine if an infringement occurred when the operator self-reports possible contamination or the inspector or reviewer suspect that organic products may be contaminated but do not have sufficient evidence to make a determination. The product and, operator if applicable, will be temporarily suspended for 90 days or until the completion of investigation. No products can be represented as organic during the temporary suspension. Investigation will include collection of samples for pesticide residue testing, which will be analyzed according to revised procedures (described below).
2. Amend the internal procedure for reviewing pesticide residue test results and investigating the cause of contamination.
 - a. Add deadline to ensure review all pesticide residue test results and notify client of result within 10 working days.
 - b. Eliminate the use of a 50% correction factor when determining residue concentrations.
 - c. Issue a Notice of Noncompliance and "Stop Sale" to ensure products are not represented as organic when pesticide residue test results indicate:
 - i. The presence of substances not authorized in organic production at any concentration;
 - ii. The presence of permitted substances above EU established MRLs for the product;
 - iii. The presence of permitted substances detected above 0.01 ppm on products with no established MRL for the pesticide.The Noncompliance will provide the operator the opportunity to comment on the cause of contamination.
 - d. Investigate the cause of contamination in each scenario described above.
3. Amend the form used to notify clients of results to be consistent with revised procedures.
4. Amend procedure to ensure appropriate action when contamination occurs in accordance with our EU 834-2007 Organic Certification Requirements manual, Section 8: Noncompliances and Sanctions for Infringements and Irregularities.
 - e. If contamination was the result of direct/intentional application of non-authorized substances or commingling with non-organic products, CB will issue a Proposed Suspension of the entire operation;
 - f. If contamination was unintentional, CB will issue a Notice of Noncompliance to address the cause of the contamination. The operation will have the opportunity to submit a corrective action plan before further sanctions are issued.
5. Amend *Sanctions Catalog* to include a Notice of Noncompliance and Stop Sale.

6. Develop a Notice of Noncompliance and Stop Sale template.

Recommendation #12

Ensure that, when notifications are received via OFIS, the CB implements the procedures in place to proper follow-up them in a timely manner and that the results of the investigations and the action taken are adequate to address the non-compliances in line with the CB organic certification manual.

Recommendation is based on conclusions No 81.

Associated findings: No 77, 78 and 79

Action Proposed by the Control Body

The CB is in the process of amending the internal procedure for reviewing pesticide residue test results and investigating the cause of contamination. The revised procedure will:

- a. Require that the CB review the pesticide residue test results and notify the operation of the results within 10 days of receipt of the results;
- b. Eliminate the use of a 50% correction factor when determining residue concentrations and actionable levels;
- c. Issue a Notice of Noncompliance and Stop Sale to ensure products are not represented as organic when pesticide residue test results indicate:
 - i. The presence of substances not authorized in organic production at any concentration;
 - ii. The presence of permitted substances above EU established MRLs for the product;
 - iii. The presence of permitted substances detected above 0.01 ppm on products with no established MRL for the pesticide.

The Noncompliance will provide the operator the opportunity to comment on the cause of contamination.

The CB will conduct an investigation upon receipt of every notification from OFIS that indicates the presence of a non-authorized substance; authorized substances detected at levels above EU established MRLs for the product; and/or authorized substances detected above 0.01 ppm on products with no established MRL for the pesticide. The designated investigator will notify the Inspection Manager and Inspection Coordinator immediately so they can arrange an additional inspection within 15 days to investigate possible cause(s) of contamination. The inspection should be unannounced unless there is a documented reason to do an announced inspection. If additional samples are to be collected during the follow-up inspection, sampling directives must be provided in the Special Instructions to the Inspector. The designated investigator will review the operator's response to the Noncompliance and the follow-up inspection report to determine the cause of contamination.

If prohibited pesticide residue was caused by a correctible violation, such as insufficient buffers, the CB will issue an additional Noncompliance related to the specific deficiency of the organic system plan. This allows the operation to correct the cause of contamination, but does not permit sale of the contaminated product. If prohibited pesticide residue was caused by direct application of prohibited

Control Body's response to the report recommendations received 26 April 2018

substance, intentional commingling, or fraudulent activity for which corrective action is not possible, the CB will issue a Proposed Suspension, followed by a Suspension of Certification if the operation does not successfully appeal or mediate the proposed suspension.

The procedure described above will be implemented by June 30, 2018. The CB will conduct a training of all certification reviewers no later than July 31, 2018.



EUROPÄISCHE KOMMISSION
GENERALDIREKTION GESUNDHEIT UND LEBENSMITTELSICHERHEIT

Gesundheits- und Lebensmittelaudits und Analysen

DG(SANTE)/2018-6392 – RS

**AUSZUG AUS DEM BERICHT DER GD GESUNDHEIT UND LEBENSMITTELSICHERHEIT ÜBER EIN
AUDIT**

24. JANUAR 2018 BIS 1. FEBRUAR 2018

**BEWERTUNG DER ANWENDUNG DER STANDARDS FÜR DIE ÖKOLOGISCHE/BIOLOGISCHE
ERZEUGUNG UND DER KONTROLLMASSNAHMEN DURCH EINE ANERKANNTE KONTROLLSTELLE
IN DER DOMINIKANISCHEN REPUBLIK**

**HINWEIS: DIES IST – IN DEUTSCHER ÜBERSETZUNG – EIN AUSZUG AUS DEM BERICHT ÜBER DAS OBEN GENANNT E AUDIT.
VERBINDLICH IST NUR DIE LANGFASSUNG DES ORIGINALBERICHTS (DG(SANTE)/2018-6392).**

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Dieser Bericht enthält die Ergebnisse eines Audits, das die GD Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit vom 24. Januar bis zum 1. Februar 2018 durchgeführt hat, um die Anwendung der Standards für die ökologische/biologische Erzeugung und die Durchführung der einschlägigen Kontrollmaßnahmen durch eine anerkannte Kontrollstelle in der Dominikanischen Republik zu bewerten.

In dem Bericht wird der Schluss gezogen, dass die Kontrollstelle über ein dokumentiertes Kontrollsystem verfügt, das die Betriebe umfasst, die von der Kontrollstelle zertifiziert werden. Die Kontrolleure der Kontrollstelle werden regelmäßig geschult und bewertet. Die Inspektionen der Kontrollstelle sind generell wirksam und umfassen Prüfungen der Rückverfolgbarkeit, und das Ausführungssystem entspricht generell den Vorschriften der Europäischen Union.

Die Kontroll- und Probenahmepläne der Kontrollstelle beruhen jedoch nicht auf einer angemessenen Risikobewertung der von ihr zertifizierten Betriebe. Die Kontrollstelle führt nicht bei allen Betrieben jährliche Kontrollbesuche sowie keine zusätzlichen Besuche bei mindestens

10 % der Betriebe durch. Dadurch wird die Wirksamkeit des bestehenden Kontrollsystems beeinträchtigt, da nicht gewährleistet werden kann, dass alle Betriebe die Standards für die ökologische/biologische Erzeugung einhalten. Dies gilt insbesondere für Betriebe mit hohem Risiko, die nicht in jedem Fall einer Probenahme und zusätzlichen Kontrollbesuchen unterzogen werden.

Außerdem ergreift die Kontrollstelle in den meisten Fällen, in denen die Analyseergebnisse auf das Vorkommen nicht genehmigter Pflanzenschutzmittel hinweisen, keine Maßnahmen.

Infolgedessen werden Erzeugnisse als ökologisch/biologisch vermarktet, ohne dass die Kontrollstelle Maßnahmen zur Untersuchung durchführt, ob die Betriebe solche Mittel verwenden. Zudem hat die Kontrollstelle kein Verfahren zur Gewährung von Ausnahmeregelungen für die rückwirkende Anerkennung des Umstellungszeitraums, um sicherzustellen, dass solche Ausnahmeregelungen nur gewährt werden, wenn die Kontrollstelle über einen angemessenen Nachweis verfügt, dass die Betriebe alle Bedingungen erfüllen.

Der Bericht enthält eine Reihe von Empfehlungen an die Kontrollstelle, wie die festgestellten Mängel beseitigt werden können und die Durchführung der Kontrollmaßnahmen verbessert werden kann.

EMPFEHLUNGEN

Nr.	Empfehlung
1.	Gemäß Kapitel 6 des Handbuchs der Kontrollstelle für die Zertifizierung der ökologischen/biologischen Erzeugung sollte gewährleistet werden, dass jährlich Kontrollbesuche bei allen Betrieben durchgeführt werden und dass bei mindestens 10 % der Betriebe zusätzliche Kontrollen durchgeführt werden. <i>Empfehlung auf Grundlage der Schlussfolgerung 31</i> <i>Damit zusammenhängende Feststellung: 26</i>
2.	Es sollte sichergestellt werden, dass die von der Kontrollstelle durchgeführte Risikobewertung eine angemessene Grundlage für die Festlegung der Art und der Häufigkeit der Kontrollen darstellt und dass die Betriebe, bei denen zusätzliche Kontrollbesuche durchgeführt werden, gemäß Kapitel 6 des Handbuchs der Kontrollstelle für die Zertifizierung der ökologischen/biologischen Erzeugung risikobasiert ausgewählt werden. <i>Empfehlung auf Grundlage der Schlussfolgerung 31</i> <i>Damit zusammenhängende Feststellung: 25</i>

3.	Es sollte sichergestellt werden, dass die Kontrollen, die die Kontrollstelle bei Erzeugergemeinschaften durchführt, Inspektionen bei einer Mindestzahl von Mitgliedern der Erzeugergemeinschaft umfassen, wie im Kapitel über die Strategie der Kontrollen bei Erzeugergruppen in den Verfahren der Kontrollstelle für die Überprüfung der Zertifizierung der ökologischen/biologischen Erzeugung vorgesehen. <i>Empfehlung auf Grundlage der Schlussfolgerung 31</i> <i>Damit zusammenhängende Feststellung: 28</i>
4.	Es sollte sichergestellt werden, dass Ausnahmeregelungen und Ausnahmebestimmungen für die Erzeugung im Rahmen festgelegter Verfahren und gemäß Punkt 2.1 der Standards der Kontrollstelle für die ökologische/biologische Erzeugung sowie gemäß Artikel 17 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 834/2007 und Artikel 36 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 889/2008 gewährt werden. <i>Empfehlung auf Grundlage der Schlussfolgerung 41</i> <i>Damit zusammenhängende Feststellungen: 38, 39, 40 und 59</i>
5.	Es sollte sichergestellt werden, dass sich die Auswahl der Betriebe, bei denen Proben zu entnehmen sind, nach der allgemeinen Bewertung des Risikos der Nichteinhaltung der Vorschriften für die ökologische/biologische Erzeugung gemäß Kapitel 9 des Handbuchs der Kontrollstelle für die Zertifizierung der ökologischen/biologischen Erzeugung und gemäß Artikel 65 Absatz 2 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 834/2007 richtet. <i>Empfehlung auf Grundlage der Schlussfolgerung 51</i> <i>Damit zusammenhängende Feststellungen: 44 und 45</i>
6.	Es sollte sichergestellt werden, dass die Auslegung der Analyseergebnisse eine gute Grundlage für Maßnahmen bei Nichteinhaltung gemäß Punkt 8.1.3 der Standards für die ökologische/biologische Erzeugung bildet. <i>Empfehlung auf Grundlage der Schlussfolgerung 51</i> <i>Damit zusammenhängende Feststellungen: 47 und 48</i>
7.	Es sollte sichergestellt werden, dass die Kontrollstelle über ein Verfahren verfügt, um zu kontrollieren, ob der Umfang der Analysen des mit den Tests beauftragten Labors ausreicht, um die Verwendung von für die ökologische/biologische Erzeugung nicht genehmigten Mitteln zu erkennen, und ob Stoffe berücksichtigt werden, die nur durch Einzelmethode nachgewiesen werden können. <i>Empfehlung auf Grundlage der Schlussfolgerung 51</i>

	<i>Damit zusammenhängende Feststellung: 46</i>
8.	Es sollte sichergestellt werden, dass die Kontrollen in den Betrieben wirksam sind. Insbesondere sollte sichergestellt werden, dass alle Anforderungen an die ökologische/biologische Erzeugung kontrolliert werden und dass die Bewertung der von Erzeugergemeinschaften durchgeführten Kontrollen bei der Kontrollstelle ausreicht, um die Wirksamkeit dieser Kontrollen zu gewährleisten. Insbesondere sollte sichergestellt werden, dass die Zeitplanung und die Art der Kontrollen der Kontrollstelle bei Erzeugergemeinschaften eine gute Basis für die Bewertung der Wirksamkeit des internen Kontrollsystems bilden. <i>Empfehlung auf Grundlage der Schlussfolgerung 64</i> <i>Damit zusammenhängende Feststellungen: 58, 59, 60 und 67</i>
9.	Es sollte sichergestellt werden, dass die Kontrolleure die Kennzeichnung der verpackten Erzeugnisse daraufhin überprüfen, dass die Anforderung gemäß Artikel 24 Absatz 1 Buchstabe a der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 889/2008 erfüllt wird. Diese besagt, dass die Kennzeichnung auch die Codenummer der Kontrollstelle enthalten muss, die für die Kontrolle des Betriebs zuständig ist, der die letzte Erzeugungs- oder Aufbereitungshandlung vorgenommen hat. <i>Empfehlung auf Grundlage der Schlussfolgerung 64</i> <i>Damit zusammenhängende Feststellung: 61</i>
10.	Es sollte sichergestellt werden, dass gemäß Artikel 13 Absatz 4 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1235/2008 Warenkontrollen der Ausfuhrsendungen auf Basis einer Risikobewertung durchgeführt werden. <i>Empfehlung auf Grundlage der Schlussfolgerung 68</i> <i>Damit zusammenhängende Feststellung: 66</i>
11.	Es sollte sichergestellt werden, dass in den Fällen, in denen ein Verdacht auf Regelverletzungen und Unregelmäßigkeiten besteht, angemessene Maßnahmen durchgeführt werden, um gemäß Punkt 8 der Standards der Kontrollstelle für die ökologische/biologische Erzeugung eine betrügerische Verwendung der Kennzeichen für ökologische/biologische Erzeugnisse zu verhindern. Insbesondere sollte sichergestellt werden, dass angemessene Maßnahmen in allen Fällen durchgeführt werden, in denen die Analyseergebnisse auf das Vorhandensein von nicht für die ökologische/biologische Erzeugung zugelassenen Wirkstoffen von Pflanzenschutzmitteln hindeuten. <i>Empfehlung auf Grundlage der Schlussfolgerung 81</i> <i>Damit zusammenhängende Feststellungen: 69 und 73</i>

12.	Es sollte sichergestellt werden, dass die Kontrollstelle beim Eingang von OFIS-Meldungen die festgelegten Verfahren durchführt, um diesen Meldungen zeitnah und ordnungsgemäß nachzugehen, und dass die Ergebnisse der Untersuchungen und die durchgeführten Maßnahmen angemessen sind, um Regelverstöße gemäß dem Handbuch der Kontrollstelle für die Zertifizierung ökologischer/biologischer Erzeugnisse zu ahnden. <i>Empfehlung auf Grundlage der Schlussfolgerung 81</i> <i>Damit zusammenhängende Feststellungen: 77, 78 und 79</i>
-----	---

Die Stellungnahme der zuständigen Behörde zu den Empfehlungen ist abrufbar unter:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_inspection_ref=2018-6392