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# Overview

**Producer name:** PATA SIA

**Producer address:** Cēsu Iela 14, LV-1012 Rīga, Latvia

**SBP Certificate Code:** N/A

**Geographic position:** 56.964710, 24.139170

**Primary contact:** Vita Rudzīte, +371 291 570 44,vita.rudzite@pata.lv

**Company website:** www.pata.lv

**Date report finalised:** 20 Apr 2022

**Close of last CB audit:** 13 May 2021

**Name of CB:** SCS Global Services

**SBP Standard(s) used:** SBP Standard 1: Feedstock Compliance Standard, SBP Standard 2: Verification of SBP-compliant Feedstock, SBP Standard 4: Chain of Custody, SBP Standard 5: Collection and Communication of Data Instruction

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

**SBP Endorsed Regional Risk Assessment**: Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia

**Weblink to SBR on Company website:** https://pata.lv/energetiskas-koksnes-sertifikacija/

|  |
| --- |
| **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** |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

# Description of the Supply Base

## General description

**Feedstock types:** Primary, Secondary

**Includes Supply Base evaluation (SBE):** Yes

**Feedstock origin (countries):** Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania

## Description of countries included in the Supply Base

**Country:**Latvia

**Area/Region:** Kurzeme, Zemgale, Vidzeme, Latgale

**Exclusions:** No

|  |
| --- |
| In  Latvia,  forests  cover  area  of  3,04  million  ha.  According  to  the  data  of  the  State  Forest  Service  (concerning  the  surveyed  area  allocated  to  management  activities  regulated  by  the  Forest  Law),  woodenness  amounts  to  52  %.  Latvia  is  one  of  the  most  forested  EU  member  states.  The  Latvian  State  owns  1,49  million  ha  of  forest  (49  %  of  the  total  forest  area),  while  the  other  1,55  million  ha  (51.  %  of  the  total  forest  area)  belong  to  other  owners.  Forests  owned  by  the  state  are  managed  by  state  stock  company  Latvijas  Valsts  Meži  (Latvian  State  Forests).  Private  forest  owners  in  Latvia  amount  to  approximately  140 000.    Forest  land  consists  of:  •   forests  3,07m  ha  (91.3%);•   marshes  0,18m  ha  (5.3%);  •   open  areas  0,035m  ha  (1.1%);  •   flooded  areas  0,018m  ha  (0,5%);  •   objects  of  infrastructure  0,062m  ha  (1.8%).  For  most  of    forest  the  dominant  tree  species  are  coniferous  trees  -­  pine  and  spruce.  Latvia  forests  mainly  consists  of  coniferous  trees,  but  significant  part  are  also  occupied  by  other  species.   Forest  area  by  dominant  species:    •   pine  35  %;•   spruce  18.1  %;  •   birch  30.6  %;•   gray  alder  7.2  %;  •   black  alder  2.9  %;  •   aspen  5.0  %;•   oak  0.3  %;•   ash  0.5  %;•   other  species  0.3  %.    The  amount  of  forestland  is  constantly  expanding,  both  naturally  and  thanks  to  afforestation  of  infertile  land  and  other  land  that  is  not  used  for  agriculture.  In  historical  terms,  the  intensive  use  of  Latvia’s  forests  for  economic  purposes  began  comparatively  later  than  in  many  other  European  countries,  and  that  has  allowed  to  preserve  extensive  biological  diversity.  Limitations  on  economic  activity  apply  to  12%  of  Latvia’s  forests  at  this  time,  and  most  of  this  territory  is  owned  by  the  state.  683  especially  protected  environmental  territories  have  been  set  aside  to  protect  nature.  Many  of  the  areas  have  been  included  in  the  European  network  of  protected  areas  Natura  2000.   In order to ensure the protection of a specially protected species or a biotope outside specially protected nature territories, micro-reserves are created, if any of the functional zones does not provide it. According to the State forest service, the total area of the micro-reserves in December 2019 was 45 100 ha. The  forest  sector  in  Latvia  is  under  the  supervision  of  the  Ministry  of  Agriculture.  It  works  with  stakeholders  to  draft  forest  policies,  development  strategies  for  the  sector,  as  well  as  regulations  on  forest  management,  the  use  of  forest  resources,  environment  protection  and  hunting.    The  state  forest  service,  under  the  Ministry  of  Agriculture,  is  the  responsible  agency  for  supervising  how  the  provisions  of  the  laws  and  regulations  are  observed  in  forest  management  irrespective  of  the  ownership  type.  State-­owned  forests  are  managed  by  Stock  Company  “Latvian  State  Forests”,  which  was  established  in  1999.  It  implements  the  state’s  interests  in  terms  of  preserving  and  increasing  the  value  of  the  forest  and  enhancing  the  contributions  of  the  forest  to  the  national  economy.  During   the   past   decade,   forest   owners   and   manufacturing   companies   in   Latvia   have   sought   to   receive  certification  of  the  sustainable  use  of  forest  resources.  Forest  management  processes  and  timber  product  delivery  chains  in  Latvia  are  certified  on  the  basis  of  the  two  most  widely  used  systems  in  the  world  –  FSC  and  PEFC.   This   proves   that   the   country’s   forests   are   managed   according   to   internationally   acknowledged  standards  of  good  forestry.  In  December  2021  total  PEFC  Certified  Forest  Area  in  Latvia  was  1 748 599  hectares  and  85  Chain  of  Custody  Certificates.               In  December  2021  total  FSC  Certified  Forest  Area  in  Latvia  was  1 227 270  hectares , 16 Forest Management Certificates   and  346  Chain  of  Custody  Certificates.    CITES  came  into  force  in  Latvia  on  12/05/1997.  |

The forest sector in Latvia is traditionally one of the most important sectors of the national economy. The share of the forest sector in the gross domestic product is about six percent. The added value of forest sector products has increased significantly - from 295 million euros in 2000 to 1.4 billion euros in 2020.

Since 1993, the total export contribution of wood products has reached 21 billion euros, with a positive export-import balance in these years - 15 billion euros.

The forest sector plays a key role in providing employment for the population. The sector directly employs more than 54 thousand people, while together with related industries, forestry and the forest sector provide income for more than 80 thousand people. The forest sector plays a particularly important role in regional development and regional employment. For example, in the wood industry, about 80% of jobs are located in one of the regions of Latvia, and only 20% of jobs are located in Riga.

SIA PATA has 13 suppliers of SBP feedstock in Latvia. 6 of them deliver SBP-compliant Primary Feedstock from mix trees species, and 7 of them deliver SBP-compliant Secondary Feedstock from mix trees species.

**Country:**Lithuania

**Area/Region:** Aukštaitija, Samogitia, Dzūkija, Suvalkija, Lithuania Minor

**Exclusions:** No

Forests  cover  amounts  to  33.3  per  cent  of  the  territory  of  the  Republic  of  Lithuania  and  forest  land  constitute  an  area  of  2  178  958  hectares  as  of  31st  December  2017.  Expansion  of  the  forest  area  has  been  one  of  the  main  objectives  of  Lithuanian  forestry  policy  over  the  last  years.  Due  to  the  implementation  of  sustainable  forest  management  and  national  afforestation  measures,  forest  coverage  in  Lithuania  has  increased  by  3  percent  since  2003.

Approximately   a   half   of   forest   land   in   Lithuania   is   owned   by   the   State   and   managed   by   42   State   Forest  Enterprises  and  the  Directorate  General  of  State  Forests.  Respectively,  around  40  per  cent  of  forest  land  is  privately  owned  and  the  rest  10  per  cent  is  still  reserved  for  restitution.

Occupying  1  152  400  ha,  coniferous  stands  prevail  in  Lithuania,  covering  56.1  per  cent  of  the  forest  area.  They  are  followed  by  softwood  deciduous  forests  (827  500  ha,  40.3  per  cent)  and  hardwood  deciduous  forest  (75  800  ha,  3.7  per  cent).  The  dominant  tree  species  are  pine  (occupying  720  300  ha)  and  spruce  (429  600  ha).  Birch  stands  are  prevalent  among  deciduous  trees,  covering  an  area  of  459  700  ha.

Sustainable  forest  management  is  the  overriding  objective  for  forest  policy  and  practise  in  Lithuania.  Therefore,  forest  resources  are  used  responsibly  and  annual  timber  harvest  rate  does  not  exceed  the  annual  increment.  Lithuania’s  forests  produce  around  7,4  million  m³  of  round wood per year.  Annual  fellings  do  not  exceed  60  per  cent  of  gross  total  annual  increment.

Forests  are  divided  into  groups  upon  the  objectives  of  the  economic  activities,  their  regime  and  the  major  functional  purpose.

Group  I  –  strict  reserves  forests.  These  are  the  strict  reserves  and  small  strict  reserves  forests  on  the  territories  of  state  strict  nature  reserves,  state  parks  and  biosphere  monitoring  territories.  Objective  of  economic  activities  –  to  preserve  the  forests  for  a  natural  growth.

Group  II  –  forests  of  special  purpose,  split  into  the  following:  A  –  ecosystem  protection  forests.  Landscape,  botanical,  forest  genetic,  zoological,  botanical-­zoological  reserves  and  reserves  of  these  types  in  state  parks  and   biosphere   monitoring   territories.   Objective   of   economic   activities   –   to   preserve   or   restore   forest  ecosystems  or  separate  ecosystem  components.  B  –  recreational  forests.  Recreational  forests  cover  forest  parks,  urban  (city)  forests,  forests  of  recreation  zones  of  the  state  parks,  recreational  forest  areas  and  other  forests  defined  for  recreation.  Objective  of  economic  activities  –  to  form  and  preserve  the  recreational  forest  environment.

Group   III   –   protective   forests.   These   are   the   forests   in   the   territories   of   geological,   geomorfological,  hidrographical,  and  cultural  reserves,  forests  of  protection  zones.  Objective  of  economic  activities  –  to  form  productive  forest  stands  capable  of  performing  the  functions  of  protection  of  soil,  air,  water  and  human  living  surroundings.

Group  IV  –  commercial  forests,  split  into  the  following:  A  –  commercial  forests  of  normal  cutting  age.  Objective  of   economic   activities   –   to   form   productive   forest   stands   and   supply   wood   continuously   following   the  requirements  of  environmental  protection;;  B  -­  forest  plantations.  Objective  of  economic  activities  –  to  grow  as  much  wood  as  possible  in  the  shortest  period  of  time.

FSC  and  PEFC  certificates  are  used  in  Lithuania.

In  December  2021  total  FSC  Certified  Forest  Area  in  Lithuania  was  1 276 608  hectares  with  32 Forest Management Certificates and 445  Chain  of  Custody  Certificates.

In  December  2021  there  were  20  PEFC  Chain  of  Custody  Certificates.

CITES  came  into  force  in  Lithuania  on  09/03/2002.





Forests and wood product industries provide over 60,000 jobs in forestry and logging, wood manufacturing and the paper and furniture industries. This is 6 percent of total employment in the country. In 2013 the forest and wood processing sector’s share of total national value added reached 4.5 percent, with forestry adding about 0.6 percent. The biggest share of the value added in the sector was generated by the furniture industry, some 2 percent. The number of companies in forestry, logging and the forest industry diminished while their average size increased in recent years. The Lithuanian forest and wood processing sector has over 2,000 operating companies as of 2014.

SIA PATA has not purchased SBP feedstock from Lithuania.

**Country:**Estonia

**Area/Region:** Coastal, Inland

**Exclusions:** No

Today  forests  cover  around  50%  of  the  territory  of  Estonia  contributing  to  approximately  2.2  million  hectares  with  the  growing  stock  around  468  million  m3.  Estonia  is  in  the  third  position  in  Europe  based  on  forest  coverage  (share  of  forestland  area  in  mainland  territory)  after  Sweden and Finland.

Estonia  lies  within  the  latitude  of  59°  00’N  in  the  temperate  zone  of  the  Northern  Hemisphere.  Due  to  moderate  maritime  climate  conditions  for  forest  growth  are  very  suitable.  Estonia  belongs  primarily  to  the  northern  area  of   the   nemoral-­coniferous   or   „mixed   forest”   belt.   Of   all   the   woodlands,   51%   of   stands   are   dominated   by  deciduous   species   and   49%   by   coniferous   species   making   landscapes   very   diverse.   Without   the   limiting  influence  of  humans  forests  would  cover  most  of  Estonia’s  mainland.  In  fact,  3,000  years  ago  more  than  80%  of  the  mainland  was  covered  with  forests.  Due  to  human  activity,  100  years  ago  forests  covered  only  30%  of  4.5  million  hectares  of  the  total  area  of  Estonia.

The  diversity  of  forests  in  Estonia  provides  habitats  for  a  large  number  of  species.

“Estonian   Forestry   Development   Program   until   2020”   is   the   framework   document   for   the   development   of  forestry  in  the  current  decade.  The  principal  goals  are  to  safeguard  the  productivity  and  viability  of  forests  and  ensure  the  varied  and  effective  use  of  forests.  In  order  to  achieve  these  aims,  it  is  important  to  procure  wood  in  the  amount  of  the  increment,  to  increase  the  volume  of  reforestation,  to  keep  at  least  10%  of  forestland  area  under  strict  protection  and  to  enhance  the  variety  of  protected  forests.  The  share  of  strictly  protected  forests  in  the  total  area  of  forests  was  10%  already  in  2010,  but  further  efforts  are  required  to  ensure  that  a  variety  of  forests   are   represented   in   the   strictly   protected   areas.   (Statistical   Yearbook   of   Estonia   2014   –   Statistics

Estonia)  Private  forest  owners  manage  around  1.01  million  ha  (47%)  of  forest  land  in  Estonia  with  the  growing  stock  of  around  275  million  m3.

40%  of  the  forests  of  Estonia  belong  to  the  state.  These  forests  are  maintained,  grown  and  managed  by  the  State  Forest  Management  Centre  (RMK).

FSC  and  PEFC  certificates  are  used  in  Estonia.

In  December  2021  total  PEFC  Certified  Forest  Area  in  Estonia  was  1 312 182  hectares  and  84  Chain  of  Custody  Certificates.

In   December   2021   total   FSC   Certified   Forest   Area   in   Estonia   was   1 238 953   hectares with 9 Forest Managements Certificates   and   312   Chain   of  Custody  Certificates.

CITES  came  into  force  in  Estonia  on  20/10/1992.

Net turnover of Forest sector in Estonia (million EUR)



**The share of Estonian forest and wood industries added value compared to Estonian GDP**



## EMPLOYMENTNUMBERS

##

SIA PATA has not purchased SBP feedstock from Estonia.

## Actions taken to promote certification amongst feedstock supplier

SIA  PATA  informs  suppliers  about  criteria  and  importance  of  FSC  and  PEFC  certificates.

SIA  PATA  also  is  informing  suppliers  about  SBP  objectives  and  requirements  and  importance  to  comply  with  them.

Feedstocks for biomass production are supplied from FSC and PEFC certified forests, and  part from Latvian private forests (non certified).  40% of the total SBP-compliant biomass amount makes secondary feedstocks. The main part of feedstocks – 80% - are FSC or PEFC certified.

## Quantification of the Supply Base

Supply Base

1. **Total Supply Base area (million ha)**: 7,42
2. **Tenure by type (million ha):**3.40 (Privately owned), 3.46 (Public), 0.56 (Community concession)
3. **Forest by type (million ha):**7.42 (Boreal)
4. **Forest by management type (million ha):**7.42 (Managed natural)
5. **Certified forest by scheme (million ha):**3.66 (FSC), 3.02 (PEFC)

**Describe the harvesting type which best describes how your material is sourced:** Mix of the above

**Explanation:** Max area of clear cut shall be 2-5 ha (it`s depend from forest type); in trees felling use harvesters and chainsaws.

**Was the forest in the Supply Base managed for a purpose other than for energy markets?** Yes - Majority

**Explanation:** The main use of logs is the wood industry and furniture production

**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

**Explanation:** Specified in the Forest Law

**Was the feedstock used in the biomass removed from a forest as part of a pest/disease control measure or a salvage operation?** No

**Explanation:** N/A

Feedstock

**Reporting period from:** 01 Jan 2021

**Reporting period to:** 31 Dec 2021

1. **Total volume of Feedstock**: 200,000-400,000 tonnes
2. **Volume of primary feedstoc**k: 1-200,000 tonnes
3. **List percentage of primary feedstock, by the following categories.**
	1. Certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme: 60% - 79%
	2. Not certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme: 20% - 39%
4. **List of all the species in primary feedstock, including scientific name:** Pinus sylvestris (Pine); Picea abies (Spruce); Betula pendula (Birch); Alnus glutinosa (Black alder); Alnus incana (White alder); Populus tremula (Aspen); Fraxinus excelsior (Ash); Quercus robur (Oak);
5. **Is any of the feedstock used likely to have come from protected or threatened species?** No
	1. Name of species: N/A
	2. Biomass proportion, by weight, that is likely to be composed of that species (%): N/A
6. **Hardwood (i.e. broadleaf trees): specify proportion of biomass from (%):** 88,00
7. **Softwood (i.e. coniferous trees): specify proportion of biomass from (%):** 12,00
8. **Proportion of biomass composed of or derived from saw logs (%):** 0,00
9. **Specify the local regulations or industry standards that define saw logs:** NA
10. **Roundwood from final fellings from forests with > 40 yr rotation times - Average % volume of fellings delivered to BP (%):** 70,00
11. **Volume of primary feedstock from primary forest:** 0 N/A
12. **List percentage of primary feedstock from primary forest, by the following categories. Subdivide by SBP-approved Forest Management Schemes**:
	1. Primary feedstock from primary forest certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme: N/A
	2. Primary feedstock from primary forest not certified to an SBP-approved Forest Management Scheme: N/A
13. **Volume of secondary feedstock**: 1-200,000 tonnes
	1. Physical form of the feedstock: Chips
14. **Volume of tertiary feedstock**: 0 N/A
	1. Physical form of the feedstock: N/A

|  |
| --- |
| **Proportion of feedstock sourced per type of claim during the reporting period** |
| **Feedstock type** | **Sourced by using Supply Base Evaluation (SBE) %** | **FSC %** | **PEFC %** | **SFI %** |
| Primary | 60,00 | 30,00 | 10,00 | 0,00 |
| Secondary | 0,00 | 90,00 | 10,00 | 0,00 |
| Tertiary | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| Other | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |

# Requirement for a Supply Base Evaluation

**Is Supply Base Evaluation (SBE) is completed?** Yes

SBP biomass supply evaluation includes:

·         Primary wood (round wood) after logging

SIA PATA defines the feedstock/biomass received from the approved sources and supplies as a “SBP-compliant biomass”.

SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessments for Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania are used. Company has been developed inspection program for supply risk mitigation.

The risk assessment is divided into : “low risk”, “specified risk” or “unspecified risk”.

# Supply Base Evaluation

## Scope

**Feedstock types included in SBE:** Primary

**SBP-endorsed Regional Risk Assessments used**: Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia

**List of countries and regions included in the SBE:**

**Country:** Latvia

**Indicator with specified risk in the risk assessment used:**

2.1.1 The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that forests and other areas with high conservation value in the Supply Base are identified and mapped.

**Specific risk description:**

High Conservation Value Forests : include Natura 2000 sites, EU protected habitats, Woodland key habitats - the risk level for this subcategory is considered to be specified risk for non-certified forests.

High Conservation Value Forests : Forest and parks in or around objects of cultural heritage, for instance, manor parks, urban forests, forests of important historical sites - there is no information compiled on the cultural heritage of such forests and the actual cultural heritage status is not fully acknowledged in private, municipal and church owned forests.

**Country:** Latvia

**Indicator with specified risk in the risk assessment used:**

2.1.2 The BP 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.

**Specific risk description:**

High Conservation Value Forests : With regard to identification and protection of conservation values, there is an expert concern about nesting areas of a number of species included in the Bird’s Directive Annex I which are not identified and registered in the forest register databases and thus “de facto” are not protected outside protected nature territories with special protection regimes.

High Conservation Value Forests : Problematic areas in relation to threats to forests and other areas with high conservation values, are nature values in woodland key habitats (WKH) and/or EU protected forest habitats in non-certified forests.

High Conservation Value Forests : isolated cases of destruction/damaging of objects of cultural heritage in private forests.

**Country:** Latvia

**Indicator with specified risk in the risk assessment used:**

2.8.1 The BP 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).

**Specific risk description:**

Low risk can be considered for: • companies working as subcontractors for certified forest managers and who are routinely checked for OH&S issues or are implementing quality management systems in relation to OH&S issues (ISO 45001 for example); • harvesting works which are carried out exclusively with forest machinery (harvesters). “Specified risk” is considered for: Harvesting works which are carried out by manual harvesting means (chainsaws) in noncertified forests. Special focus shall be paid to self-employed persons and workers of microenterprises.

**Country:** Lithuania

**Indicator with specified risk in the risk assessment used:**

2.1.2 The BP 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.

**Specific risk description:**

|  |
| --- |
| The indicator is identified as low risk for state forest enterprises and specified risk for private forest. |

**Country:** Lithuania

**Indicator with specified risk in the risk assessment used:**

2.8.1 The BP 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).

**Specific risk description:**

Within the EU forest sector, Lithuania is the country with the highest risk in relation to health and safety. There is a concern about contractors working in private forest because of periodically occurring fatal and serious injuries at the work place. In addition, there are not sufficient measures to ensure that contractors working in private forest follow the health and safety requirements, therefore it was decided to assign specified risk to this indicator for the contractors working in private forest.

**Country:** Estonia

**Indicator with specified risk in the risk assessment used:**

2.1.2 The BP 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.

**Specific risk description:**

In state forest, FSC or PEFC-certified private forest, and in private forests where a WKH contract has been signed, WKH are protected.

The risk level for this indicator in uncertified private forest is specified and low for state forest and FSC or PEFC-certified private forest.

## Justification

SBP endorsed SBP Regional Risks Assessments have been developed in accordance with SBP standard Nr.1 version 1.0 of March 2015 and SBP standard Nr.2   version 1.0 of March 2015, assessing the risk category for each SBP indicator. Through reviewing and assessing the risk, the company acquired an in-depth understanding of the wood supply risks that could affect the acceptance of SBP non-compliant material for biomass production.

By introducing efficient risk mitigation measures, the company has the option to purchase SBP approved and compliant assortment to produce the required amount of “SBP compliant biomass” products.

SIA PATA as forest company with 20 years expierence, integrating leading expertise in forest industry, has developed risk mitigation and control mechanism for the evaluation and confirmation of its biomass which comply with the “SBP compliant biomass” status.

## Results of risk assessment and Supplier Verification Programme

Taking into account the specifik characters of Latvia and expert advice and recommendations, “specified risk” was applied in relation to identification and protection of EU importance and natural forest habitats, bird species, identification and protection of cultural heritage objects (HCV category 3) in non-certificate forests and work safety( if work with chainsaw  in non-certificate forests).

In Estonia “specified risk” was applied only to biotope protection in non-certificate private forests.

In Lithuania “specified risk” was applied to biotope protection and work safety in private forests.

Supplier Verification Programme does not apply in PATA case, since we did not identify “unspecified risk” in PATA Supply Base Evaluation.

## Conclusion

Since Juny 1, 2018 when the requirements of SBE standarts were initiated and introduced, the compliance of feedstock suppliers to specific risks was reviewed. The suppliers who are informed and competent on assessment of possible risks, but who are not certified by requirements of PEFC or FSC standarts, are approved as SBP wood suppliers.

The volume of FSC or PEFC certified wood is not enough to ensure that 100% of the biomass is a “SBP compliant biomass”.

As a result of risk mitigation measures, SIA PATA has confirmed that the suppliers who logging round wood at self own or other own forests and hand in all requested information, can be provided risk mitigation measures and conform to SBE low-risk category at supply level.

# Supply Base Evaluation process

SIA PATA “SBP compliant biomas” assessment refers to supplies from Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, and obtaining of biomass from :

·         SBP-approved forestry certification scheme;

·         SBP-approved supply chain (CoC) system;

·         SBP low risk feedstocks sourced within SBE system.

The company has developed and implemented a risk mitigation procedure where the identified risk mitigation measures and tools are described.

Checking questionnaires to each specified risk indicator were designed and applied to objectively assess and obtain all information on each wood extraction site, which is approved as “SBP compliant biomass” or “SBP compliant feedstock”.

Check frequency and plan is designed so that all suppliers are checked one time per year.

Approved suppliers cutting places are checked by OZOLS data base - https://www.daba.gov.lv/public/lat/dati1/dabas\_datu\_parvaldibas\_sistema\_ozols/ (in Latvia); http://register.metsad.ee and https://ee.fsc.org/ee-ee/fsc-sertimine/kontrollitud-puit/vaeaeriselupaigad and https://hiiepaik.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=09558607d1dd4c07acc46c338b2196ac (in Estonia) - private forest owners can sign contract with the state and protect WKH or each time before felling forest owners determine the location of WKH;

 www.geoportal.lt www.natura2000info.lt (in Lithuania) – in Lithuania natural forest habitats and WKH designated as Natura 2000 sites at the EU level or biosphere polygons at the national level.

 Checking are performed prior to logging. The checking procedure is available at the company only by request, taking into account confidentiality, and is discussed with interested parties to improve it effectively.

As the basis for the establishment of the SBP and SBE risk mitigation system, there were taken requirements of the PEFC Supply chain certification system standarts, staff competence in the wood supply chain as well as knowledge in forestry, wood industry and the legality of wood supplies.

# Stakeholder consultation

On 22 April 2022, the company published the SBP risk assessments and the draft SBR on its website. An informative letter was sent electronically to the interested parties on the risk assessment and draft SBR. The list of interested parties was created so that it includes the maximum number of recipients that represent economic, social and environmental interests of society, as well as local municipalities. The total number of recipients is 57 correspondent.

SBR is available on the company`s website:

https://pata.lv/en/about-us/

## Response to stakeholder comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description:** | After informing the interested parties in 2021, no recommendations or complaints were received regarding the risk assessment and risk mitigation development and implementation process. |
| **Comment:** | After informing the interested parties in 2021, no recommendations or complaints were received regarding the risk assessment and risk mitigation development and implementation process. |
| **Response:** | After informing the interested parties in 2021, no recommendations or complaints were received regarding the risk assessment and risk mitigation development and implementation process. |

# Mitigation measures

## Mitigation measures

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country:** | Latvia |
| **Specified risk indicator:** | 2.1.1 The BP has implemented appropriate control systems and procedures for verifying that forests and other areas with high conservation value in the Supply Base are identified and mapped. |
| **Specific risk description:** | High Conservation Value Forests : include Natura 2000 sites, EU protected habitats, Woodland key habitats - the risk level for this subcategory is considered to be specified risk for non-certified forests.High Conservation Value Forests : Forest and parks in or around objects of cultural heritage, for instance, manor parks, urban forests, forests of important historical sites - there is no information compiled on the cultural heritage of such forests and the actual cultural heritage status is not fully acknowledged in private, municipal and church owned forests. |
| **Mitigation measure:** | Peerforming areas with high conservation values risk assessment procedures prior to logging and checking cadastre numbers using the https://www.daba.gov.lv/public/lat/dati1/dabas\_datu\_parvaldibas\_sistema\_ozols/. Verification in forest - protection of bird species and the possibility of cultural and historical objects are documented in the MDI (logging questionnaire). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country:** | Latvia |
| **Specified risk indicator:** | 2.1.2 The BP 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. |
| **Specific risk description:** | High Conservation Value Forests : With regard to identification and protection of conservation values, there is an expert concern about nesting areas of a number of species included in the Bird’s Directive Annex I which are not identified and registered in the forest register databases and thus “de facto” are not protected outside protected nature territories with special protection regimes.High Conservation Value Forests : Problematic areas in relation to threats to forests and other areas with high conservation values, are nature values in woodland key habitats (WKH) and/or EU protected forest habitats in non-certified forests.High Conservation Value Forests : isolated cases of destruction/damaging of objects of cultural heritage in private forests. |
| **Mitigation measure:** | Performing biotope risk assessment procedures prior to logging and checking cadastre numbers using the https://www.daba.gov.lv/public/lat/dati1/dabas\_datu\_parvaldibas\_sistema\_ozols/.   Verification in forest - protection of bird species and the possibility of cultural and historical objects are documented in the MDI (logging questionnaire). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country:** | Latvia |
| **Specified risk indicator:** | 2.8.1 The BP 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). |
| **Specific risk description:** | Low risk can be considered for: • companies working as subcontractors for certified forest managers and who are routinely checked for OH&S issues or are implementing quality management systems in relation to OH&S issues (ISO 45001 for example); • harvesting works which are carried out exclusively with forest machinery (harvesters). “Specified risk” is considered for: Harvesting works which are carried out by manual harvesting means (chainsaws) in noncertified forests. Special focus shall be paid to self-employed persons and workers of microenterprises. |
| **Mitigation measure:** | An assessment form is designed where minimal requirements for maintaining work safety in the forest are included. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country:** | Lithuania |
| **Specified risk indicator:** | 2.1.2 The BP 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. |
| **Specific risk description:** |

|  |
| --- |
| The indicator is identified as low risk for state forest enterprises and specified risk for private forest. |

 |
| **Mitigation measure:** | Performing biotope risk assessment procedures prior to logging and checking cadastre numbers using the www.geoportal.lt www.natura2000info.lt |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country:** | Lithuania |
| **Specified risk indicator:** | 2.8.1 The BP 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). |
| **Specific risk description:** | Within the EU forest sector, Lithuania is the country with the highest risk in relation to health and safety. There is a concern about contractors working in private forest because of periodically occurring fatal and serious injuries at the work place. In addition, there are not sufficient measures to ensure that contractors working in private forest follow the health and safety requirements, therefore it was decided to assign specified risk to this indicator for the contractors working in private forest. |
| **Mitigation measure:** | An assessment form is designed where minimal requirements for maintaining work safety in the forest are included. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country:** | Estonia |
| **Specified risk indicator:** | 2.1.2 The BP 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. |
| **Specific risk description:** | In state forest, FSC or PEFC-certified private forest, and in private forests where a WKH contract has been signed, WKH are protected.The risk level for this indicator in uncertified private forest is specified and low for state forest and FSC or PEFC-certified private forest. |
| **Mitigation measure:** | Performing areas with high conservation values risk assessment procedures prior to logging and checking cadastre numbers using http://register.metsad.ee and https://ee.fsc.org/ee-ee/fsc-sertimine/kontrollitud-puit/vaeaeriselupaigad and https://hiiepaik.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=09558607d1dd4c07acc46c338b2196ac |

## Monitoring and outcomes

The suppliers that refuse to cooperate with SIA PATA in the identification of the preserve biotopes, protected bird species,  cultural heritage objects and complying with work safety requirements, thus mitigated the risk of supplying SBP non-compliant feedstocks, were not approved for wood supply.

All suppliers are checked in OZOLS database for existing preserve biotopes and checked in forest for protected bird species and cultural heritage objects, thus provide SBP compliant feedstocks supplies.

After SBP risk mitigation inspections, as well as creation of information materials, the supplier and forest owner have developed an understanding of SBE requirements regarding risk categories, their recognition and mitigation mechanism.

The company performed field inspections as part of SBP certification.

As part of risk mitigation measures in Latvia, in 2021 in 2300 forest areas were carry out inspections of possible WKH, cultural and historical objects and possible nesting places of protected bird species. No protected values were identified during field inspections.

In 2021 in 12 forest areas were  found high biological value or protected forest habitats. These fellings have not been purchased.

In 2021, 25 occupational safety risk assessments have been performed in felling areas; of which 14 were assessed in felling areas with chainsaws. The main remarks for the observance of work safety requirements - incomplete technological map of the felling site, no qualification documents are available at the felling site, incomplete environmental safety equipment.

In 2021, PATA has 6 suppliers of feedstocks for production of SBP-compliant biomass.

# 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

# Review of report

## Peer review

No external peer review was carried out.

## Public or additional reviews

No additional information for the time being.

# Approval of report

|  |
| --- |
| **Approval of Supply Base Report by senior management**   |
| **Report Prepared by:** | **Vita Rudzīte** | **Certification system manager** | **14 Apr 2022** |
| **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:** | **Jānis Mierkalns** | **Member of the Board** | **20 Apr 2022** |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Date**  |

# Annex 1: Detailed findings for Supply Base Evaluation indicators

N/A