

# Control Union Certifications B.V. Evaluation of Power Plant Rotterdam B.V. Compliance with the SBP Framework: Public Summary Report

Main (Initial) Audit

[www.sbp-cert.org](http://www.sbp-cert.org)



## Completed in accordance with the CB Public Summary Report Template Version 1.4

*For further information on the SBP Framework and to view the full set of documentation see  
[www.sbp-cert.org](http://www.sbp-cert.org)*

### *Document history*

*Version 1.0: published 26 March 2015*

*Version 1.1: published 30 January 2018*

*Version 1.2: published 4 April 2018*

*Version 1.3: published 10 May 2018*

*Version 1.4: published 16 August 2018*

© Copyright The Sustainable Biomass Program Limited 2018

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Overview</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Scope of the evaluation and SBP certificate</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Specific objective</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>SBP Standards utilised</b>
4.1	SBP Standards utilised
4.2	SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment
<b>5</b>	<b>Description of Company, Supply Base and Forest Management</b>
5.1	Description of Company
5.2	Description of Company's Supply Base
5.3	Detailed description of Supply Base
5.4	Chain of Custody system
<b>6</b>	<b>Evaluation process</b>
6.1	Timing of evaluation activities
6.2	Description of evaluation activities
6.3	Process for consultation with stakeholders
<b>7</b>	<b>Results</b>
7.1	Main strengths and weaknesses
7.2	Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation
7.3	Compilation of data on Greenhouse Gas emissions
7.4	Competency of involved personnel
7.5	Stakeholder feedback
7.6	Preconditions
<b>8</b>	<b>Review of Company's Risk Assessments</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Review of Company's mitigation measures</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Non-conformities and observations</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Certification recommendation</b>

# 1 Overview

CB Name and contact: Control Union Certifications; Meeuwenlaan 4-6; P.O.Box 161, 8000AD, Zwolle, Netherlands. [certification@controlunion.com](mailto:certification@controlunion.com)

Primary contact for SBP: Andrea Ferrazzo

Current report completion date: 11/Jul/2019

Report authors: Koen Jongste

Name of the Company: Power Plant Rotterdam B.V., Missouriweg 69 (port 8030), 3199 LB, Rotterdam, NL

Company contact for SBP: ir. F.J. Serné

Certified Supply Base: N/A - End User

SBP Certificate Code: SBP-06-33

Date of certificate issue: 22/Aug/2019

Date of certificate expiry: 21/Aug/2024

This report relates to the Main (Initial) Audit

## 2 Scope of the evaluation and SBP certificate

The scope of this evaluation includes trading of wood pellets with storage. The scope is matching with the application form and only includes SBP standards 4 and 5.

### 3 Specific objective

The specific objective of this evaluation was to confirm that the traders management system is capable of ensuring that all requirements of specified SBP Standards are implemented across the entire scope of certification

The scope of the evaluation covered:

- Review of the management procedures;
- Review of Chain of Custody system control points and an analysis of the existing FSC and PEFC CoC system;
- Interviews with responsible staff;
- review of equipment and storage facility;
- Review of the records, calculations and conversion coefficients; and
- GHG data collection analysis on.

## 4 SBP Standards utilised

### 4.1 SBP Standards utilised

*Please select all SBP Standards used during this evaluation. All Standards can be accessed and downloaded from <https://sbp-cert.org/documents/standards-documents/standards>*

- ☐ SBP Framework Standard 1: Feedstock Compliance Standard (Version 1.0, 26 March 2015)
- ☐ SBP Framework Standard 2: Verification of SBP-compliant Feedstock (Version 1.0, 26 March 2015)
- ☒ SBP Framework Standard 4: Chain of Custody (Version 1.0, 26 March 2015)
- ☒ SBP Framework Standard 5: Collection and Communication of Data (Version 1.0, 26 March 2015)

### 4.2 SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment

Not applicable - No SBP endorsed Regional Risk Assessment was used for this assessment

## 5 Description of Company, Supply Base and Forest Management

### 5.1 Description of Company

Power Plant Rotterdam B.V. is situated in the port of Rotterdam (Maasvlakte)

The company is still owned by Engie, but in the coming months a transfer to Riverstone should be closed.

The plant is an end-user (power plant), combustion coal and in the transition to wood pellets. Their neighbour EMO is used as subcontractor for storage of the pellets. They intend to use over 200 000 mt biomass annually possibly increase that amount to maximum 2 million ton in the future if they were to convert to 100% biomass. They will act as an end user of the wood pellets but may possibly want to sell material they cannot use themselves to generate green energy.

The company is FSC CoC (CU-COC-866755, CU-CW-866755) and in the process of getting PEFC CoC certified.

### 5.2 Description of Company's Supply Base

Not applicable, The company is a Biomass Trader and End User

### 5.3 Detailed description of Supply Base

Not applicable, The company is a Biomass Trader and End User

### 5.4 Chain of Custody system

The organization has implemented FSC transfer and PEFC physical separation systems with biomass (wood pellets and wood chips) in the scope of their certificates. The process covers trade of biomass with physical possession. Valid FSC and PEFC system description and other documents exist. As a trading company and end user, they buy biomass (wood pellets) delivered by sea discharged at EMO.



## 6 Evaluation process

### 6.1 Timing of evaluation activities

The audit occurred on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of July 2019, by the above mentioned audit team. This report is the result of the findings of a certification evaluation carried out by an independent lead auditor representing Control Union Certifications. The purpose of the assessment was to evaluate the compliance of the client with respect to the standards used within the scope of the certificate.

Activity	Date	Executed by
Preparation	21/06/2019	Koen Jongste (lead auditor)
Site audit	03/07/2019 and 04/07/2019	Koen Jongste (lead auditor)
reporting	12/07/2019	Koen Jongste (lead auditor)

#### • Names and affiliations of people interviewed

Name:	Affiliation:
ir. Frederik Serné	Power Plant Rotterdam - Senior Environmental Expert, Health, Safety e Environment
ir. Ton Theunissen	Power Plant Rotterdam/ENGIE - Senior Project Developer Regeneration Sites Centrale Gelderland, Centrale Harculo and Centrale Rotterdam
Theo van Wezel	Power Plant Rotterdam
Arjen Jens	Power Plant Rotterdam
Leo Lokker	EMO
Chantal Poldervaart	EMO

### 6.2 Description of evaluation activities

The audit consisted of an opening meeting, during which the scope was confirmed. The auditor also explained the methods to be employed during the audit. After this introduction, all relevant requirements of the applicable SBP standard(s) were verified on compliance through the use of a report template and checklists by interviews and practical inspection on site. The audit was completed by filling in the audit report and discussing the audit results. Critical Control points were evaluated and found to be sufficiently managed and a closing meeting performed.

## 6.3 Process for consultation with stakeholders

Not applicable, The company is a Biomass Trader and End User

## 7 Results

### 7.1 Main strengths and weaknesses

The audit was conducted in an open and positive environment. Company was good prepared for the audit both in knowledge as in manual and management system. The depth procedures and record keeping are thought to be more than sufficient for the size and complexity of the company. The audit of RWE demonstrated a good level of compliance with the required criteria of Standard 4 and 5. There was reasonable evidence provided to support compliance. The existence of a FSC/PEFC Chain of Custody system in combination with GGL are considered a main strength with respect to RWE overall conformity with the relevant SBP standards.

### 7.2 Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation

Not applicable, The company is a Biomass Trader and End User

### 7.3 Collection and Communication of Data

The company has procedures for this. The company is not involved in vessel and barge transport, this is arranged by the supplier, calculations were prepared. Further on the company has just to assure completeness of incoming documentation to forward to complete the GHG calculation

### 7.4 Competency of involved personnel

The company consist of a quality department which one has the main responsibility related to the SBP system. During the audit the key responsible showed clear and in-depth understanding of SBP, its procedures and the proper execution of those. Training to other personnel was performed.

### 7.5 Stakeholder feedback

Not applicable, The company is a Biomass Trader and End User *so no stakeholder consultation is executed by the CB.*

### 7.6 Preconditions

None identified

## 8 Review of Company's Risk Assessments

*Describe how the Certification Body assessed risk for the Indicators. Summarise the CB's final risk ratings in Table 1, together with the Company's final risk ratings. Default for each indicator is 'Low', click on the rating to change. Note: this summary should show the risk ratings before AND after the SVP has been performed and after any mitigation measures have been implemented.*

Not applicable, The company is a Biomass Trader and End User

**Table 1. Final risk ratings of Indicators as determined BEFORE the SVP and any mitigation measures.**

Indicator	Risk rating (Low or Specified)	
	Producer	CB
1.1.1	Low	Low
1.1.2	Low	Low
1.1.3	Low	Low
1.2.1	Low	Low
1.3.1	Low	Low
1.4.1	Low	Low
1.5.1	Low	Low
1.6.1	Low	Low
2.1.1	Low	Low
2.1.2	Low	Low
2.1.3	Low	Low
2.2.1	Low	Low
2.2.2	Low	Low
2.2.3	Low	Low
2.2.4	Low	Low
2.2.5	Low	Low

Indicator	Risk rating (Low or Specified)	
	Producer	CB
2.3.3	Low	Low
2.4.1	Low	Low
2.4.2	Low	Low
2.4.3	Low	Low
2.5.1	Low	Low
2.5.2	Low	Low
2.6.1	Low	Low
2.7.1	Low	Low
2.7.2	Low	Low
2.7.3	Low	Low
2.7.4	Low	Low
2.7.5	Low	Low
2.8.1	Low	Low
2.9.1	Low	Low
2.9.2	Low	Low
2.10.1	Low	Low

2.2.6	Low	Low
2.2.7	Low	Low
2.2.8	Low	Low
2.2.9	Low	Low
2.3.1	Low	Low
2.3.2	Low	Low

**Table 2. Final risk ratings of Indicators as determined AFTER the SVP and any mitigation measures.**

Indicator	Risk rating (Low or Specified)	
	Producer	CB
1.1.1	Low	Low
1.1.2	Low	Low
1.1.3	Low	Low
1.2.1	Low	Low
1.3.1	Low	Low
1.4.1	Low	Low
1.5.1	Low	Low
1.6.1	Low	Low
2.1.1	Low	Low
2.1.2	Low	Low
2.1.3	Low	Low
2.2.1	Low	Low
2.2.2	Low	Low
2.2.3	Low	Low
2.2.4	Low	Low
2.2.5	Low	Low
2.2.6	Low	Low
2.2.7	Low	Low
2.2.8	Low	Low
2.2.9	Low	Low
2.3.1	Low	Low
2.3.2	Low	Low

Indicator	Risk rating (Low or Specified)	
	Producer	CB
2.3.3	Low	Low
2.4.1	Low	Low
2.4.2	Low	Low
2.4.3	Low	Low
2.5.1	Low	Low
2.5.2	Low	Low
2.6.1	Low	Low
2.7.1	Low	Low
2.7.2	Low	Low
2.7.3	Low	Low
2.7.4	Low	Low
2.7.5	Low	Low
2.8.1	Low	Low
2.9.1	Low	Low
2.9.2	Low	Low
2.10.1	Low	Low

## 9 Review of Company's mitigation measures

Not applicable, the company is an end user

## 10 Non-conformities and observations

Identify all non-conformities and observations raised/closed during the evaluation (a tabular format below may be used here). Please use as many copies of the table as needed. For each, give details to include at least the following:

- applicable requirement(s)
- grading of the non-conformity (major or minor) or observation with supporting rationale
- timeframe for resolution of the non-conformity
- a statement as to whether the non-conformity is likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks.

No non-conformities were found

<b>NC number</b> <i>Enter number</i>	<b>NC Grading:</b> <i>Choose grading.</i>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	<i>Click to enter SBP standard and requirement reference</i>
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>	
<i>Click or tap here to enter NC description.</i>	
<b>Timeline for Conformance:</b>	<i>Choose NC timeline.</i>
<b>Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:</b>	<i>Click or tap here to enter description provided by Company to close the NC.</i>
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	<i>Click or tap here to enter findings for evaluation of evidence by the auditor.</i>
<b>NC Status:</b>	<i>Choose status.</i>

## 11 Certification decision

Based on the auditor's recommendation and the Certification Body's quality review, the following certification decision is taken:	
<b>Certification decision:</b>	Certification approved
<b>Certification decision by (name of the person):</b>	Andrea Ferrazzo
<b>Date of decision:</b>	22/Aug/2019
<b>Other comments:</b>	<i>Click or tap here to enter text.</i>