

ASI-ACCREDITATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL GmbH

Charles-de-Gaulle-Str. 5 • 53113 Bonn, Germany • Tel.: +49 - 228 - 367 66 0 • info@accreditation-services.com

FSC Annual Surveillance of SGS Qualifor for 2007

Forest Management Audit to

UWA-FACE Mount Elgon National Park (SGS-FM/COC-0980)

and

UWA-FACE Kibale National Park (SGS-FM/COC-0979)

Uganda (UGA)

Date of audit: 16-21 April 2007

(Public Summary)

	NAME	DATE
Report drafted by:	Paolo Tranquillini	04 September 2006
Reviewed by ASI:	Guntars Laguns Hubert de Bonafos	17 September 2007 24 September 2007
Reviewed by CAB:	Gerrit Marais	24 October 2007
Finalized by ASI:	Paolo Tranquillini	28 November 2007

The author would like to thank Mr Gerrit Marais, Ivan Muir and Pieter Odendaal from SGS as well as Mr. Fred Kizza and his staff from UWA, for preparing and making the arrangements that made this audit possible and efficient.

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2007: UWA-FACE UGA

1 Background

The operation audited by SGS

This report includes ASI surveillance of SGS on a re-certification of two FM certificates for the same client. As the history and certificate life of both operations is parallel, the outcomes of these ASI audits are compiled in a single report.

Name of operation	UWA-FACE Foundation - Mount Elgon National Park (MENP)
Total area	25,000 ha
Name of operation	UWA-FACE Foundation - Kibale National Park (KNP)
Total area	10,000 ha
Type of management	Semi-Natural and Mixed Plantation & Natural Forest
Name of contact person	Mr. James Okonya
Address	PO Box 1943, Mbale
Country	Uganda
Phone number	+256 45 33170
Fax number	
URL	
E-mail address	UWAface@imul.com
Brief description	<p>The re-certification contract (evaluation agreement) with SGS is signed by UWA (Uganda Wildlife Authority) ED on behalf on UWA and the Dutch based FACE Foundation (Forests Adsorbing Carbon-dioxide Emissions). It covers two separate certification projects of MENP (eastern Uganda) and KNP (western Uganda).</p> <p>MENP includes one of the biggest extinct volcanoes in the world, with mountain tropical forest, bamboo and moorland. Fertile soils and very high population density.</p> <p>KNP, at the foot of the Ruwenzori mountains, incorporates a wildlife corridor and is renowned mainly for its populations of primates.</p> <p>Both areas have been established as national parks in 1993. Before that, heavy encroachments brought ecosystem degradation, and evictions brought social issues and tensions in both areas.</p> <p>UWA manages the two parks, while FACE has established carbon-offset forestry projects in the parks. The previous certificate (2002-2007) covered the forest management operations undertaken by the joint UWA-FACE project within the Restoration Zone of the two parks. No commercial timber is harvested.</p>

The certification history

Pre-audit	(desk study 2-7 June 1999)
Main audit:	12-15 Dec 1999 and 17-24 Jan 2002
Date of certificate issue	21 March 2002
Date of 1st surveillance	SGS did not perform surveillance in the first year of certification. Only in the second year. see CAR 01
Date of 2nd surveillance	26-28 April 2004 MENP – 23-25 April 2004 KNP
Date of 3rd surveillance	15-17 May 2005 MENP – 15-20 Jul 2005 KNP
Date of 4th surveillance	24-25 April 2006 MENP – 26-27 April 2006 KNP
Re-assessment	16-18 April 2007 (corresponding to this audit)

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2007: UWA-FACE UGA

ASI Audit Details

Purpose of audit	Annual FM surveillance of SGS
ASI lead auditor	Paolo Tranquillini
Local Expert/ translator	Frank Katto
Audit language	English
Sites audited	UWA offices in Mbale MENP and Mainaro KNP; field evaluations on selected sites in MENP and KNP

Audit agenda

16 April 2007	
0750-0830	UWA HQ in Kampala, meeting with UWA ED
0830-1200	Travel to Mbale (MENP)
Mount Elgon National Park audit (MENP)	
1300-1400	Opening meeting at UWA MENP office in Mbale
1415-1800	Closing of previous CARs, review of documents (split teams) and planning for field visits
17 April	
0700-0930	Split teams: Manafwa and Mbale Districts Visit to FACE restoration plot compartment 501
0930-1330	UWA outpost: interviews; Restoration Plot 401: interviews to workers
1330-1600	Travel to visitors centre; heavy rain and stuck on muddy road
1600-1700	Visitors centre in Kapkwai, meeting with other SGS team
1915-2100	SGS team work meeting
18 April	
0800-1200	Split teams: Visit inside the Park Social impact evaluation in office (other team in the field) and SGS team wrap-up meeting
1230-1300	Closing meeting for MENP audit
1400-1900	Travel to Kampala
19 April	
0730-1300	Travel to Mainaro (KNP)
Kibale National Park audit (KNP)	
1400-1445	Opening Meeting at UWA KNP Office in Mainaro
1445-1900	Closing of previous CARs, review of documents (split teams, Principles 1, 2, 3, 4, and 9) and planning for field visits
20 April	
0700-1500	Field visits to (split teams): Kamwenge District s/holders Research station, ranger camp, elephant trenches, waste management, labour camp, tending 3ys old (compt. 108), fire protection, permanent plot (compt. 205, 301), rattan, road maintenance, nursery
1500-1900	Document review and SGS team work meeting
21 April	
0830-1800	Split teams: Field visit Southern portion of KNP Document review in KNP HQ in Isunga
1820-1930	Closing meeting
	ASI feedback to SGS

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2007: UWA-FACE UGA

22 April	
1000-1300	Visit to KNP Chimpanzee Habituation Project
1400-1900	Travel to Kampala

People involved in the audit

CAB	Pieter Odendaal, SGS lead auditor for MENP audit Ivan Muir, SGS lead auditor for KNP audit Felicity Henman-Weir, SGS auditor Nelson Turyahabwe, SGS local expert
Operation	Moses Mapesa, ED, Kampala Sam Mwandha, Director field operations, Kampala Fred Kizza, MENP and KNP (UWA/FACE certif. resp.) Johnson Masereka, MENP Wilfred Chemutai, KNP Charles Tumwesigye, KNP Plus other staff in MENP and KNP (see SGS list)
Others	Igino Emmer, FACE Foundation

2 Audit objectives and planning

The objectives of this forest management surveillance audit are:

1. Evaluation of certification body's performance in implementing the accredited certification system in accordance with FSC accreditation requirements.
2. Witness an audit team to determine whether or not the team:
 - a) adequately applies the procedures and instructions of the certification body;
 - b) members exhibit the characteristics of an auditor as detailed in ISO 19011;
 - c) has the required expertise of the sector in which the audit is being undertaken;
 - d) applies appropriate expertise in the correct sense;
 - e) undertakes the audit effectively and draws correct conclusions.
3. Evaluation of the conformity of the certificate holder with FSC and certification body's certification requirements in so far as this is necessary to verify the performance of the certification body.
4. Evaluation of stakeholder comments or complaints ASI received in relation to this operation.

ASI annual surveillance audits are conducted as "*witness audits*" and are based on a sample of the valid certificates of the audited CB within the scope of accreditation. The number of audits per year is determined by ASI surveillance policy; sampling is based on the ASI sampling procedure. Due to the nature of the ASI surveillance procedure, the audit evidence is only based on a sample of the information available and therefore there is always an element of uncertainty in the audit findings.

3 ASI stakeholder consultation process

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2007: UWA-FACE UGA

The stakeholder consultation process employed by ASI consists of 2 parts:

1. public announcement of the audit on the FSC electronic fora and on the ASI website about one month prior to the audit to solicit stakeholder comments;
2. direct interviews with selected key-stakeholders mainly conducted by the contracted local expert prior, during and after the audit.

Stakeholder comments	ASI response
Why ASI did not decide to conduct an assessment in a plantation certified by them here in Brazil, instead of doing one in Africa?	ASI planned the audits at the beginning of the year. Re-certification of UWA-FACE Uganda was considered urgent to monitor. Controversial Brazilian V&M Florestal certificate had been terminated.
"National Park" implies a fully protected area, where the harvest of forest products on any significant scale would likely be prohibited.	Compliance of MENP and KNP status with IUCN categories is not direct responsibility of the forest manager UWA. In both parks, there is authorized local harvest of forest products, and none on a commercial scale. In MENP the combined area of both plantations (1,500 ha) is 1% of the total area of the park (112,000 ha), so the scale is not significant.
Do the certificates cover the whole NP areas or only the FACE Foundation areas? FACE Foundation confirmed that the certificate covered the entire park area. But SGS reports state in both cases only for the FACE Foundation carbon 'offset' areas.	At the time of main assessments, recommendation was to expand the scope of the certificates to the entire parks, but this did not happen. During the life of certificates, the scope had not been clearly indicated in the surveillance reports and was not clear to the parties involved and to the same client FACE. SGS agreed on extending the scopes with the client, only at the time of the re-certification audits. See REC 01
The certificates expire on 20 March 2007. Is there an extension in place or how does it work if the re-assessment is running past the expiry date of the existing certificate?	Certification bodies can extend a certificate up to six months, provided there is a valid rationale and appropriate justification. See CAR 02
Compliance with criterion 2.3 in MENP and KNP, if the entire parks were considered. Compliance with criterion 3.1 in MENP Compliance with P 4 in both MENP and KNP: the revenue sharing agreements that are supposed to give benefits to communities are dysfunctional in many, if not the majority of villages. If the presence of guns is required to ensure enforcement, is this compatible with FSC P&C?	SGS detected the non-compliances, but did not fully address them with the certificate holder. See CAR 03 There is no FSC requirement that explicitly forbids a certified forest manager to be armed. Some justification was provided, related to national security in bordering areas with sporadic armed rebel actions.
Nutrition and medical supplies for workers	SGS addressed the issue.

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2007: UWA-FACE UGA

are not adequate.	
KNP: CAR SGS 04 -6.1: An EIA has been prepared but the impacts identified have not yet been addressed (at the third surveillance)	It is not clear how the CAR issued was closed-out See CAR 03
Are visits to the communities in company of UWA staff or not? How does the auditor ensure that people trust him / her enough to talk about problems without fear?	See CAR 04
Councillors, who had been positive about the project at the start, were now very disappointed because of the lack of fulfillment of promises made (school, wage levels, joint management agreements, benefit sharing)	See CAR 03
On 27 October 2005 Ugandan High Court in Mbale ruled that the area should be de-gazetted and that the Benet are "entitled to stay in the said areas and carry out agricultural activities including developing the same undisturbed."	Legal modification (de-gazettment) of the park areas is beyond direct control of the forest manager UWA. SGS addressed the issue during the audit.

Please note that some stakeholders provided their comments in confidence. ASI and FSC are respecting these requests.

(See Local Expert's report attached for details; ASI version only)

4 Audit findings

CAB AUDIT PERFORMANCE	
FSC requirements	Findings and conclusions
Standard adaptation (20-003)	There is no FSC accredited national standard in Uganda. Thus, the SGS FM generic FSC standard for forestry management was adapted. Updated version of AD 33-UG-02 was finalized and published on 11 April 2007. This version does not change, as only updates on new laws and statutes have been added.
Auditor qualification (20-004)	The SGS auditors are professional foresters and have the required qualification and experience to conduct forest management audits in the FSC system.
Stakeholder consultation (20-006)	According to SGS communication, stakeholders were contacted via mail/email on 16 February 07. Contacts were based on a list provided to SGS by UWA, which includes persons from local governments, parishes, public authorities (and also the same UWA

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2007: UWA-FACE UGA

executive staff), but does not include any NGOs nor labour organizations. **See CAR 04**

Several interviews were conducted at the presence of UWA forest manager. ASI separate interviews evidenced that, in few cases, this had prejudiced open statements from the interviewee.

See CAR 04

Evaluation process (20-007; ISO 19011)

SGS experienced teams performed a thorough audit in terms of preparation and efficiency in the field work. SGS followed-up on the pending NCs of the certified operations and on the issues raised by stakeholders. ASI team appreciates how SGS auditors were always very open and transparent during the ASI witness audit.

During this audit, ASI team could witness evidence of shortfalls as follows.

The contract for the re-assessment of the UWA certificates was finalized only one week before the certificates would expire. SGS procedures require that the full re-evaluation process be completed prior to the expiry date on the current certificate.

See CAR 02

The scope of the new certification (expansion to the whole parks areas, beyond the UWA-FACE operations) was not defined between SGS, UWA and FACE prior to the audit. The contract does not refer to any change of scope, and the question was raised by SGS at the opening meeting with UWA top management and FACE representative prior to the audits in Kampala.

See REC 01

SGS addressed non-compliances under various Principles with an overall MAJ CAR. According to SGS procedures, 10 or more minor CARs raised at a re-evaluation result in a major CAR. Although this was applicable in both re-certifications, SGS applied this on KNP but not on MENP. **See CAR 03**

Extension of the duration of certificate

Section 7.1 of FSC-STD-20-001: *The specified period of validity of a certificate may be extended for a single special extension of up to six months in order to permit re-evaluation to be completed, when justified by circumstances beyond the control of the certification body and the certificate holder.* The company signed the contract with SGS one week before the expiring date of the certification. SGS performed the audit as soon as possible, and issued MAJ CARs, pre-condition for the re-issue of the certificate. SGS planned a follow-up audit for the MAJ CARs within three months (July/August). The validity of the previous certificate was extended for six months, until the 21 September. However, on SGS certificate log (entries to the new FSC managed data base), for some time (up to the end of July) MENP certificate resulted as extended while KNP resulted as terminated. Although the FSC logo is not used on product (no forest or NTFP is presently traded under FSC TM), FSC certificates of both MENP and KNP justify promotional claims made by the companies which sell carbon-compensation services coming from the two FACE projects (Green Seat and holding company Climate Neutral Group). It is not clear under what circumstances SGS granted the extension for the certificates. **See CAR 02**

Time for the audit. Original schedule proposed by the lead auditor for these two audits was 16-25 April (eight days excluding week-end). SGS had to tender the audit and the

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2007: UWA-FACE UGA

original schedule was reduced to six days. SGS communicated that they sent a 4 person team. The time allotted for this audit did not allow SGS to visit all the sites proposed by the auditor while planning the audit See REC 01 and 02	
Audit report (20-008)-	
During the ASI surveillance audit, at the SGS closing meeting with the client, SGS audit team proposed a number of major CARs. The ASI audit team agreed with these SGS findings. However, 3 or 4 months after SGS main evaluation (16-17 July 2007 or 13-14 August 2007, different dates provided in SGS reports) one SGS auditor went back to Uganda without ASI audit team, to close all three major CARs. Major CARs have been closed based on documents and procedures to be implemented rather than field performance. This is clearly indicated in SGS report: -Major CAR 09 based on a series of minor CARs; (CAR 4 closed despite unclear evidence that all aspects of CARs have been adequately addressed and implemented, CAR 05 closed despite that fact that casual workers are not in compliance, CAR 07 closed based on planning, CAR 08 was closed based on an attendance list and a flipchart rather than field check to ensure appropriate level of awareness, CAR 15 has been closed on future plans presented by the client) -Major CAR 12 closed without appropriate findings to address the requirements of the major CAR. Not clear how the prohibited chemical used in the nursery was replaced. -Major CAR 16 closed on a "first attempt" by the certificate holder. Compliance with FSC certification requirements is not clear. See CAR 05	
Public summary (20-009)	Not clear and contradictory dates of surveillances, dates of issue of the certificates (21 March / 08 August), scopes of the certificates, wrong references to other project. See REC 03

5 Nonconformities and observations

Major CAR(s)	Minor CAR(s)	Observations
1	4	3

See nonconformity reports (attached) for details.

6 Conclusion and recommendation

SGS conducted a systematic and professional audit and detected all issues in a professional manner. However, SGS did not always address the detected nonconformities according to the accreditation requirements.

Based on the findings of this audit, the ASI auditor recommends to FSC AC the continuation of the FSC forest management accreditation for SGS, subject to the timely closing of the nonconformities identified during the audit and specified in the nonconformity reports (attached).

Attachments

Nonconformity reports (NCRs)

ACCREDITATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL GmbH

Charles-de-Gaulle-Str. 5 • 53113 Bonn, Germany • Tel.: +49 - 228 - 367 66 0 • info@accreditation-services.com

NONCONFORMITY / CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

REF. No.	CAR.SGS.FM.UGA.2007.01	Date	28 August 2007
Nonconformity detected by (name of assessor)		Paolo Tranquillini	
Through (e.g. office assessment, document review)		FM surveillance	
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>SGS did not perform surveillance in the first year after certification (2003). The first surveillance was done only in 2004, after 2 years.</p>			
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD-20-007, 4.1.1 – SGS accredited procedures		
Corrective Action Request: <p>SGS shall implement appropriate measures to correct the nonconformity detected in this assessment and described above within the given timeline. The measures shall be adequate to correct the current problems and to eliminating causes of nonconformities in order to avoid recurrence.</p>			
Deadline for implementation		next office assessment	
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body			
Here: describe action taken in detail			
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI			
Here: describe conclusion in detail			
<input type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION*	Name assessor:	Date:	
Comments:			

* add comments

ACCREDITATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL GmbH

Charles-de-Gaulle-Str. 5 • 53113 Bonn, Germany • Tel.: +49 - 228 - 367 66 0 • info@accreditation-services.com

NONCONFORMITY / CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

REF. No.	CAR.SGS.FM.UGA.2007.02	Date	28 August 2007
Nonconformity detected by (name of assessor)		Paolo Tranquillini	
Through (e.g. office assessment, document review)		FM surveillance	
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>SGS accredited procedures require that the full re-evaluation process can be completed prior to the expiry date on the current certificate. Re-evaluation process should begin 3 months in advance. Contract with company was signed only in March 2007, just a week prior to the expiry of the certificate.</p> <p>SGS did not communicate to ASI the decision to extend the certificates within 10 (ten) days of the extension decision. SGS did not follow its accredited procedure for re-evaluation. SGS shall give justification for the extension of the certificates for MENP and KNP.</p>			
Normative Reference(s)	SGS proc 03-D01		
Corrective Action Request: <p>SGS shall implement appropriate measures to correct the nonconformity detected in this assessment and described above within the given timeline. The measures shall be adequate to correct the current problems and to eliminating causes of nonconformities in order to avoid recurrence.</p>			
Deadline for implementation		next office assessment	
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body			
Here: describe action taken in detail			
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI			
Here: describe conclusion in detail			
<input type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION*	Name assessor:		Date:
Comments:			

ACCREDITATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL GmbH

Charles-de-Gaulle-Str. 5 • 53113 Bonn, Germany • Tel.: +49 - 228 - 367 66 0 • info@accreditation-services.com

NONCONFORMITY / CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

REF. No.	CAR.SGS.FM.UGA.2007.03	Date	28 August 2007
Nonconformity detected by (name of assessor)		Paolo Tranquillini	
Through (e.g. office assessment, document review)		FM surveillance	
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>Despite a good audit and collection of appropriate evidences, SGS conclusions (grading of CARs) and follow-up on the non-compliances of the certificate holder were not always in line with SGS accredited procedures. During the 5 years of the certificate, many recurring issues have remained unsolved and were still detected at the time of the re-evaluation and not properly addressed by SGS (see Section 4, Operation's compliance).</p> <p>According to SGS procedures, 10 or more minor CARs raised at a re-evaluation result in a major CAR. SGS shall explain how this procedure was applied.</p>			
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD-20-002 and 20-007 – SGS accredited procedures		
Corrective Action Request: SGS shall implement appropriate measures to correct the nonconformity detected in this assessment and described above within the given timeline. The measures shall be adequate to correct the current problems and to eliminating causes of nonconformities in order to avoid recurrence.			
Deadline for implementation		next office assessment	
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body			
Here: describe action taken in detail			
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI			
Here: describe conclusion in detail			
<input type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION*	Name assessor:	Date:	
Comments:			

ACCREDITATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL GmbH

Charles-de-Gaulle-Str. 5 • 53113 Bonn, Germany • Tel.: +49 - 228 - 367 66 0 • info@accreditation-services.com

NONCONFORMITY / CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

REF. No.	CAR.SGS.FM.UGA.2007.04	Date	28 August 2007
Nonconformity detected by (name of assessor)		Paolo Tranquillini	
Through (e.g. office assessment, document review)		FM surveillance	
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>SGS stakeholder list does not include any NGOs or labour organizations. There is no evidence that SGS contacted such stakeholders.</p> <p>In some cases, field interviews were conducted at the presence of UWA forest manager. This condition did not always guarantee open statement from the interviewee.</p>			
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD-20-006		
Corrective Action Request: SGS shall implement appropriate measures to correct the nonconformity detected in this assessment and described above within the given timeline. The measures shall be adequate to correct the current problems and to eliminating causes of nonconformities in order to avoid recurrence.			
Deadline for implementation		next office assessment	
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body			
Here: describe action taken in detail			
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI			
Here: describe conclusion in detail			
<input type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION*	Name assessor:	Date:	
Comments:			

ACCREDITATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL GmbH

Charles-de-Gaulle-Str. 5 • 53113 Bonn, Germany • Tel.: +49 - 228 - 367 66 0 • info@accreditation-services.com

NONCONFORMITY / CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

REF. No.	CAR.SGS.FM.UGA.2007.05	Date	24 September 2007
Nonconformity detected by (name of assessor)		Hubert de Bonafos	
Through (e.g. office assessment, document review)		FM surveillance	
Nonconformity	Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>Based on a document review of SGS report; the three major CARs raised by SGS during ASI surveillance audit have been closed after ASI field surveillance audit based on documents and procedures to be implemented in the future rather than current field performance in compliance with FSC certification requirements.</p> <p>This issue is a recurring nonconformity which has already been pointed out following ASI field surveillance audits in Russia, Poland and Guyana.</p>			
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD-20-002 Clause 8.3 - 8.6; SGS Procedure 04-01		
Corrective Action Request: SGS shall implement appropriate measures to correct the nonconformity detected in this assessment and described above within the given timeline. The measures shall be adequate to correct the current problems and to eliminating causes of nonconformities in order to avoid recurrence.			
Deadline for implementation		next surveillance of the certificate holder	
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body			
Here: describe action taken in detail			
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI			
Here: describe conclusion in detail			
<input type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION*	Name assessor:	Date:	
Comments:			

ACCREDITATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL GmbH

Charles-de-Gaulle-Str. 5 • 53113 Bonn, Germany • Tel.: +49 - 228 - 367 66 0 • info@accreditation-services.com

NONCONFORMITY / CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

REF. No.	REC.SGS.FM.UGA.2007.01	Date	28 August 2007		
Nonconformity detected by (name of assessor)		Paolo Tranquillini			
Through (e.g. office assessment, document review)		FM surveillance			
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION		
<p>At the time of the first SGS main assessments, recommendation was to extend the scope of the certificates to the entire parks, but this did not happen. During the 5 years of the certificates, the scope had not been clearly indicated in the surveillance reports and was not clear to the parties involved, to the public and to the client FACE. The scope of the new certifications (expansion to the whole parks areas, beyond the UWA-FACE operations) was not defined between SGS, UWA and FACE prior to the audit. The contract does not refer to any change of scopes, and the question was raised by SGS only at the opening meeting with UWA top management and FACE representative prior to the audits in Kampala.</p> <p>SGS should define and communicate the scope of certificates better.</p> <p>SGS should define the scope of the evaluations in advance, so to ensure that all relevant resources (people and time) are available to cover the scope of the re-evaluation (as stated in SGS procedures).</p>					
Normative Reference(s)					
Corrective Action Request:					
-					
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body					
Here: describe action taken in detail					
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI					
Here: describe conclusion in detail					
<input type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION*		Name assessor:		Date:	
Comments:					

ACCREDITATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL GmbH

Charles-de-Gaulle-Str. 5 • 53113 Bonn, Germany • Tel.: +49 - 228 - 367 66 0 • info@accreditation-services.com

NONCONFORMITY / CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

REF. No.	REC.SGS.FM.UGA.2007.02	Date	28 August 2007
Nonconformity detected by (name of assessor)		Paolo Tranquillini	
Through (e.g. office assessment, document review)		FM surveillance	
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>Original schedule proposed by the lead auditor for these two audits was 16-25 April (eight days excluding week-end). SGS had to tender the audit and the original schedule was reduced to six days and SGS team expanded to four person team.</p> <p>Short time planned for the audit and thus a tight schedule demanded relevant effort from the certified organization's staff, in terms of working hours.</p> <p>SGS should ensure that time allotted for the field work is sufficient to perform a proper evaluation, without putting excessive effort on the audit team and the client.</p>			
Normative Reference(s)			
Corrective Action Request:			
-			
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body			
Here: describe action taken in detail			
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI			
Here: describe conclusion in detail			
<input type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION*	Name assessor:		Date:
Comments:			

ACCREDITATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL GmbH

Charles-de-Gaulle-Str. 5 • 53113 Bonn, Germany • Tel.: +49 - 228 - 367 66 0 • info@accreditation-services.com

NONCONFORMITY / CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

REF. No.	REC.SGS.FM.UGA.2007.03	Date	28 August 2007
Nonconformity detected by (name of assessor)		Paolo Tranquillini	
Through (e.g. office assessment, document review)		FM surveillance	
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION
<p>In the main evaluation and surveillance public summaries for MENP and KNP, some information is not clear or not consistent: not clear and contradictory dates of performed surveillances, dates of issue of the certificates, scopes of the certificates, occasional wrong references to the other project.</p> <p>SGS should ensure that information in public summaries is clear and congruent.</p>			
Normative Reference(s)			
Corrective Action Request:			
-			
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body			
Here: describe action taken in detail			
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI			
Here: describe conclusion in detail			
<input type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION*	Name assessor:		Date:
Comments:			