

Certification Evaluation Report

Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials

ORKA NRG SA.

SCS Certificate Code-SCS-RSB/PC-0010

Rue du Rhone 60, 1204 Geneva

Maria Kayner

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
July 14,2014	July 13, 2016

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
June 05, 2014
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
July 14, 2014

SCS Contact:

Neil Mendenhall | Manager

Environmental Certification Services

+1.510.452.8018

nmendenhall@scsglobalservices.com

SCSglobal
SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA

+1.510.452.8000 main | +1.510.452.8001 fax

www.SCSglobalServices.com

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 5
- 2.0 EVALUATION PLANNING & PROCESS 6
 - 2.1 Documentation Submitted by Operator 6
 - 2.2 Audit Type and Determination 6
 - 2.3 Audit Team 6
 - 2.4 Evaluation Schedule and Extent of Audit 7
 - 2.5 Evaluation of Management System 8
 - 2.6 Stakeholder Consultation Process 8
- 3.0 RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS 9
- 4.0 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION 9
 - 4.1 Equivalence between the Audit Team Evaluation and the Operator Self Evaluation 9
 - 4.2 Process of Determining Compliance 10
- 5.0 CERTIFICATION DECISION 11

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Operator Information

1.1.1 Name and Contact Information

Organization name	ORKA NRG SA		
Operator Number	1397		
Contact person	Maria Kayner		
Address	ROTHUSSTRASSE 23	Telephone	+41 41 783 83 41
	CH-6331 Hunenberg	Fax	+41 41 783 83 49
		e-mail	Maria.kayner@orka-nrg.com
		Website	/

1.1.2 Additional Parties Involved

Organization name	Tianjin Stolthaven Lingang Terminal Company		
Contact person			
Address	Tianjin,	Telephone	
	<i>Latitude & Longitude:</i>	Fax	
	38.951691, 117.739712	e-mail	
		Website	
Nature of Involvement: 1 (warehouse), ONLY HANDLING			
Handling of UCO and UCOME (acting as ORKA service supplier for rented tanks-warehouse)			

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/other (offices and rented storage)	
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:			
Location/City:		See site information above (non-farm)	
Geographic location:		Farm/Entity	Location (Lat. – Long.)
		Area ()	Area Planted ()
AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY OR BIOMASS PRODUCTION SITES – N/A			
Total Area (ha)			
Products/Crops Produced			
Product Type		Production Area	
INDUSTRIAL SITES			
Input Type		Volume	

INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES			
Name		Tianjin Stolthaven Lingang Terminal Company	
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		Tianjin	
Geographic location		Latitude & Longitude: 38.951691, 117.739712	
Included in certification scope		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	

▪ Number of processing steps	▪ 1 (warehouse), ONLY HANDLING
▪ Annual Throughput (Litres)	
▪ Material Input:	▪ N/A
▪ Material Output	▪ N/A
▪ % output yield compared to input material	▪ N/A
▪ Description of Activities:	
▪ Handling of UCO and UCOME (acting as ORKA service supplier for rented tanks)	

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 Operators are not required to conduct a <i>self-risk assessment</i> ; Operators are not required to conduct and maintain a <i>self-evaluation</i> against the RSB Principles & Criteria.	March 2011
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
Consolidated RSB EU RED Standard for Communication and Claims	RSB-STD-11-001-50-001	Dec 2010
RSB Standard for certification of biofuels based on end-of-life-products, by-products and residues	RSB-STD-01-010 (V1.6)	Nov 2013
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	Claim Procedure
GHG Calculations	

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:	Marinka Vignali	Auditor role:	Lead Auditor
Qualifications: Marinka is a certified Auditor against 2 EU approved voluntary schemes (RSB and ISCC EU) and 2 RED national schemes (Italian national scheme and ISCC DE) with many years of experience in the biofuels sector. Previously she has worked at the European Commission for 9 years, at DG JRC - Renewable Energy Unit. She has received a Master's Degree in Chemical Engineering at Università degli Studi di Pisa (Pisa, Italy) and a PhD in Chemistry at University of Limerick (Limerick, Ireland).			

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	Trading office and rented storage as referred to above. All trading is with suppliers certified against other EU RED – approved voluntary schemes.
Participating Operator Risk Class	3
Disputes or prior Non-compliances	N/A: FIRST AUDIT
Changes in scope since last evaluation	N/A: FIRST AUDIT
Total number of compliance claims	N/A: FIRST AUDIT

2.4.2 Evaluation Itinerary and Activities

Date: 05.06.2014	
Operation(s)/ sites visited	Activities/ notes
Geneva Headquarters	Trading

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

Note: include an overall evaluation of the participating operator's responsiveness and ability to consistently and effectively implement its management system based on the financial, technical and human resources available.

Include overall evaluation of management system implementation here (the details of the observations and substantiating evidence collected during evaluation of the central management office and management systems of the participating operator)

2.5.3 Evaluation of RSB compliance claims and use of RSB trademarks

Type (compliance claim, trademark use)	Description	Findings
RSB Compliance claim	Use of claims or trademarks shall be documented.	Specific template according to RSB-STD-11-001-50-001 is missing.

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	
N/A	
Social Concerns	
N/A	
Environmental Concerns	
N/A	

3.0 RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS

SCS Risk Assessment Results	Deviations from Operator Risk Assessment Results	Risk Factor Difference
N/A – Assumed to be Risk Class 3 as per RSB Proactive Guidance for Traders		

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	N/A		
P2: Planning, Monitoring & Continuous Improvement	N/A		
P3: Greenhouse Gases	N/A: USE OF DEFAULT VALUES FOR EU MARKET		
P4: Human and	N/A		

Labor Rights			
P5: Rural & Local Development	N/A		
P6: Food Security	N/A		
P7: Conservation	N/A		
P8: Soil	N/A		
P9: Water	N/A		
P10: Air	N/A		
P11: Technology	N/A		
P12: Land Rights	N/A		
FINAL RISK CLASS	N/A – Not required for Traders		

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
1.	MAJOR	RSB Consolidated EU RED Generic CoC Standard RSB-STD-11-001-20-001-vers.2 (6.1 and 6.2 (6.2.10) <u>RSB-STD-11-001-20-004</u> <u>(9.1.2,9.4.1,9.4.2,9.4.3, 9.4.4)</u>	No evidence of procedures or templates for forwarding RSB EU RED compliant product	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 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"/>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Comments and/or details of any issue which was difficult and/or impossible to evaluate:</p>	
<p> </p>	