Compliance with the SBP Framework: Public Summary Report

Preferred by Nature OÜ
Evaluation of Green River Panels (Thailand) Co.,Ltd

Main (Initial) Audit

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

Table of contents

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:	Hau Nguyen Van
Audit team members:	ERROR: Works only for SBR or PSR form. Please alter the function by adding more tables, or by dynamic sql
Name of the Company:	Green River Panels (Thailand) Co.,Ltd
Company legal address:	
Company contact for SBP:	Laddawan Thep-On
Company contact email:	laddawan.t@greenriverholding.com
Company website:	
Date of installation:	
SBP Certificate Code:	SBP-13-92
Date of certificate issue:	17 Sep 2026
Date of certificate expiry:	16 Sep 2031
Audit closing meeting date:	12 Jun 2026
Audit cycle:	Main (Initial) Audit

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):	Christian Jürgensen
Date of decision:	15 Sep 2026
Other comments:	N/A

2.2 Open non-conformities and observations

NC number 9725	NC Grading: Observation
Standard:	SBP Standard 2: Feedstock Verification v2.0
Requirement:	4.1 The Organisation shall prepare a Supply Base Report (SBR) using the SBP Audit Portal. N/A N/A N/A
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
The organization's Supply base report is made in English on the SBP audit portal. According to Instruction Document 1A, the indicator 2.2.2, 2.2.9, 2.2.10, 2.2.11, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.3.1 is Not Applicable TOF-Agricultural land feedstock-Woody Residues. However, under Annex 1 - Detailed SBE findings, these indicators are rated as low risk. Therefore OBS is raised.	
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

NC number 9726	NC Grading: Observation
Standard:	SBP Standard 5: Collection and Communication of Data v2.0
Requirement:	2.2 When the actual data are not available, the Organisation shall provide data with verifiableevidence from theoretical calculation provided by recognised technical expert

	usingrecognised methodology. N/A N/A N/A
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
Theoretical calculation mock up for 504 tons of wood pellet with the verifiable evidence from calculation (Diesel, Electricity). However, based on SAR verification file, the amount of drying material 61.2 at 10% moisture is not sufficient and the relatively high diesel consumption (2.767 L/t) is mainly associated with the handling and transportation of wood pellets from the production line to the warehouse area. The transportation process is currently performed using forklifts carrying approximately 1,000 kg per trip in big bags, with a total round-trip distance of approximately 740 meters per trip. This transportation arrangement is planned for the initial operational phase only. The company plans to improve transportation efficiency and reduce diesel consumption in the future by introducing a 6-wheel truck to support internal material handling operations. Based on the onsite verification the auditor confirmed that the distance wood pellets from the production line to the warehouse area is as described. As the amount of drying material 61.2 at 10% moisture is not sufficient and all data is the theorical calculation, the Observation was raised. The company will update the SAR using actual production and energy consumption data once continuous commercial operation has been conducted for at least three consecutive months.	
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 9465	NC Grading: Minor
Standard:	SBP Standard 2: Feedstock Verification v2.0
Requirement:	8.5 The Organisation shall provide stakeholders with adequate information as a basis for informed comment but does not have to provide confidential information. N/A N/A
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
During the stakeholder engagement, the BP does not provide the stakeholder the draft SBE (a. Supply Base Verifiers, b. Risk Assessment and risk ratings, and c. the Risk Management Plan, Risk Management Measures and Means of Verification) but just simple mention the panels such as: Legal compliance, Indigenous people rights, etc - Appropriate engagement: The document is not in the language of the local people (Thai language) Therefore, the minor NCR was raised,	
Timeline for Conformance:	Prior to (re)certification
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	Prior to the report finalisation, the BP has provided the documents (- Revise SBP-Quality Manual: Biomass Producer (GP-QM-SBP) (see item 8), SBE report (Thai version), Stakeholder Communication Record, Training record) to close the NCR, the auditor revised the documents and confirmed: Root cause analyse: The BP has failed to refer to the Guidance document. Correction: Translated the SBE Report into Thai and made the document available to relevant stakeholders. Furthermore, additional Stakeholder Consultations were conducted, with the SBE Report attached and presented to stakeholders for their review and comments, in accordance with SBP Guidance 8.1 and 8.5. Prevention: Revise the stakeholder consultation procedure to ensure that the SBE report is attached and communicated to stakeholders during consultation activities, including language accessibility requirements for local stakeholders. Establish procedure to verify that all required documents, including bilingual SBE reports, are attached and communicated before stakeholder consultation is conducted. Periodic reviews will also be implemented to ensure continued compliance with Guidance 8.1 and 8.5. Arrange training course relate stakeholder consultation (GP-QM-SBP and GP-SBP-004)
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	Based on the exhibit provided and interviewing with the SBP Manager and the relevant, the auditor confirmed that the root cause of this NCR was addressed. Therefore, this NCR was closed.
NC Status:	Closed
Original Due Date:	N/A
Closing Date:	2026-09-15
Upgrade Date:	N/A
Update Date:	N/A

NC number 9466	NC Grading: Minor
Standard:	Instruction Document EU RED: Bridging Requirements for Meeting the Directive EU/2023/2413

Requirement:	3.3.9 The organisation shall define a fixed balancing period. For Biomass Producers using only primary feedstock (forest feedstock and TOF feedstock) the fixed balancing period shall be 12 months24. For Biomass Producers using secondary and tertiary feedstock the fixed balancing period shall be 3 months. For Biomass Traders the fixed balancing period shall be 3 months. By the end of the balancing period, the account shall always be positive. If negative credits occur at the end of a mass balance period, the certified company must (proactively) inform the certification body immediately (and without being requested). N/A N/A
Description of Non-conformance and Related Evidence:	
The company has a mass balance system with a balancing period, for its feedstock scopes; (4A) and Trees Outside the Forest (TOF) – Agricultural land feedstock (3A) and Processing residues feedstock. However, the BP has not followed 03 months rule for mass balance with mixing between Trees Outside the Forest (TOF) – Agricultural land feedstock (3A), Processing residues feedstock (4A). Therefore, the minor NCR was raised.	
Timeline for Conformance:	Prior to (re)certification
Evidence Provided by Company to close NC:	Prior to the report finalisation, the BP has provided the updated mass balance template that the fixed balancing period is 3 months, training record to close the NCR, the auditor revised the documents and confirmed: Root cause analyse: The BP misunderstood of mass balance period, Correction and Prevention: The BP has provided the updated mass balance template with 03-month period. Arrange training course relate stakeholder consultation (GP-QM-SBP and GP-SBP-004)
Findings for Evaluation of Evidence:	Based on the exhibit provided and interviewing with the SBP Manager and the relevant, the auditor confirmed that the root cause of this NCR was addressed. Therefore, this NCR was closed.
NC Status:	Closed
Original Due Date:	N/A
Closing Date:	2026-09-15
Upgrade Date:	N/A
Update Date:	N/A

2.3 Actions taken by Organisation Prior to Report Finalisation

The BP submitted the document to close the minor NCR 2026-005759, NCR 2026-005760. The auditor reviewed documents ad confirm it is sufficient to close these NCRs.

2.4 Notes for the next Audit

The company will update the SAR using actual production and energy consumption data once continuous commercial operation has been conducted for at least three consecutive months.

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 1A: SBP Requirements for Primary Feedstock from Trees Outside Forests (TOF) v1.0; Instruction Document EU RED: Bridging Requirements for Meeting the Directive EU/2023/2413; Instruction Document Japan: Bridging Requirements for meeting Japanese sustainability, legality and GHG saving requirements v1.1 -; 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)	Yes
Products	WB 1.1 Wood pellets
Feedstock origin (countries):	Thailand
SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessments used: **Public link:** **https://sbp-cert.org/documents/standards-documents/risk-assessments/**	Not applicable
Chain of custody system	☐ Physical separation ☒ Mass balance
Outsourcing	No
Changes in the scope	NA

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.

Green River Panels (Thailand) Co., Ltd. was established in 2006 as part of the Green River Group's continued expansion in value-added wood processing. The company initially focused on utilizing wood residues such as offcuts and branches from sawmill operations to manufacture particle boards, supporting efficient resource use and waste reduction. Building on this foundation, the company has expanded into the biomass energy sector and is now a manufacturer and exporter of high-quality wood pellets and woodchips. These pellets and chips are primarily produced from rubberwood sourced from legally verified and sustainably managed plantations, reflecting the company's strong commitment to environmental responsibility. Wood pellets are manufactured at the facility, chipped inside the pellet plant and transported to external storage at TEPA TRANSIT TERMINAL COMPANY LIMITED where they are loaded directly onto the vessel and transport to Koh kham Island and exported worldwide. The organisation uses 02 type of feedstock: Trees outside forest (TOF) - Agricultural land feedstock (3A), Processing residues feedstock (4A). The whole feedstock are rubber and originates from Thailand.

3.2 Site details

Legal entity name	Address	Site Activity	Visited during the audit
Green River Panels (Thailand) Co.,Ltd	222 Moo. 4 Tha-Chang, Bang Klum, 90110 Songkhla, Thailand	Biomass Producer	☒
TEPA TRANSIT TERMINAL COMPANY LIMITED	23 Moo 4, Pak Bang Subdistrict, Thepha District, Songkhla 90150, Thailand	External Storage	☒

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 Organization sources both primary feedstock and processing residues for pellet production. For all feedstock, the Organization implements the Supply Base Evaluation with the intention to classify all inputs as SBP-compliant and EU-RED-compliant biomass. The Chain of Custody system is based on the mass balance method with a three-month balancing period. The Organization has defined two Product Group IDs: 4A and 3A, and maintains three mass balance accounts (30, 40, 41) for the production site to separately track SBP-compliant. All eligible inputs are mixed after the weighbridge, and the mass balance system is subsequently applied to allocate sustainability claims to the outputs. The Organization's traceability approach for feedstock purchase follows FSC requirements for Chain of Custody control, while mass balance and sustainability-claim allocation for SBP and EU RED compliance rely exclusively on SBP requirements to ensure traceability and integrity of sustainability claims.

4 Specific objective of the audit

The specific objective of this evaluation was to confirm that the Organization’s management system is capable of ensuring that all requirements of specified SBP Standards are implemented across the entire scope of certification.

The scope of the evaluation covered:

- Review of the Organization’s documented procedures;
- Review of the CoC system critical control points;
- Supply base evaluation;
- Interviews with responsible staff;
- Review of the records;
- GHG data collection, analysis and assessment of compliance with ID 5E;
- Supplier visit and stakeholder consultation within SBE and EU RED framework;
- Business integrity.

5 Evaluation process

5.1 Timing and duration of evaluation activities

Audit Level of Effort (LoE)		
Activity	**Auditors**	**Auditor hours**
1. Preparation	Nguyen Van Hau, Korapat Jayaphorn	8.0
2. On-site (excl. travel time)	Nguyen Van Hau, Korapat Jayaphorn	48.0
3. Report writing	Nguyen Van Hau, Korapat Jayaphorn	16.0
4. Other	Nguyen Van Hau	8.0

5.2 Auditor team qualification

Auditor qualification		
Auditor name	**Role**	**Qualification**
Nguyen Van Hau	Team Leader	Hau graduated with a bachelor's degree in Environment and Natural Resource Economic from the University of Agriculture and Forestry of Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam and Advanced Diploma in Forest Management. He has over 10 years' working experience in Forestry, Community Development, Timber industry and supply chain.Hau is a qualified FSC FM, FSC CoC auditor, FSC trademark agent, PEFC auditor, SBP auditor and has conducted several audits across APAC region. He has worked with Preferred by Nature since November 2020.
Korapat Jayaphorn (KJ	Local Technical Expert	Korapat is an accomplished agronomy professional with expertise across the agriculture sector, covering both upstream and downstream operations, particularly in the rubber sector. His specializations include Sustainable Natural Rubber management, agroforestry, conservation project development, and supply chain risk assessment. He has successfully completed industry recognized training programs in both FSC FM and FSC CoC courses. He has experience working with WWF in establishing, managing, and implementing agriforestry projects over five years, including sustainability initiatives for smallholders that enhance their capacity to meet international standards and multi-actor partnership projects that led to the creation of a national sustainable natural rubber platform.

5.3 Description of evaluation activities

The audit was conducted on-site on 04-06 June and 12 June 2026. It was focused on management system evaluation: a division of the responsibilities, record keeping, input material classification (reception and registration), analysis of the existing certification management systems and CoC critical control points, energy and carbon data collection, and communication.

During the opening meeting on 04 June 2026, the audit team was introduced, the certification scope was clarified, information about the audit plan, methodology, auditor qualification, confidentiality issues, assessment methodology, and other applicable Preferred by Nature policies and procedures was provided.

Later that day, during interviews and documentation review, all applicable requirements of the SBP and CoC standards were evaluated. During the process, the person overall responsible for the SBP system and other responsible staff were interviewed. The pellet mill facilities were visited, and observations, as well as additional interviews and document verifications, were made. SAR, Japan ID and EU RED were also verified.

On 05- 06 June 2026, suppliers of primary feedstock (Plantation), processing residue suppliers, external storage were visited and stakeholder consultation conducted to:
- Evaluation of compliance of feedstock with the supply base (Standard 1) and declared characteristics,
- Evaluation of compliance with EU RED requirements.
- During supplier evaluation, the implementation of control measures by BP within the CoC system was evaluated.

On the 12 June 2026, the closing meeting were conducted remotely where the findings were summarized, and preliminary audit conclusions based on the use of triangle evaluation method were provided to the BP's management and SBP responsible person.

5.4 List of forest management units and feedstock suppliers visited

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

Site name
MU ID 01
Site location
Songkhla Province
Site description
Planned harvest of rubber trees
Rationale and focus of visit
Evaluation of mitigation measures under SBE and EU RED SBE
Description of audit activity
Origin confirmation and relevant documentation check to confirm legality. Interviews and observations to evaluate rotation crops procedures, uses of fertilizers, chemicals or pesticides, soil management measures, buffer zones, and site preparation

Site name
MU ID 02
Site location
Songkhla Province

Site description
Planned harvest of rubber trees
Rationale and focus of visit
Evaluation of mitigation measures under SBE and EU RED SBE
Description of audit activity
Origin confirmation and relevant documentation check to confirm legality. Interviews and observations to evaluate rotation crops procedures, uses of fertilizers, chemicals or pesticides, soil management measures, buffer zones, and site preparation

Site name
MU ID 03
Site location
Songkhla Province
Site description
Planned harvest of rubber trees
Rationale and focus of visit
Evaluation of mitigation measures under SBE and EU RED SBE
Description of audit activity
Origin confirmation and relevant documentation check to confirm legality. Interviews and observations to evaluate rotation crops procedures, uses of fertilizers, chemicals or pesticides, soil management measures, buffer zones, and site preparation

Site name
MU ID 04
Site location
Songkhla Province
Site description
On-going harvest of rubber trees
Rationale and focus of visit
Evaluation of mitigation measures under SBE and EU RED SBE
Description of audit activity
Verified worker conditions, origin confirmation and relevant documentation check to confirm legality. Interviews and observations to evaluate rotation crops procedures, uses of fertilizers, chemicals or pesticides.

5.5 Describe audit sampling methodology used

When preparing for the audit and during on-site work, a sampling has been implemented, based on the following criteria: - full review of procedures; - full review of training records; - sample review of information related to suppliers; - a review of SAR, SBR, Master datasheet, invoices; - interviews with staff to evaluate theoretical and practical experience of implementation. Under Standard 1 and EU RED framework and to evaluate company management system a desk revision of evidence and documents was conducted. Additionally, auditor visited a sample of Forest Management units to verify the compliance with Standard 1 and EU RED framework BP provides the potential direct supplier list of 03 Processing residue suppliers and 04 harvesting teams to supply to BP. There are 04 MUs that potentially supply log/twigs to 04 harvesting teams. The harvesting teams purchase the standing tree from the forest owners, cutting the trees and supply the logs to the processing residue suppliers and twigs directly to BP. Based on that, under 2 processing residue suppliers, the auditor applies the formular square roof of 03 = 2 processing residue suppliers were visited. The auditor conducts forest on site verification 0.8 x square roof of 04 Mus = 02 MUs. Additionally, auditor also sampled primary suppliers (twigs), the auditor conducts 0.8 x square roof of 04 MUs = 02 Mus and select another 2 MU. The total 04 MUs including post harvested site, actively harvesting, standing trees, closing the naturel forest site etc that cover "specified risk" indicators. The auditor visit the external storage.

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.

For this evaluation, the stakeholder engagement was on an operation of Organization's factory, a community representative, Subdistrict headman, with which the Organization coordinates, and which is located near the factory, was also scheduled for an interview.
The consultations confirmed that stakeholders are aware of the Organization's planned activities and that no concerns were raised regarding compliance with applicable legislation or sustainability requirements.

5.7 Stakeholder feedback and response

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

The results of the interviews showed that:
- The households in the area were granted title deed.
- The land area was planned and used for production of TOF
- There has been no conversion from natural forest to plantation forest since 2008
- There were no serious erosion or landslides recorded in the area

5.8 Main strengths and weaknesses of the management system and operations

Strength:
 Experience with other certifications (FSC,)
 Direct participation of the management
 Robust recordkeeping system, ensuring transparency
Weaknesses:
 Lack of engagement with stakeholders
 Significant gaps in the SBE (resolved)

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 assessment of the Supply Base Evaluation included review of documented procedures, discussions with responsible staff, verification of feedstock characteristics at the production site and in the field, and evaluation of the applicability of mitigation measures across the supply base in Songkhla Satun, Trang, Phatthalung, Nakhon Si Thammarat in Thailand.

The rubber TOF classification was verified against Thai national legislation, where the Forest Act B.E. 2484, s.4(1) defines forest by tenure as land not acquired under the Land Code, so titled plantation land is not forest irrespective of tree cover; the Royal Forest Department's national forest cover survey expressly excludes rubber plantations; the sector is administered by the Rubber Authority of Thailand under the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives.

Key elements of the SBE including feedstock classification, applicability of Standard 1 indicators for TOF, justification of risk ratings, and alignment of mitigation measures with identified risks were adequately substantiated by the evidence provided.

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

All processing residues used by the Organization originate exclusively from sawmills and fully traceable and identifiable within the internal production flow.
Verification activities confirmed that the material is controlled at the point of generation, documented appropriately.

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

BP implemented mass balance module in which input feedstock data and output biomass are kept track and equivalent.
Positive balances are brought toward the next reporting period.
COC system is utilized by the FSC COC module, in which CCP is controlled from weighbridge point to biomass storage. Identification signboards in place.
Clear updated procedures covering requirements version 2.0 in SBP handbook, training records, internal records, purchase and sale invoices (FSC claim) are kept and matched with the annual volume summary, business Integrity is documented, RED commitment is signed by Senior management, and no SBP claim during reporting period. SEP is established and implemented.

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

Standard 5 and ID5E are included in the scope of certification. The Organization provides data on SAR based on the theoretical calculation mocks up for 504 tons of wood pellet with the verifiable evidence from calculation (Diesel, Electricity). However, based on SAR verification file, the amount of drying material 61.2 at 10% moisture is not sufficient, the observation 9726 was raised. The company will update the SAR using actual production and energy consumption data once continuous commercial operation has been conducted for at least three consecutive months.

There was no SBP claim on SAR during the audit period; however, the SBP manager has access to all the required data to communicate further energy and carbon information to customers.

5.13 Summary of audit findings for competency of involved personnel

Personnel performing critical tasks (e.g. quality control, safety, sustainability) meet defined competency standards.

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 company's supply base is located in Songkhla, Satun, Trang, Phatthalung, and Nakhon Si Thammarat. The Supply Base Evaluation methodology and Supply Base Verification are based on the applicable laws and regulations of Thailand. The results of the Supply Base Evaluation indicate that most criteria are classified as "Low Risk." However, the following two criteria were identified as "Specified Risk" areas:

- **4.1.8** Training shall be provided for all workers to enable them to implement the requirements set out in all relevant elements of the SBP Standards according to their responsibilities.
- **4.1.10** Safeguards shall be implemented to protect the health and safety of workers through the development, communication, and implementation of policies and procedures.

Risk mitigation and control measures will be implemented to reduce the level of risk from "Specified Risk" to "Low Risk."

These mitigation measures were reviewed for both SBP and EU-RED for Agriculture Land applicability such as: protection of soil quality and soil carbon, No go areas, health and safety for the workers etc.
Evaluation of the risk assessment confirmed that the Organization had initiated a structured approach. The Organization employs measures such as supplier questionnaires, field inspections, training activities, and verification of documentation.

6.2 CB evaluation of specified risk indicators and mitigation measures

Country
Thailand
Area/Sub-Scope
SongkhlaSatunTrangPhatthalungNakhon Si Thammarat
Indicator
4.1.8 Training shall be provided for all workers to allow them to implement the conditions set out in all elements of the SBP Standards relevant to their responsibilities.
Specified risk description
Training in workplaces is mainly governed by the Occupational Safety, Health and Environment Act B.E. 2554 (2011), which requires employers to provide safety training, and the Labour Protection Act B.E. 2541 (1998), which grants employees the right to take leave for training purposes. However, the legislation does not specify requirements for training on other aspects, such as chain of custody or SBP requirements.
Detailed description of a mitigation measure

Green River Panel has established an annual training plan for 2026 to ensure that all workers are able to implement the requirements of the SBP Standards relevant to their responsibilities. However, the company also recognizes the need to ensure that all suppliers provide appropriate training to their workers.
As a control measure, Green River Panel will provide training to all supplier management representatives. The supplier representatives will then be responsible for conducting on-the-job training for personnel involved in supplying SBP raw materials to Green River Panel.
The following activities will be provided to all suppliers:
1. Training materials
2. Training records

Detailed description of CB evaluation of mitigation measure and its conclusions

The compulsory training program has been established, and further training sessions are planned for the suppliers. During the assessment, training topics for suppliers and their packages were evaluated, and demonstrated sufficient knowledge.
It can be concluded that the implemented measures are sufficient to mitigate the identified risks.

Country
Thailand
Area/Sub-Scope
SongkhlaSatunTrangPhatthalungNakhon Si Thammarat
Indicator
4.1.10 Safeguards shall be put in place to protect the health and safety of workers by developing, communicating and implementing policies and procedures.
Specified risk description
Based on supplier verification results, safeguards to protect workers' health and safety are generally implemented in compliance with relevant Thai legislation, including the Labour Protection Act B.E. 2541 (1998), the Occupational Safety, Health and Environment Act B.E. 2554 (2011), and the Hazardous Substances Act B.E. 2535 (1992). However, the supplier verification found that Green River Wood & Lumber Manufacturing (Thailand) Co., Ltd have not fully established and consistently implemented the required policies and procedures. While the other suppliers some suppliers have occupational health and safety (OHS) measures in place—such as safety training, provision of personal protective equipment (PPE), fire evacuation training, and safety signage—implementation is not uniform across all suppliers. Although control Fols over hazardous substances are in place and no prohibited chemicals are used in the supply base areas, the inconsistency in OHS system implementation represents a specified risk.
Detailed description of a mitigation measure
The company will address the specified risk by strengthening and raise awareness of the supplier compliance with Labour Protection Act B.E. 2541 (1998), the Occupational Safety, Health and Environment Act B.E. 2554 (2011), and the Hazardous Substances

Act B.E. 2535 (1992). Measures include supplier OHS training, mandatory implementation of safety procedures (PPE, fire safety, and risk assessments), regular audits and site inspections, and review of relevant records. Suppliers with gaps will be required to implement corrective actions within defined timelines. Compliance with hazardous substance controls under the Hazardous Substances Act B.E. 2535 (1992) will also be monitored. The following activities will be provided by subjected suppliers: 1. OHS Training 2. Training Record 3. PPE Implementation
Detailed description of CB evaluation of mitigation measure and its conclusions
The mitigation measures adequately address the risk. The safety manual for production of wood pallet had been checked. Based on observations during the factory visit, no nonconformities were identified regarding health and safety practices, including the use of PPE by workers while performing their duties. Monitoring will be carried out through regular supplier verifiacton/audits, and review of OHS documentation, including training records, safety procedures, and corrective action reports.