NEPCon OÜ Evaluation of Alstrup Skovservice AS Compliance with the SBP Framework: Public Summary Report

Fourth Surveillance 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:	Alstrup Skovservice AS
Company legal address:	Egerisvej 5, 6920 Videbæk, Denmark
Company contact for SBP:	Gert Alstrup
Company contact email:	gert@alstrupskov.dk
Company website:	N/A
SBP Certificate Code:	SBP-01-81
Date of certificate issue:	14 Jun 2017
Date of certificate expiry:	13 Jun 2022
Audit closing meeting date:	31 Mar 2021
Audit cycle:	Fourth Surveillance 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 1.4	☐
Includes Supply Base Evaluation (SBE):	Yes	☐
Includes communication of Dynamic Batch Sustainability Data (DBSD)	No	☐
Includes Group Scheme	No	☐
Products	Chips	☐

Feedstock types:	Primary	☐
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

Alstrup Skovservice ApS is a private limited company under management of the General Manager Gert Alstrup. The company offers forest contractors services to Danish forest and landowners, predominantly in the central part of Jutland. The organization purchases all its feedstock in the Danish regions Midtjylland, Syddanmark and Nordjylland, with the vast majority coming from the Midtjylland region in the central part of Jutland. All feedstock is primary feedstock, and can be 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 does not foresee this, and will mainly rely on sourcing feedstock as SBP Compliant from its own Supply Base Evaluation. The organization is implementing appropriate mitigating measures in relation of the specified risks identified in all forests and stands of origin of the supplied feedstock.

2.2 Detailed description of the Chain of Custody system

The BP is usually 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 simple storage yard at the near-by address of Birkelundvej 8, Vorgod-Barde, 6920 Videbæk. The storage facilities consist of an open yard with segregation signage and the capacity is app 2800 tonnes in three separate stacks. Alstrup Skovservice ApS is a member of the PEFC CoC group certificate held by industry association Danske Maskinstationer & Entreprenører. This PEFC group certificate is issued by NEPCon Certificering ApS, and has the PEFC CoC certificate number NC-PEFC/COC-025953

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 all critical 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	2,0
2. On-site (excl. travel time)	Christian Rahbek	12,0
3. Report writing	Christian Rahbek	7,0
4. Other	N/A	N/A

Audit Schedule			
Activity	**Location**	**Auditor name**	**Date/time**
Opening meeting	BP Main Office	Christian Rahbek	30 Mar 2021/8:30
Document review: SBR, MS	BP Main Office	Christian Rahbek	30 Mar 2021/9:00
Document and systems review; SAR	BP Main Office	Christian Rahbek	30 Mar 2021/13:00
Field Visits	Wood Chip Production areas	Christian Rahbek	30 Mar 2021/14:00

Field Visits	Wood Chip Production areas	Christian Rahbek	31 Mar 2021/8:30
Closing meeting	BP Main Office	Christian Rahbek	31 Mar 2021/12:00

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 Annual Surveillance audit of Alstrup Skovservice A/S was carried out on the 30th and 31st of March, 2021. It Included visit to the main office in Vorgod-Barde,

Denmark (Mar 30 and 31) and field visits of, in total, 9 sites (8 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.

In the reporting period, the BP had only purchased feedstock for SBP product groups from low risk sub-scopes, so on site visits were focused on verify the correct classification and the low risk for any of the site selected. In the reporting period the BP had mainly sourced SBP-feedstock in relatively short radius from the main office and home address, therefore the travel time spent between sites were minimal and auditor were able to properly cover all applicable requirements and sites in shorter time than usual for this type of audit.

The Annual Surveillance process started on Tuesday Mar 30, with an opening meeting at the BP Main office attended by overall responsible and General Manager and the administration manager. 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 verified the reception of the material and it's correct classification, identification of feedstock origin, production process, mass balance, final product storage and sales. The field visits where

also initiated in the afternoon of Tuesday, Mar 30. The field visits continued and where completed on Wednesday Mar 31.

After completion of field visits at the wood chip production sites, the Lead Auditor (CAR) held a preliminary closing meeting around noon of Mar 31. Here, the Lead Auditor presented a summary of the findings to overall responsible, and a couple of very simple points for follow-up.

4.3 Sampling methodology

The most important sampling aspect of this annual surveillance audit 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 169. A minimum sample of the square root of the number of sites (169) multiplied by 0,6 = 8. 2 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, but a sample of 10 sets of project documents where reviewed. There had been no purchases of certified material; all feedstock had been sourced under the SBE.

4.4 CB stakeholder engagement

No stakeholder comments had been received by either BP nor CB in the reporting period.

4.5 Stakeholder feedback

No stakeholder comments had been received by either BP nor CB in the reporting period.

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 general manager Gert Alstrup and the office manager Jette Fromberg Nielsen, and the fact that all SBP feedstock is purchased in forest or stand of origin. The general manager showed good awareness of best practice in forest machine operation, and all operators have attended a three-day training course in machine operation in near-natural forests, which is a requirement for forest contractors that operate in the FSC and PEFC certified Danish State forests.

The BP has worked closely with the consultant 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 BP does not have in-house staff that are professional foresters, and therefore they are reliant on external staff or partners for conducting field visits and identification and mapping of “key biotopes” prior to starting wood chip production in specified risk stands. The BP has until now relied on only producing SBP-compliant Biomass in stands that belong to low risk sub-scopes.

5.2 Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation

The BP has used the SBP endorsed regional risk assessment 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 no available data for the amount of diesel used in connection with felling and transport of wood in the forest. The combination of a variety of applications, several different combinations of machines on each project, makes it very difficult to obtain meaningful figures. The BP has therefore chosen to use default values from BioGrace II for the fuel use in forest for felling and extraction (1.67 L/tons).

There are used two types of mobile chippers, silvatec chipper used in production of feedstock group nr. 3 and 6, Jenz Cobra in the production of feedstock 1,2,3 and 4. Diesel used is calculated with data form machine operators:

Silvatec:3,00 l/ton feedstock

Jenz, residues: 1,17 l/ton feedstock

Jenz, steemwood:1,28 l/ton feedstock

5.4 Competency of involved personnel

The BP has a relatively simple operation, with all administrative tasks being carried out by the general manager Gert Alstrup and the administration manager Jette Fromberg Nielsen. Both showed good awareness of their management system, and of the objectives and restrictions in the 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 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 classification to low risk or high risk subscope, and if it cannot reliably be determined to belonging to a low risk sub-scope, the feedstock is not sourced as SBP complaint Feedstock. The BP also has procedures to implement an identification and mapping key biotopes by a forester, who would also prescribe risk mitigation measures, but this option has not been used in the reporting period, where only feedstock from low risk sub-scopes has been sourced as SBP compliant feedstock. The general manager also screens and documents evaluation of 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 to belonging to a low risk sub-scope, the feedstock is not sourced as SBP complaint Feedstock. Interviews with staff responsible for

			implementation the mitigation measures confirmed that they had good understanding of the methodology, and objectives of the mitigating measures, that they met the training requirements established, and had the practical competence necessary. Based on the established procedures, reviewed documents and records, interviews and the onsite 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 classification to low risk or high risk subscope, and if it cannot reliably be determined to belonging to a low risk sub-scope, the feedstock is not sourced as SBP complaint Feedstock. The BP also has procedures to implement an identification and mapping key biotopes by a forester, who would also prescribe risk mitigation measures, but this option has not been used in the reporting period, where only feedstock from low risk sub-scopes has been sourced as SBP compliant feedstock. The general manager also screens and documents evaluation of 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 If material is sourced after felling, the sourcing area is surveyed, and if it cannot reliably be determined to belonging to a low risk sub-scope, the feedstock is not sourced as SBP complaint Feedstock. Interviews with the staff responsible for implementation the mitigation measures confirmed that they had good understanding of the methodology, and objectives of the mitigating measures, that they met the training requirements established, and had the practical competence necessary. Based on the established procedures, reviewed documents and records, interviews and the onsite 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 S8b).	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 when applicable, 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. Interviews with staff responsible for implementation the mitigation measures confirmed that they had good understanding of the methodology, and objectives of the mitigating measures, that they met the training requirements established, and had the practical competence necessary. Based on the established procedures, reviewed documents and records, interviews and the onsite 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 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 when applicable, 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 the project belongs to a low risk sub-scope, the material is not sourced as SBP compliant Feedstock. 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 trees 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 staff responsible for implementation the mitigation measures confirmed that they had good understanding of the methodology, and objectives of the mitigating measures, that they met the training requirements established, and had the practical competence necessary. Based on the established procedures, reviewed documents and records, interviews and the onsite field visits, auditor finds that the measures taken are effective in mitigating the identified risk.

7 Non-conformities and observations

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 Gorria
Date of decision:	21 May 2021
Other comments:	N/A