Compliance with the SBP Framework: Public Summary Report

SCS Global Services
Evaluation of LJR Forest Products

Re-assessment

Sustainable Biomass Program
sbp-cert.org



Completed in accordance with the CB Public Summary Report Template Version 2.1 and SBP Bridging Requirements for Meeting the Directive EU/2023/2413 (REDIII)

For further information on the SBP Framework and to view the full set of documentation see **www.sbp-cert.org**

Document history

Version 2.0	**Published 10 August 2023**
Version 2.1	Published 21 May 2025

© Copyright Sustainable Biomass Program Limited 2025

Table of contents

1 Overview **3**

2 Audit conclusions **4**

2.1 Certification decision 4
2.2 Open non-conformities and observations 4
2.2 Closed non-conformities 5
2.3 Actions taken by Organisation Prior to Report Finalisation 6
2.4 Notes for the next Audit 6

3 Scope of the audit and SBP certificate **7**

3.1 Description of the company 8
3.2 Site details 8
3.3 Detailed description of the Chain of Custody system and Product Groups 8

4 Specific objective of the audit **9**

5 Evaluation process **10**

5.1 Timing and duration of evaluation activities 10
5.2 Auditor team qualification 10
5.3 Description of evaluation activities 10
5.4 List of forest management units and feedstock suppliers visited 10
5.5 Describe audit sampling methodology used 13
5.6 CB stakeholder engagement 14
5.7 Stakeholder feedback and response 14
5.8 Main strengths and weaknesses of the management system and operations 14
5.9 Summary of evaluation activities for robustness of the Supply Base Evaluation 14
5.10 Summary of evaluation activities for Processing residues and/or Post-consumer feedstock requirements per Standard 2 and EU RED 14
5.11 Summary of evaluation activities for chain of custody system per Standard 4 15
5.12 Summary of evaluation activities for collection and communication of data per Standard 5 15
5.13 Summary of audit findings for competency of involved personnel 15
5.14 Summary of audit findings for GHG methodology per Standard 6 (if applicable) 15

6 Detailed evaluation of BP's Supply Base Evaluation (if applicable) **16**

6.1 Overview of BP's risk assessments and mitigation measures including EU RED scope 16
6.2 CB evaluation of specified risk indicators and mitigation measures 16

1 Overview

Certification Body (CB) Name:	SCS Global Services
Primary CB contact for SBP:	Maggie Schwartz
Primary CB contact email:	mschwartz@scsglobalservices.com
Audit team leader:	Jose Del Castillo
Audit team members:	N/A
Name of the Company:	LJR Forest Products
Company legal address:	1377 Old Nunez Rd., 30401 Swainsboro, United States
Company contact for SBP:	Lige Moore
Company contact email:	ljr04@yahoo.com
Company website:	-
Date of installation:	
SBP Certificate Code:	SBP-04-22
Date of certificate issue:	28 Nov 2026
Date of certificate expiry:	27 Nov 2031
Audit closing meeting date:	19 Aug 2026
Audit cycle:	Re-assessment

2 Audit conclusions

2.1 Certification decision

Based on the auditor's recommendation and the Certification Body's technical review, the following certification decision is taken:	
Certification decision:	Certification approved
Certification decision by (name of the person):	Kresimir Colic
Date of decision:	08 Oct 2026
Other comments:	N/A

2.2 Open non-conformities and observations

2.2 Closed non-conformities

NC number 9721	NC Grading: Minor
Standard:	SBP Standard 4: Chain of Custody v2.0
Requirement:	1.5 The Organisation shall maintain documented procedures (i.e., work instructions or equivalent documentation), covering all relevant requirements within the scope of the certificate and reflecting current Organisational activities. Documented procedures shall include at a minimum: – training, – internal audits, – record-keeping, – stakeholder engagement, including management of comments and complaints, – handling non-conforming products and non-appropriate documentation, – material receipt: input/purchasing, – material accounting, – sales transactions: output/sales, – claims, – business integrity, social, and health and safety requirements, – subcontracting activities/subcontractors (where applicable), and – collection and communication of data for energy and carbon balance calculations. N/A N/A
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
The procedures contained inaccurate information, the procedures states rail car use for transportation of pellets, however the pellets are transported by truck. The procedures also state there is no drying of feedstock, when the feedstock is dried	
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next surveillance audit, but no later than 12 months from report finalisation date
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	LJR -DP-06 CoC Procedure Interviews ' Observation during facility walkthrough
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	The company has updated its procedures to reflect how pellets are transported. After reviewing the document, it was confirmed that there are no references to rail transportation. During the interviews and facility walkthrough, it was also confirmed that rail cars are not used at any point for transportation.
NC Status:	Closed
Original Due Date:	2027-10-07
Closing Date:	2026-10-08
Upgrade Date:	N/A
Update Date:	N/A

NC number 9722	NC Grading: Minor
Standard:	SBP Standard 1: Feedstock Compliance v2.0
Requirement:	N/A N/A 2 21 Biodiversity is maintained or enhanced. 213 Key species, habitats, ecosystems, and areas of high conservation value (HCV) pertaining to biodiversity in the Supply Base shall be maintained or enhanced.

Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
The organization relies on its Wood Purchase Agreement provisions for evidence of conformance to these indicators, however the Wood Purchase Agreement for some suppliers have not been updated to reflect the requirements of SBP Standard Version 2 and the RED Level B requirements	
Timeline for Conformance:	By the next surveillance audit, but no later than 12 months from report finalisation date
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	Purchase agreements with processing residue suppliers
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	The company has updated its supplier agreements and required all suppliers to sign the revised documents. The new agreements reflect the requirements of Version 2 of the applicable standards and include provisions for RED Level B requirements.
NC Status:	Closed
Original Due Date:	2027-10-07
Closing Date:	2026-10-08
Upgrade Date:	N/A
Update Date:	N/A

2.3 Actions taken by Organisation Prior to Report Finalisation

N/A

2.4 Notes for the next Audit

The next audit must be conducted against Version 2-1 of the applicable standards and scheduled four months before the end of the transition period.

3 Scope of the audit and SBP certificate

Scope item	Check all that apply to the Certificate scope
Primary activity	Biomass Producer
Secondary activity	
Approved Standards	SBP Standard 1: Feedstock Compliance v2.0; SBP Standard 2: Feedstock Verification v2.0; SBP Standard 4: Chain of Custody v2.0; SBP Standard 5: Collection and Communication of Data v2.0; Instruction Document EU RED: Bridging Requirements for Meeting the Directive EU/2023/2413; Instruction Document 5E: Collection and Communication of Energy and Carbon data. v2.1
Product Group IDs	☐ Forest feedstock (1A) ☐ Trees outside forest (TOF) - Urban and landscape feedstock (2A) ☐ Trees outside forest (TOF) - Agricultural land feedstock (3A) ☒ Processing residues feedstock (4A) ☐ Post-consumer feedstock (5A) ☐ Other (please specify)
SBP Feedstock types	☒ SBP Compliant; ☐ SBP Controlled
Includes Supply Base Evaluation (SBE)	Yes
Includes EU RED Scheme	Yes
Includes EU RED Supply Base Evaluation (SBE)	No
Products	WB 1.1 Wood pellets
Feedstock origin (countries):	United States
SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessments used: **Public link:** https://sbp-cert.org/documents/standards-documents/risk-assessments/	SBP-RRA-US-NF-FOR_v1.0 RRA for US National FOR_Interim, SBP-RRA-US-PF-FOR_v1.0 RRA for US Private FOR_Interim
Chain of custody system	☐ Physical separation ☒ Mass balance
Outsourcing	No
Changes in the scope	N/A

3.1 Description of the company

Guidance: Please describe the type, structure and operations of the company including its role in the supply chain, its inputs and outputs as they related to SBP Standards.

LJR Forest Products is a single-site wood pellet facility located in Swainsboro, Georgia, United States. LJR Forest Products sources softwood mill residual chips, shaving and sawdust that originate from primary solid wood manufacturing facilities. The wood fiber inputs originate in southern Georgia and western South Carolina. LJR purchases solely softwood pine species (Pinus). LJR does not source any feedstock directly as stumpage or roundwood via suppliers. All LJR Forest Products' softwood fiber inputs are sourced indirectly from primary solid wood manufacturing facilities as residual chips, shaving and sawdust. No hardwood residuals are used and no hardwood harvesting contributes to LJR's fiber supply. LJR Forest Products' facility does not utilize any construction, demolition or post-consumer derived feedstocks. The company also conducts periodic internal audits of the suppliers' documentation to verify the source area of the wood and fiber. These measures will ensure that uncontrolled wood sources are not allowed entry into the manufacturing facilities and would not be mixed with other certified and controlled material.

3.2 Site details

Legal entity name	Address	Site Activity	Visited during the audit
LJR Forest Products	1377 Old Nunez Rd, 30401 Swainsboo, United States	Biomass producer	☒

3.3 Detailed description of the Chain of Custody system and Product Groups

Guidance: Please describe the operation of the CoC system including details of the mass balance management and a list of established Product Groups.

LJR purchases solely softwood pine species (Pinus). LJR does not source any feedstock directly as stumpage or roundwood via suppliers. All LJR Forest Products' softwood fiber inputs are sourced indirectly from primary solid wood manufacturing facilities as residual chips, shaving and sawdust. No hardwood residuals are used and no hardwood harvesting contributes to LJR's fiber supply. LJR Forest Products' facility does not utilize any construction, demolition or post-consumer derived feedstocks.

4 Specific objective of the audit

The objective of the audit was to evaluate the organization's conformity with the applicable SBP normative requirements and to determine whether its management system has been effectively implemented and maintained to support continued certification.

5 Evaluation process

5.1 Timing and duration of evaluation activities

Audit Level of Effort (LoE)		
Activity	**Auditors**	**Auditor hours**
1. Preparation	Jose del Castillo	8.0
2. On-site (excl. travel time)	Jose del Castillo	17.0
3. Report writing	Jose del Castillo	8.0

5.2 Auditor team qualification

Auditor qualification		
Auditor name	**Role**	**Qualification**
Jose del Castillo	Lead Auditor	Forester with 10 years of experience in forest management and the lumber industry, specializing in certification for over five years. As a qualified lead auditor, the auditor holds credentials in ISO 9001:2015, FSC Chain of Custody (COC), FSC Forest Management (FM), PEFC, Sustainable Biomass Program (SBP), RSPO, 4C, and Fair-Trade USA. Auditor's expertise spans auditing, compliance, and quality assurance, ensuring organizations meet rigorous industry standards and best practices

5.3 Description of evaluation activities

The evaluation included a review of documented procedures, policies, records, and reports to assess conformity with the applicable requirements of SBP Standards 1, 2, 4, and 5. The evaluation included visits to the pellet manufacturing facility, interviews with management and personnel responsible for implementing the SBP management system, and interviews with processing residue suppliers. The evaluation also included verification of feedstock sourcing, supplier approval and monitoring, receiving controls, traceability, chain of custody, mass balance, data collection and reporting, stakeholder engagement, risk management activities, and supporting records to confirm the effective implementation of the organization's management system

5.4 List of forest management units and feedstock suppliers visited

☐ N/A – No forest sites or suppliers visited during this evaluation

Site name
099002B
Site location

Georgia
Site description
Forest Management Unit
Rationale and focus of visit
The visits were used to verify that the roundwood originated from within the defined Supply Base and to confirm the effective implementation of applicable field verification, risk management measures, and environmental and legal requirements
Description of audit activity
The audit activities included visits to selected forest management units (FMUs) within the defined Supply Base that supply roundwood to the company's processing residue suppliers. The evaluation consisted of field observations of harvesting operations and site conditions, verification of the origin and traceability of the roundwood supplied to the processing residue suppliers, and assessment of the implementation of applicable risk mitigation measures. Interviews were conducted with field personnel, and supporting documentation, including harvest records, maps, and load tickets, was reviewed to verify conformance with the applicable SBP requirements.

Site name
099017
Site location
Georgia
Site description
Forest Management Unit
Rationale and focus of visit
The visits were used to verify that the roundwood originated from within the defined Supply Base and to confirm the effective implementation of applicable field verification, risk management measures, and environmental and legal requirements
Description of audit activity
The audit activities included visits to selected forest management units (FMUs) within the defined Supply Base that supply roundwood to the company's processing residue suppliers. The evaluation consisted of field observations of harvesting operations and site conditions, verification of the origin and traceability of the roundwood supplied to the processing residue suppliers, and assessment of the implementation of applicable risk mitigation measures. Interviews were conducted with field personnel, and supporting documentation, including harvest records, maps, and load tickets, was reviewed to verify conformance with the applicable SBP requirements.

Site name
Jack Creek Tract
Site location
Georgia
Site description
Forest Management Unit
Rationale and focus of visit

The visits were used to verify that the roundwood originated from within the defined Supply Base and to confirm the effective implementation of applicable field verification, risk management measures, and environmental and legal requirements
Description of audit activity
The audit activities included visits to selected forest management units (FMUs) within the defined Supply Base that supply roundwood to the company's processing residue suppliers. The evaluation consisted of field observations of harvesting operations and site conditions, verification of the origin and traceability of the roundwood supplied to the processing residue suppliers, and assessment of the implementation of applicable risk mitigation measures. Interviews were conducted with field personnel, and supporting documentation, including harvest records, maps, and load tickets, was reviewed to verify conformance with the applicable SBP requirements.

Site name
A.L. Brown Family LLP
Site location
Georgia
Site description
Forest Management Unit
Rationale and focus of visit
The visits were used to verify that the roundwood originated from within the defined Supply Base and to confirm the effective implementation of applicable field verification, risk management measures, and environmental and legal requirements
Description of audit activity
The audit activities included visits to selected forest management units (FMUs) within the defined Supply Base that supply roundwood to the company's processing residue suppliers. The evaluation consisted of field observations of harvesting operations and site conditions, verification of the origin and traceability of the roundwood supplied to the processing residue suppliers, and assessment of the implementation of applicable risk mitigation measures. Interviews were conducted with field personnel, and supporting documentation, including harvest records, maps, and load tickets, was reviewed to verify conformance with the applicable SBP requirements.

Site name
093021
Site location
Georgia
Site description
Forest Management Unit
Rationale and focus of visit
The visits were used to verify that the roundwood originated from within the defined Supply Base and to confirm the effective implementation of applicable field verification, risk management measures, and environmental and legal requirements
Description of audit activity
The audit activities included visits to selected forest management units (FMUs) within the defined Supply Base that supply roundwood to the company's processing residue suppliers. The evaluation consisted of field observations of harvesting operations and site conditions, verification of the origin and traceability of the roundwood supplied to the

processing residue suppliers, and assessment of the implementation of applicable risk mitigation measures. Interviews were conducted with field personnel, and supporting documentation, including harvest records, maps, and load tickets, was reviewed to verify conformance with the applicable SBP requirements.

Site name
096066
Site location
Georgia
Site description
Forest Management Unit
Rationale and focus of visit
The visits were used to verify that the roundwood originated from within the defined Supply Base and to confirm the effective implementation of applicable field verification, risk management measures, and environmental and legal requirements
Description of audit activity
The audit activities included visits to selected forest management units (FMUs) within the defined Supply Base that supply roundwood to the company's processing residue suppliers. The evaluation consisted of field observations of harvesting operations and site conditions, verification of the origin and traceability of the roundwood supplied to the processing residue suppliers, and assessment of the implementation of applicable risk mitigation measures. Interviews were conducted with field personnel, and supporting documentation, including harvest records, maps, and load tickets, was reviewed to verify conformance with the applicable SBP requirements.

Site name
043000040001
Site location
Georgia
Site description
Forest Management Unit
Rationale and focus of visit
The visits were used to verify that the roundwood originated from within the defined Supply Base and to confirm the effective implementation of applicable field verification, risk management measures, and environmental and legal requirements
Description of audit activity
The audit activities included visits to selected forest management units (FMUs) within the defined Supply Base that supply roundwood to the company's processing residue suppliers. The evaluation consisted of field observations of harvesting operations and site conditions, verification of the origin and traceability of the roundwood supplied to the processing residue suppliers, and assessment of the implementation of applicable risk mitigation measures. Interviews were conducted with field personnel, and supporting documentation, including harvest records, maps, and load tickets, was reviewed to verify conformance with the applicable SBP requirements.

5.5 Describe audit sampling methodology used

The forest tracts were selected in accordance with the certification body's documented sampling procedure, taking into account the intensity, scale, and risk associated with the organization's sourcing activities. The sample size was determined in accordance with SBP Standard 3, Clause 6.22, and included representative forest tracts from the defined Supply Base where applicable Risk Management Measures were implemented

5.6 CB stakeholder engagement

☒ N/A – Certification Body stakeholder consultation not applicable for this evaluation

Guidance: Please specify the number and types of stakeholders engaged, method of engagement and its outcomes.

5.7 Stakeholder feedback and response

☒ N/A – Certification Body stakeholder consultation not applicable for this evaluation

5.8 Main strengths and weaknesses of the management system and operations

The organization has implemented a robust management system supported by well-developed procedures that are effectively integrated into its operations. Personnel demonstrated a strong understanding of the applicable SBP requirements and their responsibilities through interviews and review of records. A comprehensive training program is in place to ensure personnel maintain the necessary competence. The organization has also established effective controls for supplier approval, feedstock verification, traceability, risk management, and monitoring activities. Overall, the documented procedures, supporting records, and observations made during the audit demonstrate a well-managed system that supports continued compliance with the applicable SBP requirements.

5.9 Summary of evaluation activities for robustness of the Supply Base Evaluation

☐ N/A – Standard 1 not in the scope of the evaluation

The Supply Base Evaluation (SBE) is supported by a robust management system and well-established procedures for feedstock sourcing, supplier approval, risk assessment, and ongoing monitoring. The SBE is supported by comprehensive records, supplier verification activities, field inspections, stakeholder engagement, and periodic reviews, providing confidence that the identified risks are appropriately assessed and managed. Overall, the evaluation demonstrated that the SBE has been effectively implemented and maintained in accordance with the applicable SBP requirements

5.10 Summary of evaluation activities for Processing residues and/or Post-consumer feedstock requirements per Standard 2 and EU RED

The evaluation of the processing residues supply chain included a review of documented procedures, supplier records, purchase agreements, receiving records, and supporting documentation, as well as interviews with selected processing residue suppliers. The evaluation verified that the feedstock supplied is a by-product of the suppliers' manufacturing processes and is not generated through the intentional processing of roundwood solely to produce chips, sawdust, or shavings. Records and interviews were also used to confirm that the roundwood sourced by the processing residue suppliers originates from within the Supply Base defined in the organization's Supply Base Evaluation (SBE). Additionally, it was verified that the organization has communicated the applicable policies, procedures, and risk mitigation requirements to its suppliers to support the effective implementation of the Supply Base Evaluation and the applicable SBP Standard 2 and EU RED requirements.

5.11 Summary of evaluation activities for chain of custody system per Standard 4

The evaluation of the Chain of Custody system included a review of documented procedures, records, and supporting documentation to verify the implementation of the organization's traceability and material control processes. The audit included verification of feedstock receiving records, production records, inventory controls, sales documentation, SBP Data Transfer System (DTS) transactions, and product claims. Mass balance records and accounting reports were reviewed to verify the accurate reconciliation of material inputs and outputs, maintenance of positive balances, and the correct application of SBP claims. Interviews with relevant personnel and observations during the site visit confirmed the effective implementation of the Chain of Custody system in accordance with the applicable requirements of SBP Standard 4

5.12 Summary of evaluation activities for collection and communication of data per Standard 5

The evaluation of the organization's data collection and communication processes included a review of documented procedures, records, calculations, and supporting documentation related to the Sustainability Audit Report (SAR) and the applicable SBP data requirements. Information reported in the SAR was cross-checked against supporting records to verify its accuracy, completeness, and consistency, and the calculations supporting the reported data were reviewed and found to be justified. During the site visit, the audit team verified how key operational data are collected, recorded, and transferred into the SAR. The evaluation also included a review of the SBP Data Transfer System (DTS), supporting transaction records, and other relevant documentation to confirm the effective implementation of the data collection, reporting, and communication processes in accordance with the applicable requirements of SBP Standard 5

5.13 Summary of audit findings for competency of involved personnel

Personnel involved in the implementation of the SBP management system demonstrated a high level of competence and a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities. This was verified through interviews, review of training records, and observations during the site visit. The organization has established a comprehensive training program to ensure personnel maintain the knowledge and skills necessary to effectively implement and maintain the applicable SBP requirements.

5.14 Summary of audit findings for GHG methodology per Standard 6 (if applicable)

☒ N/A – Standard 6 not in the scope

6 Detailed evaluation of BP's Supply Base Evaluation (if applicable)

☐ N/A – Supply Base Evaluation not in the scope of the evaluation

6.1 Overview of BP's risk assessments and mitigation measures including EU RED scope

The Supply Base Evaluation (SBE) is supported by a robust management system and well-established procedures for feedstock sourcing, supplier approval, risk assessment, and ongoing monitoring. The SBE is supported by comprehensive records, supplier verification activities, field inspections, stakeholder engagement, and periodic reviews, providing confidence that the identified risks are appropriately assessed and managed. Overall, the evaluation demonstrated that the SBE has been effectively implemented and maintained in accordance with the applicable SBP requirements

6.2 CB evaluation of specified risk indicators and mitigation measures

Country
United States
Area/Sub-Scope
N/A
Indicator
2.1.3 Key species, habitats, ecosystems, and areas of high conservation value (HCV) pertaining to biodiversity in the Supply Base shall be maintained or enhanced.
Specified risk description
The analysis suggests the ESA is a highly efficient system for the maintenance and enhancement of Federally listed threatened and endangered animal species. However, there is specified risk for the following due to lack of regulatory safeguards and/or resources/incentives for maintenance and enhancement of the following: Nature Serve Network identified G1-G2 animal species not on the ESA threatened or endangered list, G1- G2 plant species FSC US NRA identified species, ecosystems, and HCVs
Detailed description of a mitigation measure
As specified in SBP-RRA-US-PF-FOR v1.2, assessment of HCVs and G1/G2 plant and animal species and ecosystems by forest type within supply basin, including primary and processing residue feedstocks: Results of the assessment shall be integrated into a summary of management recommendations to support maintenance or enhancement of identified G1 and G2 species and ecosystems associated with forest types within the supply basin. Results of the summary, including forest type-based management recommendations, shall be integrated into logger training curricula for company level or coordinated delivery to loggers within the supply region. Requirement that suppliers enter binding written agreements that specify logger training inclusive of forest type-based management recommendations to maintain or enhance HCVs and G1/G2 species. This applies to both primary and processing residue suppliers.

Refinement of this specific direction in the application of LJR's program includes the following measures:
1. HCV/G1/G2 assessments for LJR's sourcing region; circulation to suppliers.
2. Contracts including provisions for use of trained loggers and use of BMPs, using sampling.
3. Supplier declarations or outbound correspondence specifying need for G1/G2 and HCV protections, inclusion of summaries with management recommendations.
4. Use of SFI Fiber Sourcing certificates by suppliers, where applicable.
5. Ongoing engagement of suppliers around key issues and use of G1/G2/HCV summaries.

These requirements apply to LJR and relevant operators in an ongoing way. See operator list.
Means of verification include:
1. HCV/G1/G2 assessments
2. Contracts including provisions for use of trained loggers and use of BMPs, using sampling.
3. Review of logger training curricula for salient content, using sampling.
4. Verification of logger training records, using sampling.
5. Supplier declarations or outbound correspondence specifying need for G1/G2 and HCV protections, inclusion of summaries with management recommendations.
6. Interviews of suppliers/foresters for knowledge of practices included in summaries, using sampling.
7. Review of a sample harvest sites for implementation consistent with management practices identified in the G1/G2/HCV summaries.
8. BMP monitoring at state level.
9. SFI Fiber Sourcing certificates, where applicable.

Detailed description of CB evaluation of mitigation measure and its conclusions

The certification body evaluated the implementation and effectiveness of the organization's risk mitigation measures through the review of documented procedures, supporting records, supplier verification activities, interviews with relevant personnel and suppliers. Based on the evidence reviewed, the mitigation measures were found to be effectively implemented and maintained, providing confidence that the specified risks identified in the Supply Base Evaluation are appropriately controlled in accordance with the applicable SBP requirements.

Country

United States

Area/Sub-Scope

N/A

Indicator

2.2.1 Feedstock shall not be sourced from land that had one of the following statuses in January 2008 and no longer has that status due to land conversion: a. Forests b. Wetlands c. Peatlands d.

Highly biodiverse grasslands.

Specified risk description

While there is consensus that deforestation rates are quite low in the US and for the RRA geography, including LJR Forest Products' sourcing area, analysis of the USDA Forest Service's Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) data for the given time period indicates net loss of timberland for the RRA geography of less than 1% (0.75%) with localized losses and gains. Similarly, using a methodology based on population growth and issuance of housing permits, which is not based on change detection analysis of the forest itself, the FSC US NRA specified risk for a set of counties within the RRA's geography. Despite relatively low rates of forest loss, with recognition to the precedence of the FSC US NRA and the results of original analysis for the RRA's geography, risk is specified as it relates to forests for 46 counties identified by the 2019 FSC US NRA and a range of FIA Units identified in the RRA's Annexes.

Detailed description of a mitigation measure

As specified in SBP-RRA-US-PF-FOR v1.2. To mitigate risk of sourcing feedstock from areas of forest converted to other land uses, biomass producers must secure binding written agreements with suppliers
that prohibit the delivery of material originating from known conversions of forest to nonforest use.

Refinement/articulation of this direction for LJR's program includes:
1. Contracts including provisions to avoid sourcing known conversions.
2. Supplier declarations or outbound correspondence prohibiting sourcing of feedstock from known conversions.
3. Request to suppliers for use geolocation for compliance with EUDR.

These measures are applied to LJR and its relevant operators (see list) in an ongoing way.

Means of verification include:
1. Contracts including provisions to avoid sourcing known conversions, using sampling.
2. Supplier declarations or outbound correspondence prohibiting sourcing of feedstock from known conversions, using sampling.
3. Interviews of suppliers/foresters for knowledge of requirements and action steps for identifying and avoiding conversions at the time of purchase, using sampling.
4. Review of geolocation samples on harvest tracts via suppliers.

Detailed description of CB evaluation of mitigation measure and its conclusions

The certification body evaluated the implementation and effectiveness of the organization's risk mitigation measures through the review of documented procedures, supporting records, supplier verification activities, interviews with relevant personnel and suppliers. Based on the evidence reviewed, the mitigation measures were found to be effectively implemented and maintained, providing confidence that the specified risks identified in the Supply Base Evaluation are appropriately controlled in accordance with the applicable SBP requirements.

Country
United States
Area/Sub-Scope
N/A
Indicator
2.2.2 Ecosystems, their health, vitality, functions and services in the Supply Base shall be maintained or enhanced.
Specified risk description
Ecosystems enjoy protections under a range of laws, including the CWA and ESA, which are consistently implemented and enforced. However, ecosystems identified via species ranking of G1 and G2 under the NatureServe Global Ranking system or the FSC NRA are not protected by law within the RRA's geography. Thus, there is specified risk for: Annex 1: Detailed findings for Supply Base Evaluation Sustainable Biomass Program Regional Risk Assessment for US Private Forest v1.2 - Nature Serve Network identified G1-G2 animal species not on the ESA threatened or endangered list, G1- G2 plant species (Figure 2.1.3.-1) - FSC US NRA identified ecosystems (HCV3) (Figure 2.1.3.-2)
Detailed description of a mitigation measure
As specified in SBP-RRA-US-PF-FOR v1.2, assessment of HCVs and G1/G2 plant and animal species and ecosystems by forest type within supply basin, including primary and processing residue feedstocks: Results of the assessment shall be integrated into a summary of management recommendations to support maintenance or enhancement of identified G1 and G2 species and ecosystems associated with forest types within the supply basin. Results of the summary, including forest type-based management recommendations, shall be integrated into logger training curricula for company level or coordinated delivery to loggers within the supply region. Requirement that suppliers enter binding written agreements that specify logger training inclusive of forest type-based management recommendations to maintain or enhance HCVs and G1/G2 species. This applies to both primary and processing residue suppliers. Refinement of this specific direction in the application of LJR's program includes the following measures: 1. HCV/G1/G2 assessments for LJR's sourcing region; circulation to suppliers. 2. Contracts including provisions for use of trained loggers and use of BMPs, using sampling. 3. Supplier declarations or outbound correspondence specifying need for G1/G2 and HCV protections, inclusion of summaries with management recommendations. 4. Use of SFI Fiber Sourcing certificates by suppliers, where applicable. 5. Ongoing engagement of suppliers around key issues and use of G1/G2/HCV summaries. These requirements apply to LJR and relevant operators in an ongoing way. See

operator list.

Means of verification includes:
1. HCV/G1/G2 assessments
2. Contracts including provisions for use of trained loggers and use of BMPs, using sampling.
3. Review of logger training curricula for salient content, using sampling.
4. Verification of logger training records, using sampling.
5. Supplier declarations or outbound correspondence specifying need for G1/G2 and HCV protections,
inclusion of summaries with management recommendations.
6. Interviews of suppliers/foresters for knowledge of practices included in summaries, using sampling.
7. Review of a sample of harvest site for implementation consistent with management practices identified in
the G1/G2/HCV summaries.
8. BMP monitoring at state level.
9. SFI Fiber Sourcing certs, where applicable.

Detailed description of CB evaluation of mitigation measure and its conclusions

The certification body evaluated the implementation and effectiveness of the organization's risk mitigation measures through the review of documented procedures, supporting records, supplier verification activities, interviews with relevant personnel and suppliers. Based on the evidence reviewed, the mitigation measures were found to be effectively implemented and maintained, providing confidence that the specified risks identified in the Supply Base Evaluation are appropriately controlled in accordance with the applicable SBP requirements.

Country

United States

Area/Sub-Scope

N/A

Indicator

3.1.1 LULUCF emissions shall be accounted for through one of the following routes: Route A Feedstock may be sourced from a country of origin which is party to the Paris Agreement, and which has submitted a Nationally Determined Contribution to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) covering carbon emissions and removals from agriculture, forestry and land use which ensure the changes in carbon stock associated with biomass harvest are counted towards the country's commitment to reduce or limit greenhouse gas emissions, or Route B Feedstock may be sourced from a country of origin which is party to the Paris Agreement and has national or sub-national laws in place (developed in accordance with Article 5 of the Paris Agreement and applicable in the area of harvest), to conserve and enhance carbon stocks and sinks, and provided there is evidence that reported LULUCF-sector emissions do not exceed removals, or Route C Feedstock may be sourced from a Supply Base where an assessment demonstrates that both the carbon stock is stable, and the forests' capacity to act as a carbon sink is stable or increasing over the long term.

Specified risk description
Upon the exit of the US from the Paris Agreement, a Level B risk assessment of the likelihood of depleting regional carbon stocks within LJR Forest Products' (hereafter “LJR”) supply basin was conducted. LJR sources processing residue from counties within Georgia and South Carolina. This responds directly to the need for a Level B analysis, as required by the Regional Risk Assessments for National Forests and US Private Forest under indicator 3.1.1 and the Renewable Energy Directive III (REDIII) under articles 29(7).
Detailed description of a mitigation measure
To develop this estimate, we used annualized state-level carbon stock inventories from the US RED III Level B LULUCF workbook and developed a modified workflow to scale these to a multi-state region aligning with the LJR fiber supply basin, inclusive of residuals and primary sourcing. Details of how this analysis was conducted can be found in a detailed report. Results of this analysis indicate that forest carbon stocks are stable or increasing within LJR's supply basin, relative to a reference period. Recent inventory data, future projections, and the consistent nature of forest management practices in the southeastern US suggest that this trend will remain through the future long-term period of 2022-2053. This report was prepared by New March by a qualified team with extensive knowledge of biomass feedstock sourcing, land use change, forests and forest carbon dynamics. The team included Sarah Crow, CEO of New March, a leading professional in the forest certification and sustainability space, Dr. Brian Clough, a data scientist and biometrician specializing in forest carbon, and Eric Werner, Forest Certification Specialist at New March, who brings operational knowledge of biomass material flows and certification programs. Dr. Clough is an expert in analyzing US Forest Service Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA). The assessment was developed with high fidelity to the SBP Guidance for US REDIII Level B LULUCF v1.0 (February 3, 2026).
Detailed description of CB evaluation of mitigation measure and its conclusions
The certification body evaluated the implementation and effectiveness of the organization's risk mitigation measures through the review of documented procedures, supporting records, supplier verification activities, interviews with relevant personnel and suppliers. Based on the evidence reviewed, the mitigation measures were found to be effectively implemented and maintained, providing confidence that the specified risks identified in the Supply Base Evaluation are appropriately controlled in accordance with the applicable SBP requirements.