

Description of the Due Diligence System, including information provided by the organisation according to FSC-STD-40-005 V3-1, Section 6

## 1. General information

Organisation name:	Ekman and Company Inc
FSC certificate code:	NC-COC-007304 / NC-CW-007304
Organisation's DDS contact person:	Ally Miller
DDS prepared/assisted by:	Neocert Certificações Florestais e Agrícolas Ltda. <i>(DDS was developed with the assistance of an external organisation)</i>
Date last reviewed/updated (by the organisation):	August 12 <sup>th</sup> 2022

## 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
<i>Name of organisation's site. Name of organisation's site. All applicable sites shall be included.</i>	<i>Describe the type of product supplied e.g. logs, sawn logs, chips, wood pulp, etc.</i>	<i>Number of suppliers directly supplying material to the site</i>	<i>E.g. Forest management enterprise, Broker/trader without physical possession, Primary processor, Secondary processor, Distributor/wholesaler.</i>	<i>Average number of organisations within the supply chains, from forest to suppliers.</i>	<i>Total number of organisations that are sub-suppliers (indirect suppliers, or suppliers of your direct suppliers) within all supply chains</i>
SC US Marketing Inc	Pulp	1	Trader with physical possession (three warehouses)	4	1
Bracell SP Celulose Trading FZCO	Pulp	1	Trader without physical possession	3	1

Bracell SP Celulose Ltda.	Pulp	1	Primary processor (Pulp mill)	2	178 (since december 2021)
Forest suppliers	Eucalyptus logs	Aprox. 20 farms/month	Forest management	1	0

### 3. Supply areas

Supply area	Controlled wood category	Reference to risk assessment used	Risk designation
São Paulo and Mato Grosso do Sul states of Brazil	1	FSC-NRA-BR V1	Specified risk
	2	FSC-NRA-BR V1	Specified risk
	3	FSC-NRA-BR V1	Specified risk
	4	FSC-NRA-BR V1	Low risk
	5	FSC-NRA-BR V1	Low risk

### 4. Risk assessment and mitigation

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

Supply area:		
Indicator	Control Measures	Findings from field verification if undertaken as a control measure
Controlled wood category 1. Illegally harvested wood		
1.1	<p><i>M (Mandatory) - Check documentation that guarantees land ownership / possession and use, as for example these: registration of the property and contract for the purchase and sale of wood;</i></p> <p><i>R (Recommended) - Consult reports relevant to the subject, such as the Pastoral Commission of Land (CPT) and others, to verify if CW suppliers are not involved in land disputes;</i></p> <p><i>R - Consult with affected and/or interested stakeholders to verify the inexistence of conflicts;</i></p>	<p><i>During the registration of supply areas, the company obtains the registration of the property.</i></p> <p><i>If this is not in the name of the wood supplier, the contract between the owner and the supplier is requested. These registrations are available at the company's legal department and were reviewed by the Neocert team during the internal audit. All are complying.</i></p> <p><i>Consultation was carried out on the CPT report considering the municipalities in the region and no evidence of conflict was evidenced. The</i></p>

		<i>stakeholder consultation also did not receive any worrisome response on the subject.</i>
1.2	<i>N/A</i>	-
1.3	<i>N/A</i>	-
1.4	<i>Low risk</i>	-
1.5	<i>N/A</i>	-
1.6	<p><i>M – Verify the existence of sales documents showing the products and volumes, can be used for example invoices, sales contracts, among others.</i></p> <p><i>M – Request debt clearance certificate from suppliers, at federal, state and/or municipal levels.</i></p>	<p><i>All wood entries are accompanied by a CTM transport guide (timber transport certificate) approved by the special regime of the São Paulo Department of Finance.</i></p> <p><i>Wood from the state of MS is transported with a "Nota Fiscal" (an invoice in the national market).</i></p> <p><i>The issuance of CNDs for each supplier was issued by the Neocert team in the beginning and after that by Bracell's team.</i></p>
1.7	<i>Low risk</i>	-
1.8	<i>N/A</i>	-
1.9	<p><i>M - Confront controlled wood supply areas in relation to conservation units and / or buffer zones to verify possible overlaps. To check overlap, maps be can used, for example;</i></p> <p><i>M - In cases where overlap occurs with conservation units and/or buffer zone, evidence of compliance with the management plan of the Conservation Unit - CU (if there's any) must be collected;</i></p> <p><i>M - In cases where the overlap occurs with conservation units and/or buffer zone and there is no management plan for the CU, the consent of the environmental agency/manager of the CU must be sought, when applicable;</i></p> <p><i>M (P) – In cases of overlap of archeological heritage identified with management units, the good management practices shall be confirmed to avoid damage to those values. Examples of good management practices are, but not limited to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Soil and water conservation measures, avoiding erosion and damages to those values;</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Bracell's geoprocessing area was used to analyse the overlap of farms with Conservation Units (CU) and their Protective Buffer Zones using a 2 km buffer, and after the implementation of the DDS by Neocert, the buffer for analysis of overlaps changed to 10 km from the supply areas with the inclusion of new shapes to consider the overlap.</i></p> <p><i>All supply areas have a shapefile to facilitate this analysis. In cases of overlap, the CU Management Plans are analyzed. If there is no Management Plan and still there is an overlap with the CU or the Protective Buffer Zone, the permit of the CU's management body is requested.</i></p> <p><i>There was no evidence of overlapping of forest management units with archaeological sites, however, as there are archaeological sites in the region, the forest management operation is carried</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Tree felling direction control, avoiding damages to those values;</i></li> <li>• <i>Planning of the harvesting and transportation aiming to avoid damages to those values;</i></li> <li>• <i>Avoid planting near archeological sites, whenever possible.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>out with good practices as a precaution. In Neocert's audits, soil conditions are verified and only one erosion situation was found in the first external audit.</i></p>
1.10	<p><i>M – Field verifications to check the conformity of operations with the applicable environmental legislation, paying attention to at least the following situations, but not limited to them:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Harvest of exotic species in APP and, when applicable, taking into account the conditions of the authorization;</i></li> <li>• <i>Soil / road conservation;</i></li> <li>• <i>Damage to remaining native vegetation;</i></li> <li>• <i>Damage to water resources;</i></li> <li>• <i>Compliance with the requirements of the Environmental Impact Study (EIA) related to Controlled Wood, when applicable;</i></li> <li>• <i>Proper collection of waste (such as oils, packaging, contaminated material, etc.) generated in harvesting and transportation activities.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>M - Consult the IBAMA website and/or the state environmental organizations to verify the existence of embargoed areas related to the supply of Controlled Wood;</i></p>	<p><i>Bracell's field checks analyze damage to soil, remaining vegetation, water resources and waste collection from the operation.</i></p> <p><i>Annually, Neocert performs an internal audit of the DDS to check these records in the field.</i></p> <p><i>Bracell has a policy of not purchasing wood from permanent preservation areas. Advanced plantations over APP are left behind, not harvested.</i></p> <p><i>During Neocert's audits, no serious situation was found.</i></p>
1.11	<p><i>M – Field verifications to check conformity of operations with occupational health and safety legislation, considering at least, but no limited to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Appropriate use of individual safety equipment;</i></li> <li>• <i>Confirmation that all legally required protection equipment is provided by the organization with no cost for the forestry worker.</i></li> <li>• <i>Access to water and food in satisfactory quantity and quality;</i></li> <li>• <i>Confirmation that working conditions related to harvest and transportation activities are safe in the management unit for all employees;</i></li> <li>• <i>Appropriate transportation conditions;</i></li> <li>• <i>Adequate sanitary facilities;</i></li> <li>• <i>Adequate housing conditions;</i></li> <li>• <i>Training to carry out the activity;</i></li> <li>• <i>ASO - Attestation of Occupational Health;</i></li> <li>• <i>License to Carry and Use (LPU) of the chainsaw.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>The company has 8 operation modules with its own workforce and 1 module conducted by a third-party company. All the transport of wood is carried out by third-party companies, over which Bracell specifically monitors OHS and legal employment. Monitoring checks the use of PPE, safety training and the safety conditions of machinery and equipment, as well as harvesting and transport signals. In general, the harvest is entirely mechanized, with chainsaws being used only in very specific situations, in any case the operators are trained and the chainsaws registered. There are no accommodations in the harvesting and transport operations. The transport and feeding of workers, as well as the restrooms and living areas are also monitored by Bracell and audited by Neocert, in addition to being PEFC certified, which audits the same requirements.</i></p> <p><i>During the pandemic, there was legal permission not to carry out periodic and admission exams,</i></p>

		<i>which was verified in Neocert's audits. In this indicator, non-conformities have already been pointed out.</i>
1.12	<p><i>M – Field verifications to check conformity of workers’ documentation and guarantees of all labor rights, confirming that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• All workers are employed according to the regulations and all required contracts/evidence are in place (e.g. payment of fees, working hours, among others);</i></li> <li><i>• At least the minimum salary or salary compatible with the category, where applicable, is being paid to employees involved in harvesting and transportation activities;</i></li> <li><i>• The minimum age is observed for all personnel involved in harvesting, transportation or hazardous activities.</i></li> <li><i>• Labor practices similar to slave labor or labor analogous to slavery are not involved in harvesting or transportation activities.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>All the workers involved in the operation are registered employees of Bracell or subcontractors. On these, Bracell exercises constant HR monitoring.</i></p> <p><i>There are monitoring by Bracell that assess whether workers are registered, benefits and working hours. Issues such as slave and child labor are not part of the company's reality.</i></p>
1.13	<p><i>M – Overlap information to check the existence of traditional communities surrounding the supplying units, such as through maps and other information, using data from official sources such as FUNAI, Palmares Cultural Foundation, Culture Office, IPHAN, local association, among others;</i></p> <p><i>M – Survey of information that indicates the existence or not of conflict, for example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Media;</i></li> <li><i>• Consultation with stakeholders (NGOs, city halls, unions, public bodies, associations and others)</i></li> </ul> <p><i>M – In the case of evidence of conflict, field checks with the affected communities shall be carried out.</i></p>	<p><i>The company's geoprocessing area overlaps shapes with indigenous lands and quilombola communities (traditional communities), in addition to non-traditional communities. When there is proximity, the social team performs the characterization with the community. The survey of information in the media is carried out by Neocert. The institutions FUNAI, INCRA, IPHAN, and Palmares Foundation are considered essential stakeholders in the consultation processes and, therefore, are consulted annually, even if there is no overlap with communities.</i></p> <p><i>Both the public consultation and the internet searches and field verifications did not indicate any evidence of land conflicts involving the company.</i></p>
1.14	<p><i>M – Using data from public bodies (FUNAI, INCRA, Palmares Cultural Foundation) check if the supply unit is inserted in indigenous or traditional lands legally demarcated.</i></p> <p><i>M – In case the supply unit is inserted in indigenous or traditional lands legally demarcated, check with the responsible bodies (IBAMA, INCRA) to guarantee that the management is being carried out in compliance with legal requirements, including environmental licensing and legal management and tenure rights. (N/A)</i></p>	<p><i>The overlapping of supply area shapes with traditional communities and indigenous lands demonstrates that there is no overlap, making FPIC inapplicable.</i></p>

	<i>M – In case the supply unit is inserted in indigenous or traditional lands legally demarcated and it is in compliance with the law, consult the traditional or indigenous people and the responsible bodies (FUNAI, INCRA, Palmares Cultural Foundation) to guarantee that the FPIC is in place. (N/A)</i>	
1.15	<p><i>M – Carry out the cross-checking of information to verify the existence of indigenous peoples and quilombolas in a range of up to 10 km from the supply units; as for example through maps with data coming from official bodies like FUNAI, Palmares Cultural Foundation or others;</i></p> <p><i>M – If there are indigenous and/or quilombola people identified within a range of up to 10 km from the supply units, consultation with stakeholders (FUNAI, Palmares Cultural Foundation and/or INCRA) must take place to attest the regularity of the activities of the enterprise in relation to the rights of possession and use and other rights related to indigenous and traditional populations;</i></p>	<p><i>The overlap or proximity analysis indicated that there is an indigenous land and some quilombolas areas close to some supply areas. In the consultation with stakeholders carried out by Neocert the institutions, FUNAI and Palmares Foundation were considered and no worrisome response has been received.</i></p> <p><i>During the field audits 2 farms closed to the indigenous area were visited. No signs of a problem was found either in the audits or in the public consultation</i></p>
1.16	<i>Low risk</i>	-
1.17	<i>Low risk</i>	-
1.18	<i>Low risk</i>	-
1.19	<i>Low risk</i>	-
1.20	<i>N/A</i>	-
1.21	<i>N/A</i>	-
<b>Controlled wood category 2. Wood harvested in violation of traditional and human rights</b>		
2.1	<i>Low risk</i>	-
2.2	<p><i>M – Carry out field surveys to evidence that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Timber is produced under policies that respect freedom of association and right to collective bargaining and absence of discrimination;</i></li> <li><i>• There is no labor analogous to slavery or child labor.</i></li> <li><i>• There is no discrimination in employment, occupation, gender and / or race.</i></li> </ul>	<i>All labor used in the harvest and transport are over the PEFC certification and the FSC CW DDS audits. Bracell and Neocert monitors interview workers about freedom of association, right to collective bargaining and absence of discrimination. No problem was found.</i>
2.3	<i>M – Confront areas of supply of controlled wood with areas of indigenous populations and/or traditional populations in order to verify possible overlap or proximity in a range</i>	<i>The Bracell team analyzes the overlap or proximity of supply areas with traditional and indigenous communities. The institutions FUNAI, INCRA,</i>

	<p>of up to 10 km. In order to verify such overlap, one can use, for example, information available in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FUNAI;</li> <li>• INCRA.</li> </ul> <p><i>M – In cases where there is overlap or proximity within a range of up to 10 km from the controlled wood supply area, interested parties must be consulted to see if there are any conflicts with indigenous populations and/or traditional populations and to attest that the situation is in accordance with the responsible bodies requirements;</i></p> <p><i>M – Consult reports related to the rights of indigenous and traditional population (such as land possession rights, rights to access to resources), such as the Pastoral Land Commission and others, to verify that the areas of supply of controlled wood are not in a situation of land disputes;</i></p> <p><i>M – Field verification of evidences that attest the management is not being conducted inside indigenous or traditional lands;</i></p>	<p><i>IPHAN, and Palmares Foundation are considered essential stakeholders in the consultation processes and, therefore, are consulted annually. Even if there is no overlap with communities. Consultation in the media and in the CPT report are carried out by Neocert.</i></p> <p><i>No signs of problems were found either in the audits or in the public consultation</i></p>
<p>Controlled wood category 3. Wood from forests in which high conservation values are threatened by management activities</p>		
<p>3.1</p>	<p><i>M – Confront the areas of supply of controlled wood in relation to the location in Priority Areas for Conservation and Conservation Units (except for Environmental Protection Areas) in order to verify possible overlaps. For this to overlap check, the following sources can be used:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICMBio;</li> <li>• MMA: CUs;</li> <li>• MMA: Priority areas</li> </ul> <p><i>M – When there is overlap of the supply area with Priority Areas for Conservation and/or Conservation Units, except APA, good management practices must be evidenced.</i></p> <p><i>R – Conduct field surveys to verify that good management practices are in place.</i></p>	<p><i>Mappings were carried out with all layers indicated by the NRA. There are overlaps with priority areas for conservation on company properties. Good management practices are the company's operating procedure. There are internal assessments on post-harvest environmental aspects. During the internal DDS audit, Neocert audits supply areas and no problem related to the topic was evidenced.</i></p>
<p>3.2</p>	<p><i>M – Confront the areas of supply of controlled wood in relation to the location in Priority Areas for Conservation and/or Conservation Units (except for Environmental Protection Areas) in order to verify possible overlaps. For this to overlap check, the following sources can be used:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICMBio;</li> <li>• MMA: CUs;</li> <li>• MMA: Priority areas</li> </ul>	<p><i>Mappings were carried out with all layers indicated by the NRA. There are overlaps with priority areas for conservation on company properties. Good management practices are the company's operating procedure. There are internal assessments on post-harvest environmental aspects. During the internal DDS audit, Neocert audits supply areas and no problem related to the topic was evidenced.</i></p>

	<p><i>M – When there is overlap of the supply area with Priority Areas for Conservation and/or Conservation Units, except APA, good management practices must be evidenced.</i></p>	
3.3	<p><i>M – Environmental Protection Areas) and/or Ramsar Sites in order to verify possible overlaps. For this to overlap check, the following sources can be used:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>ICMBio;</i></li> <li>• <i>MMA: CUs;</i></li> <li>• <i>MMA: Priority áreas;</i></li> <li>• <i>Ramsar</i></li> </ul> <p><i>M – When there is overlap of the supply area with Priority Areas for Conservation, Conservation Units, except APA, and/or Ramsar Sites, good management practices must be evidenced.</i></p>	<p><i>Mappings were carried out with all layers indicated by the NRA. There are overlaps with priority areas for conservation on company properties. Good management practices are the company's operating procedure. There are internal assessments on post-harvest environmental aspects. During the internal DDS audit, Neocert audits supply areas and no problem related to the topic was evidenced.</i></p>
3.4	<p><i>M – Confront the areas of controlled wood supply in relation to the location of the Conservation Units (except for Environmental Protection Areas), areas of local communities, indigenous and/or traditional populations in order to verify possible overlaps or proximity in a range of up to 10 km. For this overlap check, the following sources can be used:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>ICMBio;</i></li> <li>• <i>MMA: CUs;</i></li> <li>• <i>MMA: Priority áreas;</i></li> <li>• <i>FUNAI</i></li> <li>• <i>INCRA</i></li> </ul> <p><i>M – In cases where there is overlap or proximity in a range of up to 10 km from the controlled wood supply area with Conservation Units (except for Environmental Protection Areas) , areas of local communities, indigenous and / or traditional populations, affected parties should be consulted to identify whether management does not negatively impacts critical ecosystem services, for example, but not limited to: flood control; climate regulation, water resource maintenance and soil conservation.</i></p> <p><i>M – In cases where there is overlap or proximity in a range of up to 10 km from the controlled wood supply area with Conservation Units (except for Environmental Protection Areas), areas of local communities, indigenous and / or traditional populations, perform field surveys to verify if good management practices can be evidenced.</i></p>	<p><i>There is proximity to supply areas with conservation units, indigenous lands and local communities. In these cases, the UCs and communities and their management bodies (if any) are included in the stakeholder consultation carried out by Neocert.</i></p> <p><i>In the field, good management practices are checked. The institutions FUNAI, INCRA, IPHAN, and Palmares Foundation are considered essential stakeholders in the consultation processes and, therefore, are consulted annually. Even if there is no overlap with communities.</i></p>



3.5	<p><i>M – Confront the controlled wood supply area with areas of local communities, indigenous and/or traditional populations in order to verify possible overlap or proximity within a range of up to 10 km. For this to overlap check, the following sources can be used:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>IBGE</i></li> <li>• <i>FUNAI</i></li> <li>• <i>INCRA</i></li> </ul> <p><i>M – In cases where there is overlap or proximity within a range of up to 10 km from the controlled wood supply area the affected parties shall be consulted to verify that management does not adversely impact areas and resources that are critical to meeting the basic needs of local communities, indigenous populations or traditional populations.</i></p> <p><i>M – If the consultation with affected parties identifies that management may be negatively impacting areas and resources essential to meet the basic needs of local communities, indigenous populations or traditional populations, perform field surveys to ensure that the management adopted does not generate such impacts.</i></p>	<p><i>The geoprocessing analysis verifies the proximity of supply areas with indigenous, traditional and local communities. Nearby communities are characterized by Bracell's social team and included in Neocert's stakeholder consultation. The institutions FUNAI, INCRA, IPHAN, and Palmares Foundation are considered essential stakeholders in the consultation processes and, therefore, are consulted annually. Even if there is no overlap with communities.</i></p>
3.6	<p><i>M – Confront the controlled wood supply area with areas of local communities, indigenous populations, traditional populations, archeological sites and/or world heritage sites in order to verify possible overlap or proximity within a range of up to 10 km. For this overlap check, the following sources can be used:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>IBGE</i></li> <li>• <i>FUNAI</i></li> <li>• <i>INCRA</i></li> <li>• <i>IPHAN</i></li> <li>• <i>UNESCO</i></li> </ul> <p><i>M – In cases where there is overlap or proximity within a range of up to 10 km from the controlled wood supply area the affected parties shall be consulted to identify whether management does not negatively impact the critical cultural values of local communities, indigenous populations or traditional populations.</i></p> <p><i>M – If the consultation with affected parties identifies that management may be negatively impacting the critical cultural values of local communities, indigenous populations and / or traditional populations, perform field surveys to ensure that the management adopted does not generate such impacts.</i></p>	<p><i>The geoprocessing analysis verifies the proximity of the supply areas with archaeological sites, world heritage and indigenous, traditional and local communities. Nearby communities are characterized by Bracell's social team. If there is proximity, managers or communities are included in Neocert's stakeholder consultation. The institutions FUNAI, INCRA, IPHAN, and Fundação Palmares are considered essential stakeholders in the consultation processes and, therefore, are consulted annually. Even if there is no overlap with communities.</i></p>
Controlled wood category 4. Wood from forests being converted to plantations or non-forest use		
4.1	N/A	-

Controlled wood category 5. Wood from forests in which genetically modified trees are planted		
5.1	Low risk	-

#### 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
SC US Marketing Inc	Trader with physical possession (3 warehouses)	4	<i>The risk of mixing is low since the organization only receives pulp from Bracell SP Celulose Trading FZCO. The pulp when in the physical and legal possession of SC US Marketing Inc remains in up to three warehouses located in Philadelphia (Pennsylvania), Mobile (Alabama) and Port Arthur (Texas) in the US. The management of the warehouses is outsourced.</i>	<i>Prior to the first sale, the organization's warehouses and controls are audited either in person or remotely, based on a risk assessment or at the request of the FSC certificate holder. Billing document analysis (Invoices, BL and Packing lists).</i>	<i>No pulp loads have been received as of the date of this public summary.</i>
Bracell SP Celulose Trading FZCO	Trader without physical possession	3	<i>There is low risk of material mixing due to not having physical possession. This operation is for documentary purposes only. This company sells only Bracell pulp produced in Lençois Paulista, São Paulo, Brazil, pulp mill.</i>  <i>This link in the supply chain may also issue invoices directly to Ekman and Co Inc. In these cases, the customs and operational processes for nationalization of the material at the port and the inventory controls will be the responsibility</i>	<i>Billing document analysis (Invoices, BL and Packing lists).</i>	<i>Document traceability analyzed during the audit through invoices, BL and Packing list.</i>

			<i>of Ekman, which will mitigate the risks of mixing materials by outsourcing to the same companies that will do the logistics operations of SC US Marketing Inc. (fourth link in the supply chain). All applicable requirements of item 13 of FSC-STD-40-004 V3-1 have already been met by Ekman to ensure the eligibility of the pulp in this custody model.</i>		
<b>Bracell SP Celulose Ltda.</b>	<b>Primary processor (Pulp mill)</b>	<b>2</b>	<i>Entry of wood not evaluated by the DDS.</i>	<i>All suppliers are included in the DDS since December 2021</i>	<i>During the audit, a report of wood entries from the scale (SAP) was analyzed and compared with the list of suppliers approved by the DDS.</i>
<b>Forest suppliers</b>	<b>Forest management</b>	<b>1</b>	<i>There is low risk of mixing. There are no intermediate yards and the wood comes straight from the forest to the pulp mill.</i>	<i>Registration of the farms in the pulp mill database and control of wood deliveries from the invoices (purchased logs) or wood transport certificates (own logs).</i>	<i>During the audit, a report of wood entries from the scale (SAP) was analyzed and compared with the list of suppliers approved by the DDS. Invoices from purchased woods were analyzed.</i>

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

*N/A, technical experts were not required.*

## 6. Stakeholder consultation processes

Supply area	Relevant controlled wood category	List of stakeholder groups invited to participate	Summary of comments received from stakeholders	Description of how stakeholder comments were taken into account	Justification for concluding that the material sourced from the area was low risk
Regions of the company's forestry operations in the states of São Paulo and Mato Grosso do Sul	1, 2 and 3	<p><i>Invited Interest Groups:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <i>economic interests</i></li> <li>✓ <i>social interests</i></li> <li>✓ <i>environmental interests</i></li> <li>✓ <i>FSC accredited certifiers in the country</i></li> <li>✓ <i>National and state forest agencies</i></li> <li>✓ <i>Experts with experience in controlled wood categories</i></li> <li>✓ <i>Universities and research institutions</i></li> <li>✓ <i>FSC regional offices, FSC network partners, registered standard development groups and ANR working groups in the region</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>The first responses received indicate that Bracell carries out its operations without objections from society. No response could be interpreted as a complaint.</i></p>	<p><i>The comments received were analyzed and if there were any signs of problems related to the DDS, in-depth analyzes were carried out on the topic and/or individual interviews with interested parties</i></p>	<p><i>The consultation has yet to reveal any points of attention to be considered a driver for field checks. Therefore, based on the consultation with stakeholders, there is no impediment for this wood to be considered controlled wood</i></p>

## 7. Complaints procedure

We encourage stakeholders who have suggestions for improvements, comments, or complaints related to our controlled wood due diligence system to contact Marcos Planello from Neocert by mail (Neocert - Av. Comendador Pedro Morganti, 4965 – Usina de Inovação - Casa 10 – Bairro Monte Alegre, Piracicaba - SP, Zip Code 13415-000) email ([consultapublica@neocert.com.br](mailto:consultapublica@neocert.com.br)), or phone/whatsapp (+55 19 3375-1060)

We commit to follow up on stakeholder input as soon as we receive it and to provide stakeholders with feedback within 2 weeks.

*Contact of the person or position responsible for resolving complaints:*

*Neocert – Mr. Marcos Planello – [consultapublica@neocert.com.br](mailto:consultapublica@neocert.com.br) or phone or whatsapp +55 19 3375-1060*

*Procedure for filing complaints:*

*When a complaint is received this procedure must be followed:*

- a) Acknowledging receipt of complaints registering in a shared form;*
- b) Informing stakeholders of the complaint procedure, and providing an initial response to complaints within a time period of two (2) weeks;*
- c) Complaints related to risk designations in the Brazil NRA should be forwarded to FSC Brazil.*
- d) A preliminary assessment must be done to determine evidence provided in a complaint is or is not substantial, by assessing the evidence provided against the risk of using material from unacceptable sources;*
- e) Dialogue with complainants must be done aiming to solve complaints investigated as substantial before further actions are taken;*
- f) Forwarding substantial complaints to the certification body and relevant FSC National Office for the supply area within two (2) weeks of receipt of the complaint. Information on the steps to be taken by the organization in order to resolve the complaint, as well as how the precautionary approach will be used, shall be included with the complaint;*
- g) The precautionary approach towards the continued sourcing of the relevant material should be adopted while a complaint is pending; Substantial complaints must lead to the temporary suspension of supply if they are considered relevant and at the same time are not addressed.*
- h) the field verification and/or desk verification will be done to verify a complaint verified as substantial by the organization, within two (2) months of its receipt;*
- i) Determining the corrective action to be taken by suppliers and the means to enforce its implementation by the supplier if the complaint has been verified and verified as substantial. If corrective action cannot be determined and/or enforced, the relevant material and/or suppliers shall be excluded by the organization;*
- j) Verifying whether corrective action has been taken by suppliers and whether it is effective;*
- k) Excluding the relevant material and suppliers from the organization's supply chain if no corrective action is taken;*

*l) Informing the complainant, the certification body, and the relevant FSC National Office of the results of the complaint and any actions taken towards its resolution, and for maintaining the copies of relevant correspondence;*

*m) Recording and filing all complaints received and actions taken in the complaint form.*

## **Annex**

***N/A***