



SMETA Corrective Action Plan Report (CAPR)

Version 6.0



Audit Details			
Sedex Company Reference: <i>(only available on Sedex System)</i>	ZC1063399	Sedex Site Reference: <i>(only available on Sedex System)</i>	ZS1036936
Business name (Company name):	Lantmannen Cerealia		
Site name:	Lantmannen Cerealia Vejle		
Site address: <i>(Please include full address)</i>	Moellegade 12, 7100 Vejle	Country:	Denmark
Site contact and job title:	Rikke Møller Madsen, Quality Manager		
Site phone:	+45 26 34 61 42	Site e-mail:	Rikke.madsen@lantmannen.com
SMETA Audit Type:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Labour Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health & Safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Business Ethics
Date of Audit:	11 th to 12 th April 2018		

Audit Company Name & Logo: Bureau Veritas 	Report Owner (payee): Lantmannen Cerealia Vejle
---	--

Audit Conducted By					
Commercial	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Purchaser	<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade Union	<input type="checkbox"/>
NGO	<input type="checkbox"/>	Retailer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brand Owner	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multi-stakeholder	<input type="checkbox"/>	Combined Audit (select all that apply)			

Audit Content:

(1) A SMETA audit was conducted which included some or all of Labour Standards, Health and Safety, Environment and Business ethics. The SMETA Best Practice Guidance Version 5 December 2015 was applied. The scope of workers included all types at the site e.g. direct employees, agency workers, workers employed by service providers, and workers provided by other contractors. Any deviations from the SMEIA Methodology are stated (with reasons for deviation) in the SMT IA Declaration.

(2) The audit scope was against the following reference documents

2-Pillar SMETA Audit

- ETI Base Code
- SMETA Additions
 - Management systems and code implementation,
 - Entitlement to Work & Immigration,
 - Sub-Contracting and Home working,

4-Pillar SMETA

- 2-Pillar requirements plus
- Additional Pillar assessment of Environment
- Additional Pillar assessment of Business Ethics
- The Customer's Supplier Code (Appendix 1)

(3) Where appropriate non-compliances were raised against the ETI code / SMETA Additions & local law and recorded as non compliances on both the audit report, CAPR and on Sedex.

(4) Any Non-Compliance against customer code shall not be uploaded to Sedex. However, in the CAPR these 'Variances in compliance between ETI code / SMETA Additions/ local law and customer code' shall be noted in the observations section of the CAPR.

SMETA Declaration

I declare that the audit underpinning the following report was conducted in accordance with SMETA Best Practice Guidance and SMETA Measurement Criteria.

- (1) Where appropriate non-compliances were raised against the ETI code / SMETA Additions & local law and recorded as non-compliances on both the audit report, CAPR and on Sedex.
- (2) Any Non-Compliance against customer code alone shall not be uploaded to Sedex. However, in the CAPR these 'Variances in compliance between ETI code / SMETA Additions/ local law and customer code' shall be noted in the observations section of the CAPR.

Any exceptions to this must be recorded here (e.g. different sample size): None

Auditor Team (s) (please list all including all interviewers):

Lead auditor: Stine JOSEFSEN

Team auditor: - NA

Interviewers: Stine JOSEFSEN

Report writer: Stine JOSEFSEN

Report reviewer: Prasad Lohar

Date of declaration: 17th April 2018

Note: The focus of this ethical audit is on the ETI Base Code and local law. The additional elements will not be audited in such depth or scope, but the audit process will still highlight any specific issues.

This report provides a summary of the findings and other applicable information found/gathered during the social audit conducted on the above date only and does not officially confirm or certify compliance with any legal regulations or industry standards. The social audit process requires that information be gathered and considered from records review, worker interviews, management interviews and visual observation. More information is gathered during the social audit process than is provided here. The audit process is a sampling exercise only and does not guarantee that the audited site prior, during or post-audit, are in full compliance with the Code being audited against. The provisions of this Code constitute minimum and not maximum standards and this Code should not be used to prevent companies from exceeding these standards. Companies applying this Code are expected to comply with national and other applicable laws and where the provisions of law and this Code address the same subject, to apply that provision which affords the greater protection. The ownership of this report remains with the party who has paid for the audit. Release permission must be provided by the owner prior to release to any third parties.

Audit Parameters

Audit Parameters			
A: Time in and time out	Day 1 Time in: 09.00 Day 1 Time out: 17.00	Day 2 Time in: 08.00 Day 2 Time out: 12.00	Day 3 Time in: Day 3 Time out:
B: Number of Auditor Days Used:	1 Auditor X 1,5 MD on site		
C: Audit type:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full Initial <input type="checkbox"/> Periodic <input type="checkbox"/> Full Follow-up <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Follow-Up <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Other – Define		
D: Was the audit announced?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Announced <input type="checkbox"/> Semi – announced: Window detail: weeks <input type="checkbox"/> Unannounced		
E: Was the Sedex SAQ available for review?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, why not		
F: Any conflicting information SAQ/Pre-Audit Info to Audit findings?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes , please capture detail in appropriate audit by clause		
G: Who signed and agreed CAPR (Name and job title)	Rikke Hammer Madsen, Quality Manager		
H: Is further information available (if Y please contact audit company for details)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
I: Previous audit date:	7 th Jan. 2015		
J: Previous audit type:	4 pillar SMETA		
K: Was any previous audit reviewed during this audit	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		

Audit attendance	Management	Worker Representatives	
	Senior management	Worker Committee representatives	Union representatives
A: Present at the opening meeting?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
B: Present at the audit?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

C: Present at the closing meeting?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
D: If Worker Representatives were not present please explain reasons why <i>(only complete if no worker reps present)</i>	NA		
E: If Union Representatives were not present please explain reasons why: <i>(only complete if no union reps present)</i>	NA		

Corrective Action Plan

Corrective Action Plan – non-compliances									
Non-Compliance Number <i>The reference number of the non-compliance from the Audit Report, for example, Discrimination No.7</i>	New or Carried Over <i>Is this a new non-compliance identified at the follow-up or one carried over (C) that is still outstanding</i>	Details of Non-Compliance <i>Details of Non-Compliance</i>	Root cause <i>(completed by the site)</i>	Preventative and Corrective Actions <i>Details of actions to be taken to clear non-compliance, and the system change to prevent re-occurrence (agreed between site and auditor)</i>	Timescale <i>(Immediate, 30, 60, 90, 180, 365)</i>	Verification Method <i>Desktop / Follow-Up [D/F]</i>	Agreed by Management and Name of Responsible Person: <i>Note if management agree to the non-compliance, and document name of responsible person</i>	Verification Evidence and Comments <i>Details on corrective action evidence</i>	Status <i>Open/Closed or comment</i>
		Nothing to report	<input type="checkbox"/> Training <input type="checkbox"/> Systems <input type="checkbox"/> Costs <input type="checkbox"/> lack of workers <input type="checkbox"/> Other – please give details:						

Corrective Action Plan – Observations				
Observation Number <i>The reference number of the observation from the Audit Report, for example, Discrimination No.7</i>	New or Carried Over <i>Is this a new observation identified at the follow-up or one carried over (C) that is still outstanding</i>	Details of Observation <i>Details of Observation</i>	Root cause <i>(completed by the site)</i>	Any improvement actions discussed <i>(Not uploaded on to SEDEX)</i>
		Nothing to report		

Good examples		
Good example Number <i>The reference number of the non-compliance from the Audit Report, for example, Discrimination No.7</i>	Details of good example noted	Any relevant Evidence and Comments
OB Management system and Code Implementation	Der gennemføres CoC audit hos udvalgte suppliers. Udvælgelsen foretages ud fra en risikovurdering. CoC audit is carried out at selected suppliers. Selection is based on a risk assessment.	Review of documentation and interviews with management.
7: No Discrimination is Practiced	On a scale from 0-10 covering satisfaction with the workplace gave interviewed employees a score between 7 and 9. Average score is 8.	Confidential interviews with employees

Confirmation

<p>Please sign this document confirming that the above findings have been discussed with and understood by you: (site management) <i>If actual signatures are not possible in electronic versions, please state the name of the signatory in applicable boxes, as indicating the signature.</i></p>		
A: Site Representative Signature:	Rikke Hammer Madsen	Title Quality Manager Date 12 th April 2018
B: Auditor Signature:	Stine JOSEFSEN	Title Lead auditor Date 12 th April 2018
C: Please indicate below if you, the site management, dispute any of the findings. No need to complete D-E, if no disputes.		
D: I dispute the following numbered non-compliances: - None		
E: Signed: (If <u>any</u> entry in box D, please complete a signature on this line)	NA	Title Date
F: Any other site Comments: - None		



For more information visit: Sedexglobal.com

Your feedback on your experience of the SMETA audit you have observed is extremely valuable. It will help to make improvements to future versions.

You can leave feedback by following the appropriate link to our questionnaire:

[Click here for Buyer \(A\) & Buyer/Supplier \(A/B\) members:](#)

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=riPsbE0PQ52ehCo3lnq5lw_3d_3d

[Click here for Supplier \(B\) members:](#)

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=d3vYsCe48fre69DRglY_2brg_3d_3d