



FSC FM SUMMARY PUBLIC REPORT

CERTIFICATION AUDIT OF THE FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

COMPANY: *ERSAF (REGIONAL BODY FOR SERVICES TO FARMING AND FORESTS)*

CERTIFIED FOREST AREAS: *see table titled "List of certified forest areas", page 3*

<ICILA-FM 000334> CERTIFICATE REGISTRATION CODE

ISSUE DATE OF THE CERTIFICATE IN FORCE: 23/12/2009

EXPIRY DATE OF THE CERTIFICATE in FORCE: 22/12/2013

(First issue 23/12/2009)

AUDIT REPORT issued on: 16/12/2009

CONTACTS

CERTIFICATE HOLDER:

ERSAF:

REFERENT: *Dr. Monica Guglini*

TELEPHONE NO.: +39.0267404591 / +39.3286630775

E-MAIL ADDRESS: monica.guglini@ersaf.lombardia.it

ICILA:

REFERENT: *Marco Clementi, engineer*

TELEPHONE NO.: +39.039.3300232 E-MAIL ADDRESS: FMCOC@icila.org

SUMMARY PUBLIC REPORT UPDATING STORY

12/1/2010

FIRST ISSUE

DOCUMENT OWNERSHIP

This document belongs exclusively to ICILA Srl. Both its whole and partial reproduction is forbidden, be they on paper or automated support, whether in its original or elaborated version, and likewise are forbidden its distribution or any other use outside the notification of the audit results to the customer and the staff of Srl in charge of handling the certification procedure. Derogations to the mentioned rule shall be deemed valid only when previously authorised in writing by ICILA Srl's management. This document shall be deemed valid only if in a version identical to the official copy signed in the original, preserved c/o the customer archive of ICILA Srl.

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM
ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334**

Updating of 12/1/2010

LIST OF CERTIFIED FOREST AREAS

	FOREST ID	Woodland (ha)	Location
1	Azzaredo Casù (BG ¹)	37,115	The Lombardy Region
2	Gardesana Occ. (BS ²)	9.599,05	The Lombardy Region
3	Alpe Vaia (BS)	250,434	The Lombardy Region
4	Grigna Valley (BS)	1.662,332	The Lombardy Region
5	Anfo Val Caffaro (BS)	687,397	The Lombardy Region
6	Scalve Valley (BS)	567,855	The Lombardy Region
7	Legnoli (BS)	319,549	The Lombardy Region
8	Corni di Canzo (CO ³)	414,28	The Lombardy Region
9	Valsolda (CO)	207,198	The Lombardy Region
10	Monte Generoso (CO)	225,693	The Lombardy Region
11	Intelvi Valley (CO)	64,669	The Lombardy Region
12	Resegone (LC ⁴)	433,974	The Lombardy Region
13	Foppabona (LC)	67,789	The Lombardy Region
14	Masino Valley (SO ⁵)	715,115	The Lombardy Region
15	Lesina Valley (SO)	605,171	The Lombardy Region
16	Gerola Valley (SO)	393,758	The Lombardy Region
17	Alpe Boron (SO)	1,506	The Lombardy Region
18	Carpaneta (MN ⁶)	43,318	The Lombardy Region
19	Isola Boschina (MN)	33,451	The Lombardy Region
20	Freddo Valley (BG)	20,543	The Lombardy Region
	TOTAL	16.350,197	

¹ Province of Bergamo.

² Province of Brescia.

³ Province of Como.

⁴ Province of Lecco.

⁵ Province of Sondrio.

⁶ Province of Mantua

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM
ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334**

Updating of 12/1/2010

SUMMARY

1	PURPOSE OF THE CERTIFICATION _____	5
1.1.1	Certification audit _____	5
2	DESCRIPTION OF FOREST MANAGEMENT _____	5
2.1	GENERAL DESCRIPTION. _____	5
2.2	DESCRIPTION OF THE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM. _____	5
2.3	SUMMARY OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN _____	6
2.4	AREAS OUTSIDE THE CERTIFICATION PURPOSE _____	8
2.4.1	Certification AUDIT _____	8
3	BENCHMARK _____	8
3.1	BENCHMARK FOR CARRYING OUT THE AUDITS _____	8
3.1.1	Certification audit _____	8
3.2	PROCESS FOR MAKING THE OWNERS STANDARDS ADEQUATE LOCALLY _____	9
3.2.1	Certification audit _____	9
4	AUDIT PROCESS _____	9
4.1	GENERAL DESCRIPTION _____	9
4.1.1	Pre-audit _____	9
4.1.2	Certification audit _____	11
4.2	CONSULTATION OF THE STAKEHOLDERS _____	14
4.2.1	Certification audit _____	14
5	OBSERVATIONS _____	15
5.1	STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES. _____	15
5.1.1	Strengths _____	15
5.1.2	WEAKNESSES _____	15
5.2	PERFORMANCES OF THE CERTIFIED AREAS _____	15
5.3	NON-CONFORMITIES SIGNALLLED BY THE STAKEHOLDERS _____	18
5.4	LIST OF CLASSIFIED OBSERVATIONS _____	20
5.4.1	Pre-audit _____	20
5.4.2	Certification audit _____	20
5.5	LIST OF THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS PROPOSED BY THE CUSTOMER _____	22
5.5.1	Pre-audit _____	22
5.5.2	Certification audit _____	23
6	DECISION REGARDING THE CERTIFICATION _____	24
6.1.1	Certification audit _____	24

1 PURPOSE OF THE CERTIFICATION

1.1.1 Certification audit

Type of audit demanded: only FM joint FM and CoC

The purpose of the certification is: confirmed modified

And is expressed as follows: “*Forest management for mainly conservation-naturalistic aims, of ha 16.350,197, 14.897,992 of which SLIMF (slow or low intensity, managed forests), situated in the Lombardy Region, in the provinces of Bergamo, Brescia, Como, Lecco, Mantua, Sondrio*”.

2 DESCRIPTION OF FOREST MANAGEMENT

2.1 General description.

The forests of Lombardy are the forest patrimony of the Lombardy Region, as defined pursuant to R.L. no. 31/08, its management being entrusted to ERSAF pursuant to R.L. 3/02 other than to the cited regional law.

The regional forest patrimony comes mainly from the historical State Property Forest, handled until 1974 (and, partly, till 1978) by the former State Firm of the State Property Forests, subsequently by the Region through the Forest Departmental Inspectorates of the State Forest Corps and, to end with (1980), by the former Regional Forests Firm, which, in 2002, entered the Regional Body for Services to Farming and Forests, which is the current Managing Body.

In so far as not envisioned in the legislation in force, neither civic uses nor customary usage rights - being these areas State property - are present.

Tourist-commercial activities are present inside the forest areas subject to certification, managed by third parties (private people, associations), following authorisation from, or contractual agreement with, ERSAF. The State property forest consists of 20 complexes to be found in the provinces of Brescia, Mantua, Bergamo, Lecco, Como and Sondrio.

The Direction is represented by the executive of the Department of Services to the Rural Land and the Forests.

2.2 Description of the management system.

The management system is based on individual arrangement plans defined for every area included in the field of application. With reference to the provision of regional law no. 31 of 2008 whereby forest properties can be handled depending on the arrangement plans, even in their simplified version, the intent of the Organisation has been to integrate forest planning of forest properties of the Lombardy Region granted as concessions through the completion of the existing planning means, by drawing up, on a corporate basis, a Simplified Forest Arrangement Plan. Such Simplified Forest Arrangement Plan (PAFS) involves the whole regional patrimony and provides a unitary character to the whole management of forests in Lombardy, by implementing and integrating with the provisions and regulations of the existing plans.

The function of said plan is threefold:

- arrangement plan for the purposes of forest planning, such as is defined in regional law no. 31/2008;
- measures for the conservation of the SIC and ZPS areas of *Nature Net 2000* ;

- Management plan for the purposes of forest management certification.

The validity period of the plan is 15 years and concerns the period 2009-2023.

In the ambit of said period, the existing arrangement plans maintain their specific validity, provided that they do not conflict with the provisions of the current PAFS (as decided for from time to time), until their natural end is attained.

From this moment the PAFS shall take on value - under every respect - also for that land, right up to the expiry date of year 2023.

2.3 Summary of the management plan.

The objectives of the management – coherent with the choice and the taking on of a kind of forest management based on the multi-functionality of the forests, are hereinafter listed:

- The determination and development of the functions linked to the expression of services having a public character, especially the tourist-recreational one;
- The management of the forest resources according to a model oriented to increasing the worth of the natural dynamics, and the extension of the autochthonous climatic⁷ forests;
- The conservation and increase of biodiversity in its various aspects- genetic, specific and pertaining to the ecosystems or to the landscape;
- The protection and handling of the water resources, especially as far as their founts are concerned;
- The setting up of model forests;
- The increase in the worth of forests viewed as a place of memory, of history, culture, tradition, of man's activities;
- The improvement of the structure and of the composition of the woods, while seconding their evolutionary dynamics and abiding by the management/handling criteria envisioned in naturalistic silviculture;
- The safeguard and sometimes the recovery of the humid areas, by preventing possible impacts, and, in special situations, by adopting finalised handling contrivances;
- The handling, in a finalised way, special, not very extensive, sites and/or habitats, for the purpose of promoting relevant species (above all faunal ones);

The main forest types to be found within the forest patrimony, subject to certification are:

- Larches – typical stone pine wood
- Alder wood formed by green alder trees
- Mountain beech wood
- High-mountain beech wood

The forest management carried out by the Organisation and based on naturalistic forestry, promotes the multi-functional value of forests and contemplates, especially, 6 functions, among which, the most representative appears to be the environmental-naturalistic one (41%). The plan envisions the implementation of multifarious cultural models, chosen in accordance with the features of the interested area (open area, semi-open area, woodland), and with the function (production, protection, environmental and naturalistic, or pertaining to the landscape, to the tourist-recreational element, or didactic-experimental ones) that has been chosen to concentrate on.

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM
ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334**

Updating of 12/1/2010

Table: “ Rationale for annual harvest rate ”

Forest	Overall forest surface	MP forest surface production	% MP surface on total forests	Felling envisioned in the MP of production in the validity period of the PAFS (15 years) (mc)			Average increase (or Ic) referred to the 15 year period (mc)	Withdrawal rate of the average incr (or Ic) referred to the 15 year period	SLIMF	SLIMF: Yearly withdrawal threshold not to be exceeded (= 20% Im or Ic (YEARLY))
				to be achieved (obligatory)	observations (optional)	Total				
Mount Generoso	225,693	187,047	83%	4.570	280	4.850	10.650	46%	NO	/
Resegone	433,974	263,155	61%	2.070	1.050	3.120	4.395	71%	NO	/
Scalve Valley	567,855	398,654	70%	1.920	180	2.100	10.950	19%	YES	146
Anfo Caffaro	687,397	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%	1.200	300
Alpe Vaia	250,434	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%	300	0
Corni Canzo	414,28	155,308	37%	2.700	1.600	4.300	13.290	32%	1.050	200
Gardesana	9.599,05	1410,651	15%	1.640	6.810	8.450	66.232,5	13%	3.255	7.050
Legnoli	319,549	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%	0	1.685
Lesina Valley	605,171	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%	1.770	0
Valsolda	207,198	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0%	286	410
Gerla Valley	393,758	112,068	28%	1.940	1.785	3.725	9.682,5	38%	2.050	326
Grigna Valley	1662,332	53,68	32%	4.250	750	5.000	25,650	19%	200	1.200
Masino Valley	715,115	54,889	8%	500	800	1.300	6.847,5	19%	0	550

WOODY COMMERCIAL SPECIES

No.	botanic name	commercial name	estimate of maximum sustainable yearly felling volume (m3)	maximum yearly volume of permitted felling (approx.) (m3)	Maximum yearly Volume of projected felling (m3)	Volume of felling attained (current) (m3)
	All species		1306	1306	1306	780 (1)

Since there is no chain custody, the calculations of the felled masses per species are not kept separate.

(1) Average in years 2004-2008

2.4 Areas not included in the purpose of certification.

2.4.1 Certification audit

The most relevant area not included in the purpose of the certification is the one concerning the poplar wood to be found on the Isola (=island) Boschina (1,497 ha), set up as a collection field and created in agreement with the Poplar Culture Institute, Casale Monferrato. For various reasons, said poplar wood has never undergone a specific experimentation protocol. Once the shift is finished, since this is farming land, it shall be used for other, hitherto undefined ends. Considering that it is quite near the Villa, it is highly likely to be destined to didactic-recreational activities, and linked to the landscape as well.

Special controls in said area are not deemed necessary since the Organisation, not being interested in the sale of FSC certified products, as proven by the kind of certificate demanded, is not subject to risks of certified and non-certified products being mixed up.

Moreover, the forest areas taken over in these last few years, have not been included since the aims for which they were taken over appear to be clearly distinguishable from those of the “historic” forest property, and, anyhow, only marginally interesting from a managerial/handling viewpoint, since they are destined to being concretely and operationally available to the bodies that manage the protected areas that prompted the take-over action.

3 BENCHMARK

3.1 Benchmark for carrying out the audits.

3.1.1 Certification audit

The benchmarks used for the audit (for instance, adapted to specific countries, national standards, credited with FSC), standards for group certification) are available on the ICILA website www.icila.org including the related updating level.

- ICILA - <CKL02> standard: ICILA check list– Adaptation to the Alpine arc Rev: 02
- Moreover, since the woods are mostly small or handled/managed at a low intensity, the documents have been applied.

3.2 Process of local adaptation of the owners' standards.

3.2.1 Certification audit

The ICILA verification Group used the ICILA checklist, adapted for the Alpine arc, already used beforehand for other forest management assessments. Though the implementation of a process of local adaptation of the generic ICILA standard was not necessary, the decision was taken all the same to send said checklist to all the informed stakeholders, with a view to perfecting such document.

- Date of dispatch to the stakeholders: 26/10/2009 (1st dispatch)
- List of the stakeholders: provided in the table titled "Stakeholder identification"

N.B.: No comments have been received

4 AUDIT PROCESS

4.1 General description.

4.1.1 Pre-audit

AUDIT PLAN of the 1st DAY: 5/11/2009 Location: ICILA offices (MB)

Timetable	Area / Function to be checked	Process / Requirement	Auditor
9 a.m. - 12:30	Documentary analysis	Documentation of the ERSAF system	Zugno(A), Pentimalli (AT)
1:30 – 6 p.m.	////////////////////////////////////	////////////////////////////////////	////////////////////////////////////

AUDIT PLAN of the 2nd DAY: 9/11/2009 Location: ERSAF headquarters (MI)

Timetable	Area / Function to be checked	Process / Requirement	Auditor
9 - 9:30 a.m.	Initial meeting	C 4.2 and C 1.1	Bicocco (ET), Pentimalli (AT)
9:30 a.m.- 12:30	Analysis of the aspects concerning workers' health and security, system of contracts	////////////////////////////////////	////////////////////////////////////
1:30 – 4:30 p.m.	////////////////////////////////////	////////////////////////////////////	////////////////////////////////////
4:30 – 5 p.m.	Closure meeting		////////////////////////////////////

AUDIT PLAN of the 3rd DAY: 10/11/2009 Location: ICILA offices (MB)

Timetable	Area / Function to be checked	Process / Requirement	Auditor
1:30 – 4 p.m.	Analysis of the comments/observations	FSC-STD 20-006	Amariei (LA),

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM
ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334**

Updating of 12/1/2010

	received by the interested parties. Evaluation of the strategy to be used in order to carry out the consultation in the most appropriate manner.		Pentimalli (AT)
4 – 6 p.m.	Availability for consultation of stakeholders		////////////////////

AUDIT PLAN of the 4th DAY: 11/11/2009 Location: ERSAF headquarters (MI)

Timetable	Area / Function to be checked	Process / Requirement	Auditor
9:00 - 9:30 a.m.	Initial meeting	---	Amariei (LA), Pentimalli (AT)
9:30 – 10 a.m.	Short presentation of ERSAF		////////////////////
10 a.m. - 12:30	Documentary check of the ERSAF system	Documentation of the ERSAF system	////////////////////
1:30 – 4 p.m.	Documentary verification of the ERSAF system and discussion on the aspects relevant for the pre-audit, among which the approach to sampling and the applicable legislation.	////////////////////	////////////////////
4 – 5 p.m.	Meeting of the GDA, classification of comments/observations, drawing up of the pre-assessment report 1 day	////////////////////	////////////////////

AUDIT PLAN of the 5th DAY: 12/11/2009 Location: ERSAF headquarters (MI)

Timetable	Area / Function to be checked	Process / Requirement	Auditor
9- 9:15 a.m.	Initial meeting	---	Amariei (LA), Pentimalli (AT)
9:15 - 10:30 a.m.	Discussion on the relevant aspects: forest management plans of the single management units	Forest management plans, system documentation	////////////////////
10:30 - 11:30 a.m.	Discussion on the relevant aspects: social and environmental impacts of forest management,	Impact studies, registrations/recordings	////////////////////
11:30 a.m. - 12:30	Discussion on the relevant aspects: woods having a high conservation value	Documentation on forest management, forest maps	////////////////////
1:30 - 2:30 p.m.	Discussion on the relevant aspects: rapport / report and communication with the interested parties	System documentation; registrations	////////////////////
2:30 – 4 p.m.	Meeting of the GDA, classification of the observations, drawing up of the pre-assessment report	---	////////////////////
4 – 5 p.m.	Final meeting, presentation of the results of	---	////////////////////

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM
ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334**

Updating of 12/1/2010

	pre-assessment, agreement on the actions to carry out		
--	---	--	--

4.1.2 Certification audit

AUDIT PLAN of the 1st DAY: 25/11/2009

1st Group: LA – Amariei; ET - Bicocco; AT – Pentimalli
Forest areas handled/managed directly by the MORBEGNO OFFICE

Timetable	Area / Function to be checked	Requirement	HEADQUARTERS	Auditor
8:30 – 8:45 a.m.	Initial meeting		Morbegno office (SO)	Amariei, Bicocco, Pentimalli
8:45 – 9:30 a.m.	Analysis of the state of enforcement of the corrective actions (ref. NC pre-audit) Confirmation of the audit plan, including the final definition of the forest areas to be checked after having been sampled	CKL ICILA v2 (applicable parts) arrangement plan	Morbegno office (SO)	////////////////////
10:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.	Selection of the sites to be checked c/o the sampled forest area and verification in the forest	CKL ICILA v2 - P1; P2; P5; P6; P9	Masino Valley Forest (SO)	Amariei
10:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.	Verification c/o a forest site	CKL ICILA v2 - P1; P2; P4	////////////////////	Bicocco, Pentimalli
3:15 – 5 p.m.	Verification of the applicable requirements, with reference to the decentred office	CKL ICILA v2 (with reference to the sole decentred structure): P5; P6; P7; P8; P9	Morbegno office (SO)	Amariei
3:15 – 5 p.m.	Verification of the applicable requirements, with reference to the decentred office	CKL ICILA v2 (with reference to the sole decentred structure): P1; P2; P4 arrangement plan	////////////////////	Bicocco, Pentimalli
5:00 – 6 p.m.	Consultation of the local stakeholders	CKL ICILA v2 P1; P2; P4; P5; P6; P7; P8; P9	Morbegno office (SO)	Amariei, Bicocco, Pentimalli
6– 6:30 p.m.	Analysis and definition of the detected/checked observations Presentation of observations to the person in charge of the decentred office (for		Morbegno office (SO)	////////////////////

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM
ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334**

Updating of 12/1/2010

	acceptance) Confirmation of the audit plan for the subsequent days and confirmation of the forest areas to be checked after having been sampled			
--	--	--	--	--

**2nd Group: A – Zugno
Forest areas handled / managed by the BIGARELLO OFFICE**

Timetable	Area / Function to be checked	Requirement	LOCATION / HEADQUARTERS	Auditor
8:30 – 8:45 a.m.	Initial meeting		Bigarello office (MN)	Zugno
9:30 a.m. – 1 p.m.	Selection of the sites to be checked c/o the sampled forest area, and verification in the forest	CKL ICILA v2 - P1; P2; P4; P5; P6; P9	Forest of Isola Boschina (MN)	////////////////////
3 – 5:30 p.m.	Verification of the applicable requirements, with reference to the decentred office	CKL ICILA v2 (with reference to the sole decentred structure): P1; P2; P4; P5; P6; P7; P8; P9 arrangement plan	Bigarello office (MN)	////////////////////
5:30 – 6 p.m.	Analysis and definition of the observations detected /checked Presentation of the observations to the person in charge of the decentred office (for acceptance)		////////////////////	////////////////////

AUDIT PLAN of the 2nd DAY: 26/11/2009

**1st Group: LA – Amariei; AT – Pentimalli
Forest areas handled / managed by the LECCO OFFICE**

Timetable	Area / Function to be checked	Requirement	LOCATION / HEAD-QUARTERS	Auditor
8:30 – 8:45 a.m.	Initial meeting		Lecco office	Amariei, Pentimalli
9:15 a.m.– 1 p.m.	Selection of the sites to be checked c/o the sampled forest area and verification in the forest	CKL ICILA v2 - P4; P5, P6; P9,	Corni di Canzo. (LC)	////////////////////

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM
ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334**

Updating of 12/1/2010

3 – 6 p.m.	////////////////////////////////////	CKL ICILA v2 - P4;P5; P6; P9;	Resegone (LC)	////////////////////////////////////
------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------	--------------------------------------

2nd Group: A – Zugno
Forest areas handled / managed by the GARGNANO OFFICE

Timetable	Area / Function to be checked	Requirement	LOCATION / HEAD-QUARTERS	Auditor
8:30 – 8:45 a.m.	Initial meeting		Gargnano office (BS)	Zugno
9:30 a.m. – 12:30	Selection of the sites to be checked c/o the sampled forest area and verification in the forest	CKL ICILA v2 – P1; P2; P4; P5; P6; P9	Gardesana Occ. Forest (BS)	////////////////////////////////////
2 – 5 p.m.	Verification of the applicable requirements, with reference to the decentred office	CKL ICILA v2 (with reference to the sole decentred structure): P1; P2; P4; P5; P6; P7; P8; P9 Arrangement plan	Gargnano office (BS)	////////////////////////////////////
5 – 5:30 p.m.	Analysis and definition of the observations detected Presentation of the observations to the person in charge of the decentred office (for acceptance)		Gargnano office (BS)	////////////////////////////////////

AUDIT PLAN of the 3rd DAY: 27/11/2009

1st Group: LA – Amariei; AT – Pentimalli
LECCO OFFICE AND MILAN HEADQUARTERS

Timetable	Area / Function to be checked	Requirement	LOCATION / HEADQUARTERS	Auditor
9 – 11 a.m.	Verification of the applicable requirements, with reference to the decentred office	CKL ICILA v2 (with reference to the sole decentred structure): P1; P2; P4; P5; P6; P7; P8; P9 arrangement plan	Lecco office	Amariei, Pentimalli
11 a.m.– 12	Time available to describe the anomalies, and beginning of the		////////////////////////////////////	////////////////////////////////////

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM
ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334**

Updating of 12/1/2010

	drawing up of the report			
2 – 5 p.m.	Analysis and classification of the observations detected and drawing up of the report		ERSAF headquarters-Milan	Amariei, Zugno, Pentimalli
5 – 6 p.m.	Presentation of the non-conformities to the ERSAF direction (for acceptance)		////////////////////	////////////////////

**2nd Group: A – Zugno;
Forest areas handled / managed by the CURNO OFFICE**

Timetable	Area / Function to be checked	Requirement	LOCATION / HEAD-QUARTERS	Auditor
8:30 – 8:45 a.m.	Initial meeting		Curno office	Zugno
8:45 – 9: 15 a.m.	Verification of the nursery at Curno	P9; P6; P10 FSC-ADV 30-102	Curno	////////////////////
10:30 a.m. – 1 pm.	Selection of the sites to be checked c/o the sampled forest area, and verification in the forest Indication of the observations detected to the person in charge of the decentred office (for information)	CKL ICILA v2 - P1; P2; P4; P5; P6; P9 arrangement plan	Azzaredo Casù forest (BG)	////////////////////

4.2 Stakeholder consultation.

4.2.1 Certification audit

Stakeholder name	Interviewed	Informed
High Garda Park	X	X
University of Padua	X	X
University of Tuscia	X	X
FederForeste	X	X
Commune of Val Masino	X	X
Mello Valley Reservation	X	X
Association of the Operators of the Masino Valley	X	X
Legambiente	X	X
“Montagna Viva Delebio” Consortium	X	X
Park of the Valtellina Orobie	X	X

Valtellina Morbegno Mountain Community	X	X
Commune of Morbegno	X	X
Commune of Rasura	X	X
Civic Natural History Museum of Morbegno	X	X

5 OBSERVATIONS

5.1 Strengths and weaknesses.

5.1.1 Strengths

- ref. Standard *Criterion 7.3*;

Very competent and motivated technical staff.

- ref. Standard *Criterion 4.4*;

Excellent relationship and communication with the land on an office level in various provinces, very good divulgation work

- ref. Standard *Criterion 7.1*;

Very well developed management system, thus fundamentally meeting the requirements of the benchmark

- ref. Standard *Criterion 6.2*;

Excellent management of environmental protection aspects (species, habitats).

5.1.2 Weaknesses

- ref. Standard *Criterion 5.1*;

Scant attention with reference to the economic features of forest management. The range of produce/products that come from the forest has got to be diversified, and the optimal utilisation of the produce / products that come from the forest can be improved.

- ref. Standard *Criterion 4.3*;

A few elements of the management system are heretofore not well known and carried out by the staff working on the spot. In particular, in the areas of health and security and of where the environmental impacts of forest management are mitigated.

5.2 Performances of the certified areas

Principle no. 1: Compliance with laws and with FSC principles.

“Forest management must abide by all applicable laws in force in the relevant country, as well as by the international treaties and accords underwritten by the country and all the principles and criteria as defined by the FSC”.

Summary judgment

Non-conforming Scantly conforming Substantially conforming Conforming

No evidence of non-conformity with this principle was detected, except for the failure to approve the forest arrangement plan, foreseen for December 2009. At present, said non conformity can be deemed closed considering the official approval of the plan on 16/12/2009. The norms and the relevant international treaties were adopted in Italy and accepted as domestic legislation. There is a political commitment to respect the FSC benchmark for the responsible management of forests, and no problems were detected with regard to the protection of the forest resources from illegal activities.

Principle no. 2: Rights and liability of ownership and use.

“Property rights and the long term right of use of both the land and forest resources must be clearly defined, documented and established from a legal viewpoint”.

Summary judgment

Non-conforming Scantly conforming Substantially conforming Conforming

The Organisation meets the principle by taking into account said aspects: no civic uses or customary rights regarding the use of forest resources are present. Access to forests is permitted to the local population and mushroom picking is subject to approval by the single communes. The property rights for the various management units are described in a clear fashion in legally valid acts. Since they do not possess civic use rights, the local communities do not have considerable influence in managing the resources, even though there is a process of consultation of the company with the interested parties; including local communities.

Principio n°3: Diritti della popolazione indigena. (NA in Italy)

“The legal and customary rights of the indigenous populations concerning the ownership, use and handling of their land, their territories and resources must be acknowledged and protected”.

Summary judgment

Non-conforming Scantly conforming Substantially conforming Conforming

A principle which is not valid in Italy, so it is not assessed.

Principle no. 4: Relations with the community and workers' rights.

“Forest management work must either maintain or improve the long-term economic and social welfare of both forest workers and local communities”.

Summary judgment

Non-conforming Scantly conforming Substantially conforming Conforming

Communication with the land, especially with the decentred office, is one of ERSAF's strengths. The organisation offers jobs locally; almost all the staff were hired locally. The training work meets the requirements of the benchmark/standard; and some collaborations have been started up with various external bodies, devoted to didactic and research activities. As for the health and security theme, some aspects have been detected where management does not wholly conform to the benchmark. Three secondary non-conformities regarding health and security and its enforcement/implementation by 'ERSAF's staff have been detected. Said non-conformities were submitted in section 7.6.1 of this report.

Principle no. 5: Benefits deriving from the forest.

“The forest management work must encourage the efficient use of the various forest products and services to ensure economic sustainability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits”.

Summary judgment

Non-conforming Scantly conforming Substantially conforming Conforming

The organisation had classified all the forest management units (UGF) as SLIMF. During the evaluation, the calculation base to define SLIMF forest areas was found not to meet the requirements of the FSC-STD-01-003 standard. To correct such aspect, after the verification a primary non-conformity was issued. From the revision of said calculations, it appeared that 4 UGF could not be deemed SLIMF. No other weaknesses have been detected with regard to the achievement of this principle. One of the few points where the organisation could improve its performance is the diversification of the products obtained from the areas with a productive vocation and more care/more attention for the economic aspects of forest management.

Principle no. 6: Environmental impact.

FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334

Updating of 12/1/2010

“Forest management must preserve biological diversity and the values, the water resources, the land and the fragile, unique ecosystems and landscapes associated thereto, and, in that way, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest”.

Summary judgment

Non-conforming Scantly conforming Substantially conforming Conforming

Since most of the UGF handled by the organisation features small woods or ones with low withdrawal intensities, the environmental impacts of forest management are, as a rule, scarcely relevant. The parcels handled for productive ends, do not display relevant impacts, or ones that may be deemed to exceed the norm. The company and its staff are aware of the environmental impacts, of the rare species, endangered or endemic and of their habitats. There are manifold protection zones of the species and of their habitats, identified as SIC and ZPS zones, as well as specific measures for their handling. Forest management manages to guarantee the recovery and strengthening of natural regeneration and succession in the forest ecosystems, just as genetic diversity and the natural cycles that influence forest productivity. The management system envisions guidelines and procedures for various aspects linked to the potentially negative impact of forest activities (protection of water resources, use of machines; equipment, directional abatement, etc.) No synthetic, chemical product is used in forest management. Conversion of forest areas over to other types of land use is not performed; neither GMOs nor exotic species are used, except for those included during the second half of the XX century, which get to be gradually substituted with formations featuring autochthonous species.

Principle no. 7: Management plan.

“A management plan that is suitable for the capacity and intensity of the work to be carried out must be drawn up, implemented and kept updated. In the plan, the long term objectives of the management and the means to achieve them must be clearly defined”.

Summary judgment

Non-conforming Scantly conforming Substantially conforming Conforming

All the forest areas (UGF), except for two, have their own forest plan. A simplified arrangement plan was prepared for the whole ERSAF forest area. At the end of the audit, said plan still had not been approved by the Lombardy Region. Today, faced with the evidence obtained, we can consider such plan as approved, and the related non-conformity closed. The arrangement plan describes the forest areas and resources, the silvicultural systems employed, the environmental limitations, and offers a justification for the collection of woody products in the areas identified as production areas. The plan meets the requirements of the certification benchmark / standard concerning the P7. Some forest maps are at the disposal of the staff for carrying out their duties, and the staff are trained to meet the requirements of their work, and of the FSC standard. The only non-conformity detected with reference to P7 concerns the public summary of the plan, which did not exist when the certification inspection took place, but which is currently available on the website of the Organisation.

Principle no. 8: Monitoring and assessment.

“Monitoring - appropriate in relation to the capacity and intensity of the work - must be carried out in order to evaluate the state of the forest, the yields of the forest productions, the custody chain, the management activities and their related social and environmental impacts”.

Summary judgment

Non-conforming Scantly conforming Substantially conforming Conforming

The organisation has a monitoring plan that meets the requirements of the certification standard. Some monitoring indicators have been detected as well as the methodology for their evaluation. Clear data exists on the growth and regeneration rates; flora and fauna composition, on the social and environmental impacts. At the end of the certification verification, the summaries of the results of the monitoring carried out by ERSAF were not yet public. This aspect was classified as a primary non-conformity which presently can be deemed closed, since it is adequately correct. Product traceability was not assessed, ERSAF did not demand custody chain certification.

Principle no. 9: Preservation of the high conservation value forests.

“The activities of the high conservation value forests must either maintain or improve the attributions which define said forests. The decisions concerning high value conservation forests must always be considered by adopting a precautionary approach”.

FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334

Updating of 12/1/2010

Summary judgment

Non-conforming Scantly conforming Substantially conforming Conforming

Considering that most of the forest extension handled by ERSAF is managed for protective ends, that the organisation had detected the high conservation values as defined by the FSC standard, also through consultation of the interested parties, it is deemed that ERSAF meets principle no. 9. Moreover, management measures of the high values present have been detected, which are considered adequate for the purposes of their preservation. High naturalistic value areas have been detected (including SIC and ZPS areas), high protective value areas (sources, roads, manufactures articles), and areas having a special meaning, or importance, to the community (old woods, seed trees, monumental trees, landscape and geological emergencies, etc.). The communication work developed by ERSAF emphasises the environmental and social values of the forests that it protects.

Principle no. 10: Plantations.

“Plantations must be planned and managed in accordance with principles and criteria 1-9, with principle 9 and the related criteria. Considering that plantations can furnish a set of social and economic benefits and contribute to meeting the worldwide demand for forest products, they should be complementary to the management of natural forests, reduce the pressure on them, and promote their recovery and preservation”.

Summary judgment

Non-conforming Scantly conforming Substantially conforming Conforming

This principle is not relevant to ERSAF's UGF; except for the Carpaneta; already certified in 2008, and not included in the sample assessed in November 2009. Since there are no open non-conformities, the Carpaneta shall be part of the purpose of ERSAF certification, and shall be assessed again during surveillance.

5.3 Non-conformities indicated by the stakeholders

Stakeholder name: University of Turin	STKs observations	<i>To your knowledge, are the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest preserved? How? If not, can you provide us with any supplementary indications?</i> Re: Mostly not, since the forest is left to itself.
	Second Source Evidences	The management plan was verified, and so was its execution in the areas selected in the sample verified on the spot.
	"Field Activity" Evidences	Sites verified on the spot demonstrate that the ecological functions of the forest ecosystems maintain themselves
	ICILA Interpretation	all stakeholder gives no further indication to their generic declaration: Anyhow, his/her observation was taken into account during the inspection. Further verifications shall be carried out during surveillance. It would be appropriate to receive indications that are more precise, in order to be able to verify their relevance on the spot
	Summary evaluation	Conformity

Stakeholder name: University of Turin	STKs Comment	<i>Do you find that the management activities of the areas featuring high conservation values (e.g.: ZPS and SIC) respect said values and are adequate for the purpose of their conservation? Do you believe that there are other forest areas, faunal and floral species to be especially protected?</i> Re: Not always, because also these ones require a type of management that is finalised to the site.
	Second Source Evidences	The process for the identification of high conservation value areas was verified/checked, and the measures- specific for the preservation of the detected values - [as well].
	"Field Activity"	The AVC sites were verified; where the proposed measures are

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM
ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334**

Updating of 12/1/2010

	Evidences	carried out.
	ICILA Interpretation	From the assessment of the verification group, no high conservation value appear to be threatened, or unprotected. It would be appropriate to know the details of what values or of what areas, the stakeholder observation refers to.
	Summary evaluation	Conformity

Stakeholder name: CIPRA		<i>Do you believe that the management activities of the areas featuring high conservation values (e.g.: ZPS and SIC) are respectful of said values and are adequate for the purpose of their preservation? Do you believe that there are other forest areas, faunal and floral species, deserving to be especially protected?</i>
	STKs Comment	Re:As for Trentino, I believe that the protection measures adopted in the ZPS and SIC areas are adequate. In the rest of Italy, nearly everywhere, the delay with which they are approved is deplorable, then the plans that concern these zones become management tools/instruments.
	Second Source Evidences	
	"Field / on-the-spot activity" evidences	
	ICILA Interpretation	It is not clear whether the observation /comment refers to the assessed area, managed by ERSAF. This aspect must be clarified and taken into account during surveillance. Anyhow, the certification standard demands that the high conservation values be protected, even if the management plans of the SIC and ZPS zones have not been approved yet.
	Summary evaluation	Conformity

Stakeholder name: CIPRA		<i>Do you think that the plantations reap economic, social and environmental benefits? (Applicable only in case of plantations)</i>
	STKs Comment	Re:I find that plantations bring about an impoverishment in forest soils and that they imply even widespread damage of an environmental character, extending to the landscape. Instead, they can also imply relevantly important economic and social benefits.
	Second Source Evidences	
	"Field / on-the-spot activity" evidences	
	ICILA Interpretation	relevant comment for ERSAF, but not for the assessment carried out in 2009. The sole plantation in the assessed area is the Carpaneta, already certified since 2008, and not taken into account for the sample of certification verification in November 2009. ICILA shall remain actively in touch with Luigi Casanova for the future surveillance inspections. This input can be relevant for the definition process of FSC's plantation policy, and less useful for a punctual verification on a certain plantation. In the consultation process to be carried out during surveillance, the stakeholders' input shall be demanded again, with factual reference also to the Carpaneta plantation.
	Summary evaluation	Conformity

5.4 List of classified observations

5.4.1 Pre-audit

No.	Id. FMU involved	Description of NC major	Motivation of classification (with ref. to the indicators)	Origin (Audit /Stakeholder)
4NCP	N.A.	<i>The simplified forest arrangement plan does not appear to be valid since it has not been approved yet. (see PAFS and information supplied by the managing body)</i>	7.1	Audit
5NCP	N.A.	<i>The final version of the PAFS does not appear to be available to the public since it has not been approved yet (see PAFS)</i>	7.4.1	Audit
6NCP	N.A.	<i>A summary report of the monitoring results according to the modalities proposed in the corporate procedures is not available to the public</i>	8.5.1	Audit

The 3 NCPs detected in the pre-audit stage were proposed again in the certification audit stage.

No.	Id. FMU involved	Description of NC minor	Motivation of classification (with ref. to the indicators)	Origin (Audit /Stakeholder)
1NCS	N.A.	<i>The Organisation does not appear to have a list of the main international agreements and accords relevant for forest management. (see list of domestic and international norms to be found in the intranet management system)</i>	1.3.1	Audit
2NCS	N.A.	<i>Evaluation of social impacts is carried out by means of the process for elaborating forest contracts. Such contracts are not envisioned for all the management units. (see the available forest contracts and assessments of social impacts)</i>	4.4.1	Audit
3NCS	N.A.	<i>Detailed information on the collection /picking of non-woody products is not available (see PAF and discussion with the managing body/authority)</i>	6.3.12	Audit

No.	Description of observation	Id. FMU involved	Origin (Audit/Stakeholder)
1 OSS	<i>It would be appropriate to state more precisely the choice of a few DPI (gloves and earphones/headphones) in accordance with risk level.</i>	central office	Audit
2 OSS	<i>It would be appropriate to ensure continuity in communication also when telephone coverage is not present</i>	central office	Audit
3 OSS	<i>It would be appropriate to develop a more detailed emergency procedure .</i>	central office	Audit
4 OSS	<i>The number that identifies the procedure was not repeated correctly in the text</i>	central office	Audit

5.4.2 Certification audit

No.	Id. FMU involved	Description of NC major	Motivation of classification (with ref. to the	Origin (Audit /Stakeholder)
-----	------------------	-------------------------	--	-----------------------------

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM
ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334**

Updating of 12/1/2010

			indicators)	
1NCP	All	<i>The simplified forest arrangement plan does not appear to be valid since it still has not been approved. (see PAFS and Regional Law no. 31/2008 which ordains its approval by the regional government [= Giunta Regionale])</i>	1.1.1	Audit
2NCP	All	<i>The final version of the PAFS does not appear to be available to the public since it still has not been approved (see PAFS)</i>	7.4.1	Audit
3NCP	All	<i>A summary report of the monitoring results in accordance with the modalities proposed by the corporate procedures is not yet available to the public</i>	8.5.1	Audit
4NCP	All	<i>The base for calculating the definition of UGFs as SLIMFs does not conform to the standard.</i>	8.5.1	Audit

At present, the 4 NCPs detected in the certification audit stage can - in the face of the evidence obtained - be deemed closed.

No.	Id. FMU involved	Description of NC minor	Motivation of classification (with ref. to the indicators)	Origin (Audit /Stakeholder)
1NCS	Masino Valley	<i>The practice of keeping some on-site equipment controlled (straps, first aid case) is non-conforming (a worker was not wearing gloves and shoes as provided by the company)</i>	4.2.1	Audit
2NCS	Masino Valley	<i>Workers are not acquainted with the emergency procedure concerning spills over the floor /onto the ground of combustibles or lubricants, and are not equipped for such an emergency.</i>	4.4.1	Audit
3NCS	Isola Boschina	<i>The house-building site existing for the restructuring/refurbishing of the edifice to be found at Isola Boschina does not appear to be properly enclosed within fences</i>	4.2.4	Audit

NCS no. 3 of the pre-audit report remains open since the corrective actions are still under way. NCSs 1 and 2 of the pre-audit report were closed since efficacious corrective actions had been carried out.

No.	Description of observation	Id. FMU involved	Origin (Audit/Stakeholder)
1 OSS	<i>It would be advisable to state more precisely the choice of a few DPI (gloves and headphones) in accordance with the risk level.</i>	central office	Audit
2 OSS	<i>It would be advisable to ensure communication continuity even if there is no telephone coverage</i>	central office	Audit
3 OSS	<i>It would be appropriate to develop a more detailed emergency procedure.</i>	central office	Audit
4 OSS	<i>The number identifying procedure no. 7 was not given correctly in the text</i>	central office	Audit
5 OSS	<i>The forest contracts, indicated as a part of ERSAF's strategy for communication with the land, were not finalised for all of the forest management units.</i>	central office	Audit
6 OSS	<i>Even if no serious industrial accidents have been detected, the management system should indicate the logistical-administrative facilitations for the forest workmen that endured industrial accidents and that have to take part in rehabilitation programs.</i>	central office	Audit
7 OSS	<i>The system documentation should specify much more clearly the selection modalities of the possible companies working on behalf of third parties, also based on compliance with security norms.</i>	central office	Audit

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM
ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334**

Updating of 12/1/2010

8 OSS	<i>The recordings of the informative and training meetings with workers should present the information provided on organisational developments and forest management in a clearer way, so as to guarantee them the opportunity of representing and protecting their own interests inside the organisation and of participating actively in the decision-making processes that interest them.</i>	central office	Audit
9 OSS	<i>We recommend presenting in a clearer manner the indicators used for the assessments of the social impacts and the results of such assessments.</i>	central office	Audit
10 OSS	<i>Should the productive features of the forest and the state of the local market allow for it, forest management should orient toward diversification of woody products and a line outlook/perspective, as well.</i>	central office	Audit
11 OSS	<i>The wood arranged at the facility should be transferred to the subsequent stage of processing in a short period of time in all cases.</i>	Corni di Canzo	Audit
12 OSS	<i>We recommend clarifying the matter of being able to pick mushrooms inside the territory of Isola Boschina, also with reference to point VI of the regional council's deliberation dated 06/03/85, no. 3/1966</i>	Isola Boschina	Audit
13 OSS	<i>We recommend keeping evidence of the communication of a possibly cautious approach - to be had during activities in the forest, and deriving from the assessment of environmental impacts - to the staff that carry out the activities.</i>	central office	Audit
14 OSS	<i>We recommend assessing the stability of monumental poplar no. 1 (M1)</i>	Isola Boschina	Audit
15 OSS	<i>We recommend improving the assessment of the overall social-economic contribution brought about by ERSAF's activities</i>	central office	Audit
16 OSS	<i>We recommend (in the meeting envisioned for January/February 2010) to inform workers about the ends / purposes of FSC certification, principles and criteria.</i>	central office	Audit
17 OSS	<i>We recommend updating the protocol granting the DPI with the activity consisting in seed collection at heights, for the staff of the peripheral offices</i>	central office	Audit
18 OSS	<i>For years to come we recommend bringing consultation of interested parties from a provincial level down to a local level (single forests)</i>	central office; local offices	Audit
19 OSS	<i>We recommend the punctual filling in of the registers envisioned in procedure 7 on monitoring</i>	central office; local offices	Audit
20 OSS	<i>We recommend improving the identification of the facility used as a phytosanitary deposit, and improving the efforts to limit potential losses</i>	Gardesana Occ.	Audit
21 OSS	<i>We recommend carrying out an assessment of the existing products and that cannot be used to produce plants destined to certified forests and to inform workers thereof</i>	Gardesana Occ.	Audit
22 OSS	<i>Revise the risk assessment document by better specifying the protection systems of the manual transplanting device/machine</i>	Gardesana Occ.	Audit

5.5 List of corrective actions proposed by the customer

5.5.1 Pre-audit

Id. NC	Classif. (major/minor)	Description of the accepted corrective action	Date of execution
NCP 4	Major	<i>Delay in the test inspection, initially planned for September 2009. Treatment: intense interlocution of the Direction with DGA</i>	22/12/2009
NCP 5	Major	<i>The PAFS, once approved by the GR, is public, it shall also be</i>	22/10/2009

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM
ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334**

Updating of 12/1/2010

		<i>included / posted on the ERSAF website</i>	
NCP 6	Major	<i>In so far as being approved by the board of directors, the report is de facto public and was sent to the communes. Treatment: publication on the ERSAF website of the 2007 report (the guarantors' assessment has already been published), whereas the 2008 report shall be published after check and assessment by the guarantors</i>	21/11/2009
NCS 1	Minor	<i>Actually, the relevant legislation appears to have already been introduced into the Italian legal system, whose norms are already ordered in a specific folder. Treatment: preparation of a suitable folder titled "environmental/forestry legislation" on the Intranet</i>	31/05/2010
NCS 2	Minor	<i>The LA has not fully understood the articulation of the instruments adopted for the assessment of the IS (Guarantors' Report, yearly employment plan, social balance sheet, FdV, "Eco della stampa" [= "The Press Echo"], meetings with the trade unions, etc.). The re-reading of the documentation is deemed necessary</i>	30/11/2009
NCS 3	Minor	<i>The collection / picking of non-woody products appears to be governed by regional law no. 31/08 and 10/08, yet there is no detailed information as to withdrawals on a local or regional scale. In the next revision of enclosure 3, care shall be taken in providing the assessments carried out in the 2010 season, by integrating [the same] with the information concerning tourist-recreational fruition. Such latter information, though existing, has not been provided because the criterion explicitly mentions "products", not "services".</i>	30/09/2010

5.5.2 Certification audit

Id. NC	Classif. (major/minor)	Description of accepted corrective action	Date of execution
NCP 1	Major	<i>Delay in the test inspection, initially planned for September 2009. Treatment: intense talks of the Direction with DGA</i>	16/12/2009
NCP 2	Major	<i>Once approved by the regional government, the PASF is public, it shall also be published on the ERSAF website</i>	16/12/2009
NCP 3	Major	<i>Version 2008 of the guarantors' report has already been posted on the ERSAF website</i>	11/12/2009
NCP 4	Major	<i>Revisiting of the lists based on the technical document by ICILA</i>	14/12/2009
NCS 1	Minor	<i>Specific instructions to the surveillance-chiefs and to foremen and subject-matter of information in the training and updating courses on workers' security</i>	28/02/2010
NCS 2	Minor	<i>Specific instructions to the surveillance chiefs and to foremen and subject-matter of information in the training and updating courses on workers' security</i>	15/03/2010
NCS 3	Minor	<i>The fence was put back into place at once. Since the provisions concerning the modalities of site management are already contained in the special tender and in the security plan, adequate surveillance activity must be envisioned by the staff, as well as its appropriate training in the face of obligation protection</i>	11/12/2009
Id. NC	Classif. (major/minor)	Evidence of closure	Status of the non-conformity
NCP 1	Major	<i>Approval of the PAFS through deliberation no. 10822-09 of the regional government, dated 15-12-2009.</i>	Closed

**FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDIT REPORT – FSC FM
ICILA-FM CERT. CODE -000334**

Updating of 12/1/2010

NCP 2	Major	<i>Publication of the PAFS on the Organisation's website</i>	Closed
NCP 3	Major	<i>Publication of the monitoring results on the Organisation's website.</i>	Closed
NCP 4	Major	<i>Reclassification of the UGF based on the new calculation criteria.</i>	Closed

6 DECISION REGARDING CERTIFICATION

6.1.1 Certification audit

The certificate holder has demonstrated, following the correction of the identified non-conformities, that the described management system was consistently implemented throughout the whole forest area covered by the certificate purpose.