

Certification Evaluation Report

Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials

ENNOVOR BIOFUELS

SCS Certificate Code- SCS-RSB/PC-0009

12-14 Wilfred Street, London, SW1E 6PL
United Kingdom
Ian Waller
<http://www.ennovorgroup.com/>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
May 29, 2014	November 28, 2015

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
December 10-11, 2013 & January 24, 2014
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
May 29, 2014

SCS Contact:
Neil Mendenhall | Manager
Environmental Certification Services
+1.510.452.8018
nmendenhall@scsglobalservices.com

SCSglobal
SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

FOREWORD

SCS Global Services (SCS) is a certification body accredited by the Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials (RSB) to conduct evaluations of biofuel operators. Under the RSB/SCS certification system, participating operators meeting international standards of biofuel production can be certified as “sustainable,” thereby permitting the Operators use of the RSB endorsement and logo in the marketplace subject to regular RSB/SCS oversight.

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams of natural resource specialists and other experts all over the world to conduct evaluations of biofuel operations. SCS evaluation teams collect and analyze written materials, conduct interviews with Participating Operator’s staff and key stakeholders, and complete field and office audits of the operation(s) identified in the certification scope. Upon completion of the fact-finding phase of all evaluations, SCS teams determine compliance to the RSB Principles and Criteria.

Please Note: An RSB certificate itself does not constitute evidence that a particular product supplied by the certificate holder is certified to RSB standards. Products offered, shipped or sold by the certificate holder can only be considered covered by the scope of this certificate when the required RSB claim is clearly stated on-product. For more information about the RSB, visit their website at www.rsb.org.

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the Participating Operator, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the RSB Database of Registered Certificates (<http://rsbservices.org/certificates>). Section B contains more detailed results and information for use by the Participating Operator.

CONTENTS

- SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY 3
 - 1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION 3
 - 1.1 Operator Information 3
 - 1.2 Scope of Certificate 3
 - 1.3 Standards Used 4
 - 2.0 EVALUATION PLANNING & PROCESS 5
 - 2.1 Documentation Submitted by Operator 5
 - 2.2 Audit Type and Determination 6
 - 2.3 Audit Team 6
 - 2.4 Evaluation Schedule and Extent of Audit 7
 - 2.4.1 Determination of Extent of Audit 7
 - 2.5 Evaluation of Management System 8
 - 2.6 Stakeholder Consultation Process 9
 - 3.0 RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS 10
 - 4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION 11
 - 4.1 Equivalence between the Audit Team Evaluation and the Operator Self Evaluation 11
 - 4.2 Process of Determining Compliance 11
 - 5.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION 14

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Operator Information

1.1.1 Name and Contact Information

Organization name	ENNOVOR BIOFUELS		
Operator Number	1300		
Contact person	IAN WALLER/CAROL DALZIEL		
Address	12-14 Wilfred Street	Telephone	+44 (0) 207 802 0164
	London, SW1E 6PL	Fax	
	United Kingdom	e-mail	lan@5barg8.com
		Website	info@ennovorgroup.com

1.1.2 Additional Parties Involved

Organization name	Supplier of Used Cooking Oil (See Appendix 4 in the Confidential Section of this report for more information).
-------------------	---

1.2 Scope of Certificate

The scope assessment agrees with the scope under which the operator applied	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If no, please explain:		

Note: If the scope is different, please contact SCS.

SITE INFORMATION			
Site Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> Forestry	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Biomass Production	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industrial	
Current Land Use	Prior Land Use		
<input type="checkbox"/> Biomass Production	<input type="checkbox"/> Biomass Production		
<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:		
Current Employment on Site	Prior Employment on Site		
<input type="checkbox"/> Negligible	<input type="checkbox"/> Negligible		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Average	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Average		
<input type="checkbox"/> Above Local Average	<input type="checkbox"/> Above Local Average		

<input type="checkbox"/> Full	<input type="checkbox"/> Full												
Owned/Controlled By:	Ennovor Biofuels												
Location/City:	Bromborough												
Geographic location:	<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Farm/Entity</th> <th>Location (Lat. – Long.)</th> <th>Area ()</th> <th>Area Planted ()</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Biodiesel facility</td> <td>53°20'55.55"N 2°58'27.03"O</td> <td></td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Farm/Entity	Location (Lat. – Long.)	Area ()	Area Planted ()	Biodiesel facility	53°20'55.55"N 2°58'27.03"O		NA				
	Farm/Entity	Location (Lat. – Long.)	Area ()	Area Planted ()									
	Biodiesel facility	53°20'55.55"N 2°58'27.03"O		NA									
AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY OR BIOMASS PRODUCTION SITES													
Total Area (ha)	NA												
Products/Crops Produced													
Product Type	Production Area												
INDUSTRIAL SITES													
Input Type	Volume												
Used Cooking Oil	100,000 MT												
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES													
Name	ENNOVOR BIOFUELS BROMBOROUGH												
Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Milling and/or Fermentation <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetable oil Extraction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biofuel Production and/or Distribution <input type="checkbox"/> Storage or Distribution <input type="checkbox"/> Other												
Location/City	BROMBOROUGH												
Geographic location	<i>Latitude & Longitude:</i> 53°20'55.55"N 2°58'27.03"O												
Included in certification scope	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>												
Number of processing steps	1 TRANSESTERIFICATION												
Description of Activities:													
Transesterification of used cooking oil to produce biodiesel													

1.3 Standards Used

1.3.1 Applicable RSB-Accredited Standards

Title	Version	Date of Finalization
RSB GHG Calculation Methodology	RSB-STD-01-003-01 V2	Dec 2012
Consolidated RSB EU RED Standard for Participating Operators	RSB-STD-11-001-30-001 V2	March 2011

Consolidated RSB EU RED Principles and Criteria	RSB-STD-11-001-01-001 V2	May 2011
Consolidated RSB EU RED Standard for Risk Management	RSB-STD-11-001-60-001 V2	Dec 2010
Consolidated RSB EU RED Generic Chain of Custody Standard	RSB-STD-11-001-20-001 V2	Dec 2010
Consolidated RSB EU RED Mass Balance Chain of Custody Standard	RSB-STD-11-001-20-004 V2	Dec 2010
RSB Standard for EU market access	RSB-STD-11-001 V2	May 2011
Consolidated RSB EU RED Standard for Communication and Claims	RSB-STD-11-001-50-001	Dec 2010
Guidance for RSB-certified biofuels from double counting wastes and non-agricultural residues in the United Kingdom	V1	Sep 2013
RSB Standard for certification of biofuels based on end-of-life-products, by-products and residues	RSB-STD-01-010 (V1.6)	Nov 2013
RSB GHG Calculation Methodology	RSB-STD-01-003-01 V2	Dec 2012
Consolidated RSB EU RED Standard for Participating Operators	RSB-STD-11-001-30-001 V2	March 2011
All standards employed are available on the websites of the Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials (http://rsb.org/sustainability/rsb-sustainability-standards/). Standards are also available, upon request, from SCS Global Services (http://www.scsglobalservices.com/).		

2.0 EVALUATION PLANNING & PROCESS

2.1 Documentation Submitted by Operator

RSB Screening Exercise	Yes
RSB Self Evaluation	Yes
GHG Calculations	Yes
RSB Risk Assessment	Yes
Environmental and Social Management Plan	Yes
Mass Balance/Chain of Custody Procedures	Yes

2.2 Audit Type and Determination

- Initial evaluations following acceptance of the participating operator by the RSB SOE shall always be conducted as field audits.
- Evaluations following an evaluation which did not result in issuing of a valid certificate shall always be conducted as field audits.
- Evaluations following an evaluation which resulted in issuing of a valid certificate to a participating operator in risk class 3, risk class 4, risk class 5 or risk class 6 shall always be conducted as field audits.
- Evaluations following a field audit which resulted in issuing of a valid certificate to a participating operator in risk class 2 may be conducted as a desk audit if this desk audit is concluded within 9 months of the preceding field audit.
- Evaluations following a desk audit which resulted in issuing of a valid certificate to a participating operator in risk class 2 shall be conducted as a field audit if this desk audit is successfully concluded within 9 months of the preceding desk audit and within 18 month of the preceding field audit.
- Evaluations following a field audit which resulted in issuing of a valid certificate to a participating operator in risk class 1 may be conducted as a desk audit if this desk audit is concluded within 12 months of the preceding field audit.
- Evaluations following a desk audit which resulted in issuing of a valid certificate to a participating operator in risk class 1 shall be conducted as a field audit if this desk audit is successfully concluded within 12 months of the preceding desk audit and within 24 months of the preceding field audit.

2.3 Audit Team

2.3.1 Determination of Audit Team

- Desk audits shall always be conducted by at minimum one (1) international lead auditor. The lead auditor appointed may include additional auditors and/or technical experts in the audit team if this is required by the extent of the audit.
- Field audits shall always be led by one (1) international lead auditor.
- The lead auditor appointed shall include at minimum one (1) local auditor in the audit team. The lead auditor appointed may include additional auditors and/or technical experts in the audit team if this is required by the extent of the audit.
- For field audits of participating operators in risk class 4, risk class 5 or risk class 6 shall always the lead auditor appointed shall appoint at minimum
 - one (1) local auditor and

- one (1) technical expert on social issues to evaluate compliance with social requirements and the risk of non-compliance due to social issues and
- one (1) technical expert on environmental issues to evaluate compliance with environmental requirements and the risk of noncompliance due to environmental issues.
- The lead auditor appointed may include additional auditors and/or technical experts in the audit team if this is required by the extent of the audit.

2.3.2 Audit Team

Auditor Name:	JOSEP BELTRAN CAPDEVILA	Auditor role:	LEAD AUDITOR
Qualifications: Josep is a Sustainability Management Auditor with many years of experience in quality system auditing. He has performed numerous trainings and internal audits of principal players in the Biofuels market in the past 5 years. Josep served on the Technical Advisory Board in the Biofuels Division of APPA, the Spanish Association of Renewable Energy Producers. Previously, Josep has served as an auditor for Bureau Veritas, and has worked for Bionet Europa SL y Reagra SL, and Norel SA. He received a B.S. in Chemistry from the Faculty of Chemistry - Universidad Rovira y Virgili (Tarragona), and an MBA from Checmical Technology Service (STQ) – Universidad Rovira y Virgili (Tarragona). Josep is a certified RSB auditor (certificate no. 2013-10015). Josep has also completed AENOR Quality Auditor Training and is an accredited lead auditor under ISCC and 2BSvs.			
Auditor Name:	He Zhaorui (Summer)	Auditor role:	Team auditor
Qualifications: Ms. He Zhaorui has worked for the Green Panel Corporation since 2005. She completed a series of training courses (ISO 9001, ISO 14001 and FSC Standards) before becoming a full-time auditor. Her services to SCS Global Services are provided through the Green Panel Corporation. She began conducting Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Chain of Custody audits in 2008 and qualified as Lead Auditor in 2009. She qualified as PEFC Lead Auditor in 2010. She has completed 3-days ISO 19011 training course, including the successful examination provided by AB Training in Beijing, China in April 2010. She has participated in Legal Harvest Verification Program and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Forest Management (FM) since 2011. She has completed the RSB Lead Auditor online training course in August 2013. She graduated from Beijing International Studies University with a Bachelor Degree in English.			

2.4 Evaluation Schedule and Extent of Audit

2.4.1 Determination of Extent of Audit

Total number of subsidiaries, branch offices, affiliated entities, external third parties contracted or otherwise engaged, operational structures, sites, facilities, processing and production units, and supply chain structures	3 UNITS BIODIESEL PLANT → BROMBOROUGH HEADQUARTERS → LONDON
--	---

	UCO COLLECTOR → CHINA
Participating Operator Risk Class	2 (self risk assessment result=1.919)
Disputes or prior Non-compliances	None
Changes in scope since last evaluation	NA
Total number of compliance claims	NA – first audit

2.4.2 Evaluation Itinerary and Activities

Date: 10-12-13	
Operation(s)/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
BROMBOROUGH	BIODIESEL PLANT
Date: 11-12-13	
Operation(s)/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
LONDON	HEADQUARTERS
Date: 24-1-14	
Operation(s)/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
CHINA	UCO COLLECTOR

2.5 Evaluation of Management System

2.5.1 Methodology and Strategies Employed

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in agriculture, ecology, forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess an Operator’s compliance to RSB standards and policies. Evaluation methods include document and record review, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of site and facility types, observation of implementation of management plans and policies, and stakeholder analysis. When there is more than one team member, team members may review parts of the standards based on their background and expertise. On the final day of an evaluation, team members convene to deliberate the findings of the assessment jointly. This involves an analysis of all relevant site observations, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus between team members cannot be achieved due to lack of

evidence, conflicting evidence or differences of interpretation of the standards, the team is instructed to report these in the certification decision section.

2.5.2 Capacity of the participating operator to implement its management systems

During the audit in different sites it was stated that a management system is in place, but this is not fulfilling RSB requirements regarding the level of description of critical procedures. This issue must be improved through the development of specific procedures describing the relevant and critical RSB requirements, ensuring all relevant employees have access to the information and performing and recording an efficient training to ensure procedures implementation and performance.

2.5.3 Evaluation of RSB compliance claims and use of RSB trademarks

Type (compliance claim, trademark use)	Description	Findings
NA – First Audit	NO PROCEDURE AVAILABLE FOR USE OF CLAIMS OR TRADEMARKS	NO EVIDENCE OF SPECIFIC PROCEDURES ACCORDING TO RSB PRINCIPLES

2.6 Stakeholder Consultation Process

In accordance with SCS and RSB protocols, consultation with key stakeholders is an integral component of the evaluation process. Stakeholder consultation takes place prior to, concurrent with, and following field evaluations. The primary purpose of such consultation is to solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the Participating Operator’s management system and operations, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon the certification scope of the participating operator.

Stakeholder consultation activities are organized according to the requirements of the RSB. The table below summarizes the major comments received from stakeholders and the assessment team’s response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

2.6.1 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable

Stakeholder Comments	SCS Response
Economic Concerns	
COMMUNICATION TO DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS WAS DONE. NO RESPONSES IN GENERAL.	NA
Social Concerns	
COMMUNICATION TO DIFFERENT SOCIAL STAKEHOLDERS WAS DONE. NO RESPONSES.	NC- COMMUNICATION TO LOCAL UNIONS HAS BEEN REQUESTED.
Environmental Concerns	
COMMUNICATION TO DIFFERENT ENVIRONMENTAL STAKEHOLDERS WAS DONE. NO RESPONSES.	NA

3.0 RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS

SCS Risk Assessment Results	Deviations from Operator Risk Assessment Results	Risk Factor Difference
Risk Class: 2.42	RF 1.3. → Difference +3 RF 1.10.2.1 → Difference +1 RF 1.15. → Difference +3 RF 1.18.3. → Difference -1 RF 1.20.1 → Difference +1 RF 1.20.2 → Difference +3.5	0.5

--	--	--

Due to the results of the Risk Assessment, the evaluation did not need to be rescheduled.

4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

4.1 Equivalence between the Audit Team Evaluation and the Operator Self Evaluation

Principle/ Subject Area	Summary of Audit Team Findings	Comparison to Operator Self Evaluation (Equivalence)	Added Risk
P1: Legality	Same	100%	NO
P2: Planning, Monitoring & Continuous Improvement	NO COMPLIANCE (NO PROCEDURES)	0%	YES
P3: Greenhouse Gases	Same	100%	NO
P4: Human and Labor Rights	Same	100%	NO
P5: Rural & Local Development	Same	100%	NO
P6: Food Security	Same	100%	NO
P7: Conservation	NC	50%	YES
P8: Soil	NC	50%	YES
P9: Water	Same	100%	NO
P10: Air	Same	100%	NO
P11: Technology	NC	75%	YES
P12: Land Rights	Same	100%	NO
FINAL RISK CLASS		2	

4.2 Process of Determining Compliance

4.2.1 Structure of Standard and Degrees of Non-Compliance

RSB-accredited biofuel standards consist of a three-level hierarchy: principle, the criteria that correspond to that principle, and then the performance indicators that elaborate each criterion. Consistent with SCS Sustainable Biofuels Program evaluation protocols, the team collectively determines whether or not the subject operation is in compliance with every applicable indicator of the relevant

sustainable biofuel standard. Each non-compliance must be evaluated to determine whether it constitutes a major or minor noncompliance at the level of the associated criterion or sub-criterion. Not all indicators are equally important, and there is no simple numerical formula to determine whether an operation is in noncompliance. The team therefore must use their collective judgment to assess each criterion and determine if the Operator is in compliance. If the Operator is determined to be in non-compliance at the criterion level, then at least one of the applicable indicators must be in major non-compliance.

4.2.2 Interpretations of Major and Minor Non-compliances

Major Non-compliances, either alone or in combination with non-compliances of other applicable indicators, result (or are likely to result) in a fundamental failure to achieve the objectives of the relevant RSB Criterion. These non-compliances must be resolved or closed out before a certificate can be awarded. If Major NCs arise after an operation is certified, the timeframe for correcting these non-compliances is typically no more than three months. Certification is contingent on the certified FME’s response to the NCs within the stipulated time frame.

Minor Non-compliances are typically limited in scale or can be characterized as an unusual lapse in the system. Most minor NCs are the result of a nonconformance at the indicator-level. Non-compliances must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the certificate.

4.2.3 Major Non-compliances

<input type="checkbox"/>	No major NCs were issued to the Operator during the evaluation. Any minor CARs from previous surveillance audits have been reviewed and closed prior to the issuance of a certificate.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Major NCs were issued to the Operator during the evaluation, which have all been closed to the satisfaction of the audit team and meet the requirements of the standards. Any minor CARs from previous surveillance audits have been reviewed and closed prior to the issuance of a certificate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major NCs were issued to the Operator during the evaluation and the Operator has not yet satisfactorily closed all major NCs.

4.2.4 Non-compliances and Current Status

Summary of Non-compliances and Current Status				
Non-compliance Number	Type of Non-compliance	Relevant RSB Principle and Criteria	Summary of Finding	Status of Non-compliance
2013-1	MINOR	Criterion 2b	NO COMMUNICATION TO UNIONS	closed

		Consolidated EU RED Principles & Criteria RSB-IND-11-001-20-001 (V 2.0)	AS A RELEVANT STAKEHOLDER.	
2013-2	MINOR	Criterion 2c Consolidated EU RED Principles & Criteria RSB-IND-11-001-20-001 (V 2.0)	A BUSINESS PLAN IS AVAILABLE BUT IT DOES NOT FULFILL RSB REQUIREMENTS	Closed
2013-3	MAJOR	Criterion 3a,3c Consolidated EU RED Principles & Criteria RSB-IND-11-001-20-001 (V 2.0)	NO EVIDENCE OF GHG CALCULATION	Closed
2013-4	MAJOR	Criterion 1.2.1, 6.2.10, 6.4.1 Consolidated RSB EU RED Generic CoC RSB-STD-11-001-20-001	NO EVIDENCE OF SPECIFIC WRITTEN PROCEDURES ACCORDING TO RSB REQUIREMENTS. AS AN EXAMPLE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NO EVIDENCE OF WRITTEN PROCEDURE TO CALCULATE MASS BALANCE AND CONVERSION RATIOS. • NO EVIDENCE OF PROCEDURES FOR COMPLIANCE CLAIMS 	Closed
2013-5	MINOR	Criteria 3 Guidance for RSB-certified biofuels from double counting wastes and non-agricultural residues in the United Kingdom	IN CHINA THE UCO COLLECTOR WAS UNABLE TO PROVIDE EVIDENCE OF CONTRACTS WITH ALL SUPPLIERS, BUT PAYMENT RECORDS INDICATE AN AGREEMENT IS IN PLACE.	Closed
2013-6	MAJOR	Criteria 5 Guidance for RSB-certified biofuels from double counting wastes and non-agricultural residues in the United Kingdom	IN CHINA THE UCO COLLECTOR HAS NO OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE OF A MASS BALANCE MANAGING TOOL NOR ANY MASS BALANCE RECORD SYSTEM.	Closed
2013-7	MAJOR	9.1.2, 9.4.1, 9.4.2, 9.4.3, 9.4.4 Consolidated EU RED “Mass balance of product” chain of custody standard RSB-STD-11-001-20-004	Communication of compliance with RSB EU RED standards is not stated in any procedures.	Closed

4.2.5 New Non-compliances

Select one:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A Initial Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> New NC(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> No New NC(s)
-------------	--	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

5.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION

Certification Recommendation	
Operator shall be awarded RSB certification subject to the minor non-compliances stated in Section 4.2.5.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
The SCS evaluation team makes the above recommendation for certification based on the full and proper execution of the SCS Responsible Biofuels Program evaluation protocols. If certification is recommended, the Operator has satisfactorily demonstrated the following without exception:	
Operator has addressed any Major NC(s) assigned during the evaluation.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Operator has demonstrated that their system of management is capable of ensuring that all of the requirements of the applicable standards are met over the sites and facilities covered by the scope of the evaluation.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Operator has demonstrated that the described system of management is being implemented consistently over the sites and facilities covered by the scope of the certificate.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments and/or details of any issue which was difficult and/or impossible to evaluate:	
None	