

ASI-ACCREDITATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL GmbH

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

FSC Surveillance of GFA in 2008

Forest Management Assessment (PROFAFOR, Ecuador)

Date of the assessment: 1 - 3 October 2008

Final report

	NAME	DATE
Report drafted by:	Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	3 /11/2008
Reviewed by ASI:	Hubert de Bonafos	14/11/2008
Reviewed by CAB:	Gerhard Kuske	9/01/2009
Finalized by ASI:	Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	11/02/2009
Report last updated:		

Credits

The author would like to thank to the GFA Program and its audit team as well as PROFAFORS' staff members for preparing and making the arrangements that made this assessment possible and efficient.

1 Background of the assessment

The operation audited by GFA

Name of operation	PROFAFOR Forest Enterprise in Ecuador
Type of certificate	Forest Management
Total area	16.436,37 ha
Type of management	Plantations of <i>Pinus radiata</i> , <i>Pinus patula</i> , <i>Eucalyptus globulus</i> and <i>Polylepis</i> s. on community and private land.
Name of contact person	Luis Fernando Jara
Address	Av. Amazonas N33-319 y Rumipamba; Edificio Torre Carolina. Ofic.301, Quito
Country	Ecuador
URL	www.profafor.com
E-mail address	luisjara@profafor.com

The certification history

Brief description of the operation:	<p>I PROFAFOR is managing plantations in 4 different growth zones in the Ecuadorian Andes, Ecuador with a total of 16.436,37 ha (GFA main assessment report section 2 page 4).</p> <p>On its 98 FMUs (98 associate members, community based and private members), PROFAFOR is managing plantations of exotic and native species and is currently planning to extend the native forests (under protection) within its community-based associate members.</p>
Main GFA audit:	11-15.12.2006 (GFA audit team: Héctor A Martínez H, Susana R Rojas P., Damián Villacrés)
Date of certificate issue	15.05.2008, (certificate code: GFA-FM/COC-1436 Group certificate) ¹
Date of 1st GFA surveillance	16.09.2008 (GFA audit team: Juan Carlos Romero)
Date of 2nd GFA surveillance	1-3.10.2008 (GFA audit team: Juan Carlos Romero, Damián Villacrés)

¹ In 2000, PROFAFOR, hired SGS to assess the forestry management of 20,000 hectares of tree plantations in the Ecuadorian Andes. In 2000, SGS granted a certificate to PROFAFOR's plantations for absorbing carbon dioxide emissions. In December 2000, PROFAFOR was granted with the FSC certificate of a validity of five years.

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of GFA for 2008: PROFAFOR, Ecuador

ASI Assessment Details

Purpose of assessment	FM GFA - ASI surveillance 2008			
ASI Assessors	Carlos Ruiz-Garvia			
ASI Local Expert	N/A			
Language	Spanish			
Sites visited	Contract code	Site	Type of contract	Operation status
	F0002	Lumbisi	Community	Suspended
	FO041	Jarrin	Private	Thinning
	FO122	Villa Quiran	Private	No operations at the time of the visit
	FO391	Zuleta	Community	Conservation
	FO310	Casco Valenzuela	Community	No operations at the time of the visit
	FO375	Cooperativa El Abra	Community	No operations at the time of the visit
	FO87	Chacon	Private	Suspended

Assessment agenda

Tuesdays 31.09.08, Quito	
10:00 – 11:00	ASI meeting with stakeholders, Hotel la Republica, Quito – Ecuador.
Wednesday 1.10.08 (Profafor Office in Quito and 1 site visit close to Quito)	
9:00 – 10:00	GFA opening meeting
10:00 – 13:00	Closing up of previous CARs
13:00 -14:00	Samples of site and planning of the visit
14:00 – 17:00	Document review
17:00 – 18:00	Visit at Site 1 F0041: Jarrin (thinning and pruning operations, <i>Pinus radiata</i>) E: 814409 m, N:14294 m. 3144 m.a.s.l. (WGS84)
Thursday 2.10.08 site visits (northern Quito, close to Ibarra city)	
9:00 – 13:00	Visit of site 2 FO122: Villa Quiran (<i>Pinus radiata</i> and <i>Eucalyptus globulus</i>) E: 8144413 m, N:14289 m. (WGS84) Visit of site 3 FO391: Zuleta (<i>Community, Polylepis sp.</i>) E: 828044 m, N:24189 m. 3615 m.a.s.l. (WGS84)
13:00 – 19:00	Visit of site 4 FO375: El Abra (<i>Community, Pinus patula.</i>) E: 818409 m, N:27395 m. 3400 m.a.s.l. (WGS84) Visit of site 5 FO310: Casco Valenzuela, Canton Otavalo (<i>Community, Pinus radiata and native vegetation.</i>) E: 816702 m, N:26353 m. 3372 m.a.s.l. (WGS84) Visit to an associate member: Mrs. Rosa Chacon (Fo087) <i>Return to Quito</i>

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of GFA for 2008: PROFAFOR, Ecuador

Friday 3.10.08, Quito	
9:00 – 10:00	Team 1 ² : Interview to Mr. Eduardo Villaquiran, (an associate member) at Profafor Office in Quito Team 23: Visit to site 6 F0002: Lumbisi (nearby Quito)
10:00 – 18:00	Document review at PROFAFOR office
18:00 – 19:00	GFA team internal meeting
19:00 – 21:00	GFA closing ceremony
22:00 – 12:00	ASI closing ceremony – off site

People involved in the audit

GFA team	Juan Carlos Romero (GFA Lead auditor) Damián Villacrés (National Expert)
Certified Operation	Luis Fernando Jara (Manager) Pablo Mogrovejo (Operations) Maria Belen Herrera (SIG) Maria Isable Ramos (Finances) 5 associate members (3 private and 2 communal) were interviewed in this audits.
Others	ASI observer: Judith Borja (Coordinator – FSC WG Ecuador: CEFOVE)

2 Assessment objectives and planning

Background:

This operation was selected for ASI annual surveillance audit in Ecuador to monitor GFA certification activities in South America. No formal complaint had been received from stakeholders. .

Objectives:

The objectives of this forest management surveillance assessment 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;

² Luis Jara (PROFAFOR), Juan Carlos Romero (GFA), Carlos Ruiz-Garvia (ASI).

³ Pablo Mogrovejo (PROFAFOR), Damian Villacres (GFA).

- 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 surveillance assessments are conducted according to the methodology of “*witness audits*” following the recommendations of the ISO/ IAF Accreditation Auditing Practice Group (APPG) published in 2005. ASI assessments are based on a sample of the valid certificates of the assessed CAB within the scope of accreditation. The number of assessments 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, assessment evidence is only based on a sample of the information available and therefore there is always an element of uncertainty in the assessment findings.

3 ASI stakeholder consultation process

The ASI stakeholder consultation process consists of 3 parts:

1. Announcement of the assessment on the FSC electronic fora about one month prior to the assessment to solicit stakeholder comments and other comments and complaints previously sent by stakeholders to the certification body;
2. Specific messages to local stakeholders requesting input for the ASI field audit;
3. Individual contact, meetings and interviews with selected key-stakeholders prior to, during and/or after the ASI field audit.

ASI received comments from:

Main stakeholder comments	ASI response
Publication: Carbon sinks in the Ecuadorian Andes. Acción Ecológica (2005).	<p>ASI used input from the AE publication along the assessment and discussed major points with PROFAFOR and GFA.</p> <p>General comments strictly related to compliance of the company and the CAB against FSC requirements are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During this assessment, the ASI assessor didn't identify evidence that PROFAFOR was applying chemical products for pests' control, contaminating land and water. PROFAFOR was using biological products accepted by FSC. - In AE publication it is mentioned that yagual (<i>Polylepis incana</i>) is an exotic species since PROFAFOR was planting it as monoculture. However, this species grows naturally and form pure stands in

	<p>such ecosystem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some statements of the publication were crosschecked during this assessment, especially those related to points 1.2, 3.2., 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.3.2, 4.4.1. (see findings below)
<p>ASI Stakeholders meeting in Quito, Ecuador (30.09.08 10:00 – 11:00)</p>	<p>More than 50 stakeholders were contacted in advance to meet the ASI team. However, only two participants have assisted: Mrs. Judith Borja from CEFOVE and Mr. Elias Vasquez from University of Quevedo.</p> <p>No complaint or comments regarding the <u>certification body's performance</u> were raised.</p> <p>No complaint or concern was raised on the <u>conformity of the certificate holder with FSC's</u> and the certification body's certification requirements.</p>

4 Audit findings

4.1 CAB AUDIT PERFORMANCE

CAB AUDIT PERFORMANCE	
FSC requirements	Findings and conclusions
Auditor qualification (20-004)	<p>GFA lead auditor for this GFA surveillance audit is from Costa Rica, and has been working as a freelance with GFA since 2005. He has followed GFA training course for lead auditors. GFA lead auditor had the experience and qualifications to evaluate all aspects of the FSC P&C during the surveillance audit.</p> <p>The auditor qualification was in compliance with FSC requirements.</p>
Standard used (20-003)	<p>The GFA generic adapted standard V 1.0 was used for this assessment (updated recently). However, the client was using a previous version (V 6.5) with several differences in comparison to the last version of the standard.</p> <p>This situation was also detected by the GFA LA during the audit. However, this problem was not followed up by GFA LA during the closing meeting. GFA should code the version of the standards in a correlative way.</p>

	<p>See REC.FM.GFA.2008.01.EC.</p> <p>New legal changes and codes applied by the Ministry of Environment (MAE) were not included in the last version of the GFA standard. Misspellings of Ecuadorian organizations were detected.</p> <p>See minor CAR.FM.GFA.2008.01.EC.</p>
Stakeholder consultation (20-006)	<p>Prior to the audit, ASI requested GFA to provide evidence of appropriate stakeholder consultation process in the certification process of PROFAFOR.</p> <p>GFA office in Costa Rica sent a list of stakeholders that includes the contact person for the working group in Ecuador, persons from the National Forest Services, persons from indigenous organization and NGOs, and other stakeholders (56 persons in total).</p> <p>GFA has contacted all stakeholders listed in these lists via email. GFA reported to ASI that only 3 persons contacted GFA mainly for questions regarding changes in the legal framework rather than the certificate holder performance.</p> <p>ASI assessor verified if relevant NGOs for this certification process were previously consulted (e.g. Accion Ecologica and Altropico). GFA provided to ASI with an email distribution list in which these two NGOs were not included. However, after during the assessment GFA showed evidence (email sent) to the ASI assessor which demonstrates that Accion Ecologica and Altropico were contacted via email prior to the audit.</p> <p>GFA should update and consolidate its email distribution lists.</p> <p>See REC.FM.GFA.2008.02.EC.</p>
Evaluation process (20-007)	<p>Compliance with FSC-STD-20-007 V2-1 was evaluated during this ASI Assessment as GFA main evaluation took place in 2006.</p> <p>No non-compliance was identified by the ASI Assessor.</p>
Decision making (20-002 Part 2)	<p>GFA reviewed all open CARs and Recommendation (Observations) which were raised in previous audits.</p> <p>Recommendations not properly addressed by the</p>

	<p>company were raised as minor CARs according to GFA internal procedures.</p> <p>GFA did adequately implement FSC requirements regarding conditions and corrective action requests.</p>
<p>GFA Auditor performance (ISO 19011)</p>	<p>The following non-compliances were detected by the ASI assessor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews were carried out in the presence of the company (even in conflicted situations: e.g. Interview with Mrs. Rosa Chacon). <p>See minor CAR.FM.GFA.2008.02.EC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The auditor team evaluated compliance of worker's rights at the main office for Profafor's staff members. However, worker's rights were not crosschecked and evaluated on site for contractors and workers of associate members (e.g. site Villa Quiran). <p>See REC.FM.GFA.2008.03.EC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No neighbours or community members different from elected representatives were interviewed although there were many good opportunities during the site visits. <p>See REC.FM.GFA.2008.04.EC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An interview was conducted to one of the Profafor contractor (Mr. Sipresiano) that belongs to the Community Casco Valenzuela. The GFA lead auditor could have selected the president of the community for the interview (also present in the meeting) instead of the contractor to avoid conflict of interest. <p>See REC.FM.GFA.2008.05.EC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical points such as invasion of eucalyptus in the gallery forest or firebreaks, road constructions, etc. were not visited. <p>See REC.FM.GFA.2008.06.EC.</p> <p>Other more critical areas/regions could have been</p>

	<p>selected for this audit (Cotopaxi).</p> <p>See REC.FM.GFA.2008.07.EC.</p> <p>The conflict resolution procedure was not revised by the GFA team. It was not clear for the ASI assessor if in Chacon and Lumbisi cases, Profafor had followed such procedures.</p> <p>See REC.FM.GFA.2008.08.EC</p> <p>The GFA lead auditor revised all CARs which were raised in previous audit and closed them after evaluation and verification of objective evidence. However, the ASI Lead assessor detected the following deviations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GFA.CAR 2008.05: The procedure called annex 22 was prepared as requested by GFA in a previous audit. However, this was not implemented and communicated to the associate members as requested by GFA. Slopes and other key geographical information were showed in the GIS at the office but maps with this information were not available in the field and were not known/used by the supervisors, contractors and associate members in the field. <p>See REC.FM.GFA.2008.09.EC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GFA.CAR.2008.08: Annex 16 was shown as evidence of compliance by the company and thus the CAR was closed by GFA. However, even if the CAR was appropriately closed during the audit, ASI identified that the associated problems which were addressed through this CAR, still persisted in the field (lack of fire management tools, fire control equipment and fire prevention strategies). The company should be requested to provide fire control devices/tools to the associate members and put more efforts to reduce risk of fires. <p>See REC.FM.GFA.2008.10.EC.</p>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GFA.CAR.2008.01: Profafor presented a letter to the contractor highlighting a situation in which the company reports that most of the workers are lacking of safety equipment and thus the CAR was closed. However, although no active operations were visited during the audit, the ASI assessor believes this is insufficient evidence to close the GFA CAR and to effectively solve the root problem related to safety conditions of forestry workers. The company lacks of an integrated safety management system and a strategy to improve performance on health and safety issues (e.g. accident records of Casco Valenzuela in thinning operations were not registered by the company). <p>See minor CAR.FM.GFA.2008.03.EC.</p>
GFA Audit report (20-008)	By the time of drafting of this report no GFA report from this audit was available for review. The GFA report from this audit will be reviewed prior to the finalization of ASI report or during the next ASI office audit of GFA.
GFA Public summary (20-009)	No-noncompliance against this requirement was identified by ASI assessor in this assessment.

4.2 OPERATION'S COMPLIANCE WITH CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

OPERATION'S COMPLIANCE WITH CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS	
FSC requirements	Findings and conclusions
Principle 1	<p>PROFAFOR didn't update and implement into its system approved relevant legal norms (Norma 128, Ecuador) and GFA raised a minor CAR.</p> <p>The country legal framework is expected to undertake major changes as the New Constitution has recently been approved which may also result in changes of the forestry legal framework. GFA recommended PROFAFOR to periodically evaluate and implement new approved legal documents.</p> <p>The auditors evidenced that in the case of one of the associates, the timber coming from thinning operations had been stolen thus security measures were not properly implement as requested by 1.5.2. GFA raised a minor CAR.</p>

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of GFA for 2008: PROFAFOR, Ecuador

	<p>Contracted areas were not clearly marked in the field in order to prevent hunting and illegal logging activities as requested by 1.5.3. GFA raised a minor CAR.</p> <p>GFA recommended PROFAFOR to have more control over the process of obtaining permits from the forestry authorities to fulfil point 4 of the agreement with the associates.</p>
Principle 2	Not included in the audit agenda for this GFA audit. However, No-noncompliance's against P2 were identified by ASI assessor in this assessment.
Principle 3	Not included in the audit agenda for this GFA audit. However, No-noncompliance's against P3 were identified by ASI assessor in this assessment.
Principle 4	<p>During the audit, PROFAFOR clearly indicated those associates that were suspended by MAE⁴ due to a variety of reasons: lack of supervision, HSE issues, low performance and environmental impacts specially in thinning operations. However, the company didn't have documented procedures to follow up, monitor and immediately inform all its associates when MAE suspends one of the associates.</p> <p>This situation could become critical; once the case is filled by local authorities, the associate is not in a position to continue thinning and harvesting operations even once the case is closed (source: phone interview between GFA and Cristian Velasco from MAE). GFA raised minor CAR07 for noncompliance against 4.1. of the standards used.</p>
Principle 5	Not included in the objectives and scope of this assessment.
Principle 6	<p>The "J" procedure used by Profafor as an EIA is not an EIA but is rather descriptive information of certain activities used to categorize projects according to its impacts. The "J" procedure lacks of instructions to evaluate impacts, mitigate, prevent and restore environmental impacts. This issue was not detected as non-compliance by the GFA team.</p> <p>See minor CAR.FM.GFA.2008.04.EC.</p> <p>GFA should verify that the company is evaluating social impacts of NTFP utilization (mushrooms) by neighbouring communities to prevent conflicts with local communities before the harvesting activities take place.</p> <p>See REC.FM.GFA.2008.11.EC.</p>
Principle 7	The auditors evidenced lack of appropriate operational maps (maps with more detailed geographic information of what was

4 Ministry of Environment (Ecuador).

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of GFA for 2008: PROFAFOR, Ecuador

	<p>used in the field: contour curves, roads, infrastructure, etc.) during the field visits and GFA raised a minor CAR against 7.3.</p> <p>The FMP states that a perimeter fence in each FMU has to be constructed. However, this was not implemented in the field or amended in the FMP at the time of the audit. This inconsistency was not identified by the GFA team.</p> <p>See REC.FM.GFA.2008.12.EC.</p>
Principle 8	<p>Critical information (cost of thinning, pruning and firebreaks maintenance, time and personnel required, yields, etc.) was not clearly known by the company and by the associate members to improve the quality of operations and to achieve the silviculture targets. The GFA team should evaluate these issues further for the completion of silviculture prescriptions.</p> <p>See REC.FM.GFA.2008.13.EC.</p>
Principle 9	<p>GFA provided two recommendations to PROFAFOR related to P9: 1) to improve the collection, registering and mapping of data of native fauna identified by associates and workers in the field and 2) to document and quantify the production of NTFP (mushrooms).</p> <p>GFA raised also a major CAR against PROFAFOR because the company was not in compliance with 9.1 (the company couldn't demonstrate that they properly assessed HCVF areas). The non-compliance was considered as appropriate by the ASI assessor.</p> <p>The company has shown important efforts to enhance natural forest, and maintain rare and protected species. However, when asked about the inclusion of gallery forests and sensitive ecosystems close to the plantations (Paramo), including natural ecosystems within the land limits of the associates, the company mentioned that set aside areas are not included in the scope of the certified area and that these areas are beyond the responsibility of the company.</p> <p>So far, the certification process of this company has not managed to clarify the issue of HCVF. The company does not seem to fully understand the concept of HCVF. Discussing this with the GFA Lead Auditor, besides clause 9.1 it seemed that he accepted the way the company is doing things. GFA shall further evaluate compliance with P 9.</p> <p>See minor CAR.FM.GFA.2008.05.EC.</p>
Principle 10	<p>10.5.3 and 10.5.4 were not properly evaluated by GFA in previous and in the actual audits. The company was not able to</p>

	demonstrate compliance. See minor CAR.FM.GFA.2008.06.EC.
Chain of custody issues and controlled wood	PROFAFOR didn't demonstrate full compliance with 8.3.2 to monitor and trace each forest product from its origin, a process known as the "chain of custody". GFA raised minor CAR09. PROFAFOR didn't provide periodic reports of produced certified products as requested by 8.3.2 and GFA raised minor CAR01. ASI assessor identified CARs raised by GFA as appropriate.
Use of FSC trademark	At the time of the ASI assessment, the certificate holder was not using the FSC trademark.

5 Nonconformities and observations

Major CAR(s)	Minor CAR(s)	Observations
0	6	13

See nonconformity reports (attached) for details.

Note 1: the failure to successfully address MAJOR CARs within the given timeline may result in disciplinary measures, including the suspension of accreditation.

Note 2: Observations are related to an area of concern, a process, document, or activity that is currently conforming that may if not improved, result in a nonconforming system, product or service. Thus, observations which are not considered by the CB may lead to corrective action requests in the future.

6 Conclusion and recommendation

The GFA audit team conducted a professional and systematic main assessment.

Stakeholders submitted important comments about the performance of the certificate holder and GFA auditing prior to this assessment.

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

Attachments

Annex 1: Nonconformity reports (NCRs)

Annex 1

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.GFA.FM.2008.01.EC	Date	3 October 2008
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008	
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION
New legal changes and codes applied by the Ministry of Environment (MAE) were not included in the last version of the GFA standard. Misspellings of Ecuatorian organizations were detected.			
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD-20-003 V2-1, Ref 6.1		
Corrective Action Request: CB shall implement appropriate measures to correct the nonconformity detected in this audit 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.			
Timeline for implementation		Next office audit	
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 auditor:		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.GFA.FM.2008.02.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
Interviews to stakeholders were carried out in the presence of the company (even in conflicted situations: e.g. Mrs. Rosa case).				
Normative Reference(s)		ISO 19011 (version 2002), Ref 6.5.4 and FSC-STD-20-007 V2-1 Ref. 4.3.3.1		
Corrective Action Request: CB shall implement appropriate measures to correct the nonconformity detected in this audit 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.				
Timeline for implementation		Next office audit		
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 auditor:		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.GFA.FM.2008.03.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
The GFA lead auditors revised all CARs which were raised in previous audit and close them after evaluation and verification of objective evidence. However, the ASI Lead assessor detected the following deviation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GFA.CAR.2008.01: Profafor presented a letter to the contractor highlighting a situation in which most of the workers lack of safety equipment and thus the CAR was closed. However, although no active operations were visited during the audit, the ASI assessor believes this is insufficient evidence to close the CAR and to effectively solve the root problem related to safety conditions of forestry workers. The company lacks of an integrated safety management system and a strategy to improve performance on safety performance (e.g. accident records of Casco Valenzuela's thinning operations). 				
Normative Reference(s)		ISO 19011 (version 2002), Ref 6.5.4		
Corrective Action Request: CB shall implement appropriate measures to correct the nonconformity detected in this audit 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.				
Timeline for implementation		Next office audit		
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 auditor:	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.GFA.FM.2008.04.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
The "J" procedure used by Profafor to comply with EIA is not a EIA but is rather a descriptive information of certain activities that may provide an indication of project categories as used by the MAE. No EIA, mitigation, prevention of restoration of environmental impacts are considered by the "J" procedure.				
Normative Reference(s)		FSC-STD-20-007 V2-1, Ref. 4.4.1, FSC Criterion 6.1		
Corrective Action Request: CB shall implement appropriate measures to correct the nonconformity detected in this audit 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.				
Timeline for implementation		Next office audit		
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 auditor:		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.GFA.FM.2008.05.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
Although the company has shown efforts to enhance natural forest and rare and protected species, when asked about the inclusion of gallery forests and sensitive ecosystems closed to the plantations (Paramo), including those natural ecosystems within the land limits of the associates, the company mentioned that set aside areas are not legally bonded to the scope of the certify areas and that these areas are beyond the responsibility of the company. GFA shall further evaluate P9.				
Normative Reference(s)		FSC-STD-20-007 V2-1, Ref. 4.4.1 and GFA Generic STD for FM (Ecuador) V1.0, indicator 9.2c)		
Corrective Action Request: CB shall implement appropriate measures to correct the nonconformity detected in this audit 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.				
Timeline for implementation		Next office audit		
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 auditor:	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.GFA.FM.2008. 06.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
10.5.3 and 10.5.4 were not properly evaluated by GFA in previous and in the actual audit. The company was not able to demonstrate compliance.				
Normative Reference(s)		FSC-STD-20-007 V2-1, Ref. 4.4.1 and GFA Generic STD for FM (Ecuador) V1.0, indicator 10.5.3 and 10.5.4		
Corrective Action Request: CB shall implement appropriate measures to correct the nonconformity detected in this audit 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.				
Timeline for implementation		Next office audit		
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 auditor:		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.FM.GFA.2008.01.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>The GFA generic adapted standard V 1.0 was used for this assessment (updated recently). However, the client was using a previous version (V 6.5) with several differences in comparison to the last version of the standard.</p> <p>This situation was also detected by the GFA LA during the audit. However, this problem was not followed up by GFA LA during the closing meeting.</p> <p>GFA should code the version of the standards in a correlative way.</p>				
Normative Reference(s)				
Corrective Action Request:				
Timeline for implementation				
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 auditor:		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.FM.GFA.2008.02.EC	Date	3 October 2008
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008	
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>Prior to the audit, ASI requested GFA to provide evidence of appropriate stakeholder consultation process in the certification process of PROFAFOR.</p> <p>GFA office in Costa Rica sent a list of stakeholders that includes the contact person for the working group in Ecuador, persons from the National Forest Services, persons from indigenous organization and NGOs, and other stakeholders (56 persons in total).</p> <p>GFA has contacted all stakeholders listed in these lists via email. GFA reported to ASI that only 3 persons contacted GFA mainly for questions regarding changes in the legal framework rather than the certificate holder performance.</p> <p>ASI assessor verified if relevant NGOs for this certification process were previously consulted (e.g. Accion Ecologica and Altropico). GFA provided to ASI with an email distribution list in which these two NGOs were not included. However, after during the assessment GFA showed evidence (email sent) to the ASI assessor which demonstrates that Accion Ecologica and Altropico were contacted via email prior to the audit.</p> <p>GFA should update and consolidate its email distribution lists.</p>			
Normative Reference(s)			
Corrective Action Request:			
Timeline for implementation			
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body			
Here: describe action taken in detail			
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI			

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of GFA for 2008: PROFAFOR, Ecuador

Here: describe conclusion in detail			
<input type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION*	Name auditor:		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.FM.GFA.2008.03.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>The auditor team evaluated compliance of worker's rights at the main office for Profafor's staff members. However, worker's rights were not crosschecked and evaluated on site for contractors and workers of associate members (e.g. site Villa Quiran).</p>				
Normative Reference(s)				
Corrective Action Request:				
Timeline for implementation				
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 auditor:		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.FM.GFA.2008.04.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
No neighbours or community members different from elected representatives were interviewed although there were many good opportunities during the site visits.				
Normative Reference(s)				
Corrective Action Request:				
Timeline for implementation				
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 auditor:		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.FM.GFA.2008.05.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>An interview was conducted to one of the Profafor contractor (Mr. Sipresiano) that belongs to the Community Casco Valenzuela. The GFA lead auditor could have selected the president of the community for the interview (also present in the meeting) instead of the contractor to avoid conflict of interest.</p>				
Normative Reference(s)				
<p>An interview was conducted to one of the Profafor contractor (Mr. Sipresiano) that belongs to the Community Casco Valenzuela. The GFA lead auditor could have selected the president of the community for the interview (also present in the meeting) instead of the contractor to avoid conflict of interest.</p>				
Timeline for implementation				
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 auditor:		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.FM.GFA.2008.06.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
Critical points such as invasion of eucalyptus in the gallery forest or firebreaks, road constructions, etc. were not visited.				
Normative Reference(s)				
Corrective Action Request:				
Timeline for implementation				
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 auditor:		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.FM.GFA.2008.07.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
Other more critical areas/regions could have been selected for this audit (Cotopaxi).				
Normative Reference(s)				
Corrective Action Request:				
Timeline for implementation				
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 auditor:		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.FM.GFA.2008.08.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>The conflict resolution procedure was not revised by the GFA team. It was not clear for the ASI assessor if in Chacon and Lumbisi cases, Profafor had followed such procedures.</p>				
Normative Reference(s)				
Corrective Action Request:				
Timeline for implementation				
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 auditor:		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.FM.GFA.2008.09.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>The GFA lead auditor revised all CARs which were raised in previous audit and closed them after evaluation and verification of objective evidence. However, the ASI Lead assessor detected the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GFA.CAR 2008.05: The procedure called annex 22 was prepared as requested by GFA in a previous audit. However, this was not implemented and communicated to the associate members as requested by GFA. Slopes and other key geographical information were showed in the GIS at the office but maps with this information were not available in the field and were not known/used by the supervisors, contractors and associate members in the field. 				
Normative Reference(s)				
Corrective Action Request:				
Timeline for implementation				
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 auditor:		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.FM.GFA.2008.10.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>The GFA lead auditor revised all CARs which were raised in previous audit and closed them after evaluation and verification of objective evidence. However, the ASI Lead assessor detected the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GFA.CAR.2008.08: Annex 16 was shown as evidence of compliance by the company and thus the CAR was closed by GFA. However, even if the CAR was appropriately closed during the audit, ASI identified that the associated problems which were addressed through this CAR, still persisted in the field (lack of fire management tools, fire control equipment and fire prevention strategies). The company should be requested to provide fire control devices/tools to the associate members and put more efforts to reduce risk of fires. 				
Normative Reference(s)				
Corrective Action Request:				
Timeline for implementation				
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 auditor:		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.FM.GFA.2008.11.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>GFA should verify that the company is evaluating social impacts of NTFP utilization (mushrooms) by neighbouring communities to prevent conflicts with local communities before the harvesting activities take place.</p>				
Normative Reference(s)				
Corrective Action Request:				
Timeline for implementation				
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 auditor:		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.FM.GFA.2008.12.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION		
<p>The FMP estates that a perimeter fence in each FMU has to be constructed. However, this was not implemented in the field or amended in the FMP at the time of the audit. This inconsistency was not identified by the GFA team.</p>				
Normative Reference(s)				
Corrective Action Request:				
Timeline for implementation				
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 auditor:		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.FM.GFA.2008.13.EC	Date	3 October 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>Critical information (cost of thinning, pruning and firebreaks maintenance, time and personnel required, yields, etc.) was not clearly known by the company and by the associate members to improve the quality of operations and to achieve the silviculture targets. The GFA team should evaluate these issues further for the completion of silviculture prescriptions.</p>				
Normative Reference(s)				
Corrective Action Request:				
Timeline for implementation				
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 auditor:		Date:
Comments:				