



SCS Global Services Evaluation of Enviva Pellets Greenwood, LLC Compliance with the SBP Framework: Public Summary Report

Re-assessment

www.sbp-cert.org



The promise of good biomass



Table of Contents

- 1 Overview**
- 2 Scope of the evaluation and SBP certificate**
 - 2.1 Description of the company
 - 2.2 Detailed description of the Chain of Custody system
- 3 Specific objective**
- 4 Evaluation process**
 - 4.1 Timing of evaluation activities
 - 4.2 Description of evaluation activities
 - 4.3 Sampling methodology
 - 4.4 CB stakeholder engagement
 - 4.5 Stakeholder feedback
- 5 Results**
 - 5.1 Main strengths and weaknesses
 - 5.2 Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation
 - 5.3 Collection and communication of data
 - 5.4 Competency of involved personnel
- 6 Review of company's risk assessments**
 - 6.1 Overview of company's risk assessments and mitigation measures
 - 6.2 Specified risk indicators and mitigation measures
- 7 Non-conformities and observations**
- 8 Certification decision**

1 Overview

Certification Body (CB) Name: SCS Global Services

Primary CB contact for SBP: Maggie Shwartz

Primary CB contact email: mschwartz@scsglobalservices.com

Audit team leader: Kyle Meister

Audit team members: Evan Poirson, Shannon Wilk

Name of the Company: Enviva Pellets Greenwood, LLC

Company legal address: 7200 Wisconsin Ave. Suite 1000, 20814 Bethesda, MD, United States

Company contact for SBP: Don Grant

Company contact email: don.grant@envivabiomass.com

Company website: N/A

SBP Certificate Code: SBP-04-25

Date of certificate issue: 30 Nov 2016

Date of certificate expiry: 29 Nov 2021

Audit closing meeting date: 09 Apr 2021

Audit cycle: Re-assessment

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	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 1.3	<input type="checkbox"/>
Includes Supply Base Evaluation (SBE):	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Includes communication of Dynamic Batch Sustainability Data (DBSD)	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Includes Group Scheme	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Products	Pellets	<input type="checkbox"/>

Feedstock types:	Primary, Secondary	<input type="checkbox"/>
Feedstock origin (countries):	United States	<input type="checkbox"/>
SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessments used:	Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public link: https://sbp-cert.org/documents/standards-documents/risk-assessments/		<input type="checkbox"/>
Chain of custody system implemented:	PEFC, SFI, FSC: SCS-COC-006588, SCS-PEFC/COC-006588, SCS-SFI/COC-006588, SCS-SFI/COC-005306, SCS-PEFC/COC-005306, SCS-SFI/FS-007183	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Credit	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.1 Description of the company

Enviva Holdings, LP (“Enviva”) owns and operates several plants in the southeastern United States. In March 2018, Enviva acquired the Greenwood facility from another company. Enviva Pellets Greenwood, LLC. employs 75-100 people, including technicians, engineers, and operators. Most feedstock is sourced as roundwood with additional woodchips (green) and sawdust being purchased. Bark from the roundwood is used as energy in the dryer. Additional bark is purchased to fully power the dryer.

2.2 Detailed description of the Chain of Custody system

As applicable, all material is subject to the organization’s COC procedures for sourcing certified and non-certified material. The organization sources material from certified sources under its valid COC certificate(s) per the following systems: FSC PEFC and/or SFI. As applicable, any non-certified sources have been evaluated under the BP’s COC Due Diligence System (DDS) or Controlled Wood procedures, as well an SBE and/or duly approved Regional Risk Assessment.

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 over scope of certification.

The following Critical Control Points (CCPs) were identified and evaluated:

CCP

Description, including how evaluated by SCS

All wood delivered to the mill is tracked in a centralized system. Prior to delivery of round-wood, in-woods chips, residual chips and saw dust to the scale house, the owner name, district of origin (Lat/Long), product type, etc. are obtained from the supplier. All vendors are required to execute a Master Wood Purchase Agreement with specific terms and conditions.

Processes for procurement and processing, transport and storage

Roundwood is processed into wood pellets by being chipped, dried, hammered, and extruded into pellets and the bark is used as boiler fuel. In woods chips and secondary residuals are hammered and pelletized. The conversion factors used to allocate the Roundwood, thinning, in-wood chips and secondary residuals into pellets are reasonable.

Volume accounting method

This CCP was confirmed via review of COC procedures and records (e.g., credit ledger, supplier records), and risk assessments (e.g., DDS, SBE, FSC-US NRA), remote inspection of the pellet mill facility, and interviews with relevant staff. Procedures detail the process to properly maintain the volume credit spreadsheet, with provisions for subtracting certified product sold and for carrying only the past 12 months of credits. This CCP was confirmed via review of COC procedures and records (e.g., credit ledger, supplier records, DTS transaction records), and interviews with staff.

Documentation of transactions

Invoices are issued, and all outgoing transactions of SBP-certified biomass are recorded in the DTS. This CCP was confirmed via review of COC procedures and records (e.g., credit ledger, supplier records, DTS transaction records), and interviews with staff.

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. This CCP was confirmed via review of the SAR, fuel/utility records, and calculations.

4 Evaluation process

4.1 Timing of evaluation activities

<i>Audit Level of Effort (LoE)</i>		
Activity	Auditors	Auditor hours
1. Preparation	Kyle Meister, Evan Poirson, and Shannon Wilks	2,0
2. On-site (excl. travel time)	Kyle Meister and Evan Poirson	16,0
3. Report writing	Kyle Meister, Evan Poirson, and Shannon Wilks	4,0
4. Other	Shannon Wilks	8,0

Audit Schedule			
Activity	Location	Auditor name	Date/time
<i>Refer to description below</i>	Refer to description below	Refer to description below	01 Apr 2021/Below

Auditor qualification		
Auditor name	Role	Qualification
Kyle Meister	Lead auditor	Lead SBP, lead PEFC FM and COC, lead SFI FM and COC, and lead FSC FM and COC auditor.

Evan Poirson	Trainee	Trainee SBP, lead FSC FM and COC auditor.
Shannon Wilks	Technical expert	Lead SBP, lead PEFC FM and COC, lead SFI FM and COC, and lead FSC FM and COC auditor.

4.2 Description of evaluation activities

As auditor Poirson was a trainee, he shadowed the lead auditor on all activities. Auditor Wilks served as technical expert for ST 1 field visits and consulted with the lead auditor on any findings.

Site Name or Location:	Greenwood: 200 Enviva Way, Greenwood, South Carolina 29646	
Date and Time of Audit:	1 April 2021 (11 am EST): opening meeting, review of audit scopes, initial document/interview requests, selection of ICT, and scheduling of remote inspections for sites listed below.	
Audit Activity	Items to Review / Actions	Approx. Time
Opening meeting	Introductions, auditor review of audit scope, audit plan and intro/update to SBP, FSC, and SCS standards and protocols, client description of organization	90 min
Review of previous nonconformities	Review of evidence of corrective actions taken by organization since previous audit (records, documents, pictures, etc.)	
Review of CoC/SBP procedures, products and material accounting	Written procedures, work instructions, feedstock description, product group list, accounting system (transfer, percentage or credit; physical separation, percentage method)	60 min
Review of material balances and	Auditor-selected sample of the following: material tracking system, summary of purchases and	90 min

records	sales, invoices, shipping documents, training records, outsourcing agreements, other applicable SBP/CoC systems, procedures and records, tracebacks from certified outputs to eligible inputs	
Verification of calculations	Auditor-selected sample and verification of calculations for conversion factors, percentage claims, and credit accounts, as applicable	60 min
SBP ST 5, ID5E	Review of GHG data collection, including SAR, DTS, GHG data collection and interviews with relevant staff	5 hours
Evaluation of trademarks	Review of auditor-selected sample of SBP/FSC/PEFC and/or SCS on-product and/or promotional trademark uses; review of any on-site trademark uses such as banners, posters, entryway signs	30 min
Secondary/Tertiary Supplier Interviews	Cottondale: Agenda Review (2 Secondary Suppliers; 2 Tertiary Suppliers) Greenwood: Agenda Review (2 Secondary Supplier)	Approx. 15 min per call
Walkthrough of facility	Review of physical inputs and outputs, material receipt, processing, storage, credit account (if applicable), sale, and overall control	60 min
Staff interviews	Interviews with appropriate number and diversity of staff to assess knowledge of CoC procedures related to their position	90 min
Closing meeting preparation	Auditor takes time to consolidate notes and review audit findings for presentation at closing meeting	60 min
On-Site Audit Requirements	SBP ST 1-Primary harvest sites-(Greenwood: 3 Sites Selected)	Refer to separate itinerary (no findings issued during field inspection)
Primary Site Visits		
Closing meeting and review of findings	Convene with all relevant staff to summarize audit findings, review identified nonconformities, and discuss next steps	60 min
Site Name or Location:	Enviva Pellets Greenwood, LLC.	
Date and Time of Audit:	April 22, 2021; 8:00 AM	
Audit Activity	Items to Review / Actions	Approx. Start Time
Opening meeting:		
Conducted at 1st Field Stop (Outdoors)	Introductions, auditor review of audit scope, audit plan and intro/update to SCS standards and protocols, client description of organization	8:00 AM
Field Site Inspections	Logistic Plan to be Prepared in Advance. Sites listed are not in logistical order, but listed as	

reference only.

1. Edgefield Co, SC

2. Edgefield Co, SC

3. Greenwood Co, SC

Staff interviews

*(Conducted during
Field Site
Inspections)*

Interviews with appropriate number and diversity of staff and contractors to assess knowledge of SBP/BMP procedures related to their position or job function.

Closing meeting preparation

Auditor takes time to consolidate notes and review audit findings for presentation at closing meeting

Closing meeting and review of findings

Convene with all relevant staff to summarize audit findings, review identified nonconformities, and discuss next steps

4:00 PM

End

4.3 Sampling methodology

Supplier audits: Primary supplier FMUs visited: 3 Secondary/Tertiary supplier interviews: 1/0 (BP does not source tertiary feedstock) Supplier sampling is determined using SCS sampling method. Audit teams ensure to sample across the variety of forest ecosystems and/or feedstocks from which the organization sources, including by selecting different land ownership/management (e.g., small, public, private, etc.), harvesting types (thinning, final harvest), and feedstock type (primary, secondary, tertiary, hardwood, softwood, etc.).

4.4 CB stakeholder engagement

SCS relies on its Master Stakeholder List, which contains interested parties such as stakeholders and/or rightsholders that are identified by type (e.g. ENGO, Government/regulatory, Educational/Academic, Industry, Indigenous/Aboriginal/Tribal, etc.) This list is categorized by country and state/province/territory at the very least, and for this consultation was filtered to omit any interested parties that were not geographically relevant to the certificate holder/applicant's supply base. A notification is sent out to all identified interested parties after the BP's consultation period has ended. Comments from interested parties that are received outside of regular consultation periods are fully considered. Methods used to communicate with interested parties may include, but are not limited to, public, private or semi-private meetings, email, telephone, written correspondence, and/or messaging application.

Consultation that may have been conducted by the BP during the audit period may be described in the BP's SBR. Sometimes, formal and informal consultation may not be documented in the BP's SBR due to confidentiality concerns of interested parties.

The following consultation activities occurred as a part of this audit:

- Consultation has been conducted by SCS Global Services.
- Consultation has been conducted by SCS Global Services, but interested parties did not respond to any communications and/or did not provide permission to include comments in the report.
- No consultation has been conducted by SCS Global Services.

4.5 Stakeholder feedback

Consultation has been conducted by SCS Global Services, but interested parties did not respond to any communications and/or did not provide permission to include comments in the report.

5 Results

5.1 Main strengths and weaknesses

Strengths

- GHG data collection and calculation systems are consistently implemented.
- The Track & Trace system ensures a high level of transparency in the supply chain, including via the BP's own evaluation of supplier FMUs.

Weaknesses

Refer to section audit findings.

5.2 Rigour of Supply Base Evaluation

Is the current definition of scope adequate for the specific characteristics of the Supply Base and management systems in place?

Yes No

Are the means of verification and evidence provided enough to support the risk conclusion?

Yes No

Are mitigation measures implemented for specified risk sufficient and adequate?

Yes No NA, no mitigation measures necessary

Are the personnel involved in the development of the Supply Base Evaluation (SBE) knowledgeable in the required fields?

Yes No

Refer to findings section for any deficiencies noted in the SBE.

5.3 Collection and communication of data

Enviva Pellets Greenwood has a comprehensive database where all Greenhouse Gas data is compiled and maintained. All compilation is conducted by personnel at Enviva corporate in Bethesda, MD. Records and data are maintained separately for each facility under the Enviva umbrella. For Enviva Pellets Greenwood, energy use is invoiced by the month and requires adjustment to match the reporting period for electricity. Other energy use, diesel and natural gas, does not require adjustments.

5.4 Competency of involved personnel

The initial Supply Base Evaluation (SBE) was conducted by a well-known Forestry Program Certification Consultant in consultation with key Company employees. The Company has since maintained and updated the SBE using its own staff expertise. The Company's management and control systems for SBP are the

same as those used to meet the PEFC/FSC Chain of Custody, FSC Controlled Wood and the SFI Fiber Sourcing requirements. Key personnel tasked with implementing the Company's management and control systems relating to SBP compliance are well trained and competent, with strengths in markets, silviculture, management, harvesting, and conservation issues. Their knowledge of SBP requirements is strong. This is a new standard, so any relevant experience is limited to the pre-existing CoC and Controlled Wood standards.

The updated Supply Base Evaluation was conducted by Enviva Sustainability personnel who has local forestry experience and knowledge of ecological and social values associated with the supply base, applicable laws and regulations, business management practices, operation of suppliers, and the local forest resource. Enviva's management and control systems for SBP are the same as those used to meet the SFI/PEFC CoC, which have been in place since 2012. Key personnel tasked with implementing and maintaining the management and control systems relating to SBP compliance are well trained and competent. Enviva assigned management with appropriate skills and competency to implement and execute the management and control systems relating to SBP compliance. Management interviewed during the assessment were found to be knowledgeable of the SBP requirements. Interviews and desk audit with corporate personnel confirmed knowledge of GHG data requirements and accurate management of data.

6 Review of company's risk assessments

6.1 Overview of company's risk assessments and mitigation measures

Review of the SBE designated all core indicators as low, except 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4 and 2.4.1. Risk ratings were determined by reviewing the SBE, SBR and other supporting evidence such as Feedstock Compliance Implementation Manual, Controlled Wood Controlled Source Risk Assessment, Chain of Custody Procedures, supplier agreements and verification through field visits and interviews. No SVP is required.

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

Risk rating			Risk rating		
Indicator	(Low or Specified)		Indicator	(Low or Specified)	
Producer	CB		Producer	CB	
1.1.1	Low	Low	2.3.3	Low	Low
1.1.2	Low	Low	2.4.1	Specified	Specified
1.1.3	Low	Low	2.4.2	Low	Low
1.2.1	Low	Low	2.4.3	Low	Low
1.3.1	Low	Low	2.5.1	Low	Low
1.4.1	Low	Low	2.5.2	Low	Low
1.5.1	Low	Low	2.6.1	Low	Low
1.6.1	Low	Low	2.7.1	Low	Low
2.1.1	Specified	Specified	2.7.2	Low	Low
2.1.2	Specified	Specified	2.7.3	Low	Low
2.1.3	Low	Low	2.7.4	Low	Low
2.2.1	Low	Low	2.7.5	Low	Low
2.2.2	Low	Low	2.8.1	Low	Low
2.2.3	Specified	Specified	2.9.1	Low	Low
2.2.4	Specified	Specified	2.9.2	Low	Low
2.2.5	Low	Low	2.10.1	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			

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

Risk rating		Risk rating			
Indicator	(Low or Specified)	Indicator	(Low or Specified)		
Producer	CB	Producer	CB		
1.1.1	Low	Low	2.3.3	Low	Low
1.1.2	Low	Low	2.4.1	Low	Low
1.1.3	Low	Low	2.4.2	Low	Low
1.2.1	Low	Low	2.4.3	Low	Low
1.3.1	Low	Low	2.5.1	Low	Low
1.4.1	Low	Low	2.5.2	Low	Low
1.5.1	Low	Low	2.6.1	Low	Low
1.6.1	Low	Low	2.7.1	Low	Low
2.1.1	Low	Low	2.7.2	Low	Low
2.1.2	Low	Low	2.7.3	Low	Low
2.1.3	Low	Low	2.7.4	Low	Low
2.2.1	Low	Low	2.7.5	Low	Low
2.2.2	Low	Low	2.8.1	Low	Low
2.2.3	Low	Low	2.9.1	Low	Low
2.2.4	Low	Low	2.9.2	Low	Low
2.2.5	Low	Low	2.10.1	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			

6.2 Specified risk indicators and mitigation measures

Country/Area	Indicator	Specified risk description	Mitigation measure
United States	2.1.1 The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that forests and other areas with high conservation	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. Enviva is using the FSC US CWNRA as the baseline for determining potential areas of high conservation value. Additional work with interested and engaged stakeholders (see	<p>Enviva uses contractual language in its Master Wood Purchase Agreement requiring supplier to abide by all relevant laws and regulations. The contract includes the requirement to avoid the following unacceptable sources wood:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Illegally harvest wood;

	<p>value in the Supply Base are identified and mapped.</p>	<p>Section 6) has been incorporated into the supply base evaluation to supplement Enviva's ability to accurately map areas of high conservation value Use of FSC US CWNRA and stakeholder engagement to develop appropriate maps of high conservation value areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Wood harvested in violation of traditional and civil rights; · Wood harvested from forests where high conservation values are threatened by management activities; · Wood harvested from old growth or semi-natural forests being converted to plantations or non-forest use; · Wood from forests where genetically modified trees are planted; · Wood in which there was a violation of the ILO Declaration on fundamental principle and rights at work. <p>Enviva requires all suppliers to sign an annual Master Wood Supply Agreement. The Agreement requires suppliers to abide by forest management activities regulations.</p> <p>Enviva requires all suppliers to sign an annual Master Wood Supply Agreement. The Agreement requires suppliers to avoid feedstock sources from land use change.</p> <p>Enviva uses its Tract Approval process and District of Origin process to assess feedstock purchases conformance to these indicators</p>
<p>United States</p>	<p>2.1.2 The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to identify and address potential</p>	<p>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. Related to 2.1.1 Enviva's use of the FSC US CWNRA and stakeholder engagement has adequately</p>	<p>Enviva uses contractual language in its Master Wood Purchase Agreement requiring supplier to abide by all relevant laws and regulations. The contract includes the requirement to avoid the following unacceptable sources wood:</p>

	<p>threats to forests and other areas with high conservation values from forest management activities.</p>	<p>identified areas of high conservation value. Enviva has robust management systems that can address these areas of specified risk and manage the outcome to low risk Use of FSC US CWNRA and stakeholder engagement to develop appropriate maps of high conservation value areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Illegally harvest wood; · Wood harvested in violation of traditional and civil rights; · Wood harvested from forests where high conservation values are threatened by management activities; · Wood harvested from old growth or semi-natural forests being converted to plantations or non-forest use; · Wood from forests where genetically modified trees are planted; · Wood in which there was a violation of the ILO Declaration on fundamental principle and rights at work. <p>Enviva requires all suppliers to sign an annual Master Wood Supply Agreement. The Agreement requires suppliers to abide by forest management activities regulations.</p> <p>Enviva requires all suppliers to sign an annual Master Wood Supply Agreement. The Agreement requires suppliers to avoid feedstock sources from land use change.</p> <p>Enviva uses its Tract Approval process and District of Origin process to assess feedstock purchases conformance to these indicators.</p>
<p>United States</p>	<p>2.2.3 The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and</p>	<p>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).</p>	<p>Enviva uses contractual language in its Master Wood Purchase Agreement requiring supplier to abide by all relevant laws and</p>

	<p>procedures to ensure that key ecosystems and habitats are conserved or set aside in their natural state (CPET S8b).</p>	<p>Related to 2.1.1 Enviva's use of the FSC US CWNRA and stakeholder engagement has adequately identified areas of key ecosystems and habitats. Additionally, Enviva's Forest Conservation Fund provides grant monies to successful applicant to help them set aside or conserve forests containing high conservation values, key ecosystems and habitats. Further, Enviva's ongoing engagement with interested stakeholders has extended our reach into additional areas of conservation (See section 6). Enviva has robust management systems that can address these areas of specified risk and manage the outcome to low risk.</p>	<p>regulations. The contract includes the requirement to avoid the following unacceptable sources wood: (items related to this indicator are underlined)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Illegally harvest wood; · Wood harvested in violation of traditional and civil rights; · Wood harvested from forests where high conservation values are threatened by management activities; · Wood harvested from old growth or semi-natural forests being converted to plantations or non-forest use; · Wood from forests were genetically modified trees are planted; · Wood in which there was a violation of the ILO Declarations on fundamental principle and rights at work. <p>The Master Wood Purchase Agreement requires suppliers to avoid key ecosystems and habitats such as old growth forests and forest that could be threatened by forest management activities.</p> <p>The Enviva Forest Conservation Fund, a \$5 million, 10-year program sponsored by Enviva and administered by the U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities, is designed to protect tens of thousands of acres of sensitive bottomland forests in the Virginia-North Carolina coastal plain. The Enviva Forest Conservation Fund will award matching-fund grants to non-profit organizations to permanently</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>protect ecologically sensitive areas and preserve working forests. (http://envivaforestfund.org/). In the first four years we have committed \$1,935,000 to seventeen projects that will protect approximately 24,881 acres of ecologically sensitive areas, while managing many of those acres to conserve working forests. The committed \$1.9M up to this point is estimated to have helped leverage over \$32M in conservation funding to date.</p> <p>Enviva uses its Tract Approval process and District of Origin process to assess feedstock purchases conformance to these indicators.</p>
United States	2.2.4 The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to ensure that biodiversity is protected (CPET S5b).	Related to 2.1.1 Enviva's use of the FSC US CWNRA and stakeholder engagement has adequately identified areas of key ecosystems and habitats. Additionally, Enviva's Forest Conservation Fund provides grant monies to successful applicant to help them set aside or conserve forests containing high conservation values, key ecosystems and habitats. Further, Enviva's ongoing engagement with interested stakeholders has extended our reach into additional areas of conservation (See section 6). Enviva has robust management systems that can address these areas of specified risk and manage the outcome to low risk.	<p>Enviva uses contractual language in its Master Wood Purchase Agreement requiring supplier to abide by all relevant laws and regulations. The contract includes the requirement to avoid the following unacceptable sources wood: (items related to this indicator are underlined)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · <u>Illegally harvest wood;</u> · <u>Wood harvested in violation of traditional and civil rights;</u> · <u>Wood harvested from forests where high conservation values are threatened by management activities;</u> · <u>Wood harvested from old growth or semi-natural forests being converted to plantations or non-forest use;</u> · <u>Wood from forests were genetically modified trees are planted;</u>

			<p>· Wood in which there was a violation of the ILO Declarations on fundamental principle and rights at work.</p> <p>The Master Wood Purchase Agreement requires suppliers to avoid key ecosystems and habitats such as old growth forests and forest that could be threatened by forest management activities.</p> <p>The Enviva Forest Conservation Fund, a \$5 million, 10-year program sponsored by Enviva and administered by the U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities, is designed to protect tens of thousands of acres of sensitive bottomland forests in the Virginia-North Carolina coastal plain. The Enviva Forest Conservation Fund will award matching-fund grants to non-profit organizations to permanently protect ecologically sensitive areas and preserve working forests. (http://envivaforestfund.org/). In the first four years we have committed \$1,935,000 to seventeen projects that will protect approximately 24,881 acres of ecologically sensitive areas, while managing many of those acres to conserve working forests. The committed \$1.9M up to this point is estimated to have helped leverage over \$32M in conservation funding to date.</p> <p>Enviva uses its Tract Approval process and District of Origin process to assess feedstock purchases conformance to these indicators.</p>
United States	2.4.1 The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and	2.4.1 The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that the health, vitality and other services provided by forest ecosystems are maintained or improved	<p>Enviva uses contractual language in its Master Wood Purchase Agreement requiring supplier to abide by all relevant laws and</p>

	<p>procedures for verifying that the health, vitality and other services provided by forest ecosystems are maintained or improved (CPET S7a).</p>	<p>(CPET S7a). Related to 2.1.1 Enviva's use of the FSC US CWNRA and stakeholder engagement has adequately identified key forest ecosystems. Additionally, Enviva's Forest Conservation Fund provides grant monies to successful applicant to help them set aside or conserve forests containing high conservation values, key ecosystems and habitats. Further, Enviva's ongoing engagement with interested stakeholders has extended our reach into additional areas of conservation (See section 6) Enviva has robust management systems that can address these areas of specified risk and manage the outcome to low risk.</p>	<p>regulations. The contract includes the requirement to avoid the following unacceptable sources wood: (items related to this indicator are underlined)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Illegally harvest wood; · Wood harvested in violation of traditional and civil rights; · Wood harvested from forests where high conservation values are threatened by management activities; · Wood harvested from old growth or semi-natural forests being converted to plantations or non-forest use; · Wood from forests were genetically modified trees are planted; · Wood in which there was a violation of the ILO Declarations on fundamental principle and rights at work. <p>The Master Wood Purchase Agreement requires suppliers to avoid key ecosystems and habitats such as old growth forests and forest that could be threatened by forest management activities.</p> <p>The Enviva Forest Conservation Fund, a \$5 million, 10-year program sponsored by Enviva and administered by the U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities, is designed to protect tens of thousands of acres of sensitive bottomland forests in the Virginia-North Carolina coastal plain. The Enviva Forest Conservation Fund will award matching-fund grants to non-profit organizations to permanently</p>
--	---	--	--

			<p>protect ecologically sensitive areas and preserve working forests. (http://envivaforestfund.org/). In the first four years we have committed \$1,935,000 to seventeen projects that will protect approximately 24,881 acres of ecologically sensitive areas, while managing many of those acres to conserve working forests. The committed \$1.9M up to this point is estimated to have helped leverage over \$32M in conservation funding to date.</p> <p>Enviva uses its Tract Approval process and District of Origin process to assess feedstock purchases conformance to these indicators.</p>
--	--	--	---

7 Non-conformities and observations

NC number NC-000242	NC Grading: Minor
Standard:	Instruction Document 5E: Collection and Communication of Energy and Carbon Data 1.4
Requirement:	6.2.5 If the total number of days that the data relates to is not exactly the same as the Reporting Period (e.g. because of meter readings, or inventory/invoicing periods) an adjustment to match the data to the Reporting Period shall be made (e.g. using a simple proportional relationship). Whatever method is used it shall be recorded in the SAR.
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
Since electricity invoices overlap two months (e.g., Dec. 21-Jan 11), the BP calculates the average daily kWh for the first and last month of the reporting period. This average is then multiplied by the number of days within the reporting period for that month's invoice. The method is not described in the SAR, section 3.2. Evidence: SAR, section 3.2, and electricity calculations	
Timeline for Conformance:	Other
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	Section 3.2.1 now includes information on how electricity was calculated for the reporting period due to overlap of the first and last month with other years.
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	The language was confirmed in section 3.2.1 of the SAR.
NC Status:	Closed

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):	Theodore Brauer
Date of decision:	27 May 2021
Other comments:	N/A