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# Overview

**Producer name:**

**Producer address:**

**SBP Certificate Code:**

**Geographic position:**

**Primary contact name:**

**Primary contact phone:**

**Primary contact email:**

**Company website:**

**Date report finalised:**

**Close of last CB audit:**

**Name of CB:**

**SBP Standard(s) used:**

**Weblink to Standard(s) used:** <https://sbp-cert.org/documents/standards-documents/standards>

**SBP Endorsed Regional Risk Assessment**:

**Weblink to SBR on Company website:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Indicate how the current evaluation fits within the cycle of Supply Base Evaluations** |
| **Main (Initial)****Evaluation** | **First****Surveillance** | **Second Surveillance** | **Third****Surveillance** | **Fourth****Surveillance** | **Re-assessment** |
| **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |

# Description of the Supply Base

1.
2.

## General description

**Feedstock types:** [ ]  Primary[ ] Secondary [ ]  Tertiary

**Includes Supply Base evaluation (SBE):** [ ] Yes [ ]  No

**Includes RED II SBE:** [ ] Yes [ ]  No

**Feedstock origin (countries):**

## Description of countries included in the Supply Base

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** |  |
| **Area/Region** |  |
| **Exclusions** |  |
| **Description of the country** |
|  |

*Note: Copy the table above for all countries included in the supply base.*

## Actions taken to promote certification amongst feedstock supplier

*[Add description here]*

## Quantification of the Supply Base

##### Supply Base

1. **Total Supply Base area (million ha)**:
2. **Tenure by type (million ha):**
	1. Privately owned:
	2. Public:
	3. Community concession:
3. **Forest by type (million ha):**
	1. Boreal:
	2. Temperate:
	3. Tropical:
4. **Forest by management type (million ha):**
	1. Plantation:
	2. Managed natural:
	3. Natural:
5. **Certified forest by scheme (million ha):**
	1. FSC:
	2. PEFC:
	3. SFI:
	4. Other (specify):

**Describe the harvesting type which best describes how your material is sourced:**

[ ] Clearcutting [ ]  Thinning [ ]  Mix of the above [ ]  Other [ ]  N/A

**Explanation:**

**Was the forest in the Supply Base managed for a purpose other than for energy markets?**

[ ] Yes – Majority [ ]  Yes – Minority [ ]  No [ ]  N/A

**Explanation:**

**For the forests in the Supply Base, is there an intention to retain, restock or encourage natural regeneration within 5 years of felling?**

[ ] Yes – Majority [ ]  Yes – Minority [ ]  No [ ]  N/A

**Explanation:**

**Was the feedstock used in the biomass removed from a forest as part of a pest/disease control measure or a salvage operation?**

[ ] Yes – Majority [ ]  Yes – Minority [ ]  No [ ]  N/A

**Explanation:**

**What is the estimated amount of REDII-compliant sustainable feedstock that could be harvested annually in a Supply Base (estimated)?**

**Amount:**

**Explanation:**

##### Feedstock

**Reporting period from date:** Click or tap to enter a date.

**Reporting period to date:**Click or tap to enter a date.

1. **Total volume of Feedstock**:

[ ]  0

[ ]  1-200,000

[ ]  200,000-400,000

[ ]  400,000-600,000

[ ]  600,000-800,000

[ ]  800,000-1,000,000

[ ]  >1,000,000

Unit: [ ] m3 [ ] tonnes

1. **Volume of primary feedstoc**k

[ ]  0

[ ]  1-200,000

[ ]  200,000-400,000

[ ]  400,000-600,000

[ ]  600,000-800,000

[ ]  800,000-1,000,000

[ ]  >1,000,000

Unit: [ ] m3 [ ] tonnes

1. **List percentage of primary feedstock, by the following categories.**
	* Certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme:

[ ]  0%

[ ]  1%-19%

[ ]  20%-39%

[ ]  40% -59%

[ ]  60%-79%

[ ]  80-99%

[ ]  100%

* + Not certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme:

[ ]  0%

[ ]  1%-19%

[ ]  20%-39%

[ ]  40% -59%

[ ]  60%-79%

[ ]  80-99%

[ ]  100%

1. **List of all the species in primary feedstock, including scientific name:**:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Common name** | **Scientific name** |
| *Example: Black alder* | *Alnus glutinosa* |
|  |  |
|  |  |

*Note: add as many rows as needed*

1. **Is any of the feedstock used likely to have come from protected or threatened species?**

[ ]  Yes [ ]  No

Name of species:

Biomass proportion, by weight, that is likely to be composed of that species:

1. **Hardwood (i.e. broadleaf trees): specify proportion of biomass from (%):**
2. **Softwood (i.e. coniferous trees): specify proportion of biomass from (%):**
3. **Proportion of biomass composed of or derived from saw logs (%):**
4. **Specify the local regulations or industry standards that define saw logs:**
5. **Roundwood from final fellings from forests with > 40 yr rotation times - Average % volume of fellings delivered to BP (%):**
6. **Volume of primary feedstock from primary forest:**

Unit: [ ] m3 [ ] tonnes

1. **List percentage of primary feedstock from primary forest, by the following categories. Subdivide by SBP-approved Forest Management Schemes**:
	* [ ]  N/A
	* Primary feedstock from primary forest certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme:

[ ]  0%

[ ]  1%-19%

[ ]  20%-39%

[ ]  40% -59%

[ ]  60%-79%

[ ]  80-99%

[ ]  100%

* Primary feedstock from primary forest not certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme:

[ ]  0%

[ ]  1%-19%

[ ]  20%-39%

[ ]  40% -59%

[ ]  60%-79%

[ ]  80-99%

[ ]  100%

1. **Volume of secondary feedstock**:

[ ]  0

[ ]  1-200,000

[ ]  200,000-400,000

[ ]  400,000-600,000

[ ]  600,000-800,000

[ ]  800,000-1,000,000

[ ]  >1,000,000

Unit: [ ] m3 [ ] tonnes

 Physical form of the feedstock:

[ ]  Chips

[ ]  Sawdust

[ ]  Offcuts

[ ]  Clean chips or dust

[ ]  Treated chips or dust

[ ]  Other (specify):

1. **Volume of tertiary feedstock**:

[ ]  0

[ ]  1-200,000

[ ]  200,000-400,000

[ ]  400,000-600,000

[ ]  600,000-800,000

[ ]  800,000-1,000,000

[ ]  >1,000,000

Unit: [ ] m3 [ ] tonnes

 Physical form of the feedstock:

[ ]  Shavings

[ ]  Sawdust (dry)

[ ]  Offcuts

[ ]  Other (specify):

1. **Estimated amount of REDII-compliant sustainable feedstock that could be collected annually by the BP:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Proportion of feedstock sourced per type of claim during the reporting period** |
| **Feedstock type** | **SBE %** | **FSC %** | **PEFC %** | **SFI %**  |
| Primary |  |  |  |  |
| Secondary |  |  |  |  |
| Tertiary |  |  |  |  |

*Note: Sum of each row for feedstock types used has to be 100%*

# Requirement for a Supply Base Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SBE completed** | **SBE not completed** |
| **☐** | **☐** |

**Explanation:***Provide a concise summary of why a SBE was determined to be required or not require here.*

**Is REDII SBE completed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RED II SBE completed** | **RED II SBE not completed** |
| **☐** | **☐** |

*Note: If RED II SBE is completed, Annex 2 shall be filled in.*

**Explanation:**

# Supply Base Evaluation

1.
2.

## Scope

**Feedstock types included in SBE:** [ ]  Primary[ ] Secondary [ ]  Tertiary

**SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessments used**:

**List of countries and regions included in the SBE:**

**Detailed description of specified risk indicators:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Country:** |
| **Indicator with specified risk in the risk assessment used:** |
|  |
| **Specific risk description**: |
|  |

*Note: Copy this table for each specified risk and country separately.*

## Justification

*Provide a justification for the approach used in the evaluation.*

## Results of risk assessment and Supplier Verification Programme

*Give a brief summary of the results of the Risk Assessment and SVP.*

## Conclusion

*Give a concise summary of the overall conclusions from the SBE as to whether the organisation meets SBP requirements. This summary should include a discussion of the main strengths and weaknesses of the supply base evaluation, and a statement about the confidence that the evaluators have that the Biomass Producer can ensure that all specified feedstock are in full compliance with SBP Standards.*

# Supply Base Evaluation process

*Give a general description of the process for Supply Base Evaluation including any relevant consultations with stakeholders. Specify whether the SBE was performed ‘in house’ or whether an external party was contracted to perform the SBE. If the latter, give a full description of the competencies of the contracted party that includes a justification for the appointment of personnel to the evaluation team.*

*Although not required by SBP, it is likely that the verification system will also include a sampling plan for assessing forest operations within the Supply Base. If such a plan has been developed for monitoring suppliers, it should be described here.*

#  Stakeholder consultation

*Give a general description of the process of Stakeholder Consultation, including stakeholders contacted and method of communication.*

1.
2.

## Response to stakeholder comments

*Provide a summary of all stakeholder comments received and how the comments were taken into consideration in the SBE process.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Stakeholder description:** |
|  |
| **Stakeholder comment:** |
|  |
| **Response to the stakeholder comment:** |
|  |

*Note: Please copy this table for each individual comment received separately.*

# Mitigation measures

1.

## Mitigation measures

*Describe any mitigation measures taken to address specified risks associated with Indicators. You may copy the tables entered to 4.1 above and add mitigation measure for each table below.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Country:** |
| **Indicator with specified risk in the risk assessment used:** |
|  |
| **Specific risk description**: |
|  |

**Mitigation measure:**

## Monitoring and outcomes

*Describe how the Indicators are being monitoring and what the outcomes are (if known) from that monitoring.*

# Detailed findings for indicators

Detailed findings for each Indicator are given in Annex 1 in case the Regional Risk Assessment (RRA) is not used.

**Is RRA used?**

[ ]  Yes [ ]  No

# Review of report

1.
2.

## Peer review

*If an external peer review of this report was done prior to finalisation, describe the process that was followed and the competency of the parties involved.*

## Public or additional reviews

*If another type of external review was done prior to finalisation of this report (e.g. publication for comments by stakeholders, NGOs, or other independent third parties), describe the process here.*

# Approval of report

|  |
| --- |
| **Approval of Supply Base Report by senior management** |
| **Report Prepared by:** | ***[name]*** | ***[title]*** | ***[date]*** |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Date** |
| **The undersigned persons confirm that I/we are members of the organisation’s senior management and do hereby affirm that the contents of this evaluation report were duly acknowledged by senior management as being accurate prior to approval and finalisation of the report.**  |
| **Report approved by:** | ***[name]*** | ***[title]*** | ***[date]*** |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Date** |
| **Report approved by:** | ***[name]*** | ***[title]*** | ***[date]*** |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Date** |
| **Report approved by:** | ***[name]*** | ***[title]*** | ***[date]*** |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Date** |

# Annex 1: Detailed findings for Supply Base Evaluation indicators

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **1.1.1** | The Biomass Producer’s Supply Base is defined and mapped. |
| Finding | [Brief description of the rationale behind the outcome, for example reference to determination of low risk at RA, or SVP, the implementation of existing management systems or the implementation of mitigation measures.] |
| Means ofVerification | [Include the Locally Adapted Verifiers] |
| EvidenceReviewed | [Reference to the actual evidence reviewed, e.g. specific maps or documents.] |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure | [Optional comment on the indicator in the context of the SB or a brief description of mitigation measures implemented and actual/planned monitoring of their effectiveness.] |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **1.1.2** | Feedstock can be traced back to the defined Supply Base. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **1.1.3** | The feedstock input profile is described and categorised by the mix of inputs. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **1.2.1** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to ensure that legality of ownership and land use can be demonstrated for the Supply Base. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **1.3.1** | The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to ensure that feedstock is legally harvested and supplied and is in compliance with EUTR legality requirements. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **1.4.1** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to verify that payments for harvest rights and timber, including duties, relevant royalties and taxes related to timber harvesting, are complete and up to date. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **1.5.1** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to verify that feedstock is supplied in compliance with the requirements of CITES. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **1.6.1** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to ensure that feedstock is not sourced from areas where there are violations of traditional or civil rights. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.1.1** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that forests and other areas with high conservation values are identified and mapped. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.1.2** | The Biomass Producer 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. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.1.3** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that feedstock is not sourced from forests converted to production plantation forest or non-forest lands after January 2008. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.2.1** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to verify that feedstock is sourced from forests where there is appropriate assessment of impacts, and planning, implementation and monitoring to minimise them. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.2.2** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that feedstock is sourced from forests where management maintains or improves soil quality (CPET S5b). |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.2.3** | The Biomass Producer 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). |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.2.4** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to ensure that biodiversity is protected (CPET S5b). |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.2.5** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that the process of residue removal minimises harm to ecosystems. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.2.6** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to verify that negative impacts on ground water, surface water and water downstream from forest management are minimised (CPET S5b). |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.2.7** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that air quality is not adversely affected by forest management activities. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.2.8** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that there is controlled and appropriate use of chemicals, and that Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is implemented wherever possible in forest management activities (CPET S5c). |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.2.9** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that methods of waste disposal minimise negative impacts on forest ecosystems (CPET S5d). |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.3.1** | Analysis shows that feedstock harvesting does not exceed the long-term production capacity of the forest, avoids significant negative impacts on forest productivity and ensures long-term economic viability. Harvest levels are justified by inventory and growth data. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.3.2** | Adequate training is provided for all personnel, including employees and contractors (CPET S6d). |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.3.3** | Analysis shows that feedstock harvesting and biomass production positively contribute to the local economy, including employment. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.4.1** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that the health, vitality and other services provided by forest ecosystems are maintained or improved (CPET S7a). |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.4.2** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that natural processes, such as fires, pests and diseases are managed appropriately (CPET S7b). |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.4.3** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that there is adequate protection of the forest from unauthorised activities, such as illegal logging, mining and encroachment (CPETS7c). |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.5.1** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that legal, customary and traditional tenure and use rights of indigenous people and local communities related to the forest are identified, documented and respected (CPET S9). |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.5.2** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that production of feedstock does not endanger food, water supply or subsistence means of communities, where the use of this specific feedstock or water is essential for the fulfilment of basic needs. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.6.1** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that appropriate mechanisms are in place for resolving grievances and disputes, including those relating to tenure and use rights, to forest management practices and to work conditions. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.7.1** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that Freedom of Association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining are respected. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.7.2** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that feedstock is not supplied using any form of compulsory labour. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.7.3** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to verify that feedstock is not supplied using child labour. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.7.4** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that feedstock is not supplied using labour which is discriminated against in respect of employment and occupation. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.7.5** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that feedstock is supplied using labour where the pay and employment conditions are fair and meet, or exceed, minimum requirements. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.8.1** | The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that appropriate safeguards are put in place to protect the health and safety of forest workers (CPET S12). |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.9.1** | Biomass is not sourced from areas that had high carbon stocks in January 2008 and no longer have those high carbon stocks. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.9.2** | Analysis demonstrates that feedstock harvesting does not diminish the capability of the forest to act as an effective sink or store of carbon over the long term. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** |
| **2.10.1** | Genetically modified trees are not used. |
| Finding |  |
| Means ofVerification |  |
| EvidenceReviewed |  |
| Risk Rating | **☐ Low Risk ☐ Specified Risk ☐ Unspecified Risk at RA** |
| Comment or Mitigation Measure |  |

# Annex 2: Detailed findings for REDII Supply Base Evaluation indicators (Level B)

*Please copy the table below for each country included in the RED II SBE.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Please add all countries where RED II Supply Base Evaluation is used** |
| **Country** |  |
| **Sustainable harvesting criteria 29(6)** |
| **(i) The legality of harvesting operations** |
| **Type of Risk Assessment used** | [ ] Level A – proof at national or sub-national level[ ] Level B – management system at forest sourcing area level |
| **Level A risk assessment description\*** | * *Level A risk assessment for Germany published by Bundesverband Bioenergie (BBE), the Federal Bioenergy Association.*
* *Level A for Sweden by Skosstyrelsen*
 |
| **Level B management system** **at the level of the forest sourcing area \*** |  |
| **(ii) Forest regeneration of harvested areas** |
| **Type of Risk Assessment used** | [ ] Level A – proof at national or sub-national level[ ] Level B – management system at forest sourcing area level |
| **Level A risk assessment description\*** | * *Level A risk assessment for Germany published by Bundesverband Bioenergie (BBE), the Federal Bioenergy Association.*
* *Level A for Sweden by Skosstyrelsen*
 |
| **Level B management system** **at the level of the forest sourcing area \*** |  |
| **(iii) That areas designated by international or national law or by the relevant competent authority for nature protection purposes, including in wetlands and peatlands, are protected unless evidence is provided that the harvesting of that raw material does not interfere with those nature protection purposes** |
| **Type of Risk Assessment used** | [ ] Level A – proof at national or sub-national level[ ] Level B – management system at forest sourcing area level |
| **Level A risk assessment description\*** | * *Level A risk assessment for Germany published by Bundesverband Bioenergie (BBE), the Federal Bioenergy Association.*
* *Level A for Sweden by Skosstyrelsen*
 |
| **Level B management system** **at the level of the forest sourcing area \*** |  |
| **(iv) That harvesting is carried out considering the maintenance of soil quality and biodiversity with the aim of minimising negative impacts** |
| **Type of Risk Assessment used** | [ ] Level A – proof at national or sub-national level[ ] Level B – management system at forest sourcing area level |
| **Level A risk assessment description\*** | * *Level A risk assessment for Germany published by Bundesverband Bioenergie (BBE), the Federal Bioenergy Association.*
* *Level A for Sweden by Skosstyrelsen*
 |
| **Level B management system** **at the level of the forest sourcing area \*** |  |
| **(v) That harvesting maintains or improves the long-term production capacity of the forest.** |
| **Type of Risk Assessment used** | [ ] Level A – proof at national or sub-national level[ ] Level B – management system at forest sourcing area level |
| **Level A risk assessment description\*** | * *Level A risk assessment for Germany published by Bundesverband Bioenergie (BBE), the Federal Bioenergy Association.*
* *Level A for Sweden by Skosstyrelsen*
 |
| **Level B management system** **at the level of the forest sourcing area \*** |  |
| **LULUCF criteria 29(7)** |
| **Type of Risk Assessment used** | [ ] Level A – proof at national or sub-national level[ ] Level B – management system at forest sourcing area level |
| **Level A risk assessment description\*** | * *Level A risk assessment for Germany published by Bundesverband Bioenergie (BBE), the Federal Bioenergy Association.*
* *Level A for Sweden by Skosstyrelsen*
 |
| **Level B management system** **at the level of the forest sourcing area \*** |  |