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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle in annual surveillance evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; annual evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; annual evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; annual evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; annual evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other (expansion of scope, Major CAR audit, special audit, etc.):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:

Duratex Florestal Ltda. – Duratex or FME

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual evaluations to ascertain ongoing conformance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the FSC Certificate Database [http://info.fsc.org/](http://info.fsc.org/).

Pursuant to FSC and SCS guidelines, annual / surveillance evaluations are not intended to comprehensively examine the full scope of the certified forest operations, as the cost of a full-scope evaluation would be prohibitive and it is not mandated by FSC evaluation protocols. Rather, annual evaluations are comprised of three main components:

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or Corrective Action Requests (CARs; see discussion in section 4.0 for those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual evaluation);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to this evaluation; and
- As necessary given the breadth of coverage associated with the first two components, an additional focus on selected topics or issues, the selection of which is not known to the certificate holder prior to the evaluation.

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database [http://info.fsc.org/](http://info.fsc.org/) no less than 90 days after completion of the on-site evaluation. Section B contains more detailed results and information for required FSC record-keeping or the use by the FME.
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SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Evaluation Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditor name:</th>
<th>Naiara Teodoro Zamin</th>
<th>Auditor role:</th>
<th>Leader Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications:</td>
<td>Ms. Zamin graduated with degrees in forestry (B.F.) and forest management (M.F.) from the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR). She has participated in research projects in the UFPR’s Dendrology Lab focused on the evaluation of stand structure and dynamics of mixed broadleaf forest fragments on Campus III (2009), and monthly growth and production studies (diameter and height) of Araucaria and Pinus species (2009-12). She has been a lead chain of custody auditor in FSC since 2011. She has been a lead forest management auditor in FSC since 2013 and in Cerflor since 2014. She completed a tropical forest management course at the National Institute of Amazon Research (INPA) in 2019. Recent trainings include lead auditor in ISO 14001 (environmental management) and ISO 9001 (quality management). She has research experience in forest resources and engineering, with emphasis on forest management. Currently, she is the Supervisor of the Forest Management Certification Program at Sysflor, representative of SCS in Brazil.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditor name:</th>
<th>Rosinês Luciana da Motta</th>
<th>Auditor role:</th>
<th>Team member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications:</td>
<td>Rosinês Luciana da Motta is a Biologist who was graduated at Paulista State University in São José do Rio Preto (1989-1992). Moreover, Ms. Motta holds a master and doctor degree in biological sciences, namely zoology, at Paulista State University in Botucatu. Ms. Motta was a university professor (1998 -2011) where she developed researches about community and ecosystems ecology. She has published several essays in national and international magazines and congresses. Ms. Motta has attended master and doctor degree graduation workbench and provided courses and trainings about several ecological essays for the conclusion of course. She has actuated as higher education pedagogical director (2007-2010) and as director of the Environmental Center (area for release and sorting facility and rehabilitation of wild animals), from 2006 to 2010. Ms. Motta was a scholarship holder from RHAE-CNPq (Research Program) from 2011 to 2013 to restructure eucalyptus the pest and disease monitoring program from the enterprise called Equilíbrio Proteção Ambiental. Ms. Motta has actuated in the forest protection segment since 2011 and she was Equilíbrio Proteção Ambiental operational coordinator and provided guidance about forest protection. In addition, she is the author of several guidebooks for identification of the main pests, illnesses, leaf-cutting ants and weeds that may occur in eucalyptus culture in Brazil. Ms. Motta is partner of the enterprise Hotspot Ambiental which provides environmental-related services for forestry enterprises. Attended the ISO 9001 course (Quality Management System) and has worked in FSC Certification with SCS/Sysflor since 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditor name:</th>
<th>Maurício Canestraro Nadolny</th>
<th>Auditor role:</th>
<th>Team member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications:</td>
<td>Forest Engineer graduate with a Master's degree in forest management from UFPR and an MBA from Fundação Getúlio Vargas. 24 years' experience in the Brazilian forest sector, acting in different activities, with solid knowledge of the business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
environment. He worked in national and multinational companies in the areas of geoprocessing, forest planting and management, forest inventory, forest planning, forestry operations - forestry and harvesting, wood supply and certification. He has served as Forestry and Harvesting Supervisor in Pisa Forestry, Timber Supply and Planting Deployment Manager at Norske Skog Pisa (2000-2007) and Forest Supply Manager at Berneck (2007-2017). He was coordinator of the implementation of the FSC Berneck Forest Stewardship and Chain of Custody Certification (2010 to 2017). He is currently a forest consultant for companies in the sector.

**Auditor name:** Alexandre Di Ciero  
**Auditor role:** Observer  
**Qualifications:** Agronomist, graduate of the Faculty of Agronomy and Zootechnics Manoel Gonçalves - Espírito Santo do Pinhal, SP, with an MBA in Business Management from the Federal University of Espírito Santo and Project Management from FGV. Thirty years of experience in the forestry sector, with the last 12 years as head of sustainability of a pulp and paper company, responsible for managing the social and environmental portfolio, forest licensing, greenhouse gas management, and certifications (FSC, CERFLOR, ISOs 9001, 14001, OHSAS 18001). Strong performance in FSC certification issues, having held the position of Vice President of FSC Brazil and participated in 3 FSC General Meetings: Malaysia, Spain and Canada.

**Auditor name:** Vilmar Picinatto Filho  
**Auditor role:** Observer  
**Qualifications:** PhD student in Forest Engineering from the Federal University of Paraná. Masters in Forestry Engineering from Santa Catarina State University (2014) and graduate of Forest Engineering from Santa Catarina State University (2011). Professor at the State University of Santa Catarina of the Wildlife Management and Wilderness Management disciplines from 03/2012 to 12/2015. Has experience with wildlife and environments, acting on the following subjects: wildlife management, environmental management, and Conservation Units.

### 1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:</td>
<td><strong>05</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:</td>
<td><strong>03 (02 observers)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Number of days spent by any technical experts (in addition to amount in line A):</td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and follow-up:</td>
<td><strong>01</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Total number of person days used in evaluation:</td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3 Standards Used

All standards used are available on the websites of FSC International ([www.fsc.org](http://www.fsc.org)) or SCS Global Services ([www.SCSglobalServices.com](http://www.SCSglobalServices.com)). All standards are available on request from SCS Global Services via the comment form on our website. When no national standard exists for the country/region, SCS Interim Standards are developed by modifying SCS’s Generic Interim Standard to reflect forest management in the region and by incorporating relevant components of any Draft Regional/National Standard and comments from stakeholders. More than one month prior to the start of the field evaluation, SCS Draft Interim Standards are provided to stakeholders identified by FSC International, SCS, forest managers under evaluation, and the FSC National or Regional Office for comment. SCS’s COC indicators for FMEs are based on the most current versions of the FSC Chain of Custody Standard, FSC Standard for Group Entities in Forest Management Groups (FSC-STD-30-005), and FSC Accreditation Requirements.
Standards applicable

**NOTE:** Please include the full standard name and Version number and check all that apply.

- ☒ Forest Stewardship Standard(s), including version: FSC-STD-BRA-01-2014 v1-1
- ☒ FSC Trademark Standard (FSC-STD-50-001 V2-0)
- ☒ SCS COC indicators for FMEs, V7-0
- ☐ FSC standard for group entities in forest management groups (FSC-STD-30-005), V1-1
- ☒ Other: FSC-DER-30-V1-0 Deltamethrin Brazil 290216; FSC-DER-30-V1-0 Fipronil Brazil 290216; FSC-DER-30-V1-0 Sulfluramid Brazil 290216 and guidance memo on Motion 65 on IFL – ADVICE-20-007-018 V1-0.

## 2. Certification Evaluation Process

### 2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: 13/05/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FMU / location / sites visited</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities / notes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FME office, Agudos, SP, Taquari, RS and Estrela do Sul, MG (Video-conference).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Meeting: Introductions, client update, review scope of evaluation, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards, confidentiality and public summary, conformance evaluation methods, emergency and security procedures for evaluation team, final site selection. Verification of actions taken to close non-conformities opened in the previous audit; Verification of documents and records; Interview with workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field inspection: Fazenda Nossa Senhora Aparecida, Fazenda Ramos and farm of a sponsored producer (outside of the scope), São Jerônimo, RS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection of planting and harvesting operations; Interview with workers and service providers; Verification of occupational health &amp; safety conditions on job sites; Inspection of living areas; Verification of conditions of native conservation areas (APP and RL); Verification of conditions of roads and firebreaks; Verification of maps vs. terrestrial truth; Interview with interested/ affected parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field inspection - Fazenda Monte Carmelo, Nova Ponte, MG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection of input storage area, where the following was done: - Verification of signs used for warning, signaling, and obligatory use of PPE; - Verification of chemical product list and their respective MSDS; - Building and storage conditions (separation of incompatible products, alternation of flammable and non-flammable solids and liquids); - Stored product records: stock and control of additions and deductions; - Interview with worker in charge; Inspection in forestry activities - mechanized application of herbicide and manual and mechanized application of formicide; - Verification of occupational health &amp; safety conditions on job sites;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Verification of occupational health & safety conditions in worker transport;
- Interview with workers;
- Inspection of HCV area;
- Inspection in apiary installation area in partnership with beekeepers;
- Verification of maps vs. terrestrial truth;
- Verification of Environmental Recovery Areas - Natural Regeneration.

**Date:** 14/05/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FMU / location / sites visited</th>
<th>Activities / notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FME office, Taquari, RS.</td>
<td>Verification of FME and service provider documents; Interview with FME workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental coordinator of the Agricultural Secretary of Taquari, RS.</td>
<td>Public consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field inspection: Fazenda Nova Ponte, Uberaba, MG.</td>
<td>Inspection of harvesting operations; Interview with workers; Verification of occupational health &amp; safety conditions on job sites; Verification of environmental safeguards; Verification of general development of forest stands; Verification of conditions of native conservation areas (APP and RL); Verification of conditions of roads and firebreaks; Verification of maps vs. terrestrial truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field inspection: Fazenda Santana, Uberaba, MG.</td>
<td>Verification of general development of forest stands Verification of conditions of native conservation areas (APP and RL); Verification of conditions of roads and firebreaks; Verification of maps vs. terrestrial truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal School of Afonsina Maria de Jesus, Prata, MG.</td>
<td>Public consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field inspection: Fazenda São Judas Tadeu Anhembi, SP.</td>
<td>Inspection of module II harvesting conducted by buyer of standing timber; Inspection of Skidder and Harvester operations; Verification of occupational health &amp; safety conditions on job sites; Verification of conditions of roads and firebreaks; Interview with workers; Verification of general development of forest stands; Verification of conditions of native conservation areas (APP and RL); Verification of maps vs. terrestrial truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field inspection: Fazenda São Bernardino, Botucatu, SP.</td>
<td>Verification of planting operations; Verification of irrigation operations; Verification of conditions of roads and firebreaks; Verification of native conservation areas; Verification of worker transport bus; Verification of conditions and maintenance of machines; Verification of conditions of living areas and bathrooms; Verification of PPE use – proper use and conditions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fazenda Morro do Ouro, Botucatu, SP</td>
<td>Verification of cloning and planting recommendations in the field; Interview with workers; Verification of general development of forest stands; Verification of conditions of native conservation areas (APP and RL); Verification of maps vs. terrestrial truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fazenda Morro do Ouro, Botucatu, SP</td>
<td>Verification of mechanized application of formicide; Verification of operational conditions for tractor; Verification of regulations and dosages; Verification of PPE use – proper use and conditions; Verification of storage trailer; Verification of conditions of living area; Verification of packaging of empty formicide containers; Interview with workers; Verification of general development of forest stands; Verification of conditions of native conservation areas (APP and RL); Verification of maps vs. terrestrial truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field inspection: Fazenda Cascata, Itatinga, SP</td>
<td>Inspection of road maintenance operations conducted by service providers; Verification of road and drainage conditions; Verification of living areas; Verification of worker transport vehicle; Verification of conditions of machinery; Interview with workers; Verification of general development of forest stands; Verification of conditions of native conservation areas (APP and RL); Verification of maps vs. terrestrial truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cercado II Community, Curral Velho, Buri, SP</td>
<td>Public consultation with community member; Interview with contracted timber transporter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bypass Highway Aparício Lopes, Buri, SP</td>
<td>Public consultation with community member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field inspection: Fazenda Bela Vista, Itapeva, SP</td>
<td>Inspection of mechanized fertilizer application; Interview with workers; Inspection of utility truck; Inspection of portable mechanics office; Verification of occupational health &amp; safety conditions on job sites; Verification of general development of forest stands; Verification of conditions of native conservation areas (APP and RL); Verification of conditions of roads and firebreaks; Verification of maps vs. terrestrial truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field inspection: Fazenda Santa Terezinha, Buri, SP</td>
<td>Inspection of mechanized harvesting; Interview with workers; Verification of occupational health &amp; safety conditions on job sites; Verification of general development of forest stands; Verification of conditions of native conservation areas (APP and RL); Verification of conditions of roads and firebreaks; Verification of maps vs. terrestrial truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field inspection: Fazenda Cambará, Itapetininga, SP.</td>
<td>Inspection of farm evaluated for inclusion in the scope of certification; Interview with workers; Verification of general development of forest stands; Verification of conditions of native conservation areas (APP and RL); Verification of conditions of roads and firebreaks; Verification of maps vs. terrestrial truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong> 15/05/2019</td>
<td><strong>Activities / notes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FMU / location / sites visited</strong></td>
<td><strong>Field inspection:</strong> Fazenda Monte Alegre Agudos, SP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FME office, Agudos, SP.</td>
<td>Verification and analysis of documents and records; Interview with workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FME office, Uberaba, MG.</td>
<td>Verification and analysis of documents and records; Interview with workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of Environment, Uberaba, MG.</td>
<td>Public consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field inspection: Fazenda Monte Alegre Agudos, SP.</td>
<td>Inspection in mechanized herbicide application operations; Chemical depot inspection; Packaging depot inspection; Verification of internal timber transport activity - Off-Road A30; Verification of PPE issues - use and conditions; Verification of machinery conditions; Verification of operation with harvester; Verification of the operation with Feller; Verification of road and drainage conservation issues; Verification of the environmental education project - Espaço Arvorar; Verification of Class I Waste Depot; Verification of general development of forest stands; Verification of conditions of native conservation areas (APP and RL); Verification of maps vs. terrestrial truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field inspection:</strong> Fazenda Palmital, Paulistânia, SP.</td>
<td>Inspection of ant control, fertilization with mechanized herbicide application, road maintenance, and loading and transportation activities; Interview with workers; Inspection of the worker transport vehicle; Inspection of temporary formicide storage sites; Verification of occupational health &amp; safety conditions on job sites; Verification of general development of forest stands; Verification of conditions of native conservation areas (APP and RL); Verification of conditions of roads and firebreaks; Verification of maps vs. terrestrial truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong> 16/05/2019</td>
<td><strong>Activities / notes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FMU / location / sites visited</strong></td>
<td><strong>Field inspection:</strong> Visit to the Monte Alegre farm surveillance tower, block 881;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CETESB, Bauru, SP.</td>
<td>Public consultation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fazenda Monte Alegre, Agudos, SP | Interview with workers.
FME office, Agudos, SP | Verification and analysis of documents and records; Interview with workers; HCVA documentation verification; Verification of environmental and social data monitoring documents.

Date: 17/05/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FMU / location / sites visited</th>
<th>Activities / notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FME office, Agudos, SP</td>
<td>Verification and analysis of documents and records; Interview with workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FME office, Agudos, SP</td>
<td>Closing Meeting Preparation: Auditor(s) consolidate notes, deliberate, and confirm evaluation findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FME office, Agudos, SP</td>
<td>Closing Meeting: Review preliminary findings (potential non-conformities and observations) and discuss next steps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess an FME’s conformance to FSC standards and policies. Evaluation methods include reviewing documents and records, interviewing FME personnel and contractors, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observing implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and collecting and analyzing stakeholder input. When there is more than one team member, each member may review parts of the standards based on their background and expertise. On the final day of an evaluation, team members convene to deliberate the findings of the assessment jointly. This involves an analysis of all relevant field observations, interviews, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus among team members cannot be achieved due to lack of evidence, conflicting evidence or differences of interpretation of the standards, the team is instructed to report these in the certification decision section and/or in observations.

3. Changes in Management Practices

☒ There were no significant changes in the management and/or harvesting methods that affect the FME’s conformance to the FSC standards and policies.
☐ Significant changes occurred since the last evaluation that may affect the FME’s conformance to FSC standards and policies (describe):

4. Results of Evaluation

4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations

Major CARs: Major nonconformances, either alone or in combination with nonconformances of all other applicable indicators, result (or are likely to result) in a fundamental failure to achieve the objectives of the relevant FSC Criterion given the uniqueness and fragility of each forest resource. These are corrective actions that must be resolved or closed out before a certificate can be awarded. If Major CARs arise after an operation is certified, the
timeframe for correcting these nonconformances is typically shorter than for Minor CARs. Certification is contingent on the certified FME’s response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

**Minor CARs:** These are corrective action requests in response to minor nonconformances, which are typically limited in scale or can be characterized as an unusual lapse in the system. Most Minor CARs are the result of nonconformance at the indicator-level. Corrective actions must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the certificate.

**Observations:** These are subject areas where the evaluation team concludes that there is conformance, but either future nonconformance may result due to inaction or the FME could achieve exemplary status through further refinement. Action on observations is voluntary and does not affect the maintenance of the certificate. However, observations can become CARs if performance with respect to the indicator(s) triggering the observation falls into nonconformance.

### 4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No findings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Minor CAR (1.5.2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Minor CAR (1.5.1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>OBS (3.3.1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Major CAR (4.4.3, 4.4.4 and 4.4.8); Minor CARs (4.2.3; 4.2.14; 4.4.2); OBS (4.2.5; 4.4.1; 4.4.6; 4.4.7; 4.5.1)</td>
<td>Major CAR (4.4.2); Minor CAR (4.2.11); OBS (4.2.9; 4.2.12; 4.2.14)</td>
<td>OBS (4.2.8; 4.2.14)</td>
<td>Minor CARs (4.2.14; 4.4.3 and 4.4.4); OBS (4.4.3)</td>
<td>Minor CAR (4.4.6); OBS (4.2.8; 4.4.2; 4.4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>OBS (5.3.2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>Minor CARs (6.1.1; 6.1.5; 6.6.2); OBS (6.6.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Minor CAR (6.3.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Minor CAR (6.3.3); OBS (6.2.1; 6.7.3; 6.10.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>Minor CARs (7.1.2.a; 7.1.2.e; 7.1.5; 7.2.4; 7.4.1)</td>
<td>Major CAR (7.4.1); Minor CAR (7.1.2); OBS (7.4.3)</td>
<td>OBS (7.1.2.a)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>Major CAR (8.1.1, 8.1.2 and 8.1.3); Minor CARs (8.2.2; 8.2.6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Minor CAR (8.2.2; 8.2.7)</td>
<td>Major CAR (8.2.7); OBS (8.2.2; 8.5.1, 8.5.2 e 8.5.3)</td>
<td>OBS (8.2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Major CAR (9.1.1; 9.1.2; 9.1.3 and 9.1.4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Minor CAR (9.1.3)</td>
<td>Minor CAR (9.4.1); OBS (9.1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC for FM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding Number: 2018-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select one:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</strong> (when more than one FMU):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deadline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FSC Indicator:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Conformity** *(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):*

The Health and Safety Programs of the FME and service provider were evaluated (PPRA, PCMSO, LTCAT, Service Order), where the following irregular points were verified:

- There is a lack of the document LTCAT - Technical Report on the Environmental Conditions of Work, in some companies that provide services. Such document is required by labor law and is required in the company's internal procedure, called "EL-030".
- There is a lack of Service Order of Service Provider Companies in Units SP and MG;
- The FME has a Generic Service Order that is issued at the moment of integration, for the employees of outsourced companies, at the Taquari unit. This Service Order does not include the job description, nor the environmental risks of the position, as required by NR 01 and as determined in the procedure "EL-030", item "1. Documentation of the Service Provider(s)", p. 5, Annex 03 - Documentation for Provision of Service.

**Corrective Action Request** *(or Observation):*

The FME shall correct deviations in the health, safety and environmental management system of workers.

**FME response** *(including any evidence submitted)*

The occupational safety department conducted a survey of service provider documentation to verify the regularity of the companies. In cases where deviations were identified, service providers were contacted for regularization. In addition, considering that LTCAT is a document of social security legislation, EL-030 has been revised to make the submission of LTCAT mandatory only in cases where PPRA (Environmental Risk Prevention Program - Regulatory Standard NR-09) and PGSSMATR (Rural Health Safety, Health and Environment Management Program - Regulatory Standard NR-31) does not include the constituent elements provided for in Normative Instruction INSS 77 (such as: conclusive, elaborated by occupational
With respect to the LTCAT document, the FME carried out an assessment of the harmful agents of service providers and verified whether the PPRA presented by them was conclusive in order to exclude the need for LTCAT (as permitted by IN 77). After this analysis, the FME requested that the service providers of Minas Gerais and São Paulo present the document.

Regarding the LTCAT of the Rio Grande do Sul service providers, as the companies are smaller, the FME chose to complete a collective LTCAT, which contains the data of the harmful noise agent of each function under which this risk falls, as well as the ART. LTCAT, issued May 13, 1919. According to the FME, collective LTCAT is provided for in IN 77 in its Article 262.

Regarding the deviation pointed out in the service order, the FME makes its argument based on item 1.7 b) of the MTE Regulatory Standard NR 1, which allows the service order to be informed in different ways:

1.7. It is up to the employer:

b) prepare work orders on occupational safety and health, informing employees by announcements, posters or electronic means. (101.002-6/I1) (Amended by Ordinance SIT 84/2009).

Thus, the FME argues that health and safety standards are communicated to service providers employees through various ways that replace the need for an individual Work Order, as follows:

- integration of own employees and service providers;
- Hazard and risk assessment (LPR) available on work fronts, describing control measures to be taken.
- 9 safety rules to be followed by workers;
- Company Policy and Security “Carterinha”.

Even so, it was evidenced that in MG and SP the FME has established OS by function and is extending this action to the RS unit, with completion scheduled for July 2019, according to the schedule presented.

It was evidenced in the Taquari Unit the use of the Duraseg system: MSST 02: Revision 03, 07/08/2017. Manual of OSH contractors Forestry Taquari.

This document is provided to service providers and describes the safety guidelines to follow.
Receipts were verified for “Term of Science and Responsibility, from the Occupational Safety Manual Contracted Companies Forestry Taquari MSS-T-02 by service providers:
- Harvest service providers, in Taquari, RS, August 11, 2017, signed by the managing partner;
- Silviculture service providers, in Butiá, RS, August 15, 2017, signed by the managing partner;
- Forestry service providers, in Taquari, RS, March 2, 2018, signed by the owner partner;
- Soil and Land Preparation service providers in Charqueadas, RS, August 10, 2017, signed by the managing partner.

**Status of CAR:**
- [X] Closed
- [ ] Upgraded to Major
- [ ] Other decision (refer to description above)

### Finding Number: 2018-02

**Select one:**
- [ ] Major CAR
- [ ] Minor CAR
- [X] Observation

**FMU CAR/OBS issued to:** (when more than one FMU):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Pre-condition to certification/recertification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 months from Issuance of Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>Observation – response is optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other deadline (specify):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FSC Indicator:**
- 4.4.3

**Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):**

In audit, it was identified that the company, demonstrates knowledge regarding the labor reform, occurred on 11/11/2017. In the analysis carried out by the FME, 39 actions of impact of the reform were identified for the company, classifying them as high, medium and low importance for the business. In progress, there is the discussion regarding the hours *in itinere* and the Time of Preparation for the effective beginning of the working day. Regarding the hours *in itinere*, there was concern about the impact on the remuneration structure of employees, identifying the need for adjustments in relation to isonomy. The FME proved to have informed its employees of the decision to extend the payment of these hours until the end of June 2018, as negotiated with the Union. However, to date, the proposal of labor relations and HR has not been defined legally to incorporate/replace the amount currently paid as *in itinere* hours.

**Corrective Action Request (or Observation):**

The organization should evaluate the socioeconomic impacts of the labor reform on workers.

**FME response (including any evidence submitted):**

Duratex has developed a study, which is currently being finalized, to evaluate the substitution of *in itinere* hourly payment for alternatives that seek to mitigate the socioeconomic impact on workers. Upon completion of the study and decision-making by senior management, the proposal will be negotiated with the unions and changes will be disclosed to workers. Until the conclusion of this process, the payment of hours *in itinere* has been provisionally maintained for all entitled workers, as provided for in a collective agreement, negotiated with the unions and approved by the workers.
It was observed that the company is conducting a study to replace the compensation of hours *in itinere* for workers. Thus, it was defined by the maintenance of the temporary payment of employees' itineraries, until the evaluation of the possible remuneration alternatives in substitution to the itineraries hours is concluded. Wages were presented (February, March and April 2019), evidencing the continuity of the payment of in-hours by the company and in the field interviews this information was confirmed with the workers.

The company included in the collective agreements, signed with unions in January 2019, the provision for the change in the form of remuneration of hours *in itinere* (about 20% salary) from March 2019, establishing that until this period would be provisionally maintained the payment of hours *in itinere*. It was established in the collective bargaining agreements that: “Due to the recent changes introduced in the Consolidation of Labor Laws by Law 13.467/2017, the parties agree that it will be provisionally maintained, until March 2019, to workers who travel daily in public transportation provided by the Company. Company, from home to work, and vice versa, one hour per day “*in itinere*”, with an increase of 50% (fifty percent) over the normal hour value, regardless of the actual time spent by the employee on the move”. Also, an agreement was established that “Expired the term referred to in the caput of this clause, the parties will re-establish the negotiation to define the continuity of the hours *in itinere*, its incorporation to the salary or even the alteration or extinction of this clause.”. With this, the company is concluding a study that proposes that this payment be replaced by a form of payment via meritocracy (e.g., monthly awards or variable compensation), and in this new model this amount can reach up to 50% of salary, depending on productivity and employee performance data from 70 to 120% compared to the target set by activity.

Currently, it has been found that the company is discussing the system of taxation of this new form of payment and is awaiting a return of the legal to continue its evaluation of proposal for replacement of hours *in itinere*. After the legal return the project must be renegotiated with the union (May/June) and from July the new compensation would take effect. Therefore, considering that the action plan is expected to be completed in July 2019 and that the company is taking actions in a preventive manner, this OBS was kept open (see OBS 2019-03).

**Status of CAR:**

- [ ] Closed
- [x] Upgraded to Major
- [ ] Other decision (refer to description above)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding Number: 2018-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select one:</strong> □ Major CAR  □ Minor CAR  X Minor CAR  □ Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deadline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Pre-condition to certification/recertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Observation – response is optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other deadline (specify):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FSC Indicator:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):**
Since 2015, the FME has been adopting an impact identification and evaluation methodology, where it uses its operational micro-planning as a tool, aiming at a local assessment and stakeholder involvement in the process.

During the audit, in the analysis of the documentation, it was observed that, although micro-planning indicates the concentration of communities, this does not evidence the impacts of the operations and does not direct actions to prevent and/or mitigate impacts on such communities. The matrix of social impacts, used as a reference for the realization of micro-planning and for the evaluation of social impacts, as determined by PROC-059, is generic and was elaborated in 2015 (not updated). Regional/local impacts are not listed in this matrix. Ex: impacts identified in the micro-plans.

In addition, the interview form, presented at the audit, has no date, which makes it impossible to conclude at what stage of the operation was applied with the interested parties. In public consultation with the communities, significant impacts (e.g., dust, night noise, high speed of trucks and vehicles) were reported that were not identified in the company's impact assessment system.

**Corrective Action Request (or Observation):**
The Organization shall conduct an assessment of socio-economic impacts, identifying the impacts associated with forest management activities through a participatory process involving stakeholders. The evaluation shall be commensurate with the scale and intensity of the operations, according to the requirements of the FSC P&C.

The Organization shall update the social impacts matrix to also contemplate the regional/local impacts identified in the micro-planning of farms' activities.

**FME response (including any evidence submitted)**
The micro-planning development system was changed and the social impacts with potential occurrence in the operating area were identified in one of the maps made available to operators, as well as the appropriate measures for mitigation. Impacts identified in community dialogues are recorded and used as a basis for defining mitigation actions, as well as for indication on maps that are made available to managers, with assessment of quarterly reported highlights. Mapped records allow viewing of impacts on a regional scale at the desired level of detail. The monitoring technicians were advised to indicate the dates on which they were performed, passing quarterly alignment meetings on the applicability of the tools and other questions about their attributions. An application was implemented for data collection via mobile phone application, obligatorily recording information such as date and place where it was performed. Dialogue with neighbors has been intensified to ensure greater coverage of areas subject to the impacts of operations, and their information is inserted into internal controls and reported to stakeholders.

**SCS review**
The company demonstrated that it has set up a monitoring team, where there is a technician (social and environmental monitor) in each region that participates in
microplanning, regarding social issues, and also conducts dialogue with the community before the start of operation, when the social impacts are evaluated. Also, the system of inclusion of mitigating measures of impacts on the microplanning of operations has been changed, so that it currently shows what are the impacts of operations and actions to prevent and/or mitigate impacts on such communities. The microplanning of Fazendas Rondinha, Angatuba 2, Santa Terezinha and Palmital was verified and the actions to be taken to minimize the identified social impacts are detailed as verified therein. In inspection of the Santa Terezinha farm, it was found that a harvest was carried out in stands neighboring the Matão Community and microplanning describes measures to be taken to minimize noise, such as operating in the stands near the houses only during the day shift, etc. In the field, it was evidenced that these measures were implemented by the operators.

It was also verified that the company currently records the dialogue held in the communities through an application and that the records have information regarding the date, time, farm and geographical coordinates of the locality where the interviewee resides. Currently, the dialogue is done before operations and at the end of operations, as well as during the activities there are dialogues. The goal is to cover 100% of harvest impacts.

The information obtained in the dialogues, regarding the identified social impacts, is consolidated in an online platform (Sharepoint), through which it is possible to analyze the impacts regionally (i.e., by municipality or farm). It was verified the record of the impacts identified by the company in the municipality of Buri, where it was verified the traffic as most cited/significant impacts in the levitation carried out by the company. Also, the information management system allows the generation of impact assessment data by farm. It was verified for example from Santa Terezinha and Angatuba Farms 2.

Therefore, considering that this information management platform is dynamic and has the regionally identified impact information updated with each dialogue held in the communities, the company chose not to include regional impacts in the impact matrix.

The company also demonstrated that it has been conducting training with all social and environmental technicians through quarterly workshop routines, in order to standardize the collection of information in the field. The dialogues are conducted with the communities via mobile application, with the geoprocessing and time of the interviews. And there was also a process of intensifying the dialogues.

Thus, considering that there was a systematization of the impact identification process, allowing its regionalized analysis and that the microplanning of operations was adjusted to include the relevant information to mitigate the identified social impacts, the CAR is closed.

**Status of CAR:**

- [x] Closed
- [ ] Upgraded to Major
- [ ] Other decision (refer to description above)
**Finding Number:** 2018-04

**Select one:**  [ ] Major CAR  [ ] Minor CAR  [x] Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Pre-condition to certification/recertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] 3 months from Issuance of Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x] Observation – response is optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Other deadline (specify):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FSC Indicator:**  8.2.2

**Non-Conformity** *(or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):*
For the monitoring of environmental impacts of operations on natural remnants, soils and water resources, the FME structured a team of monitors that collects information and records the issues observed in a plan of action to subsequently give appropriate negotiations. During interviews with employees, it was verified that these questions are passed on to the supervisors of each operation. However, the records worksheet does not contemplate the dealings given and their respective deadlines for each of the identified issues, and it is not possible to verify the flow of each demand.

**Corrective Action Request** *(or Observation)*:
The FME should review the information contained in the action plan and assess the need to include in the spreadsheet the treatment given to the issues raised in the monitoring.

**FME response (including any evidence submitted):**
The incident record worksheet has been revised to include a new field, through which one can record what action has been taken. Additionally, the monitors also started to register the name (not just the role) of the person responsible for the action.

**SCS review**
It was verified in the occurrence records worksheet called “Environmental Monitoring System (SMA)” of the FME that a set of information (“Follow up”) was added in which it is possible to follow up the dealings made for each of the identified demands. The flow of information about each demand raised by the field monitor can be tracked by the following fields: What (what is the demand), Forwarded (yes/no), Who (responsible), What to do (mitigation measure), Timeframe, Status (open/closed) and date of last investigation. During inspection at Fazenda Nova Ponte/Block 608 during the harvest, it was verified that the roads were in good maintenance condition, with containment boxes and water outlets. In the impact spreadsheet there was an occurrence for road maintenance in the pre-harvest phase whose status was completed. Thus, considering that the systematization occurred and the flow of negotiations for each identified demand, the observation was closed.

**Status of CAR:**  [x] Closed

[ ] Upgraded to Major

[ ] Other decision (refer to description above)
### Finding Number: 2018-05

**Select one:** [X] Major CAR  [ ] Minor CAR  [ ] Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Pre-condition to certification/recertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X] 3 months from Issuance of Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Observation – response is optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other deadline (specify):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FSC Indicator:** 8.2.7

**Non-Conformity (or Background/Justification in the case of Observations):**

Failure to fully close NC 2017-03 in the Taquari-RS unit by the SP and MG units: “The FME monitors compliance with labor legislation and collective agreement monthly, but some items of the collective agreement are not controlled, such as the payment of life insurance (transportation contractor).”

Duratex Florestal’s Taquari unit reviewed the spreadsheet for monitoring of fixed service providers (forestry, harvesting, transportation, road maintenance and patrimonial surveillance), which included mandatory items contained in collective agreements for service providers ensure compliance with them. The FME evaluates quarterly the time cards, point sheets, total overtime, FGTS extracts, INSS, meal, life insurance, ergonomic report, ASO and Occupational Health and Safety Programs (e.g., PPRA, PCMSO and Service Order). However, this same NC was verified in the evaluation of the units of São Paulo and Minas Gerais, of which the Taquari Unit is now part. For company workers, the SP and MG units monitor, in the field, compliance with labor legislation through the tool "HR in the Forest", which is used to identify deviations and make the necessary corrections. However, it was verified that for service providers operating in MG and SP there is no standard in the field monitoring system of compliance with labor legislation. In document review incidents in the FGTS gatherings were identified of company providing services in the area of transportation. In consultation with the FME, it was found that, prior to the audit, the issue had already been identified and is being addressed by the company's ombudsman.

The FME does not have procedures to verify, in the field, compliance with labor legislation by service providers.

**Corrective Action Request (or Observation):**

The Organization shall have in place procedures and/or internal field monitoring systems to ensure compliance with labor laws and collective bargaining agreements applicable to service providers' employees.

**FME response (including any evidence submitted)**

The systematic evaluation of compliance with the requirements of collective agreements and agreements by service providers (i.e., contractors) was revised and centralized in the Human Resources (HR) Management Unit, unifying the treatment of all units, according to the characteristics of each business of the company. With the implementation of the new computerized third-party control system, collective agreements become documents that contractors must submit annually to Duratex, and service is monitored along with other labor obligations (e.g., monthly payment of pay slips, FGTS payment receipts, etc.). The agreements are reviewed by the HR Management Unit, which indicates which items in the checklist are applicable and should be evaluated during the quarterly verification. The Nucleus also monitors the delivery of monthly documentation of contractors’ employees working in Duratex areas through the system. In the field, the verification of conformity of labor issues related to work safety is done through inspections carried out by the safety technicians. Any deviations, when found, are communicated to contractors and the
contract manager at Duratex. In cases of serious deviations, the security technicians have the prerogative to suspend the operation or withdraw any worker from the job site. Employees of contractors may also use the Duratex Ombudsman channel to file complaints of irregularities. In relation to the contractors mentioned in the non-compliance, Duratex maintained the monitoring of the situation until its regularization.

**SCS review**

The company is implementing a computerized third-party management system, through which it registers the contractors and monitors the labor documentation periodically. This computerized system was implemented corporately throughout 2018 and is currently in the 5th Stage of implementation, as verified in the document "Implementation Level - DTX". Through this system it is possible to analyze if there are pending documents delivery, or even if irregularities in the documentation presented by the contractor were detected. The company presented an excel report extracted from the computerized system of two contractors, referring to monitoring from December 2018.

The company presented the "Checklist of verification of compliance with collective agreements and conventions", through which it monitors compliance with the requirements of agreements and collective agreements by contractors on a quarterly basis. This checklist is part of the documentation required in the computerized system, as reported by the FME. Every 3 months the system alerts the FME to the need to insert the checklist with the analysis of compliance with the collective agreements of the contractors. The checklists of two Transport Contractors, dated January 22, 2019, were presented, where it was verified the fulfillment of all the requirements of the collective agreement signed with the "TRADE UNION OF TRAVELERS IN TRANSPORTATION ROADS OF UBERABA AND REGIAO", valid for 01/05/2018 to 04/30/2019.

To monitor compliance with the labor legislation in the field, the company has included in the "CHECKLIST CONTRACTORS - EVALUATION" information related to this subject (e.g., check registration form, deviation of function, etc.). The checklists of three Loading and Transport contractors performed on 11/6/2018, 12/12/2018 and 12/27/2018 were presented. According to the registry present in the checklists, no labor deviations were identified in these field inspections. The company evaluates the performance of the contractors in field evaluations and generates monthly reports with % of service indicators. If deviations are identified in the field, there is a record of nonconformities and even blocking operations or employees, depending on the severity of the situation.

For the company mentioned in the NC with pending in the FGTS collections, the FME sent the proofs of salary payment of December 2018, as well as the emails and records of follow-up of the question by Duratex. As such, the CAR was closed.

**Status of CAR:**

- **X** Closed
- □ Upgraded to Major
- □ Other decision (refer to description above)
### Finding Number: 2018-06

**Select one:**
- [ ] Major CAR
- [ ] Minor CAR
- [x] Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deadline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Pre-condition to certification/recertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] 3 months from Issuance of Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x] 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Observation – response is optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Other deadline (specify):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FSC Indicator:**
- 8.5.1, 8.5.2 and 8.5.3

**Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):**
The results of the monitoring conducted by the FME are made available to the Public through the Public Summary of the Forest Management Plan and the Sustainability Report (2017). In the Public Summary, it was verified that social, environmental and economic indicators were presented that address different themes and the monitoring results of 2017. However, the information presented does not allow monitoring of monitoring results compared to previous years and, in most of the indicators presented in the public summary, the FME does not have the defined goals. This information, if enriched and better systematized, would enable a better understanding by the public of the results presented in the document.

**Corrective Action Request (or Observation):**
The Organization should review the environmental, social and economic monitoring results information available to the public in order to clarify and ensure understanding of the results.

**FME response (including any evidence submitted):**
For 2019, a new set of indicators was developed to monitor economic, environmental and social aspects. The 2018 results still follow the old model, but the 2019 compiled data will be published according to the new set of indicators.

**SCS review**
The Public Summary of the FMP (May 2019 version) was verified, where item 10 contains the monitoring results of the economic, environmental and social indicators of 2018, as well as a parallel with the established goal and whether or not it was achieved. The public summary was made available by email on 05/10/2019 and can be found on the company's website. In this document there are still some monitoring without targets indicated, as the results are substantiated in the monitoring performed in 2018. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the company revised the monitoring indicators for 2019 and presented the new system that is being implemented. Therefore, in addition to the adjustment already made in the 2018 RPPM, it was found that in the next edition of the public summary, the monitoring results will be aligned with the new established indicators and their respective goals.

**Status of CAR:**
- [x] Closed
- [ ] Upgraded to Major
- [ ] Other decision (refer to description above)
Finding Number: 2018-07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one:</th>
<th>Major CAR</th>
<th>Minor CAR</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FMU CAR/OBS issued to** (when more than one FMU):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Pre-condition to certification/recertification</th>
<th>3 months from Issuance of Final Report</th>
<th>12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</th>
<th>Observation – response is optional</th>
<th>Other deadline (specify):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FSC Indicator**: 9.1.3

**Non-Conformity (or Background/Justification in the case of Observations):**
For the new areas of the certification scope (Fazendas Barra Longa, SP and Canhambola, MG), the FME conducted a stakeholder consultation to identify areas of high conservation value. The consultations were conducted by means of electronic mail, dialogue wheel with the communities and interviews with the neighbors of the farms. Experts, researchers, NGOs, universities, forestry companies and others were consulted. As a result of the consultation, some considerations were received regarding the potential presence of HCVs related to the environmental aspects of the farms. However, it was verified that this information was not analyzed by the company. Thus, it is concluded that there is no complete evaluation after the consultation that allows identifying and/or de-characterizing the presence of HCVs in the new areas of the certification scope. The public comments received, which mention the existence of endemic, rare and endangered species, were answered by the FME, disqualifying them, without a technical background (primary and/or secondary data), that demonstrate the absence of a HCV.

**Corrective Action Request (or Observation):**
The FME shall make a full assessment for whether or not there are HCVs within the FMU, taking into account the technical evaluation of the comments received in the public consultations.

**FME response (including any evidence submitted)**
In 2019 there was a review of the HCV assessment procedure as well as the criteria for identification and sources of information. To ensure a proper assessment, farms that came into scope in 2018 (Barra Longa and Canhambola) were re-evaluated along with the area applying for certification in 2019 (Cambará) using the new procedure. The evaluation result did not indicate the presence of HCV in these areas.

**SCS review**
It was found that the FME carried out a review of the HCV assessment procedure, which aimed to provide greater technical basis to demonstrate the existence or not of HCV attributes applied to Barra Longa, Cambará and Canhambola Farms. The results were synthesized in the material available for Online consultation (“Online (supporting material) - Duratex - HCVAs 2019 Public consultation”) and in-person (“In-person (supporting material) - Duratex - HCV - Informative - Evaluation - 2019”). The Public consultation to identify and/or declassify the presence of HCV in these areas was conducted with experts, researchers, NGOs, universities and forestry companies via email (“Online Form - 2019 Duratex - Public High Conservation Value Areas”). Conservation (HCV) ”and neighbors of farms and communities through interviews (“HCV In-person Form - Questionnaire - 2019”. The FME received some comments in the online consultation (“ Online (replies) - 2019 Duratex - Public High Conservation Value Areas (HCV) consultation.”) The company responded to these comments including supplementary data such as assessment results and connectivity satellite images to technically justify the absence of HCV attributes.
### 4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

**Finding Number: 2019-01**

Select one:  □  Major CAR  □  Minor CAR  □  Observation

**FMU CAR/OBS issued to** (when more than one FMU):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Pre-condition to certification/recertification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 months from Issuance of Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation – response is optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other deadline (specify):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FSC Indicator: 4.2.8

**Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):**
The FME has a procedure for the development of beekeeping activity in its management areas carried out through partnerships with Beekeepers Associations, which provides for the installation of warning signs for placing bait boxes and apiaries in the field. However, when visiting the Monte Carmelo property, it was found that in the beekeeping area that the form of signage used does not guarantee safety for passers-by, transporters and machine operators because depending on the direction of travel there is no signage, which can be a risk to safety.

**Corrective Action Request (or Observation):**
The FME should review the security system for installing apiaries and bait boxes in their management areas to ensure the safety of passers-by, carriers and machine operators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCS review

**Status of CAR:**  □  Closed  □  Upgraded to Major  □  Other decision (refer to description above)

---

**Finding Number: 2019-02**

Select one:  □  Major CAR  □  Minor CAR  □  Observation

**FMU CAR/OBS issued to** (when more than one FMU):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Pre-condition to certification/recertification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 months from Issuance of Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation – response is optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other deadline (specify):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FSC Indicator: 4.4.2
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):
It was found that during the dialogue with the community that the company asks some questions regarding the occupation and number of residents, which help in the socioeconomic characterization of the affected parties. Additionally, field technicians include the general characteristics observed in the interviewed communities in the company’s social database system. However, this information is not standardized and does not allow one to conclude what are the socioeconomic characteristics of the affected communities.

Corrective Action Request (or Observation):
The FME should improve the mechanism for collecting and recording information from affected communities to conclude on their socioeconomic characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding Number: 2019-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):
OBS 2018-02 kept open: “In audit, it was identified that the company, demonstrates knowledge regarding the labor reform, occurred on 11/11/2017. In the analysis carried out by the FME, 39 actions of impact of the reform were identified for the company, classifying them as high, medium and low importance for the business. In progress, there is the discussion regarding the hours in itinere and the Time of Preparation for the effective beginning of the working day. Regarding the hours in itinere, there was concern about the impact on the remuneration structure of employees, identifying the need for adjustments in relation to isonomy. The FME proved to have informed its employees of the decision to extend the payment of these hours until the end of June 2018, as negotiated with the Union. However, to date, the proposal of labor relations and HR has not been defined legally to incorporate/replace the amount currently paid as in itinere hours.”
In 2019, it was observed that the company is conducting a study to replace the compensation of hours in itinere for workers.
Thus, it was defined by the maintenance of the temporary payment of employees’ itineraries, until the evaluation of the possible remuneration alternatives in substitution to the itineraries hours is concluded. Wages were presented (February, March and April 2019), evidencing the continuity of the payment of in-hours by the company and in the field interviews this information was confirmed with the workers.
The company included in the collective agreements, signed with unions in January 2019, the provision of respect for the change in the form of remuneration of hours in itinere (about 20% salary) from March 2019,
establishing that until this period would be provisionally maintained the payment of hours *in itinere*. It was established in the collective bargaining agreements that: “Due to the recent changes introduced in the Consolidation of Labor Laws by Law 13.467/2017, the parties agree that it will be provisionally maintained, until March 2019, to workers who travel daily in public transportation provided by the Company. Company, from home to work, and vice versa, one hour per day “*in itinere*”, with an increase of 50% (fifty percent) over the normal hour value, regardless of the actual time spent by the employee on the move”. Also, an agreement was established that “Expired the term referred to in the caput of this clause, the parties will re-establish the negotiation to define the continuity of the hours *in itinere*, its incorporation to the salary or even the alteration or extinction of this clause.”.

With this, the company is concluding a study that proposes that this payment be replaced by a form of payment via meritocracy (e.g., monthly awards or variable compensation), and in this new model this amount can reach up to 50% of salary, depending on productivity and employee performance data from 70 to 120% compared to the target set by activity.

Currently, it has been found that the company is discussing the system of taxation of this new form of payment and is awaiting a return of the legal to continue its evaluation of proposal for replacement of hours *in itinere*. After the legal return the project must be renegotiated with the union (May/June) and from July the new compensation would take effect.

Therefore, considering that the action plan is expected to be completed in July 2019 and that the company is taking actions in a preventive manner, this OBS was kept open.

**Corrective Action Request (or Observation):**
The organization should assess the socioeconomic impacts of labor reform on workers.

### FME response
(covering any evidence submitted)

### SCS review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of CAR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Upgraded to Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other decision (refer to description above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Finding Number: 2019-04**

**Select one: □ Major CAR □ Minor CAR □ Observation**

**FMU CAR/OBS issued to** (when more than one FMU):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Pre-condition to certification/recertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Observation – response is optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other deadline (specify):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FSC Indicator:** 4.4.6

**Non-Conformity (or Background/Justification in the case of Observations):**
It was verified that there is a spreadsheet with the registration of the demands received by the company called “DPI”, including data such as the commentator, date of comment, content of the comment and action proposed for the company to deal with. It was found that there is a complementary form, called “Action Plan for impact mitigation” that includes evidence of the actions taken and the commentator's signature, indicating being aware of the answer provided. However, it was found, according to the sampling
performed in the audit, that not all DPIs have a record of the actions taken by the company and the answers provided to the commentators.

**Corrective Action Request (or Observation):**
The FME shall document the consultations held and keep records of comments received, actions taken and responses provided to stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FSC Indicator:** 6.2.1

**Non-Conformity (or Background/Justification in the case of Observations):**
The FME conducts surveys of fauna and flora and has a list of endemic, rare, endangered or endangered species identified in the FMP. However, the identification of endangered species is not based on recent national and international lists, such as *Leopardus tigrinus* identified in the Vulnerable (VU) threat category in the FMP and currently classified in the endangered category (EN) (Red Book of Endangered Brazilian Fauna, v. II, 2018).

**Corrective Action Request (or Observation):**
The FME should maintain mechanisms for updating the list of endangered species occurring in its management areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCE review**

**Status of CAR:**

- Closed
- Upgraded to Major
- Other decision (refer to description above)
Finding Number: 2019-06

Select one: □ Major CAR  X Minor CAR  □ Observation

FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):

Deadline

☐ Pre-condition to certification/recertification
☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report
X 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)
☐ Observation – response is optional
☐ Other deadline (specify):

FSC Indicator: 6.3.3

Non-Conformity (or Background/Justification in the case of Observations):

It was verified at Monte Carmelo Farm (MG) that the FME is performing adjustments in APPs for recovery of the natural remnants. The procedure adopted by the FME, described in the FMP (p. 50), states that in the areas to be recovered, natural regeneration is initially observed for a period of at least five years before the decision to implement other recovery actions. However, the FME does not have assessments of natural remnant remnants older than five years that indicate their long-term viability or the need for management measures.

Corrective Action Request (or Observation):

The FME shall perform the analysis of the natural remnants in recovery, and based on the results obtained, adopt restoration measures in these remnants, aiming at their long-term viability.

FME response (including any evidence submitted)

SCS review

Status of CAR:

☐ Closed
☐ Upgraded to Major
☐ Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2019-07

Select one: □ Major CAR  □ Minor CAR  X Observation

FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):

Deadline

☐ Pre-condition to certification/recertification
☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report
☐ 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)
X Observation – response is optional
☐ Other deadline (specify):

FSC Indicator: 6.7.3

Non-Conformity (or Background/Justification in the case of Observations):

The FME has procedures for cases of oil spillage on the ground, which describes that, depending on the amount spilled, what are the forms of mitigation, such as spreading, containment or recovery (IT 001). The collection is performed only in quantities above 80 liters. The company presented a justification based on the number of occurrences and the possible spill quantities in relation to the total area (Hectares), justifying the low probable impact. However, the justification is based on the spread in total area (hectares) and not in a punctual and concentrated way, as spill usually occurs.
Corrective Action Request (or Observation):
The FME should re-evaluate its field oil spill procedure to define measures to minimize environmental impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCS review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of CAR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded to Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other decision (refer to description above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding Number: 2019-08

Select one: □ Major CAR □ Minor CAR □ Observation

FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-condition to certification/recertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months from Issuance of Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation – response is optional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other deadline (specify):

FSC Indicator: 6.10.2

Non-Conformity (or Background/Justification in the case of Observations):
The FME presented studies using LandSat 5 satellite images (spatial resolution of 30 meters), in which it was possible to verify that there was no conversion of forests to plantations or non-forest uses within the FMU after 1994 with direct or indirect involvement of the FME. However, the FME does not have a consolidation of all management area conversion information to show that the conversion percentage does not exceed 5% of the total FMU area.

Corrective Action Request (or Observation):
The FME should consolidate information from its conversion management areas in order to clearly demonstrate that the conversion percentage is less than 5% of the total FMU area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCS review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of CAR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded to Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other decision (refer to description above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FME should re-evaluate its field oil spill procedure to define measures to minimize environmental impacts.
### Finding Number: 2019-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one:</th>
<th>Major CAR</th>
<th>Minor CAR</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</strong> (when more than one FMU):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Pre-condition to certification/recertification</td>
<td>☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report</td>
<td>☐ 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td>
<td>☑ Observation – response is optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other deadline (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FSC Indicator:</strong></td>
<td>8.2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Conformity (or Background/Justification in the case of Observations):**
It was evidenced that the FME has been monitoring social impacts before, during and after the execution of operations, as provided for in the procedure. In inspection of Fazenda Santa Terezinha, it was found that there was a harvesting operation in a field near some homes and that there is a road of easement used by the Matão Community that passes through the property. In the interviews with the operators it was evidenced that the mitigating measures of the social impacts defined in the microplanning were employed. Nonetheless, monitoring with consultation with affected parties included only houses near the crop plot and did not cover the community that uses the road that passes through the property. In addition, harvesting impacts were not monitored during field activity in the vicinity of the community. As a result, it became clear that clearer mechanisms are lacking to ensure that monitoring enables the effectiveness of mitigation actions employed by the company to be assessed.

**Corrective Action Request (or Observation):**
The FME should establish clearer mechanisms for monitoring social impacts to ensure that results enable the effectiveness of the mitigation actions employed by the company to be assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCS review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status of CAR:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Upgraded to Major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other decision (refer to description above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Finding Number: 2019-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one:</th>
<th>Major CAR</th>
<th>Minor CAR</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FMU CAR/OBS issued to</strong> (when more than one FMU):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Pre-condition to certification/recertification</td>
<td>☐ 3 months from Issuance of Final Report</td>
<td>☐ 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td>
<td>☑ Observation – response is optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other deadline (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FSC Indicator:</strong></td>
<td>9.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Conformity (or Background/Justification in the case of Observations):**
The FME conducted an assessment of the presence of high conservation value attributes for the six HCV categories for the new area under scope (Cambará Farm), as determined by the operating procedure X X X X X
(CEDOC No. 48643). According to the study presented (Evaluation Report of High Conservation Value Areas), no High Conservation Value Attributes were identified in the Cambará farm. However, it was found that the report does not have a description of the sources of information and data that were used by the FME to technically conclude and support the presence or absence of areas of high conservation value, being necessary for the audit team to verify the documents for the report and consult with responsible staff to validate the findings of the organization.

**Corrective Action Request (or Observation):**
The FME should review the HCVA identification report so that it has sufficient and complete information to conclude and technically support the presence or absence of areas of high conservation value at Cambará Farm.

**FME response**
*(including any evidence submitted)*

**SCS review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of CAR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded to Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other decision (refer to description above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding Number: 2019-11

**Select one:**

- [ ] Major CAR
- [x] Minor CAR
- [ ] Observation

**FMU CAR/OBS issued to** (when more than one FMU):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Pre-condition to certification/recertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] 3 months from Issuance of Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x] 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Observation – response is optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Other deadline (specify):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FSC Indicator:**

9.4.1

**Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):**
The FME presented the Annual Monitoring Report of the HCVAs identified in the company's forest management areas (CEDOC_48.700). However, it was found that the monitoring performed are not defined based on the identified HCV attribute, and it is not possible to evaluate the effectiveness of management measures.

**Corrective Action Request (or Observation):**
The Organization shall define monitoring to assess the effectiveness of the measures employed to maintain or improve the attributes of identified HCVAs and/or reduce threats to these attributes.

**FME response**
*(including any evidence submitted)*

**SCS review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of CAR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded to Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other decision (refer to description above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Stakeholder Comments

In accordance with SCS protocols, consultation with key stakeholders is an integral component of the evaluation process. Stakeholder consultation takes place prior to, concurrent with, and following field evaluations. Distinct purposes of such consultation include:

- To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the FME’s management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the FME and the surrounding communities.
- To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying any high conservation value forests (HCVFs).

Stakeholder consultation activities are organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based on the three FSC chambers, as well as the SCS Interim Standard, if one was used.

5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from past evaluations, lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources. Stakeholder groups who are consulted as part of the evaluation include FME management and staff, consulting foresters, contractors, lease holders, adjacent property owners, local and regionally-based social interest and civic organizations, purchasers of logs harvested on FME forestlands, recreational user groups, tribal members and/or representatives, members of the FSC National Initiative, members of the regional FSC working group, FSC International, local and regionally-based environmental organizations and conservationists, and forest industry groups and organizations, as well as local, state, and federal regulatory agency personnel and other relevant groups.

5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses

The table below summarizes the major comments received from stakeholders and the assessment team’s response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Comment</th>
<th>SCS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is an expectation of general job generation. Part of the expectation is not met, but the affected parties understand that it is not just about the FME.</td>
<td>The company generates a total of 1489 direct and indirect jobs. The company's socio-economic aspects and impacts matrix lists job creation as a positive impact generated by the company's forest management. To open new opportunities, HR publishes vacancies on the company's website, periodically visits the municipalities where it uses sound car, warns union leaders and even churches in the region. Additionally, it was found that the company develops social projects aimed at generating jobs and local income, such as:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education and Social Inclusion Project: Since 2009, Duratex has participated in the Education and Social Inclusion project in partnership with SENAR (National Rural Learning Service), APAE (Association of Parents and Friends of the Exceptional), ADEFILP (Association of People with Disabilities, Paulista) and Lençóis Paulista City Hall. The initiative aims to develop training in the areas of seedling production and management for horticulture, eucalyptus management and other areas of the same nature. The planned activities are intended to educate about agricultural production chains and are aimed at people with special needs and other audiences evaluated by the Lençóis Paulista City Hall Social Service.

Formare Project: Held in partnership with the Iochpe Foundation of São Paulo and the Federal Technological University of Paraná (UTFPR), Formare contributes to the vocational training of young people at social risk by offering vocational technical courses. Its methodology is based on the company's employees acting as volunteer educators, following the content and guidelines provided by the Foundation. Young program participants are paid and integrated into the company's operating activities. There are currently active classes in the units of Uberaba and Agudos.

Affected parties generally realize that the FME preserves natural areas.

The company demonstrates environmental regularity in the performance of its operations and proactivity in presenting the necessary documents to the environmental agency.

It was found that the remnants of native vegetation are identified in the maps provided by Duratex. Of the total area of 208,338.47 ha described in the scope of certification, approximately 27% (55,461.48 ha) correspond to conservation areas (APPs and Legal Reserve). It was verified in the field and in the Forest Management Plan (p. 50) of the company that the management areas are in the Atlantic Forest, Cerrado and Pampa biomes. Duratex employs management actions to protect conservation areas as found in the FMP (p. 56-61). Additionally, it was verified at Monte Carmelo Farm (MG) that the FME is performing adjustments in APPs for the recovery of natural remnants. The procedure adopted by the FME described in the FMP (p. 50) states that in the areas to be recovered, natural regeneration is initially observed for a period of at least five years before the decision to implement other recovery actions.

6. Certification Decision

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship Council standards. The SCS annual evaluation team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual evaluations and the FME’s response to any open CARs.

Yes ☒ No ☐

Comments: Continued FME certification is recommended as no Major CARs have been identified. It is also recommended to include Fazenda Cambará in the scope of the certificate.
7. Annual Data Update

- ☐ No changes since previous evaluation.
- ☒ Information in the following sections has changed since previous evaluation.

| ☒ Name and Contact Information | ☒ Pesticide and Other Chemical Use |
| ☐ FSC Sales Information | ☐ Production Forests |
| ☐ Scope of Certificate | ☐ FSC Product Classification |
| ☐ Non-SLIMF FMUs | ☒ Conservation & High Conservation Value Areas |
| ☒ Social Information | ☒ Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification |

Name and Contact Information

| Organization name | Duratex Florestal Ltda. |
| Contact person | Lennon Franciel Neto |
| Address | Fazenda Monte Alegre 17.139-899, Agudos, Estado de São Paulo, Brasil. |
| Telephone | (14) 3262-8468 |
| Fax | - |
| e-mail | lennon.franciel@duratex.com.br |
| Website | www.duratex.com.br |

FSC Sales Information

- ☒ FSC Sales contact information same as above.

| FSC salesperson | |
| Address | Telephone |
| | Fax |
| | e-mail |
| | Website |

Scope of Certificate

| Certificate Type | ☒ Single FMU | ☐ Multiple FMU |
|☐ Group |

SLIMF (if applicable)

| ☐ Small SLIMF certificate | ☒ Low intensity SLIMF certificate |
| ☐ Group SLIMF certificate |

# Group Members (if applicable)

| N/A |

Number of FMUs in scope of certificate

| 1 |

Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)

| Latitude & Longitude: 22° 25' 49,4" S e 48° 53' 57,6 W – Unidade SP 19°18'47.76"S e 48° 1'17.33"W – Unidade MG |

| ☐ Boreal | ☐ Temperate |
| ☐ Subtropical | ☒ Tropical |

Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:

- Units: ☒ ha or ☐ ac
List of farms in the scope of certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Planted area</th>
<th>Conserv Area</th>
<th>Perm Preserv</th>
<th>Other areas (f)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>São Paulo</td>
<td>Agudos</td>
<td>América</td>
<td>362.98</td>
<td>50.44</td>
<td>35.73</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>466.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baronesa</td>
<td>243.52</td>
<td>56.13</td>
<td>48.81</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>363.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bela Vista 2</td>
<td>97.19</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>113.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boa Vista</td>
<td>323.72</td>
<td>55.55</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>34.22</td>
<td>441.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>312.18</td>
<td>50.75</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>21.77</td>
<td>410.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cristina</td>
<td>165.82</td>
<td>61.49</td>
<td>31.83</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>275.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dinamérica</td>
<td>463.90</td>
<td>247.95</td>
<td>81.64</td>
<td>38.31</td>
<td>831.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lar dos Desamparados</td>
<td>98.52</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>118.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linda China</td>
<td>167.58</td>
<td>126.93</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>308.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mamedina</td>
<td>1951.98</td>
<td>480.25</td>
<td>71.48</td>
<td>87.93</td>
<td>2591.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manoelita</td>
<td>262.49</td>
<td>69.70</td>
<td>39.14</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>393.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miracema</td>
<td>533.19</td>
<td>31.78</td>
<td>38.03</td>
<td>45.42</td>
<td>638.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monte Alegre</td>
<td>11038.88</td>
<td>1566.38</td>
<td>513.50</td>
<td>480.15</td>
<td>13598.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nossa Senhora Aparecida 2</td>
<td>111.00</td>
<td>50.44</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>186.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nova Conquista</td>
<td>791.19</td>
<td>294.99</td>
<td>269.77</td>
<td>72.49</td>
<td>1428.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nova Esperança 2</td>
<td>70.28</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>85.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palmeiras</td>
<td>589.63</td>
<td>158.71</td>
<td>72.50</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td>863.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palmiral</td>
<td>646.00</td>
<td>115.61</td>
<td>65.19</td>
<td>42.34</td>
<td>869.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palmiral 2</td>
<td>330.02</td>
<td>86.11</td>
<td>38.09</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>470.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pentágono</td>
<td>152.09</td>
<td>63.59</td>
<td>34.12</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>266.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saltinho 2</td>
<td>271.64</td>
<td>32.37</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>331.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cândida</td>
<td>217.71</td>
<td>112.95</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>41.69</td>
<td>401.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Helena</td>
<td>157.07</td>
<td>165.93</td>
<td>72.10</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>410.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Luiza</td>
<td>601.06</td>
<td>215.62</td>
<td>156.24</td>
<td>67.73</td>
<td>1040.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Terezinha 2</td>
<td>437.31</td>
<td>130.25</td>
<td>85.57</td>
<td>44.84</td>
<td>697.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santo Antônio 2</td>
<td>227.79</td>
<td>76.38</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>342.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Active Tree Area (ha)</td>
<td>Dead Tree Area (ha)</td>
<td>Dead Non-Forest (ha)</td>
<td>Total Area (ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santo Antonio da Nova Floresta</strong></td>
<td>505.83</td>
<td>65.71</td>
<td>34.69</td>
<td>668.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Francisco</td>
<td>228.41</td>
<td>36.22</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>251.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São João</td>
<td>121.71</td>
<td>45.84</td>
<td>26.97</td>
<td>194.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São João 2</td>
<td>105.61</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>127.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São José 3</td>
<td>44.79</td>
<td>25.33</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>71.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Pedro</td>
<td>1066.02</td>
<td>341.93</td>
<td>119.50</td>
<td>1527.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segredo</td>
<td>140.04</td>
<td>21.98</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>169.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Três Irmãos</td>
<td>156.25</td>
<td>68.82</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>244.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triângulo</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Botucatu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto Grande</td>
<td>71.59</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>94.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americana</td>
<td>805.77</td>
<td>41.28</td>
<td>37.31</td>
<td>943.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angatuba 1</td>
<td>695.79</td>
<td>61.89</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>896.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angatuba 2</td>
<td>314.95</td>
<td>196.44</td>
<td>53.13</td>
<td>564.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Árvore Grande</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Árvore Grande 2</td>
<td>23.28</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>33.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barra Longa</td>
<td>448.77</td>
<td>110.77</td>
<td>64.75</td>
<td>624.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bofete</td>
<td>1315.23</td>
<td>216.69</td>
<td>84.30</td>
<td>1516.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capão Rico</td>
<td>698.26</td>
<td>244.10</td>
<td>137.76</td>
<td>1080.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascata</td>
<td>546.90</td>
<td>171.16</td>
<td>93.21</td>
<td>711.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerrados do Tamanduá</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côrrego Fundo</td>
<td>357.10</td>
<td>190.41</td>
<td>51.82</td>
<td>599.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côrrego Fundo 2</td>
<td>259.78</td>
<td>125.29</td>
<td>57.12</td>
<td>442.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estância Harmonia</td>
<td>17.99</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>29.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estância Lívia</td>
<td>188.96</td>
<td>88.95</td>
<td>33.79</td>
<td>311.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estância Lívia 2</td>
<td>246.34</td>
<td>120.77</td>
<td>36.10</td>
<td>303.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estância Três Irmãos</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>24.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faxinal</td>
<td>280.09</td>
<td>85.69</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>374.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horto Itatinga</td>
<td>110.27</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>162.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipê</td>
<td>755.51</td>
<td>50.76</td>
<td>33.42</td>
<td>849.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jequitibá</td>
<td>79.09</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>85.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobo</td>
<td>714.33</td>
<td>40.04</td>
<td>28.69</td>
<td>883.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedónia</td>
<td>840.95</td>
<td>63.83</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>936.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morroinhos</td>
<td>256.10</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>26.05</td>
<td>304.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morro do Ouro</td>
<td>2420.06</td>
<td>319.69</td>
<td>151.31</td>
<td>2991.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nossa Senhora Aparecida</td>
<td>56.95</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>59.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nossa Senhora de Lourdes</td>
<td>820.37</td>
<td>502.99</td>
<td>196.88</td>
<td>1520.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paniguêl</td>
<td>155.45</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>160.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinheiro</td>
<td>675.67</td>
<td>57.81</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>764.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinheiros 2</td>
<td>133.43</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>154.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinheiros 3</td>
<td>91.76</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>110.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitanguêras</td>
<td>431.20</td>
<td>79.89</td>
<td>34.73</td>
<td>545.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primavera</td>
<td>272.55</td>
<td>47.68</td>
<td>22.47</td>
<td>342.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quatro Meninas</td>
<td>149.42</td>
<td>60.69</td>
<td>52.77</td>
<td>263.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querência</td>
<td>145.05</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>179.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retiro do Faxinal</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincão do Pinhal</td>
<td>890.84</td>
<td>222.69</td>
<td>101.95</td>
<td>1215.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Catarina</td>
<td>853.57</td>
<td>181.26</td>
<td>76.71</td>
<td>1111.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fé</td>
<td>993.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>993.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fé 2</td>
<td>121.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>121.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Luzia</td>
<td>206.50</td>
<td>115.71</td>
<td>36.62</td>
<td>358.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Inácio</td>
<td>257.57</td>
<td>132.94</td>
<td>67.51</td>
<td>458.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Bernardino</td>
<td>276.92</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>303.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São José 2</td>
<td>542.56</td>
<td>61.97</td>
<td>54.63</td>
<td>659.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Judas Tadeu</td>
<td>634.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>634.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Itapetininga</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angatuba 4 A/F</td>
<td>166.76</td>
<td>23.48</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>201.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Management &amp; Stump-to-Forest Gate Chain-of-Custody Surveillance Evaluation Report</td>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araçagi</td>
<td>78.29</td>
<td>43.79</td>
<td>29.34</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>155.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bela Vista</td>
<td>451.11</td>
<td>275.59</td>
<td>146.93</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>890.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambará</td>
<td>160.44</td>
<td>115.27</td>
<td>68.77</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>354.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamalotte</td>
<td>190.22</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>82.85</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>384.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coqueiral</td>
<td>216.85</td>
<td>58.67</td>
<td>43.20</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>337.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estância Velha Mäezinha</td>
<td>123.90</td>
<td>91.52</td>
<td>45.77</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>272.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarei 1</td>
<td>202.49</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>260.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizonte</td>
<td>297.28</td>
<td>103.51</td>
<td>94.99</td>
<td>33.06</td>
<td>528.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>João XXIII</td>
<td>1136.03</td>
<td>802.30</td>
<td>468.28</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>2476.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvu</td>
<td>250.64</td>
<td>93.58</td>
<td>74.80</td>
<td>44.86</td>
<td>463.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missioneria</td>
<td>467.36</td>
<td>45.97</td>
<td>28.39</td>
<td>28.69</td>
<td>570.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moquem</td>
<td>432.20</td>
<td>67.56</td>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>18.99</td>
<td>552.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moquem 2</td>
<td>522.96</td>
<td>1255.46</td>
<td>249.25</td>
<td>58.63</td>
<td>2086.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilar</td>
<td>1628.04</td>
<td>368.86</td>
<td>189.01</td>
<td>195.68</td>
<td>2381.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio das Pedras</td>
<td>3245.47</td>
<td>1048.39</td>
<td>212.96</td>
<td>154.65</td>
<td>4661.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondinha</td>
<td>545.31</td>
<td>151.32</td>
<td>83.27</td>
<td>49.39</td>
<td>829.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Albertina</td>
<td>88.16</td>
<td>44.90</td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>165.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Amália</td>
<td>700.42</td>
<td>319.63</td>
<td>157.36</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>1226.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Edwiges</td>
<td>159.55</td>
<td>63.09</td>
<td>35.09</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>268.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Luzia 2</td>
<td>873.08</td>
<td>258.66</td>
<td>129.83</td>
<td>60.78</td>
<td>1322.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Luzia do Campo Largo</td>
<td>1724.38</td>
<td>721.94</td>
<td>160.37</td>
<td>74.07</td>
<td>2680.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>619.56</td>
<td>169.33</td>
<td>90.35</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>928.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria 2</td>
<td>2117.92</td>
<td>840.78</td>
<td>312.22</td>
<td>207.96</td>
<td>3478.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Terezinha</td>
<td>714.86</td>
<td>200.53</td>
<td>52.51</td>
<td>75.39</td>
<td>1043.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Antonio</td>
<td>472.96</td>
<td>182.31</td>
<td>89.65</td>
<td>28.99</td>
<td>773.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Antonio da Água Santa</td>
<td>142.87</td>
<td>113.16</td>
<td>40.61</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>306.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Bento</td>
<td>180.17</td>
<td>79.76</td>
<td>57.55</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>327.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Geraldo</td>
<td>206.81</td>
<td>100.95</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td>20.57</td>
<td>378.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São José</td>
<td>168.83</td>
<td>55.18</td>
<td>34.82</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>273.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Judas</td>
<td>437.40</td>
<td>94.28</td>
<td>76.85</td>
<td>35.11</td>
<td>643.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Três Corações</td>
<td>135.38</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>38.54</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>207.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lençóis Paulista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Claro</td>
<td>3026.11</td>
<td>382.58</td>
<td>151.02</td>
<td>144.33</td>
<td>3704.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Claro 2</td>
<td>567.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>567.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Pardo</td>
<td>2614.52</td>
<td>495.67</td>
<td>163.96</td>
<td>95.90</td>
<td>3370.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Pardo 2</td>
<td>1437.49</td>
<td>344.47</td>
<td>61.32</td>
<td>46.26</td>
<td>1889.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Tereza do Palmital</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Tereza do Palmital 2</td>
<td>507.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>507.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minas Gerais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Monte Carmelo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brejão</td>
<td>687.42</td>
<td>89.49</td>
<td>48.06</td>
<td>29.05</td>
<td>854.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buqueirão</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>56.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>56.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Córrego do Ou ro</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2511.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2511.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duas Pontes</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>475.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>475.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnas</td>
<td>3918.57</td>
<td>159.45</td>
<td>649.25</td>
<td>207.02</td>
<td>4934.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoa e Boqueirão 1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>438.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>438.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoa e Boqueirão 2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Monte Carmelo</td>
<td>39604.05</td>
<td>9703.23</td>
<td>308.12</td>
<td>1516.26</td>
<td>51131.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salitre</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>415.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>415.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uberaba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Água Emendada</td>
<td>3383.62</td>
<td>2048.45</td>
<td>270.80</td>
<td>122.26</td>
<td>5825.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliança</td>
<td>95.27</td>
<td>54.70</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>172.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; Danklin</td>
<td>339.98</td>
<td>249.04</td>
<td>62.72</td>
<td>18.49</td>
<td>670.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buraco</td>
<td>404.68</td>
<td>201.49</td>
<td>51.45</td>
<td>54.81</td>
<td>712.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canhambola</td>
<td>1528.62</td>
<td>1071.14</td>
<td>298.71</td>
<td>83.37</td>
<td>2981.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caraça</td>
<td>719.79</td>
<td>249.07</td>
<td>157.60</td>
<td>110.97</td>
<td>1237.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caxuana</td>
<td>407.01</td>
<td>144.75</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>583.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerradão Carolina</td>
<td>147.14</td>
<td>49.16</td>
<td>20.82</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>228.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapadão da Babilônia 1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>321.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>321.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapadão da Babilônia 2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>161.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>161.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapadão da Babilônia 3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>149.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>149.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estância Mariana</td>
<td>135.79</td>
<td>72.43</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>241.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estrela do Sul</td>
<td>412.61</td>
<td>533.56</td>
<td>149.36</td>
<td>29.13</td>
<td>1124.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forquilha</td>
<td>125.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>125.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furna Rica</td>
<td>813.32</td>
<td>315.05</td>
<td>97.71</td>
<td>85.01</td>
<td>1311.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humaitá</td>
<td>211.77</td>
<td>137.39</td>
<td>40.38</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>410.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Preta</td>
<td>200.61</td>
<td>138.58</td>
<td>38.27</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>390.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mata Fresca</td>
<td>52.31</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>100.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matinha</td>
<td>145.00</td>
<td>57.34</td>
<td>20.97</td>
<td>28.08</td>
<td>251.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matinha 2</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>80.31</td>
<td>32.96</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>143.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morro Bonito</td>
<td>138.53</td>
<td>91.52</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>262.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Ponte</td>
<td>13700.38</td>
<td>1269.68</td>
<td>183.58</td>
<td>585.94</td>
<td>15739.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraíso do Rio do Peixe</td>
<td>118.55</td>
<td>56.53</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>196.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piracanjuba</td>
<td>50.01</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>63.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posses</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>241.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>241.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primas</td>
<td>567.63</td>
<td>214.17</td>
<td>80.47</td>
<td>64.44</td>
<td>926.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafabellla</td>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>34.82</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>86.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Borá</td>
<td>316.84</td>
<td>149.36</td>
<td>113.42</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>602.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>46.71</td>
<td>81.81</td>
<td>27.71</td>
<td>43.69</td>
<td>199.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santana</td>
<td>1227.34</td>
<td>210.83</td>
<td>104.68</td>
<td>59.08</td>
<td>1601.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Antônio 3</td>
<td>98.96</td>
<td>43.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>149.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Antônio do Rio do Peixe</td>
<td>392.35</td>
<td>250.03</td>
<td>86.96</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>746.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Miguel 2</td>
<td>138.20</td>
<td>412.03</td>
<td>169.41</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>731.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Sebastião</td>
<td>35.88</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>57.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Vicente de Paula</td>
<td>70.66</td>
<td>41.20</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>119.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailhados</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>463.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>463.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texana</td>
<td>176.27</td>
<td>160.68</td>
<td>33.15</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>379.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texana 2</td>
<td>166.79</td>
<td>89.38</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>280.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rio Grande do Sul       | Bela Vista da Porterinha 1 | 198.66 | 52.33 | 24.98 | 14.64 | 290.60 |
|                        | Bela Vista da Porterinha 2 | 100.10 | 16.66 | 15.69 | 9.90 | 142.35 |
|                        | Borba                      | 523.11 | 299.33 | 190.82 | 19.37 | 1032.63 |
|                        | Borba 2                    | 38.02 | 2.37 | 2.75 | 2.98 | 46.12 |
|                        | Campo do Estado 1          | 174.18 | 32.76 | 14.35 | 14.77 | 236.07 |
|                        | Campo do Estado 2          | 33.29 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 4.29 | 37.63 |
|                        | Campo do Estado 3          | 63.46 | 2.03 | 3.09 | 6.44 | 75.03 |
|                        | Campo do Estado 4          | 27.48 | 12.82 | 3.51 | 1.20 | 45.02 |
|                        | Campo do Estado 5          | 31.48 | 17.99 | 0.00 | 5.49 | 54.96 |
|                        | Campo do Meio              | 147.48 | 30.46 | 45.94 | 27.96 | 251.83 |
|                        | Campo do Meio 2            | 21.06 | 24.17 | 7.64 | 3.53 | 56.40 |
|                        | Campo dos Maios            | 267.10 | 45.71 | 83.18 | 16.22 | 412.21 |
|                        | Capororoca                 | 6.05 | 6.66 | 3.13 | 1.13 | 16.97 |
|                        | Carapuça                   | 23.92 | 11.79 | 0.00 | 2.12 | 37.82 |
|                        | Costa do Santa Cruz        | 23.67 | 25.85 | 3.00 | 7.48 | 60.00 |
|                        | Eloy                       | 113.03 | 31.01 | 10.37 | 6.90 | 161.31 |
|                        | Jung                       | 203.26 | 72.92 | 0.52 | 15.92 | 292.62 |
|                        | Locatelli                  | 40.75 | 12.49 | 21.69 | 6.64 | 81.56 |
|                        | Menezes                    | 887.47 | 341.93 | 314.85 | 36.93 | 1581.17 |
|                        | Monjolo Velho              | 90.75 | 21.59 | 37.93 | 5.03 | 156.30 |
|                        | Monte Alegre 2             | 165.08 | 259.94 | 81.69 | 34.55 | 541.26 |
|                        | Morro do Leão              | 190.32 | 56.46 | 50.50 | 13.89 | 311.16 |
|                        | Mundo Novo 1               | 247.31 | 114.79 | 81.47 | 20.21 | 463.77 |
|                        | Mundo Novo 2               | 30.18 | 6.07 | 13.01 | 4.40 | 53.66 |
|                        | Nossa Senhora Aparecida 3  | 117.52 | 79.32 | 14.37 | 29.73 | 240.94 |
|                        | Nova Era                   | 204.19 | 72.45 | 54.49 | 13.58 | 344.70 |
### Social Information

**Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):**

- **955** FME workers, **406** workers of service providers, **128** FME workers

**Accident frequency rate (Jan-Dec/2018):** **47**

**Accident severity rate (Jan-Dec/2018):** **1.83**

### Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

☐ **FME does not use pesticides**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide</th>
<th>Active ingredient</th>
<th>Quantity applied since previous evaluation (kg or lbs)</th>
<th>Total area treated since previous evaluation in 2018 (ha or ac)</th>
<th>Reason for use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atta mex-S / Mirex-S Max / Dinagro-S</td>
<td>Sulfuramid</td>
<td>484,787.30 kg</td>
<td>111,291.03</td>
<td>Leaf-cutter ant control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIPIS Evolution Mirex-S Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blitz</td>
<td>Fipronil</td>
<td>656 kg</td>
<td>332.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-othrine 2P</td>
<td>Deltamethrin</td>
<td>577.45 kg</td>
<td>2144.22</td>
<td>Termite and Leaf Wasp Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actara 250 WG</td>
<td>Thiamethoxam</td>
<td>157.58 kg</td>
<td>3613.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence 700WG</td>
<td>Imidacloprid</td>
<td>75.47 kg</td>
<td>156.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glifosato sólido Scout</td>
<td>Glyphosate</td>
<td>1840 kg</td>
<td>864.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glifosato líquido Touchdown</td>
<td>Glyphosate</td>
<td>204,286.27 L</td>
<td>66,572.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ffordor 750 WG</td>
<td>Isoxaflutole</td>
<td>2,203.76 kg</td>
<td>26,467.49</td>
<td>Control of competing vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flumyzin 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>403.28 kg</td>
<td>3994.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flumyzin 500 SC</td>
<td>Flumioxazin</td>
<td>159.84 L</td>
<td>1543.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumyzin 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>302.40 kg</td>
<td>4195.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotlight</td>
<td>Carfentrazone</td>
<td>737.87 L</td>
<td>8804.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solara 500</td>
<td>Sulfentrazone</td>
<td>17,894.31 L</td>
<td>20,882.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outliner</td>
<td>Fluroxipyr-Meptile + Triclopyr-Butothyl</td>
<td>60.00 L</td>
<td>55.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Triclopyr-Butothyl</td>
<td>120.00 L</td>
<td>39.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamit 360CS</td>
<td>Clomazone</td>
<td>60.00 L</td>
<td>39.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missil</td>
<td>Haloxifope-P-meptile</td>
<td>464.28 L</td>
<td>1143.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ramos</th>
<th>227.82</th>
<th>121.32</th>
<th>64.26</th>
<th>14.50</th>
<th>427.90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rio Pardo 3</td>
<td>147.35</td>
<td>51.53</td>
<td>34.84</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>247.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Olívia</td>
<td>36.38</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>54.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rita</td>
<td>247.32</td>
<td>56.58</td>
<td>99.25</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>420.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Miguel</td>
<td>99.51</td>
<td>33.88</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>162.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sede</td>
<td>61.19</td>
<td>33.73</td>
<td>52.08</td>
<td>55.85</td>
<td>202.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<p>| 144,681.01 | 43,560.81 | 11,900.66 | 8,196.00 | 208,338.47 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production Forests</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timber Forest Products</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)</td>
<td>144,681.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'</td>
<td>102,605.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems</td>
<td>42,075.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silvicultural system(s)</strong></td>
<td>Area under type of management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even-aged management</td>
<td>144,681.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearcut (clearcut size range )</td>
<td>144,681.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelterwood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uneven-aged management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual tree selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)</td>
<td>8,196.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-timber Forest Products</strong></td>
<td>Area under type of management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas managed for NTFPs or services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FSC Product Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timber products</th>
<th>Product Level 1</th>
<th>Product Level 2</th>
<th>Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1 Rough wood</td>
<td>W1.1 Logs</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 Rough wood</td>
<td>W1.2 Fuelwood</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 Wood in chips or particles</td>
<td>W3.1 Woodchips</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conservation and High Conservation Value Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Area</th>
<th>Units: ☒ ha or ☐ ac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total amount</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of land in certified area protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives (includes both forested and non-forested lands).*</td>
<td>55,461.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Total conservation and HCV areas may differ since these may serve different functions in the FME’s management system. Designation as HCV may allow for active management, including commercial harvest. Conservation areas are typically under passive management, but may undergo invasive species control, prescribed burns, non-commercial harvest, and other management activities intended to maintain or enhance their integrity. In all cases, figures are reported by the FME as it pertains local laws & regulations, management objectives, and FSC requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>HCV Type</th>
<th>Description &amp; Location</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HCV1 | Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia). | - Fragmento na Faz. João XXIII que faz conexão entre os parques estaduais Jurupará e Carlos Botelho  
- Parque Florestal de Patrocínio  
- Fragmento localizado na Fazenda Moquém 2 | 245.00 |
| HCV2 | Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance. | - Parque Florestal de Patrocínio | 3,904.67 |
| HCV3 | Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems. | - Áreas de veredas na Faz. Nova Monte Carmelo  
- Áreas de veredas na Faz. Água Emendada | 2,315.45 |

### Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)

Eucalyptus (Eucalyptus grandis, E. camaldulensis, E. saligna, E. urophylla, e híbridos), Pinus (Pinus caribaea var. hondurensis, Pinus caribaea. var. tecunumanii, Pinus oocarpa e Pinus tecunumanii).
HCV4  Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).

HCV5  Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).

HCV6  Forests or areas critical to local communities’ traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).

- Captação de água na fazenda Moquém 2  446.63

Total area of forest classified as ‘High Conservation Value Forest / Area’  8,914.80

Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification (Partial Certification and Excision)

☐ N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.

☒ Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.

☐ Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.

Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:

Newly acquired or newly planted areas are out of scope of certification, which will be incorporated into the scope in future annual audits. The São Paulo, Pintada and Maringá farms (all in the Itapetininga unit) were leased to another company and are therefore being removed from the scope of the certificate.

Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):

The FME has a forest registration system that identifies all certified and uncertified areas. Forest planning defines the areas to be harvested annually. Only certified areas are used to supply the factories. All wood loads are properly identified, according to information from the forest register and transported with documents that identify their origin. All personnel involved in the chain of custody of management receive training. This way there is no risk of mixing FSC certified and non-certified timber.

Description of FMUs excluded from, or forested area excised from, the scope of certification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of FMU or Stand</th>
<th>Location (city, state, country)</th>
<th>Size (ha or ac)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Água Bonita</td>
<td>Itatinga, SP</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabreúva</td>
<td>Agudos, SP</td>
<td>203.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estância Santa Verônica</td>
<td>Botucatu, SP</td>
<td>79.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fábrica Itapetininga</td>
<td>Itapetininga, SP</td>
<td>72.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maringá</td>
<td>São Miguel Arcanjo, SP</td>
<td>289.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirante da Boa Vista</td>
<td>Sarapuí, SP</td>
<td>649.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pintada</td>
<td>São Miguel Arcanjo, SP</td>
<td>677.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piracema</td>
<td>Lençóis Paulista, SP</td>
<td>23.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primavera 2</td>
<td>Piratininga, SP</td>
<td>119.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreio</td>
<td>Avaré, SP</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rita 2</td>
<td>Itapetininga, SP</td>
<td>778.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Paulo</td>
<td>Salto de Pirapora, SP</td>
<td>698.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Pedro da Terra Nova</td>
<td>Itatinga, SP</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapioca</td>
<td>Itatinga, SP</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umuarama</td>
<td>Itatinga, SP</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitória</td>
<td>São Miguel Arcanjo, SP</td>
<td>2687.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babilônia</td>
<td>Uberlândia, MG</td>
<td>2472.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barra</td>
<td>Veríssimo, MG</td>
<td>204.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douradinho</td>
<td>Monte Alegre de Minas, MG</td>
<td>1430.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cândida 2</td>
<td>Veríssimo, MG</td>
<td>356.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Iza</td>
<td>Veríssimo, MG</td>
<td>2832.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Tereza das Palhas</td>
<td>Prata, MG</td>
<td>403.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabocas</td>
<td>Veríssimo, MG</td>
<td>252.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>14,262.40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>