

# SODEFOR

Timber and pulp assessment

Total score:

11.5%

Latest update: July 2019

Next scheduled: July 2020

## About this company:

Founded in 1994, SODEFOR is one of the largest forestry companies operating in West Africa and has forestry operations in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Parent company Norsudtimber is headquartered in Liechtenstein. The company is involved in timber production, processing and manufacturing.

## Parent company:

Norsudtimber

## Thomson Reuters ticker:

Private company

## Bloomberg ticker:

Private company

## Activities:

Timber production, timber processing and manufacturing

## Locations:

DRC (Kinshasa, and Mai Ndombe and Tshopo provinces)

## Headquarters:

Democratic Republic of the Congo

## Related companies:

Precious Woods is one of SODEFOR's shareholders through its parent company Norsudtimber.

## Website:

<http://www.sodefor.net>

Total:

14.5 / 126

11.5%



## > Sustainability policy and leadership

2 / 8 22.2%

1. Sustainable forestry policy or commitment for all its operations?

✓

1 / 1 [Source](#)

2. Sustainability policy or commitment applies to all sourcing?

✗

0 / 1 [Source](#)

3. High-level position of responsibility for sustainability?

✗

0 / 1 [Source](#)

4. One or more board members have responsibility for sustainability?

This indicator is disabled as the company is not publicly listed

5. Percentage or number of women board members?

This indicator is disabled as the company is not publicly listed

6. Percentage or number of women in senior management team?

✗

0 / 1 [Source](#)

7. Sustainability report published within last two years?

✗

0 / 1 [Source](#)

8. Member of multiple industry schemes or other external initiatives to improve forest management or transparency?

✗

0 / 1 [Source](#)

	✓	1 / 1	Source
<b>9. Activities with government, NGOs or academic institutions to improve the sustainability of forest products?</b> The company has been engaging with academic and non-governmental organisations to undertake research to improve forest management, and has received support from WWF for forestry, socioeconomic and environmental initiatives			
<b>10. Climate risks assessment available?</b>	✗	0 / 1	Source
<b>11. Natural capital assessment available?</b>	✗	0 / 1	Source



> Landbank, mills and traceability

35 / 24	11.6%		
1 media report			
<b>12. Lists countries and operations?</b> The company is engaged in timber production in Mai Ndombe Province and Tshopo Province, and timber processing in Nioki and Kinshasa (DRC)	✓	1 / 1	Source
<b>13. Total area of natural forest designated for wood/wood fibre production (ha)?</b>	✗	0 / 1	Source
<b>14. Total area of forest plantation (ha)?</b>	✗	0 / 1	Source
<b>15. Area of plantation/natural forest within outgrower schemes (ha)?</b>	✗	0 / 1	Source
<b>16. Unplanted (areas designated for future development as plantation forest) (ha)?</b>	✗	0 / 1	Source
<b>17. Conservation set-aside and/or HCV area (ha)?</b>	✗	0 / 1	Source
<b>18. Area of Intact Forest Landscape (ha)?</b>	✗	0 / 1	Source
<b>19. Number of Forest Management Units (FMUs)?</b> 15 - The company reports having 15 concessions, but this information is from an undated source. OTP records 13 FMUs, and GFW records 16	✗	0 / 1	Source
<b>20. Maps of forest management units (FMUs)?</b> Maps are available for some of the company's FMUs on external sites, but the number does not equal the number of FMUs the company reports so it is unclear whether all FMUs are represented	P	0.5 / 1	Source
<b>21. Forest management plans available for all FMUs?</b>	✗	0 / 1	Source
<b>22. Monitoring of forest management plan implementation?</b>	✗	0 / 1	Source

<p><b>23. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on use rights (at the time of SPOTT assessments)?</b> 66.67% - Score of SODEFOR in this OTP category. Please note: company scores on Open Timber Portal are updated daily. Visit the OTP website to review the company's current performance by clicking on the source link</p>	<p>✓ 1 / 1 <a href="#">Source</a></p>
<p><b>24. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on forest management (at the time of SPOTT assessments)?</b> 0% - Score of SODEFOR in this OTP category. Please note: company scores on Open Timber Portal are updated daily. Visit the OTP website to review the company's current performance by clicking on the source link</p>	<p>✗ 0 / 1 <a href="#">Source</a></p>
<p><b>25. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on timber harvesting (at the time of SPOTT assessments)?</b> 0% - Score of SODEFOR in this OTP category. Please note: company scores on Open Timber Portal are updated daily. Visit the OTP website to review the company's current performance by clicking on the source link</p>	<p>✗ 0 / 1 <a href="#">Source</a></p>
<p><b>26. Number of company owned pulp and paper mills?</b> This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it does not own pulp or paper mills. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this</p>	
<p><b>27. Maps or addresses of company owned pulp and paper mills?</b> This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it does not own pulp or paper mills. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this</p>	
<p><b>28. Number of company owned sawmills?</b> 2 - The company states it operates two sawmills, but this information is from an undated source</p>	<p>✗ 0 / 1 <a href="#">Source</a></p>
<p><b>29. Maps or addresses of company owned sawmills?</b></p>	<p>✗ 0 / 1 <a href="#">Source</a></p>
<p><b>30. Number of supplier mills?</b></p>	<p>✗ 0 / 1 <a href="#">Source</a></p>
<p><b>31. Maps or addresses of supplier mills?</b></p>	<p>✗ 0 / 1 <a href="#">Source</a></p>
<p><b>32. Procedures to trace raw materials to country of harvest?</b> The company mentions traceability but it is unclear whether this only relates to its own concessions and limited details are provided</p>	<p>P 0.5 / 1 <a href="#">Source</a></p>
<p><b>33. Procedures to trace raw materials to FMU level?</b> The company mentions traceability but it is unclear whether this only relates to its own concessions and limited details are provided</p>	<p>P 0.5 / 1 <a href="#">Source</a></p>
<p><b>34. Percentage of supply traceable to country level (above 80%)?</b></p>	<p>✗ 0 / 2 <a href="#">Source</a></p>

35. Percentage of supply traceable to FMU level (above 75%)?

✘ 0 / 2 [Source](#)



> Deforestation and biodiversity

25 / 12 20.8%

⚠ 2 media reports

36. Commitment to zero conversion of natural forest?

✘ 0 / 1 [Source](#)

37. Zero conversion commitment applies to all sourcing?

✘ 0 / 1 [Source](#)

38. Commitment to minimise the impact of logging roads?

The company states that it undertakes a number of methods to reduce the impact of logging roads, including bypassing steep, swampy, ecological, sensitive areas; respecting a maximum deforestation of 30 m for roads, maintaining canopy bridges at least every 5 km, avoiding disturbances to the banks of streams, and closing roads that will not be used until the next rotation

✓ 1 / 1 [Source](#)

39. Commitment to protect forest areas from illegal activities?

The company states it aims to prevent illegal hunting and poaching on its concessions. A full commitment to protect forest areas from all illegal activities could not be identified

P 0.5 / 1 [Source](#)

40. Evidence of monitoring deforestation?

✘ 0 / 1 [Source](#)

41. Amount of deforestation recorded?

✘ 0 / 1 [Source](#)

42. Commitment to biodiversity conservation?

The company states that it conserves biological diversity, water resources, soils, ecosystems and fragile landscapes to maintain the ecological functions and integrity of the forest. The company also states it has a wildlife management program to combat direct and indirect negative impacts of its activities

✓ 1 / 1 [Source](#)

43. Examples of species and/or habitat conservation management?

✘ 0 / 1 [Source](#)

44. Implementing a landscape-level approach to biodiversity conservation?

✘ 0 / 1 [Source](#)

45. Identified species of conservation concern referencing international or national system of species classification?

✘ 0 / 1 [Source](#)

46. Commitment to sustainably manage the use of non-timber forest products (NTFPs)?

✘ 0 / 1 [Source](#)

47. Commitment not to use genetically modified organisms?

✘ 0 / 1 [Source](#)



> HCV, HCS and impact assessments

0 5 / 9 5 6%

 1 media report

	P	0.5 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>48. Commitment to conduct High Conservation Value (HCV) assessments?</b> The company states that it identifies forest with high conservation values and applies the precautionary principle to ensure the conservation or enhancement of the attributes that define such forests, but it does not explicitly state that this applies to all new developments			
	X	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>49. HCV commitment applies to all sourcing?</b>			
<b>50. Commitment to only use licensed High Conservation Value (HCV) assessors accredited by the HCV Resource Network's Assessor Licensing Scheme (ALS)?</b> This indicator is disabled until sufficient number of HCV ALS licensed assessors are available for the location where the company operates			
	X	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>51. High Conservation Value (HCV) assessments available?</b>			
	X	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>52. High Conservation Value (HCV) management and monitoring plans available?</b>			
	X	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>53. Commitment to the High Carbon Stock (HCS) Approach?</b>			
	X	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>54. High Carbon Stock (HCS) assessments available?</b>			
	X	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>55. Commitment to conduct social and environmental impact assessments (SEIAs)?</b>			
	X	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>56. Social and environmental impact assessments (SEIAs) available?</b>			
	X	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>57. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on impact assessments (at the time of SPOTT assessments)?</b> 0% - Score of SODEFOR in this OTP category. Please note: company scores on Open Timber Portal are updated daily. Visit the OTP website to review the company's current performance by clicking on the source link			



> Soils, fire and GHGs

1 5 / 14 10 7%

	X	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>58. Commitment to best management practices for soils and/or peat?</b>			
	✓	1 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>59. Commitment to reduced impact logging?</b> The company states that it has fully adopted reduced impact logging on all active concessions			

60. Commitment to no planting on peat of any depth?	✘	0 / 1	Source
61. Commitment on peatland planting applies to all sourcing?	✘	0 / 1	Source
62. Landbank or planted area on peat (ha)?	✘	0 / 1	Source
63. Evidence of best management practices for soils and/or peat? The company states some examples of best management practice for soils. However, it is unclear whether it operates on peat, and therefore partial points have been awarded for this indicator	P	0.5 / 1	Source
64. Commitment to zero burning?	✘	0 / 1	Source
65. Commitment to zero burning applies to all sourcing?	✘	0 / 1	Source
66. Evidence of management and monitoring fires?	✘	0 / 1	Source
67. Details/number of hotspots/fires in FMUs controlled by the company?	✘	0 / 1	Source
68. Time-bound commitment to reduce GHG emissions intensity?	✘	0 / 1	Source
69. Progress towards reducing GHG emission intensity?	✘	0 / 1	Source
70. Report GHG emissions from land use change?	✘	0 / 1	Source
71. Methodology used to calculate GHG emissions?	✘	0 / 1	Source



## > Water, chemical and waste management

1 / 9 11.1%

⚠ 1 media report

72. Time-bound commitment to improve water quality (BOD and COD)?	✘	0 / 1	Source
73. Progress towards commitment on water quality (BOD and COD)?	✘	0 / 1	Source
74. Commitment to protection of natural waterways through buffer zones?	✓	1 / 1	Source
75. Evidence of treatment of pulp and paper mill effluent?			

This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it does not own pulp or paper mills. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this

	✘	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>76. Evidence of sawmill run-off containment and wastewater treatment?</b>			
<b>77. Time-bound commitment to improve water use intensity?</b> This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it does not own pulp or paper mills. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this			
<b>78. Progress towards commitment on water use intensity?</b> This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it does not own pulp or paper mills. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this			
<b>79. Commitment to eliminate chlorine and chlorine compounds for bleaching?</b> This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it does not own pulp or paper mills. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this			
	✘	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>80. Commitment to minimise the use of chemicals, including pesticides and chemical fertilisers?</b>			
	✘	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>81. No use of World Health Organisation (WHO) Class 1A and 1B pesticides?</b>			
	✘	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>82. No use of chemicals listed under the Stockholm Convention and Rotterdam Convention?</b>			
	✘	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>83. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approach?</b>			
	✘	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>84. Chemical usage per ha or list of chemicals used?</b>			



## > Community, land and labour rights

35 / 24 146%

4 media reports

	✘	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>85. Commitment to human rights, referencing the UN Declaration on Human Rights or UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights?</b>			
	✘	0 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>86. Commitment to human rights applies to all sourcing?</b>			
	P	0.5 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>87. Commitment to respect indigenous and local communities' rights?</b> The company commits to respect legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples over the ownership, exploitation and management of their lands and resources. No equivalent commitment is made for the rights of local communities			
	✓	1 / 1	<a href="#">Source</a>
<b>88. Commitment to respect legal and customary property rights?</b>			

<b>89. Commitment to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC)?</b>	✘	0 / 1	Source
<b>90. FPIC commitment applies to independent suppliers?</b>	✘	0 / 1	Source
<b>91. Details of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) process available?</b>	✘	0 / 1	Source
<b>92. Examples of local stakeholder engagement to prevent conflicts?</b> The company only mentions having a permanent socio-economic team by concession	P	0.5 / 1	Source
<b>93. Details of process for addressing land conflicts available?</b>	✘	0 / 1	Source
<b>94. Commitment to support the inclusion of women across forestry operations, including addressing barriers faced?</b>	✘	0 / 1	Source
<b>95. Commitment to provide essential community services and facilities?</b>	✓	1 / 1	Source
<b>96. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on population rights (at the time of SPOTT assessments)?</b> 0% - Score of SODEFOR in this OTP category. Please note: company scores on Open Timber Portal are updated daily. Visit the OTP website to review the company's current performance by clicking on the source link	✘	0 / 1	Source
<b>97. Commitment to respect all workers' rights?</b>	✘	0 / 1	Source
<b>98. Reference to Fundamental ILO Conventions?</b>	✘	0 / 1	Source
<b>99. Commitment to eliminate gender related discrimination with regards to employment and occupation?</b>	✘	0 / 1	Source
<b>100. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on labour regulations (at the time of SPOTT assessments)?</b> 0% - Score of SODEFOR in this OTP category. Please note: company scores on Open Timber Portal are updated daily. Visit the OTP website to review the company's current performance by clicking on the source link	✘	0 / 1	Source
<b>101. Percentage or number of temporary employees?</b>	✘	0 / 1	Source
<b>102. Percentage or number of women employees?</b>	✘	0 / 1	Source
<b>103. Payment of minimum wage?</b>	✘	0 / 1	Source
<b>104. Reporting of salary by gender?</b>	✘	0 / 1	Source



<b>105. Commitment to address occupational health and safety, referencing the ILO Code of Practice on Safety and Health in Forestry Work?</b>	X	0 / 1	Source
<b>106. Time lost due to work-based injuries?</b>	X	0 / 1	Source
<b>107. Number of fatalities as a result of work-based accidents?</b>	X	0 / 1	Source
<b>108. Provision of personal protective equipment and related training?</b> The company provides details of training for e.g. logging/felling/cutting, and makes reference to training ensuring loggers' safety, but does not provide evidence of personal protective equipment	P	0.5 / 1	Source



### > Certification standards

<b>0 / 12</b>	<b>0%</b>		
<b>⚠️ 3 media reports</b>			
<b>109. Time-bound plan for achieving 100% third-party legality verification of FMUs or achieved?</b>	X	0 / 1	Source
<b>110. Time-bound plan to source only wood/wood fibre that is in legal compliance verified by a third party?</b>	X	0 / 1	Source
<b>111. Percentage area (ha) verified as being in legal compliance by a third party?</b>	X	0 / 1	Source
<b>112. Percentage of all wood/wood fibre supply traded/processed verified as being in legal compliance by a third party?</b>	X	0 / 1	Source
<b>113. Time-bound plan for achieving 100% FSC FM certification of FMUs or achieved 100% FSC-certification of FMUs?</b>	X	0 / 1	Source
<b>114. Commitment to source only wood/wood fibre that meets FSC Controlled Wood requirements?</b>	X	0 / 1	Source
<b>115. Percentage area (ha) FSC FM certified?</b>	X	0 / 2	Source
<b>116. Percentage of wood/wood fibre supply from outgrower scheme and/or independent suppliers that is FSC FM certified?</b>	X	0 / 2	Source
<b>117. Percentage of all wood/wood fibre supply traded/processed that are FSC certified (above 75%)?</b>	X	0 / 2	Source
<b>118. Percentage area (ha) PEFC certified (excluding FSC certified area)?</b> This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it does not operate in a country with a PEFC-endorsed SFM standard. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this			



## > Smallholders and suppliers

0 / 5 0%

119. Programme to support outgrower scheme smallholders?	✘	0 / 1	Source
120. Percentage of outgrower scheme smallholders involved in programme?	✘	0 / 1	Source
121. Process used to prioritise, assess and/or engage suppliers on compliance with company's policy and/or legal requirements?	✘	0 / 1	Source
122. The company has a Due Diligence System (DDS)? This indicator is disabled as the company's reporting broadly suggests that it does not trade wood/wood fibre. Please note that ZSL has been unable to confirm this			
123. Suspension or exclusion criteria for suppliers?	✘	0 / 1	Source
124. Percentage of suppliers assessed and/or engaged on compliance with company requirements?	✘	0 / 1	Source



## > Governance and grievances

0 / 8 0%

⚠ 4 media reports			
125. Commitment to ethical conduct and prohibition of corruption?	✘	0 / 1	Source
126. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on legal registration (at the time of SPOTT assessments)? 0% - Score of SODEFOR in this OTP category. Please note: company scores on Open Timber Portal are updated daily. Visit the OTP website to review the company's current performance by clicking on the source link	✘	0 / 1	Source
127. Disclosure of the company's management approach to tax and payments to governments?	✘	0 / 1	Source
128. Company has provided valid legal documents to Open Timber Portal on taxes, fees and royalties (at the time of SPOTT assessments)? 0% - Score of SODEFOR in this OTP category. Please note: company scores on Open Timber Portal are updated daily. Visit the OTP website to review the company's current performance by clicking on the source link	✘	0 / 1	Source
129. Whistleblowing procedure?	✘	0 / 1	Source
130. Own grievance or complaints system open to all stakeholders?	✘	0 / 1	Source

