

# SBP

Sustainable Biomass Program

# SCS Global Services Evaluation of SIA PATA Compliance with the SBP Framework: Public Summary Report

First Surveillance Audit

Scope Change Audit

[www.sbp-cert.org](http://www.sbp-cert.org)



## Completed in accordance with the CB Public Summary Report Template Version 1.3

*For further information on the SBP Framework and to view the full set of documentation see  
[www.sbp-cert.org](http://www.sbp-cert.org)*

### *Document history*

*Version 1.0: published 26 March 2015*

*Version 1.1: published 30 January 2018*

*Version 1.2: published 4 April 2018*

*Version 1.3: published 10 May 2018*

*© Copyright The Sustainable Biomass Program Limited 2018*

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Overview</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Scope of the evaluation and SBP certificate</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Specific objective</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>SBP Standards utilised</b>
4.1	SBP Standards utilised
4.2	SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment
<b>5</b>	<b>Description of Company, Supply Base and Forest Management</b>
5.1	Description of Company
5.2	Description of Company's Supply Base
5.3	Detailed description of Supply Base
5.4	Chain of Custody system
<b>6</b>	<b>Evaluation process</b>
6.1	Timing of evaluation activities
6.2	Description of evaluation activities
6.3	Process for consultation with stakeholders
<b>7</b>	<b>Results</b>
7.1	Main strengths and weaknesses
7.2	Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation
7.3	Compilation of data on Greenhouse Gas emissions
7.4	Competency of involved personnel
7.5	Stakeholder feedback
7.6	Preconditions
<b>8</b>	<b>Review of Company's Risk Assessments</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Review of Company's mitigation measures</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Non-conformities and observations</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Certification recommendation</b>

# 1 Overview

CB Name and contact:	SCS Global Services, 2000 Powell St. Ste 600 Emeryville, CA 94608
Primary contact for SBP:	Sarah Harris
Current report completion date:	14/Sep/2018
Report authors:	Renal Lastik
Name of the Company:	SIA "PATA", Cesu iela 14, Riga, LV-1012, Latvia
Company contact for SBP:	Vita Rudzīte, vita.rudzite@pata.lv, + 371 29157044
Certified Supply Base:	Latvia; Estonia & Lithuania
SBP Certificate Code:	SBP-04-07
Date of certificate issue:	02/Nov/2017
Date of certificate expiry:	01/Nov/2022

This report relates to the First Surveillance Audit & Scope Change Audit

## 2 Scope of the evaluation and SBP certificate

This certificate covers the production of woodchips and transportation to log yard and port locations. It also covers a Supply Base from certified PEFC and FSC material from Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania & Supply Base Evaluation of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania.

### 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 SBP Standards 1, 2, 4, & 5 are implemented across the entire scope of certification; the objective includes collecting assessment information, and generating assessment findings.

The following SBP critical control points were audited and are described here and in the report:

\*Feedstock procurement, storage and processing: The company purchases roundwood and chips them with mobile chippers at their storage facilities at the ports of Liepāja, Ventspils and Rīga in Latvia. The mobile chippers do not travel to other locations.

\*Volume Accounting: SIA PATA holds valid PEFC and FSC COC certificates, covering volume credit method (PEFC) and transfer system (FSC); all feedstock used for biomass production and trade with SBP claims is sourced under the existing PEFC CoC systems. The auditor reviewed the accounting system of the organization. All calculations are site specific and are not combined between different sites.

\*Outgoing transactions: Invoices will be issued and outgoing transactions of SBP-certified biomass will be recorded in the DTS. This has been verified by review of procedures and interviews.

\*Energy data collection and reporting: The organization developed and maintains databases to record data values and calculate energy data as required by Standard 5 and keeps records that substantiate the data.

## 4 SBP Standards utilised

### 4.1 SBP Standards utilised

Please select all SBP Standards used during this evaluation. All Standards can be accessed and downloaded from <https://sbp-cert.org/documents/standards-documents/standards>

- SBP Framework Standard 1: Feedstock Compliance Standard (Version 1.0, 26 March 2015)
- SBP Framework Standard 2: Verification of SBP-compliant Feedstock (Version 1.0, 26 March 2015)
- SBP Framework Standard 4: Chain of Custody (Version 1.0, 26 March 2015)
- SBP Framework Standard 5: Collection and Communication of Data (Version 1.0, 26 March 2015)

### 4.2 SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessment

RRA for Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania

<https://sbp-cert.org/documents/risk-assessments/latvia>

<https://sbp-cert.org/documents/risk-assessments/estonia>

<https://sbp-cert.org/documents/risk-assessments/lithuania>

## 5 Description of Company, Supply Base and Forest Management

### 5.1 Description of Company

SIA PATA holds valid PEFC and FSC COC certificates, covering volume credit method (PEFC) and transfer system (FSC); all feedstock used for biomass production and trade with SBP claims is sourced under the existing PEFC CoC systems. All of certified material is stored separately from any other non-certified material SIA PATA might have sourced.

For the scope of SBP certification SIA PATA includes following roles:

- Biomass Producer that creates biomass (woodchips) from feedstock inputs – wood chips are produced using portable woodchipper
- Trader that takes legal ownership of biomass (woodchips) and supplies it to another Legal Owner – Wood chips are purchased from wood chips suppliers.

Feedstock inputs SIA PATA uses consists of roundwood and fuel wood (for biomass production and sale) and woodchips (for biomass purchase and sale). Presented species are birch, spruce, pine, alder, aspen. No CITIES or IUCN species presented.

SIA PATA purchases feedstock from private forests and also from state owned forests.

The input material used by SIA PATA for the scope of SBP contains primary feedstock supplied by suppliers from Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

### 5.2 Description of Company's Supply Base

#### Latvia

In Latvia, forests cover area of 3,07 million ha. According to the data of the State Forest Service (concerning the surveyed area allocated to management activities regulated by the Forest Law), woodenness amounts to 52 %. Latvia is one of the most forested EU member states.

The Latvian State owns 1,5 million ha of forest (49 % of the total forest area), while the other 1,57 million ha (51. % of the total forest area) belong to other owners. Forests owned by the state are managed by state stock company Latvijas Valsts Meži (Latvian State Forests). Private forest owners in Latvia amount to approximately 144,000.

#### Lithuania

Forests cover amounts to 33.3 per cent of the territory of the Republic of Lithuania and forest land constitute an area of 2 177 000 hectares as of 1st January 2014. Expansion of the forest area has been one of the main objectives of Lithuanian forestry policy over the last years. Due to the



implementation of sustainable forest management and national afforestation measures, forest coverage in Lithuania has increased by 2 per cent since 2003.

Approximately a half of forest land in Lithuania is owned by the State and managed by 42 State Forest Enterprises and the Directorate General of State Forests. Respectively, around 40 per cent of forest land is privately owned and the rest 10 per cent is still reserved for restitution.

Occupying 1 152 400 ha, coniferous stands prevail in Lithuania, covering 56.1 per cent of the forest area. They are followed by softwood deciduous forests (827 500 ha, 40.3 per cent) and hardwood deciduous forest (75 800 ha, 3.7 per cent). The dominant tree species are pine (occupying 720 300 ha) and spruce (429 600 ha). Birch stands are prevalent among deciduous trees, covering an area of 459 700 ha.

#### Estonia

Today forests cover around 50% of the territory of Estonia contributing to approximately 2.2 million hectares with the growing stock around 468 million m<sup>3</sup>. Estonia is in the fifth position in Europe based on forest coverage (share of forestland area in mainland territory) after Finland, Sweden, Slovenia and Latvia.

Estonia lies within the latitude of 59° 00'N in the temperate zone of the Northern Hemisphere. Due to moderate maritime climate conditions for forest growth are very suitable. Estonia belongs primarily to the northern area of the nemoral-coniferous or „mixed forest” belt. Of all the woodlands, 51% of stands are dominated by deciduous species and 49% by coniferous species making landscapes very diverse. Without the limiting influence of humans forests would cover most of Estonia's mainland. In fact, 3,000 years ago more than 80% of the mainland was covered with forests. Due to human activity, 100 years ago forests covered only 30% of 4.5 million hectares of the total area of Estonia.

The diversity of forests in Estonia provides habitats for a large number of species.

## 5.3 Detailed description of Supply Base

### Supply Base

- a. Total Supply Base area (ha): 7.45 million ha
- b. Tenure by type (ha): 3.47 million ha state owned; 3.45 million ha privately owned; 0.53 -- other
- c. Forest by type (ha): boreal forest
- d. Forest by management type (ha): Managed, partly natural forests 7.45 million ha
- e. Certified forest by scheme (ha): 3.65 million ha FSC-certified forest / 2.82 million ha PEFC-certified forest

#### Latvia

Forest land consists of:

- forests 3,07m ha (91.3%);;
  - marshes 0,18m ha (5.3%);;
  - open areas 0,035m ha (1.1%);;
  - flooded areas 0,018m ha (0,5%);;
  - objects of infrastructure 0,062m ha (1.8%). For most of forest the dominant tree species are coniferous trees -□ pine and spruce. Latvia forests mainly consists of coniferous trees, but significant part are also occupied by other species. Forest area by dominant species:
- pine 35 %;;
  - spruce 18.1 %;;
  - birch 30.6 %;;
  - gray alder 7.2 %:
  - black alder 2.9 %;;
  - aspen 5.0 %;;
  - oak 0.3 %;;
  - ash 0.5 %:
  - other species 0.3 %.

The amount of forestland is constantly expanding, both naturally and thanks to afforestation of infertile land and other land that is not used for agriculture.

In September 2016 total PEFC Certified Forest Area in Latvia was 1,683,604 hectares and 44 Chain of Custody Certificates. (PEFC Global Statistics: SFM & CoC Certification, September 2016).

In November 2016 total FSC Certified Forest Area in Latvia was 1,299,477 hectares and 300 Chain of Custody Certificates. (FSC Facts & Figures, November 3, 2016) .

Please note that a quantitative description of the Supply Base can be found in the SIA PATA's Supply Base report.

### Lithuania

Forests are divided into groups upon the objectives of the economic activities, their regime and the major functional purpose.

Group I – strict reserves forests. These are the strict reserves and small strict reserves forests on the territories of state strict nature reserves, state parks and biosphere monitoring territories. Objective of economic activities – to preserve the forests for a natural growth.

Group II – forests of special purpose, split into the following: A – ecosystem protection forests. Landscape, botanical, forest genetic, zoological, botanical-zoological reserves and reserves of these types in state parks and biosphere monitoring territories. Objective of economic activities – to preserve or restore forest ecosystems or separate ecosystem components. B – recreational forests. Recreational forests cover forest parks, urban (city) forests, forests of recreation zones of the state parks, recreational forest areas and other forests defined for recreation. Objective of economic activities – to form and preserve the recreational forest environment.

Group III – protective forests. These are the forests in the territories of geological, geomorphological, hydrographical, and cultural reserves, forests of protection zones. Objective of economic activities – to form productive forest stands capable of performing the functions of protection of soil, air, water and human living surroundings.

Group IV – commercial forests, split into the following: A – commercial forests of normal cutting age. Objective of economic activities – to form productive forest stands and supply wood continuously following the requirements of environmental protection;; B - forest plantations. Objective of economic activities – to grow as much wood as possible in the shortest period of time.

FSC and PEFC certificates are used in Lithuania.

In November 2016 total FSC Certified Forest Area in Lithuania was 1,085,548 hectares and 263 Chain of Custody Certificates. (FSC Facts & Figures, November 3, 2016)

In September 2016 there were 9 PEFC Chain of Custody Certificates. (PEFC Global Statistics: SFM & CoC Certification, September 2016).

### Estonia

“Estonian Forestry Development Program until 2020” is the framework document for the development of forestry in the current decade. The principal goals are to safeguard the productivity and viability of forests and ensure the varied and effective use of forests. In order to achieve these aims, it is important to procure wood in the amount of the increment, to increase the volume of reforestation, to keep at least 10% of forestland area under strict protection and to enhance the variety of protected forests. The share of strictly protected forests in the total area of forests was 10% already in 2010, but further efforts are required to ensure that a variety of forests are represented in the strictly protected areas. (Statistical Yearbook of Estonia 2014 – Statistics

Estonia) Private forest owners manage around 1.01 million ha (47%) of forest land in Estonia with the growing stock of around 275 million m<sup>3</sup>.

40% of the forests of Estonia belong to the state. These forests are maintained, grown and managed by the State Forest Management Centre (RMK).

FSC and PEFC certificates are used in Estonia.

In September 2016 total PEFC Certified Forest Area in Estonia was 1,131,711 hectares and 59 Chain of Custody Certificates. (PEFC Global Statistics: SFM & CoC Certification, September 2016).

In November 2016 total FSC Certified Forest Area in Estonia was 1,264,503 hectares and 242 Chain of Custody Certificates. (FSC Facts & Figures, November 3, 2016)

## 5.4 Chain of Custody system

SIA PATA holds valid PEFC and FSC COC certificates, covering volume credit method (PEFC) and transfer system (FSC); all feedstock used for biomass production and trade with SBP claims is sourced under the existing PEFC CoC systems.

SIA PATA is on a multi-site certificate for FSC covering the distribution of sawn timber, Roundwood, pulp wood, fuel wood, chips, bark, and sawdust, and the production of chips using the transfer system. Its management system and documented procedures are fully capable of determining feedstock compliance.

SIA PATA is using a server to gather and control information related to the feedstock such as supplier name, scale tickets, fibre type, certification, and district of origin. SIA PATA has appropriate control mechanisms to calculate output volumes, claims and trademark/logo approval. Additionally, SIA PATA conducts an annual management review of the commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the SBP management system.

## 6 Evaluation process

### 6.1 Timing of evaluation activities

Item	Date and time	Location	Participants
Document Review	17.08.2018 (8 hours)	Off site	Renal Lastik
Scope Extension Audit	21.08.2018 (8 hours)	SIA PATA Office	SIA PATA: Vita Rudzite – Certification System Manager (CSM); Aldis Strankals – Logistic Manager; Inese Viguls – Accountant; Zanda Vetra – Accountant; Liene Krastina – Logistic Specialist; Agnita Sallame – HR Manager; SCS: Renal Lastik - Lead Assessor
Scope Extension Audit	22.08.2018 (8 hours)	Field Audits	SIA PATA: Vita Rudzite - Certification System Manager; Arturs Abels – Logging Manager (SIA PATA Saldus); Guntors Rubulis – Forwarder Operator (SIA PATA Saldus); Janis Gredzens – Harvester Operator (SIA PATA Saldus); Edgars Levics – Logging Manager (SIA PATA Saldus);

			<p>Armants Students – Forwarder Operator (SIA PATA Saldus);                  Aigars Strelevics – Logyard Foreman (SIA PATA Saldus);                  Guntis Gruzniņš – Logyard Manager (SIA PATA Saldus);                  SCS:                  Renal Lastik - Lead Assessor</p>
Scope Extension Audit	23.08.2018 (8 hours)	Field Audits + Office	<p>SIA PATA:                  Vita Rudzite - Certification System Manager;                  Aldis Strankals - Logistic Manager;                  Ojars Petrovics – Logging Manager (SIA PATA Strenci);                  Inars Siksaliētis – Forwarder Operator (SIA PATA Strenci);                  Maris Rujens – Chainsaw Operator (Contractor of Strenci);                  Romans Vasiljevs – Chainsaw Operator (Contractor of Strenci);                  Edgars Jelitis – Forest Manager (SIA PATA Strenci);                  Andris Sarkans – Forwarder Operator (SIA PATA Strenci);                  SCS:                  Renal Lastik - Lead Assessor</p>

## 6.2 Description of evaluation activities

Audit was carried out on-site in 3 days (21.08.2018 – 23.08.2018). Audit included: opening meeting; review of COC and SBP procedures and systems; review of records and evidences; SBE; FMU visits, visits to logyards.

During the audit following areas were assessed:

- a) Quality management
- b) Material sourcing
- c) Material receipt and storage
- d) Volume control
- e) Chain of Custody scheme used as SBP framework
- f) System(s) for controlling claims
- g) Sales and delivery
- h) Processing steps for manufacturing
- i) SBE and monitoring of suppliers

## 6.3 Process for consultation with stakeholders

SIA PATA

SIA PATA carried out stakeholder consultation process at 27.04.2018. During the stakeholder notification process wide range of stakeholders (suppliers, clients, associations, state authorities etc.) were informed about organizations upcoming SBP evaluation audit, inputs and SBE system. BP did not received any feedback from stakeholders during the consultation.

SCS Conducted Stakeholder Consultation

Geographical area: The geographical area for the stakeholder consultation is the same as the supply areas identified in the company's Supply Base. This stakeholder consultation included Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. List of Stakeholders invited: SCS relies on its Master Stakeholder List, which contains stakeholders that are identified by type, e.g. ENGO, Government/regulatory, Educational/Academic, Industry, Indigenous/Aboriginal/Tribal. This list is categorized by country and state/province at the very least, and for this consultation was filtered to omit any stakeholders that were not geographically relevant to the certificate-holder/applicant's supply base. Relevant FSC Network Partners were also included in the invitation process.

SCS launched their stakeholder consultation for the Scope Extension audit of the SIA PATA on XXX (date needed) from SCS's Emeryville office to stakeholders. Stakeholders had the opportunity to present their points of view to the auditor(s) in confidence.

SCS received no comments regarding SIA PATA procurement operations / supply.

## 7 Results

### 7.1 Main strengths and weaknesses

Main strengths: BP has a good and transparent feedstock and reporting control system which enables them to track and assess material origin and transportation throughout the process. For weaknesses please see audit findings in section 10.

### 7.2 Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation

The Supply Base Evaluation was implemented only for primary feedstock sourced from Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania. SIA PATA carries out the verification of the origin of the supply base through the primary raw material that is stored in SB and sold without:

- SBP approved forest management certificate;
- partial sales claim made on the basis of a SBP approved forest management certificate;
- sales claim of the SBP approved supply chain certificate.

In order to mitigate risks associated with the primary raw material, the company checks the origin of the material for all supplies. The risk assessment used by the organization is the Approved Regional SBP Risk Assessment for all three countries available at the SBP website. Based on the specified risk indicators in these risk assessments organization has worked out and implemented mitigation measures (see section 9 of BP's SBR).

### 7.3 Collection and Communication of Data

As a BP only producing woodchips, the requirements for Greenhouse Gas emission data collection is considerably lessened. The BP has created procedures to trace the material back to the district of origin in a logical and thorough way. During the audit, actual invoices showing the distances and justifying the average haulage distance were assessed. Additionally organization is using separate program (AXAPTA) adapted to their needs to record all the relevant information.

### 7.4 Competency of involved personnel

Organizations Compliance Policy and Procedures define and show the structure of the organization and assignment of responsibilities regarding SBP system (Overall responsibility, Timber procurement and sales manager, warehouse logistic manager, logistic manager, deputy of chief accountant, timber procurement specialist). Based on the in-house know-how from different units organization has put together the SBE and created related procedures and work instruction. Division of responsibilities are clearly defined e.g. responsible position and SBP system to cover. Justification of the selection of the persons and positions come from the existing situation (the best available competence is tried to use, based on persons CV's and competence).



## 7.5 Stakeholder feedback

No comments were received during the BP's stakeholder consultation period by the BP and no comments were received by Certification Body during their consultation period either.

## 7.6 Preconditions

NA

## 8 Review of Company’s Risk Assessments

*Describe how the Certification Body assessed risk for the Indicators. Summarise the CB’s final risk ratings in Table 1, together with the Company’s final risk ratings. Default for each indicator is ‘Low’, click on the rating to change. Note: this summary should show the risk ratings before AND after the SVP has been performed and after any mitigation measures have been implemented.*

SBP endorsed Regional Risk Assessment for Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania were used by the Biomass Producer. Risk ratings in table 1 are taken from the approved risk assessments for all 3 countries.

**Table 1. Final risk ratings of Indicators as determined BEFORE the SVP and any mitigation measures.**

Indicator	Risk rating (Low or Specified)	
	Producer	CB
1.1.1	Low	Low
1.1.2	Low	Low
1.1.3	Low	Low
1.2.1	Low	Low
1.3.1	Low	Low
1.4.1	Low	Low
1.5.1	Low	Low
1.6.1	Low	Low
2.1.1	Specified	Specified
2.1.2	Specified	Specified
2.1.3	Low	Low
2.2.1	Low	Low
2.2.2	Low	Low
2.2.3	Low	Low
2.2.4	Low	Low
2.2.5	Low	Low
2.2.6	Low	Low
2.2.7	Low	Low
2.2.8	Low	Low
2.2.9	Low	Low
2.3.1	Low	Low
2.3.2	Low	Low

Indicator	Risk rating (Low or Specified)	
	Producer	CB
2.3.3	Low	Low
2.4.1	Low	Low
2.4.2	Low	Low
2.4.3	Low	Low
2.5.1	Low	Low
2.5.2	Low	Low
2.6.1	Low	Low
2.7.1	Low	Low
2.7.2	Low	Low
2.7.3	Low	Low
2.7.4	Low	Low
2.7.5	Low	Low
2.8.1	Specified	Specified
2.9.1	Low	Low
2.9.2	Low	Low
2.10.1	Low	Low

**Table 2. Final risk ratings of Indicators as determined AFTER the SVP and any mitigation measures.**

Indicator	Risk rating (Low or Specified)	
	Producer	CB
1.1.1	Low	Low
1.1.2	Low	Low
1.1.3	Low	Low
1.2.1	Low	Low
1.3.1	Low	Low
1.4.1	Low	Low
1.5.1	Low	Low
1.6.1	Low	Low
2.1.1	Low	Low
2.1.2	Low	Low
2.1.3	Low	Low
2.2.1	Low	Low
2.2.2	Low	Low
2.2.3	Low	Low
2.2.4	Low	Low
2.2.5	Low	Low
2.2.6	Low	Low
2.2.7	Low	Low
2.2.8	Low	Low
2.2.9	Low	Low
2.3.1	Low	Low
2.3.2	Low	Low

Indicator	Risk rating (Low or Specified)	
	Producer	CB
2.3.3	Low	Low
2.4.1	Low	Low
2.4.2	Low	Low
2.4.3	Low	Low
2.5.1	Low	Low
2.5.2	Low	Low
2.6.1	Low	Low
2.7.1	Low	Low
2.7.2	Low	Low
2.7.3	Low	Low
2.7.4	Low	Low
2.7.5	Low	Low
2.8.1	Low	Low
2.9.1	Low	Low
2.9.2	Low	Low
2.10.1	Low	Low

## 9 Review of Company's mitigation measures

Risk mitigation measures are related to the following biomass supply risk categories:

- Identification of the signs of forest biotopes and natural forest biotopes of European significance,
- Protection of identified forest biotopes and natural forest biotopes of European significance,
- Mitigation of work protection and work safety risks.

The inspections process:

- Inspections are performed selectively for suppliers who supply SBP compliant feedstock,
- After supplier evaluation, a decision is taken on further wood supply. The suppliers that refuse to cooperate with SIA PATA in compliance of the SBP requirements may be excluded from the list of suppliers.

SIA PATA gather opinion of forestry sector experts and specialists and create additional informative materials in order to better inform suppliers with SBP-compliant feedstock supply conditions and potential risks, thus reducing delivery risks of feedstock that is not compliant with SBP standards.

General description of risk mitigation system :

- The purchase of PEFC or FSC certified wood as priority for procurement of SBP-compliant biomass (100% PEFC, FSC Mix),
- Signing supply contracts and including the conditions of SBP standards for biomass supply, timely identification and reduction of SBP-noncompliant feedstock supply risks,
- Performing biotope risk assessment procedures prior to logging and checking cadastre numbers using the "Biotope Tool" available in different countries: LATBIO database ([http://latbio.lv/MBI/search\\_db](http://latbio.lv/MBI/search_db)) in Latvia; In Estonia forestry related protected areas and species are listed in the Public Forest Registry <http://register.metsad.ee/avalik/> and in Lithuania following databases are used: [www.geoportal.lt](http://www.geoportal.lt) - natural habitats of EU importance, data of State Cadastre for Protected Areas, data of the Cultural Heritage Register; and [www.natura2000info.lt](http://www.natura2000info.lt).

An assessment form is designed where all natural forest biotope structures are included.

- An assessment form is designed where minimal requirements for maintaining work safety in the forest are included.
- Additional informative materials are provided for the biomass suppliers. The objective of informative materials is to teach suppliers to recognize the signs of potential possible biotopes and help to provide work safety requirements at their and service provider companies.

## 10 Non-conformities and observations

*Identify all non-conformities and observations raised/closed during the evaluation (a tabular format below may be used here). Please use as many copies of the table as needed. For each, give details to include at least the following:*

- *applicable requirement(s)*
- *grading of the non-conformity (major or minor) or observation with supporting rationale*
- *timeframe for resolution of the non-conformity*
- *a statement as to whether the non-conformity is likely to impact upon the integrity of the affected SBP-certified products and the credibility of the SBP trademarks.*

<b>NC number 1</b>	<b>NC Grading: Minor</b>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Framework Standard 4: 6.3.1
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>	
During the FMU assessment of supplier PATA Strenci Health and Safety aspects in regard to working in the forest were not fully compliant. The monitoring system to maintain compliance with the Health and Safety requirements of Suppliers and their contractors is not fully working.	
<b>Timeline for Conformance:</b>	By the next surveillance audit, but no later than 12 months from report finalisation date
<b>Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:</b>	<i>Click or tap here to enter description provided by Company to close the NC.</i>
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	<i>Click or tap here to enter findings for evaluation of evidence by the auditor.</i>
<b>NC Status:</b>	Open

<b>NC number 2</b>	<b>NC Grading: Major</b>
<b>Standard &amp; Requirement:</b>	SBP Framework Standard 1, 2.7
<b>Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:</b>	
Mitigation measure for Supply Base of Estonia is described, reference and access to the public database available, but as this database will not cover all of the potential Woodland Key Habitat places this is not enough to reduce the risk to low level.	
<b>Timeline for Conformance:</b>	Other Prior to expansion of scope to include SBP Standard 1 in scope
<b>Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:</b>	Evidence submitted and reviewed include: training record for relevant positions, WKH database for Estonia, updated supply base report, updated procedures for checking for woodland key habitats in Estonia.
<b>Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:</b>	Evidence submitted and reviewed include: training record for relevant positions, WKH database for Estonia, updated supply base report, updated procedures for checking for woodland key habitats in Estonia. Reviewed the evidence, which now includes the FSC WKH database and procedures specify the process for checking for WKH in Estonia. Evidence is sufficient to close CAR.
<b>NC Status:</b>	Closed

NC number 3	NC Grading: Minor
Standard & Requirement:	Instruction Document 5B 6.2.5
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
In SAR Template under Part 3 – Storage, handling and trans-shipment part not correct information (metric tonnes) was recorded. Quantity of biomass handled at the different storage, handling and trans-shipment locations: not recorded in metric tonnes. Energy usage data: not recorded in liters per metric tonnes	
Timeline for Conformance:	Other 12 months from report certification decision date or before submission to SBP approval
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	Revised SAR
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	The missing information has been added to the Sar and a revised version submitted to and reviewed by SCS. CAR is closed.
NC Status:	Closed

## 11 Certification decision

<b>Based on the auditor's recommendation and the Certification Body's quality review, the following certification decision is taken:</b>	
<b>Certification decision:</b>	Certification approved
<b>Certification decision by (name of the person):</b>	Sebastian Häfele
<b>Date of decision:</b>	01/Nov/2018
<b>Other comments:</b>	Certification decision updated November 5, 2018 upon closure of Major CARs. Expansion of scope to include SBP Standard 1 is approved.