

# SBP

Sustainable Biomass Partnership

## NEPCon Evaluation of Statkraft Markets GmbH Compliance with the SBP Framework: Public Summary Report

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



## Completed in accordance with the CB Public Summary Report 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 .....	8
<b>6</b>	<b>Evaluation process</b> .....	<b>9</b>
6.1	Timing of evaluation activities .....	9
6.2	Description of evaluation activities .....	10
6.3	Process for consultation with stakeholders .....	11
<b>7</b>	<b>Results</b> .....	<b>12</b>
7.1	Main strengths and weaknesses .....	12
7.2	Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation .....	12
7.3	Compilation of data on Greenhouse Gas emissions .....	12
7.4	Competency of involved personnel .....	12
7.5	Stakeholder feedback .....	12
7.6	Preconditions .....	12
<b>8</b>	<b>Review of Biomass Producer's Risk Assessments</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Review of Biomass Producer's mitigation measures</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Non-conformities and observations</b> .....	<b>15</b>
10.1	Open Non-Conformity Reports (NCRs) .....	15
10.2	Observations .....	19
<b>11</b>	<b>Certification decision</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Surveillance updates</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Evaluation details</b> .....	<b>22</b>

# 1 Overview

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

Primary contact for SBP: Ondřej Tarabus, [ot@nepcon.net](mailto:ot@nepcon.net), +420 606 730 382

Report completion date: 18<sup>th</sup> August 2016

Report authors: Ondřej Tarabus

Certificate Holder: Statkraft GmbH, Derendorfer Allee 2a 40476, Düsseldorf, Germany trading as Statkraft UK Limited

Producer contact for SBP: Elizabeth Warren, Commercial Operations Manager, +44 (0) 7825 642163, [elizabeth.warren@statkraft.com](mailto:elizabeth.warren@statkraft.com)

Certified Supply Base: Norway

SBP Certificate Code: SBP-01-45

Date of certificate issue: 14/10/2016

Date of certificate expiry: 13/10/2021

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 chip producer from Germany with office in London and chipping site located in Tofte, Norway.

The Organisation holds valid FSC (TT-COC-004832) and PEFC (BMT-PEFC-1311) Chain of Custody covering FSC/PEFC certified material. The organizations FSC CoC scope of certificate does not contain verification program according FSC. All material is sourced with certified claim.

The input material used by the organisation for chips production is primary feedstock only. All input material is Roundwood.

All inputs materials chipped are PEFC certified sourced from Norway.

The BP is procuring the material at their chipping site in Norway, the material is stored for some period of time and then is chipped and transported to the clients.

The BP is selling the chips at the different ports in Europe.

Supply Base Evaluation is not included into the scope of the evaluation as the biomass producer is sourcing all the material as FSC or PEFC certified and therefore can be sourced as SBP compliant.

Scope Item	Check all that apply to the Certificate Scope		Change in Scope (N/A for Assessments)
<b>Approved Standards:</b>	<i>SBP Standard #2 V1.0 SBP Standard #4 V1.0 SBP Standard #5 V1.0</i> <a href="http://www.sustainablebiomasspartnership.org/documents">http://www.sustainablebiomasspartnership.org/documents</a>		<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Primary Activity:</b>	Producer of wood chips		<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Input Material Categories:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SBP-Compliant Primary Feedstock	<input type="checkbox"/> SBP-Compliant Secondary Feedstock	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input 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"/> SBP-approved Recycled Claim	<input type="checkbox"/> Post-consumer Tertiary Feedstock	

<b>Chain of custody system implemented:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PEFC	<input type="checkbox"/> SFI	<input type="checkbox"/> GGL
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transfer	<input type="checkbox"/> Percentage	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit	
<b>Points of sales</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Harbour (including own handling of material)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Harbour (e.g. FOB incoterms) legal owner is not responsible for handling of material at the harbor	<input type="checkbox"/> Other point of sale (e.g. gate of the BP, boarder, railway station etc.)	
<b>Provide name of all points of sales</b>	- - -	- Skaerbaek, - Copenhagen - Randers - Gothenburg - Verberg - Emden - Bremen - Amsterdam  All DAP or CIF incoterms	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Use of SBP claim:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		<input type="checkbox"/> No	
<b>SBE Verification Program:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Low risk sources only		<input type="checkbox"/> Sources with unspecified/ specified risk	
	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 and storage site visits;
- Review of FSC system control points, analysis of the existing FSC CoC system;
- Interviews with responsible staff;
- Review of the records, calculations and conversion coefficients; and
- GHG 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

Instruction document 5A Collection and Communication of Data 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

Statkraft is a wood chips producer chipping material at Tofte, Norway, with administration office in London and headquarter office in Dusseldorf, Germany.

Statkraft is producing green wood chips only.

BP is sourcing primary feedstock for its chips production – low quality Roundwood from some few Norwegian suppliers.

All feedstock chipped is either PEFC certified. There might be also situation that non-certified material could be sourced (which is not foreseen) in in that case physical separation would be applied and such material would not be sold as SBP-compliant. The biomass producer does not plan to source SBP-controlled material.

The BP is implementing PEFC transfer system. The physical separation would apply only in case the suppliers would delivered non-certified material but the supplier contracts clearly states that only PEFC certified material will be accepted.

After the production, chips are loaded from the chipping site to the vessel and transported to the client by sea. The material will be sold at different harbours in Europe with CIF or DAP incoterms conditions.

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

The supply base is the whole Norway, primarily consists of small closed-forest family-owned holdings in south-east Norway. A limited proportion (approximately 15% +/- 5%) of forest owners/family members are actively engaged in their forest through felling and/or transport operations and some family holdings carry out their own reforestation and silvicultural work too. The remaining 85% are managed by co-operatives or other external professional companies. The tenure rights of ownership is 80% private and 20% public in Norway.

Harvesting rates are low in Norway and Scandinavia are low compared to other EU countries as rated by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) with harvesting being less than 1 t/ha in instances. Forest resources within the supply base are within < 150km to enable sourcing to be economically viable by truck and approximately < 200km via barge.

Historically, the Sodra mill at Tofte provided a market for pulpwood and non-saw or non-joinery-grade wood. This mill has now been closed. The wood now is received at Statkraft's biomass production site in Tofte. The site at Tofte add values to the supply chain as the biomass supplied to Tofte is co-harvested with highergrade wood and the low-grade wood has a market outlet opposed to being a waste.

Saw or joinery-grade wood is not sourced as a feedstock, and timber from local sawmill markets is not diverted to biomass. Sawlogs or joinery-grade wood harvested under comparatively long rotation does enter the sawmill

industry. There are more than 200 industrial-size sawmills in the country making this side of the wood industry far more significant to the economy than biomass.

The sawmill industry accounts for 40% of commercial wood removals<sup>5</sup> and commercial biomass approximately 8% (2013) Therefore sourcing and processing of fuel-grade or pulpwood is not deemed to have a negative effect and replaces a market for local suppliers whom formerly supplied such pulpwood or low-economic-value wood to Sodra at Tofte.

#### Forest Cover, Land Use, Economics and Wood-Based Policy

Approximately 37% of the surface area in Norway is covered by forest. Twenty-five percent of Norwegian land area is productive forest. Latest available figures (2011) state that the growing stock of timber was 878 million cubic metres. The annual increment was almost 25 million cubic metres. In 2011, the forest owners cut 8.5 million cubic metres industrial roundwood for sale, 2.5 million cubic metres for household logs. The total forested area amounts to 12 million hectares, including 7.4 million hectares of productive forest<sup>8</sup>. An estimated 15% of the productive forest area has been designated as non-economic due to difficult terrain and long distance transport, which means that economical forestry may be operated in only 50% of the

forested area. The most important species are Norway spruce (47%), Scots pine (33%) and birch (18%). Standing volume of forest is nearly 900 million cubic metres, compared with 300 million when the first national forest survey was carried out in 1919. The tremendous increase is a result of a forest policy with the main objective of restoring the forest resources. Each year the standing forest volume increases by approximately 20 million cubic metres through tree growth. The total annual harvest is less than 50% of this growth, which again means that the forest volume increases every year. The variety of small-scale forestry creates good conditions for environmental biodiversity. Felling areas are 1.4 hectares on average, with long rotation between harvesting.

Nationally in Norway forest resource policies are based on principles of maintaining the long-term stability and resilience of the resource base. The goal of Norwegian forest management policies is to meet social, economic, ecological and cultural needs for present and future generations. Norway has ratified the Rio convention on biological diversity and the climate and signed resolutions on sustainable management of Europe's forests. The principles expressed in these documents are also incorporated into Norwegian forest policy.

## 5.3 Detailed description of Supply Base

Total Supply Base area (ha): 12 million ha

Tenure by type (ha): public 9,6 million ha private, 2,4 million ha public

Forest by type (ha): 12 million ha boreal

Forest by management type (ha): 12 million ha managed natural

Certified forest by scheme (ha): 9,142,702 ha is PEFC certified  
417,900 ha is FSC certified

## 5.4 Chain of Custody system

The Organisation holds valid FSC (TT-COC-004832) and PEFC (BMT-PEFC-1311) Chain of Custody covering FSC/PEFC certified material. The organizations FSC CoC scope of certificate does not contain verification program according FSC. All material is sourced with certified claim.

The Organisation is implementing FSC transfer system. The BP has signed contracts with suppliers ensuring that only PEFC certified material will be sourced. In case any non-certified material would be delivered and accepted it would be physically separated – stored at separated storage area, marked and the total amount of chips would be sold as non-certified.

Supplier list is maintained.

After the reception, incoming feedstock is unloaded in specially designated places according to individual deliveries and is registered into the recordkeeping system.

The purchasing documents are stored at Tofte site and are checked by receptionist and double checked by FSC responsible person together with purchasing invoice. The invoices are recorded also in the system which means that can be reached in London office as well.

The sales invoices are issued from London office with close cooperation with operators in Tofte.

## 6 Evaluation process

### 6.1 Timing of evaluation activities

The pre-assessment took place on 11<sup>th</sup> May 2016.

The assessment was carried out on 15<sup>th</sup> June and 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2016. One and half day were needed for the onsite audit.

Activity	Location	Auditor(s)	Date/time
Opening meeting*	Main Office	OT + DvB	03th August 2016 9.00
Interviews with the certification responsible person; review of SBP procedures, SBR, determination of material origin	Main office	OT + DvB	09:30
Evaluation of purchasing activities, evaluationon of incoming material,	Purchasing department	OT + DvB	11:30
GHG calculation review	Main office, accounting, energy department	OT + DvB	12:00
Evaluation of sales process, evaluationon of outcoming material, communication of GHG and profiling data	Sales department	OT + DvB	15:00
Internal team meeting		OT + DvB	15:30
Closing meeting*		OT + DvB	16:00
Estimated end of the evaluation		OT + DvB	16:30
Chain of custody review (site tour); interview with roundwood acceptance department	Production and storage	OT + MK	15th June

## 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 FSC system and FSC system control points as well as GHG data availability.

Description of the assessment evaluation:

All SBP related documentation connected to the SBP as well as FSC/PEFC CoC system of the organisation, including SBP Procedures, GHG data calculations/ data sheet, Supply Base Reports, Biomass profiling data, Batch specific data, and FSC system description were provided by the company in advance.

There was a pre-assessment conducted in May 2016 where was agreed that the first part of the evaluation will take place at the production site in Tofte where the material is chipped. During the site tour reception, recordkeeping, production process was observed, applicable records were reviewed, chip production staff was interviewed and FSC/PEFC system critical control points were analysed.

Second part of the assessment took place in office in London where the responsible staff is located and this part of the audit was more focused on evaluation of management system. Auditor team was welcomed in Statkraft office in London. Audit started with an opening meeting attended by all management staff of the Organisation.

Auditor introduced the audit team, provided information about audit plan, methodology, auditor qualification, confidentiality issues, and assessment methodology and clarified verification scope.

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 over responsible staff having key responsibilities within the system were interviewed.

At the end of the audit finding were summarised and audit conclusion based on use of 3 angle evaluation method were provided to the Organisation. Composition of audit team:

Auditor(s), roles	Qualifications
Ondrej Tarabus, Lead 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.
Debora van Boven Trainee auditor	Debora holds an MSc in Tropical Forestry from Wageningen University and Research Centre, the Netherlands. She has participated in various lead auditor courses for FSC, PEFC, LegalSource and SAN and she has been conducting audits since 2008. In 2015 she passed the SBP Lead Auditor Exam.
Michael Kutschke	Michael is FSC / PEFC / Legal source lead auditor. He has a professional background in forestry and speaks German, English and Norwegian.

Local expert for Norway, trainee auditor for SBP	
--	--

### 6.3 Process for consultation with stakeholders

The stakeholder consultation was carried out by the Certification Body on 15th of February, 2016 by sending direct email to different stakeholder categories: state institutions, local NGOs, authorities, government bodies, forest owners associations, academic and research institutions. Mostly stakeholders from Norway were contacted as all feedstock is sourced and the chips are produced in Norway. Additionally, some relevant stakeholders from UK and Germany were also consulted in order to seek some information about the organization. No comments from stakeholders were received.

The stakeholder consultation took place so much in advance to the audit due to the fact that the certification audit was postponed several times.

## 7 Results

### 7.1 Main strengths and weaknesses

Strength: SBP system elements are implemented at the time of the assessment. Sourcing only certified material from small number of suppliers. Small number of the management staff and clearly designated responsibilities within the staff members.

Weaknesses: Quite complex record keeping system – transition from one system to another. The responsible staff is not located at the site. See also in NCR section of the report

### 7.2 Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation

Not applicable

### 7.3 Compilation of data on Greenhouse Gas emissions

Prior the assessment the organization has not recorded data on greenhouse gas emissions and has only started for purposes of the SBP certification. This included the most part of the work spent on the preparation for the certification. The BP has implemented the collection of the energy and emission data into their internal record keeping system and at the end of the assessment the data were complete and accurate.

### 7.4 Competency of involved personnel

The supply base evaluation was not included into this evaluation.

During the assessment it was identified that number of staff members are involved into the SBP system management and implementation, including chip production responsible person, commercial operation officer and one external consultant who helped with implementation of the system and will continue supporting the maintenance of the system in the future. Interviewed staff demonstrated awareness of their responsibilities within SBP system.

### 7.5 Stakeholder feedback

No comments were received.

### 7.6 Preconditions

No open preconditions to this certification exist.

## 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

## 10.1 Open Non-Conformity Reports (NCRs)

<b>NCR number:</b> 11734 NCR 01/16	<b>NC grading:</b>	<b>Major</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Minor</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	Standard #2 V1.0 - Verification of SBP-compliant feedstock - 6.1		
<b>Description of Non-conformance:</b>			
<p>The biomass producer is sourcing only primary feedstock. At the moment of the assessment there are 3 suppliers (e.g. Viken Skog, NEG/AT Skog, SB Skog). The contract with the suppliers includes section where the supplier declares what is the material origin – all contracts has an exhibit with sustainability requirements to be filled by the supplier including the specification of the origin on a regional level. All sourced material is 100% PEFC certified. On the to of that the suppliers Viken Skog and SB Skog provides information of the origin through access to the database where each deliver is registered and can be traced back to the forest. However, the supplier NEG/AT Skog has provided only signed annex to the contract where the origin declaration is provided but no additional access to information of the origin is provided on delivery basis. Considering the very low risk that material could come outside the SB this is considered as minor non-conformity.</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>NCR conformance deadline:</b>	12 months		
<b>Client evidence:</b>			
<b>Evaluation of Evidence:</b>			
<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 number:</b> 11735 NCR 02/16	<b>NC grading:</b>	Major <input type="checkbox"/>	Minor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	Standard #2 V1.0 - Verification of SBP-compliant feedstock - 15.7		
<b>Description of Non-conformance:</b>			
<p>The interviewed personnel has proved good knowledge of the system. The training is planned for next year when the system is implemented (so far only 3 people are involved in the SBP system and these have got a training from external consultant). Training process is implemented only partly at the moment of the assessment and there was not prepared proper training plan so far.</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>NCR conformance deadline:</b>	12 months		
<b>Client evidence:</b>			
<b>Evaluation of Evidence:</b>			
<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 number:</b> 11736 NCR 03/16	<b>NC grading:</b>	<b>Major</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Minor</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	Standard #4 V1.0 - Chain of Custody - 6.2.1		
<b>Description of Non-conformance:</b>			
The organization has provided good knowledge of the SBP procedures. The SBP procedure requires to follow the applicable and latest version of the SBP standard. However, it is not described what would be the follow up process after the SBP standard 5 would change.			
<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>NCR conformance deadline:</b>	12 months		
<b>Client evidence:</b>			
<b>Evaluation of Evidence:</b>			
<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 number:</b> 11737 NCR 04/16	<b>NC grading:</b>	<b>Major</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Minor</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	Instruction Document 5A - Collection and Communication of Data - 2.01		
<b>Description of Non-conformance:</b>			
The organization has prepared set of documents but these are not linked anyhow to the invoice as the set of documents does not contain any code.			
<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>NCR conformance deadline:</b>	12 months		
<b>Client evidence:</b>			
<b>Evaluation of Evidence:</b>			
<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 number:</b> 11739 NCR 05/16	<b>NC grading:</b>	<b>Major</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Minor</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	Instruction Document 5A - Collection and Communication of Data - 3.7.1		
<b>Description of Non-conformance:</b>			
The organization has recorded the data based on the information provided by the supplier in the contact. However, one supplier (out of 3) did not provided any information about the km travelled. It is not expected that there would be big variation between the 3 suppliers and therefor the data from 2 suppliers only could sufficiently reflect the reality thus this NCR is considered as minor.			
<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>NCR conformance deadline:</b>	12 months		
<b>Client evidence:</b>			
<b>Evaluation of Evidence:</b>			
<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 number:</b> 11740 NCR 06/16	<b>NC grading:</b>	<b>Major</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Minor</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	Instruction Document 5A - Collection and Communication of Data - 4.1.2		
<b>Description of Non-conformance:</b>			
The PB has a weighbridge at the site but is not measuring the weight as all material received is in form of Roundwood and therefore m3 are measured. This is later on recalculated to tones.			
<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>NCR conformance deadline:</b>	12 months		
<b>Client evidence:</b>			
<b>Evaluation of Evidence:</b>			
<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"/>

## 10.2 Observations

<b>OBS number: 11738</b>	<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	Instruction Document 5A - Collection and Communication of Data - 3.3.1
<b>Description of findings leading to observation:</b>	The values are received from the suppliers who declare the values in their contracts which is officially signed off. The value is 2,5 which is in line with the default value. SB Skog did provide the value 2,9 which was not considered by mistake.	
<b>Observation:</b>	The organization should make sure that data provided by the suppliers are used.	

## 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> 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>Certification decision by: Olesja Puiso</b>	
Date of decision: <b>14.09.2016</b>	

## 12 Surveillance updates

Not applicable.



## 13 Evaluation details

Primary Responsible Person: (Responsible for control system at site(s))	Elizabeth Warren
Auditor(s):	Ondřej Tarabus – lead auditor Debora van Boven – auditor in training Michel Kutske – local expert, auditor in training
People Interviewed, Titles:	Elizabeth Warren – SBP responsible person Robin Askey – external consultant Tiago Thomaz – biomass trader Trond Sværen – operator  Kjell Åge Nilsen – chipping operator
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