

# NEPCon Evaluation of Biomasa Forestal S.L. Compliance with the SBP Framework: Public Summary Report

[www.sustainablebiomasspartnership.org](http://www.sustainablebiomasspartnership.org)



## Completed in accordance with the CB Public Summary Template Version 1.0

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

### *Document history*

*Version 1.0: published 26 March 2015*

*© Copyright The Sustainable Biomass Partnership Limited 2015*

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Overview .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Scope of the evaluation and SBP certificate .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Specific objective .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>SBP Standards utilised .....</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1	SBP Standards utilised .....	5
4.2	SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment .....	5
<b>5</b>	<b>Description of Biomass Producer, Supply Base and Forest Management .....</b>	<b>6</b>
5.1	Description of Biomass Producer .....	6
5.2	Description of Biomass Producer's Supply Base .....	6
5.3	Detailed description of Supply Base .....	7
5.4	Chain of Custody system .....	7
<b>6</b>	<b>Evaluation process .....</b>	<b>8</b>
6.1	Timing of evaluation activities .....	8
6.2	Description of evaluation activities .....	8
6.3	Process for consultation with stakeholders .....	9
<b>7</b>	<b>Results .....</b>	<b>10</b>
7.1	Main strengths and weaknesses .....	10
7.2	Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation .....	10
7.3	Compilation of data on Greenhouse Gas emissions .....	10
7.4	Competency of involved personnel .....	10
7.5	Stakeholder feedback .....	10
7.6	Preconditions .....	10
<b>8</b>	<b>Review of Biomass Producer's Risk Assessments .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Review of Biomass Producer's mitigation measures .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Non-conformities and observations .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Certification decision .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Surveillance updates .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Evaluation details .....</b>	<b>27</b>

# 1 Overview

*On a title page, include the following information:*

CB Name and contact: NEPCon OÜ, Filosoofi 31, 50108 Tartu, Estonia

Primary contact for SBP: Ondrej Tarabus, Programme Manager [ot@nepcon.net](mailto:ot@nepcon.net)

Report completion date: 24/03/2016

Report authors: Pilar Gorriá Serrano, Lead auditor and Ondrej Tarabus, witness auditor

Certificate Holder: BIOMASA FORESTAL S.L. Polígono Industrial de Penapurreira. Parcela C3 - A  
As Pontes, 15320. Spain

Producer contact for SBP: María Vázquez, Plan Manager and product certification responsible,  
[maria.vazquez@grupogestlan.net](mailto:maria.vazquez@grupogestlan.net)

Certified Supply Base: Galicia, Asturias and León

SBP Certificate Code: SBP-01-17

Date of certificate issue: 10/May/2016

Date of certificate expiry: 09/May/2021

Indicate where the current audit fits within the certification cycle				
Main (Initial) Audit	First Surveillance Audit	Second Surveillance Audit	Third Surveillance Audit	Fourth Surveillance Audit
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 2 Scope of the evaluation and SBP certificate

The certificate scope covers the production site in As Pontes, Galicia – Spain.

The Organisation holds valid PEFC Chain of Custody certificate with PEFC controlled sources in the scope. The PEFC certificate covers the pellet production.

Until 2015 the Organisation was sourcing logs from different suppliers, from 2016 the organisation has only one supplier that is supplying all the material used for pellets production. In the purchase agreement, the supplier agrees to source 70% of the material as “PEFC 100% Certified” in the first year and upgrade this amount upto 80% in the consecutive year.

Secondary feedstock: sawdust and, sawmill residues is used for the pellet production. Tertiary feedstock and other waste wood is used for drying only (back, branches and post-consumer pallets)

All inputs material delivered to the pellet production plant are covered by their PEFC CoC and classified as PEFC certified, or PEFC Certified sources.

Supply Base Evaluation is not included into the scope of the evaluation.

Scope of the evaluation is indicated in the table below:

Scope Item	Check all that apply to the Certificate Scope				Change in Scope (N/A for Assessments)
Approved Standards:	SBP Standard #2 V1.0 SBP Standard #4 V1.0 SBP Standard #5 V1.0 http://www.sustainablebiomasspartnership.org/documents				<input type="checkbox"/>
Primary Activity:	Pellet producer				<input type="checkbox"/>
Input Material Categories:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SBP-Compliant Primary Feedstock		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SBP-Compliant Secondary Feedstock		<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Controlled Feedstock		<input type="checkbox"/> SBP non-Compliant Feedstock		
	<input type="checkbox"/> SBP-Compliant Tertiary biomass	<input type="checkbox"/> Post-consumer Tertiary Feedstock			
		<input type="checkbox"/> Post-consumer Tertiary Feedstock			
		<input type="checkbox"/> SBP-approved Recycled Claim			
Chain of custody system implemented:	<input type="checkbox"/> FSC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PEFC	<input type="checkbox"/> SFI	<input type="checkbox"/> GGL	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/> Transfer	<input type="checkbox"/> Percentage		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Credit	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of SBP claim:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		<input type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>SBE Verification Program:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Low risk sources only	<input type="checkbox"/> Sources with unspecified/ specified risk	<input type="checkbox"/>
	New districts approved for SBP-Compliant inputs:		
<b>Sub-scopes</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>
Specify SBP Product Groups added or removed:			
Comments:			

### 3 Specific objective

The specific objective of this evaluation was to confirm that the Biomass Producer's 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 BP's management procedures;
- Review of the production processes, production site visit;
- Review of PEFC system control points, analysis of the existing PEFC CoC system;
- Interviews with responsible staff;
- Review of the records, calculations and conversion coefficients; and
- Energy and emission data collection analysis;

## 4 SBP Standards utilised

### 4.1 SBP Standards utilised

Verification of SBP-compliant Feedstock, SBP Standard 2, Version 1.0, March 2015

Chain of Custody, SBP Standard 4, Version 1.0, March 2015

Collection and Communication of Data, SBP Standard 5, Version 1.0, March 2015

<http://www.sustainablebiomasspartnership.org/documents>

### 4.2 SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment

Not applicable. Supply Base Evaluation is not covered by the scope of the evaluation



## 5 Description of Biomass Producer, Supply Base and Forest Management

### 5.1 Description of Biomass Producer

The organization is included in a group of companies GRUPO GESTAN that groups entities with different activities such as waste management, water management, environment and energy consultancy.

90% of the feedstock is classified as logs - primary feedstock. Secondary feedstock percentage corresponds to the other 10%, this secondary feedstock is sawdust, coastal, chips from primary production sourced from industries in nearby areas.

The reporting period is the calendar year 2015. During the reporting period the organization used several suppliers for input material. In 2016 the organisation will only work with one supplier in order simplify the BP sourcing requirements. In the beginning of 2016 there was also accepted some secondary feedstock material from other suppliers to allow to these suppliers find another destiny to these secondary outputs.

As part of the single contract with this supplier, organisation has included some technical and environmental requirements, ex: supply diameters less than 7cm or the minimum of 70% PEFC certified material for 2016. In the second year 2017, the commitment of certified material will rise to 80%.

Biomasa Forestal has one production line for pellets production, the production can produce both domestic and industrial pellets. The organization is certified in carbon footprint and EPlus.

In the dryer Biomasa Forestal use 60% of bark from internal and external sources and recycled material (40%) from pallets, forest residues and other residues.

Pellets are sold in Galicia, "Puerto de Ferrol". The organization considers to include other ports in UK because it is previewed that in the future customers will require the transport until other harbours.

### 5.2 Description of Biomass Producer's Supply Base

Supply Base of Biomasa Forestal is the region of Galicia, Asturias and León in the north west of Spain.

The raw material used by Biomasa Forestal for the production of pellets comes only from Spain. Around 90% of the raw material comes from the Autonomous Community of Galicia, around 9% comes from Asturias and around the remaining 1% comes from Leon.

Forest area in Spain occupies 54.8% of its territory, 27.7 M ha. Spain has the third largest extension of wooded area in the EU, with 18.4 M is equivalent to 36.3% of its national territory and forest an area of 0.4 hectares per capita. Furthermore, the surface is treeless in Spain 9.3 M ha, covering 18.5% of the national area.

Forest area in Galicia has barely registered any change in the last thirteen years, according to the Fourth National Forest Inventory (MAGRAMA 2011). Galicia has just over 2 million hectares of forest area of which 70% is forested. 66% of this forest correspond to private (87.532 ha PEFC Certified and 27.505 has FSC Certified).

Principal species are *Pinus pinaster* (27%), 13% of *Quercus robur* and 12% of *Eucalyptus*. From these numbers productive forest correspond to *Eucalyptus* and Conifers with similar percentages.

Forest area in Asturias according to the Fourth National Forest Inventory (MAGRAMA 2011) is 770.000 has with around 60% of woodland. Around 38% correspond to public land and 61% is private and 0.2 community land. The main species distribution according to the same national inventory is: 18% *Castanea sativa*, 15 % *Fagus sylvatica*, 10% different *Quercus* species and 10% different *Pinus* species.

Castilla y Leon, with less representation in the Supply Base of Biomasa Forestal, has 2,933,030 hectares of forest surface, of which 973,898 hectares are conifers and 1,812,718 hectares are broadleaf.

## 5.3 Detailed description of Supply Base

Total Supply Base area (ha): 2.4 million ha (90% Galicia, 9% Asturias and 1% León)

Tenure by type (ha): 100% private.

Forest by type (ha): 2.4 million ha temperate forests

Forest by management type (ha): 2.0 million ha plantation / 0.4 million managed natural

Certified forest by scheme (ha): FSC - total certified area 30.400 ha

PEFC – total certified area 174.400 ha

Quantitative description of the Supply Base can be found in the Supply Base Report of the Biomass Producer.

<http://www.bioforestal.es/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/SBP-Supply-Base-Report.pdf> and

<http://www.bioforestal.es/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/SBP-Supply-Base-Report.pdf>

## 5.4 Chain of Custody system

Origination holds a valid PEFC Chain of Custody with PEFC Controlled sources in the scope of the certificate. Critical control points of the PEFC CoC system were evaluated also during the SBP assessment.

Organisation has implemented PEFC credit system. All the input material are received either with PEFC Certified claims or the material is covered by organisation's own controlled sources verification system. The organization does not use any imported material. Incoming wood reception register and supplier list are maintained. All material is checked during the arrival and correctly recorded in the internal system. No physical separation is needed. Based on the proportion of certified and controlled wood material the proportion of the SBP-compliant and SBP-controlled biomass is calculated.

## 6 Evaluation process

### 6.1 Timing of evaluation activities

The assessment was carried out on 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> February. Two days were needed for the onsite audit and two additional days for the documentation review.

### 6.2 Description of evaluation activities

The assessment visit was focused on management system evaluation: division of the responsibilities, document and system, input material classification (reception and registration), analysis of the existing PEFC CoC system and PEFC CoC system control points as well as the collection of the energy and emission data.

Description of the assessment evaluation:

All SBP related documentation connected to the SBP as well as PEFC CoC/Controlled sources system of the organisation, including SBP Procedures, GHG related data, Supply Base Reports, were evaluated during the assessment.

Auditor was welcomed in Biomasa Forestal Company. Audit started with an opening meeting attended by the quality Manager and NEPCon Internal witness auditor, Ondrej Tarabus.

Auditors introduced themselves, provided information about audit plan, methodology, auditor qualification, confidentiality issues, and assessment methodology and clarified verification scope. During the opening meeting the auditor explained CB's approval related issues.

After that auditor went through all applicable requirements of the SBP standards nr.2, 4, 5 and instruction documents 5a covering input clarification, existing chain of custody and controlled wood system, management system, CoC, recordkeeping/mass balance requirements, emission and energy data and categorisation of input and verification of SBP compliant and SBP Controlled feedstock/ biomass. During the process overall responsible person for SBP system and as well as other persons having key responsibilities within the system were interviewed.

After that, roundtrip around BP's pellet production was undertaken. During the site tour reception process were observed, applicable records were reviewed, pellet factory staff was interviewed and PEFC system critical control points were analysed.

At the end of the audit findings were summarised and audit conclusion based on use of 3 angle evaluation method were provided to the quality manager of Biomasa Forestal.

Composition of the audit team:

Auditor(s), roles	Qualifications
Pilar Gorriá	Pilar is a forestry engineer from the University of Madrid. Part of her studies took place at the Forestry Research National Center-BFV in Vienna, where she explored carbon soil emissions in commercially managed forests. He has participated in several FSC FM, FSC CoC, PEFC CoC and Carbon Footprint in Spain and Portugal.
Ondrej Tarabus Witness auditor Evaluation against all applicable requirements	Czech citizen, graduated in University of Life Sciences Prague, The Faculty of Forestry. He has participated in several FSC assessments in Czech Republic, Slovakia, Italy, Germany, Vietnam, Egypt, Spain, Romania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Austria, etc. and FSC FM audits in Czech Republic and Lithuania. Ondřej Tarabus successfully completed SBP training course and he has practical experience with carbon footprint certification as well as biofuels certification.

## 6.3 Process for consultation with stakeholders

The stakeholder consultation was carried out on 7th of January, 2016 by sending direct email to different stakeholder categories: state institutions, local NGOs, authorities, government bodies, forest owners associations, academic and research institutions. The stakeholder notification letter is added as an Exhibit No. 2 to this report.

## 7 Results

### 7.1 Main strengths and weaknesses

**Strength:** Most of the elements of SBP system were implemented at the time of the assessment. Use of the PEFC system and control of all incoming materials at the level of log reception.

**Weaknesses:** See the non-conformities below.

### 7.2 Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation

Not applicable

### 7.3 Compilation of data on Greenhouse Gas emissions

Prior the assessment the organization has recorded partially data on greenhouse gas emissions and has only started for purposes of the SBP certification. Some data required for the GHG calculation were not supported by weak evidence as the organization did not collect all information on regular basis before the decision to go for SBP certification was taken. However, there are all required data and the newly established system is well implemented and the responsible workers are aware about their requirements.

### 7.4 Competency of involved personnel

Supply Base Evaluation is not in the scope of the evaluation.

During the assessment it was identified that number of staff members are involved into the SBP system management and implementation, including Quality Manager, Production manager, Production operators and accountant. Interviewed staff demonstrated awareness of their responsibilities within SBP system. Overall responsible staff was familiar with the SBP requirements.

### 7.5 Stakeholder feedback

Comments from stakeholders related to the forest management practices in areas with cultural high conservation values were received, stating that in some cases forest operations do not respect the mitigations measures established by the technical heritage report. These comments were for general practices and no related to Biomasa Forestal. In order to follow up in annual audits and ensure that forest practices in which the organization is involved do not violate these requirements, the stakeholder commit to forward specific references to the FMUs with infringements.

### 7.6 Preconditions

All pre-conditions identified during the field work were addressed by the BP before close this report.



## 8 Review of Biomass Producer's Risk Assessments

Not applicable

## 9 Review of Biomass Producer's mitigation measures

Not applicable



## 10 Non-conformities and observations

<b>NCR: 01/16</b>	<b>NC Classification: minor</b>	
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard # 2 requirement 6.1.	
<b>Report Section:</b>	Appendix A p 1.2.	
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>		
<p>Organisation used delivery notes to record the place of harvesting. These documents, include the information about the type of material and species (Pinus or various). Place of harvesting is mentioned as the municipality and only in case of PEFC Certified inputs reference to the FMU identification is provided. In 2016 at least 70% of the material will be PEFC Certified and in 2016, 80% with information about the FMU identification in the delivery notes.</p> <p>Biomasa Forestal shall record the place of harvesting for all the primary feedstock. Currently, for non-certified material only municipality level is record (which provides the assurance that the material comes within defined SB) but FMU level is requested only for PEFC certified material.</p>		
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.	
<b>Timeline for Conformance:</b>	By the next annual surveillance audit	
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	PENDING	
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	PENDING	
<b>NCR Status:</b>	OPEN	
Is the non-conformity likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks?		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>NCR: 02/16</b>	<b>NC Classification: minor</b>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard # 2 requirement 6.2.
<b>Report Section:</b>	Appendix A p 1.3.
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>	
<p>Biomasa Forestal keep records of the origin in the IT System LIBRA. The secondary feedstock origin is not known at the level of the harvesting place. The origin known is the sawmill-supplier location, based on delivery notes.</p> <p>Prior to close this report the organisation has develop additional documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedure IT SBP 5.1.1. "Feedstock traceability" where is stated that to ensure place of harvesting of secondary feedstock, origination will ask the supplier to provide the information detailed in Annex 1. This information will be confirmed through internal audits.</li> <li>• Annex I. "Cuestionario proveedores material prima secundaria" is a survey to be filled by the secondary feedstock suppliers with information about: municipality of harvesting, type of material processed, species and other info.</li> <li>• Internal supplier audit program has been prepared with specific audit report template (see internal procedure Anexo2. "Informe auditoria suministradores de material prima secundaria").</li> </ul> <p>Place of harvesting of secondary feedstock couldn't be confirmed during the assessment because this procedure described above has not been implemented yet. The effectiveness of the action implemented by the organisation will be evaluated in the next annual audit.</p>	
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	<p>Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above.</p> <p>Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.</p>
<b>Timeline for Conformance:</b>	By the next annual surveillance audit
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	PENDING
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	PENDING
<b>NCR Status:</b>	<b>OPEN</b>
Is the non-conformity likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks?	
<div>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div>	

<b>NCR: 03/16</b>	<b>NC Classification: MAJOR</b>	
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard # 2 requirement 7.1.	
<b>Report Section:</b>	Appendix A p 2.1.	
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>		
<p>The BP have an active homepage for the company. <a href="http://www.bioforestal.es/">http://www.bioforestal.es/</a></p> <p>Biomasa Forestal establish in their SBP procedures (section 4.2.) that the SBR will be publically available at the website, once it was finished and approved. The report is available in Biomasa Forestal office upon request. During the evaluation the final SBR version was not yet updated.</p>		
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	<p>Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above.</p> <p>Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.</p>	
<b>Timeline for Conformance:</b>	Prior to certification	
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	Biomasa Forestal website: <a href="http://www.bioforestal.es/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/SBP-Supply-Base-Report.pdf">http://www.bioforestal.es/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/SBP-Supply-Base-Report.pdf</a>	
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	Organisation has published the latest SB report BP at the website (see download section). <a href="http://www.bioforestal.es/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/SBP-Supply-Base-Report.pdf">http://www.bioforestal.es/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/SBP-Supply-Base-Report.pdf</a>	
<b>NCR Status:</b>	<b>CLOSED</b>	
Is the non-conformity likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks?		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>NCR: 04/16</b>	<b>NC Classification: MAJOR</b>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard # 2 requirement 2C 1.1..
<b>Report Section:</b>	Appendix A p 2.6.
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>	
Spanish SBR version is available in Spanish in the organization office up on request but the SBR is not available in English.	
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.
<b>Timeline for Conformance:</b>	Pre-condition
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	SBR available in English.
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	Before close this report the organisation has sent the Supply Base Report translated to English.
<b>NCR Status:</b>	<b>CLOSED</b>
Is the non-conformity likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>NCR: 05/16</b>	<b>NC Classification: Minor</b>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard # 4 requirement 6.1.
<b>Report Section:</b>	Appendix B p 6.1
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>	
Standard requires to use the latest version of the standard nr.5. This requirement has been applied for this assessment (using the valid standard version) but the update in the future this the latest version is not clearly designated in the BP procedures. Requirement for the procedure review is stated in the procedures	
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.
<b>Timeline for Conformance:</b>	By the next annual surveillance audit
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	PENDING
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	PENDING
<b>NCR Status:</b>	<b>OPEN</b>
Is the non-conformity likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks?	
<div>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div>	

<b>NCR: 06/16</b>	<b>NC Classification: minor</b>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard # 4 requirement 4B, 3.1., 3.3., 3.4.
<b>Report Section:</b>	Appendix B p 9.13., 9.15., 9.16
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>	
<p>SBP logo artwork is slightly covered in section 6 of the SBP procedures. The following requirements are missing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SBP logo artwork may be used only in landscape and horizontal alignment</li> <li>• When used on a non-white background a white space must be retained around the SBP logo artwork to clearly differentiate it from the background</li> <li>• There are some points don't allowed: a) change color, transparency or proportions, b) Making the SBP logo art work appear to be part of other information such as environmental claims not relevant to SBP certification. c) Making the SBP logo art work appear to be part of other information such as environmental claims not relevant to SBP certification. d) Rotating the SBP logo art work to anything other than a horizontal alignment</li> </ul>	
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	<p>Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above.</p> <p>Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.</p>
<b>Timeline for Conformance:</b>	By the next annual surveillance audit
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	PENDING
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	PENDING
<b>NCR Status:</b>	<b>OPEN</b>
Is the non-conformity likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks?	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

<b>NCR: 07/16</b>	<b>NC Classification: minor</b>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard # 5 requirement 5a, 3.1.1.
<b>Report Section:</b>	Appendix C, 4.1.1.
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>	
<p>The BP is applying EC and UK feedstock classification. The classification is mentioned in the GHG and profiling information under the section feedstock used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to EC classification: Material is classified as steam wood and wood industry residues.</li> <li>• According to UK classification: Long rotation forestry (conifer) with less than 40 years, sawdust, sawmill residues and slab wood.</li> <li>• Waste wood and bark are also used for the dryer.</li> </ul> <p>During the warehouse visit, the following feedstock material was found:</p> <p>a) Wood classified by the BP as extra-size with diameters bigger than 40 cm. It can be hardly used for other productive purposes but biodiversity uses of this material if it is left in the forest could be considered. This material has not been used for pellets production during 2015 because the BP needs to outsource special equipment to cut and chip this material and enter into the pellets production process. The material is too big and the BP has not equipment to work with. After the field work the BP has sent a procedure to remove this material from the BP yard and do not use for pellet production. The procedure will be handled by a topographer who will measure the total amount of material and it will be sold as row material to customers.</p> <p>b) Currently for this reporting period all the material has been classified as final felling because the BP has not enough evidences to justify that some material could be classified as forest residues from thinning or tree tops. The BP decided to classify all the primary feedstock as final felling applying a conservative approach.</p> <p>The BP aims to agree with the supplier that in the next delivery notes, the supplier will indicate if the wood comes from a final felling or thinning, using the information provided in the harvesting permit. Currently, at the moment of finish this report a more accurate classification of the row material shall be needed to comply with SBP requirements.</p> <p>Taken into account the material evaluated in the company yard and the conservative approach established by the company, auditor considers this lack of classification as minor NCR.</p>	
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	<p>Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above.</p> <p>Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.</p>
<b>Timeline for Conformance:</b>	By the next annual surveillance audit
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	PENDING
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	PENDING

<b>NCR Status:</b>	<b>OPEN</b>
Is the non-conformity likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



<b>NCR: 08/16</b>	<b>NC Classification: minor</b>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard # 5 requirement 5a, 3.7.1.
<b>Report Section:</b>	Appendix C, 4.7.1
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>	
<p>For primary feedstock (more than 80% of the total feedstock received) diesel used for haulage is calculated based on capacity of the trucks, total tonnes of feedstock from the forest and the distance. In case of distances, the company has developed a case of study during 5 months in 2015 where it is calculated the following: Origin of feedstock is classified in 3 different categories based on distance and the relevant number of travels area allocated in each category. A weight average is used to calculate the final data for the distance and a conservative value of 80 km is used for GHG calculation (the result of the calculation was a bit lower).</p> <p>By the assessment field work, the BP didn't included the energy used in the haulage of secondary feedstock and bark to the pellet plant. Before closing this report, the BP has included these data. The distance used is also 80km/one way and the specific diesel used has been added. The auditor keep a minor NCR open connected with secondary feedstock and the bark. It will be necessary to verify these data with the relevant evidences in the next annual audit.</p>	
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	<p>Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above.</p> <p>Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.</p>
<b>Timeline for Conformance:</b>	By the next annual surveillance audit
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	PENDING
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	PENDING
<b>NCR Status:</b>	<b>OPEN</b>
Is the non-conformity likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks?	
<div>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></div> <div>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div>	

<b>NCR: 09/16</b>	<b>NC Classification: minor</b>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard # 4 requirement 5.4.2.
<b>Report Section:</b>	Appendix B, 4.2.
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>	
Organization keeps records of all the customers to which it supplies biomass but the specific requirement of record the certificate number is not yet implemented in the system	
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above. Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing the specific occurrence described in evidence above, as well as the root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the non-conformance.
<b>Timeline for Conformance:</b>	By the next annual surveillance audit
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	PENDING
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	PENDING
<b>NCR Status:</b>	<b>OPEN</b>
Is the non-conformity likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<b>OBS: 01/16</b>	<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard # 5 requirement 5a. 3.3.1.
	<b>Report Section</b>	Appendix C p 4.3.1.
<b>Description of findings leading to observation:</b>	Organisation has data provided by their supplier for cutting (harvester and loader). Data are higher than other averages in the sector. Other forestry activities as plantations and pruning if exists has not been taken into account. The BP has not information/data about it.	
<b>Observation:</b>	Organisation should consider the total energy used for soil preparation, planting and other forest activities if these are applicable.	

<b>OBS: 02/16</b>	<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard # 5 requirement 4.5.3.
	<b>Report Section</b>	Appendix C p 4.5.3.
<b>Description of findings leading to observation:</b>	<p>In 2014 the BP monitored the electricity used based on the engine power in all the production lines. The difference between the electricity used in the production and the total invoiced was 1% that corresponds to office facilities.</p> <p>Electricity calculation included in the GHG table do not exclude the Kwh used in the office. In procedure PSBP 5.1. Section 4.5. the amount of electricity classified as "other" and not related with the pellets production is 1%.</p>	
<b>Observation:</b>	Organisation should deduct the energy used in other facilities like office with theoretical approach if direct measurements are not available.	

## 11 Certification decision

<b>Based on Organisation's conformance with SBP requirements, the auditor makes the following recommendation:</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Certification approved: Upon acceptance of NCR(s) issued above
<input type="checkbox"/>	Certification not approved:
<b>Based on auditor's recommendation and NEPCon quality review following certification decision is taken:</b>	
<b>NEPCon certification decision:</b> <b>The Biomass producer has been certified by NEPCon as meeting the requirements of the specified SBP Standard, the certificate can be issued immediately after SBP technical committee will approve the report. The expiration of the certificate will be then 5 years.</b>	
<b>Certification decision by: Asko Lust</b>	
Date of decision: <b>24.03.2016</b>	

## 12 Surveillance updates

Note: Surveillance updates shall be provided to SBP as specified in SBP Standard 3: Certification Systems: Requirements for Certification Bodies.

## 13 Evaluation details

Primary Responsible Person: (Responsible for control system at site(s))	María Vazquez, Quality Manager
Auditor(s):	Pilar Gorría Serrano - Lead Auditor. Ondřej Tarabus – Witness Auditor
People Interviewed, Titles:	María Vazquez, Quality Manager Ana Vigo, Administration Ainhoa Sanjurjo, Administration Julio Guerreiro Castro, Operator Manuel Viveiro, Jefe de turno.
Brief Overview of Audit Process for this Location:	See in section 6.2, Description of evaluation activities in the main part of the report.
Comments:	N/A