

ASI-ACCREDITATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL GmbH

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

FSC Annual Surveillance of SQS 2008

Forest Management Audit to Waldwirtschaftsverband beider Basel,
Switzerland (SQS-FM/COC 000923)

Date of assessment: 26 - 27 Jan 2009

Final Version

	NAME	DATE
Report drafted by:	Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	28 May 2009
Reviewed by ASI:	Martin Walter	13 June 2009
Reviewed by CAB:	Alexander Wyrsh	19 June 2009
Finalized by ASI:	Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	19 June 2009
Report last updated:		

Credits

The author would like to thank Mr. Mischa Siroky and Mr. Alexander Wyrsh from SQS as well as Mr. Daniel Wenz and all members of Waldwirtschaftsverband beider Basel involved in the audit for preparing and making the arrangements that made this assessment possible and efficient.

1 Background

The operation audited by SQS

Name of operation	Waldwirtschaftsverband beider Basel WbB.
Total area	18.205 ha
Type of management	Temperate natural forest management
Name of contact person	Daniel Wenz
Address	Grammetstrasse 14, 4410 Liestal
Country	Switzerland
Phone number	0041 61 9220430
Fax number	0041 61 9220463
URL	www.partnerimwald.ch
E-mail address	daniel.wenz@benwil.bl.ch

The certification history

Previous certification	From 2002-2006 the operation was certified by SGS
Main audit:	10 th -11 th January 2007
Date of certificate issue	01 st February 2007
Date of 1st surveillance	4 th April 2008

ASI Assessment Details

Purpose of assessment	Annual surveillance of SQS for forest management
ASI lead assessment	Dr. Carlos Ruiz-Garvia
Local Expert/ translator	-
Language	German
Sites visited	Group headquarters, three group members

Audit agenda of SQS

DAY 1: 27th January 2009	
7.30-7.45	Meeting for discussion of audit schedule, purpose and scope of the ASI audit.
7.45 -8.00	Opening meeting with staff from WbB
8.00-10.00	Discussion of open issues and corrective action requests. Document review.
10.30 – 12.00	Visit of group member Sissach (office)
12.00 - 13.00	Lunch
13.00 - 15.00	Visit of group member Sissach (field)

ASI-REP-54-SQS 2009 Basel

15.00 -16.00	Visit of group member Farnsberg (office)
16.00 -17.00	Visit of group member Farnsberg (field)
17.00 -17.30	Drive to headquarters
17.30 –18.00	SQS audit conclusions
DAY 2: 28th January 2009	
10.30 – 12.00	Visit of group member Homburg (office)
13.00 - 15.00	Visit of group member Homburg (field)
12.00 - 13.00	Lunch
15.00 -16.00	Visit of group member Oberes Diegtertal (office)
16.00 -17.00	Visit of group member Oberes Diegtertal (field)
17.00 -17.30	Drive to headquarters
18.00 – 19.00	Closing meeting of SQS audit
19.00 – 20.30	Closing meeting and discussion of ASI findings with SQS auditor

People involved in the assessment

CAB	Mr. Mischa Siroky (Lead auditor) and Mr. Alexander Wyrsh (observer)
Operation	Mr. Daniel Wenz (group manager)
Others	Staff from the visited group members

2 Assessment objectives and planning

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;
 - 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" (CB); 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 non-conformance 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 FSC accreditation requirements.

Witnessing: ASI assessors are observing the CAB auditors carrying out FSC certification services in an FSC certified company / operation.

4 ASI stakeholder consultation process

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

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

No comments were received for this assessment.

5 Assessment findings

CAB AUDIT PERFORMANCE	
FSC requirements	Findings and conclusions
Standard adaptation (20-003)	SQS used the locally adapted standard developed for Switzerland for the initial evaluation and this year's surveillance audit.
Auditor qualification (20-004)	SQS lead auditor for this surveillance audit is from Switzerland, and has been working for SQS since 2007. He has followed SQS training procedures for lead auditors. SQS lead auditor had the experience and qualifications to evaluate all aspects of the FSC P&C during the surveillance audit.

	<p>The auditor qualification was in compliance with FSC requirements.</p>
<p>Stakeholder consultation (20-006)</p>	<p>Prior, during and after the assessment, ASI requested SQS to provide evidence of appropriate stakeholder consultation for this surveillance audit to <i>Waldwirtschaftsverband beider Basel</i>. No public consultation processes were carried out by the SQS team for this audit different from the interviews to employees, contractors and subcontractors during the audit.</p> <p>Minor NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.01</p>
<p>Evaluation process (20-007; ISO 19011)</p>	<p><u>The Opening meeting</u></p> <p>The Opening meeting lacked different elements indicated in the ISO Guide 19011 such as: declaration of conflict of interest, description and clarifications of the role of observers, ASI team, the STD used (updates of the STD), definition of nonconformities.</p> <p>REC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.01</p> <p><u>Review of documentation and records</u></p> <p>SQS didn't systematically (partially) reviewed the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complaints received • Accident records • Chemical use records (Trend and strategies to reduce the chemicals), • Records of sales of FSC certified products (copies of invoices, bills, shipping documents), • Changes in the list of group members (SQS used a 19.03.2009 version) • The rate of change of membership within the group, • Formal communications and written documents sent to group members by the group entity since the previous certification body surveillance <p>Minor NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.02</p> <p><u>Sampling size and audit durations</u></p> <p><i>Waldwirtschaftsverband beider Basel</i> is composed of 25 group members. The greater part of the forest surface concerned is public forest.</p>

	<p>In general, one member is equal to one forest manager. Each forest manager follows a Development Management Plan (also called <i>Waldentwicklungsplaene</i> (WEP)). The number of the FMUs is equal to the number of WEPs even though a WEP may include, certified and non-certified forest, in each district. Each forest manager normally manages the forest of more than one owner and each of these different owners has its own management plan.</p> <p>SQS planned two audit days for the evaluation of the certificate holder. The audit team sampled and visited four group members.</p> <p>The audit time was in compliance with FSC and ASI requirements.</p> <p>Following SQS audit agenda, SQS checked most of the indicated selected/sampled criteria for this surveillance audit. However, more emphasis should have been put on safety issues taking into account a fatal work accident which occurred two weeks prior to the audit.</p> <p>REC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.02</p> <p><u>Non-compliances identified during surveillance</u></p> <p>At the beginning of the audit, the auditor's team were appropriately informed by the manager about a fatal working accident in one of the certified FMUs which have occurred two weeks prior to the audit.</p> <p>Investigations of this accident were currently on progress by the designated federal bodies.</p> <p>SQS partially evaluated P4 and announced 5 related observations at the closing meeting. However, the ASI assessor concluded that although a large number of observations were raised by SQS, this criteria was insufficiently evaluated by SQS and a number of safety issues were not properly followed up e.g.: 1) analysis of a number of incident records (5) in one of the ??? and 2) in one of the interviews to the workers, one of them was not using his communication equipment as requested by the internal working instructions). A minor nonconformity was therefore raised against SQS for not having properly addressed these issues.</p> <p>Minor NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.03</p>
Audit report (20-008)	By the time of drafting of this report SQS report from this

	<p>audit was available for review and available at the SQS website.</p> <p>This was in compliance with FSC requirements.</p>
Public summary (20-009)	<p>The public summary was available on the SQS website only in German. The content of the public summary for WbB was evaluated by ASI.</p> <p>The Following non compliances were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public summary does not make reference to the standards used. (6.1) • A list of all non-compliances that the managers are required to correct in order to maintain their certification was not found. (5.2) • Annual updates in an official language were not added to the public summary. (2.1) <p>Minor NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.04</p>
Decision making (20-002)	<p>The SQS decision making system is based on the classification of indicators from the checklist (MB FSC_FM 411_1, 11.1.1). All 'Hinweise' (observations) and 'Auflagen' (minor non-compliances). Findings were announced by the lead auditor at the closing meeting and consistently confirmed in the audit report following SQS decision making procedure, in line with FSC procedures.</p> <p>SQS issued 1 Major CAR 'Schwachstellen', 2 minor CARs and 10 Observations to <i>Waldwirtschaftsverband beider Basel</i>. However, the references to the STD provided in the 2009 SQS audit report are not consistently presented throughout the report. Furthermore, conformity presented in the SQS report were not properly closed and graded, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minor CAR Nr. 08.05 (from the SQS report dated on 11.08.08) was extended and not upgraded (not clearly explained in the audit report). This failure (related to the lack valid WEP/FMP in Liestal) is presented in the report as a nonconformity at a principle level. Non-compliances shall be considered as major nonconformities and not as minor. - The Observations/Recommendations called 'Hinweise' were referenced in the report as non

	<p>conformities even though they were referenced at a Criterion Level. Non-compliances shall be considered as minor nonconformities.</p> <p>Major NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.05</p>
<p>Application of FSC policies and guidelines</p>	<p><i>Waldwirtschaftsverband beider</i> Basel is a certificate holder with a complex structure. Total area is 18.205 ha, an area which is distributed over a number of public FMUs managed jointly by one forest manager or individually. Private forest owners can participate in the certificate through signing an agreement with the group.</p> <p>For this SQS group certificate, similar as in other group certificates in the country a number of issues with FSC group certification guidelines and sampling requirements for groups were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Membership in the group is granted to forest owners associations which are themselves groups of different forest management units. According to FSC rules only owners or managers can be members of a group. b) The sampling strategy applied is based on the membership list where groups of forest owners count as one member although FSC rules define the unit for sampling as the 'forest management unit' <p>These issues were followed up by the ASI assessor after this audit. ASI approached/consulted FSC PSU and the FSC WG in Switzerland following an FSC meeting for FSC group certification (FSC Meeting on Certification for Small Holders in Europe, in Bonn 27/28 April 2009) requesting clarification about the implementation of FSC group requirements in Switzerland. No final conclusion was provided by PSU before the drafting of this document. PSU is organizing a meeting by the end of June 2009 with PSU and Swiss stakeholders to specifically address these issues. ASI will closely follow up the results of these meetings and address these issues in the next SQS office assessment.</p>

OPERATION'S COMPLIANCE WITH CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS	
FSC requirements	Findings and conclusions
Principle 1	<p>1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6 clauses of the STD were evaluated by SQS. 1.3 was not evaluated during this surveillance audit.</p> <p>No non-compliances against SQS related to the evaluation of</p>

	P1 were identified.
Principle 2	<p>SQS evaluated evidence of long-term forest use rights to the land and was demonstrated by WbB.</p> <p>As indicated in the ASI report from 2008, WbB has an outstanding policy for consultation with the public. Issues are regularly discussed during round tables with interested stakeholders. As the enterprises are owned by the municipalities they are by their very nature bound to community interests.</p> <p>Clause 2.1 was evaluated by SQS and no non-compliances against SQS related to P2 were identified during the audit.</p>
Principle 3	N/A
Principle 4	<p>SQS evaluated if forest management meet applicable laws and regulations covering health and safety of employees.</p> <p>Safety issues are respected by workers and continuously monitored by SUVA-Switzerland. SQS identified a number of issues and grade them as observations mainly related to lack of first aid training and records (see appended SQS audit report dated on 15.03.09).</p> <p>Forest workers are generally trained and perform their tasks on good level of professionalism. Training is regularly provided by national or federal institutions.</p> <p>A number of deficiencies related to safety issues were identified during the onsite visits which were not sufficiently evaluated by SGS (see minor NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.03)</p>
Principle 5	<p>SQS also evaluated in the field if forest management operations minimized waste associated with harvesting and on-site processing operations and avoid damage to other forest resources following clause 5.3. WbB demonstrated that, the rate of harvest of forest products do not exceed levels which can be permanently sustained.</p> <p>SQS appropriately confirmed that WbB forest management operations use forest's multiple products and provide services in a wide range of benefits for the community.</p> <p>No nonconformity against SQS was identified to this point.</p>
Principle 6	<p>SQS evaluated P6 (6.1 – 6.9). WbB demonstrated that assessment of environmental impacts was completed and appropriate to the scale, intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources.</p>

	<p>Site-disturbing operations were visited with an eye on environmental impacts. No nonconformities were identified.</p> <p>Forest management applied by the group members mimic natural processes (continued cover forestry).</p> <p>A warehouse was visited by SQS where the auditors verified if chemicals, containers, liquid and solid non-organic wastes including fuel and oil were disposed of in an environmentally appropriate manner at off-site locations. An issue, regarding to chemical use, aroused about the presence of 1.65 l of Pentocide ND 400 in the warehouse. Although none of the group members is currently using the product, according to the manager's statement, the enterprise indicates that a derogation request was sent to FSC by WbB on 14.06.07. Till today no answer was received therefore the enterprise stopped using the product. ASI will closely follow this issue with SQS and PSU in the next SQS office assessment.</p> <p>SQS verified the records of non-native species such Douglas fir. WbB controlled and actively monitored the use of such species in line with FSC requirements.</p>
Principle 7	<p>SQS reviewed status of WEPs and FMPs in the visited units. WEP at Liestal has been expired in 2008 and the enterprise indicated that they were in the process to obtain a new WEP approved at the beginning of 2009. SQS raised a minor CAR to address this nonconformity at a principle level (see Major NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.02).</p>
Principle 8	<p>SQS evaluated and evidenced that monitoring at WbB is conducted appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management to assess the condition of the forest and yields of forest products. No nonconformity against SQS was identified to this point.</p>
Principle 9	<p>SQS verified on site that management activities in high conservation value forests are maintained and enhanced the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests are presented and considered in the WEPs.</p> <p>The presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests were evaluated and discussed by SQS and WbB. However, due to the lack of time and the critical points selected by SQS it was not possible for the ASI team to verify if the management plan includes specific measures to ensure the maintenance and/or enhancement of the applicable conservation attributes consistent with the precautionary approach. Forest protection measures are</p>

	<p>provided in the summary of the publicly available management plan but measures specifically applicable for conservation attributes were not found (Merkblatt zur Erstellung eines Übergangs-Betriebsplans (WP).</p> <p>Minor NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.06 (9.3)</p>
Principle 10	NA

5 Nonconformities and observations

Major CAR(s)	Minor CAR(s)	Observations
1	5	2

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

Significant improvements in the SQS system were identified since the ASI assessment 2008. However, the SQS audit showed weaknesses with regard to completeness, accuracy and decision making specially related to addressing and grading nonconformity.

SQS is currently undergoing a re-accreditation process. Expected changes in key staff in 2009 as well as the lack of practical experience in conducting forest management audits will create the biggest challenge for SQS in the new accreditation period. SQS at the time of drafting this report manage one FSC FM certificate.

Based on the findings of this assessment, the ASI lead assessor recommends to FSC AC the continuation of the FSC forest management accreditation for SQS, 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 2: ASI feedback to CAB comments on report (if provided)

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.	NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.01	Date	27 January 2009
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM Assessment 2009	
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
Prior, during and after the assessment, ASI requested SQS to provide evidence of appropriate stakeholder consultation for this surveillance audit to <i>Waldwirtschaftsverband beider Basel</i> . No public consultation processes were carried out by the SQS team for this audit different from the interviews to employees, contractors and subcontractors during the audit.			
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD-20-006 V2-1, clause 8.1		
Corrective Action Request: SQS 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 assessment		
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body			
To be filled-in by ASI			
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI			
To be filled-in by ASI			
<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.	NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.02	Date	27 January 2009
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM Assessment 2009	
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<u>Review of documentation and records</u>			
<p>SQS didn't systematically review the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complaints received • Accident records • Chemical use records (Trend and strategies to reduce the chemicals), • Records of sales of FSC certified products (copies of invoices, bills, shipping documents), • The list of group members (SQS used a 19.03.2009 version) • The rate of change of membership within the group, • Formal communications and written documents sent to group members by the group entity since the previous certification body surveillance 			
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD-20-007 V2-1, clause 4.2.1		
<p>Corrective Action Request:</p> <p>SQS 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 assessment		
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body			
To be filled-in by ASI			
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI			
To be filled-in by ASI			

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SQS for 2009: Waldwirtschaftsverband beider Basel

<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.	NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.03	Date	27 January 2009
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM Assessment 2009	
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>SQS partially evaluated P4 and announced 5 related observations at the closing meeting. However, the ASI assessor concludes that although a large number on observations were raised by SQS, this criteria was insufficiently evaluated as a number of safety issues were not properly followed e.g.: (1) analysis of a number of incident records (5) in one of the visited sites and (2) in one of the interviews to the workers, one of them was not using his communication equipment as requested by the internal working instructions). A minor nonconformity was therefore raised against SQS for not having properly addressed these issues.</p>			
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD-20-007 V2-1, clause 4.4.1		
<p>Corrective Action Request: SQS 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 assessment	
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body			
To be filled-in by ASI			
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI			
To be filled-in by ASI			
<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.	NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.04	Date	27 January 2009
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM Assessment 2009	
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>The public summary was available on the SQS website only in German. The content of the public summary for WbB was evaluated by ASI.</p> <p>The Following non compliances were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public summary does not make reference to the standards used. (6.1) • A list of all non-compliances that the managers are required to correct in order to maintain their certification was not found. (5.2) • Annual updates in an official language were not added to the public summary. (2.1) 			
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD-20-009 V2-1, clauses 6.1, 5.2 and 2.1		
<p>Corrective Action Request:</p> <p>SQS 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 assessment	
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body			
To be filled-in by ASI			
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI			
To be filled-in by ASI			

FSC Forest Management Surveillance Audit of SQS for 2009: Waldwirtschaftsverband beider Basel

<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.	NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.05	Date	27 January 2009
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM Assessment 2009	
Nonconformity	Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>SQS issued 1 Major CAR 'Schwachstellen', 2 minor CARs and 10 Observations to <i>Wadwirtschaftsverband beider Basel</i>. However, the references to the STD provided in the 2009 SQS audit report are not consistently presented throughout the report. Furthermore, conformity presented in the SQS report were not properly closed and graded, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minor CAR Nr. 08.05 (see SQS report dated on 11.08.08) was extended and not upgraded (not clearly explained in the audit report). This failure (related to the lack valid WEP/FMP in Liestal) is presented in the report as a nonconformity at a principle level. Non-compliances shall be considered as major nonconformities and not as minor. <p>The Observations/Recommendations called 'Hinweise' were referenced in the report as non conformities even though they were referenced at a Criterion Level. Non-compliances shall be considered as minor nonconformities.</p>			
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD 20-002 v2.1, Clause 8.3.2		
<p>Corrective Action Request:</p> <p>SQS 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 (from the finalization of this report)		
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body			
To be filled-in by ASI			
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI			

To be filled-in by ASI

- CLOSED
- UPGRADED
- 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.	NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.06	Date	27. January 2009
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM Assessment 2009	
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
Forest protection measures are provided in the publicly available management plan summary but measures specifically applicable for conservation attributes were not found (Merkblatt zur Erstellung eines Übergangs-Betriebsplans (WP)).			
Normative Reference(s)	P9, Criterion 9.3 and FSC-STD-20-007 V2-1, clause 4.1.1		
Corrective Action Request: SQS 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 assessment	
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body			
To be filled-in by ASI			
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI			
To be filled-in by ASI			
<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.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.01	Date	27 January 2009
Issue detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM Surveillance Assessment 2009	
The Opening meeting The Opening meeting lacked different elements indicated in the ISO Guide 19011 such as: declaration of conflict of interest, description and clarifications of the role of observers, ASI team, the STD used (updates of the STD), definition of nonconformities.			
Recommendation:		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION

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.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.02	Date	27 January 2009
Issue detected by (name of auditor)		Carlos Ruiz-Garvia	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM Surveillance Assessment 2009	
Following SQS audit agenda, SQS checked most of the indicated selected/sampled criteria for this surveillance audit. However, more emphasis should have been put on Safety issues taking into account a fatal work accident which occurs two weeks prior to the audit.			
Recommendation:		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION

ASI-ACCREDITATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL GmbH

Annex 2

Statement to the ASI report (Draft version) of the FSC Annual Surveillance of SQS 2008 in the Waldwirtschaftsverband beider Basel, Switzerland (SQS-FM/COC 000923)				
CAR/Observation	Description ASI (CAR)	Statement (SQS)	SQS View	ASI Comments (19.06.2009)
NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.01 (Minor)	Prior, during and after the assessment, ASI requested SQS to provide evidence of appropriate stakeholder consultation for this surveillance audit to Waldwirtschaftsverband beider Basel. No public consultation processes were carried out by the SQS team for this audit different from the interviews to employees, contractors and subcontractors during the audit. FSC-STD-20-006 V2-1, clause 8.1	The observations will be internally analyzed and taken into account in the next auditor instruction (26th august) and the next audit.	The records are justified. Actions to remove them will be taken.	No further comments
NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.02 (Minor)	Review of documentation and records SQS didn't systematically review the following elements: 1. Complaints received 2. Accident records 3. Chemical use of records (Trend and strategies to reduce the chemicals), 4. Records of sales of FSC certified products (copies of invoices, bills, shipping documents), 6. The list of group members (SQS used a 19.03.2009 version) 7. The rate of change of membership within the group. 8. Formal communications and written documents sent to group members by the group entity since the previous certification body surveillance Review of documentation and records FSC-STD-20-007 V2-1, clause 4.2.1	SQS did revise the „Auswertung Jahresbericht 2007“ from the Kanton where statistics of the whole group are documented except from the "Unfallstatistik". Additionally a lot of documents were revised as noted in the audit report (especially Unfallstatistiken SUVA, invoices, working contracts, planning docs., etc.). On the top level of the group the attention to every point wasn't the same, which is in this context a lack of systematical review.	The records are partially justified. Actions to remove them will be taken. Because all topics were raised and on FMU-level verified in various occasions (see report) we apply to downgrade from Minor CARs to recommendation.	Evidence that all these points were reviewed in the audit is not provided in the report. The NC remains open.
NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.03 (Minor)	SQS partially evaluated P4 and announced 5 related observations at the closing meeting. However, the ASI assessor sustained that although a large number of observations were raised by SQS, this criteria was insufficiently evaluated by SQS to come to a factual conclusion and a number of safety issues which were not properly followed up (e.g.: 1) analysis of a number of incident records (5) in one of the and 2) in one of the interviews to the workers???, one of them was not using his communication equipment as requested by the internal working instructions). A minor nonconformity was therefore raised against SQS for not having properly addressed these issues. FSC-STD-20-007 V2-1, clause 4.4.1	SQS revised the SUVA-reports to the ground, additionally asked the accidents and documents concerning. There were no heavy accidents, except from the already mentioned fatal accident some weeks before the audit. Because of the ongoing investigation, Mr. Wenk could not give more note on this case as it is also stated in the ASI-report. To the second point: the topic of the headset was raised on the audit and reminded to forester and workers, even though, working on sight and voice distance does not necessarily require headsets (the headset was on the helmet for other working steps). We accept, that therefore a recommendation could have been raised additionally to the recommendation on instruction in first aid and safety (09.b.c.g).	The record is partially justified (recommendation on headsets). Actions to remove them will be taken. Because the general topic was raised and on FMU-level verified in various occasions we apply to downgrade from Minor CAR to recommendation.	The NC is not related to the investigation of the accident but to the safety management systems. The NC remains open

ASI-ACCREDITATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL GmbH

NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.04 (Minor)	<p>The public summary was available only in german on the SQS website. The content of the public summary for WbB was evaluated by ASI.</p> <p>The Following non compliances were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public summary does not make reference to the standards used. (6.1) • A list of all non-compliances that the managers are required to correct in order to maintain their certification was not found. (5.2) • Annual updates in an official language were not added to the public summary. (2.1) FSC-STD-20-009 V2-1, clauses 6.1, 5.2 and 2.1 	<p>The public summary from the last report was available in English (going to the German summary and changing webpage language to English). The translation of the new report is on the way.</p>	<p>The observations will be internally analyzed and taken into account in the next auditor instruction (26th august) and the next audit.</p>	<p>No further comments</p>	
NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.05 (Major)	<p>SQS issued 1 Major CAR 'Schwachstellen', 2 minor CARs and 10 Observations to Wadwirtschaftsverband beider Basel. However, the references to the STD provided in the 2009 SQS audit report are not consistently presented throughout the report. Furthermore, conformity presented in the SQS report were not properly closed and graded, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minor CAR Nr. 08.05 (see SQS report dated on 11.08.08) was extended and not upgraded (not clearly explained in the audit report). Furthermore, this failure (related to the lack valid WEP/FMP in Liestal) is presented in the report as a nonconformity at a principle level. Non-compliances shall be considered as major nonconformities and not as minor. - The Observations/Recommendations called 'Hinweise' were referenced in the report as non conformities even though they were referenced at a Criterion Level. Non-compliances shall be considered as minor nonconformities. FSC-STD 20-002 v2.1, Clause 8.3.2 	<p>Minor CAR Nr. 08.05 was not upgraded, because the new WEP (Waldentwicklungsplan) is still in development (political process). The depending FMP from Liestal was announced for End 2008/Beginning 2009. The audit was in January, so they were still in time. Even though it has to be considered that the process of creating a new WEP (from which the FMPs depend) is also issue to many not only forest based local and political decisions, that's why Liestal themselves only have restricted influence on the duration until it is finished. So there is few influence on the process even if upgrading to a MajorCAR. Until there is an existing new plan the old one is valid (so there is no lack of plan).</p> <p>Another issue raised by this CAR are the terms used by SQS. In ISO- and general understanding of the term "Auflage" can also significate "observation"-and is not absolutely terminated until the next audit (of course in FSC-docs it is defined and considered as a minor CAR). This creates a lot of confusion (same problems with "Hinweise"). We are aware of this existing problems in terms for findings between SQS-ISO-use and FSC-application. We are working on a solution to this issue (application of the CAR-system).</p>	<p>In our view there is no need for action concerning this CAR on the specific level (FMP), because they are depending from the WEP. In general changes on terms for findings are already planned, to solve confusion on this issues. SQS requests an internal review of the examination of the evaluation by ASI and a downgrading to a minor CAR on the declaration system and terms.</p>	<p>ASI applies precautionary approach and remain the Major and minor NC till SQS demonstrate compliance.</p>	
NC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.06 (Minor)	<p>Forest protection measures are provided in the publicly available management plan summary but measures specifically applicable for conservation attributes were not found (Merkblatt zur Erstellung eines Übergangs-Betriebsplans (WP), P9, Criterion 9.3 and FSC-STD-20-007 V2-1, clause 4.1.1</p>	<p>We do not exactly understand this CAR: In Switzerland conservation and environmental protection areas are documented in various different levels from state (Bundesinventare) over district (Kanton) down to regions. Their controlling and monitoring of measures is guaranteed on this levels and is especially in forests quite strict. This inventories are integrated in the district forest planning (WEP) which again is the base of the local forest planning. A miss use of such a documented area would not be tolerated by the local officials. Forest managers are obliged to manage forest within this framework. SQS raised a "Hinweis" (09.f) on additionally and voluntarily done works by the forest manager, "recommending" to integrate them to the FMP.</p>	<p>In our view there is no need for action concerning this CAR. SQS requests an internal review of the examination of the evaluation by ASI.</p>	<p>No further comments</p>	
REC.SQS.FSC.FM.2009.01	<p>The Opening meeting The Opening meeting lacked different elements indicated in the ISO Guide 19011 such as: declaration of conflict of interest, description and clarifications of the role of observers, ASI team, the STD used (updates of the STD), definition of nonconformities.</p>		<p>The observations will be internally analyzed and taken into account in the next auditor instruction (26th august) and the next audit.</p>	<p>No further comments</p>	