Compliance with the SBP Framework: Public Summary Report

Preferred by Nature OÜ
Evaluation of Palleteries SIA

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 7
2.4 Notes for the next Audit 8

3 Scope of the audit and SBP certificate **9**

3.1 Description of the company 10
3.2 Site details 10
3.3 Detailed description of the Chain of Custody system and Product Groups 10

4 Specific objective of the audit **11**

5 Evaluation process **12**

5.1 Timing and duration of evaluation activities 12
5.2 Auditor team qualification 12
5.3 Description of evaluation activities 12
5.4 List of forest management units and feedstock suppliers visited 13
5.5 Describe audit sampling methodology used 14
5.6 CB stakeholder engagement 14
5.7 Stakeholder feedback and response 15
5.8 Main strengths and weaknesses of the management system and operations 15
5.9 Summary of evaluation activities for robustness of the Supply Base Evaluation 15
5.10 Summary of evaluation activities for Processing residues and/or Post-consumer feedstock requirements per Standard 2 and EU RED 15
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) 16

6 Detailed evaluation of BP's Supply Base Evaluation (if applicable) **17**

6.1 Overview of BP's risk assessments and mitigation measures including EU RED scope 17
6.2 CB evaluation of specified risk indicators and mitigation measures 17

1 Overview

Certification Body (CB) Name:	Preferred by Nature OÜ
Primary CB contact for SBP:	Pilar Gorria Serrano
Primary CB contact email:	pgorria@preferredbynature.org
Audit team leader:	Liene Suveizda
Audit team members:	N/A
Name of the Company:	Palleteries SIA
Company legal address:	O.Vaciesa street 18, LV-1004 Riga, Latvia
Company contact for SBP:	Edijs Ošs
Company contact email:	info@palleteries.lv
Company website:	https://www.palleteries.lv/en/
Date of installation:	06 May 2025
SBP Certificate Code:	SBP-08-42
Date of certificate issue:	01 Jul 2026
Date of certificate expiry:	30 Jun 2031
Audit closing meeting date:	16 Jun 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):	Ģirts Karss
Date of decision:	30 Jun 2026
Other comments:	N/A

2.2 Open non-conformities and observations

NC number 9083	NC Grading: Observation
Standard:	Instruction Document EU RED: Bridging Requirements for Meeting the Directive EU/2023/2413
Requirement:	3.1.5 "The organisation shall conduct an annual internal audit to determine whether the organisation: – N/A N/A N/A
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
As of the audit date, the BP had conducted an annual internal audit covering Chain of Custody (CoC) and the mass balance system. The internal audit was carried out by an external consultant and covered the RED, SBP, and PEFC systems. The results of the internal audit were discussed with senior management, and the audit report was presented during the reassessment audit. According to interviews conducted, the corrective actions applied for all identified nonconformities. During the SBP assessment audit, the auditor identified 3 non-conformities related to the maintenance of the mass balance system that had not been detected during the internal audit. This indicates that the internal audit process may have been overly formal in nature. However, as the organisation effectively addressed the identified shortcomings and demonstrated adequate knowledge of maintaining the mass balance system going forward, an Observation was issued. See Internal audit materials in Exhibit No. 5.	
Timeline for Conformance:	N/A
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	N/A
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	N/A
NC Status:	Open
Original Due Date:	N/A
Closing Date:	N/A
Upgrade Date:	N/A
Update Date:	N/A

2.2 Closed non-conformities

NC number 9080	NC Grading: Minor
Standard:	SBP Standard 4: Chain of Custody v2.0
Requirement:	4.10 For Organisations opting to use a mass balance system for material accounting, the Organisation shall set up and maintain a mass balance account to which additions and deductions of eligible input for a single physical site shall be recorded. Note 1: A mass balance system allows consignments of feedstock or biomass with differing sustainability and greenhouse gas emissions savings characteristics to be mixed for instance in a container, processing or logistical facility, transmission and distribution infrastructure or site. Note 2: Site is a single functional unit of an Organisation situated at one physical location, which is geographically distinct from other units of the same Organisation. An Organisation's units with distinct physical locations may, however, be regarded as part of a site if they are an extension of it with no purchasing, processing, or sales functions of their own (e.g., a remote stockholding). A site can never include more than one legal entity. Subcontractors that are used within the terms of outsourcing agreements (e.g., outsourced warehouse) are not considered sites. Typical examples for sites are processing or trading facilities such as manufacturing sites, sales offices, or company-owned warehouse. N/A N/A
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
According to the SBP procedure and staff interviews, overall responsibility for the SBP system at the biomass producer (BP) rests with the Production Director. The Office Administrator/Recordkeeper is responsible for the day-to-day management of feedstock and biomass accounting. More detailed roles and responsibilities are defined within the SBP procedure. Mass balance accounting is used for material tracking purposes. All eligible additions and deductions of SBP-compliant feedstock and biomass at the storage site are recorded accordingly. A review of the organisation's mass balance table indicates that a separate mass balance account has not been established for the SBP-controlled biomass product group, as required by the SBP Normative Interpretations v2.0 (https://sbp-cert.org/normative-interpretations-2-0/). According to the information provided by the organisation, no production or sales of SBP-controlled material took place during the audit period. However, given that SBP-controlled feedstock and biomass are included within the scope of the SBP certificate, and no input or output of such material was recorded during the audit period, a minor non-conformity report (NCR) has been raised.	
Timeline for Conformance:	Prior to (re)certification
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	Updated mass balance table. Interview with Production Director, Office Administrator/Recordkeeper and External Consultant. Procedure "SBP atbilstoša materiāla apstiprināšana, verifikācija, riska mazināšanas process SBPStandard2v2.0". Interviews with responsible personnel. For details see Exhibit 4.
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	According to the information provided by the Organization, no production or sale of SBP controlled material was carried out during the reporting period. For this reason, the Organization had not established a mass balance accounting account for SBP controlled material. During the audit report preparation period, the Organisation established a separate mass balance account for SBP-controlled material and submitted it to the Certification Body (CB). To date, no purchases or sales of SBP-controlled material have been recorded. Interviews with responsible staff confirm that employees are aware of their respective roles and responsibilities, as well as the requirements of the SBP Standard and the SBP Normative Interpretations v2.0. For further details, see Exhibit 4.

NC Status:	Closed
Original Due Date:	N/A
Closing Date:	2026-06-30
Upgrade Date:	N/A
Update Date:	N/A

NC number 9081	**NC Grading: Major**
Standard:	Instruction Document EU RED: Bridging Requirements for Meeting the Directive EU/2023/2413
Requirement:	3.3.4 For organisations opting to use a Mass Balance material account methodology, the organisation shall set up and maintain a Mass Balance account to which additions and deductions of eligible input for a single site shall be recorded. The mass balance system shall operate at the level of a site (geographical location, logistical facilities, transmission or distribution infrastructures with precise boundaries within which products can be mixed, e.g., pellet mill, chipping mill, harbour storage). N/A N/A
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
According to the SBP procedure and staff interviews, overall responsibility for the SBP system at the biomass producer (BP) rests with the Production Director. The Office Administrator/Recordkeeper is responsible for the daily management of feedstock and biomass accounting. Detailed roles and responsibilities are defined in the SBP procedure. The Organisation has established a mass balance system to account for eligible feedstock inputs and outputs within the defined scope. The system operates at a single-site level, in line with the standard requirements, and separate mass balance accounts are maintained for SBP and RED-compliant materials. However, a review of the RED mass balance account identified the following non-conformities: • Additions of RED-compliant input material do not correspond to the amounts of SBP-controlled (compliant) input recorded; • No deductions are recorded in the RED mass balance account, despite RED-compliant sales being registered in the RADIX Tree system; • Opening stock from the previous period has not been recorded in the RED mass balance account, although such stock is reflected in the SBP mass balance system. These inconsistencies indicate that the RED mass balance account does not accurately reflect material flows and is not properly maintained in accordance with the requirements of Instruction Document EU RED (Section 3.3.4). Based on the above findings, a major non-conformity (NCR) was raised.	
Timeline for Conformance:	Prior to (re)certification
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	Updated mass balance table. Interview with Production Director and External Consultant. Procedure “SBP atbilstoša materiāla apstiprināšana, verifikācija, riska mazināšanas process SBPStandard2v2.0”. Mass balance in Exhibit 4.
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	Based on interviews with responsible personnel, the identified shortcomings in the RED mass balance account were primarily due to insufficient knowledge and capacity of the Office Administrator/ Recordkeeper, who left the organisation during the SBP reassessment audit period. Historically, greater emphasis had been placed on maintaining the SBP mass balance account, as all SBP-compliant material is considered RED-compliant. Following the departure of the Office Administrator, the Production Director assumed responsibility for maintaining all mass balance accounts during the temporary vacancy. During the audit report preparation period, the Organisation submitted an updated RED mass balance account, which includes corrected data on opening stock, additions, and deductions. The updated records demonstrate alignment with SBP data and reflect actual material flows. Based on the evidence provided, the non-conformity is

	considered adequately addressed and closed. Updated mass balance table see in Exhibit 4.
NC Status:	Closed
Original Due Date:	N/A
Closing Date:	2026-06-30
Upgrade Date:	N/A
Update Date:	N/A

NC number 9082	**NC Grading: Minor**
Standard:	Instruction Document EU RED: Bridging Requirements for Meeting the Directive EU/2023/2413
Requirement:	3.3.10 The start and end of the period shall be aligned with the calendar year or, where applicable, the four quarters of the calendar year. As an alternative to the calendar year, economic operators may also use the economic year that they use for bookkeeping purposes, provided that the choice is clearly indicated and applied consistently. N/A N/A
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
The Organisation maintains a mass balance system covering processing residues (category 4A) and primary feedstock (category 1A). However, only processing residues (category 4A) have been used for biomass production in audit period. Quarterly accounting periods are applied for processing residues. As material accounting begins in May (aligned with the audit period), the RED mass balance account does not align with the calendar year quarters required for consistent RED reporting. Due to this shortcoming, a minor non-conformity report (NCR) has been raised.	
Timeline for Conformance:	Prior to (re)certification
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	Updated mass balance table. Interview with Production Director and External Consultant. For details see Exhibit 4.
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	According to information provided by the person responsible, the previously identified deficiency was due to the historical timing of the SBP audit, which typically began in May. Interviews with responsible persons confirmed that they are familiar with and understand the requirements of the EU RED Directive. During the audit report preparation, the Organization updated the RED mass balance account. The start and end of the accounting period are now aligned with the four quarters of the calendar year. For details see Exhibit 4.
NC Status:	Closed
Original Due Date:	N/A
Closing Date:	2026-06-30
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

N/A.

3 Scope of the audit and SBP certificate

Scope item	Check all that apply to the Certificate scope
Primary activity	Biomass Producer
Secondary activity	Trader
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 2.1 Wood chips
Feedstock origin (countries):	Latvia
SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessments used: **Public link:** https://sbp-cert.org/documents/standards-documents/risk-assessments/	Not applicable, SBP-RRA-EU-LV-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Latvia FOR_Endorsed
Chain of custody system	☐ Physical separation ☒ Mass balance
Outsourcing	No
Changes in the scope	Wood pellet production excluded from the scope of SBP certificate. Standard No. 1 v2.0 included in the scope.

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.

BP is a biomass producing company located in Kuldīga, Latvia. The biomass (wood chips) production is based on processing residues originating from two own sawmills situated next to each other. Primary feedstock is used for biomass (wood chips) production as well. The roundwood used in both sawmills (logs for primary production) is originating from Latvia only. For chipping (agreement based service) the organisation is also buying low grade roundwood from single supplier: joint stock company "Latvijas valsts meži" with PEFC 100% claim. The benchmarking applied to PEFC certified primary feedstock. The volume of incoming material and volume of materials used is measured and recorded. The Organisation holds valid PEFC Chain of Custody certificate. The Organisation is implementing the PEFC credit system for feedstock coming with PEFC claim. SBP biomass production covers SBP product group - woodchip production from own processing residuals and chipped low grade primary feedstock. FSC/ PEFC certified (including FSC Controlled Wood and PEFC Controlled Sources) feedstock is used for wood chips production. The amount of the biomass produced might be sold as SBP-compliant or SBP- controlled biomass. Pellet production excluded from the scope of SBP certificate.

3.2 Site details

Legal entity name	Address	Site Activity	Visited during the audit
Palleteries SIA	Zala street 6, LV-3301 Kuldīga , Latvia	Production	☒
Ventspils tirdzniecības osta	Dzintaru iela 41, Ventspils	Storage site	☒

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.

The Organisation holds a PEFC chain of custody certificate VK-PEFC-COC-0038 (PBN-PEFC/CoC-022294). An input materials are PEFC 100% certified and PEFC Controlled Sources. The Organisation is implementing a PEFC credit system. SBP mass balance system is implemented within SBP system. The Organisation has one Product group - Wood chips. The feedstock types are low grade stemwood (1A) and processing residues (4A) only from own sawmill. The feedstock type 1A hasn't been used during audit period.

4 Specific objective of the audit

The scope of the evaluation covered:

- Review of the BP's management procedures;
- Review of the production processes, production site visit;
- Review of the control points, analysis of the existing CoC system;
  Review of SBP SBE and RED system;
- Interviews with responsible staff;
- Review of the records, calculations and conversion coefficients;
- GHG data collection analysis;
- Evaluation of sales activities and DTS registration process.
-

5 Evaluation process

5.1 Timing and duration of evaluation activities

Audit Level of Effort (LoE)		
Activity	**Auditors**	**Auditor hours**
1. Preparation	LS	1.0
2. On-site (excl. travel time)	LS	13.0
3. Report writing	LS	11.0
4. Other	N/A	

5.2 Auditor team qualification

Auditor qualification		
Auditor name	**Role**	**Qualification**
Liene Suveizda	Lead Auditor	Joined NEPCon Latvia in 2016. M.Sc in biology, forest ecology. Graduated from University of Latvia. Liene has also studied law and hold the 2nd level higher education in law, Business School "Turība". Liene has long term experience in forestry sector in Latvia. Liene has passed the NEPCon lead assessor training course in FSC Forest Management and FSC Chain of Custody operations and obtained the FSC lead auditor qualification. Acquired SBP auditor qualification in 2018 and has participated in capacity of auditor and lead auditor in a number of SBP assessments, scope change audits and re-assesssment audits, including Supply Base Evaluation in biomass processing and trading companies in Latvia.

5.3 Description of evaluation activities

Main attention during the reassessment evaluation was focused on practical implementation aspects of the SBP Standard V2.0 system, review of documents and system, evaluation of input material classification (reception and registration), analysis of the critical control points in existing recordkeeping system as well as correctness and availability of GHG data.

Description of the evaluation:
First day (26.05.2026)
The audit began with an opening meeting in Palleteries SIA office in Kuldiga. Opening meeting was attended by production director and consultant in SBP certification.
Auditor introduced herself, provided information about audit plan, methodology, auditor qualification, confidentiality issues, surveillance audit methodology and clarified verification scope. During the opening meeting auditors explained CB’s accreditation related issues related to the audit.
After the opening meeting auditor went through all applicable requirements of the SBP standards nr. 1, 2, 4, 5 and instruction documents 5E covering input clarification, existing chain of custody, management system, CoC,

emission and energy data and categorisation of input and verification of SBP compliant and SBP Controlled feedstock/ biomass. During the process overall responsible person for SBP system and over responsible staff having key responsibilities within the system were interviewed.
After the document review, a roundtrip to BP's pellet production was undertaken. During the site tour applicable records were reviewed, FSC system control points were analysed and related risks were evaluated.

After this auditor reviewed the SAR and the documents and evidences related to implementation of the SBP standard 5 and instruction document 5E documents as well as SBR, SBP related procedures, recordkeeping/mass balance requirements and sales documents and DTS records.

Short summary of the 1st day results was provided to the BP.

2nd Day (27.05.2026):
Field verifications (3 FMUs) carried out to evaluate the effectiveness of risk mitigation measures within SBE system for primary feedstock.

At the end of the audit on June 16, audit findings were summarised and audit conclusion based on use of 3 angle evaluation method were provided.

5.4 List of forest management units and feedstock suppliers visited

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

Site name
FMU Mežstrēlnieki
Site location
Cad. No. 62500040159, block No.1, comp. No. 7
Site description
Aspen stand mix of birch and geay alder. Cutting licence for thinning issued.
Rationale and focus of visit
Potential nesting site of Buteo buteo registered in data base "Ozols".
Description of audit activity
No forest management carried out in forest compartment No.7. Clearcut carried out in other compartments included in cutting license. No negative impact on stand structure or bird nesting site observed.

Site name
FMU Mesteriņi 1
Site location
Cad. No. 46760020095, block No. 1, comp. No. 22
Site description
Mature Norway spruce forest stand with mix of other species. Age of stand 110 years.

Rationale and focus of visit
There is protected habitat "Western Taiga"of EU importance registered in comp. No. 22 in data base "Ozols". Cutting licence issued for clearcut in border comp. No. 9
Description of audit activity
Field visits revealed that no forest management activities carried out in compartment No. 22. No direct negative impact on protected habitat observed.

Site name
FMU "Mesteriņi 2"
Site location
Cad. No. 46760020095, block No. 2, compartment No. 2
Site description
Mature Silver birch forest stand with structure formula: 4B4E2P75. Stand age 75 years.
Rationale and focus of visit
Harvesting licence issued for compartment No. 2 by State Forest Service. There is information about potential presence signs of black woodpecker (Dryocopus martius) registered in data base "Ozols".
Description of audit activity
The field visit confirmed that a small-scale clearcut has been carried out in compartment No. 2. A group of retention trees has been preserved, and the surrounding forest stands are suitable as a habitat for the black woodpecker. According to data available in the IS “Ozols” system and the opinion of certified nature expert A.K., the recorded data are of low confidence. The existing records are informative only and indicate a potential habitat for the black woodpecker in the surrounding area. Based on the expert’s opinion during interview, the logging activities have not destroyed the black woodpecker’s habitat.

5.5 Describe audit sampling methodology used

Procurement/ sales documents were verified based on sampling. Invoices from 2 months were verified for accuracy and compared with summary information. Sample of DTS transactions is determined on square root of the number of transactions. Main responsible staff was interviewed. The production and storage sites inside the main company address were visited. During reassessment audit the storage place in the Ventspils port visited. For SBE feedstock - primary feedstock delivered to sawmill with PEFC Controlled Sources status - the origin data on individual FMU level were analyzed. From total pool 4 FMUs were selected which contained attributes of HCV values of category 1 or 3. The size of the sample was determined using the relationship: 0.8x square root from 4 ~ 2 FMU (nominal number of FMU for field inspections visit). Totally 3 FMUs were visited.

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.

During 2 last audit periods the Organisation has launched the stakeholder consultations two times. The BP had initiated stakeholder consultations on March 31, 2025 through publishing Risk Mitigation Plan and description of

SBE process by sending out the notification letter for consultations to stakeholders. The stakeholder consultation process ended on May 2nd, 2025. The BP has also made phone calls to several key stakeholders for comments and arranged a meeting with Nature Protection Agency. Proposals regarding risk mitigation measures from Nature Protection Agency received.
The BP has conducted additional stakeholder consultations on April 30, 2026 by involving 8 different stakeholder like Society of Entomologists, Society of dendrologists, University of Daugavpils and other stakeholders. The BP has sent out the Revised Risk Assessment, Risk Mitigation Plan and description of SBE process via e-mail. No comments received during last stakeholder consultation phase.

5.7 Stakeholder feedback and response

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

Recommendations from Nature Protection Agency were received and incorporated in Risk management plan. No comments from other stakeholders have been received.

5.8 Main strengths and weaknesses of the management system and operations

Strengths: The main SBP system elements are implemented. Feedstock used for production is being sourced from the company's own production (sawmill) as co-products/ production waste. Primary feedstock sourced as low grade roundwood and chipped by mobile chippers and sold as product group wood chips. Small number of responsible staff, having experience in forest sector and FSC/ PEFC certification systems.
Logs used in both sawmills as well are at least FSC Controlled wood / PEFC Controlled Sources (either purchased as FSC certified, FSC Controlled wood, PEFC certified or controlled within companies PEFC Controlled wood verification system). Biomass used into the biomass drier is at least with PEFC Controlled Sources statuss.
Weaknesses: See in the NCR section of the report.

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 organisation has developed and is implementing the Supply Base Evaluation for primary feedstock originating from Latvia. As to processing residues the Organisation is sourcing feedstock from SBP-recognized certification scheme. The BP has applied the SBE process to feedstock sourced as PEFC Controlled Sources within audit period.

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

The BP sources only processing residues from own sawmills with PEFC certification claim.
The PEFC certification system is implemented.

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

The BP has implemented the CoC system per SBP Standard No. 4. The BP has developed and implemented Chain of custody system according Standard 4 requirements. The responsible person for SBP CoC system is Production Director. The mass balance system is implemented. The auditor has reviewed the CoC system, procedures, records, carried out interviews with responsible staff.

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

The data had been updated and provided prior the onsite evaluation and verified and validated at the time of audit. The data is complete, accurate and is based on the records from the internal recordkeeping system.
The following energy sources are used by BP: diesel for feedstock handling, chipping and for biomass transportation to customer.

5.13 Summary of audit findings for competency of involved personnel

During the audit staff members involved into the SBP system management and implementation were identified, including Production director, office administrator. Interviewed staff demonstrated awareness of their responsibilities within SBP system.

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

To reduce the risk of sourcing from high conservative value forests and meet the demand for SBP compliant biomass, SIA Palleteries has undertaken a supply base evaluation for primary feedstock that is originating from Latvia according to the SBP Framework Standard 1: Feedstock Compliance Standard and Standard 2: Verification of SBP-compliant Feedstock.
The benchmarking principles implemented (see document Evaluation of the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC) scheme) for primary feedstock sourced from joint stock company "Latvijas Valsts meži" with PEFC 100% claim.
As to processing residues the Organisation is sourcing feedstock from SBP-recognized certification scheme. The BP has applied the SBE process to feedstock sourced as PEFC Controlled Sources within audit period to increase the share of SBP compliant feedstock.
The risk assessment of the SBE is based on the Revised Regional Risk Assessment for Latvia V2.0. Risk assessments are available on SBP homepage: https://sbp-cert.org/documents/normativedocuments/version-2/risk-assessments/
The organization has developed the risk mitigation measures so that feedstock can be sourced and sold as SBP compliant feedstock. For more details see Risk management measures section.

6.2 CB evaluation of specified risk indicators and mitigation measures

Country
Latvia
Area/Sub-Scope
whole country
Indicator
2.1.1 Key species, habitats, ecosystems, and areas of high conservation value (HCV) pertaining to biodiversity in the Supply Base shall be identified.
Specified risk description
see the description of risk in: https://sbp-cert.org/documents/consultationdocuments/archive/revised-rra-latvia/
Detailed description of a mitigation measure
1. All suppliers undergo a supplier approval process, during which suitability to organisation's supply base evaluation is assessed. 2. Guidance is provided to SBE suppliers regarding identified threats to the forests and areas of high conservation values and management measures to be implemented to mitigate these risks. 3. The origin of all feedstock deliveries (including supplier, feedstock type, delivered volume, certification status, and origin of feedstock) is verified before acceptance of feedstock. 4. The origin of primary feedstock is validated against the Ozols database to

prescreening deliveries for Natura 2000 forest habitats and the occurrence of protected species within harvesting sites. Deliveries with a risk of the material originating from Natura 2000 a forest habitat type or site of protected species are rejected under the scope of SBE.
5. In the case of an identified HCV threat within a harvesting site a field visit may be used to verify the HCV is intact. Material is only accepted if the field visit confirms the WKH has been preserved.
6. Annual sample-based supplier audits and forest visits are carried out to assess the performance of the suppliers and check the absence of identified risks in the forests. if risks are identified sourcing under the scope of SBE is only continued if corrective actions have been implemented and their effectiveness has been confirmed.
7. In the case of primary feedstock under the SBP-recognised certification scheme the BP effectively mitigate the risk of indicators 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3 and thus effectively in the case of the RRA for Latvia also indicator 3.2.3. 8.

Detailed description of CB evaluation of mitigation measure and its conclusions

1. Personnel and suppliers are aware of threats to HCV areas in forests and are trained in using mitigation measures to reduce the risk of sourcing and delivering biomass originating from these areas.
2. No deliveries with unknown origins are accepted.
3. Material from high-risk areas is identified and avoided.
4. Material from harvesting sites where an HCV is present is only accepted if the HCV has been preserved and this is confirmed via a protocolled site visit.

Country

Latvia

Area/Sub-Scope

whole country

Indicator

2.1.2 Threats to and impacts on the identified key species, habitats, ecosystems, and areas of high conservation value (HCV) pertaining to biodiversity in the Supply Base shall be identified and evaluated.

Specified risk description

see the description of risk in: https://sbp-cert.org/documents/consultationdocuments/archive/revised-rra-latvia/

Detailed description of a mitigation measure

1. All suppliers undergo a supplier approval process, during which suitability to organisation's supply base evaluation is assessed.
2. Guidance is provided to SBE suppliers regarding identified threats to the forests and areas of high conservation values and management measures to be implemented to mitigate these risks.
3. The origin of all feedstock deliveries (including supplier, feedstock type, delivered volume, certification status, and origin of feedstock) is verified before acceptance of feedstock.

4. The origin of primary feedstock is validated against the Ozols database to prescreening deliveries for Natura 2000 forest habitats and the occurrence of protected species within harvesting sites. Deliveries with a risk of the material originating from Natura 2000 a forest habitat type or site of protected species are rejected under the scope of SBE.
5. In the case of an identified HCV threat within a harvesting site a field visit may be used to verify the HCV is intact. Material is only accepted if the field visit confirms the WKH has been preserved.
6. Annual sample-based supplier audits and forest visits are carried out to assess the performance of the suppliers and check the absence of identified risks in the forests. if risks are identified sourcing under the scope of SBE is only continued if corrective actions have been implemented and their effectiveness has been confirmed.
7. In the case of primary feedstock under the SBP-recognised certification scheme the BP effectively mitigate the risk of indicators 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3 and thus effectively in the case of the RRA for Latvia also indicator 3.2.3. 8.

Detailed description of CB evaluation of mitigation measure and its conclusions

1. Personnel and suppliers are aware of threats to HCV areas in forests and are trained in using mitigation measures to reduce the risk of sourcing and delivering biomass originating from these areas. 2. No deliveries with unknown origins are accepted. 3. Material from high-risk areas is identified and avoided. 4. Material from harvesting sites where an HCV is present is only accepted if the HCV has been preserved and this is confirmed via a protocolled site visit.

Country

Latvia

Area/Sub-Scope

whole country

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

see the description of risk in: https://sbp-cert.org/documents/consultationdocuments/archive/revised-rra-latvia/

Detailed description of a mitigation measure

1. All suppliers undergo a supplier approval process, during which suitability to organisation's supply base evaluation is assessed.
2. Guidance is provided to SBE suppliers regarding identified threats to the forests and areas of high conservation values and management measures to be implemented to mitigate these risks.
3. The origin of all feedstock deliveries (including supplier, feedstock type, delivered volume, certification status, and origin of feedstock) is verified before acceptance of feedstock.

4. The origin of primary feedstock is validated against the Ozols database to prescreening deliveries for Natura 2000 forest habitats and the occurrence of protected species within harvesting sites. Deliveries with a risk of the material originating from Natura 2000 a forest habitat type or site of protected species are rejected under the scope of SBE.
5. In the case of an identified HCV threat within a harvesting site a field visit may be used to verify the HCV is intact. Material is only accepted if the field visit confirms the WKH has been preserved.
6. Annual sample-based supplier audits and forest visits are carried out to assess the performance of the suppliers and check the absence of identified risks in the forests. if risks are identified sourcing under the scope of SBE is only continued if corrective actions have been implemented and their effectiveness has been confirmed.
7. In the case of primary feedstock under the SBP-recognised certification scheme the BP effectively mitigate the risk of indicators 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3 and thus effectively in the case of the RRA for Latvia also indicator 3.2.3. 8.

Detailed description of CB evaluation of mitigation measure and its conclusions

1. Personnel and suppliers are aware of threats to HCV areas in forests and are trained in using mitigation measures to reduce the risk of sourcing and delivering biomass originating from these areas. 2. No deliveries with unknown origins are accepted. 3. Material from high-risk areas is identified and avoided. 4. Material from harvesting sites where an HCV is present is only accepted if the HCV has been preserved and this is confirmed via a protocolled site visit

Country

Latvia

Area/Sub-Scope

whole country

Indicator

3.2.3 feedstock shall not be sourced from forest areas in the Supply Base which, according to local definitions or norms, are classified as having combined attributes of high carbon stocks and high conservation value (HCV).

Specified risk description

see the description of risk in: https://sbp-cert.org/documents/consultationdocuments/archive/revised-rra-latvia/

Detailed description of a mitigation measure

1. All suppliers undergo a supplier approval process, during which suitability to organisation's supply base evaluation is assessed.
2. Guidance is provided to SBE suppliers regarding identified threats to the forests and areas of high conservation values and management measures to be implemented to mitigate these risks.
3. The origin of all feedstock deliveries (including supplier, feedstock type, delivered volume, certification status, and origin of feedstock) is verified before acceptance of feedstock.

4. The origin of primary feedstock is validated against the Ozols database to prescreening deliveries for Natura 2000 forest habitats and the occurrence of protected species within harvesting sites. Deliveries with a risk of the material originating from Natura 2000 a forest habitat type or site of protected species are rejected under the scope of SBE.
5. In the case of an identified HCV threat within a harvesting site a field visit may be used to verify the HCV is intact. Material is only accepted if the field visit confirms the WKH has been preserved.
6. Annual sample-based supplier audits and forest visits are carried out to assess the performance of the suppliers and check the absence of identified risks in the forests. if risks are identified sourcing under the scope of SBE is only continued if corrective actions have been implemented and their effectiveness has been confirmed.
7. In the case of primary feedstock under the SBP-recognised certification scheme the BP effectively mitigate the risk of indicators 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3 and thus effectively in the case of the RRA for Latvia also indicator 3.2.3. 8.

Detailed description of CB evaluation of mitigation measure and its conclusions

1. Personnel and suppliers are aware of threats to HCV areas in forests and are trained in using mitigation measures to reduce the risk of sourcing and delivering biomass originating from these areas.
2. No deliveries with unknown origins are accepted.
3. Material from high-risk areas is identified and avoided.
4. Material from harvesting sites where an HCV is present is only accepted if the HCV has been preserved and this is confirmed via a protocolled site visit.