# DDS summary

**Organisation Name:**

**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.*

**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: Russia, north west region | Unspecified Risk | FSC approved National Risk Assessment prepared according to version 2-1 of the FSC CW standard. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Description of source types:**

*Describe what type of wood is sourced*

**Comments or complaints**

Stakeholders who have suggestions for improvements, comments or complaints related the organisations due diligence system are encouraged to contact [ORGANISATION CONTACT] 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.*

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

*List the technical experts used for development of Control Measures.*

**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.

Similar, **Table 3** describes the details of the risks at the harvesting level, the established control measures and a summary of the verification process.

**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.*

**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*
 | *Number of tiers* |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Wood delivered and purchased directly from concession holder to Organisation’s log yard
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Wood delivered and purchased directly from concession holder to Organisation’s log yard, but purchased through a round wood trader.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Wood delivered from forest to railway terminal and transported by train to organisation.
 |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3: Risk and associated control measures at the harvesting level:**

| Indicator | Risk | Control Measure | Verification Cycle | Verification summary |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category 1. Illegally harvested wood |
| 1.1 Evidence of enforcement of logging related laws in the district |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1a. The structures controlling illegal harvesting are in place. |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1b. Control bodies for Illegal logging are working effectively |  |  |  |  |
| According to requirements during evaluation of Legality indicator “1.1 Evidence of enforcement of logging related laws in the district” the organization shall use the “Minimum list of applicable laws, regulations and nationally ratified international treaties, conventions and agreements” (table below) for the identification of logging related laws in the supply area under evaluation. |
| 1.1 Land tenure and management rights |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 Concession licenses |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 Management and harvesting planning |  |  |  |  |
| 1.4 Harvesting permits |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.5 Payment of royalties and harvesting fees |  |  |  |  |
| 1.6 Value added taxes and other sales taxes |  |  |  |  |
| 1.7 Income and profit taxes |  |  |  |  |
| 1.8 Timber harvesting regulations |  |  |  |  |
| 1.9 Protected sites and species |  |  |  |  |
| 1.10 Environmentalrequirements |  |  |  |  |
| 1.11 Health and safety |  |  |  |  |
| 1.12 Legal employment |  |  |  |  |
| 1.13 Customary rights |  |  |  |  |
| 1.14 Free, Prior and Informed Consent |  |  |  |  |
| 1.15 Indigenous peoples’ rights |  |  |  |  |
| 1.16 Classification of species, quantities, qualities |  |  |  |  |
| 1.17 Trade and transport |  |  |  |  |
| 1.18 Offshore trading and transfer pricing |  |  |  |  |
| 1.19 Custom regulations |  |  |  |  |
| 1.20. CITES |  |  |  |  |
| 1.21 Legislation requiring due diligence/due care procedures |  |  |  |  |
| Below are indicators 1.2-1.4 from current NRA |
| 1.2 There is evidence in the district demonstrating the legality of harvests and wood purchases that includes robust and effective system for granting licenses and harvest permits |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2a. The proof of existence of reliable and effective system of forest lease and issuing harvesting permits as well as other documents which can confirm the legality of harvest and sale of timber in the region in question is presented. |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2b. There is no proof of timber coming from radionuclide contaminated districts where commercial timber harvest is prohibited |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 There is little or no evidence or reporting of illegal harvesting in the district of origin |  |  |  |  |
| 1.4a. There is a low perception of corruption with relation to granting harvesting permits and other related areas of law enforcement |  |  |  |  |
| 1.4b. There are serious conflicts with relation to granting harvesting permits and other related areas of law enforcement identified during interviews with stakeholders |  |  |  |  |
| Category 2. Wood harvested from areas where traditional or civil rights are violated |
| 2.1 There is no UN Security Council ban on timber exports from the country concerned |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 The country or district is not designated a source of conflict timber (e.g. USAID Type 1 conflict timber) |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 There is no evidence of child labor or violation of ILO Fundamental Principles and Rights at work taking place in forest areas in the district concerned |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3a. There is no evidence of violation of freedom of association and collective bargaining |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3b. There is no evidence of violations of the rights of prisoners of corrective labour institutions during wood harvest |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3c. There is no evidence of child labor use |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3d. There is no evidence of discrimination in the area of employment and occupation |  |  |  |  |
| 2.4 There are recognized and equitable processes in place to resolve conflicts of substantial magnitude pertaining to traditional rights including use rights, cultural interests or traditional cultural identity in the district concern |  |  |  |  |
| 2.5 There is no evidence of violation of the ILO Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples taking place in the forest areas in the district concerned |  |  |  |  |
| Category 3. Wood harvested in forests where high conservation values are threatened by management activities |
| 3.1 Forest management activities in the relevant level (eco-region, sub-eco-region, local) do not threaten eco-regionally significant high conservation values |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1a. Forest district is not included into the ecoregion (sub-ecoregion) from The Global 200 of WWF |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1b. The forest district is not included into “Caucasus” bio-diversity hotspot |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1c. The forest district is not included or does not contain intact forest landscapes |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1d. The forest district is not included in the IUCN world centre of plant diversity |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1e. The forest district does not contain important bird areas |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1f. The forest district has no wetlands of international importance |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1g. The forest district has no rare forest ecosystems |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1h. The forest district does not belong to important plant areas |  |  |  |  |
| 3.2 A strong system of protection (effective protected areas and legislation) is in place that ensures survival of the HCVs in the ecoregion |  |  |  |  |