

# NEPCon Evaluation of DSHwood A/S Compliance with the SBP Framework: Public Summary Report

[www.sbp-cert.org](http://www.sbp-cert.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.sbp-cert.org](http://www.sbp-cert.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>5</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>SBP Standards utilised</b> .....	<b>6</b>
4.1	SBP Standards utilised .....	6
4.2	SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment .....	6
<b>5</b>	<b>Description of Biomass Producer, Supply Base and Forest Management</b> .....	<b>7</b>
5.1	Description of Biomass Producer's Supply Base .....	8
5.2	Detailed description of Supply Base .....	11
5.3	Chain of Custody system .....	12
<b>6</b>	<b>Evaluation process</b> .....	<b>13</b>
6.1	Timing of evaluation activities .....	13
6.2	Description of evaluation activities .....	16
6.3	Process for consultation with stakeholders .....	16
<b>7</b>	<b>Results</b> .....	<b>17</b>
7.1	Main strengths and weaknesses .....	17
7.2	Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation .....	17
7.3	Compilation of data on Greenhouse Gas emissions .....	18
7.4	Competency of involved personnel .....	18
7.5	Stakeholder feedback .....	19
7.6	Preconditions .....	19
<b>8</b>	<b>Review of Biomass Producer's Risk Assessments</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Review of Biomass Producer's mitigation measures</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Non-conformities and observations</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Certification decision</b> .....	<b>30</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Surveillance updates</b> .....	<b>31</b>
12.1	Evaluation details .....	31
12.2	Significant changes .....	31
12.3	Follow-up on outstanding non-conformities .....	31
12.4	New non-conformities .....	31

12.5 Stakeholder feedback .....31

12.6 Conditions for continuing certification .....31

12.7 Certification recommendation .....31

**13 Evaluation details.....32**

# 1 Overview

CB Name and contact: NEPCon OÜ. Filosoofi 31, 51009 Tartu, Estonia

Primary contact for SBP: Ondrej Tarabus, SBP Program Manager

Report completion date: 18/Jan/2018

Report authors: Christian Rahbek and Rebecka Mc Carthy

Certificate Holder: DSHwood A/S

Producer contact for SBP: Erik T. Kjær, DSHwood A/S, Glarmestervej 7, 7000 Fredericia, Denmark  
 Email: [etk@dshwood.com](mailto:etk@dshwood.com) mobile : +45 2344 9555

Certified Supply Base: The certified Supply Base covers all of Denmark

SBP Certificate Code: SBP-01-91

Date of certificate issue: 25/Jan/2018

Date of certificate expiry: 24/Jan/2023

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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 2 Scope of the evaluation and SBP certificate

The scope of this evaluation is based on SBP standards 1; 2; 4; and 5. During the assessment, the geographical scope of the Supply Base was confirmed to be all of Denmark. The risk evaluation and required mitigation measures in the Supply Base Evaluation are applicable to all of Denmark.

The scope of the SBP certification includes DSHwood's purchase and production of SBP feedstock in all Danish regions, hence the Supply Base is all of Denmark. All feedstock is primary feedstock, and is purchased either as standing volume, as fuel wood in stacks in the forest of origin or as fuel wood or chips from other suppliers under a Supplier Verification Program from suppliers working and sourcing within the Supply Base. In all cases the stand of origin is known, and when buying wood chips from other companies, and the BP takes full responsibility for all feedstock classification and risk mitigation measures. The organization also buys wood as PEFC or FSC certified, but will mainly rely on sourcing feedstock as SBP Compliant under its own Supply Base Evaluation. The organization implements a Supplier Verification Program to ensure correct classification of feedstock and that all necessary mitigating measures are observed in all forests and stands of origin of the supplied feedstock.

The BP is supplying the woodchips directly from the forest via truck to the customers, which are combined heat and power plants and district heating plants. The organization has, at the moment, no storage outside of the forests. The BP will contact NEPCon before any storage yard or facility are used by the BP.

Scope description: "Production and trade of woodchips for use in energy production, storage and sale at different energy producers in Denmark. The scope includes supply base evaluation for primary feedstock from Denmark".

Scope Item	Check all that apply to the Certificate Scope	Change in Scope (N/A for Assessments)			
<b>Approved Standards:</b>	SBP Standard #1 V1.0 SBP Standard #2 V1.0 SBP Standard #4 V1.0 SBP Standard #5 V1.0 <a href="http://www.sbp-cert.org/documents">http://www.sbp-cert.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 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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transfer	<input type="checkbox"/> Percentage	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Points of sales</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Harbour (including own handling of material)	<input type="checkbox"/> Harbour (e.g. FOB incoterms) legal owner is not responsible for handling of material at the harbor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other point of sale (e.g. gate of the BP, boarder, railway station etc.)		<input type="checkbox"/>
	-	-	The SBP Biomass is sold at the customers location after weighing in on weighbridge. All customers are located in Denmark.		
<b>Use of SBP claim:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>SBE Verification Program:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Low risk sources only	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sources with unspecified/ specified risk		<input type="checkbox"/>	

	New districts approved for SBP-Compliant inputs: Denmark	
<b>Sub-scopes</b>	<p>The feedstock is divided in following sub-scopes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Primary feedstock sourced from coniferous thinning operations</li> <li>▪ Primary feedstock sourced from areas of first generation afforestation</li> <li>▪ Primary feedstock sourced from a forest holding with a FM certificate (FSC/PEFC)</li> <li>▪ Primary feedstock sourced from a forest holding with a Green Management Plan</li> <li>▪ Primary feedstock sourced from an area without a Green Management Plan</li> <li>▪ Primary feedstock from non-forest areas, such as windbreaks, city and park areas, nature projects</li> </ul>	<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 this evaluation also covered the Supply Base Evaluation, and the mitigation measures describing herein.

The scope of the evaluation covered:

- Review of the BP's management procedures;
- 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;
- GHG data collection analysis.
- Evaluation of mitigation measures implemented

## 4 SBP Standards utilised

### 4.1 SBP Standards utilised

Feedstock Compliance Standard, SBP Standard 1, Version 1.0, March 2015

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-v1-1-Oct16

Instruction-Document-5B-Energy-and-GHG-Data-v1-1-Oct16

Instruction-Document-5C-Static-Biomass-Profiling-v1-1-Oct16

<https://sbp-cert.org/documents>

### 4.2 SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment

The Regional Risk Assessment (RRA) for Denmark has been endorsed by SBP on June 29, 2017. At the time of the main assessment, it is referred to the SBP-endorsed RRA for Denmark. Mitigation measures appropriate to the risk designations have been implemented by the BP.

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

The scope of this evaluation is based on SBP standards 1; 2; 4; and 5. During the assessment, the geographical scope of the Supply Base was confirmed to be all of Denmark. The risk evaluation and required mitigation measures in the Supply Base Evaluation are applicable to all of Denmark.

DSHwood A/S is a private limited company under the management of Rasmus Grønberg Bak.

DSHwood is trading logs, lumber and chips from European forests. DSHwood aims to buy the timber directly from the supplier and sell directly to the end user. DSHwood is a dedicated wood trading company and has no ownership in forests, industry or equipment.

DSHwood originates as a trading office as part of the Danish Forest Association – the trade organization of the Danish private forest owners. The trading office was established in 1967 with the purpose of developing export opportunities for Danish wood. In year 2000, the office was reorganized into an independent subsidiary of the Forest Association and renamed DSHwood.

DSHwood A/S holds FSC and PEFC CoC certificates issued by NEPCo, and have the PEFC CoC certificate number NC-PEFC/COC-000079 and FSC certificate number NC-COC-011786.

The scope of the SBP certification includes DSHwood's purchase and production of SBP feedstock in all Danish regions, hence the Supply Base is all of Denmark. All feedstock is primary feedstock, and is purchased either as standing volume, as fuel wood in stacks in the forest of origin or as fuel wood or chips from other suppliers under a Supplier Verification Program from suppliers working and sourcing within the Supply Base. In all cases the stand of origin is known, and when buying wood chips from other companies, the BP takes full responsibility for all feedstock classification and risk mitigation measures. The organization also buys wood as PEFC or FSC certified, but will mainly rely on sourcing feedstock as SBP Compliant under its own Supply Base Evaluation. The organization implements a Supplier Verification Program to ensure correct classification of feedstock and that all necessary mitigating measures are observed in all forests and stands of origin of the supplied feedstock.

The BP is supplying the woodchips produced directly from the forest via truck to the customers, which are combined heat and power plants and district heating plants. The organization has, at the moment, no storage outside of the forests. The BP will contact NEPCo before any storage yard or facility are used by the BP.

Scope description: "Production and trade of woodchips for use in energy production, storage and sale at different energy producers in Denmark. The scope includes supply base evaluation for primary feedstock from Denmark".

## 5.1 Description of Biomass Producer’s Supply Base

### The Danish Forest area

According to Danmarks Statistik (2014) is the Danish forest area measured to 620.500 ha, equivalent to 14.4% of the country's total area. Approximately 75% of forest land is owned by private, and the last 25% owned by public organizations.

<b>Danmark (Distribution by forest size)</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>Total</i>	24.142	100
<i>0,5 - 19,9 ha</i>	21.570	89,3
<i>20,0 - 49,9 ha</i>	1.335	5,5
<i>50,0 - 99,9 ha</i>	579	2,4
<i>100,0 - 249,9 ha</i>	365	1,5
<i>250,0 - 499,9 ha</i>	145	0,6
<i>Over 500,0 ha</i>	148	0,6

The total growing stock in the Danish forest is 130 million m<sup>3</sup> equivalent to 209 m<sup>3</sup>/ha. The largest share of the total growing stock is hardwood (57%), while softwood is 43%. From 2000 until today, the total growing stock in the Danish forests has increased significantly. The reason to the increase can be found in a growing forest area and probably a greater growing stock per hectare.

Net growth in the period 2010-2014 was approximately 2.9 million m<sup>3</sup> / year. In the same period was the felling amounted to 4.8 million m<sup>3</sup> / year. The total average annual increase has been 7.7 million m<sup>3</sup> / year.

### Supply Base

The terrestrial environment of Denmark is divided between two EU biogeographical regions by means of a north-south divide through the middle of the Jutland Peninsula: 1) the Atlantic region, covering the western part of Jutland, and 2) the Continental region covering the eastern part of Jutland and Denmark’s islands. These regions are used by the Danish Nature Agency under the Ministry of the Environment and Food to the EU Commission to report on the status and management results of Natura 2000 conservation areas.

In the early 1800’s, the forest cover in Denmark is estimated to have been as low as 3-4% of the total land area. Deforestation was caused by logging for timber and firewood and for animal grazing areas. Denmark’s first forest legislation came into force in 1805. Its main objective and as wells as following Danish forest acts, have been to maintain the forest covered area and to protect the existing forest from overexploitation, premature felling and grazing by farm animals. In the mid nineteenth century, intensive forest management became widespread and large afforestation projects were carried out. Today approximately 14% (615,000 hectares) of Denmark’s land area is covered by various types of forest.

According to the Danish Nation Forest Inventory, conducted by the Danish Nature Agency, 41% of Denmark’s forest area is dominated by deciduous trees, 39% by coniferous tree species, 11% by a mixed coniferous and deciduous tree species, 5% are Christmas tree plantation (located within all the above forest types) and 4% of the area is unstocked, e.g., log loading and landing yards, fire prevention areas etc. Furthermore, 67% of the Danish forest area is covered with even-aged planted stands with 9% being even-aged stands from natural regeneration and 6% of the forest area is uneven-aged natural forest. The latter represent pockets forests that would be closest to what is considered of natural forest stands having retained or regained natural forest characteristics; which can be found in forests both under private and public ownership and they are predominantly located in the Continental region (east Jutland and the isles). The location of these natural forest stands are generally well-known, but some may still be unidentified.

Of Denmark’s 615,000 hectares of forest, 440,000 hectares are managed as forest reserves (called ‘fredskov’ in Danish) governed under the Danish Forest Act. The Forest Act permits forest management activities within these

areas; however, Article 8 (see Category 1 for more details) requires the managed area shall maintain continuous forest cover, that a maximum of 10% of the forest area can be used for short rotation Christmas trees or greenery production (e.g., cuttings typically from *Abies procera*), and another maximum of 10% of the area can be used for coppicing or for animal forest grazing. The Forest Act also protects streams and wetlands in forests that are not covered by the Nature Protection Act nor under the Ministry of Environment or local authorities. It stipulates that lakes, bogs, heaths, species-rich grasslands, coastal grasslands and swamps located in “fredskov” forest reserve may not be planted or cultivated, drained or in other way changed. It is also important to note the Forest Act does not include many measures relating to forest techniques, e.g. harvesting, planting or thinning (also see Category 1).

There are 79,000 hectares of forests designated as Natura 2000 areas (13% of the Danish forest area) which have some overlap with the 74,900 hectares’ forests and other natural areas designated under the EU Habitat Directive, 51,500 hectares under the EU Birds Directive and 13,900 hectares as Ramsar sites. A harvest permit must be obtained from the Danish Nature Agency to conduct any timber harvesting activities within Natura 2000 forests; permits are given with the proviso that the natural condition of the forest will not deteriorate and issuing permits is more an exception than common practice.

In relation to HCV category 3, it is worth noting that although the Forest Act §25 sets provisions for registering ‘especially valuable forests’ i.e., valuable in terms of their biodiversity and conservation value, and accompanying appropriate conservation management activities for these areas, these areas have not yet been registered by the Danish Nature Agency. Danish forests biodiversity and conservation values have been surveyed by Department of Geosciences and Natural Resource Management at Copenhagen University through a sampling methodological approach. Therefore, not all forest management areas have been systematically surveyed, particularly small privately forests area. The task of systematically surveying ‘especially valuable forests’ will be carried out by the Danish Nature Agency in the years 2016 - 2019.

Forest ownership in Denmark are divided by private forests owners, (70%), State and Municipal owners (24%), trust funds or foundations (4%) and unknown owners (2%).

### Biodiversity in Danish forests

Due to its historical context, most Danish forests have been exposed to some level of forest management activities, varying from low impact to very intensive forestry. Today the majority of Denmark’s forests are semi-natural ecosystems of composing of either native or exotic tree species, interspersed with a few small pockets of (recovered or remnant) natural forest-like stands. Although the forests area has increased over the last two centuries from 3-4% to more than 14%, the nature value of the pre-1800 forest stands have decreased significantly. This is due to intensive forest management practices aiming to manage even-aged, single-tree species stands. Examples of some the detrimental effects of intensive forest management practices include depleting or draining natural hydrology levels, extensive soil cultivation, eutrophication, removal of mature and over-mature trees and deadwood, semi or natural forest stand replacement with exotic species, coppicing and animal grazing.

Since the mid-1990s, forestry practices in Denmark, especially in State and Municipality owned forest, have shifted from traditional, production oriented forest management towards management regimes with a wider set of goals for conservation, biodiversity, recreation and addressing other social needs such as preserving cultural heritage sites.

Danish forest has been surveyed by Department of Geosciences and Natural Resource Management at Copenhagen University by means of a sample methodology and their biodiversity and conservation values have been documented under the Danish National Forest Inventory (NFI) hosted by the Danish Nature Agency.

Denmark ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1994. Today more than 11% of Denmark’s terrestrial lands are protected, one third of which are classified as IUCN Categories I and II; of which a large number are protected under the Nature Protection Act and the Natura 2000 EU Directive. These areas have been designated specifically to protect species, landscapes, cultural heritage and/or for scientific research and/or education purposes. For conservation areas, i.e., forest management activities are only allowed in accordance with the

specific protection for the individual areas, cover approximately 5% of the country’s terrestrial land. Approximately, over 6,300 species in 8 major species groups in Denmark have been assessed according to IUCN Red List criteria, and just over 1,500 or 24% of these have been red-listed. Forests constitute 52% of the habitat affiliations for red-listed species. Furthermore, areas enjoying protection under the Forest Act, Natura 2000 and/or the Nature Protection Act are also mapped and available online via the Danish Nature Agency’s digital nature map. Biodiversity data is updated regularly by the Danish Nature Agency and, as mentioned above, it will be completing the registry of “especially valuable forest” over 2016 - 2019. There is one forest area in North Zealand which is listed as UNESCO world heritage due to its historical significance as royal 'Parforce' (a type of hunting system) hunting grounds landscape as, the site demonstrates the application of Baroque landscaping principles to forested areas. DSH (The Biomass producer) has adopted the description above from the draft Region Risk Assessment for Denmark.

**DSHwood's wood chip resource:** DSHwood is dealing with all kinds of raw wood, wood chips and sawn wood from the Danish forests. Through our own purchasing and sales organization, we strive to buy wood directly from the supplier and sell directly to the end user. DSHwood is a pure trading company and does not own the own industry or forests.

DSH is sourcing our raw material from our supply base which is Denmark. The feedstock is supplied as wood chips produced in the forest of origin. DSH is purchasing the wood chip form Danish contractors. The contractor is performing the harvesting and chipping operations. DSHwood is supplying the produced wood chips directly from the forest via truck to the customers (heat /power plants/district heating plants)

The distribution of the volumes sold in 2016:

	% Share
Energy	44,62%
Hardwood	11,95%
Softwood	32,51%
Pulpwood	10,91%

The wood that is used for chips, is the utilization of low-quality wood which cannot be used for high quality products such as timber, pulpwood.

The resource of Danish woodchip has an origin from forests across the country. Suppliers are a wide section of the Danish forest owners. The chips are typically purchased as follows:

- The forest owner, who is PEFC / FSC certified
- The forest owner who has been responsible for harvesting, driving to road and possibly chipping himself
- Forest contractor who bought the wood standing and have completed reprocessing himself.

The certified wood will come from the forest owner who is PEFC / FSC certified and from the forest contractor who is approved Biomass Producer. Today are 5 % of our purchased chip wood from PEFC/FSC Certified forest.

Forest management practices are based on the Danish specific forestry laws, forestry guidelines, and forest management planning practices. Even-aged forestry is the dominant method. The forest rotation period is 60-100 years, containing mostly tending of the young seedling stands, two thinning's, a final harvesting and regeneration of a mature stand. Planting or natural seeding can be used in regeneration. Recently, un-even-aged forestry has become more popular and applied to the extent possible.

Overview of the proportions of SBP feedstock for chip wood

SBP-compliant Primary Feedstock	>99%
SBP-compliant Secondary Feedstock	None
SBP-compliant Tertiary Feedstock	None
SBP non-compliant Feedstock	<1%

## 5.2 Detailed description of Supply Base

DSHwood is defining the Supply Base as Denmark: Feedstock is currently sourced in all administrative regions of Denmark. Hence, data is presented for all of Denmark from the National Forest Inventory (2014):

### Supply Base

- a. Total Supply Base area (ha): 620,500 ha
- b. Tenure by type (ha): 458,205 ha Privately owned/ 150,298 ha Public/ 0 ha Community concession/ 11,997 ha unspecified
- c. Forest by type (ha): 0 ha Boreal/ 620,500 ha Temperate/ 0 ha Tropical
- d. Forest by management type (ha): 409,530 ha Plantation (plantation and semi-natural planted forest)/ 117,895 ha Managed Natural/ 93,075 ha Natural
- e. Certified forest by scheme (ha): 204,107 ha of FSC or 250,000 ha PEFC-certified forest.  
(<http://www.trae.dk/leksikon/certificering-af-skovdrift-systemerne/>) Please note that many forests hold both FSC and PEFC PEFC certificates.

### Feedstock

- f. Total volume of Feedstock: 100,000-150,000 m<sup>3</sup>
- g. Volume of primary feedstock: 100,000-150,000 m<sup>3</sup>
- h. List percentage of primary feedstock (g), by the following categories. Subdivide by SBP-approved Forest Management Schemes
  - 40 % forest holdings certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Schemes
  - 60 % forest holdings not certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Schemes
- i. List all species in primary feedstock, including scientific name

Softwood			
<i>Abies alba</i>	<i>Larix</i> spp.	<i>Pinus contorta</i>	<i>Pinus</i> spp.
<i>Abies grandis</i>	<i>Picea abies</i>	<i>Pinus nigra</i>	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>
<i>Abies normaniana</i>	<i>Picea glauca</i>	<i>Pinus ponderosa</i>	<i>Thuja plicata</i>
<i>Abies procera</i>	<i>Picea sitchensis</i>	<i>Pinus strobus</i>	<i>Tsuga heterophylla</i> (Raf.) Sarg
<i>Abies</i> spp.	<i>Picea</i> spp.	<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	

Hardwood			
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	<i>Betula pubescens</i>	<i>Populus tremuloides</i>	<i>Quercus rubra</i>
<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	<i>Carpinus betuius</i> L.	<i>Populus</i> spp.	<i>Quercus</i> spp.

<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	<i>Prunus avium</i>	<i>Salix</i> spp.
<i>Alnus incana</i>	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	<i>Quercus petraea</i>	<i>Sorbus</i> spp.
<i>Betula pendula</i>	<i>Populus tremula</i>	<i>Quercus robur</i>	

j. Volume of primary feedstock from primary forest 0%

k. List percentage of primary feedstock from primary forest (j), by the following categories. Subdivide by SBP-approved Forest Management Schemes:

- 0 % Primary feedstock from primary forest certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme
- 0 % Primary feedstock from primary forest not certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme

l. Volume of secondary feedstock: None.

m. Volume of tertiary feedstock: None.

The Qualitative description of the Supply Base can also be found in the Biomass Producer’s Supply Base Report which will be available in <http://www.dshwood.dk/miljoe>

### 5.3 Chain of Custody system

DSHwood A/S holds FSC and PEFC Chain of Custody (CoC) certificates issued by NEPCo, and have the PEFC CoC certificate number NC-PEFC/COC-000079 and FSC certificate number NC-COC-011786.

The organization implements a PEFC CoC transfer system based on physical segregation. SBP claims are only made for material that is delivered directly from the forest of origin, where physical segregation is ensured, and no uncontrolled material (“other biomass”) has been added.

All relevant information with regards to volume tracking and verification of origin is handled in the BP’s system for tracking projects and forest stack volumes, and production orders and in the system from in- and outbound sales documents.



## 6 Evaluation process

### 6.1 Timing of evaluation activities

The SBP assessment was carried out on the 18<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> of September 2017. The first day was an office audit at DSHwood’s main office in Fredericia, Denmark. The field audits were carried out on the second and third days. This included visits of totally 13 sites, from which feedstock is sourced and/or where production of wood chips have been or currently are carried out.

The SBP assessment was conducted in accordance with the plan below; please note that the field visits were conducted after consulting the Biomass Producer’s records of ongoing and recent wood chip production engagements. The field visits started and ended in the field, including a summary of the observation from the field visits.

In total, 3 days were used for this evaluation: 1 day at the BP’s main office site and 2 days for field audits of forests and forest stands. Six sites were visited in Region Sjælland, while seven sites were visited in Regions Syddanmark and Midtjylland where 6 production sites were visited. The time used for reporting and administration is not included in these figures.

#### September 18, 2017

Time	Activity	Location
9.00 – 9.30	Opening Meeting. Introduction of participants. Review of the agenda.	DSHwood Main office
9.30 – 12.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply Base Report and SBE, and stakeholder comments</li> <li>• Documented procedures (Management system), including risk minimization measures and Supplier Verification Program</li> <li>• Training activities and registration of completed training</li> </ul> Interview with staff Planning the field trip	DSHwood Main office
12.00 – 12.30	Break	
12.30 – 17.00	Review of the traceability system  Review of the system for the collection and reporting of energy and emissions data  Review of procedures for the use of SBP logos and trademarks	DSHwood Main office
17.00 – 17.30	Preliminary Closing meeting. Auditor summarizes preliminary conclusions. Program for field visits confirmed.	DSHwood Main office

**September 19, 2017**

Field visits are conducted on the basis of the inventory of ongoing, planned and completed projects. Auditor is responsible for selecting projects for field visits, taking into account the number of projects, as well as the type of project, size and geographical location. The sample size was determined after taking into account the approximate number of annual wood chip projects/purchases delivered to the customers in the scope of this certification (app. 200 - 250) and an approach based on a sample size of 0.8 x square root of the number of projects yielded a sample of 13 sites.

<b>19<sup>th</sup> of September 2017</b>			
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Auditor(s)</b>	<b>Time (ca.)</b>
Evaluation at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures.	Supplier site	CAR, RMC	9.00-9:45
Evaluation at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures.	Supplier site	CAR, RMC	9:45 - 10:00
Evaluation at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures.	Supplier site	CAR, RMC	10.30-11:30
Evaluation at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures.	Supplier sites	CAR, RMC	11.30-12:30
Evaluation at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures.	Supplier site	CAR, RMC	14.00-14:30
Evaluation at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures.	Supplier site	CAR, RMC	15.30-16:00

**September 20, 2017**

<b>20<sup>th</sup> of September 2017</b>			
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Auditor(s)</b>	<b>Time (ca.)</b>
Evaluation at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures.	Supplier site	CAR	8.00-8:45

Evaluation at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures.	Supplier site	CAR	8:45 - 9:00
Evaluation at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures.	Supplier site	CAR	9.30-10:30
Evaluation at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures.	Supplier sites	CAR	11.00-12:00
Evaluation at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures.	Supplier site	CAR	13.00-14:00
Evaluation at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures.	Supplier site	CAR	14.00-14:30
Evaluation at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures.	Supplier site	CAR	15.30-16:00
Closing meeting: Auditor summarizes audit conclusions and presents NCRs.		CAR	16:30 – 17:00

## 6.2 Description of evaluation activities

### Composition of audit team:

Auditor(s), roles	Qualifications
Christian Rahbek, Lead Auditor and Local expert	M.Sc. (Forestry) from University of Copenhagen. Has passed NEPCon Lead Auditor Training for FSC and PEFC FM and CoC certification. Experience from more than 200 FSC and PEFC CoC and FM audits in Denmark and Europe. Christian was approved as SBP Lead auditor in January 2017, and has lead several SBP assessments in Denmark.
Rebecka Mc Carthy, SBP auditor-in-training	M.Sc. and Ph. D. in forestry. Has passed NEPCon Lead Auditor Training for FSC and PEFC FM and CoC certification. Experience from FSC and PEFC CoC and FM audits in Denmark and Europe. Rebecka is under training as SBP Lead auditor and has participated in SBP audits in Denmark.

## 6.3 Process for consultation with stakeholders

Stakeholder consultation processes were carried out by both the Biomass Producer and the Certification Body.

The BP conducted a stakeholder consultation process that took place in a 30-day period from the 30<sup>th</sup> of March to 30<sup>th</sup> of April 2017. Nineteen stakeholders were notified by e-mail. This included associations, national NGOs, Copenhagen University, and umbrella organizations for recreational and labour organizations. The full list of stakeholders is available at the BP and in the exhibit of this report. The BP received no stakeholder responses during the stakeholder process.

The CB conducted a 30-day stakeholder notification process by e-mailing 20 stakeholders, which were largely the same as contacted by the BP, but in addition the Danish Industry Association was contacted. This process took place on the 12<sup>th</sup> of April to 16<sup>th</sup> of May 2017. By the time of the main assessment (September 18, 2017), no comments were received by the CB, but most of the key stakeholders had taken part in the Stakeholder meeting in relation to the Regional Risk Assessment for Denmark.

The BP’s and CB’s stakeholder processes ran with a partial overlap. This was justified in the light of the BP adapting the SBP endorsed Regional Risk Assessment for Denmark and implementing the suggested mitigating from the final draft version of the same document. These had all been subject to discussion at a stakeholder meeting where all relevant stakeholders had been invited. The meeting was held on May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016, and was attended by most of the key stakeholders. Some stakeholders provided their input to the process by e-mail in advance. All comments from the previous stakeholder consultations were taken into account by the organization while preparing the final draft of their risk assessment.

## 7 Results

### 7.1 Main strengths and weaknesses

**Main strengths:** The main strengths of the BP lies in the well documented processes. The management system provides a strong backbone for implementing the SBP requirements. The BP has a professional staff of foresters with good training and qualification for sourcing feedstock. The BP has also taken actions and provided training for contractors to ensure they know requirements relevant for them. The BP showed strong engagement in implementation of the SBP system and a positive approach.

All SBP feedstock that is purchased can be tracked back to its origin forest or stand. The machine operators showed good awareness of best practice in forest operation, and the contractors had at least one operator that have attended a three-day training course in machine operation in nature-like forest. This course is a requirement for forest contractors that operate in the FSC and PEFC certified Danish state forests. Except of this course, all contacts had at least one operator that had participated in DSHwood's training for screening of forest stands.

The BP has worked closely with the consultant Anders Bjørnkjær-Nielsen from B4trees ApS, who has assisted in creating the Supply Base Report and the documented management system, etc. The BP will also have access to support from this source in the future. Furthermore, all interviewed staff had a strong engagement in implementation of SBP system and positive approach.

**Weaknesses:** The BP has in-house staff that are professional foresters, but the organization is totally reliant on contractors when sourcing biomass. This means that the contractors or their partners are conducting field visits and identification and mapping of “key biotopes” prior to starting harvests and wood chip production in specified risk stands. The BP does not have easily assessable fuel consumption data for harvest, extraction and chipping of biomass, and will therefore instead report default values in accordance with Instruction Document 5B.

### 7.2 Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation

At the time of the assessment, the Supply Base Evaluation was implemented only for Primary feedstock sourced from Denmark. The BP will carry out the SBE for primary feedstock (forest products) that are originating from Denmark and is sold without SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme claim, SBP-approved Forest Management partial claim or SBP-approved Chain-of-Custody (CoC) system claim. Risk mitigation measures are implemented for material coming from both forest land and from other origin, e.g. landscape maintenance, or residential areas.

The BP has used the Regional Risk Assessment for Denmark, which has been widely circulated for stakeholder consultation. Based on the “specified risks” in this risk assessment the organization has adapted mitigation measures, which were consulted with relevant stakeholders during a meeting held on the 20<sup>th</sup> of May 2016, and calls/e-mails which took place prior the assessment.

The stakeholder consultation process started with sending a notification email, including the SBR and SBE to numerous stakeholders. The BP keeps records of communication with stakeholders.

The supply base evaluation was a rigorous process, and there has generally been acceptance of the defined sub-scopes and the associated risk conclusions.

All feedstock is primary feedstock, and can be purchased either as standing volume, as fuel wood in stack in the forest of origin or as fuel wood or chips from other suppliers under a Supplier Verification Program from suppliers working and sourcing within the Supply Base. In all cases the stand of origin is known, and when buying wood chips from other companies, the BP takes full responsibility for all feedstock classification and risk mitigation measures. The organization also buys wood as PEFC or FSC certified, but will mainly rely on sourcing feedstock as SBP Compliant under its own Supply Base Evaluation. The organization is implementing appropriate mitigating measures in relation of the specified risks identified, and also implements a Supplier Verification Program to ensure correct classification of feedstock and that all necessary mitigating measures in all forests and stands of origin of the supplied feedstock.

### 7.3 Compilation of data on Greenhouse Gas emissions

Prior to the main assessment the BP has not systematically recorded data on greenhouse gas emissions, and therefore the BP does not have readily available fuel consumption data for the felling, extraction and chipping of biomass, and therefore for now will instead report default values in accordance with Instruction Document 5B.

The BP has opted to use the accepted Default Values from BioGrace II for reporting fuel used in forestry used and felling/chipping. Auditor has accepted the justification that actual fuel use records were not available at the time of the main assessment.

### 7.4 Competency of involved personnel

Both administrative staff showed good awareness of their management system, and of the objectives and restrictions in the SBP system.

The machine operators showed good awareness of best practice in forest machine operation, and all operators have attended a three-day training course in machine operation in near-natural forests, which is a requirement for forest contractors that operate in the FSC and PEFC certified Danish State forests.

The BP has worked closely with the consultant Anders Bjørnkjær-Nielsen from B4trees ApS, who has assisted in creating the documented management system, SAR, Static Biomass Profiling Data etc. The BP will also have access to support from this source in the future. Furthermore, all interviewed staff had a strong engagement in implementation of SBP system and positive approach.

All involved personal has provided good knowledge in relevant fields, including project management classification to correct sub-scope, and implementation of relevant mitigating measures, if needed by means of external expertise, during the site visits.

The BP has documented qualification requirements for personnel involved in the different aspects of the SBP system, including the qualifications needed for SBE.

According to interviews, review of formal qualifications and the set of procedures and documents that were composed for the SBP system, auditors evaluated the competency of main responsible staff to be sufficient.

## 7.5 Stakeholder feedback

During the BP's stakeholder consultation, no comment was received. However, the BP implements an adaption in the mitigating measures based on feedback previously received by the consultant from the industry association. The CB finds that the BP stakeholder consultation was sufficient, but comments that the BP should have contacted municipal authorities. See OBS 01/17.

## 7.6 Preconditions

None remain open. See NCRs 06/17 and 07/17.

# 8 Review of Biomass Producer’s Risk Assessments

Table 1. Initial 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	Specified	Specified	2.7.2	Low	Low
2.1.2	Specified	Specified	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	Specified	Specified	2.9.1	Low	Low
2.2.4	Specified	Specified	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)		Indicator	Risk rating (Low or Specified)	
	Producer	CB		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

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 Biomass Producer’s mitigation measures

The BP has used the suggested mitigation measures in the Regional Risk Assessment for Denmark, which found 4 Indicators with specified risk and suggests mitigating measures. The table below shows the specified risk Indicators and the corresponding mitigation methods that the BP will implement. However, the BP will not implement the suggestion that HCV maps are made publicly available.

The BP has documented and described systematic procedures for implementing the relevant risk mitigating measures according to the sub-scope of the stand of origin. For forests with a green management plan, the relevant maps of HCVs will be used, and for Specified risk stands without the necessary identification and mapping of Key Biotopes, an onsite inspection will be carried out by a trained professional with a minimum of a B.Sc. in Forestry or biology, and maps identifying HVCs including key biotopes will be created.

The BP has also implemented documented procedures for protection of biologically valuable dead wood in the forests. The BP has described a short procedure for monitoring the implementation and effectiveness of the planned mitigation measures during annual internal audits.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Mitigating measure</b>
<p><i>2.1.1 Forests and other areas with high conservation values in the Supply Base are identified and mapped.</i></p>	<p><i>The goal of the mitigation measure is to ensure that any HCV in the area within the Supply Base is identified and sufficiently mapped before sourcing begins of feedstock for biomass production, so that the information about any HCVs can be securely passed on to staff carrying out the felling and chipping operation.</i></p> <p><i>The BP creates a map for all wood chip production areas, and all projects are assigned a project ID and a checklist is filled in by the owner-operator. This also includes assigning the project to the correct sub-scope. If the area is in a specified risk sub-scope, it is checked if certification or green management plan maps are available, and if this is the case, these are used. This ensures that natural values, including key biotopes can be respected and protected during felling and extraction. If the area is in a specified risk sub-scope, and no maps of key biotopes is available, procedures state that a local expert must be consulted. The online HNV forest map (Map with indication of prevalence of areas of High Nature Value, which is available at <a href="http://miljoegis.mim.dk/cbkort?profile=miljoegis-plangroendk">http://miljoegis.mim.dk/cbkort?profile=miljoegis-plangroendk</a>) is also checked prior to the field survey of HCVs for a calculated indication of the potential for HCVs. If the area is too small to carry the cost of a local expert, the biomass will be classed as “other biomass”. If the project area is in a low risk sub-scope, screening is not conducted. Further consideration for all wood chip production areas include consulting maps of legally protected areas, e.g. wetland, marchland, bog, heath or areas of historical, archaeological or any other legal protection status. Procedures are also in place to ensure that any information the owner might have about nesting trees, fox burrows, special local agreements etc. are registered in the project documents.</i></p>

<p>2.1.2 Potential threats to forests and other areas with high conservation values from forest management activities are identified and addressed.</p>	<p>For all wood chip production areas the following material is given to the operator(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Map of project area</li> <li>- Written instructions from project manager (owner-operator)</li> <li>- Checklist as per 2.1.1</li> <li>- Any other relevant information</li> </ul> <p>This, along with easy access to the project responsible (owner-operator) via mobile phone, ensures that any identified element on the maps requiring protection and any other element requiring protection is respected during felling, extraction and wood chip production processes,</p>
<p>2.2.3 Key ecosystems and habitats are conserved or set aside in their natural state (CPET S8b).</p>	<p>Risk mitigation measures are the same as for Indicator 2.1.2:</p> <p>For all wood chip production areas the following material is given to the operator(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Map of project area</li> <li>- Written instructions from project manager (owner-operator)</li> <li>- Checklist as per 2.1.1</li> <li>- Any other relevant information</li> </ul> <p>This, along with easy access to the project responsible (owner-operator) via mobile phone, ensures that any identified element on the maps requiring protection and any other element requiring protection is respected during felling, extraction and wood chip production processes,</p>
<p>2.2.4: Biodiversity is protected</p>	<p>The goal of the mitigation measure is to ensure that biodiversity is sufficiently protected. This Indicator is seen as being partially covered by Indicators 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, and as such Low risk will be demonstrated or reached through mitigating measures. Required risk mitigation measures are the same as outlined for Indicators 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.</p> <p>Due to the technical requirements that the biomass shall fulfill with regards to humidity and density, it is generally not accepted by Energy Producers that decaying wood is used as input in the chips supplied from Danish Forests. The BP has also established procedures for ensuring that biologically valuable dead and decaying and deadwood on the forest floor is not chipped or removed in connection with production and extraction of biomass. The BP has also established procedures for ensuring that a volume of deadwood is left in the forest after final felling, and for preserving standing dead trees in thinning or afforestation areas.</p>

## 10 Non-conformities and observations

<b>NCR: 01/17</b>	<b>NC Classification: MINOR</b>	
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard 2, Requirement 10.1 Appendix B 10.1 Sub-scopes within the SB may be defined by BPs to enable the SBE to be implemented more effectively...	
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>		
The BP implements a sub-scope (“source type”) in procedures, but the sub-scope is not defined and described in the SBE.		
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	Organization 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>	Before next annual audit, but no later than 12 months.	
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	The BP has updated the procedure and addressed this NCR.	
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	Auditor finds the corrective actions to be sufficient.	
<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: 02/17</b>	<b>NC Classification: MINOR</b>	
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard 2, Requirement 15.7 Appendix B 15.7 Relevant personnel shall be informed promptly of any changes to management systems.	
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>		
Responsibility for staff training has been assigned (see Exhibit 1) and trainings have been carried out as per training materials and records (Exhibit 8), but there are no procedures on how to immediately inform staff about changes in the management system.		
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	Organization 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>	Before next annual audit, but no later than 12 months.	
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	The BP has updated the Management system (Exhibit 2, section 15) to include procedures and responsibilities for immediately informing staff of any changes to the management system.	
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	Auditor has reviewed the updated management system, and finds the corrective actions to be sufficient.	

<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: 03/17</b>	<b>NC Classification: MINOR</b>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard 2, Instruction Note 2A, Requirement 1.8 Appendix B
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>	
The BP does not have a procedure for how to strengthen the monitoring system if problems appear (i.e. increase the number of samples if needed).	
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	Organization 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>	Before next annual audit, but no later than 12 months.
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	The BP has addressed this NCR in the updated procedure.
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	Auditor finds the corrective actions to be sufficient.
<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: 04/17</b>	<b>NC Classification: MAJOR / PRE-CONDITION</b>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard 5, Instruction Note 5A Appendix D
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>	
The BP had completed and submitted SARs to auditor, but they were found to be lacking in the assignment of SDIs and justification.	
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	Organization 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>	Prior to certification
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	The BP has submitted a complete and correct SAR to the auditor shortly after the audit. See exhibit 11
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	Auditor has reviewed the SAR submitted by the BP and has found it to be correct and complete. The NCR is closed on this background.
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

<b>NCR: 05/17</b>	<b>NC Classification: MAJOR / PRE-CONDITION</b>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard 5, Instruction Note 5C

Appendix D	
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>	
The BP has not completed and submitted a Static Biomass Profiling Data sheet to the auditor.	
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	Organization 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>	Prior to certification
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	The BP has submitted a Static Biomass Profiling Data sheet to the auditor shortly after the audit. See exhibit 10.
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	Auditor has reviewed the Static biomass Profiling Data sheet submitted by the BP and has found it to be correct and complete. The NCR is closed on this background.
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

<b>NCR: 06/17</b>	<b>NC Classification: MAJOR / PRE-CONDITION</b>	
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard 2, requirement 7.1 Appendix D	
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>		
The BP has procedures for sharing the SBR on their own website. During the audit, it was confirmed through interview that they will implement this once the SBR and certification has been approved, and prior to 90 days after the closing meeting.		
The BP had not made the SBR available in Danish and English in the BP website at the time of the assessment. This is a precondition to certification.		
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	Organization 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>	Prior to certification	
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	The BP has made the SBR available in Danish and English in the BP website at <a href="http://www.dshwood.dk/miljoe/">http://www.dshwood.dk/miljoe/</a>	
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	Auditor has successfully downloaded the SBR in Danish and English from the above location. The NCR is closed on this background.	
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	

<b>NCR: 07/17</b>	<b>NC Classification: MAJOR / PRE-CONDITION</b>	
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard 4B 1.2	
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>		
The BP has signed a SBP Trademark License Agreement and is well-aware of this requirement. See		

Exhibit 1, section 21, and Exhibit 9.	
The signed SBP Trademark License Agreement is an outdated version provided by the NEPCon auditor. A signed version of the most recent SBP Trademark License Agreement is a prerequisite to certification.	
<b>Corrective action request:</b>	Organization 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>	Prior to certification
<b>Evidence Provided by Organisation:</b>	The BP has provided signed version of the most recent SBP Trademark License Agreement available at the time of the assessment. See exhibit 9
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	Auditor find that the TMLA is correct and signed. The NCR is closed on this background.
<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>OBS: 01/17</b>	<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	Standard 2, Instruction Note 2A, Requirement 1.1
	<b>Report Section</b>	Appendix B
<b>Description of findings leading to observation:</b>	The BP conducted a stakeholder consultation process that took place in a 30-day period from the 30th of March to the 30th of April 2017. 21 stakeholders were notified by e-mail and the communication included the SBR and SBE. The stakeholder contacted included relevant associations, national NGOs, Copenhagen University, and umbrella organizations for recreation. The full list of stakeholders is available at the BP and in Exhibit 4. The BP received no stakeholder responses during the stakeholder process. However, the BP has not contacted any Municipal authorities during the stakeholder process.	
<b>Observation:</b>	The BP should expand its list of stakeholders to also include municipal authorities, since this is the authority for the Nature Protection Act.	

<b>OBS: 02/17</b>	<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	Standard 2, Instruction Note 2C, Requirement 3.1
	<b>Report Section</b>	Appendix B
<b>Description of findings leading to observation:</b>	The BP is aware that the SBR, including SBE, must be submitted to SBP no later than 90 days after the on-site closing meeting with the CB. However, the BP doesn't have a procedure on how to send the SBR to SBP within 90 days.	
<b>Observation:</b>	The BP should address this requirement to avoid a future NCR.	

<b>OBS: 03/17</b>	<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	Standard 2, Instruction Note 2A,
-------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

		Requirement 1.5
	<b>Report Section</b>	Appendix B
<b>Description of findings leading to observation:</b>	The BP is aware of the requirement to audit different sites than those that have been audited by the CB, but there are no written procedures where the BP addresses this requirement. The BP has no procedure for requirements 1.5 and 1.7 in Instruction Note 2A.	
<b>Observation:</b>	The BP should describe which sites they are visiting in order to avoid the ones visited by the CB and save the internal audit history.	

<b>OBS: 04/17</b>	<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	Standard 2, Requirement 15.5
	<b>Report Section</b>	Appendix B
<b>Description of findings leading to observation:</b>	The BP has described in the procedure that the list of stakeholders and correspondence with them will be kept for five years (see section 13 in Exhibit 1). However, there are no described procedure for keeping other SBP relevant records.	
<b>Observation:</b>	The BP has updated the procedures and have now addressed this problem.	

<b>OBS: 05/17</b>	<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	Standard 5, Instruction Note 5C, Requirement 4.1.2
	<b>Report Section</b>	Appendix D
<b>Description of findings leading to observation:</b>	The BP mainly source feedstock from forest residues, but should have records of the part (%) of biomass that doesn't come from forest areas (forest residues).	
<b>Observation:</b>	The BP should have records of the part (%) of biomass that doesn't come from forest areas (forest residues).	

<b>OBS: 06/17</b>	<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	Standard 2, Requirement 19.3
	<b>Report Section</b>	Appendix B
<b>Description of findings leading to observation:</b>	The BP conducted a stakeholder consultation process that took place in a 30-day period from the 30th of March to the 30th of April 2017. 21 stakeholders were notified by e-mail and the communication included the SBR and SBE. The stakeholder contacted included relevant associations, national NGOs, Copenhagen University, and umbrella organizations for recreation. The full list of stakeholders is available at the BP and in Exhibit 4. The BP received no stakeholder responses during the stakeholder process. However, the BP has not contacted any Municipal authorities during the stakeholder process and should expand the list to include municipal authorities, since this is the authority for the Nature Protection Act (see also observation 01/17 under point 7.4 above). The SBR has not been subjected to Peer Review, but since the SBE is based on the SBP endorsed RRA for Denmark, this is not seen as a requirement.	
<b>Observation:</b>	The BP should consider subjecting the SBR to peer review.	



*Findings: The BP conducted a stakeholder consultation process that took place in a 30-day period from the 30th of March to the 30th of April 2017. 21 stakeholders were notified by e-mail and the communication included the SBR and SBE. The stakeholder contacted included relevant associations, national NGOs, Copenhagen University, and umbrella organizations for recreation. The full list of stakeholders is available at the BP and in Exhibit 4. The BP received no stakeholder responses during the stakeholder process. However, the BP has not contacted any Municipal authorities during the stakeholder process and should expand the list to include municipal authorities, since this is the authority for the Nature Protection Act (see also observation 01/17 under point 7.4 above). The SBR has not been subjected to Peer Review, but since the SBE is based on the SBP endorsed RRA for Denmark, this is not seen as a requirement.*

# 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: NCRs closed
<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 NEPCon will obtain the approval of the report from SBP technical committee. The expiration of the certificate will then be 5 years.	
<b>Certification decision by: Nikolai Tochilov</b>	
Date of decision: <b>18.01.2018</b>	

## 12 Surveillance updates

12.1 to 12.7 are not applicable since this evaluation was a main assessment and not an annual surveillance.

### 12.1 Evaluation details

Not applicable.

### 12.2 Significant changes

Not applicable.

### 12.3 Follow-up on outstanding non-conformities

*Not applicable.*

### 12.4 New non-conformities

Not applicable.

### 12.5 Stakeholder feedback

Not applicable.

### 12.6 Conditions for continuing certification

Not applicable

### 12.7 Certification recommendation

Not applicable

## 13 Evaluation details

Primary Responsible Person: (Responsible for control system at site(s))	Dennis Flanz, Fuel wood manager
Auditor(s):	Christian Rahbek, Lead auditor Rebecka Mc Carthy, Auditor-in-training
People Interviewed, Titles:	Erik T. Kjær, Forester Dennis Flanz, Fuel wood manager Rasmus Grønborg Bak, CEO Palle Haugsted, CFO Margrethe Ruby, Logistics assistant Anders Bjørnkjær-Nielsen, External consultant, B4Trees ApS Pia Mathisen, Office assistant Peter Thomassen, Machine operator (Skoventreprenør Per Kjær ApS) Bjarne Olsen, Forest worker (Stub og Gren.dk ApS) Lars Carlsson, Forester (Stub og Gren.dk ApS) Arne Jørgensen, Owner-operator (Poppen Skovservice A/S) Henrik Abild, Operator (Poppen Skovservice A/S) Torben Stabell, Owner-operator (Skoventreprenør Torben Stabell) René Langkjær, Operator (Skovrødderne ApS) Emil Andersen Hvid, Forester (Valdemarskilde estate)
Brief Overview of Audit Process for this Location:	Please see the audit overview in section 6.1
Comments:	