SBP

Sustainable Biomass Program

# DNV GL Business Assurance Finland Oy Ab Evaluation of Haderup Skovservice A/S Compliance with the SBP Framework: Public Summary Report

Main (Initial) Audit

www.sbp-cert.org

# Completed in accordance with the CB Public Summary Report Template Version 1.4

*For further information on the SBP Framework and to view the full set of documentation see www.sbp-cert.org*

*Document history*

*Version 1.0: published 26 March 2015*

*Version 1.1: published 30 January 2018*

*Version 1.2: published 4 April 2018*

*Version 1.3: published 10 May 2018*

*Version 1.4: published 16 August 2018*

# Table of Contents

# 1 Overview

| | |
|---|---|
| CB Name and contact: | DNV GL Business Assurance Finland Oy Ab |
| Primary contact for SBP: | Jyrki Sopanen (Jyrki.sopanen@dnvgl.com) |
| Current report completion date: | 15/May/2019 |
| Report authors: | Karina Seeberg Kitnaes |
| Name of the Company: | Haderup Skovservice A/S |
| Company contact for SBP: | Anders Røhr Lauritzen (anders@haderup-skovservice.dk) |
| Certified Supply Base: | Denmark |
| SBP Certificate Code: | SBP-05-11 |
| Date of certificate issue: | 01/Jun/2019 |
| Date of certificate expiry: | 31/May/2024 |

This report relates to the Main (Initial) Audit

# 2 Scope of the evaluation and SBP certificate

**Introduction**

Haderup Skovservice A/S is a biomass trader and producer of wood chips based in Denmark. In the context of SBP, the BP purchases primary feedstock as roundwood or wood chips at roadside in Danish forests. The feedstock is transported by truck directly to the customers or to the storage, where the BP stores the wood chips until the biomass is then loaded onto trucks to delivery to customers in Denmark.

The period of ownership begins when the feedstock is picked up at roadside and transported from the forest. The period of ownership ends when the biomass (wood chips) is offloaded at the customer. Thus, the post-production endpoint is delivery at the facilities of the buyers (Danish energy sector), where the buyer takes over the responsibility of the biomass.

**Scope**

The biomass producer with company office and storage purchases roundwood and woodchips, performs wood chipping, trade and transport of wood chips from Danish forests for use in energy production in Denmark. The scope of the certificate does include Supply Base Evaluation for the Supply Base Denmark.

# 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 the certification.

# 4 SBP Standards utilised

## 4.1 SBP Standards utilised

*Please select all SBP Standards used during this evaluation. All Standards can be accessed and downloaded from https://sbp-cert.org/documents/standards-documents/standards*

☒ SBP Framework Standard 1: Feedstock Compliance Standard (Version 1.0, 26 March 2015)

☒ SBP Framework Standard 2: Verification of SBP-compliant Feedstock *(Version 1.0, 26 March 2015)*

☒ SBP Framework Standard 4: Chain of Custody *(Version 1.0, 26 March 2015)*

☒ SBP Framework Standard 5: Collection and Communication of Data *(Version 1.0, 26 March 2015)*

## 4.2 SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment

SBP endorsed Regional Risk Assessment for Denmark, June 2017.

# 5 Description of Company, Supply Base and Forest Management

## 5.1 Description of Company

Haderup Skovservice A/S is a Danish company, which operates as a forest contractor and purchases roundwood and wood chips from Danish forests and surrounding landscapes. The company produces and trades wood chips. The company office located in Jytland in Denmark is responsible for the trading, chain-of-custody and the wood chipping. In the context of SBP, the company has one storage facility located close to the company office. The raw materials are primary feedstock (roundwood) originating from Danish forests and surrounding landscape, which are chipped in the forest as part of the harvest operation and then either placed at roadside (temporary storages) or occassionally transported to the company' storage facility. The wood chips are sold and transported to the Danish energy sector, where the buyer takes over the responsibilities. The company holds valid PEFC COC certificate. The feedstock is either PEFC certified or non-certified, which is controlled through the company SBE including SVP and use of the SBP endorsed RRA for Denmark.

## 5.2 Description of Company's Supply Base

The feedstock to the BP is sourced from the supply Base: Denmark. The feedstock is supplied through the harvest and chipping operations screened, performed and monitored by the BP. The BP's supply base is both state owned and privately owned forests.

The company has conducted a supply base evaluation (SBE) using the SBP endorsed RRA for Denmark and with SVP and risk mitigation measures for the specified risk indicators to categorise them as low risk.

## 5.3 Detailed description of Supply Base

Forest management practices in Denmark are based on the country specific forestry and nature protection laws, forestry guidelines, and forest management planning practices. Even-aged forestry or uneven-aged semi-natural forestry is the dominant method. The forest rotation is typically 60-100 years, with the silvi-cultural practice most often consists of planting or natural regeneration, tending of the young seedling stands, two thinnings, final harvesting of the mature stand followed by obligatory regeneration of a new forest stand.

The Danish forest area is approximately 625 000 ha, which corresponds to approx. 15% of the terrestrial land area of Denmark. The forest area is increasing. Other woodland areas are also found in the open landscape (arboricultural arising).

Total standing timber in Danish forests is 130 million m3. Generally, Danish forests include a variety of tree species of which the most common species are: Norway spruce 15%, beech 14% and oak 10%, while other species include: pine 11%, silver spruce 6%, Nordmann fir 5%, noble fir 2%, other fir species 10%, Sycamore maple 4%, birch 7%, ash 3% and other broadleaves 9%.

The number of forest properties in Denmark is estimated to 28 000. The general size of Danish FMUs range between 2 to 1,000 hectares. There is limited variation in terms of ownership within the supply base.

In Denmark, approx. 74 % of the forest area is owned by private persons or companies, while the remaining 26% is state-owned or owned by municipalities and other public bodies.

For more information on the supply base: Denmark, the BP has elaborated the SBP SBR in Danish and English and will be made publicly available on the webpage of the BP after their approval.

## 5.4 Chain of Custody system

All feedstock sourced is covered by the BPs own wood traceability system, which is recently third party certified according to PEFC Chain of Custody. The BP has PEFC COC certificate code NC-PEFC/COC-000067, issued by Nepcon on 21-12-2018.

All feedstock is sourced through the PEFC COC system of the BP, which covers wood chips as a product group. The scope of the PEFC system is physical separation in all phases with purchase of feedstock followed by chipping, storage, transport and sales of wood chips.

Based on the reviewed purchase documentation from the suppliers and the BPs own sales documentation, claims are/will be transferred correctly to sales documents. This system is applied for SBP as well, since the only processes are chipping, transport, storage and sales of wood chips.

The main part of the feedstock will be purchased as non-PEFC certified but will through the BPs SBE be categoried as low risk with the possibility to sell the biomass as SBP-compliant biomass.

The BP is aware of the allowed SBP claims and the batch specific coding system, which will be used on the sales invoices. The BP maintains volume accounts and calculations for all inputs and outputs.

# 6 Evaluation process

## 6.1 Timing of evaluation activities

13 Mar 2019: Pre-Assessment on and offsite with review of documents and procedures (1 person-day) performed by the Lead Auditor.

15 Mar 2019: Offsite stakeholder consultation and audit preparation (½ person-day of total 1 person-day). Location: Home office and DNV office, Espoo Finland, performed by the Lead Auditor and DNVGL staff responsible for contracting.

24-26 April 2019: IA onsite audit with office and field visits and document review (1,5 person-days) and SBE evaluation (1 person-day). Locations: Company Office of the BP, storage facility and site visits to ongoing and finalised forest operations and forest temporary storages, performed by the Lead Auditor and representatives of the BP, i.e. the SBP responsible project manager.

April-May 2019: Off-site technical review and reporting (½ person-day of total 1 person-day). Location: Home office and DNV office, Espoo Finland) performed by the Lead auditor, Technical reviewer and Certification decision maker.

## 6.2 Description of evaluation activities

Pre-assessment: The pre-assessment consisted of document review and interviews regarding the Supply Base evaluation, management system descriptions, calculations and invoicing arrangements etc. The pre-assessment resulted in a short list of nonconformities for the company to deal with before the Main (IA) Audit.

Stakeholder consultation: See beneath.

Main/Initial Assessment: The Main (IA) Assessment contained document reviews, record reviews, interviews of responsible personnel, calculation verifications, site inspection at storage and chipping facility, five forest site visits and tracking of feedstock batches. Critical control points included verification of feedstock classification and category (SBP-compliant biomass) within the defined supply base and checking the chain-of-custody volume accounting thoroughly, as well as the data available as specified in the Instruction notes 5A, 5B and 5C on collection and communication of data.

The Main (IA) Assessment also included the thorough review of the SBE with document and procedures review, record review, interviews of responsible personnel, verification of SBE including use of the SBP endorsed RRA and SVP and mitigation measures developed by the BP, as well as field visits to forest operation sites and temporary forest storage with ongoing and finalised operations.

The Main (IA) Assessment resulted in closure of the nonconformities from the pre-assessment and identification of a short list of minor nonconformities and observations.

## 6.3 Process for consultation with stakeholders

Before the Main (IA) Assessment, a stakeholder consultation was performed including sending a consultation letter together with the BP's SBR and RRA mitigation measures by e-mail to a total of 29 Danish stakeholder organisations encouraging the stakeholders - as well as their local and national network partners and colleagues - to raise their concerns related to the SBP certification of the BP.

The list of consulted stakeholders was based on the list of stakeholders also consulted as part of the national RRA development process for Denmark.

No stakeholder comments received, which related to the BP. This process can be seen as the stakeholders generally are not concerned about the company’s forest management, sourcing of feedstock, SBE nor risk mitigation measures.

# 7 Results

## 7.1 Main strengths and weaknesses

The main strengths of the BP is proven long-term experience of trading and forest planning of the management team. During the review and evaluation of the BP' SBE with using the SBP-endorsed RRA for Denmark and the SVP, the strengths of the BP include the clear track of feedstock to origin and its flows from the forest to the energy sector, the full overview of suppliers, the use of the SBP approved RRA for Denmark with identification of four indicators with specified risk. The BP has well-developed and clear SVP risk mitigation measures to get these four specified risk indicators categorised to low risk, including the screening and monitoring of suppliers and their forests and the system setup, procedures, field verification, control and monitoring of forest operations.

The audits did not identify any significant weaknesses.

## 7.2 Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation

The BP has used the SBP endorsed RRA for Denmark and by using this conducted a rigorous Supply Base Evaluation of the defined Supply Base. For the SBP endorsed risk assessment (RRA), the risk was designated low for all indicators of the SBP Standard 1 apart from four: 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.

The BP has built the developed mitigation measures for these four indicators into its procedures and feedstock sourcing programmes and has sufficient knowledge and procedures in place to demonstrate also low risk in practise for all indicators. For the four indicators with specified risk in the RRA, the BP has developed clear risk mitigation measures, including supplier screening (all similar suppliers being forest owners or land owners) in their SVP, and screening procedures for the forest site before harvest operations, routines for field verification, recording and control and monitoring mechanisms of the forest operations conducted.

The evaluation found that the mitigation measures are sufficient to bring the four specified risk indicators down to low risk.

## 7.3 Collection and Communication of Data

The scope of the SBP system is limited to purchase of feedstock, chipping, storage and transport and the feedstock originates from primary feedstock with detailed records on forest of origin of all feedstock. The GHG profiling data can therefore be obtained through a quite simple routine and by use of reference values (BioGrace). The baseline and general procedures are in line with the Document 5A, 5B and 5C requirements and procedures. The BP has recorded data and prepared the ID5B Woodchip Data Report (SAR) v1-0 and the ID5C Static Biomass Profiling Data sheet v1-1.

## 7.4 Competency of involved personnel

The BP has one responsible project manager and two supporting project managers with full control of all feedstock related and biomass related procedures and routines, as well as one bookkeeper with full control of all records relevant for the purchase and sales documents and volume control.

The personnel responsible for the management and control system has long-term professional experience of managing and controlling forest operations as well as tracing the feedstock flow from the forest to the customer.

The knowledge and experience of the responsible personnel relating to GHG data profiling procedures is also found to be on a suitable level given the level and limited extend of the SBP scope.

## 7.5 Stakeholder feedback

No stakeholder comments received related to the BP.

## 7.6 Preconditions

None.

# 8 Review of Company's Risk Assessments

*Describe how the Certification Body assessed risk for the Indicators. Summarise the CB's final risk ratings in Table 1, together with the Company's final risk ratings. Default for each indicator is 'Low', click on the rating to change. Note: this summary should show the risk ratings before AND after the SVP has been performed and after any mitigation measures have been implemented.*

The BP has used the SBP endorsed RRA for Denmark (June 2017) with low risk in all indicators apart from four indicators with specified risk (2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4).

The lead auditor reviewed the RRA and the related documentation maintained by the BP and audited the biomass producer up against the SBP Std. 1 (and 2) to confirm any sensitive or missing elements to the BP approach for using the RRA and to review if the BP has sufficient knowledge and documentation in place as verification and had implemented sufficient mitigation measures to confirm low risk for the specified risk indicators.

**Table 1. Final risk ratings of Indicators as determined BEFORE the SVP and any mitigation measures.**

| Indicator | Risk rating (Low or Specified) | |
|---|---|---|
| | Producer | CB |
| 1.1.1 | Low | Low |
| 1.1.2 | Low | Low |
| 1.1.3 | Low | Low |
| 1.2.1 | Low | Low |
| 1.3.1 | Low | Low |
| 1.4.1 | Low | Low |
| 1.5.1 | Low | Low |
| 1.6.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.1.1 | Specified | Specified |
| 2.1.2 | Specified | Specified |
| 2.1.3 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.2 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.3 | Specified | Specified |
| 2.2.4 | Specified | Specified |
| 2.2.5 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.6 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.7 | Low | Low |

| Indicator | Risk rating (Low or Specified) | |
|---|---|---|
| | Producer | CB |
| 2.3.3 | Low | Low |
| 2.4.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.4.2 | Low | Low |
| 2.4.3 | Low | Low |
| 2.5.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.5.2 | Low | Low |
| 2.6.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.7.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.7.2 | Low | Low |
| 2.7.3 | Low | Low |
| 2.7.4 | Low | Low |
| 2.7.5 | Low | Low |
| 2.8.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.9.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.9.2 | Low | Low |
| 2.10.1 | Low | Low |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2.2.8 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.9 | Low | Low |
| 2.3.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.3.2 | Low | Low |

**Table 2. Final risk ratings of Indicators as determined AFTER the SVP and any mitigation measures.**

| Indicator | Risk rating (Low or Specified) | |
|---|---|---|
| | Producer | CB |
| 1.1.1 | Low | Low |
| 1.1.2 | Low | Low |
| 1.1.3 | Low | Low |
| 1.2.1 | Low | Low |
| 1.3.1 | Low | Low |
| 1.4.1 | Low | Low |
| 1.5.1 | Low | Low |
| 1.6.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.1.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.1.2 | Low | Low |
| 2.1.3 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.2 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.3 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.4 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.5 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.6 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.7 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.8 | Low | Low |
| 2.2.9 | Low | Low |
| 2.3.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.3.2 | Low | Low |

| Indicator | Risk rating (Low or Specified) | |
|---|---|---|
| | Producer | CB |
| 2.3.3 | Low | Low |
| 2.4.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.4.2 | Low | Low |
| 2.4.3 | Low | Low |
| 2.5.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.5.2 | Low | Low |
| 2.6.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.7.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.7.2 | Low | Low |
| 2.7.3 | Low | Low |
| 2.7.4 | Low | Low |
| 2.7.5 | Low | Low |
| 2.8.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.9.1 | Low | Low |
| 2.9.2 | Low | Low |
| 2.10.1 | Low | Low |

# 9 Review of Company's mitigation measures

The four indicators with specified risk in the SBP endorsed RRA for Denmark are:

2.1.1 The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that forests and other areas with high conservation value in the Supply Base are identified and mapped.

2.1.2 The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to identify and address potential threats to forests and other areas with high conservation values from forest management activities.

2.2.3 The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to ensure that key ecosystems and habitats are conserved or set aside in their natural state (CPET S8b).

2.2.4 The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to ensure that biodiversity is protected (CPET S5b).

The reason for the specified risk for these four indicators are related to protection of key biotopes as defined in Danish context and HCVs.

For this purpose, the BP has developed appropriate and clear systems and procedures as risk mitigation measures to ensure that these four indicators can be categorised as low risk. The four specified risk indicators are all related to appropriate control systems and procedures to identify, address potential threats and avoid damage to nature values (key biotopes and HCVs) during forest operations. These four indicators can thus be tackled by the same set of SVP and risk mitigation measures.

The BP has setup the SVP and risk mitigation measures including listing and screening suppliers (forest owners), defining one set of suppliers (forest owners and external forest managers), and developing tools and screening procedures for checking and verifying that no nature values are damaged as part of the forest operations performed, and monitoring procedures for field verification.

The BP uses the SBP endorsed RRA for Denmark, June 2017. The specified risks of indicators 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4 are further defined as only being so for two types:

2) primary feedstock from forest (with a green management plan) without mapping of key biotopes (2.1.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4), and

5) primary feedstock from uneven--aged stands or stands of broadleaf species (without green management plan/certification) (2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4),

while there is low risk for primary feedstock from: FSC or PEFC certified forests, forests with a green management plan including mapping of key biotopes, thinnings of even-aged conifer stands, thinnings of first generation reforestation forest, and non-forest areas (arboricultural arising), e.g. nature maintenance projects, windbreaks or residential areas.

To minimise the specified risk and bring this to 'Low Risk', the BP is working according to its own risk mitigation measures described in the company procedures manual.

General:

- The BP handles the entire process for most of the feedstock purchased and wood chips sold. This means customer contact, job planning with screening of forest site, job execution with field inspection of forest site as well as transport and sale of wood chips. Each job order/project is planned and controlled by the BP's project managers or in few cases by external forest managers.

- Each project is given a unique case number and address, which is marked in the system, on the work instruction, weighing forms etc.

Screening:

- For all suppliers (forest owners), the BP agrees with the forest owner about the harvest operation and obtains information regarding whether or not the forest site is covered by a green management plan, mapping of key biotopes or a forest certification. If the property is certified or has a green management plan, the map with recorded key biotopes must be provided to the BP.

- The forest area is screened through checking all known data (DM&E's map portal with all available maps and records) from the official databases/portals.

Field control:

- The BP physically assess the harvest operation site after the screening and before felling. This means that it is highly certain that the areas are screened correctly.

- The forest site is classified as one of the defined six types in the RRA by the project manager, which is familiar with identifying key biotopes according to the Danish methodology.

- During and after the harvest operation, the BP checks on-site again.

Map and work instructions:

- A map and checklist of the harvesting site is prepared to ensure that the machine operator is aware of any protected or valuable key biotopes/culture elements/HCVs. The map shows identified areas with key biotopesHCV.

Biomass is only sold as SBP-compliant biomass if it originates from suppliers for which Low Risk can be established for the four specified risk indicators through the measures above.

Occasionally, a minor part of the wood chips may be purchased from an external forest manager. The procedure for the purchase of external wood chips is that the BP handles this exactly as if it was its own project. The external forest manager being trained by the BP performs and records the performed screening and field check and provide the documentation to the BP.

The BP has prepared a monitoring plan by sampling of the suppliers of roundwood and wood chips respectively, which include clear sampling rules and to monitor that the required mitigation measures are

being implemented, records are being kept and whether the measures were shown to be effective in addressing the identified risks.

The review of the lead auditor included checking forest operation sites, interviewing the project manager and the suppliers (forest owner), checking training implemented and checking the recorded information and examples of maps with known key biotopes/HCVs, project work instructions, project id documentation and company evaluation.

# 10 Non-conformities and observations

*Identify all non-conformities and observations raised/closed during the evaluation (a tabular format below may be used here). Please use as many copies of the table as needed. For each, give details to include at least the following:*

- *applicable requirement(s)*
- *grading of the non-conformity (major or minor) or observation with supporting rationale*
- *timeframe for resolution of the non-conformity*
- *a statement as to whether the non-conformity is likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks.*

| **NC number** SBP1-IA-2019-01 | **NC Grading:** Observation |
|---|---|
| **Standard & Requirement:** | SBP STD 1: 2.1.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4 |
| **Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:** | |
| As part of the SBE, the BP has mitigation measures developed and implemented for the four specified risk indicators in the SBP endorsed RRA for Denmark, June 2017 (2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4). The BP has strong focus on field control of forest sites for HCVs and key biotopes and the measures are implemented for all forest operations. The risk mitigation measures are found clear and sufficient to bring the indicators to low risk. However, the BP has not clearly described in the BPs internal handbook nor in the SBR that the risk mitigation measures for safeguarding HCFs/Key biotopes are implemented to bring not only the RRA defined type 5 but also the type 2 from specified risk to low risk. | |
| **Timeline for Conformance:** | Other |
| **Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:** | *Click or tap here to enter description provided by Company to close the NC.* |
| **Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:** | *Click or tap here to enter findings for evaluation of evidence by the auditor.* |
| **NC Status:** | Open |

| **NC number** SBP2-IA-2019-02 | **NC Grading:** Minor |
|---|---|
| **Standard & Requirement:** | SBP STD 2: 16.3, 18.4, Instruction Note 2A: 1.7 |
| **Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:** | |
| The BP has defined and is implementing the risk mitigation measures for the four specified indicators. The BP has defined just one set of suppliers (forest owners and external forest managers), which are screened by own project managers and field verification performed by own project managers. So far, the BP has described the system for monitoring and checking implementation of mitigation measures. Since this is the IA, the BP has not yet implemented the monitoring plan to monitor the effectiveness of the mitigation measures at least annually. The results from monitoring and any subsequent changes to | |

| | |
|---|---|
| mitigation measures shall be updated at least once per year in an annual update of the SBR (i.e. every 12 months). | |
| **Timeline for Conformance:** | By the next surveillance audit, but no later than 12 monhts from report finalisation date |
| **Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:** | *Click or tap here to enter description provided by Company to close the NC.* |
| **Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:** | *Click or tap here to enter findings for evaluation of evidence by the auditor.* |
| **NC Status:** | Open |

| | |
|---|---|
| **NC number** SBP2-IA-2019-03 | **NC Grading:** Minor |
| **Standard & Requirement:** | SBP STD 2: Instruction Note 2A: 1.2 |
| **Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:** | |
| The BP has defined monitoring based on the risk mitigation measures for the four indicators to get them to low risk. The BP has sets of suppliers: Forest owners and harvesting sites screened either own project managers by 100% sampling or by external forest managers by 10% sampling. However, at the time of the audit, the BP had not defined the exact criteria to be monitored during verification according to supplier characteristics, risk factors and local circumstances. | |
| **Timeline for Conformance:** | By the next surveillance audit, but no later than 12 monhts from report finalisation date |
| **Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:** | *Click or tap here to enter description provided by Company to close the NC.* |
| **Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:** | *Click or tap here to enter findings for evaluation of evidence by the auditor.* |
| **NC Status:** | Open |

| **NC number** SBP2-IA-2019-04 | **NC Grading:** Minor |
|---|---|
| **Standard & Requirement:** | SBP STD 2: Instruction Note 2C: 3.1 |
| **Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:** | |
| The BP has prepared and submitted the SBR in English and Danish, but has not yet made the SBR accessible on the BP's website after approval. | |
| **Timeline for Conformance:** | By the next surveillance audit, but no later than 12 monhts from report finalisation date |
| **Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:** | *Click or tap here to enter description provided by Company to close the NC.* |
| **Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:** | *Click or tap here to enter findings for evaluation of evidence by the auditor.* |
| **NC Status:** | Open |

| **NC number** SBP4-IA-2019-05 | **NC Grading:** Observation |
|---|---|
| **Standard & Requirement:** | SBP STD 4: 5.2.6, 5.4.1 |
| **Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:** | |
| The BP has not yet supplied biomass with a SBP claim. The BP has prepared format for sales documentation with correct SBP-compliant biomass claim and position for including the SBP certificate code. An observation is issued to remind the BP to secure correct information on sales documentation: Specific batch data, SBP certificate code and SBP claim. | |
| **Timeline for Conformance:** | Other |
| **Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:** | *Click or tap here to enter description provided by Company to close the NC.* |
| **Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:** | *Click or tap here to enter findings for evaluation of evidence by the auditor.* |
| **NC Status:** | Open |

| **NC number** SBP5-IA-2019-06 | **NC Grading:** Observation |
|---|---|
| **Standard & Requirement:** | SBP STD 5: Instruction Note 5A: 4.1-4.4 |
| **Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:** | |
| The BP is aware of the DTS system, but has not done any transactions yet in the DTS system. This observation is to remind that all SBP transactions shall be recorded in the DTS. | |
| **Timeline for Conformance:** | Other |
| **Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:** | *Click or tap here to enter description provided by Company to close the NC.* |
| **Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:** | *Click or tap here to enter findings for evaluation of evidence by the auditor.* |
| **NC Status:** | Open |

| **NC number** SBP5-IA-2019-07 | **NC Grading:** Minor |
|---|---|
| **Standard & Requirement:** | SBP STD 5: Instruction Note 5C: 2.1.1-2.1.2 |
| **Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:** | |
| The BP has started setting up the data recordings to be reported annually in the ID5C SBP Static Biomass Profiling data sheet. However, the data recording of quantitative biomass profiling data is not yet implemented nor used for calculating annual profile data. The BP is expected to operate a management system to ensure that data for the annual static profiling data sheet is recorded consistently and in compliance with the requirements specified in the Instruction Document 5C. | |
| **Timeline for Conformance:** | By the next surveillance audit, but no later than 12 monhts from report finalisation date |
| **Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:** | *Click or tap here to enter description provided by Company to close the NC.* |
| **Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:** | *Click or tap here to enter findings for evaluation of evidence by the auditor.* |
| **NC Status:** | Open |

# 11 Certification decision

| **Based on the auditor's recommendation and the Certification Body's quality review, the following certification decision is taken:** | |
|---|---|
| **Certification decision:** | Certification approved |
| **Certification decision by (name of the person):** | Kimmo Haarala |
| **Date of decision:** | 01/Jun/2019 |
| **Other comments:** | Based on the assessment process, it has been shown that the management system implemented by the BP meets the requirements of the applicable SBP standards and the certificate remains valid. The corrective actions resulting from the minor NCs shall be initiated and implemented within 12 months following this surveillance |