Universiteit Utrecht

Copernicus Institute of
Sustainable Development

Questionnaire Review Regarding GHG Emissions Calculation & SFM Certification

Thuy Mai-Moulin and Dr. Martin Junginger

Table of Contents

I. Response Summary

		Number of stakeholders	Number of respondents
Belgium			
	Policy makers	2	2
Denmark			
	Policy makers	1	1
	Industry	3	3
The Netherlands			
	Policy makers	3	2
	Industry	3	3
The United Kingdom			
	Policy maker	1	0
	Industry	2	2
Others (stakeholders from Italy, USA, Norway)		3	1
	Total	**18**	**14**

II. GHG Emissions Calculation (1)

Issues	Response
1. Methodological approach	- *UK has two methodological changes leading to change in calculations* - *Belgian methodologies are considered acceptable to meet the country's policy objectives (net amount of support to be paid for)* *- A harmonised one, prefer at EU/international level & based on BioGrace framework*
2. Feedstock material	- *Harmonised definition of feedstock material at EU level* - *Generators have information of material in the whole supply chain*
3. Typical & default values	*Should be set by EU & JRC but in consultation with MSs that have sus. criteria*
4. Collection, energy & carbon data for calculations	
4.1 Emissions levels	- *Thresholds/targets in MSs are doable but single reference is better* - *Comparators should be specific according to different purposes*

II. GHG Emissions Calculation (2)

Issues	Response
4. Collection, energy & carbon data for calculations	
4.2 Mass balance approach	- *Applicable & reflects industry practice in FSC/PEFC* - *Feasible as demonstrate sustainability through certification of pellet mill* - *Relevant as long as the national sustainability requirements are met*
4.3 Recommended minimum GHG savings	- *Follow EU recommendation*
4.4 Default values	- *Too much details/info may make calculations more complicated* - *JRC should make consultation to gather realistic data*
4.5 Chain-specific data for each shipment of solid biomass	- *As a few number of parameters have high impacts (e.g. boiler fuel) on GHG savings of biomass -) focus on the main ones*

Policy makers / Industry / Both

III. SFM Certification (1)

Issues	Response
1. Legislation update	- *Level of certification is of high concern* - *Further discussions are on-going in the UK, BE (Wallonia), DK and NL* - *Consultation with international initiatives (SBP, PEFC, FSC)*
2. Demonstration of sustainability	
2.1 Legality	- *Some MSs have their own Timber Procurement Policy in consultation with policies of neighboring countries* - *Forest certification followed by CoC* - *Product certification supported by CoC*
2.2 Level of certification	*Pellet mill level is more practical/workable*
2.3 Minimum certified forest site size	- *Vary by countries* - *Regional risk assessment should be considered instead of forest size*
2.4 Preferred certification systems	- *Each scheme developed for specific purposes & specific markets* - *Opinions vary*

III. SFM Certification (2)

Issues	Response
2. Demonstration of sustainability	
2.5 Percentage of SFM certified biomass	- *Bioenergy sector is a minor player in the forest market* - *100% legal with 70% certified min + 30% max controlled wood (or equivalent) would be feasible* - *Non SFM certified material should demonstrate sustainability* - *Prefer no change over time*
2.6 Chain of Custody	*FSC and PEFC already offer Mass Balance so those systems exist & work well*
2.7 Should SFM systems include a GHG footprint by default	- *Currently, no consensus on science & methodologies* - *GHG can be done by complementary systems such as SBP*

IV. Other Sustainability Criteria (1)

Issues	Response
1. Carbon debt	
1.1 Relation between GHG balance and carbon debt	- *Carbon debt should not be included as long as there are currently no uniform accepted methods* - *The Dutch have proposed a positive and negative list that is drawn up to prevent unwanted long C-debt. That is considered more practical to work with in the market*.
1.2. Is risk of carbon debt could also be assessed on a case-by-case basis?	- *The bioenergy industry uses the low quality material left unutilized by the major operators in the forest-timber/paper/pulp -) carbon debt should not be a big issue* - *Whether the necessary data can be collected by a pellet mill to implement this criterion –need to be tested*

IV. Other Sustainability Criteria (2)

Issues	Response
2. Indirect effects of biomass production	
2.1 Competition with other uses of wood	- *Risk is low since the industry only utilizes the lowest quality / priced wood (a high number of reports indicate that more wood is growing than is used)*
2.2 Indirect land-use change	- *ILUC is not a big issue for bioenergy since the probability of forest remaining as a forest is high* - *Environmental and social impacts of ILUC vary widely according to the specific circumstances in which biomass is produced* - *Addressing ILUC might be relevant in the long term*

Thank you for your attention!

More information?

Thuy Mai-Moulin: t.p.t.mai-moulin@uu.nl
Dr. Martin Junginger: h.m.junginger@uu.nl