NEPCon OÜ Evaluation of Peder Østergaard & Søn Transport A/S Compliance with the SBP Framework: Public Summary Report

Main (Initial) Audit

www.sbp-cert.org

Table of Contents

1 Overview

Certification Body (CB) Name:	NEPCon OÜ
Primary CB contact for SBP:	Ondrej Tarabus
Primary CB contact email:	otarabus@preferredbynature.org
Audit team leader:	Christian Rahbek
Audit team members:	Christian Rahbek
Name of the Company:	Peder Østergaard & Søn Transport A/S
Company legal address:	Kjelsigvej 2, 7430 Ikast, Denmark
Company contact for SBP:	Dennis Flanz
Company contact email:	df@po-son.dk
Company website:	N/A
SBP Certificate Code:	SBP-08-37
Date of certificate issue:	01 Apr 2021
Date of certificate expiry:	31 Mar 2026
Audit closing meeting date:	26 Feb 2021
Audit cycle:	Main (Initial) Audit

2 Scope of the evaluation and SBP certificate

Scope Item	Check all that apply to the Certificate Scope	Change in scope (N/A for Assessments)
Primary Activity:	Biomass Producer	☐
Approved Standards:	SBP Standard 1: Feedstock Compliance Standard; SBP Standard 2: Verification of SBP-compliant Feedstock; SBP Standard 4: Chain of Custody; SBP Standard 5: Collection and Communication of Data Instruction; Instruction Document 5E: Collection and Communication of Energy and Carbon Data 1.3	☐
Includes Supply Base Evaluation (SBE):	Yes	☐
Includes communication of Dynamic Batch Sustainability Data (DBSD)	No	☐
Includes Group Scheme	No	☐
Products	Chips	☐

Feedstock types:	Primary, Secondary	☐
Feedstock origin (countries):	Denmark	☐
SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessments used: **Public link:** https://sbp-cert.org/documents/standards-documents/risk-assessments/	Denmark	☐
Chain of custody system implemented:	PEFC: NC-PEFC/COC-025953	☐
	Transfer	☐

2.1 Description of the company

Peder Østergaard & Søn Transport A/S is a private limited company offering forest contractors services to Danish forest and landowners, predominantly in the central part of Jutland. The organization purchases primary feedstock in the Danish regions Midtjylland, Syddanmark and Nordjylland. The majority of feedstock is primary feedstock, purchased either as standing volume, as fuel wood in stack in the forest of origin or very occasionally as fuel wood or chips from other suppliers working and sourcing within the Supply Base. In all cases the stand of origin is known, and when buying wood chips from other companies, the BP takes full responsibility for all feedstock classification and risk mitigation measures. The organization can buy wood as PEFC certified but will mainly rely on sourcing feedstock as SBP Compliant from its own Supply Base Evaluation. The organization only applies the SBE to primary feedstock, and is implementing appropriate mitigating measures in relation of the specified risks identified in all forests and stands of origin of the supplied feedstock. The BP also sources a minor proportion of the feedstock as PEFC certified secondary feedstock from a nearby wood industry. All of this secondary feedstock in of Danish origin. The BP is supplying the woodchips produced directly from the forest via truck to the customers, which are combined heat and power plants and district heating plants. However, the organization also maintains a storage yard at the main address. The storage facilities consist of an open yard with segregation. Peder Østergaard & Søn Transport A/S is a member of the PEFC CoC group certificate held by industry association Danske Maskinstationer & Entreprenører. This PEFC group certificate is issued by Preferred by Nature, and has the PEFC CoC certificate number NC-PEFC/COC-025953

2.2 Detailed description of the Chain of Custody system

Peder Østergaard & Søn Transport is a member of the PEFC CoC group certificate held by industry association Danske Maskinstationer & Entreprenører. This PEFC group certificate is issued by Preferred by Nature, and has the PEFC CoC certificate number NC-PEFC/COC-025953 The organization implements a PEFC CoC system based on physical segregation. Therefore, SBP claims can only be made for material that

is delivered directly from the wood chipper in the forest, or via the storage yard at the BP’s address, where physical segregation is ensured, and no uncontrolled material (“other biomass”) has been added. All relevant information with regards to volume tracking and verification of origin is handled in the BP’s system for tracking projects and storage yard volumes, and production orders and in the system from in- and outbound sales documents.

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 Evaluation process

4.1 Timing of evaluation activities

Audit Level of Effort (LoE)		
Activity	***Auditors***	**Auditor hours**
1. Preparation	Christian Rahbek	4,0
2. On-site (excl. travel time)	Christian Rahbek	18,5
3. Report writing	Christian Rahbek	11,0
4. Other	N/A	N/A

Audit Schedule			
Activity	**Location**	**Auditor name**	**Date/time**
Opening meeting	BP Main Office	Christian Rahbek	09 Feb 2021/8:30
Document review: SBR, MS	BP Main Office	Christian Rahbek	09 Feb 2021/9:00
Document and systems review; SAR	BP Main Office	Christian Rahbek	09 Feb 2021/13:00
Field Visits	Wood Chip Production areas	Christian Rahbek	09 Feb 2021/15:00

Field Visits	Wood Chip Production areas	Christian Rahbek	11 Feb 2021/8:30
Follow up Meeting, Evaluate Corrective actions on NCRs	Online meeting	Christian Rahbek	26 Feb 2021/13:00
Closing meeting	Online meeting	Christian Rahbek	26 Feb 2021/14:30

Auditor qualification		
Auditor name	**Role**	**Qualification**
Christian Rahbek	Audit Team Leader	M.Sc. (Forestry) from University of Copenhagen. Has passed NEPCon Lead Auditor Training for FSC and PEFC FM and CoC certification. Experience from more than 10 years of FSC and PEFC CoC and FM audits. Approved as SBP Lead auditor in January 2017.

4.2 Description of evaluation activities

The SBP Main assessment of Peder Østergaard & Søn Transport was carried out on the 9th, 11th, and 26th of February 2021 in accordance with the audit plan below, and it included visit to the main office in Ikast, Denmark (Feb 9th and 11th) and field visits of, in total, 13 sites (12 production sites and 1 storage site) in Region Midtjylland. The field visits included sites from which 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.

The SBP audit was conducted in accordance with the plan below.

The main assessment process started on Tuesday Feb 9, with an opening meeting at the BP Main office attended by overall responsible and managing director. The main office commenced with evaluation of documented procedures, projects administration, records and invoices/claims took place. Chain of custody implementation was reviewed focusing in the Critical Control Points, in particular it was verified reception of the material and it's classification, identification of feedstock origin, production process, mass balance, final product storage and sales. The field visits continued on Thursday Feb 11th. After completion of field visits at the wood chip production sites, the Lead Auditor (CAR) held a preliminary closing meeting in the afternoon Feb 11th. Here, the Lead Auditor presented a summary of the findings to overall responsible, and since a few preconditions required the BP to implement corrective action and improve documents, an additional follow-up meeting was agreed for Friday Feb 26th to evaluate the corrective actions implemented by the BP. At the online meeting of Friday 26th the BP presented their corrective actions and improved documents, and based on the provided information, it was auditor's conclusion that sufficient corrective actions had been carried out.

Activity

Activity

	Location	**Auditor (s)**	**Date / Time**
			February 9, 2021
Opening Meeting	Main office	CAR	8:30 to 9:00
Review of the Management System and interviews with the certification responsible: • Management system or procedures with special focus on scope changes • Status of internal audits of the management system • Training of staff • Compliance with the EU Timber Regulation • Safety and health procedures • Classification of projects in sub-scopes • Risk minimization initiatives in the company • Supply Base Report, Annual update • SAR and Static Biomass Profile Data •	Main office	CAR	**February 9, 2021** 9:00 to 12:00

• Follow-stakeholder approach			
Break	Main office	CAR	12:00 to 12:30
Review of SBP CoC system and Credit System, DTS, and the use of logos	Main office	CAR	12:30 to 14:30
Field visits	Production sites	CAR	14:30 to 17:00

Activity	**Location**	**Auditor (s)**	**Date / Time**
Field Visit to forest/wood chip projects and storages after agreement with company	Production sites	CAR	**February 11, 2021** 8:30 to 16:00
Preliminary closing meeting: Auditor summarizes findings	Main Office	CAR	16:00 - 16:30
BP present updated documents and implementation of corrective actions	On-line meeting	CAR	**February 26, 2021** 13:00 - 14:30
Auditor summarizes the results of the evaluation	On-line meeting	CAR	14:30 - 15:00

4.3 Sampling methodology

The most important sampling aspect of this Main assessment was the sampling applied to the approximate number of wood chip project in the reporting period of the calendar year 2020. This was determined to be 220. A minimum sample of the square root of the number of sites (220) multiplied by 0,8 = 12. 3 sites where picked at random, and the sample included both sites where production had been finalized, where biomass was still in stacks and sites only in the planning phase. For document verification, no sampling strategy was applied, as this was a main assessment. For secondary feedstock all recent invoices for feedstock were reviewed.

4.4 CB stakeholder engagement

A stakeholder consultation was carried out by the BP (starting 15 October 2020) and the CB; starting November 5, 2020. No stakeholder comments had been received by either BP or CB by the time of the Main assessment starting February 9, 2021. Furthermore, it is noted that he SBE is based on the SBP endorsed (June 2017) RRA for Denmark, and that a thorough stakeholder process, including a physical meeting, was carried out in 2016 during the development of this document.

No stakeholder comments had been received by either BP nor CB at the time of the main assessment.

4.5 Stakeholder feedback

No stakeholder comments had been received by either BP nor CB at the time of the main assessment.

5 Results

5.1 Main strengths and weaknesses

Main strengths:

The main strengths of the BP lie in the relatively simple operation, with all administrative tasks being carried out by the overall responsible. The overall responsible holds a M.Sc. in forestry and was found competent in conducting field visits and identification and mapping of “key biotopes” prior to starting wood chip production in specified risk stands.

The BP has worked closely with the consultant Claus Danefeldt Clemmensen for the industry association Danske Maskinstationer og Entreprenører (also DM&E), whom assisted in creating the Supply Base Report and the documented management system, etc. The BP has an on-going membership with DM&E, and therefore will also have access to support from this source in the future. Furthermore, all interviewed staff had a strong engagement in implementation of SBP system and positive approach.

Weaknesses: The main weakness of the organization lies within lack of experience in meeting the documentation requirements of the SBP Standards. See also the NCR section.

5.2 Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation

The BP has used the SBP endorsed regional risk assessment for Denmark (June 2017) which has been widely circulated for stakeholder consultation. Based on the “specified risks” in this risk assessment the organization has implemented relevant mitigation measures.

5.3 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. Further information about fuel consumption for transport was readily avaliable, as the BP is a trucking company. The methodologies for collecting and reporting data were complete and accurate at the end of the annual audit.

5.4 Competency of involved personnel

The overall responsible for the SPB system is the forestry department manager and forest Dennis Flanz. He is the soel person resonsible for all aspects of the biomass production of the BP. Interviews carried out demonstrated good awareness of responsibilities within SBP system.

The overall responsible is supported by external consultant Mr. Claus Danefeldt Clemmensen (B.Sc. Forestry)

Involved personal has demonstrated good knowledge in relevant fields, including project management and recognition of HCV 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 of formal qualifications and the set of procedures and documents that were composed for the SBP system, auditor evaluated the competency of main responsible staff to be sufficient.

6 Review of company's risk assessments

6.1 Overview of company's risk assessments and mitigation measures

The BP uses the final risk ratings of Indicators as determined in the SBP-endorsed (June 2017) Regional Risk Assessment for Denmark (RRA) and has established and implemented risk mitigating measures to achieve a low risk rating.

6.2 Specified risk indicators and mitigation measures

Country/Area	Indicator	Specified risk description	Mitigation measure
Denmark	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.	Not all forests and other areas with high conservation values are identified and mapped.	The Biomass producer has made detailed instructions for implementing mitigation measures. For this indicator, the mitigating measure consist of a project-for-project field identification of any key biotope not already present on the publicly available maps for legal protections on forest, biological and historical and archaeological interests. If material is sourced after felling, the sourcing area is surveyed, and if it cannot reliably be determined that there are no HCVs present, the material is excluded. Interviews with and demonstration of procedures by the forester responsible for implementation the mitigation measures confirmed that he had good understanding of the methodology, and objectives of the mitigating measures, that he met the training requirements established, and had the practical

			competence necessary. Based on the established procedures, reviewed documents and records interviews and the on-site field visits, auditor finds that the risk mitigation measures taken are effective in mitigating the identified risk.
Denmark	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.	Since not all forests and other areas with high conservation values are identified and mapped, mitigating measures are needed so that these are not threatened by forest management activities.	The Biomass producer has made detailed instructions for implementing mitigation measures. For this indicator, the mitigating measure consist of a project-for-project field identification of any key biotope not already present on the publicly available maps for legal protections on forest, biological and historical and archaeological interests. The maps the project area with clear indication of any HCVs present and the instructions for protections these are provided to the machine operators, and it is ensured that they review the instructions and project maps, which include both all publicly available maps of protected areas and habitats and mapping of any key biotope identified by the BP as part of the risk mitigation measure for indicator 2.1.1 The identification and mapping is used for planning the felling and extraction activities in a way that any HCV is conserved and protected from damage. If material is sourced after felling, the area is surveyed, and and if it cannot reliably be determined that there are no HCVs present, the material

			is excluded. If material is sourced after felling, the sourcing area is surveyed, and if it cannot reliably be determined that there are no HCVs present, the material is excluded. Interviews with and demonstration of procedures by the forester responsible for implementation the mitigation measures confirmed that he had good understanding of the methodology, and objectives of the mitigating measures, that he met the training requirements established, and had the practical competence necessary. Based on the established procedures, reviewed documents and records interviews and the on-site field visits, auditor finds that the risk mitigation measures taken are effective in mitigating the identified risk.
Denmark	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	Not all key ecosystems and habitats are conserved or set aside in their natural state	The Biomass producer has made detailed instructions for implementing mitigation measures. For this indicator, the mitigating measure consist of providing maps and instructions to the machine operators, and ensuring that they review the project maps, which include both all publicly available maps of protected areas and habitats and mapping of any key

	S8b).		biotope identified by the BP as part of the risk mitigation measure for indicator 2.1.1 The identification and mapping is used for planning the felling and extraction activities in a way that any HCV is conserved and protected from damage. If material is sourced after felling, the area is surveyed, and and if it cannot reliably be determined that there are no HCVs present, the material is excluded. Interviews with and demonstration of procedures by the forester responsible for implementation the mitigation measures confirmed that he had good understanding of the methodology, and objectives of the mitigating measures, that he met the training requirements established, and had the practical competence necessary. Based on the established procedures, reviewed documents and records interviews and the on-site field visits, auditor finds that the measures taken are effective in mitigating the identified risk.
Denmark	2.2.4 The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to ensure that biodiversity is protected (CPET S5b).	Biodiversity is not sufficiently protected	The Biomass producer has made detailed instructions for implementing mitigation measures. For this indicator, the mitigating measure consist of a project-for-project field identification of any key biotope not already present on the publicly available maps for legal protections on forest, biological and historical and archaeological

			interests. The maps the project area with clear indication of any HCVs present and the instructions for protections these are provided to the machine operators, and it is ensured that they review the instructions and project maps, which include both all publicly available maps of protected areas and habitats and mapping of any key biotope identified by the BP as part of the risk mitigation measure for indicator 2.1.1 The identification and mapping is used for planning the felling and extraction activities in a way that any HCV is conserved and protected from damage. If material is sourced after felling, the area is surveyed, and and if it cannot reliably be determined that there are no HCVs present, the material is excluded. If material is sourced after felling, the sourcing area is surveyed, and if it cannot reliably be determined that there are no HCVs present, the material is excluded. The BP has developed specific documented procedures to ensure sufficient protection of biologically valuable dead wood during felling and chipping operations. These are a part of the training of the machine operators and any additional information that forester regarding protection of dead wood and/or other biologically important tress can also be shared on the project

			documents. During the field audits, the current level of protection of biologically valuable dead wood during felling and chipping operations was discussed, and good awareness was found on the documented procedures and importance of dead wood to the biodiversity of the forests. Interviews with and demonstration of procedures by the forester responsible for implementation the mitigation measures confirmed that he had good understanding of the methodology, and objectives of the mitigating measures, that he met the training requirements established, and had the practical competence necessary. Based on the established procedures, reviewed documents and records interviews and the on-site field visits, auditor finds that the measures taken are effective in mitigating the identified risk.

7 Non-conformities and observations

NC number NC-000099	NC Grading: Major
Standard:	SBP Standard 2: Verification of SBP-compliant Feedstock
Requirement:	7.1 The BP shall prepare a Supply Base Report (SBR) which shall be made readily accessible on the BP's website. Commercially sensitive and confidential information may be excluded from the SBR.
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
The Biomass Producer's Supply Base Report was not yet finalized nor available online at the BP's website at the time of the main assessment.	
Timeline for Conformance:	Prior to (re)certification
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	Shortly after the on-line follow-up audit the SBR had been made available in Danish and English at the BP's website at: https://po-son.dk/sbp-report/
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	Auditor finds that the BP has used the most recent version (V1.3 - April 20) of the SBR template available at the time of the audit, and that the SBR meets the requirements for covering the most important aspects and features, including risk mitigation measures. Auditor finds that this is sufficient to address the non-conformity and the NCR is closed on this background.
NC Status:	Closed

NC number NC-000100	NC Grading: Minor
Standard:	SBP Standard 2: Verification of SBP-compliant Feedstock
Requirement:	IN2C; 5.1 The SBR shall be formally updated every year (i.e. every 12 months). Each annual update shall provide actual values for the previous 12 months and forecast values for the following 12 months.

Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
At the time of the main assessment the BP was not aware that the SBR must be updated annually in the SBP Audit Portal prior to the annual audits.	
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next surveillance audit, but no later than 12 months from report finalisation date
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	In connection with the on-line follow-up audit on February 25, the BP has forwarded an updated version of their documented Management System, which now includes brief procedures for annually updating the SBR on the SBP audit Portal. During interview the BP was also aware that this update must include any significant changes to the Supply Base, and if appropriate to the risk rating or mitigating measures. See exhibit 1.
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	Based on review of the updated procedures and interview with overall responsible, Auditor finds that corrective actions are sufficient, and the NCR is closed on this background.
NC Status:	Closed

NC number NC-000101	NC Grading: Major
Standard:	SBP Standard 2: Verification of SBP-compliant Feedstock
Requirement:	15 Management system
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
Prior to the Main assessment the BP has established and documented a management system that assigns almost all responsibilities to the overall responsible for the SBP system, and defines most of the necessary procedures for risk mitigation and recording of activities, but that does not define all procedures necessary to complying with all relevant SBP standard and requirements. Auditor found the documented procedure missing for at least the following aspects: • The procedures for preparation, publishing and annual updating of SBR (See also findings for requirements under Instruction note 2C above and NCR 02/21) • The procedures for internal review of the management system and feedback into planning is brief and does not specify that evalution of the effecitveness of the risk mitigating measures must be carried out • The procedure also did not include procedures for any weakness identified that leads to non-conformance with the SBP standard including insufficient risk mitigation, must be reported to management that has the authority to make improvements to the management system as necessary. Since these shortcomings in the docuemtned procedures are found by auditor to be central for the continuous function and maintenance of the SBP system and sufficient risk mitigation Major NCR 03/21 was raised.	
Timeline for Conformance:	Prior to (re)certification
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	In connection with the on-line follow-up audit on February 25, the BP has forwarded a significantly updated and improved documented Management System, which now includes necessary procedures for the preparing and publishing and updating the SBR, and which documents the system fom internal monitoring and management

	reporting is described in Section 7. See exhibit 1. The updates and improvements where discussed with the overalle responsible during the follow-up audit.
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	Auditor has reviewed the updated documented management system and finds that it is significantly improved, and found during interview that there is good awareness on the improved procedures with the overall responsible. The NCR is closed on this background.
NC Status:	Closed

NC number NC-000102	**NC Grading: Major**
Standard:	Instruction Document 5E: Collection and Communication of Energy and Carbon Data 1.3
Requirement:	3.1.8 Each BP shall record all data as specified in one of the three 'SBP Audit Report (SAR) for Energy and Carbon data' templates, where production and transportation of feedstock or biomass contributes to energy or carbon balance during the period of legal ownership by the BP: - BPs producing wood pellets shall complete the 'SBP Audit Report (SAR) for Energy and Carbon data for pellets'; - BPs producing only woodchips and energy logs and no other biomass with an SBP Claim shall complete one of the following templates: o 'SBP Audit Report (SAR) for Energy and Carbon data for pellets' if both stationary chipping and thermal treatment are carried out on a separate processing site. Any specific reference to pelletisation in the document may be ignored; o 'SBP Audit Report (SAR) for Energy and Carbon data for woodchips with stationary chipping' if only stationary chipping is carried out on a separate processing site, with or without phytosanitary treatment (see definition in section 2); or o 'SBP Audit Report (SAR) for Energy and Carbon data for woodchips with mobile chipping' if there is no separate processing site with chipping or thermal treatment, other than a standard phytosanitary treatment (see definition in section 2).
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
During the main assessment the SAR was reviewed and found to not include all applicable data and information correctly. Since a correct SAR is as precondition for certification, a Major NCR was raised.	
Timeline for Conformance:	Prior to (re)certification
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	In connection to the online follow-up meeting an updated SAR (exhibit 4) was presented and forwarded to auditor, along with background data (exhibit 10).

Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	The SAR was reviewed with the BP representative and found to correct and complete for the scope and activities of the BP. The NCR was closed on this background.
NC Status:	Closed

NC number NC-000103	**NC Grading: Observation**
Standard:	SBP Standard 2: Verification of SBP-compliant Feedstock
Requirement:	6.2 The BP shall record the place of harvesting and the identity of the primary wood processor responsible for the supply of inputs classified as SBP-compliant secondary feedstock.
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
The BP sources around 10% of it's feedstock as PEFC Certified secondary feedstock from one specific FSC and PEFC certified Primary and secondary wood industry. This wood industry has, in accordance with FSC and PEFC requirements, forwarded requested information about the origin of the supplied Certified secondary feedstock, which consisted of declarations directly from five of the suppliers of material to the industry. Auditor has reviewed the declarations, and has found that they originate from Denmark-based organization, that are all FSC and/or PEFC certified. This is seen as confirmation that this secondary feedstock is all originating from within the Supply Base of Denmark. See exhibit 8. The information regarding the country of origin of FSC / PEFC certified secondary feedstock is found to correct at the time of the main assessment, but the BP should be aware that if the supplier of secondary feedstock starts sourcing inputs from other countries, the BP shall expand its Supply Base and update the supply Base Report	
Timeline for Conformance:	N/A
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	N/A
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	N/A
NC Status:	N/A

8 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):	Pilar Gorría
Date of decision:	31 Mar 2021
Other comments:	N/A