

ASI-ACCREDITATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL GmbH

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

FSC Annual Surveillance of VIBO 2008

**Forest Management Audit to Predio Particular Las Bayas in
Pueblo Nuevo, Durango, México, (FVB-FM/COC-001)**

Date of audit: 09 - 10 April 2008

FINAL VERSION

	NAME	DATE
Report drafted by:	Alfredo Unda	14 April 2008
Reviewed by ASI:	Hubert de Bonafos	17 April 2008
Reviewed by VIBO:	No comments received	21 May 2008
Finalized by ASI:	Alfredo Unda	01 July 2008
Report last updated:		

Table of Contents

	Page
Credits	3
1 Background.....	3
2 Assessment objectives and planning.....	5
3 ASI stakeholder consultation process.....	5
4 Audit Findings.....	6
4.1 CAB Audit Performance.....	6
4.2 Operation's compliance with certification requirements	8
5 Nonconformities and observations	11
6 Conclusion and recommendation.....	11
Attachments.....	12
Annex 1 – Non-Conformity Reports	13
Annex 2 – VIBO and ASI Comments.....	24

Credits

The author would like to thank Fabián Fernández and Saul from VIBO as well as all the University and staff in charge of the Predio Particular Las Bayas involved for preparing and making the arrangements that made this assessment possible and efficient.

1 Background

The operation audited by VIBO

Name of operation	Predio Particular Las Bayas
Type of certificate	Single FM certificate
Total area	4,721 ha
Type of management	Natural forest management
Name of contact person	Mr. Rubén Calderón L. Rector de la Universidad Juárez
Address	Blvd. Durango y Río Papaloapan S/N, Colonia Valle del Sur, Durango
Country	México
Phone number	+526 188-275 940
Fax number	
URL	http://www.bosquevibo.org.mx/participa.html
E-mail address	vibo@bosquevibo.org.mx
Brief description	<p>The Universidad Juárez is responsible for the management of the “Predio Particular Las Bayas” forestlands on a total area of 4,721 ha. Of this area, 2,425 ha correspond to forest productive land divided in 1,224 ha of commercial forest and 1,200 ha of protection and conservation forests. The non forested area is left to pasture and roads.</p> <p>The Universidad Juárez does not have resources and infrastructure for forest harvesting and wood transformation activities, therefore it contracts technical personnel and equipment services with a local company that processes and sells the wood.</p> <p>The “Predio” is located in the Municipality of Pueblo Nuevo, Durango, 101 km South of the city of Durango, by the highway Durango – La Flor – Las Bayas. Geographically, is located between parallels 23° 22' 15” and 23° 29' 50” North latitude and the 104° 48' 45” and 104° 53' 00” of West longitude.</p> <p>The areas managed are located in the Western Sierra Madre in the sub-province “Grandes Mesetas” and “Cañones Duranguenses”.</p> <p>The forest type is Pine-Oak mixed with other conifers and broadleaves like: <i>Pinus cooperii</i>, <i>Pinus duranguensis</i>, <i>Pinus engelmannii</i>, <i>Pinus leiopylla</i>, <i>Pinus</i></p>

	<i>teocote, Quercus spp., juniperus Spp., Cuperssus Spp.</i> These are the main commercial species and the main production is pine and oak round wood, oak charcoal, and fuelwood.
--	---

The certification history

Main assessment:	13 to 18 August 2007
Date of certificate issue	29 February 2008
Date of ASI surveillance	9 to 10 April 2008

ASI Assessment Details

Purpose of assessment	Regular annual surveillance
ASI lead assessor	Hubert de Bonafos (ASI Managing Director)
Local Expert/ translator	Alfredo Unda
Language	Spanish, English
Sites visited	Las Bayas forest area, San Bernardino de Milpillas Chico community

Audit agenda

The focus of the audit was the evaluation of compliance with FSC accreditation and certification requirements.

07 Apr 2008	
11:00 – 13:00	Opening meeting at the Forestal of the University of Durango and visit of the nursery
08 Apr 2008	
06:30 – 10:00	Travel to Las Bayas
10:00 – 14:00	Visit to forest area under Environmental Services plan
14:15 – 15:00	Field visit to water source under PES
15:00 – 16:00	Interview field personnel
17:00 – 19:00	Field visit to harvesting area
09 Apr 2008	
08:30 – 14:00	Group 1: Visit to San Bernardino community
08:00 – 13:00	Group 2: Field visit to Permanent plot # 07, limit of FMU
17:00 – 19:30	Return to Durango
10 Apr 2008	
12:00 - 13:00	VIBO closing meeting with the University

People involved in the audit

VIBO team	Mr. Fabián Fernández (lead auditor) Mr. Saúl Rodríguez, consultant
Operation	Mr. Jose (Responsible on site for Las Bayas forest) Mr. Antonio Salinas, worker from indigenous community Mr. Gerardo Castro worker at the entrance of Las Bayas
Others	Mr. Raimundo Huerta A. (Water responsible), from indigenous community Mr. Jose Luis Martinez Hernandez (Sawmill in Milpillas Chico),

	from indigenous community Mr. Jenera Salinas (Second in charge at the Milpillas community), from indigenous community
--	---

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

3 ASI stakeholder consultation process

The 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 audit to solicit stakeholder comments;
2. Direct interviews with selected key-stakeholders, conducted by ASI prior to the assessment with the stakeholder list from the VIBO's report. The first stage was an interview form sent by e-mail to several stakeholders. Only two stakeholders responded; the FSC Mexico representative and a representative of the “Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y Medio Ambiente”. No issues were raised by these stakeholders.

A number of local NGOs were contacted by the ASI team prior to and during the audit to organise personal meetings.

ASI received comments from:

- FSC México
- La Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y Medio Ambiente
- The San Bernardino de Milpilllas Chico community

Main stakeholder comments	ASI response
The stakeholders indicated that they were contacted by VIBO. They had mainly positive answers when surveyed regarding the University performance in Las Bayas forest management, see Annex 3.	Consulted stakeholders did not raise any particular issue.

4 Audit Findings

4.1 CAB Audit Performance

VIBO AUDIT PERFORMANCE	
FSC requirements	Findings and conclusions
General requirements for FSC accredited certification bodies: Application of ISO/IEC Guide 65:1996 (E) (20-001)	<p>VIBO needs to have policy and procedures to avoid and deal with potential conflict of interest.</p> <p>ASI proposes the following minor corrective action request to address the lack of demonstrated compliance with FSC-STD-20-001, sections 3.1, and 3.1.1: CAR.VIBO.FM.2008.01</p> <p>Other ISO 65 requirements have been evaluated during the ASI office audit. ASI findings are reported in ASI office audit 2008 report.</p>
Auditor qualification (20-004)	<p>VIBO audit was conducted by two auditors. The two VIBO auditors have the required qualification and experience to conduct FSC forest management audits.</p> <p>No nonconformity with FSC accreditation requirements was identified.</p>
Stakeholder consultation (20-006)	<p>The consultation carried out by ASI revealed some weaknesses in the implementation of VIBO's procedures. Some important stakeholders were not included on the list of stakeholders like the neighbouring indigenous community of San Bernardino de Milpilllas Chico. A visit to this indigenous community would have been essential to confirm compliance with Principle 3 in the field.</p> <p>ASI proposes the following major corrective action</p>

	<p>request to address the lack of demonstrated compliance with FSC-STD-20-006, sections 3.1 and 3.3.1 on stakeholder consultation: CAR.VIBO.FM.2008.02</p>
<p>Evaluation process (20-007; ISO 19011)</p>	<p>The evaluation carried out did not considered all the requirements as set in FSC-STD-20-007. Including sections 4.3.3.1 b) and c) on surveillance procedures.</p> <p>At the time of the audit there was no evidence that VIBO did evaluate the existence of procedure controls regarding possible complaints of the forest management currently applied by the university in Las Bayas forest area. As a result no interview was made to an important neighbour stakeholder.</p> <p>ASI proposes the following minor corrective action request to address the lack of demonstrated compliance with FSC-STD-20-007, sections 4.3.3.1 b) and c) on evaluation process: CAR.VIBO.FM.2008.03</p>
<p>Audit report (20-008)</p>	<p>Information missing in the certification report:</p> <p>The certificate date of issue is missing as set in FSC-STD-20-008, section 3.1. f, under D. Terms and definitions.</p> <p>The number of forest workers is not indicated as set in FSC-STD-20-008, section 1.1. j, under 1. Forest management description.</p> <p>There is no list of pesticides used (although pesticides are used in the Faculty's nursery). FSC-STD-20-008, Section 1.1.o, under 1. Forest management description.</p> <p>ASI proposes the following minor corrective action request to address the lack of demonstrated compliance with FSC-STD-20-008, sections 3.1.f, 1.1.j, 1.1.o on audit report: CAR.VIBO.FM.2008.04</p>
<p>Public summary (20-009)</p>	<p>At the time of the ASI audit, the VIBO public summary report for the certification of Las Bayas was not published on VIBO's Website. The FSC procedures require VIBO to publish its public summary report within 30 days of issuing a certificate.</p> <p>However, VIBO provided the ASSI audit team with</p>

	<p>a copy of its public summary report. VIBO shall publish its public summary report for las Bayas.</p> <p>ASI proposes the following minor corrective action request to address the lack of demonstrated compliance with FSC-STD-20-009: CAR.VIBO.FM.2008.05</p>
Decision making (20-002, Part 2)	<p>The VIBO procedure for classifying, wording and setting deadlines for corrective action requests shows some weaknesses in relation to FSC requirements.</p> <p>The CARs do not make clear reference to the related requirement of the standard.</p> <p>VIBO systematically prescribes the measures to be undertaken by the certified company. These measures are often described in details without clear reference to the performance level required by the standard. Wording CARs in this way may lead to a potential conflict of interest as the detailed proposals are of consultative nature.</p> <p>The 2-years timelines should be used only in exceptional cases, and not systematically. FSC-STD-20-002, Part 2. Section 8.3.3.</p> <p>Compliance with some requirements was not adequately checked, for example with Principles 3 and 9.</p> <p>ASI proposes the following minor corrective action request to address the lack of demonstrated compliance with FSC-STD-20-002, Part 2: CAR.VIBO.FM.2008.06</p>

4.2 Operation's compliance with certification requirements

OPERATION'S COMPLIANCE WITH CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS	
FSC requirements	Findings and conclusions
Principle 1	VIBO adequately evaluated compliance with Principle 1 and no nonconformity with FSC accreditation requirements was identified during this ASI audit.
Principle 2	VIBO adequately evaluated compliance with Principle 2 and no nonconformity with FSC accreditation requirements was identified during this ASI audit.

<p>Principle 3</p>	<p>A nonconformity was identified by the ASI audit team. VIBO did not consult or visit the neighbouring indigenous community of San Bernardino de Milpillas Chico, an important indigenous community.</p> <p>Such visit would have been essential to evaluate compliance with Principle 3 in the field, as this community has its only source of water and is receiving its water only from the certified FMU las Bayas.</p> <p>Other important aspects should have been evaluated by VIBO in relation to this indigenous community and the ASI audit team concluded that VIBO had not adequately evaluated compliance with principle 3.</p> <p>Major CAR.VIBO.FM.2008.02 was raised to address this lack of evaluation.</p>
<p>Principle 4</p>	<p>VIBO did not adequately evaluate compliance with FSC criterion 4.2 and 4.4 of Principle 4.</p> <p>At the time of the ASI audit, some workers were not well informed of their contract, working conditions, and were unaware or unclear on vacation and other benefits.</p> <p>There were some instances of non-compliance with legal health and safety regulations particularly for personnel working in Las Bayas forest area. Health and safety equipments were not available on site and the living conditions provided to the workers were not in line with ILO requirements.</p> <p>ASI proposes the following major corrective action request to address the lack of evaluation of compliance with Principle 4; criteria 4.2 and 4.4: CAR.VIBO.FM.2008.07</p>
<p>Principle 5</p>	<p>VIBO did not adequately evaluate compliance with criteria 5.1.4 of Principle 5. At the time of the audit there was not information to demonstrate economic feasibility of forest management activities, including environmental, social and operational costs of forest production activities.</p> <p>At the time of the ASI audit, there was no report or table indicating detailed investments and costs related to the forest area improvement and forest operations to be carried out in Las Bayas forests, like tree harvesting activities and enrichment planting, road improvement, water sources protection and maintenance, and garbage handling. Also cost or investments planned for social extension activities with neighbouring communities was not available.</p> <p>ASI proposes the following minor corrective action request to</p>

	<p>address the lack of evaluation of compliance with Principle 5; criteria 5.1.4: CAR.VIBO.FM.2008.08</p>
Principle 6	<p>VIBO did not adequately evaluate compliance with FSC criterion 6.7. ASI audit team found in the certified FMU Las Bayas some pollutant waste that had not been eliminated properly, and there was pollution risk as containers with chemicals components were left on the ground or buried next to water sources.</p> <p>Furthermore, the ASI audit team could witness the use of FSC prohibited chemicals at the nursery; e.g. Arsenic used to eliminate rats.</p> <p>At the time of the audit ASI could not find evidence of a soil productivity conservation plan. Criterion 6.5.5</p> <p>Also, ASI witnessed that road maintenance needs improvement to avoid soil erosion and water contamination problems originated from roads. Criterion 6.5.11.</p> <p>ASI also witnessed that water sources need protection in Las Bayas forest areas to improve and maintain water quality. Criterion 6.5.12</p> <p>ASI proposes the following major corrective action request to address the lack of demonstrated compliance with Principle 6, criteria 6.6 and 6.7: CAR.VIBO.FM.2008.09</p>
Principle 7	<p>VIBO did not adequately evaluate compliance with FSC criterion 7.3 1 as ASI could confirm in the field that the personnel in the certified FMU Las Bayas lacked appropriate training and adequate supervision for field activities in relation to forest management. Example: The contracting company does not harvest trees marked to be cut, compromising the forest improvement plan.</p> <p>ASI proposes the following minor corrective action request to address the lack of demonstrated compliance with Principle 7, criteria 7.3.1: CAR.VIBO.FM.2008.10</p>
Principle 8	<p>VIBO adequately evaluated compliance with Principle 1 and no nonconformity with FSC accreditation requirements was identified during this ASI audit.</p>
Principle 9	<p>VIBO did not adequately evaluate compliance with FSC criterion 9.1 and other elements of Principle 9 and therefore at the time of the ASI audit the Las Bayas forest area was not in compliance with FSC Principle 9.</p>

	<p>VIBO report makes reference to a document from the University to demonstrate compliance with Principle 9. This document indicates there are no HVCF in the certified FMU Las Bayas.</p> <p>However, during the ASI audit, the ASI audit team found evidence that HCVF had not been adequately evaluated. An important area of around 400 ha of forest inside the FMU Las Bayas providing important environmental benefits had been overlooked. This area is an essential habitat for a number of species on the list of Legislation No 59 and provides Environmental Services such as water to the indigenous community San Bernardino de Milpillas located downstream. The Mexican government is also paying the University for the environmental services provided by this watershed area. The University has to maintain the forest and protect the water resource.</p> <p>ASI proposes the following major corrective action request to address the lack of evaluation to demonstrate compliance with FSC principle 9: CAR.VIBO.FM.2008.11</p>
Principle 10	N/A

5 Nonconformities and observations

Major CAR(s)	Minor CAR(s)	Observations
4	7	0

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

VIBO conducted a systematic and professional audit and during the ASI audit addressed all nonconformities identified in a professional manner. However, some of the nonconformities should have been identified during VIBO initial assessment, before ASI surveillance audit.

Based on the findings of this assessment, the ASI audit team recommends FSC AC to maintain the current scope of FSC forest management accreditation for VIBO, subject to the timely closing of the nonconformities identified during the audit and specified in the nonconformity reports.

Attachments

Nonconformity reports (NCRs)

ASI feedback to VIBO comments on report (if provided)

Annex 1 – Non-Conformity Reports

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.VIBO.FM.2008.01	Date	9 April 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Hubert de Bonafos		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM assessment		
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION		
<i>VIBO need to have available policy and procedures document to handle and avoid conflicts of interests.</i>				
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD 20-001			
Corrective Action Request: VIBO shall 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 eliminate 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:	Hubert de Bonafos	Date:	14 April 2008
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.VIBO.FM.2008.02	Date	9 April 2008
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)	Hubert de Bonafos		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)	FM assessment		
Nonconformity	Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
Deficiency in implementation of procedures for stakeholder consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none">o In the list of stakeholders prepared by VIBO some important NGOs are not included as e.g. the Comunidad San Bernardino de Milpillas Chico, Municipio de Pueblo Nuevo, Dgo.			
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD 20-006, sections 3.1 and 3.3.1, and Principle 3		
Corrective Action Request: VIBO 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 eliminate causes of nonconformities in order to avoid recurrence.			
Timeline for implementation	Three 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:	Hubert de Bonafos	Date: 14 April 2008
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.VIBO.FM.2008.03	Date	9 April 2008
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)	Hubert de Bonafos		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)	FM assessment		
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<i>The evaluation carried out did not consider all the requirements as set in FSC-STD-2-007, including sections 4.3.3.1 b) and c) on surveillance procedures</i>			
Normative Reference(s)	Evaluation process (20-007; ISO 19011)		
Corrective Action Request: VIBO 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 eliminate 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:	Hubert de Bonafos	Date: 14 April 2008
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.VIBO.FM.2008.04	Date	9 April 2008
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Hubert de Bonafos	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM assessment	
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p>Information missing in the certification report: <i>The certificate date of issue is missing as set in FSC-STD-20-008, section 3.1. f, under D. Terms and definitions.</i> <i>The number of forest workers is not indicated as set in FSC-STD-20-008, section 1.1. j, under 1. Forest management description.</i> <i>There is no list of pesticides used (although some pesticides are used in the nursery at the Faculty). FSC-STD-20-008, Section 1.1.o, under 1. Forest management description.</i></p>			
Normative Reference(s)	Audit report (20-008), sections 3.1.f, section 1.1.j and section 1.1.o		
<p>Corrective Action Request: VIBO 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 eliminate 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:	Hubert de Bonafos	Date: 14 April 2008
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.VIBO.FM.2008.05	Date	9 April 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Hubert de Bonafos		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM assessment		
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION		
<p><i>At the time of the ASI audit, the VIBO public summary report for the certification of Las Bayas was not published on VIBO Website, although the certificate was already issued. The FSC procedures require VIBO to publish its public summary report within 30 days of issuing a certificate. VIBO provided the ASI audit team with a copy of its public summary report for Las Bayas. VIBO shall publish its public summary report for Las Bayas.</i></p>				
Normative Reference(s)	FSC-STD 20-009			
Corrective Action Request: VIBO 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 eliminate 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:	Hubert de Bonafos	Date:	14 April 2008
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.VIBO.FM.2008.06	Date	9 April 2008
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Hubert de Bonafos	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM assessment	
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION
<p><i>The VIBO procedure for classifying, wording and setting deadlines for corrective action requests shows some weaknesses in relation to FSC requirements. The CARs do not make clear reference to the related requirement of the standard.</i></p> <p><i>VIBO systematically prescribes the measures to be undertaken by the certified company. These measures are often described in detail without clear reference to the performance level required by the standard. Wording CARs in this way may lead to a potential conflict of interest as the detailed proposals are of consultative nature.</i></p> <p><i>The 2-years timelines should be used only in exceptional cases, and not systematically. FSC-STD-20-002, Part 2. Section 8.3.3.</i></p> <p><i>Compliance with some requirements was not adequately checked, for example with Principles 3 and 9.</i></p>			
Normative Reference(s)		FSC-STD 20-002, Part 2, section 8.3.3	
Corrective Action Request: VIBO 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 eliminate 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:	Hubert de Bonafos	Date: 14 April 2008
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.VIBO.FM.2008.07	Date	9 April 2008
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Hubert de Bonafos	
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM assessment	
Nonconformity	Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p><i>VIBO did not adequately evaluate compliance with FSC criterion 4.2 and 4.4 of Principle 4. At the time of the ASI audit, some workers were not well informed of their contract, working conditions, and were unaware or unclear on vacation and other benefits.</i></p> <p><i>There were some instances of non-compliance with legal, health and safety regulations particularly for personnel working in Las Bayas forest area. Health and safety equipments were not available on site and the living conditions provided to the workers were not in line with ILO requirements.</i></p>			
Normative Reference(s)	Principle 4, criteria 4.2 and 4.3		
<p>Corrective Action Request:</p> <p>VIBO 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 eliminate causes of nonconformities in order to avoid recurrence.</p>			
Timeline for implementation	Three 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:	Hubert de Bonafos	Date: 14 April 2008
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.VIBO.FM.2008.08	Date	9 April 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Hubert de Bonafos		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM assessment		
Nonconformity		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION	
<p><i>VIBO did not adequately evaluate compliance with criterion 5.1.4 of Principle 5. There is no information to demonstrate economic feasibility of the forest management activities, including environmental, social and operational costs of forest production activities. At the time of the ASI audit, there was no report or table indicating detailed investments and costs related to the forest area improvement and forest operations to be carried out in Las Bayas forests, like tree harvesting activities and enrichment planting, road improvement, water sources protection and maintenance, and garbage handling. Further, cost or investments planned for social extension activities with neighbouring communities was not available.</i></p>				
Normative Reference(s)		Principle 5, Criterion 5.1.4		
Corrective Action Request: <p>VIBO 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 eliminate causes of nonconformities in order to avoid recurrence.</p>				
Timeline for implementation		Next office audit		
Corrective Action implemented by Certification Body <p>Here: describe action taken in detail</p>				
Corrective Action evaluated by ASI <p>Here: describe conclusion in detail</p>				
<input type="checkbox"/> CLOSED <input type="checkbox"/> UPGRADED <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DECISION*	Name auditor:	Hubert de Bonafos	Date:	14 April 2008
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.VIBO.FM.2008.09	Date	9 April 2008		
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Hubert de Bonafos			
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM assessment			
Nonconformity		Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION		
<p><i>VIBO did not adequately evaluate compliance with FSC criterion 6.7. ASI audit team found in the certified FMU Las Bayas some pollutant waste that had not been eliminated properly, and there was pollution risk as containers with chemicals components were left on the ground or buried next to water sources.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, the ASI audit team witnessed the use of FSC prohibited chemicals at the nursery; e.g. Arsenic used to eliminate rats.</i></p> <p><i>At the time of the audit, ASI could not find evidence of a soil productivity conservation plan. Criterion 6.5.5</i></p> <p><i>Also, ASI witnessed that road maintenance needs improvement to avoid soil erosion and water contamination problems originated from roads. Criterion 6.5.11.</i></p> <p><i>ASI also witnessed that water sources need protection in Las Bayas forest areas to improve and maintain water quality. Criterion 6.5.12</i></p>					
Normative Reference(s)		Principle 6, criteria 6.7			
Corrective Action Request: VIBO 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 eliminate causes of nonconformities in order to avoid recurrence.					
Timeline for implementation		Three 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:	Hubert de Bonafos	Date:	14 April 2008
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.VIBO.FM.2008.10	Date	9 April 2008	
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Hubert de Bonafos		
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM assessment		
Nonconformity	Status	<input type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION		
<i>VIBO did not adequately evaluate compliance with FSC criterion 7.3 1 as ASI could confirm in the field that the personnel in the certified FMU Las Bayas lacked appropriate training and adequate supervision for field activities in relation to forest management. Example: The contracting company is not harvesting trees marked to be cut, compromising the forest improvement plan.</i>				
Normative Reference(s)	Principle 7, Criteria 7.3.1			
Corrective Action Request: VIBO 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 eliminate 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:	Hubert de Bonafos	Date:	14 April 2008
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.VIBO.FM.2008.11	Date	9 April 2008		
Nonconformity detected by (name of auditor)		Hubert de Bonafos			
Through (e.g. office audit, document review)		FM assessment			
Nonconformity		Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVATION		
<p><i>VIBO report makes reference to a document from the University to demonstrate compliance with Principle 9. This document indicates there are no HCVF in the certified FMU Las Bayas. However, during the ASI audit, the ASI audit team found evidence that HCVF had not been adequately evaluated. An important area of around 400 ha of forest inside the FMU Las Bayas providing important environmental benefits had been overlooked. This area is an essential habitat for a number of species on the list of Legislation No 59 and provides Environmental Services such as water to the indigenous community San Bernardino de Milpillas located downstream. The Mexican government is also paying the University for the environmental services provided by this watershed area. The University has to maintain the forest and protect the water resource.</i></p>					
Normative Reference(s)		Principle 9			
<p>Corrective Action Request: VIBO 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 eliminate causes of nonconformities in order to avoid recurrence.</p>					
Timeline for implementation		Three 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:	Hubert de Bonafos	Date:	14 April 2008
Comments:					

Annex 2 – VIBO and ASI Comments

VIBO comments	ASI Response
N/A	N/A