



Supply Base Report:

Meža Enerģija SIA Re-assessment

Sustainable Biomass Program
sbp-cert.org



Completed in accordance with the Supply Base Report Template Version 2.2 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 1.0	Published 26 March 2015
Version 2.0	Published 10 August 2023
Version 2.1	Published 15 April 2024
Version 2.2	Published 21 May 2025
Version 2.3	Published 14 August 2025

© Copyright Sustainable Biomass Program Limited 2025

Table of contents

1 Overview

2 Description of the Biomass Producer and the Supply Base

- 2.1 Description of the company
- 2.2 Detailed description of the Supply Base
- 2.3 Feedstock information

3 Supply Base Risk Assessments and Risk Management Measures

- 3.1 Summary of the Supply Base Evaluation
- 3.2 Conflicts with applicable national and sub-national legislation
- 3.3 Risk Management Measures

4 Stakeholder engagement

- 4.1 General description
- 4.2 Response to stakeholder comments

5 Report updates and approval

Annex 1: Detailed findings for Supply Base Evaluation indicators

Annex 2: EU RED Supply Base Evaluation

Annex 2a: EU RED II Supply Base Evaluation

Annex 3: SBP Processing residues and/or Post-consumer feedstock requirements

Annex 4: EU RED detailed findings for Trees Outside Forest (TOF) feedstock

Annex 4a: RED II detailed findings for Trees Outside Forest (TOF) feedstock

1 Overview

Producer name:	Meža Enerģija SIA
Producer address:	Skolas iela 12A - 1, LV-1010 Rīga, Latvia
SBP Certificate Code:	SBP-08-54
Geographic position:	56.958000, 24.042000
Primary contact:	Artis Šteinbergs, +371 626 06 000 or +371 202 555 54, artis@mezaenergija.lv
Company website:	https://www.mezaenergija.lv
Date report finalised:	24 Aug 2026
SBR reporting period from:	01 Jun 2025
SBR reporting period to:	31 May 2026
Name of the Certification Body:	Preferred by Nature OÜ
Certification Body Approval date:	21 Sep 2026
SBP Standard(s) used:	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 5E: Collection and Communication of Energy and Carbon data. v2.1, Instruction Document EU RED: Bridging Requirements for Meeting the Directive EU/2023/2413
Feedstock origin (countries)	Latvia (3.343 million ha)
Weblink to Standard(s) used:	https://sbp-cert.org/documents/standards-documents/standards

2 Description of the Biomass Producer and the Supply Base

2.1 Description of the company

Meža Enerģija SIA is a Latvian forestry and energy biomass enterprise established in 2018, with offices in Skaņkalne and Rīga and operations conducted across Latvia.

The company holds FSC certification (FM/CoC) and SBP certification, focusing on sustainable forest management, timber harvesting and energy wood chip production.

The business model encompasses full-cycle forestry services, from planting and forest stand management to harvesting, procurement of standing timber and forest harvesting residues, and direct logistics to key export terminals, including Salacgrīva and three port terminals in Rīga.

The company is led by Artis Šteinbergs.

Products included in the scope of SBP Certification: *WB 2.1 Wood chips*

Number of employees: 53

Annual maximum production capacity (metric tonnes): 94000

Number of direct feedstock suppliers: 69

Approximate number of feedstock sub-suppliers: 58

Description of the chain-of-custody and upstream supply chain:

Description of the Chain-of-Custody and Upstream Supply Chain

The Organisation maintains FSC and SBP Chain of Custody systems to ensure the traceability of feedstock from its origin through procurement, transport, biomass production and sale. Feedstock origin, certification status and relevant documentation are verified in accordance with the Organisation's applicable FSC and SBP procedures.

1. Upstream Supply Sources

Feedstock originates from forests in Latvia, including privately owned, state-owned and municipal forests. Feedstock is sourced directly from forest owners and managers, as well as from suppliers and wood trading companies.

The origin, certification status and applicable sustainability requirements of the feedstock are verified through the Organisation's due diligence procedures and, where applicable, the Supply Base Evaluation (SBE).

2. Feedstock Types

The Organisation sources primary feedstock consisting of roundwood, material from thinnings and forest harvesting residues, including branches and tops.

3. Transport and Logistics

Feedstock and produced biomass are primarily transported using the Organisation's own transport fleet. Contracted hauliers are used where necessary.

Produced wood chips are delivered to biomass storage facilities at the port of Salacgrīva and at three locations in the port of Riga, where they are stored prior to loading onto vessels. Mērsrags harbour is also included in the scope.

Relevant transport, origin and volume documentation is maintained to ensure traceability throughout the supply chain.

4. Chain of Custody Control

The Organisation applies FSC and SBP Chain of Custody controls, including:

- supplier approval and evaluation;
- verification of feedstock origin, certification status and applicable documentation;
- verification through relevant Latvian databases, where applicable;
- recording and reconciliation of incoming and outgoing volumes; and
- application of risk assessment and risk mitigation measures for feedstock covered by the Supply Base Evaluation, where applicable.

Only feedstock meeting the Organisation's applicable legality, sustainability and traceability requirements is accepted into the SBP supply chain.

5. Compliance with SBP Standards

The Organisation applies documented procedures to ensure that feedstock entering the SBP supply chain meets applicable SBP requirements. This includes verification of feedstock origin, certification status and documentation and, where applicable, Supply Base Evaluation, risk assessment and implementation of risk mitigation measures.

2.2 Detailed description of the Supply Base

Guidance: Tables below have been generated automatically for each sourcing country based on the selection of 'Feedstock origin (countries)' in section 1 above.*

Annex 1 is generated by the system if the SBP SBE is used without Regional Risk Assessment(s) (RRAs). In case RRA(s) is used, further details shall be given only in section 3 below.

Annex 2 is generated if EU RED SBE is in the scope for each country separately.

Country	Latvia
Area/Region	3.343 million ha
Exclusions	none
Feedstock types	Primary feedstock
Feedstock Product Groups	Forest feedstock (1A)
Feedstock inputs	SBP Compliant feedstock , SBP Controlled feedstock
Is the forest managed to supply energy and non-energy markets?	Yes - Majority
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
Risk assessment(s)	Yes – Regional Risk Assessment (RRA) used
Provide a concise summary of why a SBE was determined to be required or not required here:	
An SBE was determined to be required because the Organisation sources primary feedstock from forests for which compliance with the applicable SBP requirements needs to be evaluated through the Supply Base Evaluation process. The Organisation uses the applicable SBP Regional Risk Assessment (RRA) as the basis for evaluating risks and implements risk mitigation measures where required.	

Feedstock types included in SBE:	Primary feedstock
Includes EU RED SBE:	Yes
Includes EU RED II SBE grandfathering	No
Includes EU RED TOF:	No
Includes EU RED II TOF grandfathering	No
Size of Supply Base area (million ha):	3.4300
Map(s) of the Supply Base area:	



2.3 Feedstock information

- a. **Total volume of Feedstock:** 200,000-400,000 m³
b. **Volume of primary feedstock:** 200,000-400,000 m³
c. **List of all the species in primary feedstock, including scientific name:**

Picea abies	Norway Spruce
Pinus sylvestris	Scots Pine
Alnus incana	Grey Alder
Populus tremula	Aspen
Betula pendula	Silver Birch
Betula pubescens	Downy birch
Alnus glutinosa	Black Alder

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

Explanation: In the reporting period, 17,222.87 m³ of feedstock originated from sanitary fellings and other relevant salvage operations. These operations were carried out mainly due to pest and disease control and other forest damage. The volume represents a minority share of the total feedstock supply.

- e. **Hardwood (i.e. broadleaf trees): specify proportion of feedstock from (%):** 80.00
f. **Softwood (i.e. coniferous trees): specify proportion of feedstock from (%):** 20.00
g. **Proportion of feedstock composed of or derived from saw logs by weight (%):** 0.00
h. **Indicate how you determine the proportion of saw log:** Specification issued by a body exercising functions of a public nature and issued for use by sawmills in the area in which the wood was grown.
i. **Roundwood from fellings from forests with > 40 yr rotation times - Average % volume of fellings delivered to BP (%):** 40.70
j. **Select forest type(s) where the primary feedstock was sourced from:** Mix of The Above
k. **Select the main harvesting system(s) used for the sourced primary feedstock:** Mix of the above
l. **Volume of primary feedstock from primary forest:** 0 tonnes
m. **Volume of processing residues feedstock:** 0
Physical form of the feedstock: N/A
n. **Share of SBP-recognised system claim for processing residues:**

- o. **Volume of post-consumer feedstock:** 0
Physical form of the feedstock: N/A
p. **Estimated amount of EU RED-compliant sustainable feedstock that could be collected annually by the BP:** 230000 tonnes
q. **What is the estimated amount of EU RED-compliant sustainable feedstock that could be harvested annually in a Supply Base (estimated):** 13000000.00 tonnes
Explanation: 13000000.00

3 Supply Base Risk Assessments and Risk Management Measures

Guidance: Biomass Producers shall demonstrate that any specified risks of sourcing feedstock not in compliance with SBP Standard 1 have been adequately reduced to low risk, following Standard 2 requirements. Following section applies to Biomass Producer's implementing SBP Supply Base Evaluation (SBP RRA or company own risk assessment). EU RED Supply Base Evaluation details are reported in Annex 2.

☐ **Not Applicable – Supply Base Evaluation not implemented**

3.1 Summary of the Supply Base Evaluation

SIA Meža Enerģija has held SBP certification since 2022 and has managed an FSC FM certified group in Latvia since 2019. The Organisation sources primary feedstock from forests in Latvia, including its FSC FM certified group and other forest owners and suppliers.

The Supply Base covers Latvia. Latvia has an established regulatory framework governing forest management, harvesting, nature conservation and biodiversity protection. Forest management activities are supervised by the competent national authorities, including the State Forest Service.

The Organisation implements a Supply Base Evaluation (SBE) for primary feedstock where evaluation under the SBE is applicable. The applicable SBP Regional Risk Assessment (RRA) for Latvia is used as the basis for risk assessment. Identified specified risks are addressed through documented risk mitigation measures and verification procedures in accordance with the Organisation's SBP procedures.

Feedstock origin, certification status and relevant documentation are verified in accordance with the Organisation's FSC and SBP procedures. Where applicable, relevant Latvian databases and other information sources are used to verify legality, forest and land status, nature conservation requirements and other applicable sustainability criteria.

During the reporting period, the Organisation sourced SBP-compliant primary feedstock from its FSC FM certified group and other eligible certified sources, as well as primary feedstock evaluated through the SBE.

3.2 Conflicts with applicable national and sub-national legislation

Latvia has a well-developed and comprehensive legal framework regulating forest management, land use, environmental protection, nature conservation and timber harvesting. The main legislation includes the Forest Law, the Environmental Protection Law, the Law on Specially Protected Nature Territories and other applicable legislation. These laws are supported by Cabinet regulations and are enforced by the State Forest Service, the Nature Conservation Agency and other competent authorities.

Compliance with forest management, nature conservation and harvesting requirements is subject to supervision by the competent authorities. Felling activities and the origin of forest feedstock are subject to applicable documentation, permitting and verification requirements.

The applicable SBP requirements have been considered in relation to the national legal framework applicable within the Supply Base. No conflicts have been identified between the applicable SBP requirements and national or sub-national legislation in Latvia. Individual cases of non-compliance with legal requirements, where identified, are subject to investigation and enforcement by the competent authorities and do not constitute a conflict between SBP requirements and the applicable legal framework.

3.3 Risk Management Measures

Guidance: Please provide more details about specified risk indicators in each supply country and describe mitigation measures taken to address all specified risks associated with indicators.

Country: Latvia	
Area/sub-scope:	
Risk Assessment used:	
	☐ SBP-RRA-AS-VN-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Vietnam FOR_Interim ☐ 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 ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-DK-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Denmark FOR_Endorsed ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-DK-TOF_v1.0 RRA for Denmark TOF_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-EE-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Estonia FOR_Endorsed ☒ SBP-RRA-EU-LV-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Latvia FOR_Endorsed ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-LT-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Lithuania FOR_Endorsed ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-QC-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Quebec FOR_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-AB-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Alberta FOR_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-BC-FOR_v2.0 RRA for British Columbia FOR_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-NB-FOR_v1.0 RRA for New Brunswick FOR_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-NS-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Nova Scotia FOR_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-NO-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Norway FOR_Interim ☐ Biomass Producer's own risk assessment
Indicator with specified risk:	
2.1.1 Key species, habitats, ecosystems, and areas of high conservation value (HCV) pertaining to biodiversity in the Supply Base shall be identified.	
Description of the specific risk:	
HCV1 – Protected species and bird nesting sites: Information on the occurrence of protected species in Latvia is fragmented, as protected species were not comprehensively mapped during the Nature Census (2017–2022). Not all locations of protected species are mapped or legally protected. Therefore, there is a specified risk that protected species, their habitats and bird nesting sites may not be identified before harvesting operations. HCV3 – Woodland Key Habitats (WKHs) and EU protected habitats: There is a risk of damage to Woodland Key Habitats (WKHs) and EU protected habitats, particularly in forests where such conservation values have not been formally identified or legally protected. Available information on the occurrence of protected habitats may be incomplete. Therefore, there is a risk that valuable habitats may not be identified before harvesting operations.	
Mitigation measure:	
- Feedstock origin is checked using the Nature Conservation Agency's OZOLS database and LVM GEO, including information on protected areas, micro-reserves, protected habitats, protected species and bird nesting sites. - Field inspections form part of the risk verification process and include completion of an inspection form. During inspections, particular attention is given to large nests in trees, bird presence and other signs of	

nesting, as well as signs of protected species and habitats.

- Particular attention is given to the three species identified in the RRA and their characteristic habitat features:

- thick shelled river mussel (*Unio crassus*) – clean, fast-flowing watercourses with sandy or gravel substrate;
- hermit beetle (*Osmoderma eremita*) – old, large hollow deciduous trees with decaying wood or wood mould;
- western barbastelle (*Barbastella barbastellus*) – old or dead trees with cavities, cracks or loose bark.

- Where a bird nest or signs of protected species or habitats are identified, appropriate mitigation measures are applied, including postponement of harvesting, establishment of protection zones and the use of low-impact harvesting methods. Where necessary, a species, habitat or ornithology expert is consulted.

- Feedstock is not accepted where a protected species occurrence, bird nesting site or protected habitat is identified in the source forest stand. Where a conservation value is identified in an adjacent stand, the potential impact of harvesting activities on that conservation value is assessed.

- Suppliers sign a self-declaration regarding known occurrences of protected species, bird nesting sites and protected habitats.

Monitoring and outcomes:

Compliance with the mitigation measures is monitored through OZOLS and LVM GEO checks, field inspection records, supplier self-declarations and, where applicable, specialist assessments. Identified bird nests, protected species and habitats are subject to additional verification and applicable protection measures.

No non-compliant feedstock related to protected species, bird nesting sites or protected habitats was identified in the SBP supply chain during the reporting period.

The monitoring and verification process ensures that identified risks are addressed before feedstock is accepted into the SBP supply chain. Where available information is insufficient to demonstrate compliance, additional verification is required and the material is not accepted until the identified risk has been adequately addressed.

Country: Latvia

Area/sub-scope:

Risk Assessment used:

- ☐ SBP-RRA-AS-VN-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Vietnam FOR_Interim
- ☐ 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
- ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-DK-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Denmark FOR_Endorsed
- ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-DK-TOF_v1.0 RRA for Denmark TOF_Interim
- ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-EE-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Estonia FOR_Endorsed
- ☒ SBP-RRA-EU-LV-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Latvia FOR_Endorsed
- ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-LT-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Lithuania FOR_Endorsed
- ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-QC-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Quebec FOR_Interim
- ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-AB-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Alberta FOR_Interim

	☐ SBP-RRA-CA-BC-FOR_v2.0 RRA for British Columbia FOR_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-NB-FOR_v1.0 RRA for New Brunswick FOR_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-NS-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Nova Scotia FOR_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-NO-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Norway FOR_Interim ☐ Biomass Producer's own risk assessment
Indicator with specified risk:	
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.	
Description of the specific risk:	
HCV1 – Protected species and bird nesting sites: Threats and impacts from harvesting activities on protected species, their habitats and bird nesting areas may not always be fully identified and evaluated. Information on protected species is fragmented and not all locations are mapped or legally protected. Therefore, harvesting activities may negatively affect protected species, nesting sites or their habitats. HCV3 – Woodland Key Habitats (WKHs) and EU protected habitats: Not all Woodland Key Habitats (WKHs) and EU protected habitats are legally protected or fully represented in available information. Therefore, the potential impacts of harvesting activities on these habitats may not always be identified and evaluated before harvesting. The risk is considered specified and requires additional verification and mitigation measures.	
Mitigation measure:	
- OZOLS and LVM GEO are checked to identify protected habitats, micro-reserves and other conservation values that may be affected by harvesting activities. - Where available information indicates a potential risk, additional verification is carried out, including field verification where necessary. - Where protected habitats or other conservation values are identified, appropriate mitigation measures are applied, including protection zones, harvesting restrictions and low-impact harvesting methods. - Harvesting activities are planned to minimise impacts on soil, watercourses and biodiversity. Where soil conditions are wet or vulnerable to damage, harvesting is postponed or appropriate machinery, timing and temporary crossings are used. - Ecologically valuable trees, shrubs and deadwood are retained to maintain biodiversity and habitat structures. - Where conditions deteriorate and harvesting creates a risk of significant soil or environmental damage, operations are suspended until suitable conditions are restored. - Where necessary, a species, habitat or ornithology expert is consulted to assess potential impacts and determine appropriate mitigation measures.	
Monitoring and outcomes:	
Implementation of the mitigation measures is monitored through OZOLS and LVM GEO checks, field inspection records and, where applicable, specialist assessments. Compliance with applicable protection measures and harvesting restrictions is verified, including measures related to protected habitats, soil and water protection, retention of ecologically valuable trees and deadwood, and harvesting conditions. Where potential adverse impacts are identified, additional verification is carried out and harvesting practices are adjusted or operations are suspended where necessary. During the reporting period, the applied controls did not identify any significant adverse impacts on protected species, habitats, soil or water resulting from harvesting activities. Where potential risks were identified, appropriate mitigation measures were applied.	

The monitoring and verification process ensures that threats and potential impacts from harvesting activities are identified, assessed and mitigated through appropriate operational and protection measures.

Country: Latvia	
Area/sub-scope:	
Risk Assessment used:	
	☐ SBP-RRA-AS-VN-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Vietnam FOR_Interim ☐ 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 ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-DK-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Denmark FOR_Endorsed ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-DK-TOF_v1.0 RRA for Denmark TOF_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-EE-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Estonia FOR_Endorsed ☒ SBP-RRA-EU-LV-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Latvia FOR_Endorsed ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-LT-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Lithuania FOR_Endorsed ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-QC-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Quebec FOR_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-AB-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Alberta FOR_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-BC-FOR_v2.0 RRA for British Columbia FOR_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-NB-FOR_v1.0 RRA for New Brunswick FOR_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-NS-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Nova Scotia FOR_Interim ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-NO-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Norway FOR_Interim ☐ Biomass Producer's own risk assessment
Indicator with specified risk:	
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.	
Description of the specific risk:	
HCV1 – Protected species and bird nesting sites: Protected species, their habitats and bird nesting sites are particularly sensitive to harvesting impacts. There is a risk that these conservation values may be damaged or disturbed during harvesting activities, particularly where they have not been identified before operations begin. HCV3 – Woodland Key Habitats (WKHs) and EU protected habitats: Harvesting is permitted in some Natura 2000 areas and in forests containing EU protected habitats. Therefore, there is a risk that Woodland Key Habitats (WKHs) and EU protected habitats may be damaged where appropriate protection measures are not applied during harvesting activities. The risk is considered specified and requires mitigation measures to ensure that identified conservation values are maintained.	
Mitigation measure:	
- Feedstock origin is checked using OZOLS and LVM GEO for information on protected species, bird nesting sites, protected habitats and micro-reserves. - Where protected species, bird nests, habitats or other conservation values are identified, appropriate protection measures are applied, including protection zones, harvesting outside the bird nesting period and low-impact harvesting methods. - During harvesting, ecologically valuable trees and deadwood are retained to maintain biodiversity and	

habitat structures.

- Where necessary, harvesting operations are postponed or suspended and a species, habitat or ornithology expert is consulted.

Monitoring and outcomes:

Compliance with the mitigation measures is monitored through OZOLS and LVM GEO checks, field inspection records and, where applicable, specialist assessments. Compliance with protection measures, including protection zones, harvesting restrictions and retention of ecologically valuable trees and deadwood, is verified.

During the reporting period, no significant damage to protected species, bird nesting sites or protected habitats was identified as a result of harvesting activities. Where conservation values or potential risks were identified, appropriate protection measures were applied.

The monitoring and verification process ensures that identified protected species, bird nesting sites, habitats and other conservation values are maintained through appropriate protection and harvesting measures.

Country: Latvia

Area/sub-scope:

Risk Assessment used:

- ☐ SBP-RRA-AS-VN-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Vietnam FOR_Interim
- ☐ 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
- ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-DK-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Denmark FOR_Endorsed
- ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-DK-TOF_v1.0 RRA for Denmark TOF_Interim
- ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-EE-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Estonia FOR_Endorsed
- ☒ SBP-RRA-EU-LV-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Latvia FOR_Endorsed
- ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-LT-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Lithuania FOR_Endorsed
- ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-QC-FOR_v2.0 RRA for Quebec FOR_Interim
- ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-AB-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Alberta FOR_Interim
- ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-BC-FOR_v2.0 RRA for British Columbia FOR_Interim
- ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-NB-FOR_v1.0 RRA for New Brunswick FOR_Interim
- ☐ SBP-RRA-CA-NS-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Nova Scotia FOR_Interim
- ☐ SBP-RRA-EU-NO-FOR_v1.0 RRA for Norway FOR_Interim
- ☐ Biomass Producer's own risk assessment

Indicator with specified risk:

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).

Description of the specific risk:

Some HCV areas and conservation values in Latvia may not be fully identified or legally protected. There is a risk that such areas may overlap with forests having high carbon stocks, including mature, old-growth and wetland forests.

Therefore, there is a risk that primary feedstock may be sourced from forest areas where high carbon stock and high conservation value (HCV) attributes occur together.

The risk is considered specified and requires additional verification and mitigation measures.

Mitigation measure:

- Feedstock origin is checked using OZOLS and LVM GEO for information on protected habitats, Natura 2000 areas, micro-reserves and other conservation values.
- Forest inventory and State Forest Service (VMD) data are used to assess stand age, species composition and structure.
- Where a forest stand meets the defined age screening criteria, available information is further assessed for signs of human intervention, including drainage, forest fragmentation and previous harvesting.
- Where the potential presence of an old or naturally developed forest cannot be excluded, a field inspection is carried out. The inspection considers biologically old trees, standing and lying deadwood, stand structure, natural regeneration and signs of protected species.
- High carbon stock characteristics are assessed based on stand age, species composition, forest type and structure, including characteristics associated with wetland forests.
- Where uncertainty remains regarding the status of the area, a biologist or certified nature expert is consulted.
- Where high carbon stock and high conservation value (HCV) attributes are identified together, primary feedstock from the area is not accepted into the SBP supply chain.

Monitoring and outcomes:

Compliance with the mitigation measures is monitored through OZOLS and LVM GEO checks, forest inventory data and field inspection records. Where necessary, expert assessments are used for additional verification.

During the reporting period, no primary feedstock originating from forest areas with combined high carbon stock and HCV attributes was identified in the SBP supply chain.

Where potential high carbon stock or HCV characteristics are identified, additional verification is carried out to determine whether these attributes occur together before the feedstock is accepted into the SBP supply chain.

4 Stakeholder engagement

4.1 General description

Biomass Producer's stakeholder engagement start date: 27 Jul 2026

Biomass Producer's stakeholder engagement end date: 26 Aug 2026

Total number of stakeholders contacted: 9

Give a general description of the process of Stakeholders Engagement, including stakeholders contacted, method of communication and a summary of the comments received:

Stakeholder engagement was carried out by contacting relevant stakeholders representing environmental, forestry, governmental and other relevant interests. Nine stakeholders were contacted by e-mail and invited to provide comments on the Organisation's Supply Base Evaluation and feedstock sourcing activities. The consultation period was 30 days. No comments or concerns were received during the consultation period.

4.2 Response to stakeholder comments

5 Report updates and approval

This document is: Updated SBR (surveillance audits/scope-change audits)

The SBR has been updated for the current reporting period. Updates include current feedstock and Supply Base information, annual volume data, stakeholder engagement information, and updated descriptions of specified risks, mitigation measures and monitoring outcomes in accordance with the applicable SBP requirements and the Latvia Regional Risk Assessment.

Name	Artis Šteinbergs
Title	Management representative
Date of report approval	24 Aug 2026

Annex 1: Detailed findings for Supply Base Evaluation indicators

Annex 2: EU RED Supply Base Evaluation

Countries where EU RED Supply Base Evaluation is used	
Country	Latvia
Area	3.343 million ha
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 for Latvia by Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia (RED III)
Level B management system at the level of the forest sourcing area	N/A
(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 for Latvia by Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia (RED III)
Level B management system at the level of the forest sourcing area	N/A
(iii) That areas designated by international or national law or by the relevant competent authority for nature protection purposes, including in wetlands, grasslands, heathland and peatlands, are protected with the aim of preserving biodiversity and preventing habitat destruction, 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 for Latvia by Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia (RED III)
Level B management system at the level of the forest sourcing area	N/A
(iv) that harvesting is carried out considering the maintenance of soil quality and biodiversity in accordance with sustainable forest management principles, with the aim of preventing any adverse impact, in a way that avoids harvesting of stumps and roots, degradation of primary forests, and of old growth forests as defined in the country where the forest is located, or their conversion into plantation forests, and harvesting on vulnerable soils, that harvesting is carried out in compliance with maximum thresholds for large clear-cuts as defined in the country where the forest is located, and with locally and ecologically appropriate retention thresholds for deadwood extraction and that harvesting is carried out in compliance with requirements to use logging systems that minimise any adverse impact on soil quality, including soil compaction, and on biodiversity features and habitats	

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 for Latvia by Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia (RED III)
Level B management system at the level of the forest sourcing area	N/A
(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 for Latvia by Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia (RED III)
Level B management system at the level of the forest sourcing area	N/A
(vi)¹ That forests in which the forest biomass is harvested do not stem from the lands that have the statuses referred to in Article 29(3) points (a), (b), (d) and (e); Article 29(4), point (a), and Article 29(5), respectively under the same conditions of determination of the status of land specified in those paragraphs. <i>Article 29 (3): biomass fuel produced from agricultural biomass shall not be made from raw material obtained from land with a high biodiversity value, namely land that had one of the following statuses in or after January 2008, whether or not the land continues to have that status:</i> <i>(a) primary forest and other wooded land and old growth forest, namely forest and other wooded land of native species, where there is no clearly visible indication of human activity and the ecological processes are not significantly disturbed; and old growth forests as defined in the country where the forest is located. If there is no definition of old growth forest at the national level, then the following definition shall apply: A forest stand or area consisting of native tree species that have developed, predominantly through natural processes, structures and dynamics normally associated with late-seral developmental phases in primary or undisturbed forests of the same type. Signs of former human activities may be visible, but they are gradually disappearing or too limited to significantly disturb natural processes.</i>	
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 for Latvia by Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia (RED III)
Level B management system at the level of the forest sourcing area	N/A
(vi)² That forests in which the forest biomass is harvested do not stem from the lands that have the statuses referred to in Article 29(3) points (a), (b), (d) and (e); Article 29(4), point (a), and Article 29(5), respectively under the same conditions of determination of the status of land specified in those paragraphs. <i>Article 29 (3): biomass fuel produced from agricultural biomass shall not be made from raw material obtained from land with a high biodiversity value, namely land that had one of the following statuses in or after January 2008, whether or not the land continues to have that status:</i> <i>(b) highly biodiverse forest and other wooded land which is species-rich and not degraded, and has been identified as being highly biodiverse by the relevant competent authority, unless evidence is provided that the production of that raw material did not interfere with those nature protection purposes.</i>	
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 for Latvia by Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia (RED III)

Level B management system at the level of the forest sourcing area	N/A
(vi)³ That forests in which the forest biomass is harvested do not stem from the lands that have the statuses referred to in Article 29(3) points (a), (b), (d) and (e); Article 29(4), point (a), and Article 29(5), respectively under the same conditions of determination of the status of land specified in those paragraphs. Article 29 (3): biomass fuel produced from agricultural biomass shall not be made from raw material obtained from land with a high biodiversity value, namely land that had one of the following statuses in or after January 2008, whether or not the land continues to have that status: (d) highly biodiverse grassland spanning more than one hectare that is: (i) natural, namely grassland that would remain grassland in the absence of human intervention and that maintains the natural species composition and ecological characteristics and processes; or (ii) non-natural, namely grassland that would cease to be grassland in the absence of human intervention and that is species-rich and not degraded and has been identified as being highly biodiverse by the relevant competent authority, unless evidence is provided that the harvesting of the raw material is necessary to preserve its status as highly biodiverse grassland.	
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 for Latvia by Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia (RED III)
Level B management system at the level of the forest sourcing area	N/A
(vi)⁴ That forests in which the forest biomass is harvested do not stem from the lands that have the statuses referred to in Article 29(3) points (a), (b), (d) and (e); Article 29(4), point (a), and Article 29(5), respectively under the same conditions of determination of the status of land specified in those paragraphs. Article 29 (3): biomass fuel produced from agricultural biomass shall not be made from raw material obtained from land with a high biodiversity value, namely land that had one of the following statuses in or after January 2008, whether or not the land continues to have that status: (e) heathland - Biomass Producer shall use the official definition for Heathland used in the applicable feedstock origin country. In the absence of such a definition, then the following definition shall be applied: Vegetation with low and closed cover, dominated by bushes, shrubs, dwarf shrubs (heather, briars, broom, gorse, laburnum etc.) and herbaceous plants, forming a climax stage of development (Source: EU Copernicus).	
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 for Latvia by Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia (RED III)
Level B management system at the level of the forest sourcing area	N/A
(vi)⁵ That forests in which the forest biomass is harvested do not stem from the lands that have the statuses referred to in Article 29(3) points (a), (b), (d) and (e); Article 29(4), point (a), and Article 29(5), respectively under the same conditions of determination of the status of land specified in those paragraphs. Article 29 (4): biomass fuel produced from agricultural biomass shall not be made from raw material obtained from land with high-carbon stock, namely land that had one of the following statuses in January 2008 and no longer has that status: (a) wetlands, namely land that is covered with or saturated by water permanently or for a significant part of the year (NOTE: Evidence of verification of wetlands should reflect seasonal changes within a year).	

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 for Latvia by Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia (RED III)
Level B management system at the level of the forest sourcing area	N/A
(vi)⁶ That forests in which the forest biomass is harvested do not stem from the lands that have the statuses referred to in Article 29(3) points (a), (b), (d) and (e); Article 29(4), point (a), and Article 29(5), respectively under the same conditions of determination of the status of land specified in those paragraphs. <i>Article 29 (5): biomass fuel produced from agricultural biomass shall not be made from raw material obtained from land that was peatland in January 2008, unless evidence is provided that the cultivation and harvesting of that raw material does not involve drainage of previously undrained soil. For a peatland that was partially drained in January 2008, a subsequent deeper drainage, affecting soil that was not fully drained, would constitute a breach of the criterion.</i>	
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 for Latvia by Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia (RED III)
Level B management system at the level of the forest sourcing area	N/A
(vii) that installations producing biomass fuels from forest biomass, issue a statement of assurance, underpinned by company-level internal processes, for the purpose of the audits conducted pursuant to Article 30(3), that the forest biomass is not sourced from the lands referred to in point (vi).	
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 for Latvia by Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia (RED III)
Level B management system at the level of the forest sourcing area	<i>Not applicable, requirement only applies to Level A</i>

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 for Latvia by Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia (RED III)
Level B management system at the level of the forest sourcing area	N/A

Annex 2a: EU RED II Supply Base Evaluation

Annex 3: SBP Processing residues and/or Post-consumer feedstock requirements

☒ Not Applicable (Processing Residues and/or post-consumer feedstock not used)

Verification and monitoring of suppliers

N/A

Feedstock inspection and classification upon receipt

N/A

Supplier audit for processing residues and post-consumer feedstock

N/A

Annex 4: EU RED detailed findings for Trees Outside Forest (TOF) feedstock

NOTE: For “Trees outside forests (TOF) – Urban and landscape feedstock” no EU RED sustainability requirements apply, only the GHG savings criteria apply (SBP EU RED Bridging ID v2.0 Section 1.1). The land use category in this case is neither forest land nor agricultural land. For “Trees outside forests (TOF) – Agricultural land feedstock” the applicable criteria are Article 29 paragraphs (2)-(5).

Not Applicable (RED II TOF not included)

Annex 4a: RED II detailed findings for Trees Outside Forest (TOF) feedstock

NOTE: For “Trees outside forests (TOF) – Urban and landscape feedstock” no REDII sustainability requirements apply, only the GHG savings criteria apply (SBP REDII Bridging ID Section 4.2). The land use category in this case is neither forest land nor agricultural land. For “Trees outside forests (TOF) – Agricultural land feedstock” the applicable criteria are Article 29 paragraphs (2)-(5).