

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 SGS Qualifor in 2008

Forest Management Assessment (Rietavas FE and Jurbarkas FE,
Lithuania)

Date of audit: 18 – 22 August, and
8 – 9 September 2008

Final report

	NAME	DATE
Report drafted by:	Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	1 November 2008
ASI Local expert annex report	Evaldas Blazevicius	13 November 2008
Reviewed by ASI:	Guntars Laguns	6 January 2009
Reviewed by CAB:	Gerrit Marais	16 January 2009
Finalized by ASI:	Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	29 January 2009
Report last updated:		

Credits

The author would like to thank Gerrit Marais from SGS Qualifor Program, Mr. Jankowski and his audit team as well as Rietavas FE and Jurbarkas FE's staff members for preparing and making the arrangements that made this assessment possible and efficient.

1 Background of the assessment

The operation audited by SGS

Name of operations	RIETAVAS and JURBARKAS Forest Enterprises in Lithuania
Type of certificate	Forest Management
Total area	22.121 ha (Rietavas FE) and 31.386 ha (Jurbarkas FE) ¹
Type of management	<p>The Lithuanian Forest Law establishes rights and duties of all forest managers, owners and users of the Republic of Lithuania to utilize, reproduce, grow and protect forests, strikes a balance between the interests of forest owners and society, establishes the main principles of forest management (see http://www.unece.org).</p> <p>Management objectives of Lithuanian state forests (2) are established by the Lithuanian Forest Law and various regulations. According to the Law the objectives are defined for each of the four forest groups separately. In strictly protected forests (I group) the management objective is to leave forests for natural dynamic. The logging is not allowed in these forests, except from cases defined in the law of Protected Areas and statutes of strict nature reserves.</p> <p>In the A subgroup of II group forest the management objective is to preserve or re-establish various forest ecosystems or their components. Sanitary logging or clear cutting is allowed in forest stands damaged as a result of elemental or biotic factors, or being in bad sanitary condition. Final felling is allowed at the age of natural maturity leaving the permanent forest cover.</p> <p>The management objective in recreation forests (II group, subgroup B) is to form and preserve the recreational environment of the forest. As in the case of subgroup B, sanitary logging or clear cutting is allowed in forest stands damaged as a result of elemental or biotic factors, or being in bad sanitary condition. Final fellings are allowed at the age of natural maturity leaving</p>

¹ Source: www.gmu.lt

² Source: SmartWood Certification Assessment Report for: RIETAVAS Forest Enterprise in Lithuania
Date Report Finalized: March 2003

	<p>the permanent forest cover. All kinds of improvement, sanitary and landscape formation fellings are allowed. Logging is done in non-holiday season, except from cases when stands are damaged as a result of elemental or biotic factors.</p> <p>In protected forests (III group) the management objective is to form productive forest stands that could fulfil the functions of soil, air, water resources, and human environment protection. Logging supporting the permanent forest cover, small clear cuts (not more than 5 ha), improvement and sanitary fellings are allowed on the territory of this forest group.</p> <p>The management objective for commercial forests (IV group) is to form productive stands and to incessantly supply wood, at the same time observing the requirements of nature protection. All logging types are allowed in commercial forests. Clear cut areas will not exceed 8 ha.</p> <p>State forestry-related organizations:</p> <p><u>Forest Department</u> currently employs 19 individuals. Up till the start of year 2002 forestry authorities were part of the Department of Forests and Protected Areas under the Ministry of Environment (DFPA). Due to the recent changes in Forest Law this institution was split into two parts and foresters moved to the Ministry of Environment forming an internal Forest Department. The other part, which resulted after division of DFPA is State Protected Areas Service. Functions of the department were significantly reduced after this change. Now this unit is responsible for forest policy formation in forests of all types of ownership. Besides the Forest Department, Ministry of Environment maintains the position of vice-minister, who is solely dedicated to forestry issues.</p> <p><u>General Forest Enterprise (GFE)</u> currently employs 29 individuals. It is a state institution under the Ministry of Environment. The GFE is responsible for implementation of the state forest management policy in state forests at the highest level. This organization supervises and coordinates activities of 42 state forest enterprises, the heads of which are reporting to the Director of GFE. The Director of the GFE reports to the vice-minister for forestry or the Minister of Environment. GFE itself is not carrying out any commercial activities and is dependent on the funding from state budget.</p> <p><u>Forty-two State Forest Enterprises (SFEs)</u> in total</p>
--	--

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	employ 7.488 individuals. SFE is a state profit-oriented company. SFEs are responsible for operational management of state forests. These institutions must implement forest policy on the lowest level and strive to produce profit by managing state forests. These organizations are self-dependent and are not funded from the state budget. On the contrary, SFEs pay all applicable taxes to the state and an additional contribution to the state budget designated for the state forestry programs. Average size of SFE is 18.3 thousand hectares. Each of 42 SFEs is subdivided into 5 to 17 districts with an average area of 3.800 hectares. Each SFE has an executive director and two deputies, as well as an administration team. The SFE Forest Districts each have a district manager and additional staff. Furthermore, each forest district has from 1 to 6 forest guards respectively.
<u>RIETEVAS FE</u>	
Name of contact person	Žydrūnas Mažeika
Address	Taikos 4a, 90315 Rietavas
Country	Lithuania
URL	http://www.rietmu.lt/
E-mail address	Telefonas: +370 448 68540 Faksas: +370 448 69781 info@rietmu.lt
<u>JURBARKAS FE</u>	
Name of contact person	Edmundas Mačieža
Address	Miškininkų str. 5, LT-4430 Jurbarkas, Lithuania
Country	Lithuania
URL	N/A
E-mail address	Telefonas: +370 68624787 Faksas: +370 447 71544 jmu@jurbarkas.omnitel.net

The certification history

Certification history	<p>Rietavo FE was FSC certified by Smartwood (SW) from 2002-2007. The Certification code was SW-FM/CoC-261.</p> <p>Jurbarkas FE was FSC certified by Smartwood (SW) from 2002-2007. The Certification code was SW-FM/CoC- SW-FM/CoC-270.</p> <p>SmartWood Certification Assessment Reports for: <u>Rietavas</u> and <u>Jurbarkas</u> State Forest Enterprise in Lithuania was dated March 2003.</p>
------------------------------	---

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	SmartWood Interim standard for Lithuania was used during the period 2002-2007.
The tender process for a new FSC certification process	In early 2008 the Directorate General of State Forests under the Ministry of Environment of Lithuania launched a tender to pursue the FSC certification process for 16 state forest enterprises. SGS was selected and granted the contract with the Directorate in April ³ 2008. SGS started the main assessment audits in Lithuania in late June 2008.

ASI Assessment Details

Purpose of assessment	ASI FM surveillance assessment to SGS ASI perform its surveillance assessment by sampling 2 of the FMUs under evaluation, and witnessing SGS audit team at these two locations (see details of ASI surveillance assessment in the table below).
SGS Audit team	Wlodzimierz Jankowski (SGS Lead Auditor) Jonas Vaiciulis (SGS Local Expert in Rietavas FE) ⁴
ASI Assessors	Carlos Ruiz-Garvia (ASI Lead asesor)
ASI Local Expert	Evaldas Blazevicius
Language	English/ Russian/ Lithuanian

Sites visited Rietavas FE				
No	Site code	Date	Time	Description
1	Uredija. Skrobles girininkija 53kts. 7,11 skl.	19.08.08	10:50	Woodland Key Habitat: Swamp protected forest (882 ha).
2	Alko Alkakaanis	19.08.08	11:54	Church
3	Stand No 25/24 (1.7 ha)	19.08.08	12:10	Thinning operations
4	Stand No 28-4 (1.2 ha)	19.08.08	12:30	Clear cutting operations
5	Nursery	19.08.08	13:50	Main office, workers area, greenhouse, warehouse (chemicals), other facilities.
6	Feru -Ranger	19.08.08	14:15	Dolmens, archaeological sites and resting places.
7	Stand No. 78 - 2 (1,6 ha)	19.08.08	15:05	Clear cutting operations
8	Riskio brestovaizdino draustiais	19.08.08	15:20	Dolmens, archaeological sites and resting places.
9	Kaltineny girininkijai - 1800 ha	19.08.08	16:00	District office
10	Stant No 39 -23 (1.2 ha)	19.08.08	16:30	Sanitary felling operations
11	Stand No 24	19.08.08	16:45	Old oak 2.3 diameter monument

³ Source: SGS email dated on 11th of August 2008.

⁴ Mr. Vaiciulis was the local expert for 8 of the FMUs audited by SGS before and after this ASI assessment.

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

Sites visited Jurbarkas FE				
No	Site code	Date	Time	Description
1	Genetic reserve (86/85) 23P6D94	21.08.08	11:00	Genetic reserve, Pine different densities.
2	Office District: Smalininku distr.	21.08.08	11:30	Interviews to staff members
3	Post harvesting operations. Pasvencio distr.	21.08.08	11:59	Post harvesting operations. 60% Pine, 40% Spruce. Soil preparation prescribed for 2009.
4	Stand No 29-4 (1.9 ha)	21.08.08	12:30	Commercial thinning. Average age 35 yr.
5	Stand No 18-11. Smalininku distr. (1.9 ha)	21.08.08	13:40	Clear cutting operations
6	District office Mantvilu distr.	21.08.08	14:15	Interviews to staff members
7	Stand No. 18 - 31 (1,5 ha)	21.08.08	15:05	Clear cutting operations
8	District office Pasvencio	21.08.08	15:20	Interviews to staff members
9	Woodland key habitats	21.08.08	15:35	
9	Woodland key habitats close to the city	21.08.08	15:35	
10	Stand No. 29 - 9 (1,3 ha)	21.08.08	16:50	Harvested area
11	Genetic reserve (<i>Pinus silvestris</i>)	21.08.08		

Assessment agenda

The audit agenda was set up to accommodate a thorough evaluation of these issues.

RIETAVAS FE

Monday 18.08.08 (Team 1: SGS LA, ASI assessor, staff members)	
9:00 – 10:00	Opening meeting (all participants),
10:00 – 13:00	Interviews with staff,
13:00 -14:00	Lunch break
14:00 – 17:00	Analysis of the forestry documents,
17:00 – 18:00	Sampling of the field sites
Monday 18.08.08 (Team 2: SGS expert, ASI local expert, some staff members)	
10:00 – 13:00	Interviews to stakeholders (Rietavas Municipality)
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch break
14:00 – 16:00	Interviews to stakeholders (Environmental District Department)
Tuesday 19.08.08 (Team 1: SGS LA, ASI assessor, staff members)	
8:00 – 18:00	Field visits (10 sites)

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	2 Districts: Woodland Key habitats, Logging operations, Forest Park (recreational purposes), Post harvesting operations (please see sites visited above).
--	---

JURBARKAS FE

Wednesday 20.08.08 (Team 1: SGS LA, ASI assessor, staff members)	
9:00 – 10:00	Opening meeting (all participants),
10:00 – 13:00	Interviews with staff,
13:00 -14:00	Lunch break
14:00 – 17:00	Analysis of the forestry documents,
17:00 – 18:00	Sampling of the field sites
Thursday 21.08.08 (Team 1: SGS LA, ASI assessor, staff members)	
8:00 – 18:00	Field visits (10 sites)
	4 Districts visited: Genetic Reserve (86/85), Office Districts, Harvested areas, commercial thinning operation (stand: 29-4), Harvesting operations ((No 18-31), Woodland Key habitats, Forest Park (urban forest).
Friday 22.08.08 (ASI assessor, stackeholders)	
8:00 – 10:00	People interviewed by ASI (Vilnius)

VILNIUS: Forest Directorate

Tuesday 9.09.08 (Team 1: SGS LA, ASI assessor, staff members)	
10:00 – 14:00	SGS closing meeting (all participants),
14:00 – 16:00	ASI closing meeting (ASI and SGS teams)

People involved in the audit

RIETAVAS FE

Name	Position	Enterprise	Place	Date	Comment
Wlodzimierz Jankowski	LAT auditor Qualifor	SGS Qualifor	Rietavas	18.08.2008	Opening meeting
Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	APM	ASI	Rietavas	18.08.2008	Opening meeting
Evaldas Blazevicius	local expert	ASI	Rietavas	18.08.2008	Opening meeting
Vacys Jankauskas	Director	Rietavas SFE	Rietavas	18.08.2008	Opening meeting
Zydrunas Mazeika	Deputy dir. resp. for silviculture	Rietavas SFE	Rietavas	18.08.2008	Opening meeting
Violeta Paulaviciute	Deputy dir. resp. for harvesting	Rietavas SFE	Rietavas	18.08.2008	Opening meeting
Jonas Vaiciulis	expert	SGS	Rietavas	18.08.2008	Opening meeting

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

Danute Norkeviciene	Forest regeneration engineer	Rietavas SFE	Rietavas	18.08.2008	Desk review
Vijoleta Stasiuliene	Forest harvesting and H&S engineer	Rietavas SFE	Rietavas	18.08.2008	Desk review
Eugenijus Bunka	Specialist for public relations	Rietavas SFE	Rietavas	18.08.2008	Desk review
Virginija Stulpiniene	Head accountant	Rietavas SFE	Rietavas	18.08.2008	Desk review
Field visit					
Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	APM	ASI	Rietavas	19.08.2008	2nd day Office
Stasys Vaicikauskas	Giliogirio district manager	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	19.08.2008	2nd day Office
Violeta Paulaviciute	Staff member	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	19.08.2008	2nd day Office
Zydrunas Mazeika	Staff member	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	19.08.2008	2nd day Office
Wlodzimierz Jankowski	Staff member	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	19.08.2008	2nd day Office
Jonas Siurys	Skrobles district manager	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	19.08.2008	2nd day Office
Danute Norkeviciene	Staff member	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	19.08.2008	2nd day Office
Rimantas Pocius	Nursery manager	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	19.08.2008	Nursery
Jonas Rekasius	Tveru district manager	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	19.08.2008	Nursery
Vaclovas Dabulskis	Kaltinenu district manager	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	19.08.2008	Nursery
Gintautas Venckunas	Kaltinenu distr. deputy manager	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	19.08.2008	Nursery
Briefing of the SGS closing meeting - in Rietavos					
Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	APM	ASI	Rietavas	19.08.2008	Closing meeting 17:45
Danute Norkeviciene	Staff member	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	19.08.2008	Closing meeting 17:45
Zydrunas Mazeika	Staff member	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	19.08.2008	Closing meeting 17:45
Violeta Paulaviciute	Staff member	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	19.08.2008	Closing meeting 17:45
Stasys Vaicikauskas	Giliogirio district manager	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	19.08.2008	Closing meeting 17:45
People interviewed by SGS in Rietavas FE					

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

Antanas Cerneckis	Major	Rietavas municipality	Rietavas	18.08.2008	
Irena Latakaite	Leader of the agency	Siauliai Regional Environment Protection Department Plunge Agency	Rietavas	18.08.2008	
Eugenijus Bunka	Specialist for public relations	Rietavo SFE	Rietavas	18.08.2008	
Albinas Ezerskis	Major	Silale district municipality	Rietavas	18.08.2008	
Zita Lazdauskiene	Director of the administration	Silale district municipality	Rietavas	18.08.2008	
Loreta Gerybiene	Ecologist	Silale district municipality	Rietavas	18.08.2008	
People interviewed by ASI					
Darius Stoncius	Project manager	Lithuania Fund for Nature (LFN)	Vilnius	22.08.2008	11:00 - 12:00
Gediminas Brazaitis	Head of Silviculture Department	Lithuanian University of Agriculture	Kauna	21.08.2008	21:30 - 10:00

JURBARKAS FE

Name	Position	Enterprise	Place	Date	Comment
Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	APM	ASI	Jurbarkas	20.08.2008	Opening meeting
Jonas Vaiciulis	expert	SGS	Jurbarkas	20.08.2008	Opening meeting
Evaldas Blazevicius	local expert	ASI	Jurbarkas	20.08.2008	Opening meeting
Vydas Rutka	Deputy dir. resp. for silviculture	Jurbarko SFE	Jurbarkas	20.08.2008	Opening meeting
Danute Varkojiene	Forest regeneration engineer	Jurbarko SFE	Jurbarkas	20.08.2008	Opening meeting
Edmundas Macieza	Deputy dir. resp. for harvesting	Jurbarko SFE	Jurbarkas	20.08.2008	Opening meeting
Kestutis Kaucikas	Forest protection engineer	Jurbarko SFE	Jurbarkas	20.08.2008	Desk review

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

Danguole Levanauskiene	H&S engineer	Jurbarko SFE	Jurbarkas	20.08.2008	Desk review
Virginija Vaitkeviciene	Head accountant	Jurbarko SFE	Jurbarkas	20.08.2008	Desk review
Field visits					
Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	APM	ASI	Jurbarkas	21.08.2008	workshop
Vydas Rutka		Jurbarko SFE	Jurbarkas	21.08.2008	workshop
Evaldas Blazevicius		ASI	Jurbarkas	21.08.2008	workshop
Juzefas Jurkevicius	Leader of forest harvesting, trade and technical department	Jurbarko SFE	Jurbarkas	21.08.2008	workshop
Sigitas Labunaitis	Senior machanic	Jurbarko SFE	Jurbarkas	21.08.2008	workshop
Irena Petrosiene	Kalveliu district manager	Jurbarko SFE	Jurbarkas	21.08.2008	Ist distr. Visited
Danute Varkojiene		Jurbarko SFE	Jurbarkas	21.08.2008	Ist distr. Visited
Romas Petrauskas	chainsaw operator	Contractor	Kalveliu distr	21.08.2008	I st distr. Visited
Mindaugas Grybauskas	Smalininku distr. deputy manager	Jurbarko SFE	Smalininku distr.	21.08.2008	II nd distr. visited
Marius Rimkus	Smalininku distr. Manager	Jurbarko SFE	Smalininku distr.	21.08.2008	II nd distr. visited
Robertas Isganaitis	Mantviliu distr. Manager	Jurbarko SFE	Mantviliu distr.	21.08.2008	III rd distr. Visited
Jonas Kundrotas	Mantviliu distr. Ranger	Jurbarko SFE	Mantviliu distr.	21.08.2008	III rd distr. Visited
Violeta Isganaitiene	Mantviliu distr. ranger	Jurbarko SFE	Mantviliu distr.	21.08.2008	III rd distr. Visited
Robertas Ceponis	Pasvencio distr. Deputy manager	Jurbarko SFE	Pasvencio distr.	21.08.2008	IV th distr. Visited
Antanas Plienaitis	Pasvencio distr. Manager	Jurbarko SFE	Pasvencio distr.	21.08.2008	IV th distr. Visited
Closing meeting					
Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	APM	Jurbarko SFE	Smalininku distr.	21.08.2008	Closing meeting 18:30
Vydas Rutka		Jurbarko SFE	Smalininku distr.	21.08.2008	Closing meeting 18:30
Danute Varkojiene		Jurbarko SFE	Smalininku distr.	21.08.2008	Closing meeting 18:30
Rima Majoraviciene	Smalininku distr. ranger	Jurbarko SFE	Smalininku distr.	21.08.2008	Closing meeting 18:30

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

Marius Rimkus		Jurbarko SFE	Smalininku distr.	21.08.2008	Closing meeting 18:30
Mindaugas Grybauskas		Jurbarko SFE	Smalininku distr.	21.08.2008	Closing meeting 18:30
Antanas Plienaitis		Jurbarko SFE	Smalininku distr.	21.08.2008	Closing meeting 18:30
Kestutis Masaitis	Viesviles distr. Manager	Jurbarko SFE	Smalininku distr.	21.08.2008	Closing meeting 18:30
Irena Petrosiene		Jurbarko SFE	Smalininku distr.	21.08.2008	Closing meeting 18:30

SGS closing meeting in Vilnius⁵

Name	Position	Enterprise	Date	Comment
Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	APM	ASI	9.09.08	SGS Closing meeting
Gindaras Niselga	Deputy Director	Directorate General of State Fores	9.09.09	SGS Closing meeting
Raimundas Peleckas	Chief Specialist, Forest Regeneration and Protection Division, Directorate General of State Forests under the Ministry of Environment	Directorate General of State Fores	9.09.10	SGS Closing meeting
Adam Sarnashek	SGS certification - Business Manager	SGS	9.09.11	SGS Closing meeting
Evaldas BlazeVICIUS	Asi Local expert	ASI	9.09.12	SGS Closing meeting
Ibigen Seladolsla	SGS certification manager	SGS	9.09.13	SGS Closing meeting
Wlodzimierz Jankowski	LAT auditor	SGS	9.09.14	SGS Closing meeting
Rasa Zudina	SGS auditor	SGS	9.09.15	SGS Closing meeting

⁵ Source: ASI attendance sheet.

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

Jan Wojaululis	SGS	SGS	9.09.16	SGS Closing meeting
Ibiguen Seladolsla	SGS	SGS	9.09.16	SGS Closing meeting
Zbigniew Suchodolski	SGS	SGS	9.09.16	SGS Closing meeting
Mindiagas Sudzius	inzinierius	FE	9.09.17	SGS Closing meeting
Jirgijar Auslingo	VAAH	LMI	9.09.18	SGS Closing meeting
Gintatos Veerlauns	Vilnius FE	FE	9.09.19	SGS Closing meeting
Valentinas Pozanashes	Vilnius FE	FE	9.09.20	SGS Closing meeting
Robertas Judiclor	Prignus FE	FE	9.09.21	SGS Closing meeting
Prunas Kraujales	Ignalinos FE	FE	9.09.22	SGS Closing meeting
Dainius Stoullcees	Kupritcio FE	FE	9.09.23	SGS Closing meeting
Soirmiur Stoulaes	Kupritcio FE	FE	9.09.24	SGS Closing meeting
Uptutis Brleslios	Kupritcio FE	FE	9.09.25	SGS Closing meeting
Tomas Pateas	Kupritcio FE	FE	9.09.26	SGS Closing meeting
Martas Digrutus	ULM	FE	9.09.27	SGS Closing meeting

2 Assessment objectives and planning

The objectives of this forest management surveillance assessment were:

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 the team:
 - a) adequately applies the procedures and instructions of the certification body;

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

- 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 assessments are based on a sample of the valid certificates of the audited CAB 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. ASI conducts witness audits following the recommendations of the ISO/ IAF Accreditation Auditing Practice Group (APPG) published in 2005. 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 Terminology

ASI is applying the terminology following ISO Guide 65, ISO/IEC 17000:2004, ISO/IEC 19011:2002, and the FSC Terms and Definitions from the applicable accreditation and certification standards.

In the following, definitions are provided that apply for key terms relating to this report:

Assessment: Evaluation by ASI to assess the competence of a CAB, based on particular accreditation requirements and for a defined scope of accreditation.

Assessor: Person assigned by ASI to perform, alone or as part of an assessment team, an assessment of a CAB.

Audit: Evaluation by a CAB to verify the compliance of a company with FSC standards.

Auditor: Person assigned by the CAB with the competence to conduct an audit.

CAB: "Conformity Assessment Body", also "Certification Body"; body that performs certification services under the authority of FSC and under the control of ASI.

CAR: "Corrective Action Request"; is issued against the assessed CAB to describe and correct detected nonconformity with accreditation requirements. According to the severity of the nonconformity, a short (usually 3 months) or medium (usually 12 months) timeline is defined to correct the problem.

Nonconformity: The absence of, or the failure to implement and maintain, one or more management system requirements of the reference standards, or a situation

which would, on the basis of available objective evidence raise significant doubt as to the credibility of the certificates issued by the CAB.

According to their severity, nonconformity is graded into three categories:

Major Nonconformity (Category 1)

A systematic failure or significant deficiency -either as a single incident or a combination of a number of similar incidents- in a significant part of the quality system, or the lack of implementation of such a part, governed by applicable standards. A number of minor nonconformities against one requirement of the applicable standards can represent a total breakdown of the system and thus be considered a major nonconformity

Minor Nonconformity (Category 2)

An isolated or sporadic lapse in the content or implementation of procedures or records which could reasonable lead to failure of the system if not corrected. If a pattern of minor nonconformities occurs over successive assessments, it may represent a total breakdown of the system and a major nonconformance is issued.

Observation (Category 3)

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. Observations shall be recorded in the audit report for the benefit of the customer.

Objective evidence: evidence that someone can inspect and evaluate for themselves; this includes documented evidence from documents and records, anecdotal evidence from interviews (if independently corroborated), and factual evidence through direct observations in the field.

Surveillance: set of activities to monitor the continued compliance of accredited CABs with accreditation requirements.

Witnessing: ASI assessors are observing the CAB auditors carrying out certification services in the company / operation of their certificate holder.

4 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:

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

Code	Stakeholder comments	ASI response
Nepcon		
1	As regarding HCVF in LT it is considered that Woodland Key Habitats (In Lithuanian: Kertines Misko Buveines (KMB)) are the key biotopes covering from 0,1 ha to 10 ha areas. No logging activities are allowed in these areas. Each SFE shall have a list with WKH in their forests. Furthermore, they shall also be mapped in forest plans.	These requirements were evaluated by SGS during the assessment (See P9 below).
2	<p>In addition to that Interim Smartwood standard for FSC certification in Lithuania requested SFEs to have at least 5% set aside areas where no logging activities are allowed. Each SFE has got the list of these areas that were chosen with input from various stakeholders. A part of these 5% is also WKH (app 2-3%).</p> <p>SGS Lithuania standard is close to a direct copy of the standard we have developed except from one very important point — 5 pct set aside areas. Exactly this point has been a thorn in the side of the state forest. We have insisted on this requirement in Lithuania and in the other Baltic countries, where it has been widely accepted. Compared to Latvia and Estonia the state forest in Lithuania has very little strictly protected forest area. E.g. woodland key habitats have no official protection and are only protected due to the FSC certification. It seems clear that SGS has copied our interim standard, but taken this requirement out based on input from the state forest.</p>	<p>No noncompliance against FSC standards and requirements was identified by the ASI assessor in reference to these comments.</p> <p>However, a Nonconformity (related to a different issue) was identified in the SGS standard for Lithuania.</p> <p>See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.01.LT below.</p>
3	Furthermore, the result of the tender clearly showed that SGS had access to our prices and could offer prices marginally below. There is no way that the prices can be that close	ASI acknowledges these comments, but these issues are beyond the scope of the ASI assessment process. This allegation could not be

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	without SGS having access to our prices.	investigated during the ASI assessment.
4	Consultation process: foreign language, narrow to stakeholders. In Russia, and English not Lithuanian. WWF was not contacted in Lithuanian Fund for Nature.	See Major CAR.SGS.FM.2008.06.LT
5	Audits are not done with local auditor: 1) Slovakia 2) Poland 3) Latvia none of whom speak Lithuanian. Reviewing of documents.	See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.04.LT
Lithuanian Fund for Nature		
6	LFN was not contacted by SGS for this audit although LFN has provided some input during the development of the adapted standard.	See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.03.LT
7	There were communication problems between SGS and LFN.	ASI investigated this comment during the SGS assessment but did not have access to enough information. This issue will be further investigated during ASI surveillance assessments.
8	LFN proposed that at least 10 m ³ /ha of organic residuals (dead wood) from thinning, clear cutting, and commercial and sanitary fellings shall be left in site. SGS accepted but only for clear cutting operations. The current situation in Lithuania in all forests, including protected areas is at about 6.4 m ³ /ha according to the national inventory. LFN believe this goal is easy to reach and positive for the ecosystems quality but SGS rejected the proposal without an explained reason.	<p>No noncompliance against FSC requirement was identified on this point. The certification body was able to demonstrate that the requirements of its locally adapted generic standard was broadly in line with the requirements of other FSC-accredited national standards applicable to similar forest types in the region in accordance to FSC-STD-20-003 V2-1, clause 4.6.</p> <p>ASI will closely monitor compliance of SGS against FSC-STD-20-003 V2-1, clause 4.8 in future office assessment audits.</p>

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

9	LFN reported problems with the translation to Lithuanian of the Standard used during the audit.	See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.01.LT
10	LFN expressed their concern about the tender process for the selection of the CB. One reason of the selection of SGS could be that the STD develop by SGS is much softer than others CB's STDs.	ASI assessors evaluated if FSC requirements were properly implemented by SGS in Lithuania. ASI assessors verified if considerations of any FSC-approved guidance documents on the implementation of the FSC Principles and Criteria and other applicable FSC international policies and standards, and of any FSC approved 'recommended' or 'best practice' generic Indicators were included. SGS was able to demonstrate that the requirement of its locally adapted generic standard was broadly in line with FSC requirements.
11	LFN presented their concern about SGS working in Lithuania being suspended in Poland taken into account that the auditors team used in Lithuania is the same that in Poland.	There is currently no FSC requirement that prevent accredited CBs to use international qualify auditors as long as they comply with FSC and /or ISO 19011 requirements. No nonconformity was detected.
12	LFN indicated that the concept of set aside areas (5% according to the STD) is misinterpreted and not well applied by the enterprises. The definition of the 5% of the areas considers only economic criteria but not ecological criteria. In some enterprises; lakes, sand banks and bare soils are considered as a set aside conservation areas. Conservation areas are managed following commercials objectives like sanitary felling in genetic reserves or other Woodland Key Habitats, etc. Furthermore, HCVF were defined without consultation to NGOs and stakeholders.	The ASI assessor followed up on this issue along the assessment and checked whether this was properly evaluated and addressed by SGS during the assessment (See comments in P9 below).

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

13	LFN reported violation of national legislation when affecting black store nests and clear cutting activities in one of the certified enterprises (UKMERGE FE).	ASI could not investigate this issue during this ASI assessment. However, ASI expect that this issue will be included within the scope of next surveillance audits and ASI will follow up compliance of FSC related requirements in the next surveillance assessment to SGS.
Comments from a University Staff Member		
14	The stakeholder reported to ASI that he has asked to SGS the possibility to participate as an observer of the audit process (he or a student). He requested to participate via email but didn't receive a reply.	ASI shared this comment with SGS and will follow up with SGS South Africa on this issue.
15	Low performance of the SGS auditors in TELSIA FE. Auditors were frequently distracted by the botanical features of the forests.	ASI did not find enough elements (objective evidence) to identify a nonconformity and there is no specific requirements regarding this specific issue.
16	Poor translation of the adapted standard from English to Lithuanian. The SGS Lithuanian Std to be more exigent.	See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.01.LT
17	SGS low performance in Lithuania may affect reputation of FSC in the country.	ASI acknowledges these comments, but these issues are beyond the scope of the assessment process. No objective evidence that demonstrate noncompliance was identified.
18	SGS is suspended in Poland and is using the same audit team in Lithuania.	See 11 above.
19	There are uncertainties of what happen with the applicant enterprises if the process is interrupted by the suspension of SGS in Lithuania.	Please refer to ASI Procedures for Extension, Reduction, Suspension, Withdrawal and Termination of Accreditation and ASI-ADV-20-003-V1.1

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

		certificate transfer applicable (these documents can be sent to interest parties upon request).
20	There is a perception that the enterprises have a preference for Nepcon but they didn't participate in the tender process.	See 3 above.
21	In the last audits participated Lithuanian nationality auditor from Poland. I agree that he could be good translator, but functional he couldn't be classified as "local" auditor in the auditing team. There are so many differences between Poland and Lithuania forest management, country political structures that he couldn't change local person that is deep in overall country situation. I am sure he is not so familiar with social, economic and moreover ecological issues of Lithuania. It is the same as auditor from Chile were counted "local auditor" in Mexico because they both speak the same mother language. It is nonsense! ⁶	See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.04.LT

5 Audit findings

5.1 CAB AUDIT PERFORMANCE

CAB AUDIT PERFORMANCE	
FSC requirements	Findings and conclusions
Standard adaptation (20-003)	<p>The standard used was the SGS QUALIFOR Forest Management Generic Standard for Lithuania 2008.</p> <p>A Lithuanian translated version of the standard was also being distributed and used during the assessment.</p> <p>The translation of the SGS QUALIFOR Forest Management Generic Standard for Lithuania 2008 (STD) to Lithuanian language (STD LT) was evaluated by the ASI assessors. The STD LT shows</p>

⁶ Source: email dated on 4th of September 2008.

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	<p>inconsistency in relation to the English text. Furthermore, the Standard used in the audit (STD LT) has wording problems that make its utilization by the Enterprise staff members difficult:</p> <p>e.g. Part 6.2.4.</p> <p><i>“Kai mažiau nei 10% didelių miško valdymo vienetų ploto buvo priskirta apsaugos zonoms ir saugomoms teritorijoms, tai turi būti pagrįsta konsultacijomis su vietiniais ekspertais ir (arba) vyriausybės institucijomis.</i></p> <p><i>LTišskiriama ne mažiau kaip 5 proc. miškų tvarkymo vieneto (MTV) ploto. Šiame atskirtame plote turi būti prioritetinių miško tipų; tokiu būdu didesnio dėmesio neskiriama mažiau našiems plotams, jį skiriant svarbia biologine įvairove pasižyminčioms miško žemėms. Mažesnių miško valdymo vienetų atveju, apsaugos zonos ir saugomos teritorijos turi būti nustatytos pačiuose miško valdymo vienetuose arba netoli esančiose landšafto teritorijose. Planai ir žemėlapiai ir užbaigtų darbų protokolai. Pokalbiai su miško ūkio specialistais, vietiniais ekspertais ir vyriausybės institucijomis.”</i></p> <p>See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.01.LT</p> <p>Standard to be used in the audits was not previously distributed to enterprises (case of Jurbarkas). The SGS lead auditor sent the audit plan to the General Directorate but didn't contact the enterprises directly prior to the audit in order to ensure presence of key staff members.</p> <p>See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.02.LT</p>
Auditor qualification (20-004)	<p>Mr. Wlodzimierz Jankowski is a qualified Qualifor Lead Auditor since 2005, in compliance with FSC requirements. Mr. Wlodzimierz Jankowski is currently appointed by SGS Qualifor to conduct audits in Lithuania and other countries in the Baltic and Eastern European region.</p>
Standard used (20-003)	<p>There is no national FSC National Initiative in Lithuania.</p> <p>The Adapted FSC FM Standards by SGS was used as a basis of the assessment.</p>

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	<p>The standards have been a subject of stakeholder consultation⁷ in order to ensure their applicability and feasibility of the STD and the STD LT are available at: http://www.forestry.sgs.com/ with the following file codes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 AD 33-LT-04 FM Standard Lithuania – English • 0 AD 33-LT-04 FM Standard Lithuania - Local Language
Stakeholder consultation (20-006)	<p>SGS Stakeholder consultation process started before the main assessment took place. About 40 to 45 stakeholders were interviewed before the audit via email in English and Russian. Some of the emails were sent in Lithuanian but only few of them. No reply was received.</p> <p>Interviews to local administration officers were carried out during the ASI assessment.</p> <p>Check list used in the interview were written in Polish and were signed by the stakeholders even though most stakeholders were not fluent in Polish. The SGS expert has no forestry expertise and he showed bias attitude answering on behalf of the company/interviewers ignoring important comments that may provide key elements for the audits (e.g. 1: at the Municipality an stakeholder mentioned that in a recreational forest areas, which belongs to the enterprise, the Municipality is spending some money to clean the garbage and to maintain sculptures which may lead to a potential conflict between the Enterprise and the Municipality; e.g. 2: The Shilaly municipality identified 27 potential cultural heritage elements (subject to approval), some of them are inside the forest land and they were not properly known by the enterprise (Rietavas FE) according to the interview. The SGS expert didn't follow up on that issue.</p> <p>The stakeholder's consultation process lacked several relevant Stakeholders such as NGOs, forestry users, neighbors, and hunter groups.</p>

⁷ Evidence reviewed: emails from SGS and LFN.

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.03.LT
Pre-audit (20-005)	<p>Pre-audits are not mandatory for re-evaluations. However, taking into account the size of these operations and the presence of high conservation values, SGS could have completed a pre-evaluation visit in order to prepare for the main evaluation.</p> <p>See REC.SGS.FM.2008.01.LT</p>
Evaluation process (20-007)	<p><u>Selection of forest management units (FMUs) for evaluation</u></p> <p>The certification body selected for evaluation, specific FMUs within each set to achieve the required sample number and a wide range of sites were visited. However, selection of sites lacked different relevant combinations: buffer zones, operations next to HCVF, sanitary loggings in WKH were not visited. Although there are no specific FSC requirements to address this issue, the ASI audit team would recommend SGS to ensure that key sites are visited.</p> <p>See REC.SGS.FM.2008.02.LT</p> <p><u>Time planning and management</u></p> <p>The certification body didn't allow sufficient time for the auditors to complete all the requirements of the assessment and the SGS auditors didn't interview a sufficient variety and number of people affected by or involved in the forest management of each FMU as to make direct, factual observations as to compliance with all the indicators of the applicable Forest Stewardship Standard that are under evaluation at that FMU and for which such consultation is a necessary means of verification, over the range of conditions under management by the applicant forest management enterprise.</p> <p>The ASI assessment team considers that this main assessment was performed with very limited number of auditors and very short duration of the audit. This main assessment was below SGS Qualifor requirements. Considering the extension of the areas, time allocated should follow SGS Qualifor guidelines.</p> <p>As a Lead auditor for this main assessment, Mr. Jankowski planned and prepared the assessment</p>

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	<p>and conducted an opening meeting, selected the sites to visit in the field, interviewed staff and stakeholders, and conducted a closing meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Jankowski conducted the audit alone, there were no other auditors involved. However, a social expert (national from Lithuania) Mr. Jonas Vaiciulis was appointed to carry out the interview to a number of selected stakeholders using the SGS checklist.</p> <p>According to SGS handbook for main evaluations, (part 02) the team shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Lead qualified auditor (<u>in compliance</u>) • Assessors; at least one team or a member who is resident in the country in which the evaluation takes place or in a nearby country of the same region. <u>(not in compliance: e.g. Jurbarkas FE)</u> • At least one team member who is fluent in the main language of the district/state in which the evaluation takes place <u>(not in compliance: e.g. Jurbarkas FE⁸)</u>. <p>See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.04.LT</p>
Decision making (20-002 Part 2)	<p><u>Closing out of open CARs</u></p> <p>In both visited enterprises, the SGS Lead auditor requested previous reports from SW and reviewed open CAR from previous SW audits.</p> <p>In the case of Rietavas FE, the enterprise didn't have any open CAR at the time of the audit. In Jurbarkas FE, 3 CARs were reviewed: CAR #: 01/07 (Reference Standard #: 1.6.1), CAR #: 02/07 (Reference Standard #: 6.6.5) and CAR #: 04/06 (Reference Standard #: 6.3.8). The SGS Lead auditor closed 3 CARs (all) and opened a new major CAR based on CAR #: 02/07 (see P6 below).</p> <p><u>Relationship between findings and CARs.</u></p> <p>Findings were reflected properly. Clear relationships were established between findings and standard</p>

⁸ Mr. Jonas Vaiciulis was a SGS team member fluent in Lithuanian; he carried out interviews to stakeholders in the audit in Rietavos. However, Mr. Jonas Vaiciulis was not present at the time of the ASI assessment in Jurbarkas.

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	<p>requirements.</p> <p><u>Closing meeting</u></p> <p>Eight enterprises were audited by SGS in Lithuania in June 2008 and another eight enterprises from 18 August to 09 September 2008, making a total of 16 SFE audited by SGS in Lithuania in 2008.</p> <p>The SGS lead auditor organized the audit in a way that he visited each company over two days (desk review and field visits) during this period. The SGS lead auditor requested all audited forest enterprises to hold a common closing meeting in presence of the Forest General Directorate in Vilnius the 9th of September at the Forest General Directorate Office.</p> <p>All Nonconformities and Observations resulting from the 16 main assessments carried out by SGS were announced by the SGS lead auditor at the closing meeting. The nonconformities were provided in a general basis and were not specifically addressed to every company. At the end of the closing meeting the SGS lead auditor provided each of these enterprises with specific list of findings in order to respect confidentiality between the enterprises. General finding announces by SGS in the closing meeting are provided in this report.</p> <p>During the closing meeting, the SGS lead auditor indicated that the next step for the enterprises is the closing out of the major non-conformances. He also indicated that SGS must perform follow-up visits before a certificate can be issued.</p> <p>In total, SGS issued 4 MAJOR and 14 MINOR CARs and 10 Observations against the Enterprises as a result of these audits. As this number of noncompliance indicates a breakdown of the system, SGS subsequently requested the Major CARs to be closed before granting FSC certificates. This is in line with FSC and SGS decision making procedures.</p>
<p>SGS Auditor performance (ISO 19011)</p>	<p><u>Identified weaknesses when conducting the audit</u></p> <p>a) Evidence was not fully checked and interviews were not cross checked with documents (See</p>

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	<p>section 5.2 below).</p> <p>b) Workers were interviewed in presence of the company (site visits at Rietevas FE and Jurbarkas FE).</p> <p>c) In the felling operations visited, the workers were not interviewed and environmental impacts were not verified.</p> <p>d) Neighbors, authorities and subcontractors were not interviewed (e.g. visit to Harvesting operation ((No 18-31)).</p> <p>e) Not all criteria and indicators were revised during the assessment (See section 5.2, Principle 6 below).</p> <p>See Major CAR.SGS.FM.2008.05.LT</p> <p><u>Language proficiency of the SGS Lead Auditor</u></p> <p>The ASI auditor identified that there were language proficiency constraints along the audit from the SGS Lead auditor side. The SGS Lead auditor speaks Polish (fluent), Russian and English but he wasn't able to communicate in Lithuanian.</p> <p>The language used during the audit (field visits, desk review and staff members' interviews) was Russian.</p> <p>Although most of the staff members of the audited enterprises and contractors were fluent in Russian, there were some situations, especially with young staff members, where Russian Language was not considered as adequate by the ASI auditors.</p> <p>Most of the documents during the desk review process were presented to SGS only in Lithuanian without the presence of a local expert.</p> <p>See Major CAR.SGS.FM.2008.06.LT</p>
SGS Audit report (20-008)	During the drafting of this report no reports were available for review. The SGS Qualifor report from this audit will be reviewed after finalization of the ASI report.
SGS Public summary (20-009)	As the SGS forest certification report is also the

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	public summary, SGS is expected to publish and make the report available to the public including the annexes containing the information required for the public (decision, outcome of the stakeholder consultation, evaluation dates). ASI will monitor this aspect.
--	--

5.2 OPERATION'S COMPLIANCE WITH CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

OPERATION'S COMPLIANCE WITH CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS	
FSC requirements	Findings and conclusions
Principle 1	<p>The lead auditor interviewed staff members to evaluate if the forest management operations maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well being of forest workers and local communities.</p> <p>The enterprises didn't provide enough evidence to demonstrate that the policy is communicated throughout the organization (including contractors) and to external stakeholders as requested by 1.6.2 and made this available on their website. The SGS lead auditor presented appropriate CAR at the closing meeting to address this Nonconformity.</p> <p>The documentation which includes a list of species was not written in Latin and SGS made an observation.</p> <p>The forest enterprise did not publicly announce that it is currently not FSC certified and SGS made an observation.</p>
Principle 2	<p>One of the enterprises does not hold an agreement with the municipality although there are certain obligations regarding the maintaining and cleaning of public forest and SGS presented appropriate observation to address the issue.</p>
Principle 3	<p>In Lithuania there are no groups identified as "indigenous people".</p> <p>One of the enterprises demonstrates that it has sites of special cultural and or religious significance to the community clearly identified in co-operation with such peoples, and recognized and protected by forest managers (Evidence reviewed: Publication ISBN 9955-631-13-9 Takas per Rietavo Misku Uredija).</p>
Principle 4	<p>SGS lead auditor evaluated if the forest management operations maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well being of forest workers and local communities.</p>

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	<p>One of the enterprises didn't meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of different stakeholders and SGS lead auditor raised a minor CAR with reference to the LT STD 4.2.2 based on an observation in one of the visited sites where a broken woody trail put the visitors at a risk.</p> <p>Management planning and operations didn't fully incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact and SGS lead auditor raised a major CAR referenced to 4.4.1 because the company didn't carry out analysis of the influence of the forest management on the social issues. Furthermore, processes of the public consultations were not sufficiently documented and SGS raised a minor CAR referencing 4.4.6 of the LT STD.</p> <p>The list of stakeholders kept in the Forest Enterprise was not completed and SGS raised an observation.</p>
Principle 5	<p>In Rietavas, the SGS lead auditor evaluated if the forest management operations encourage the efficient use of the forest's multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits. The Enterprise provided a working procedure coded FE: V-109 (2007) and also an example of a report (Rietavas FE: 09.07.2008 Nr. Ve 986) indicating that residues and waste shall be left in the forest in compliance with FSC requirements.</p> <p>The SGS auditor also checked a list of different publications and announcements published in local media including a variety of forestry related issues (trash left in forest, forestry operations, visitors, training courses, etc.).</p> <p>Points 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 were verified by the SGS lead auditor. The auditor reviewed the annual plan budget 2007 and budget and financial statements.</p> <p>The SGS lead auditor raised a Minor CAR against one of the visited enterprises with reference to 5.3.2 because in one of the sites visited, some stock-piles against living, standing trees were observed.</p> <p>The SGS lead auditor provided an observation to one of the enterprises because it didn't have sufficient guidelines to minimize damage of regeneration in felling operations.</p>
Principle 6	The SGS auditor evaluated compliance against P6 and reviewed verifiers in the SFE offices ¹⁰ .

¹⁰ Rietavas FE provided the following documentation,: Harvesting operation, Procedure for EIA 2004 V140, Procedure for detecting special biodiversity components 16.06.2008 Nr 50, EIA for Road Construction.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SGS lead auditor didn't systematically follow implementation of the above listed procedures e.g. Rietavas FE: V140 (only one sample), Nr 50 (no complementary records were checked). • The SGS lead auditor raised a minor CAR against clause 6.1.2 because the enterprise didn't fully implement a procedure for environment impact assessment in one the visited sites. However, Indicator 6.1.1 was not fully assessed SGS lead auditor. • SGS adapted standard for Lithuania requires that EIAs shall be performed for all operations (Indicator 6.1.1). A documented impact assessment is required only for large scale organizations which is applicable for Rietavas FE and Jurbarkas FE from the ASI assessor point of view. With this in mind, the impact assessment shall be documented also for harvesting operations including clear-cuts operations on areas up to 4 Hectares. Based on the observed management activities, the company does not seem to conduct systematically evaluations of impacts for any of its activities. • Site-specific assessments of the potential environmental impacts of all forest operations are carried out prior to commencement of site disturbing operations, in a manner appropriate to the scale of the operations and the sensitivity of the site. However, the SGS lead auditor didn't ask for a list of significant activities as required by the standard. This criterion was not systematically reviewed by the SGS lead auditor. • Operational plans were not evaluated by the SGS lead auditor as required by 6.5.3 of the STD. • Procedure for protection of buffer zones (dated on 16.06.2008) was shown by the enterprise to indicate complaints with P6. However, Records resulting from the implementation of this procedure were not checked by the SGS lead auditor. <p style="text-align: center;">See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.05.LT</p> <p>The SGS lead auditor evaluated if the enterprise's management system promotes the development and adoption of environmentally friendly non-chemical methods of pest management. A short list of pesticides was provided the enterprise. In the case of Jurbarkas FE, the SGS lead auditor</p>
--	--

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	<p>raise a major CAR because the enterprise was using prohibited chemicals by FSC (<i>Alpha-cypermethrin</i> –FASTAC) although the enterprise argue that they have a temporary derogation from FSC to use the product. This issue will be further monitor by ASI in the next office assessment since no official answer was received from FSC at the time of the drafting of this report.</p> <p>The SGS lead auditor raised a minor CAR against clause 6.6.1 because the enterprise was making use of FASTAC prohibited by FSC.</p> <p>The ASI assessor contacted FSC-PSU after the assessment to explore further about the derogations request sent by Jurbarkas FE and Rietavas FE to FSC. FSC replied to this enquire on 11 November 2008 indicating that these requests were submitted by Smartwood in December 2006.</p> <p>A one year temporary derogation until December 31 2006 (proposed exceptional derogations) was given to all the FSC certified forest enterprises that were already using these pesticides (including alpha-cypermethrin). Alpha- cypemethrin (Fastac) is one of the pesticides that was identified and added to the FSC list of highly hazardous pesticides in December 2005.</p> <p>These forest enterprises would by December 31 2006 either stop using the pesticides or apply for derogation while continuing to use the pesticides until a decision on the application has been made. Apparently due further reviews of pesticides related documents in 2007, there has not been any decision taken on these applications and thus the forest enterprises in Lithuania that submitted derogation applications for Alpha-cypermethrin are still allowed to use it.</p> <p>SGS <u>should</u> have checked for this during its assessment of the two forest enterprises according to FSC PSU.</p> <p>See REC.SGS.FM.2008.03.LT</p> <p>On addition to the above mentioned, clause 6.6.3 was not properly reviewed since reduction targets were not checked (See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.05.LT).</p> <p>Management of rare, threatened and endangered specie and their habitat were reviewed by the SGS auditor:</p> <p>The Red book of Lithuania (1992) was familiar and available to staff members at each site visited. Ecological elements are not recorded, inventoried and records, According to the Forest Managers, the enterprises are cooperating with Universities and Research institutions and is increasing its knowledge and understanding of the ecological elements of their forest.</p>
--	---

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	<p>However, the Lead auditor didn't check contract agreements or documented evidence of these scientific research initiatives (See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.05.LT).</p> <p>The SGS lead auditor raised a minor CAR against clause 6.2.2 because the inventory of rare, threatened and endangered species is not yet finished.</p> <p>An observation was provided by SGS because the amount of the dead wood in the forest was weakly documented.</p> <p>SGS raised a minor CAR because contractors working on the nursery were not regularly trained for chemical use as requested by 6.6.1.4. SGS proposed minor CAR adequately addressed the nonconformity identified.</p>
Principle 7	<p>Nonconformities related to regeneration strategies including information on the origin of seeds were detected by SGS for P7 (7.1.5.5.) and addressed by a corrective action request.</p> <p>The enterprise is conducting forest operations with an expired forest management plan due to external circumstances. Furthermore, the updating process of the forest management plan is not being conducted in a consistency way. SGS announced two Nonconformities to address these issues. ASI will closely monitor the evaluation of this Principle in the SGS audit report.</p> <p>Training of forester in relation to rare, threatened and endangered species are not offered in a regular basis. SGS provided an observation to address this issue.</p>
Principle 8	<p>The lead auditor asked about the monitoring activities in a general terms but it wasn't well understood by the company.</p> <p>The SGS lead auditor didn't check procedures developed by the company to evaluate compliance against 8.3.1 (See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.05.LT).</p> <p>The company uses different stamp marks for every one of the 9 districts.</p> <p>The SGS auditor asked for examples of invoices to verify compliance against 8.3.3. The company brought 4 different copies of invoices (RMU Nr. 12760, 13060, 16086 and 16084). It was clear for the auditors that the company was not using the FSC logo SW-FM/CoC 261 (27.03.2008 and 24.04.2008) in the more recently invoices dated on 02.07.2008 and 02.08.2008 and no noncompliance was identified by SGS. (See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.05.LT).</p>

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SGS for 2008: Lithuania

	<p>Monitoring programs provided by the enterprises did not cover all essential issues as requested by 8.1.1 and a minor CAR was announced by the SGS auditors.</p> <p>The procedures for demarcation of slumps were not present in the field and SGS auditors announced a minor CAR against 8.3.1.</p> <p>At the time of the assessment, the enterprise didn't demonstrate full compliance against 8.5.1. The SGS lead auditor appropriately addressed this issue with a minor CAR.</p>
Principle 9	<p>The Forest Management Institute has defined the HCVF areas of the forest enterprises audited by SGS.</p> <p>One of the enterprises performed consultation activities in a protected area and in a national park in compliance with 9.2.1. Once a year an ecologist from neighboring national parks comes to the protected area and verifies the conservation status of these areas. The lead auditor didn't check reports or document evidence for compliance with this indicator (See CAR.SGS.FM.2008.05.LT).</p> <p>So far, the certification process at these enterprises has not managed to clarify the issue of HCVF. The enterprises do not seem to fully understand the link between the concept of HCVF and the set-aside areas. A CAR was appropriately raised by the SGS Lead auditor in reference to 9.1.1 to address this nonconformity.</p> <p>No objective evidence that public consultations were conducted in compliance with clause 9.2.1 was provided by the enterprises and SGS appropriately announced a minor CAR to address this issue.</p>
Principle 10	Not applicable for this audit.
Use of FSC trademark	At the time of the ASI assessment, the enterprise was not using the FSC trademark.

6 Nonconformities and observations

Major CAR(s)	Minor CAR(s)	Observations
4	2	3

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.

7 Conclusion and recommendation

Based on ASI sampling, the ASI audit team concluded that the SGS audit team conducted a professional and systematic main evaluation.

Stakeholders submitted important comments about the performance of the certificate holders and SGS auditing performance prior to this ASI assessment. ASI is satisfied with the CARs raised by SGS in this audit to address the detected nonconformities. ASI supports SGS decision to evaluate on site through a follow-up audit that all MAJOR nonconformities have been adequately addressed before making a certification decision and issuing a certificate.

Based on the findings of this ASI assessment, the ASI lead assessor 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

Annex 1: conformity 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.SGS.FM.2008.01.LT	Date	10 November 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	
<p>The translation of the SGS QUALIFOR Forest Management Generic Standard for Lithuania 2008 (STD) to Lithuanian language (STD LT) was evaluated by the ASI assessors. The STD LT shows inconsistency in relation to the English text. Furthermore, the Standard used in the audit (STD LT) has wording problems that make its utilization by the Enterprise staff members difficult:</p> <p>e.g. Part 6.2.4.: "Kai mažiau nei 10% didelių miško valdymo vienetų ploto buvo priskirta apsaugos zonoms ir saugomoms teritorijoms, tai turi būti pagrįsta konsultacijomis su vietiniais ekspertais ir (arba) vyriausybės institucijomis. LT Išskiriama ne mažiau kaip 5 proc. miškų tvarkymo vieneto (MTV) ploto. Šiame atskirtame plote turi būti prioritetinių miško tipų; tokiu būdu didesnio dėmesio neskiriama mažiau našiems plotams, ji skiriant svarbia biologine įvairove pasižymintiems miško žemėms. Mažesnių miško valdymo vienetų atveju, apsaugos zonos ir saugomos teritorijos turi būti nustatytos pačiuose miško valdymo vienetuose arba netoli esančiose landšafto teritorijose. Planai ir žemėlapiai ir užbaigtų darbų protokolai. Pokalbiai su miško ūkio specialistais, vietiniais ekspertais ir vyriausybės institucijomis."</p>			
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD-20-003, part 4.7		
<p>Corrective Action Request:</p> <p>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.</p>			
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.SGS.FM.2008.02.LT	Date	10 November 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		
Standard to be used in the audits was not previously distributed to enterprises (case of Jurbarkas). The SGS lead auditor sent the audit plan to the General Directorate but didn't contact the enterprises directly prior to the audit in order to ensure presence of key staff members.				
Normative Reference(s)	ISO 19011, clause 5.2			
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.SGS.FM.2008.03.LT	Date	10 November 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity	Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION		
The stakeholder's consultation process lacked several relevant Stakeholders such as NGOs, forestry users, neighbors, and hunter groups.				
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD-20-006, part 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		3 months		
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.SGS.FM.2008.01.LT	Date	10 November 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>Pre-audits are not mandatory for re-evaluations. However, taking into account the size of these operations and the presence of high conservation values, SGS could have completed a pre-evaluation visit in order to prepare for the main evaluation.</p>				
Normative Reference(s)				
<p>Corrective Action Request:</p> <p>CB should 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.</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.SGS.FM.2008.02.LT	Date	10 November 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 certification body selected for evaluation, specific FMUs within each set to achieve the required sample number and a wide range of sites were visited. However, selection of sites lacked different relevant combinations: buffer zones, operations next to HCVF, sanitary loggings in WKH were not visited. Although there are no specific FSC requirements to address this issue, the ASI audit team would recommend SGS to ensure that key sites are visited.</p>				
Normative Reference(s)				
<p>Corrective Action Request: CB should implement appropriate measures to correct the nonconformity detected in this audit and described above within the given timeline. The measures should be adequate to correct the current problems and to eliminating causes of nonconformities in order to avoid recurrence.</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.	CAR.SGS.FM.2008.04.LT	Date	10 November 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008		
Nonconformity	Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION		
According to SGS handbook for main evaluations, (part 02) the team shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Lead qualified auditor (<u>in compliance</u>) Assessors; at least one team or a member who is resident in the country in which the evaluation takes place or in a nearby country of the same region. (<u>not in compliance: e.g. Jurbarkas FE</u>) At least one team member who is fluent in the main language of the district/state in which the evaluation takes place (<u>not in compliance: e.g. Jurbarkas FE</u>). 				
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD-20-007, part 3.6.1 and SGS handbook part 2.			
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		3 months		
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.SGS.FM.2008.05.LT	Date	10 November 2008
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008	
Nonconformity	Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<u>Identified weaknesses when conducting the audit</u> a) Evidence was not fully checked and interviews were not cross checked with documents (See section 5.2, Principle 6 below). b) Workers were interviewed in presence of the company (site visits at Rietevas FE and Jurbarkas FE). c) In the felling operations visited, the workers were not interviewed and environmental impacts were not verified. d) Neighbors, authorities and subcontractors were not interviewed (e.g. visit to Harvesting operation ((No 18-31))). e) Not all criteria and indicators were revised during the assessment (See section 5.2, Principle 6 below).			
Normative Reference(s)	ISO 19011 clause 6.5.4. FSC-STD-20-007 V2-1 clauses 3.4.2.2 and 3.4.1,		
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		3 months	
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.SGS.FM.2008.06.LT	Date	10 November 2008
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM surveillance Audit 2008	
Nonconformity	Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p><u>Language proficiency of the SGS Lead Auditor</u></p> <p>The ASI auditor identified that there were language proficiency constraints along the audit from the SGS Lead auditor side. The SGS Lead auditor speaks Polish (fluent), Russian and English but he wasn't able to communicate in Lithuanian.</p> <p>The language used during the audit (field visits, desk review and staff members' interviews) was Russian.</p> <p>Although most of the staff members of the audited enterprises and contractors were fluent in Russian, there were some situations, especially with young staff members, where Russian Language was not considered as adequate by the ASI auditors.</p> <p>Most of the documents during the desk review process were presented to SGS only in Lithuanian without the presence of a local expert.</p>			
Normative Reference(s)	ISO 19011 Clause 6.2.4 g)		
<p>Corrective Action Request:</p> <p>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.</p>			
Timeline for implementation		3 months	
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.SGS.FM.2008.03.LT	Date	10 November 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 ASI assessor contacted FSC-PSU after the assessment to explore further about the derogations request sent by Jurbarkas FE and Rietavas FE to FSC. FSC replied to this enquire on 11 November 2008 indicating that these requests were submitted by Smartwood in December 2006.</p> <p>A one year temporary derogation until December 31 2006 (proposed exceptional derogations) was given to all the FSC certified forest enterprises that were already using these pesticides (including alpha-cypermethrin). Alpha- cypemethrin (Fastac) is one of the pesticides that was identified and added to the FSC list of highly hazardous pesticides in December 2005.</p> <p>These forest enterprises would by December 31 2006 either stop using the pesticides or apply for derogation while continuing to use the pesticides until a decision on the application has been made. Apparently due further reviews of pesticides related documents in 2007, there has not been any decision taken on these applications and thus the forest enterprises in Lithuania that submitted derogation applications for Alpha-cypermethrin are still allowed to use it.</p> <p>SGS <u>should</u> have checked for this during its assessment of the two forest enterprises according to FSC-PSU.</p>			
Normative Reference(s)			
<p>Corrective Action Request:</p> <p>CB should implement appropriate measures to correct the nonconformity detected in this audit and described above within the given timeline. The measures should be adequate to correct the current problems and to eliminating causes of nonconformities in order to avoid recurrence.</p>			
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 SGS for 2008: Lithuania

Here: describe conclusion in detail				
<input type="checkbox"/> CLOSED	Name auditor:		Date:	
<input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED				
<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION*				
Comments:				