



# NEPCon Evaluation of Skovdyrkerforeningen Syd a.m.b.a.'s Compliance with the SBP Framework: Public Summary Report

Fourth Surveillance Audit

[www.sbp-cert.org](http://www.sbp-cert.org)



**The promise of good biomass**



# 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](http://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*

*© Copyright The Sustainable Biomass Program Limited 2018*

# Table of Contents

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

# 1 Overview

CB Name and contact:	NEPCon OÜ, Filosoofi 31, 50108 Tartu, Estonia
Primary contact for SBP:	Ondrej Tarabus ot@nepcon.org, +34 605 638 383
Current report completion date:	13/Jan/2021
Report authors:	Steffen Just, Auditor
Name of the Company:	Skovdyrkerforeningen SYD a.m.b.a., Brejning Søndergade 26, 7080 Børkop, Denmark
Company contact for SBP:	Henrik Fredslund, ph. +4520574810, e-mail: hfr@Skovdyrkerforeningen.dk
Certified Supply Base:	The certified Supply Base covers the following regions of Denmark: Midtjylland and Syddanmark
SBP Certificate Code:	SBP-01-73
Date of certificate issue:	12/May/2017
Date of certificate expiry:	11/May/2022

This report relates to the Fourth Surveillance Audit

## 2 Scope of the evaluation and SBP certificate

Production of wood chips for use in energy production, storage and sale at different energy producers in the Regions of Midtjylland and Syddanmark of Denmark. The scope includes Supply Base Evaluation for primary feedstock from Denmark and the use of remote storage sites.

### 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

*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

The BP has used the SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment for Denmark June 2017, which is available for download at <https://sbp-cert.org/documents/risk-assessments>

# 5 Description of Company, Supply Base and Forest Management

## 5.1 Description of Company

Skovdyrkerforeningen SYD a.m.b.a. is a cooperative owned by forest owners in South Jutland, Denmark, established to provide advisory services in forest management, to assist in managing contractors and to provide a sales channel for the forest owner's forest products, including timber, wood chips, Christmas trees and greenery.

Skovdyrkerforeningen SYD a.m.b.a. is itself a part of the umbrella organization "De Danske Skovdyrkerforeninger" and is also covered by the NEPCo issued PEFC CoC certificate held by this organization (NC-PEFC/COC-000070). Skovdyrkerforeningen SYD a.m.b.a. also offers its members the opportunity of participating in FSC / PEFC Forest management group certification in collaboration with "De Danske Skovdyrkerforeninger".

In relation to the SBP certification, the main activity of the BP is the production and sales of wood chips. The wood chips are produced by contractors in the forests of origin, in the Danish regions Syddanmark and Midtjylland. 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 working and sourcing within the defined Supply Base. The BP doesn't produce wood chips from secondary or tertiary feedstock, and thus this is not included in the scope of the certification.

The BP supplies the material via truck, occasionally using outdoor storage facilities, to the endpoints at customers which are combined heat and power plants or district heating plants.

## 5.2 Description of Company's Supply Base

### **Denmark - forest resources**

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 the Continental region, 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 well 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 broadleaved trees, 39% by coniferous tree species, 11% by a mixed coniferous and broadleaved 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 is 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 or 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 is 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 has 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 have 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.

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.

*The Biomass producer has adopted the description above from the draft Region Risk Assessment for Denmark. Please see the BP's SBR which is available at <http://www.skovdyrkerne.dk/syd/salg-af-flis/>*

## 5.3 Detailed description of Supply Base

Skovdyrkerforeningen SYD is defining the Supply Base as the following regions of Denmark: Syddanmark and Midtjylland. Data is collected from the National Forest Inventory (2014)

- a. Total Supply Base area (ha): 363.000 ha forest
- b. Tenure by type (ha): 268.700 ha privately owned, 8.200 ha owned by foundations, 78.000 ha public owned, 8.100 ha other
- c. Forest by type (ha): 0 ha boreal, 363.000 ha temperate, 0 ha tropical
- d. Forest by management type (ha): 250.900 ha plantation/planted forest, 77.900 ha natural forest, 34.200 ha unknown.
- e. Certified forest by scheme (ha): 3.468 ha FSC-certified forest and 5.142 ha PEFC forest. Note that many forests hold both FSC and PEFC certificates. The numbers are based on an estimate for the regions Syddanmark and Midtjylland.

The Qualitative description of the Supply Base can also be found in the Biomass Producer's SBR which is available at <http://www.skovdyrkerne.dk/syd/salg-af-flis/>

## 5.4 Chain of Custody system

Skovdyrkerforeningen SYD a.m.b.a. is itself a part of the umbrella organization "De Danske Skovdyrkerforeninger" and is also covered by the NEPCo issued PEFC CoC certificate held by this organization (NC-PEFC/COC-000070). Skovdyrkerforeningen SYD a.m.b.a. also offers its members the opportunity of participating in FSC / PEFC Forest management group certification in collaboration with "De Danske Skovdyrkerforeninger".

The organization implements both PEFC CoC systems based on physical segregation and a volume credit system, but only physical segregation has been used for SBP biomass. Therefore, SBP claims can only be made for material that is delivered directly from the wood chipper in the forest, or alternatively, when stacks of wood chips consist only of material meeting certification requirement, and no uncontrolled material has been added.

The BP delivers most of the produced biomass directly from the forest to the powerplant, but also uses an open-air storage site at four locations. These are open-air storage sites, which has no facilities or staff, and loading of wood chips here is done by a contracted wheel loader.

The BP has established clear documented procedures in the management system for only storing SBP Compliant Biomass at these storage facilities, and for ensuring that any "other biomass" is not put into storage, but only delivered directly to the customer/powerplant.

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

## 6 Evaluation process

### 6.1 Timing of evaluation activities

The SBP audit was carried out on the 4<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> of December 2020, and it included office audit at Skovdyrkerforeningen SYD's main office in Brejning on the 4<sup>th</sup>, and field visits at 11 biomass production sites and 2 storage sites. The field visit included sites from which SBP-feedstock had been, currently are being, or was planned to be sourced from. These sites have been, are or will be used for production of wood chips to be sold with SBP claim. The number of sites that was selected for field audit was based on the 0.8 times the square root of the number of projects since last audit. The number of projects corresponded to 174. This results in a minimum sample of  $\sqrt{174} \times 0.8 = 11$  sites and 4 storage sites  $\sqrt{4} \times 0.8 = 2$  storages.

A total of 4,0 days was used for this evaluation: 1 day of preparations, 1 day at the BP's main office, and 2 days for audit of feedstock origin and risk mitigation measures in the forest stands – a total of 13 sites in Regions Midtjylland and Syddanmark. Time used for reporting and administration is not included in these figures.

The SBP audit was conducted in accordance with the plan below. Please note that the field visits were conducted after consulting the Biomass Producer's records of planned, ongoing and recent wood chip production projects. The field visit of the second field day ended with a closing meeting at the main office in Brejning. Here, the auditor presented a summary of the findings to the forester in charge of management of wood chip operations and the CEO.

#### **Audit plan for December 4, 7 and 8, 2020**

Time	Activity	Location
4. December 2020 9:00 – 9:30	Opening Meeting. Introduction of participants. Review of the agenda	Skovdyrkerforeningen SYD – Main office
9:30 – 12:00	Review of the Management System and interview with the certification responsible: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Management system or procedures, special focus on any changes since last audit</li><li>• Status of intern audits on the management System and SVP (if applicable)</li><li>• Training records</li><li>• Compliance with EUTR</li><li>• Health and Safety procedures</li><li>• Classification of projects in sub-scopes</li><li>• Mitigation measures</li><li>• SBR and annual update of SBR</li><li>• SAR and Static Biomass Profile Data</li><li>• Interviews with employees</li><li>• Follow up on Stakeholder comment</li></ul>	Main office

12:00 – 12:30	Lunch Break	Main office
12:30 – 14:00	Continued review of Management System	Main office
14:00 – 15:00	Review of SBP CoC system and Credit system, DTS, as well as the use of logos	Main office
15:00 – 15:30	Planning of field visit and preliminary closing meeting with preliminary conclusions.	Main office
7. December 2020	Field visits on project locations and storage sites in accordance with plan. Visits at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures. Interviews with the responsible foresters.	Field, production locations and storage sites
8. December 2020	Field visits on project locations and storage sites in accordance with plan. Visits at forest of origin of primary feedstock, evaluation of relevant mitigation measures. Interviews with the responsible foresters.	Field, production locations and storage sites
	Closing meeting. Auditor presents the results of the audit.	Main office

## 6.2 Description of evaluation activities

Auditor was welcomed in the office in Børkop, Denmark. Audit started with an opening meeting.

Auditor introduced himself, provided information about audit plan, methodology and aim of the audit. CB's approval related issues and confidentiality issues were covered as well.

After that auditor went through all applicable requirements of the standard covering management system, CoC, recordkeeping requirements and verification of SBP compliant /SBP-controlled biomass. Later on the purchasing and logistics functions were audited, as well as methodologies for collecting and communicating GHG data. The following days was set with field visits.

During the process all staff responsible for SBP systems and staff having key responsibilities within the system as well as external staff that handles the biomass were interviewed.

During the closing meeting auditor explained the results of the audit and further actions were discussed

#### Composition of audit team:

Name	Qualification	Role/focus in evaluation
Steffen Just	M.Sc. (Forestry) from University of Copenhagen. Has passed NEPCon Lead Auditor Training for FSC and PEFC FM and CoC certification. Experience from previous work for the Danish Nature Agency and Danish Environmental Protection Agency. Steffen has successfully completed the SBP training course and has partaken in several SBP assessments and surveillance audits.	Auditor

**Impartiality commitment:** NEPCon – Preferred by Nature 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: <https://preferredbynature.org/impartiality-policy>

**Dispute resolution:** If NEPCon – Preferred by Nature clients encounter organisations or individuals having concerns or comments about Preferred by Nature services, these parties are strongly encouraged to contact the relevant Preferred by Nature regional office or any member of the Preferred by Nature Chain of Custody Programme. Formal complaints and concerns should be sent in writing.

## 6.3 Process for consultation with stakeholders

Stakeholder consultation processes were carried out by both the Biomass Producer (BP) and the Certification Body (CB) in connection with the 2017 main assessment.

No stakeholder outreach was done during this audit and neither NEPCon or Skovdyrkerforeningen Syd has had any comments during this audit period.

## 7 Results

### 7.1 Main strengths and weaknesses

Main strengths: All processes have been well documented; project management system provides a strong backbone for material balances and is very functional and ensures that all relevant information can be reported. The BP has a professional staff of foresters with good training and qualification for sourcing feedstock, including determining the need for mitigation measures and implementing these when needed. The BP has long-term relations with most of the forest or land owners, where the wood chips are produced. All interviewed staff had a strong engagement in implementation of SBP system and positive approach.

Weaknesses: See the NCR section of this report

### 7.2 Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation

At the moment, the Supply Base Evaluation was implemented only for primary feedstock sourced from administrative 2 regions of Denmark. Skovdyrkerforeningen SYD A.m.b.a. implements an SBE for primary feedstock (forest products) originating from Denmark and is sold without SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme claim, SBP-approved Forest Management partial claim, 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 SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment for Denmark June 2017 June 2017, which has been widely circulated for stakeholder consultation during its development. Based on the “specified risks” in this risk assessment the organization has suggested some mitigation measures which were consulted with relevant stakeholders during a meeting held on May 20th, 2016, and calls/emails which took place prior the assessment.

The stakeholder consultation process started with sending email to numerous stakeholders. The BP keeps records of communication with stakeholders.

### 7.3 Collection and Communication of Data

The BP has opted to use the accepted Default Values from BioGrace II for reporting fuel used in forestry used and felling/chipping. Information about transport distances was collected from trucking companies. The methodologies for collecting and reporting data were complete and accurate at the end of the annual audit.

## 7.4 Competency of involved personnel

The SBE was mainly implemented by the Wood Chip Production Manager and forester with main responsibility for wood chip production, holding B.Sc. and M.Sc. degrees in forestry respectively, supported by personnel from the umbrella organization of Danish Forest Growers Association..

All involved personal has provided good competency and knowledge in relevant fields, including project management and recognition of HCVF aspects, and implementation of relevant mitigating measures 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 for 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 comments were received, and the consultation only proved that the stakeholders already expressed their opinion to the Certification Body (CB) in charge of the process of the SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment for Denmark June 2017. The CB finds that the BP stakeholder consultation was sufficient.

## 7.6 Preconditions

There are no open preconditions to this certification.

## 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.*

Final risk ratings of Indicators as determined in the SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment for Denmark June 2017 (RRA), by the Biomass Producer (BP) after the SVP and any mitigation measures, and by the Certification Body (CB) after the Biomass Producer's risk mitigation measures.

**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
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

**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

Skovdyrkerforeningen SYD has used the mitigation measures as specified in the SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment for Denmark June 2017, 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 Skovdyrkerforeningen SYD will implement. However, the BP will not implement the suggestion that HCV maps are made publicly available.

Skovdyrkerforeningen SYD has documented and described procedures both for proceeding with extraordinary caution in potential areas and of specified risk, and for monitoring the implementation and effectiveness of the planned mitigation measures. Skovdyrkerforeningen SYD has documented and implemented procedures for protection of biologically valuable dead wood in the forests.

2.1.1	Forests and other areas with high conservation values in the Supply Base are identified and mapped.	<p>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 of feedstock for biomass production begins, so that the information about any HCV can be securely passed on to staff carrying out the felling and chipping operation. For non-FSC or PEFC certified forests and forests without a green management plan, identification and mapping of HCVs must be carried out.</p> <p>It is suggested that the HNV forest online map (available at <a href="http://miljoegis.mim.dk/cbkort?profile=miljoegis-plangroendk">http://miljoegis.mim.dk/cbkort?profile=miljoegis-plangroendk</a>) is consulted for a calculated indication of the potential for HCVs prior to a field survey of HCVs, and that the catalog of key biotopes or similar is used. The effectiveness of the application of the catalog of key biotopes is reliant upon sufficient skill and training of the personnel carrying out the survey. For a skilled professional the identification and mapping of HCVs would be possible with an acceptable level of effort compared to the size of the area where sourcing of feedstock will take place. It is also suggested that, as a safeguard mechanism, the resulting maps are made publicly available. This would allow for expert and stakeholder review and comments.</p>
2.1.2	Potential threats to forests and other areas with high conservation values from forest management activities are identified and addressed.	<p>For forests with a green management plan, HCVs have been identified and mapped, but since there is no requirement for independent evaluation of adherence to limitations in the green management plan, the plan including the maps, must be consulted and planned activities must be compared to limitations in the management plan.</p> <p>For forests without at least a green management plan, HCVs in the area where feedstock for biomass production is sourced must first be identified and mapped (see indicator 2.1.1), and sufficient maps and instruction be prepared for personnel in charge for the felling or other activities, so that it is ensured that HCV will not be threatened for FM activities.</p> <p>It is also suggested that, as a safeguard mechanism, the resulting maps are made publicly available. This would allow for expert and stakeholder review and comments.</p>
2.2.3	Key ecosystems and habitats are conserved or set aside in their natural state (CPET S8b).	<p>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 of feedstock for biomass production begins, so that the information about any HCV can be securely passed on to staff carrying out the felling and chipping operation. For non-FSC or PEFC certified forests and forests without a green management plan, identification and mapping of HCVs must be carried out.</p> <p>It is suggested that the HNV forest online map (available at <a href="http://miljoegis.mim.dk/cbkort?profile=miljoegis-plangroendk">http://miljoegis.mim.dk/cbkort?profile=miljoegis-plangroendk</a>) is consulted for a calculated indication of the potential for HCVs prior to a field survey of HCVs, and that the catalog of key biotopes or similar is used. The effectiveness of the application of the catalog of key biotopes is reliant upon sufficient skill and training of the personnel carrying out the survey. For a skilled professional the identification and mapping of HCVs would be possible with an acceptable level of effort compared to the size of the area where sourcing of feedstock will take place. It is also suggested that, as a safeguard mechanism, the resulting maps are made publicly available. This would allow for expert and stakeholder review and comments.</p>
2.2.4	Biodiversity is protected (CPET S5b).	<p>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 of feedstock for biomass production begins, so that the information about any HCV can be securely passed on to staff carrying out the felling and chipping operation. For non-FSC or PEFC certified forests and forests without a green management plan, identification and mapping of HCVs must be carried out.</p> <p>It is suggested that the HNV forest online map (available at <a href="http://miljoegis.mim.dk/cbkort?profile=miljoegis-plangroendk">http://miljoegis.mim.dk/cbkort?profile=miljoegis-plangroendk</a>) is consulted for a calculated indication of the potential for HCVs prior to a field survey of HCVs, and that the catalog of key biotopes or similar is used. The effectiveness of the application of the catalog of key biotopes is reliant upon sufficient skill and training of the personnel carrying out the survey. For a skilled professional the identification and mapping of HCVs would be possible with an acceptable level of effort compared to the size of the area where sourcing of feedstock will take place. It is also suggested that, as a safeguard mechanism, the resulting maps are made publicly available. This would allow for expert and stakeholder review and comments.</p>

## 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 01/20	NC Grading: Minor
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Standard 5, SBP Instruction Document 5E, requirement 3.1.9
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>	
The Organisation has made two SREG's since last audit. In the SREG's however, it is not clear, where the start and ending point of the delivery is. The map is not fulfilling and there are no addresses to show, where the trucks are coming from or going to.	
<b>Timeline for Conformance:</b>	By the next surveillance audit, but no later than 12 months from report finalisation date
<b>Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:</b>	The company has not used any SREG's in the following audit-period. However, the company has corrected the old SREG's, so that the start and ending points are clear. Attached is also a map. See Exh 15.
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	Auditor evaluates, that this is sufficient to close the NCR and that the issue will not arise again, since they are now aware of the requirements for making an SREG.
<b>NC Status:</b>	Closed

## 11 Certification decision

Based on the auditor's recommendation and the Certification Body's quality review, the following certification decision is taken:

<b>Certification decision:</b>	Certification approved
<b>Certification decision by (name of the person):</b>	Christian Rahbek
<b>Date of decision:</b>	13/Jan/2021
<b>Other comments:</b>	None.