



Supply Base Report: Bitus AB

Main (Initial) Audit

www.sbp-cert.org

LOCAL TRANSLATION



The promise of good biomass



Completed in accordance with the Supply Base Report Template Version 1.4

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 1.1 published 22 February 2016

Version 1.2 published 23 June 2016

Version 1.3 published 14 January 2019; re-published 3 April 2020

Version 1.4 published 22 October 2020

Table of Contents

1	Overview
2	Description of the Supply Base
2.1	General description
2.2	Description of countries included in the Supply Base
2.3	Actions taken to promote certification amongst feedstock supplier
2.4	Quantification of the Supply Base
3	Requirement for a Supply Base Evaluation
4	Supply Base Evaluation
4.1	Scope
4.2	Justification
4.3	Results of risk assessment and Supplier Verification Programme
4.4	Conclusion
5	Supply Base Evaluation process
6	Stakeholder consultation
6.1	Response to stakeholder comments
7	Mitigation measures
7.1	Mitigation measures
7.2	Monitoring and outcomes
8	Detailed findings for indicators
9	Review of report
9.1	Peer review
9.2	Public or additional reviews
10	Approval of report
Annex 1: Detailed findings for Supply Base Evaluation indicators	

1 Overview

Producer name: Bitus AB Fågelfors

Producer address: Bruksgatan 60, 570 75 Fågelfors

SBP Certificate Code:

Geographic position: Bruksgatan 60, 570 75 Fågelfors, Lat: 57.209169 Long: 15.830823

Primary contact name: Johan Eliasson

Primary contact phone: 070-612 15 88

Primary contact email: johan.eliaasson@bergstimber.com

Company website: <https://bitus.se/>

Date report finalised:

Close of last CB audit: 2021-09-30

Name of CB: DNV GL Business Assurance Finland Oy Ab

SBP Standard(s) used:

BP Standard 2: Verification of SBP-compliant Feedstock

SBP Standard 4: Chain of Custody

SBP Standard 5: Collection and Communication of Data Instruction

Instruction Document 5E: Collection and Communication of Energy and Carbon Data 1.3

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

SBP Endorsed Regional Risk Assessment:

Weblink to SBR on Company website: <https://bitus.se/dokument/>

Indicate how the current evaluation fits within the cycle of Supply Base Evaluations					
Main (Initial) Evaluation	First Surveillance	Second Surveillance	Third Surveillance	Fourth Surveillance	Re-assessment
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2 Description of the Supply Base

2.1 General description

Feedstock types: Primary Secondary Tertiary

Includes Supply Base evaluation (SBE): Yes No

Feedstock origin (countries): Sverige

2.2 Description of countries included in the Supply Base

Country	Sverige
Area/Region	
Exclusions	
Description of the country	
<p>I Sverige äger privatpersoner och familjer mer än 50% av skogsområdet. Mer än 30% av skogarna ägs av företag, inklusive delvis Stora Ensoown skogar och resten av skogen är offentligt ägda.</p> <p>Sverige representeras av halvnaturliga skogsskogar med inhemska trädslag deras naturliga tillväxtmiljöer. Trädslag som kommer är tall (Pinus sylvestris) och Gran (Picea abies). Dessutom finns skogar med björk (Betula sp), Aspen (Populus Tremula), Alder (Alnus sp) och Willows (Salix sp). I södra Sverige, andra lövfällande arter (Quercus, Fraxinus) förekommer. Inga CITES -listade trädslag är representerade i inköpet.</p> <p>Skogsområdet i Sverige är 28,6 miljoner hektar. Olika typer av bevarande områden (11%) och icke-förvaltade oproduktiva skogsmarker (14%) täcker över 7 miljoner hektar (25%) av skogens totala areal.</p> <p>Den totala skogsavverkningsvolymen i Sverige är årligen cirka 80 miljoner m3, vilket ligger under skogens årliga tillväxt (ca 120 miljoner m3).</p> <p>Skogsförvaltningspraxis baseras på skogsbrukslagen, skogsbruksriktlinjer, och skogsbruksplaneringspraxis. Skogsrotationsperioden är 60-100 år, mestadels med 2-3 kvalitets gallringar, en sista skörd och regenerering av en mogen stativ. Plantering eller naturlig sådd kan användas vid förnyelse. GMO -träd eller införda trädslag används inte vid regenerering.</p> <p>Under de senaste åren har kontinuerlig täckningsskogbruk också blivit tillgänglig. Kontinuerligt täckskogbruk är baserat på en 15-20 års skördscykel med selektivt skörd eller skogsförnyelse genom miniloggar (till exempel 0,2 -0,5 ha var).</p>	

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

2.3 Actions taken to promote certification amongst feedstock supplier

[Add description here]

2.4 Quantification of the Supply Base

Supply Base

- a. Total Supply Base area (million ha): 23.50
- b. Tenure by type (million ha):
 - Privately owned: 19
 - Public: 4,5
 - Community concession:
- c. Forest by type (million ha):
 - Boreal: 23,50
 - Temperate: 0
 - Tropical: 0
- d. Forest by management type (million ha):
 - Plantation: 0
 - Managed natural: 23,50
 - Natural: 0
- e. Certified forest by scheme (million ha):
 - FSC: 11,90
 - PEFC: 13,60
 - SFI:
 - Other (specify):

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

Clearcutting Thinning Mix of the above Other N/A

Explanation:

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

Yes – Majority Yes – Minority No N/A

Explanation:

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

Yes – Majority Yes – Minority No N/A

Explanation:

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

Yes – Majority Yes – Minority No N/A

Explanation:

Feedstock

Reporting period from date: 20200801

Reporting period to date:20210731

a. Total volume of Feedstock:

- 0
- 1-200,000
- 200,000-400,000
- 400,000-600,000
- 600,000-800,000
- 800,000-1,000,000
- >1,000,000

Unit: m3 tonnes

b. Volume of primary feedstock

- 0
- 1-200,000
- 200,000-400,000
- 400,000-600,000
- 600,000-800,000
- 800,000-1,000,000
- >1,000,000

Unit: m3 tonnes

c. List percentage of primary feedstock, by the following categories.

- Certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme:
 - 0%
 - 1%-19%
 - 20%-39%
 - 40% -59%
 - 60%-79%
 - 80-99%

- 100%
- Not certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme:
 - 0%
 - 1%-19%
 - 20%-39%
 - 40% -59%
 - 60%-79%
 - 80-99%
 - 100%

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

Common name	Scientific name
<i>Example: Black alder</i>	<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>

Note: add as many rows as needed

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

Yes No

Name of species:

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

f. Hardwood (i.e. broadleaf trees): specify proportion of biomass from (%):

g. Softwood (i.e. coniferous trees): specify proportion of biomass from (%):

h. Proportion of biomass composed of or derived from saw logs (%):

i. Specify the local regulations or industry standards that define saw logs:

j. Roundwood from final fellings from forests with > 40 yr rotation times - Average % volume of fellings delivered to BP (%):

k. Volume of primary feedstock from primary forest:

Unit: m3 tonnes

l. List percentage of primary feedstock from primary forest, by the following categories. Subdivide by SBP-approved Forest Management Schemes:

- N/A
- Primary feedstock from primary forest certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme:
 - 0%
 - 1%-19%
 - 20%-39%
 - 40% -59%
 - 60%-79%
 - 80-99%
 - 100%

- Primary feedstock from primary forest not certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme:
 - 0%
 - 1%-19%
 - 20%-39%
 - 40% -59%
 - 60%-79%
 - 80-99%
 - 100%

m. Volume of secondary feedstock:

- 0
- 1-200,000
- 200,000-400,000
- 400,000-600,000
- 600,000-800,000
- 800,000-1,000,000
- >1,000,000

Unit: m³ tonnes

Physical form of the feedstock:

- Chips
- Sawdust
- Offcuts
- Clean chips or dust
- Treated chips or dust
- Other (specify): Kutterspån

n. Volume of tertiary feedstock:

- 0
- 1-200,000
- 200,000-400,000
- 400,000-600,000
- 600,000-800,000
- 800,000-1,000,000
- >1,000,000

Unit: m³ tonnes

Physical form of the feedstock:

- Shavings
- Sawdust (dry)
- Offcuts
- Other (specify):

Proportion of feedstock sourced per type of claim during the reporting period				
Feedstock type	SBE %	FSC %	PEFC %	SFI %
Primary				
Secondary		90	10	
Tertiary				

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

LOCAL TRANSLATION

3 Requirement for a Supply Base Evaluation

SBE completed	SBE not completed
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

LOCAL TRANSLATION

4 Supply Base Evaluation

4.1 Scope

Feedstock types included in SBE: Primary Secondary Tertiary

SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessments used:

List of countries and regions included in the SBE:

Detailed description of specified risk indicators:

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

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

4.2 Justification

Provide a justification for the approach used in the evaluation.

4.3 Results of risk assessment and Supplier Verification Programme

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

4.4 Conclusion

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

5 Supply Base Evaluation process

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

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

LOCAL TRANSLATION

6 Stakeholder consultation

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

6.1 Response to stakeholder comments

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

Stakeholder description:
Stakeholder comment:
Response to the stakeholder comment:

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

7 Mitigation measures

7.1 Mitigation measures

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

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

Mitigation measure:

7.2 Monitoring and outcomes

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

8 Detailed findings for indicators

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

Is RRA used?

Yes No

LOCAL TRANSLATION

9 Review of report

9.1 Peer review

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

9.2 Public or additional reviews

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

LOCAL TRANSLATION

10 Approval of report

Approval of Supply Base Report by senior management			
Report Prepared by:	<i>Johan Eliasson</i>	<i>Systemansvarig</i>	<i>20210929</i>
	Name	Title	Date
The undersigned persons confirm that I/we are members of the organisation's senior management and do hereby affirm that the contents of this evaluation report were duly acknowledged by senior management as being accurate prior to approval and finalisation of the report.			
Report approved by:	<i>Roger Eckerstig</i>	<i>VD</i>	<i>20210929</i>
	Name	Title	Date
Report approved by:	<i>[name]</i>	<i>[title]</i>	<i>[date]</i>
	Name	Title	Date
Report approved by:	<i>[name]</i>	<i>[title]</i>	<i>[date]</i>
	Name	Title	Date

Annex 1: Detailed findings for Supply Base Evaluation indicators

LOCAL TRANSLATION

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

	Indicator
1.1.2	Feedstock can be traced back to the defined Supply Base.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
1.1.3	The feedstock input profile is described and categorised by the mix of inputs.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
1.2.1	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to ensure that legality of ownership and land use can be demonstrated for the Supply Base.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
1.3.1	The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to ensure that feedstock is legally harvested and supplied and is in compliance with EUTR legality requirements.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
1.4.1	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to verify that payments for harvest rights and timber, including duties, relevant royalties and taxes related to timber harvesting, are complete and up to date.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
1.5.1	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to verify that feedstock is supplied in compliance with the requirements of CITES.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
1.6.1	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to ensure that feedstock is not sourced from areas where there are violations of traditional or civil rights.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk at RA <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.1.1	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that forests and other areas with high conservation values are identified and mapped.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.1.2	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to identify and address potential threats to forests and other areas with high conservation values from forest management activities.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.1.3	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that feedstock is not sourced from forests converted to production plantation forest or non-forest lands after January 2008.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.2.1	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to verify that feedstock is sourced from forests where there is appropriate assessment of impacts, and planning, implementation and monitoring to minimise them.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk at RA <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.2.2	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that feedstock is sourced from forests where management maintains or improves soil quality (CPET S5b).
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.2.3	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to ensure that key ecosystems and habitats are conserved or set aside in their natural state (CPET S8b).
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.2.4	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to ensure that biodiversity is protected (CPET S5b).
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.2.5	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that the process of residue removal minimises harm to ecosystems.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.2.6	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to verify that negative impacts on ground water, surface water and water downstream from forest management are minimised (CPET S5b).
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.2.7	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that air quality is not adversely affected by forest management activities.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.2.8	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that there is controlled and appropriate use of chemicals, and that Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is implemented wherever possible in forest management activities (CPET S5c).
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.2.9	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that methods of waste disposal minimise negative impacts on forest ecosystems (CPET S5d).
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.3.1	Analysis shows that feedstock harvesting does not exceed the long-term production capacity of the forest, avoids significant negative impacts on forest productivity and ensures long-term economic viability. Harvest levels are justified by inventory and growth data.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.3.2	Adequate training is provided for all personnel, including employees and contractors (CPET S6d).
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.3.3	Analysis shows that feedstock harvesting and biomass production positively contribute to the local economy, including employment.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.4.1	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that the health, vitality and other services provided by forest ecosystems are maintained or improved (CPET S7a).
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.4.2	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that natural processes, such as fires, pests and diseases are managed appropriately (CPET S7b).
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.4.3	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that there is adequate protection of the forest from unauthorised activities, such as illegal logging, mining and encroachment (CPETS7c).
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.5.1	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that legal, customary and traditional tenure and use rights of indigenous people and local communities related to the forest are identified, documented and respected (CPET S9).
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.5.2	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that production of feedstock does not endanger food, water supply or subsistence means of communities, where the use of this specific feedstock or water is essential for the fulfilment of basic needs.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.6.1	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that appropriate mechanisms are in place for resolving grievances and disputes, including those relating to tenure and use rights, to forest management practices and to work conditions.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.7.1	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that Freedom of Association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining are respected.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.7.2	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that feedstock is not supplied using any form of compulsory labour.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.7.3	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures to verify that feedstock is not supplied using child labour.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.7.4	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that feedstock is not supplied using labour which is discriminated against in respect of employment and occupation.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.7.5	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that feedstock is supplied using labour where the pay and employment conditions are fair and meet, or exceed, minimum requirements.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.8.1	The Biomass Producer has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that appropriate safeguards are put in place to protect the health and safety of forest workers (CPET S12).
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.9.1	Biomass is not sourced from areas that had high carbon stocks in January 2008 and no longer have those high carbon stocks.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.9.2	Analysis demonstrates that feedstock harvesting does not diminish the capability of the forest to act as an effective sink or store of carbon over the long term.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	

	Indicator
2.10.1	Genetically modified trees are not used.
Finding	
Means of Verification	
Evidence Reviewed	
Risk Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Specified Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Unspecified Risk at RA
Comment or Mitigation Measure	