

# NEPCon Evaluation of Postavsky Furniture Centre, PMUE Compliance with the SBP Framework: Public Summary Report

First Surveillance Audit

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 <a href="https://www.sustainablebiomasspartnership.org">www.sustainablebiomasspartnership.org</a>

Document history

Version 1.0: published 26 March 2015

© Copyright The Sustainable Biomass Partnership Limited 2015



## **Contents**

1	Overview	1
2	Scope of the evaluation and SBP certificate	2
3	Specific objective	4
4	SBP Standards utilised	5
4.1	SBP Standards utilised	5
4.2	SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment	5
5	Description of Biomass Producer, Supply Base and Forest Management	6
5.1	Description of Biomass Producer	6
5.2	Description of Biomass Producer's Supply Base	6
5.3	Detailed description of Supply Base	7
5.4	Chain of Custody system	7
6	Evaluation process	8
6.1	Timing of evaluation activities	8
6.2	Description of evaluation activities	9
6.3	Process for consultation with stakeholders	10
7	Results	11
7.1	Main strengths and weaknesses	11
7.2	Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation	11
7.3	Compilation of data on Greenhouse Gas emissions	11
7.4	Competency of involved personnel	11
7.5	Stakeholder feedback	11
7.6	Preconditions	11
8	Review of Biomass Producer's Risk Assessments	12
9	Review of Biomass Producer's mitigation measures	13
10	Non-conformities and observations	14
11	Certification decision	19
12	Surveillance updates	20
12.1	Evaluation details	20
12.2	Significant changes	20



### Focusing on sustainable sourcing solutions

13	Evaluation details	21
12.7	Certification recommendation	20
12.6	Conditions for continuing certification	20
12.5	Stakeholder feedback	20
12.4	New non-conformities	20
12.3	Follow-up on outstanding non-conformities	20



### 1 Overview

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

Primary contact for SBP: Ondrej Tarabus ot@nepcon.net, +420 606 730 382

Report completion date: 28/Aug/2017

Report authors: Aliaksandr Zubkevich

Certificate Holder: Private Production Unitary Enterprise "Postavsky Mebelny Center", 28,

Ozernaya str, Postavy, Vitebsk Region, 211871, The Republic of Belarus

Producer contact for SBP: Artemy Grebennikov (Technic-technologist), Ozernaya, 28, Postavy, 211871,

Belarus, telephone: +375 29 895 27 03, email: grebearty@gmail.com

Certified Supply Base: sourcing from Republic of Belarus

SBP Certificate Code: SBP-01-21

Date of certificate issue: 24/Jun/2016

Date of certificate expiry: 23/Jun/2021

In	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			
	$\boxtimes$						



## 2 Scope of the evaluation and SBP certificate

The certificate scope covers the pellet production site in city Postavy, Belarus.

The Organisation holds valid FSC Chain of Custody certificate with FSC credit system in the scope. The FSC certificate contains the sawmill, door production and pellet production.

The Organisation is sourcing logs for their own production. BP is using secondary and tertiary production residues, which have not been use in their own sawmill or door production. Also, secondary feedstock is sourced from external suppliers.

Secondary and tertiary feedstock: sawdust and wood chips are used for the pellet production. Slab wood, woodchips are used for biomass drying.

All inputs materials delivered to the pellet production plant are or FSC certified or FSC Controlled. Feedstock used in the biomass production originates only from Belarus.

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

Description of the scope:

The certificate scope covers production of wood pellets, for use in energy production, at PPUE Postavsky Furniture Center and transportation by rail to Belarusian/Latvian border, Bigosovo railway station and Belarusian/Lithuanian border, Gudogai railway station. The scope of the certificate does not include Supply Base Evaluation.

Scope Item	Check all that apply to the Certificate Scope			Change in Scope (N/A for Assessments)
Approved Standards:			#4 V1.0 SBP Standard #5 V1.0 tnership.org/documents	
Primary Activity:	Pellet producer			
Input Material Categories:	SBP-Compliant P Feedstock  Controlled Feedsto	•	SBP-Compliant Secondary  Feedstock  SBP non-Compliant Feedstock	
	SBP-Compliant Tertiary biomass	⊠Pre-cons	sumer Tertiary Feedstock	
	\$BP-approved Recycled Claim	Post-con	sumer Tertiary Feedstock	



## Focusing on sustainable sourcing solutions

Chain of custody system	⊠FSC	□₽E	EFC	□\$FI		<b>□</b> GGL	
implemented:	Transfer		Percenta	age	$\boxtimes$	Credit	
Points of sales	Permanent storage (Storage site)		– Temporally gistic site)	Other point of sale (e.g. gate of the BP, boarder, railway station etc.) -DAF Bigosovo			
Provide name of all points of sales	- - -		- - -		railv - Be Lith	way station elarusian- uanian border, dogai railway	
Use of SBP claim:	⊠Yes			□No			
SBE Verification Program:	Low risk sou	·		\$sources with unspecified/ specified risk		nspecified/	
Sub-scopes	New districts approved for				' <del>-</del>		
Specify SBP Product (	Groups added or removed:						<u> </u>
Comments:							



## 3 Specific objective

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

The scope of the evaluation covered:

- Review of the BP's management procedures;
- Review of the production processes, production site visit;
- Review of FSC system control points, analysis of the existing FSC CoC system;
- Interviews with responsible staff;
- Review of the records, calculations and conversion coefficients;
- 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 documents:

5A: Collection and Communication of Data, 1.1, October 2016

5B Energy and GHG Data, 1.1, October 2016

5C Static Biomass Profiling data version 1.1, October 2016

http://www.spbo-cert.org/documents

## 4.2 SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment

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



# Description of Biomass Producer, Supply Base and Forest Management

#### 5.1 Description of Biomass Producer

The organization is a biomass producer with a production situated in city Postavy, Belarus

BP is sourcing secondary and tertiary feedstock, coming from its own primary production, as well as secondary feedstock from other sawmills.

Logs for the primary production (sawmill) are purchased from state sales agent or local forestry management units. In both cases logs are delivered directly from the forest with harvesting permit. Logs are originating from Belarus.

All incoming feedstock is FSC certified or controlled (controlled wood by own FSC controlled wood system). Origin information at FMU level (forestry) is available on the delivery documents or checked during the supplier audits focused on origin identification.

The BP is implementing FSC credit system. Biomass is transported by railway transport and are sold at Belarusian – Latvian border, Bigosovo railway station and Belarusian-Lithuanian border, Gudogai railway station.

## 5.2 Description of Biomass Producer's Supply Base

The supply base of the organization is Belarus. Almost all the material, which is used in the biomass production is coming from the sawmill, which is a part of the same organization. This sawmill sources from Belarus only.

In Belarus, forest land covers 9.5 million ha. Forests are quite evenly spread over the country's six regions with the average value of the forest cover (ratio between the stocked forest land and the total land) being 39.3%. The size of agricultural land is 8.7 million ha.

The area covered by forest is increasing. The expansion happens both naturally and by afforestation of infertile land unsuitable for agriculture. Within the last decade, the timber production in Belarus has fluctuated approx., 11 million cubic metres (http://www.mlh.by 2015.)

Forest area of Belarus consists: forests- 7,89 million ha, Other wooded land 0.91 million ha.

The main wood species in Belarus are: pine 50,4%, spruce 9,2%; birch 23,1%; black alder 3,3%; grey alder 3,3 %: aspen 2,1%; other species 3,3%.

The forests in the Republic of Belarus are state property. Forests under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Forestry (Minleshoz) cover 86% of the forest fund. Besides, a significant share of the forest fund is managed by the Administration of the President of the Republic of Belarus (8%) and by the Ministry of Emergency Situations of the Republic of Belarus (2%).

Belarus has been a signatory of the CITES Convention since 1995. CITES requirements are respected in forest management, although there are no species included in the CITES lists in Belarus.

Forest regeneration is carried out annually over an area of 32,000 ha, including 81% of the forest planting and seeding and 19% by natural regeneration. There are 2 strictly protected Nation reserves and 4 National parks present in Belarus at the moment. Area of National reserves accounts 2,98 million ha and area of National parks is 3,98 million ha.

Forestry and the forest industry are essential parts of the republic's economy. The share of forest sector in GNP is 4-5%, 3.2% of local inhabitants are employed in forest sector.



#### Focusing on sustainable sourcing solutions

The forest area is certified by PEFC certification scheme: 7,9 million. ha (93 forestry's) and FSC certification scheme app 7,1 million. ha (90 forestry's)

For detailes see the BP internet site: http://www.pmc.by/?text\_section\_id=6

### 5.3 Detailed description of Supply Base

Total Supply Base area (ha): 9.5 million ha

Tenure by type (ha): 9,5 million ha state ownership, 0 million ha private forests and 0 million ha

other ownership types.

Forest by type (ha): 9.5 million ha temperate forests

Forest by management type (ha): 9.5 million ha managed semi-natural Certified forest by scheme (ha): FSC - total certified area 7,1 million ha

PEFC - total certified area 7,9 million ha

Quantitative description of the Supply Base can be found in the Supply Base Report of the Biomass Producer (http://www.pmc.by/?text\_section\_id=6)

#### 5.4 Chain of Custody system

The Organisation holds valid FSC Chain of Custody certificate (TT-COC-005327). Critical control points of the FSC CoC system were evaluated also during SBP audit.

The Organisation has implemented FSC credit system. All the input materials are received with FSC certified claim. The organization does not use any imported material. Incoming wood reception register and supplier list are maintained. All material is checked during the arrival and correctly recorded in the internal system. If needed physical separation may be implemented. The company use one credit account for SBP and FSC. If they sell FSC material this amount of material automatically deduct as SBP credit as well.



## 6 Evaluation process

## 6.1 Timing of evaluation activities

Onsite audit was conducted on March 28, 2017 (8h). Audit activities included documents review at office, inspection of production facilities and staff interviews. Desk review of updated document and SAR prepared by BP with help of their customer was reviewed 30.05.2017.

Action	Place	Auditor	date/ time
Introduction meeting (Appr at 10.00-10.15)	Office	Aliaksandr Zubkevich	28.03.2017 10.15-12.30; 13.30-17.30
Analyse of the organization SBP system;	Office		
Staff interview;	Pellet factory		
Documents review procedure, instructions, training minutes, group products list, suppliers list and etc.			
Analyse of FSC COC system. Checking of critical points.			
Review of GHG date calculation, interview with staff			
Visit of pellet factory and laboratory, staff interview, review of records			
List of reviewed processes (visited departments):			
purchase and acceptance of raw material			
moisture measurement of raw material and products (operator);			
3) production and accounting (bookkeeping);			
4) Use of resources (electrician, mechanic);			
5) Realisation and sales. Work with clients			
Lunch time	Office		
12.30-13.30			

#### Focusing on sustainable sourcing solutions

Final meeting 17.00-17:30	Office	
Review of updated documents and SAR	Minsk, desk review	30.05.2017

### 6.2 Description of evaluation activities

The audit 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 the collection of the energy and emission data.

Description of the audit evaluation:

All SBP related documentation connected to the SBP as well as FSC system of the organisation, including SBP Procedures, GHG related data, Supply Base Reports, were evaluated during the audit.

Auditor was welcomed in the company. Audit started with an opening meeting attended by the deputy director.

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

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

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

At the end audit findings were summarised and audit conclusion based on use of 3 angle evaluation method were provided to the representative of the company.

After the audit the final review of the SAR document and additional evidence provided by the organization was done. The outcomes of this additional review were discussed with the company over phone.

Composition of audit team:

Auditor(s), roles	Qualifications
Aliaksandr Zubkevich Lead auditor Evaluation against all applicable requirements	Mr Aliaksandr Zubkevich has education of engineer-economist in timber industry. He had postgraduate study at the Belarusian State Technological University. A. Zubkevich has passed FSC CoC/ FM lead auditor training course, Legal Source, ISO 14001 and SBP training coursed. Previous experience in woodworking industry and SBP pre-assessment and assessments in Belarus.

Impartiality commitment: NEPCon commits to using impartial auditors and our clients are encouraged to inform NEPCon management if violations of this are noted. Please see our Impartiality Policy here: <a href="http://www.nepcon.org/impartiality-policy">http://www.nepcon.org/impartiality-policy</a>



## 6.3 Process for consultation with stakeholders

No Consultation was conducted for this surveillance audit.



## 7 Results

#### 7.1 Main strengths and weaknesses

Strength: Use of the own production residuals, logs used in the primary production of the factory are delivered directly from the forest. All elements of SBP system are implemented at the time of the audit. Use of the FSC credit system and control of all incoming materials at the level of log reception.

Weaknesses: See the non-conformities below

#### 7.2 Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation

Not applicable.

#### 7.3 Compilation of data on Greenhouse Gas emissions

Prior the assessment held in year 2016 the organization has not recorded data on greenhouse gas emissions and has only started for purposes of the SBP certification. The data at the end of the assessment were complete and accurate, however there are some minor non-conformities to be addressed. For details see below. Additional information was collected by the BP during the time until the first surveillance audit. Quality of GHG data was improved. During the surveillance audit the organization has already implemented all the requirements for collection of energy data.

#### 7.4 Competency of involved personnel

The SBP responsible person in the company is design Engineer. The SBP responsible person has shown good understanding of the requirements in relation to SBP certification and of the already implemented FSC CoC system.

#### 7.5 Stakeholder feedback

No stakeholder comments were received.

#### 7.6 Preconditions

No preconditions to this certification were identified at the time of this surveillance audit.



# 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

-			
NCR: 01/17	NC Classification: minor		
Standard & Requirement:	SBP Instruction 5a requirement 2.1.3 Each Legal Owner shall operate a management system to ensure that data recorded is consistently compliant with the requirements specified in SBP Standards and Instruction documents		
Description of Non-conformance	e and Related Evidence:		
During the SBP annual audit, the BP presented an SBP management system, prepared documented procedures, designated responsibilities among the existing staff and conducted the staff training. It includes procedures to collect and record the GHG and sustainable information requested by STD5. But the procedure was prepared per old Instruction 5a and was not updated using new version of instruction 5a, 5b, 5c.  Во время ежегодного аудита организация предоставила систему менеджмента по SBP, подготовила процедуры, определила ответственных среди сотрудников и провела обучение ответственных сотрудников. Была предоставлена процедура по сбору и записи данных по расчету GHG (эмиссии углерода). Однако процедура была подготовлена согласно старой версии инструкции 5a. Организация не обновила свою процедуру с учетом требования новь инструкций 5a, 56, 5c.			
Corrective action request:	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.		
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next annual surveillance audit, but not later than 12 months from report finalisation date		
Evidence Provided by Organisation:			
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:			
NCR Status:	Open		



#### **CLOSED NON-CONFORMANCES**

NCR: 02/16	NC Classification: Minor
Standard & Requirement:	SBP Standard # 2 requirement 2c, p.4.1.
	The report shall be concise, covering the most important features, and shall be completed using the latest versions of the SBR Template for Biomass Producers downloaded from the SBP website. (2C, 4.1)
Report Section:	Appendix A p 2.8

#### **Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:**

The Supply Base Report meets the requirements of SBP: covering figures designated in SBR report template is completed by using the latest version of the SBR Template for Biomass producers. The following inaccuracies were identified into the report:

- According to section 2.1. and 2.5. (g) primary feedstock is used, but in other SBP documents, including GHG calculation, profiling data and batch specific data stated that only secondary and tertiary feedstock use
- indication of the number of suppliers for each SBP feedstock product group are missing in SBR section 2.1. General Description. The information is considered to be confidential and is partly available in other sections of the SBR as well as other SBP related reports submitted directly to the customers.
- Indication that forest type is boreal while all forest in Belarus are temperate
- In section 2.5 (I, m) volume is shown in a banding between 0 to 200,000 tonnes instead of as a % of the figure in (f)
- Section 3. Requirements for Supply Base Evaluation contains information that SBE is not sufficient as soon as not all the feedstock is covering directly from FSC certified forests with FSC claim and company is not considering PEFC material as buying SBP-compliant.

Corrective action request:	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.
Timeline for Conformance:	12 months from the audit closing date
Evidence Provided by Organisation:	SBR http://www.pmc.by/?text_section_id=6
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	Organization submitted updated SBR to auditor. Organization used newest template. The BP has updated SBR. Review of SBR confirmed that SBR concise and accurate.
NCR Status:	CLOSED



Is the non-conformity likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBPcertified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks?

No 

No

NOD: 00/40	NO Olassifications Minera			
NCR: 03/16	NC Classification: Minor			
Standard & Requirement:	SBP Standard/ Interpretation 5a (ver. 1.0), requirement			
	4.4.1-3 The legal owner shall provide the data necessary to calculate the average moisture content of the processed feedstock leaving the plant.			
	Ideally the legal owner should introduce a continuous measurement of the moisture content of the processed feedstock in order to produce an annual average.			
	The legal owner shall justify any lower frequency of mois measurements to the auditor	ture		
Report Section:	Appendix C p.5.4.1			
Description of Non-conformance	and Related Evidence:			
the period less than 12 months.  Corrective action request:	ths.			
the period less than 12 months.	i i			
	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.			
Timeline for Conformance:	12 months from the audit closing date			
Evidence Provided by Organisation:	Moisture measurements register			
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	The BP have started own measurement of moisture just during assessment in 2016. The measurement is done 2-3 times per day; records are kept on paper.			
NCR Status:	Closed			
Comments (optional):				
Is the non-conformity likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks?				



NCR: 04/16	NC Classification: Minor			
Standard & Requirement:	SBP Standard/ Interpretation 5a (ver. 1.0), requirement			
	6.3 It may be feasible for the legal owner to collect data usectual fuel records (e.g. tank level and uplifts) along the retravel route with the mode of transport actually used. Whe applicable, diesel use is reported in MJ/t biomass. (5a, 5.	elevant ere		
Report Section:	Appendix C p.6.3			
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:				
The data about the fuel consumption for transportation by railway is provided by the haulers by phone. No written evidence, besides the act prepared by the BP was demonstrated to prove fuel consumption for railway transportation.				
Corrective action request:	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 root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the nor conformance.	as the		
Timeline for Conformance:	12 months from the audit closing date			
Evidence Provided by Organisation:	SAR			
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	The BP has prepared in accordance with new versions of instructions (5A, 5B, 5C). Thus NCR is not relevant anymore. The organization has prepared Audit-report-on-Energy-and-GHG-Data (SAR). The BP used BioGrace reference values in SAR.			
NCR Status:	Closed			
Comments (optional):	mments (optional):			
Is the non-conformity likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks?				

NCR: 05/16	NC Classification: Minor	
Standard & Requirement:	SBP Standard/ Interpretation 5a (ver. 1.0), requirement	
	9.4 It shall be linked to the batch using the unique batch code (5a, 8.4)	
Report Section:	Appendix C p.8.4	



#### **Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:**

The responsible person is aware about requirement of use unique batch code. During the first certification period it is planned that BP will use just one batch code as the organization does not foresee any changing in sourcing and all the input material shares the same sustainability characteristics. (one sales point). The organization has used the same code for batch code and GHG and profiling information code which might lead to confusion in case the GHG and profiling information code changes over the time furthermore. However, SBP procedure does not contain the indication that the mentioned code covers both this information.

indication that the mentioned code covers both this information.		
Corrective action request:	Organisation shall implement corrective actions to demonstrate conformance with the requirement(s) referenced above.	
	Note: Effective corrective actions focus on addressing th specific occurrence described in evidence above, as wel root cause to eliminate and prevent recurrence of the no conformance.	l as the
Timeline for Conformance:	12 months from the audit closing date	
Evidence Provided by Organisation:	invoices	
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	Review of invoices confirmed that the BP use unique batch code in right way. The BP use DTS system to register transactions	
NCR Status:	Closed	
Comments (optional):		
Is the non-conformity likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks?		



## 11 Certification decision

Based on Organisation's conformance with SBP requirements, the auditor makes the following recommendation:				
	Certification approved:			
	Upon acceptance of NCR(s) issued above			
	Certification not approved:			
Based on auditor's recommendation and NEPCon quality review following certification decision is taken:				
NEPCon certification decision:				
The Biomass Producer has been certified by NEPCon as meeting the requirements of the specified SBP Standard, the certificate can be maintained. The expiration of the certificate will be then 5 years.				
Certification decision by: Ondřej Tarabus				
Date of decision: 28 August 2017				
Next sur	rrveilance audit should take place:	⊠within 12 months		
		more frequently (please specify)		



## 12 Surveillance updates

#### 12.1 Evaluation details

Please see in a section: p.6.2. Description of evaluation activities.

#### 12.2 Significant changes

No changes

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

See information about the NCR reviewed during the surveillance audit is section 10 of the report. 10. Non-conformities and observations

#### 12.4 New non-conformities

There are no new non-conformities identified as results of the surveillance audit.

#### 12.5 Stakeholder feedback

No comments or comments from the stakeholders had been received.

#### 12.6 Conditions for continuing certification

No preconditions are identified. List of open NCR is available is section 10. Non-conformities and observations of the report

#### 12.7 Certification recommendation

It is recommended to maintain certification of the organisation.



# 13 Evaluation details

Primary Responsible Person: (Responsible for control system at site(s))	Artem Grigorjevich Zemchenok, quality engineer
Auditor(s):	Aliaksandr Zubkevich - Lead auditor
People Interviewed, Titles:	Ginko Eugene, Design Engineer
	Grebenikov Artemij, engineer
	Tillyaev Artur, foreman
	Eremova Elena, bookkeeper
	Golozubets Natalia, bookkeeper
	Vasilchenko Aleksandra, bookkeeper
	Svartsevich Oksana, marketer
Brief Overview of Audit	See in section 6.2, Description of evaluation activities in the main
Process for this Location:	part of the report.
Comments:	N/A