# FSC Controlled Wood Due Diligence System Public Summary

*Note: Guidance on how to use this document is in grey italic font and should be deleted from the final version*

**1. General information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organisation name:** | **Greensaw OÜ** |
| **FSC certificate code:** | **NC-CoC-001234; NC-CW-001234;** |
| **Organisation’s DDS contact person:** | **…., production manager** |
| **DDS prepared/assisted by:** | *DDS prepared by company (production manager …..)* |
| **Date last reviewed/updated (by the organisation):** | **dd.mm.yyyy** |

**2. Suppliers**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participating site** | **Non-certified material type sourced** | **Exact number of suppliers** | **Supplier type(s)** | **Average no. of tiers in the supply chains** | **Approximate or exact number of sub-suppliers** |
| *Name of organisation’s site. All applicable sites shall be included.* | *Describe the type of product supplied e.g. logs, sawn logs, chips, wood pulp, etc.* | *Number of suppliers directly supplying material to the site* | *E.g.*  *Forest management enterprise,*  *Broker/trader without physical possession,*  *Primary processor,*  *Secondary processor,*  *Distributor/wholesaler.* | *Average number of organisations within the supply chains, from forest to suppliers.* | *Total number of organisations that are sub-suppliers (indirect suppliers, or suppliers of your direct suppliers) within all supply chains* |
| **Greensaw OÜ sawmill** | **roundwood** | **7** | **Forest manager, traders** | **2-3** | **Ca 10** |

**3. Supply areas**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Supply area** | **Controlled wood category** | **Reference to risk assessment used** | **Risk designation** |
| **Estonia** | 1 | CNRA for Estonia, see https://ic.fsc.org/en/document-center/id/121 | Low risk |
| 2 | Specified risk |
| 3 | Specified risk |
| 4 | Low risk |
| 5 | Low risk |

**4. Risk assessment and mitigation**

**4.a Risk mitigation for the origin of the material**

*Copy the table for each supply area. Add information about control measures for each indicator that is designated* ***specified or unspecified risk*** *in the relevant risk assessment (****deleting rows for indicators that are low risk or aren’t found in the applicable risk assessment****) and complete the table.*

*If you only source from low risk areas, delete the table and state “****N/A, all supply areas are low risk****”.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Supply area:** | | |
| **Indicator** | **Control Measures** | **Findings from field verification if undertaken as a control measure** |
| *Number of the indicators designated specified or unspecified risk in the applicable risk assessment. Note that the number of applicable indicators will change depending on the type of risk assessment used, and not all will be applicable to company risk assessments and ’old’ national risk assessments.* | *Describe the control measures implemented to mitigate the risk and describe their desired outcome.*  *Describe the activities conducted to verify the effectiveness of the control measures. Include information on the cycle (how often you conduct verification), number of audits, justification of sampling intensity, and the key results of the audits. If you found non-conformities, state steps taken to address them.* | *Summarise findings, if field verification was conducted.*  *Describe steps taken to address any non-conformities found, unless confidential.*  *If information is deemed confidential and not published, provide a justification for this.*  *Assessment on forest level only! Control nr of workers from Creditinfos database.*  *If forest manager or contractor is FSC certified then low risk may be considered.* |
| Controlled wood category 2. Wood harvested in violation of traditional and human rights | | |
| 2.2 | *Specified risk on discrimination of women at work (unequal payment):*  *1 – Evidence from suppliers (and their contractors) that they have no men and women working on same position (and same qualification) and for additional information Nr of men and women working in that company. List of contractors with nr of workers. Evidence may include a signed declaration and employment/staff records (e.g. list of employees, contracts).*  *2 – Evidence from suppliers (and their contractors) that where there are men and women working on the same position, wage discrimination is avoided in the company (Add detail description for example salary by piece, etc).*  *Nr of men and women working in that company. List of contractors with nr of workers.*   * *Evidence may include:Written company policy to apply to all staff the principle of equal remuneration for men and women for work of equal value. The term "remuneration" is broadly defined to include the ordinary, basic or minimum wage or salary and any additional emoluments payable directly or indirectly, whether in cash or in kind, by the employer to the worker and arising out of the worker's employment.* * *System to implement the policy (and monitor this)* * *Records of sex-disaggregated data by age class on wages, work hours and social and economic benefits, including retirement benefits paid.* * *Records of regular wages and other benefit reviews* * *Payslips or contracts of men and women in similar roles* * *Designation of a role within the company to work on equality issues* * *Procedures for hiring, promoting and determining pay of employees are transparent and contain equality/anti-discrimination measures* * *Initiatives to measure or act on equal pay* * *Details of insurance policies.*   *Each supplier is evaluated before the first supply and later on twice a year. Evaluation process can include review of declarations, visiting companies, interviews with staff of companies (normal workers, and management).*  *If the requirements are not met material will not be accepted.*  *The outcome of these control measures is to eliminate material from companies where there is a pay gap between men and women who do the same work or work of equal value.* |  |
| Controlled wood category 3. Wood from forests in which high conservation values are threatened by management activities | | |
| 3.3 | *Specified risks regarding Natura 2000 sites (forest habitat types listed in the Habitat Directive.), Woodland Key Habitats,*  *Registered Woodland Key Habitats (WKH):*  *Each supply is controlled from Public forest registry. If material is originating from WKH it is not accepted.*  *Potential WKH:*  *Each supply is controlled from potential WKH database sent by FSC Estonia.*  *If FMU is not registered in potential WKH database then it is ok to accept material.*  *If material is originating from potential WKH it is not accepted.*  *If material is originating from potential WKH but comes with a signed field visit protocol from licensed WKH expert stating that the pot WKH was not actually a WKH, together with the reasons why it did not meet the criteria of WKH, then the material can be accepted*  *Regarding potential WKHs Company has used an expert opinion (guidance to use the database they created) from ELF worker Liis Kuresoo to confirm the adequacy of the control measures.*  *Regarding registered WKHs there is an explanation from FSC Estonia (including the opinion of environmental SHs)*  *Natura 2000 sites:*  *Each supply is controlled from NATURA 2000 database.*  *If FMU is not registered in Natura 2000 database then it is ok to accept material.*  *If material is originating from Natura 2000 habitat type it is not accepted.*  *If material comes with a signed field visit protocol from Natura 2000 expert stating that the cutting sub-compartment(s) was not actually a Natura 2000 habitat type and also together with the reasons why it did not meet the criteria of WKH, then the material can be accepted.*  *Regarding Natura 2000 sites: Company has also asked an expert opinion from Expert Name to confirm the adequacy of the control measures.*  *The outcome of these control measures is to eliminate material from specified risk supplies.* |  |
| 3.6 | *Specified risk regarding cross trees and Natural sacred grounds:*  *Each supply is controlled from cross trees and sacred natural grounds database sent by FSC Estonia.*  *If FMU is not registered in cross trees and natural sacred grounds database then it is ok to accept it.*  *If material is originating from these areas it is not accepted. If material is originating from cross trees limited management zone then company must confirm that the forest in this zone is managed according to the instructions sent by FSC Estonia before accepting the material.*  *Company has used an expert opinion(guidance to use the database they created) from Ahto Kaasik (TÜ looduslike pühapaikade keskus ) to confirm the adequacy of the control measures.*  *The outcome of these control measures is to eliminate material from specified risk supplies.* |  |

**4.b Risk assessment and mitigation for mixing in the supply chain**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participating site** | **Supply chain type** | **No. of tiers** | **Risk of mixing** | **Control measures** | **Findings from field verification if undertaken as a control measure** |
| *This table shall be filled for each applicable participating site (listed in the table in Section 2)* | *Describe the supply chain e.g.*   * *Wood delivered and purchased directly from concession holder to Organisation’s log yard* * *Wood delivered and purchased directly from concession holder to Organisation’s log yard, but purchased through a round wood trader.* * *Wood delivered from forest to railway terminal and transported by train to organisation.*   *and state the relevant supply area, or state that the material previously had an FSC claim but was coursed from a non-FSC certified (chain of custody) supply chain.* | *‘Tiers’ indicates the legal entities taking ownership of the wood from harvesting to the organisation purchasing it. If there is only 1 tier, it means that wood is purchased directly from the concession holder.* | *Summarise the risk assessment of mixing in this supply chain. Justify any conclusions.* | *If risk is identified, state what actions are being taken to mitigate that risk. Describe the activities that have been conducted by the organisation to verify the effectiveness of the control measures. Include information on the cycle (how often verification is conducted), number of audits, justification of sampling intensity, and the key results of the audits. If non-conformities were found, state steps taken to address them.* | *Summarise findings, if field verification was conducted.*  *Describe steps taken to address any non-conformities found, unless confidential.*  *If information is deemed confidential and not published, provide a justification for this.* |
| *Greensaw OÜ sawmill* | Wood delivered and purchased directly from forest owner to Organisation’s log yard | *1* | *Low risk*  *Justification: material is moving physically from felling site in forest to company log yard together with waybill that indicates the origin* | *N/A* | *N/A* |
| *Greensaw OÜ sawmill* | Wood delivered directly from forest to Organisation’s log yard, but purchased through a forest manager and/or round wood traders. | *2-3* | *Low risk*  *Justification: material is moving physically from felling site in forest to company log yard together with waybill that indicates the origin* | *N/A* | *N/A* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**5. Technical experts used in the development of control measures**

*List all technical experts used for developing control measures.*

*If none were required or used, delete table and write “****N/A, technical experts were not required****”.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **License/Registration #** | **Qualification** | **Scope of service** | **Source of information** |
|  |  |  | *State the relevant supply area(s) and indicator(s) for which expertise was used in the development of control measures* | *For publicly available expertise, provide the citation for the specific source(s) of information used* |
| *Liis Kuresoo* | *N/A* | *Representative of ELF, has wide range of experience regarding forest protection and WKHs* | *3.3 Woodland Key Habitats (WKH)* | *Email sent by FSC Estonia* |
| *Name Surename* | *N/A* | *To be added* | *3.3 Natura 2000 habitats* |  |
| *Ahto Kaasik* | *N/A* | *Representative TÜ Natural Sacred Grounds Centre, has wide range of experience in that field* | *3.6 cross trees, Natural sacred grounds* | *Email sent by FSC Estonia, guridance document for using database they created.* |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**6. Stakeholder consultation processes**

***N/A, stakeholder consultation not required***

**7. Complaints procedure**

We encourage stakeholders who have suggestions for improvements, comments, or complaints related to our controlled wood due diligence system to contact [ORGANISATION CONTACT NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS] by mail, email, or phone. We commit to follow up on stakeholder input as soon as we receive it and to provide stakeholders with feedback within 2 weeks.

*Provide the organisation’s complaints procedure. The procedure must satisfy the requirements of Section 7 of the standard.*

**Annex**

***Include all company risk assessments and extended company risk assessments as annexes.***