

Control Union
Certifications B.V.
Evaluation of RWE
Eemshaven Holding II
B.V. Compliance with the
SBP Framework: Public
Summary Report

Main (Initial) Audit

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*

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

1	Overview
2	Scope of the evaluation and SBP certificate
3	Specific objective
4	SBP Standards utilised
4.1	SBP Standards utilised
4.2	SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment
5	Description of Company, Supply Base and Forest Management
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
6	Evaluation process
6.1	Timing of evaluation activities
6.2	Description of evaluation activities
6.3	Process for consultation with stakeholders
7	Results
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
8	Review of Company's Risk Assessments
9	Review of Company's mitigation measures
10	Non-conformities and observations
11	Certification recommendation

1 Overview

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

Primary contact for SBP: Andrea Ferrazzo

Current report completion date: 10/Jun/2019

Report authors: Koen Jongste

Name of the Company: RWE Eemshaven Holding II B.V.

Company contact for SBP: Mr. R. Kruit

Certified Supply Base: N/A - End User

SBP Certificate Code: SBP-06-32

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 certificate

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

RWE Eemshaven Holding II B.V. is, being a power plant, an end user of biomass. For SBP, the power plant has a biomass trader scope to be able to buy and sell biomass with an SBP claim. The company does not have the aim to sell biomass, but in order to manager the flow of incoming biomass for the plant, the option to so sell surpluses of biomass is possible, and their COC system can accommodate this.

The company is a coal power plant, planning to use 15% of biomass input. Delivery takes place by vessels.. On the premises the company is able to store and buffer biomass prior to usage. The company consists of many technical people, safety on the site is highest priority. Mr R. Kruit (Senior Risk & Quality officer) is responsible for the SBP system.

The company is FSC CoC (CU-COC-866470, CU-CW-866470) certified and in the process of becoming also GGL and PEFC CoC cerified.

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) by sea mainly without storage.

6 Evaluation process

6.1 Timing of evaluation activities

The audit occurred on June 25 – 27, 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	19/06/2019	Koen Jongste (lead auditor)
Administration site audit	25/06/2019	Koen Jongste (lead auditor)
Power plant site audit	27/06/2019	Koen Jongste (lead auditor)
reporting	10/07/2019	Koen Jongste (lead auditor)

• Names and affiliations of people interviewed	
Name:	Affiliation:
Mr R. Kruit	Senior Risk & Quality Officer
Mr P. Mulder	Data & Reporting Officer
Mr. Iewke Hoekstra	Logistiek coördinator BHB-stoffen
Mrs O. Olree	Backoffice administration

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)		Indicator	Risk rating (Low or Specified)	
	Producer	CB		Producer	CB
1.1.1	Low	Low	2.3.3	Low	Low
1.1.2	Low	Low	2.4.1	Low	Low
1.1.3	Low	Low	2.4.2	Low	Low
1.2.1	Low	Low	2.4.3	Low	Low
1.3.1	Low	Low	2.5.1	Low	Low
1.4.1	Low	Low	2.5.2	Low	Low
1.5.1	Low	Low	2.6.1	Low	Low
1.6.1	Low	Low	2.7.1	Low	Low
2.1.1	Low	Low	2.7.2	Low	Low
2.1.2	Low	Low	2.7.3	Low	Low
2.1.3	Low	Low	2.7.4	Low	Low
2.2.1	Low	Low	2.7.5	Low	Low
2.2.2	Low	Low	2.8.1	Low	Low
2.2.3	Low	Low	2.9.1	Low	Low
2.2.4	Low	Low	2.9.2	Low	Low
2.2.5	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

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

Certification decision:	Certification approved
Certification decision by (name of the person):	Andrea Ferrazzo
Date of decision:	22/Aug/2019
Other comments:	<i>Click or tap here to enter text.</i>