**DDS summary examples**

**Organisation Name: Greenwood ltd**

**Contact person:**

**Date published: 26. October 2016**

*Note: guidance on how to use this document is added with Italic font*

**General description of the due diligence system:**

*Provide a summary of the due diligence system include where is the organisation sourcing from and what are the key elements of the due diligence system.*

Example: The organisation is a Sawmill in Estonia sourcing round wood only from Estonia and Latvia. The organisation has 45 suppliers of which 35 are forest managers and 10 traders of round wood.

The organisation due diligence system includes supplier approval program conducted prior to sourcing of wood from the suppliers. The supplier approval program includes following elements:

1. Control of legally required registrations and documents
2. Signing a supplier committing binding the supplier to follow all applicable requirement of the FSC controlled wood standard, as well as additional supplier requirements defined by the organisation (optional).

When suppliers have been approved by the organisation compliance with the requirements will continually be monitored. The monitoring program include following elements:

1. Verification of required documents prior to each purchase.
2. Field verification of the suppliers where risk of mixing is identified as high

Detailed description of the risk identified and the established control measures can be found in the sections below.

**Table 1: Description of supply area**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Supply Area information: | | |
| Description of Supply Area(s) | **Risk Designation** | Risk Assessment |
| *The description should allow the identification of the area with a homogeneous risk designation in the applicable risk assessment for each controlled wood category. Normally should include a country of origin.* | *Choose one of the following for each supply area:*   1. *Unspecified Risk* 2. *Low Risk* | *Choose one of the following for each supply area:*   1. *FSC Approved NRA* 2. *Simplified Risk Assessment* 3. *Extended Risk Assessment*   *Note: if 2 or 3 is chosen, append the company owned risk assessment to this summary report.* |
| Example:  Estonia and Latvia | Example:  Low Risk | Example:  Simplified Risk Assessment according to Global Forest Registry |

*INSERT RISK ASSESSMENT HERE!*

**Description of source types:**

*Describe what type of wood is sourced*

Example: The organisation sources round wood of pine (Pinus sylvatica) and Spruce (Picea abies).

**Comments or complaints**

Stakeholders who have suggestions for improvements, comments or complaints related the organisations due diligence system are encouraged to contact XXX by mail, email or phone. The organisation is committed to immediately follow up on stakeholder input and to provide stakeholders with feedback within 2 weeks.

**Stakeholder Consultation Processes/Summary**

*Provide a summer of the stakeholder consultation process that that the organisation has done in connection with preparing control measures and due diligence system.*

Example: Due to Low Risk for all CW categories stakeholder consultation was not required.

**Technical Experts Used for Development of Control Measures**

Example: Due to Low Risk for all CW categories no Control Measures was developed.

**Risk, control measures and verification**

**Table 2** describe the details of the types of supply chains, the potential risk of mixing in the supply chains as well as the action taken to control the risk, as well as well as a summary of the findings for the verifications conducted by the organisation. Tiers indicate the legal entities taking ownership of the wood from harvesting to the organisation is purchasing it. If there is only 1 tier, it means that wood is purchased directly from the concession holder.

**General summary of verification program**

*Describe the activities that have been conducted by the organisation to verify compliance with the requirements during the previous year. Include information on the number of audits and the key results of these audits.*

Example: During the last year, the organisation approved 3 new suppliers and terminated contact with 1 supplier due to failure to comply with the sourcing requirements. In addition, 2 suppliers obtained FSC forest management certification and these has therefore been excluded from the verification program.

Three suppliers had at least one visit to their round wood terminals to evaluate how risk of mixing is addressed.

**Table 2: Description of the supply chains, risk of mixing and control measures:**

| Supply chain type | Tiers | Risk of Mixing | Control Measure | Verification Cycle | Verification summary |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. *Describe the different types of supply chains* | *The number of tires* | *Evaluate the risk of mixing.* | *Describe the established control measures* | *Describe the verification cycle planned.* | *Provide a summary of the results of the verification conducted by the company.* |
| 1. Wood delivered and purchased directly from forest owner to Organisation’s log yard | 1 | Low | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 1. Wood delivered and purchased directly from forest owner to Organisation’s log yard, but purchased through a round wood trader or harvesting company. | 2 | Low | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 1. Wood delivered from forest to railway terminal and transported by train to organisation. | 1 – 2 | There is a risk that wood is mixed other sources that informed to the organisation that the rail way terminals. It may be from sources within the same supply area or from another supply area not covered by DDS (i.e. Russia) | 1. Contract with the supplier to keep material segregated. 2. Verify that suppliers have procedures in place not to mix material from Estonia and Latvia with material from other countries. 3. Audit of suppliers checking procedures, records and staff interviews | 1. Prior to first purchase. 2. Audit at terminals at least every year. | During the year all 4 terminals used were visited by the certification manger. Records were checked and staff interviewed. No violations were identified. |