

# **CCB - VALIDATION REPORT**

Client: The World Bank

## **Humbo Ethiopia Assisted Natural Regeneration Project**

14 February, 2011

Report No. GR10W0016D

**JACO CDM., LTD**

## Validation Report

Date of first issue: 4 February, 2011	
Approved by: Yasunori SHIMOI CEO, President of JACO CDM	Project No.: UNFCCC CDM reference No. 2712
Client: Client Name: The World Bank	Client ref.:
<p>Summary:</p> <p>JACO CDM., Ltd has been ordered by the World Bank (the Client) to perform the CCB - validation of A/R project "Humbo Ethiopia Assisted Natural Regeneration Project" (hereinafter the Project) This CCB - validation report summarizes the findings of the validation.</p> <p>The purpose of this validation is an independent assessment by a Third Party (JACO CDM) of the proposed project activity against the CCB standard First Edition.</p> <p>The validation consisted of the following three steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) desk review of the project design, the baseline and the monitoring plan etc.,</li> <li>ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders</li> <li>iii) the resolution of outstanding issues and issuance of the final validation report and the opinion.</li> </ul> <p>The CCB - Validation was performed using CCB standard checklist and also using approved A/R CDM methodology AR-AM0003 version 04. The validation team pointed out 6 Clarifications.</p> <p>The responses to the 6 Clarifications to the original PDD version 01 (August 18, 2008) were satisfactorily provided by the Project participants.</p> <p>In our opinion, the project as described in the PDD version 03 (June 19, 2009) meets all relevant requirements of CCBA Standards First Edition.</p> <p>According to the scorecard approach introduced by CCBA, JACO CDM considers the project to comply with Gold level.</p>	

Report No.: GR10W0016D		
Report title: CCB-Validation Humbo Ethiopia Assisted Natural Regeneration Project		
Work carried out by: Teruo FUKUDA, Osamu KOBAYASHI		
Work verified by: Tatsuo TANAKA		
Date of this revision 14 February, 2011	Rev. No.: 01	Number of pages: 16

- No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit
- Limited distribution
- Unrestricted distribution

## Validation Report

### Abbreviations

AGB	Above-ground Biomass
A/R	Afforestation Reforestation
ARDFCO	Agricultural, Rural Development and Forestry Development Coordination Office
BEF	Biomass Expansion Factor
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CCB (A)	Climate Community and Biodiversity (Alliance)
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEF	Carbon Emission Factor
CERs	Certified Emission Reduction
CL	Clarification Request
COP	Conference of Parties
DBH	Diameter at Breast Height
dm	Dry Matter
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operating Entity
ERs	Emission Reductions
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FMNR	Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration
GHG	Green House Gas(es)
GIS	Geographical Information Systems
GPS	Global Positioning System
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
JACO CDM	JACO CDM Co., Ltd
KP	Kyoto Protocol
ICERs	Long-term Certified Emission Reductions
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change and forestry
MoARD	Ministry of Agriculture and Lural Development
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PDD	Project Design Document
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
QA	Quality Assurance
QC	Quality Control
SNNPRS	The Southern Nations Nationalities and Peoples Regional State
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
SV	Stem Volume
tCERs	Temporary Certified Emission Reductions
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UTM	Universal Transverse Mercator coordinate system
VERs	Verified Emission Reductions
VVM	Validation and Verification Manual
WD	Wood Density
WV	World Vision
WVA	World Vision Australia
WVE	World Vision Ethiopia

<b>Table of Contents</b>		<b>Page</b>
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Objective	1
1.2	Scope	1
2	Methodology	1
2.1	Review of Documents	2
2.2	Follow-up Interviews	3
2.3	Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests	3
3	Validation Findings	4
3.1	General Section	4
3.2	Climate Section	8
3.3	Community Section	9
3.4	Biodiversity Section	11
3.5	CCBA Score Card	12
4	Comments by Parties, Stakeholders and NGOs	13
5	Validation opinion	13
6	references	14
Appendix A: Validation Protocol		A-1 ~ A-24

## Validation Report

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1. Objective

The World Bank has commissioned JACO CDM to validate the A/R project “Humbo Ethiopia Assisted Natural Regeneration Project” (hereinafter called “the project”) by the CCB standard. A CCB validation is the process whereby an independent third party assesses the design of a land use, land use change or forestry (LULUCF) project against each of the CCB Standards’ (CCBS).

JACO CDM is a DOE accredited by UNFCCC to validate AR-CDM projects. CCBA recognizes this accreditation.

The CDM (Clean Development Mechanism) validation of this project was conducted by JACO CDM and the project was registered as a CDM project on 07 December, 2009. The CDM validation report dated 7 December, 2009 is available in the UNFCCC CDM web page.

(<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/JACO1245724331.7/view>)

#### 1.2. Scope

The validation scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document (PDD). The PDD is reviewed against the criteria stated in CCB Standard 1<sup>st</sup> edition.

The validation is not meant to provide any consulting towards the project participants. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may have provided input for improvement of the project design.

The validation was conducted by the following validation team through the assessment of the PDD and the additional documents listed in the Chapter 6 “References”, also by the interviews with persons listed in the same Chapter.

The result of validation team activity was reviewed by the internal verifiers.

#### Validation Team

Teruo FUKUDA	JACO CDM	Team Leader
Osamu KOBAYASHI	JACO CDM	Team Member
MakinoYAMADA	JOPP*	Technical Expert

#### Internal Verifiers

Tatsuo TANAKA	Board Director & General Manager of JACO CDM
---------------	--

### 2. METHODOLOGY

The validation consists of the following three phases:

- I a desk review of the project design documentation
- II follow-up interviews with project stakeholders
- III the resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report and opinion.

In order to ensure transparency, a validation protocol was customized for the project, according to the Validation and Verification Manual of UNFCCC and CCB Standard. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), means of verification and the results from validating the identified criteria. The validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organizes, details and clarifies the requirements a CCB project is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent validation process where the validator will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

The validation protocol consists of 2 tables. The different columns in these tables are described in Figure 1.

The validation protocol is enclosed in Appendix A to this report.

\* JOPP: Japan Overseas Plantation Center for Pulpwood

## Validation Report

Findings established during the validation can either be seen as a non-fulfillment of validation protocol criteria or where a risk to the fulfillment of project objectives is identified. Corrective Action Requests (CAR) is issued, where:

- i) Mistakes have been made with a direct influence on project results;
- ii) Validation protocol requirements have not been met; or
- iii) There is a risk that the project would not be accepted as a CDM project or that emission reductions will not be certified.

The validation team may also use the term Clarification, which would be where:

- iv) Additional information is needed to fully clarify an issue.

<b>Validation Protocol Table 1: CCB Conformity checklist</b>				
<b>Checklist Question</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Means of verification (MoV)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Draft and/or Final Conclusion</b>
<i>The checklist is organized according to the sections of CCB standards. Each section is then further subdivided. The lowest level constitutes a checklist question.</i>	<i>Gives reference to documents where the answer to the checklist question or item is found.</i>	<i>Explains how conformance with the checklist question is investigated. Examples of means of verification are document review (DR) or interview (I). N/A means not applicable.</i>	<i>The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist question and/or the conformance to the question. It is further used to explain the conclusions reached.</i>	<i>This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (OK), or a <b>Corrective Action Request (CAR)</b> due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below). <b>Clarification Request (CL)</b> is used when the validation team has identified a need for further clarification.</i>

<b>Validation Protocol Table 2: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests</b>			
<b>clarifications and corrective action requests</b>	<b>Ref. to checklist question in table 1</b>	<b>Summary of project owner response</b>	<b>Validation conclusion</b>
<i>If the conclusions from the draft Validation are either a Corrective Action Request or a Clarification Request, these should be listed in this section.</i>	<i>Reference to the checklist question number in Table 1 where the Corrective Action Request or Clarification Request is explained.</i>	<i>The responses given by the Client or other project participants during the communications with the validation team should be summarized in this section.</i>	<i>This section should summarize the validation team's responses and final conclusions. The conclusions should also be included in Table 1, under "Final Conclusion".</i>

**Figure 1 Validation protocol tables**

### 2.1. Review of Documents

The Project Design Document submitted by the project participants and additional background documents related to the project design were reviewed.

Documents reviewed are listed in Chapter 6 "References".

The validation findings stated hereafter are based on the PDD version 01, dated 18 Aug. 2008.

## Validation Report

### 2.2. Follow-up Interviews

In the period of March 30, 2009 to April 05, 2009 the validation team performed interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. DNA of Ethiopia, representatives of WB, WVE and WVA, also representatives of local government and community member's staff at project site and representative of the cooperatives were interviewed. The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1 Interview topics**

Interviewed organisation	Interview topics
DNA (EPA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ DNA's approval of the Project</li> <li>➤ Authorization of project participants</li> <li>➤ Sustainable development policy</li> <li>➤ EIA and socio-economic impacts</li> <li>➤ Laws and Regulations</li> <li>➤ Land use right and CER</li> </ul>
MoARD (local government)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Laws and Regulations</li> <li>➤ Land use right and CER</li> </ul>
World Vision Ethiopia (Project participant) & World Vision Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Project overview</li> <li>➤ PDD                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General (incl. Definition of Forest, Boundary, Project Participants, Cooperatives, Public funding, etc.)</li> <li>- Baseline &amp; Additionality</li> <li>- Monitoring Methodology</li> <li>- GHG removal</li> <li>- Environmental Impacts</li> <li>- Socio-economic Impacts</li> <li>- Biodiversity Impacts</li> <li>- Stakeholders comments</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Evidences</li> <li>➤ Schedule</li> </ul>
World Bank Carbon Finance Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Ditto</li> </ul>
Local Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Relation with the PP and local government</li> <li>➤ Laws/ bye-laws</li> <li>➤ Land use right and CER</li> <li>➤ Any grievances in the communities and mitigation measures</li> <li>➤ Difficulties necessary to be cleared</li> </ul>
Cooperatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Organization and Activity</li> <li>➤ Purpose and expecting benefits</li> <li>➤ Concerns about potential negative impacts</li> <li>➤ Procedures for handling unresolved conflicts</li> <li>➤ Environmental and Biodiversity impacts</li> </ul>

### 2.3. Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the validation is to resolve the requests for corrective actions and clarification and any other outstanding issues which needed to be clarified for JACO CDM's positive conclusion on the project design. The Corrective Action Requests and Clarification Requests raised by JACO CDM were resolved during communications between the Client and JACO CDM.

## Validation Report

To guarantee the transparency of the validation process, the concerns raised and responses given are summarized in chapter 3 below and documented in more detail in the validation protocol in Appendix A.

Since modifications to the Project design document were necessary to resolve JACO CDM's concerns, the Client decided to revise the documentation. After revised PDD was submitted and reviewed, JACO CDM issued the final validation report and opinion.

### 3. VALIDATION FINDINGS

In the following sections the findings of the validation are stated. The validation findings for each validation subject are presented as follows:

1) The findings from the desk review of the original project design documents and the findings from interviews during the follow up visit are summarized. A more detailed record of these findings can be found in the Validation Protocol in Appendix A.

2) Where JACO CDM had identified issues that needed clarification or that represented a risk to the fulfillment of the project objectives, a Clarification or Corrective Action Request, respectively, have been issued. The Clarification and Corrective Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Validation Protocol in Appendix A.

The validation of the Project resulted in 6 Clarifications.

3) Where Clarification or Corrective Action Requests have been issued, the exchanges between the Client and JACO CDM to resolve these Clarification or Corrective Action Requests are summarised.

4) The conclusions for each validation subject are presented.

The validation findings relate to the project design as documented and described in the original project design documentation.

#### 3.1. General Section

##### 3.1.1 Discussion

###### G.1 Original Conditions at Project Site

The location of the project and the physical parameters are clearly indicated in the PDD. The types and conditions of vegetation are indicated for each strata in the PDD, C.4 and documented in a paper "Humbo Site Forest Area Stratification".

In accordance with the CDM methodology AR-AM0003 version 04 applied to the project, the current carbon stocks are above-ground biomass and below-ground biomass.

As for the community information, 7 Communities located in and around the project area are described in the PDD and its Annex 7. The Socio-economic study was conducted for communities around the project area.

Current land use is grass land, shrub and scattered trees. Land tenure is described in the PDD A.6.

As for biodiversity information, there is a description about several threatened species, identified in IUCN red list in the PDD A5.1& A5.2. This project is a regeneration of native species for the degraded land. Major tree species are native species and 500ha among 2728 ha are mixed naturalized species. This region contains several threatened species, identified in the World Conservation Union (IUCN) red list, associated with the temperate and tropical mountain forest habitats which are anticipated to benefit directly from the proposed project. (Ref. PDD table-A-

###### G.2 Baseline Projections

The results of baseline study carried out by PP are included in the PDD.

The proposed project areas have been denuded and anthropogenic pressures prohibit natural regeneration. This is attested to in the PRA workshops, which have been held in the region



## Validation Report

(see PDD Annex 4). Without a change in ownership and forest management (FMNR), as proposed in this project the forest vegetation is not expected to get reestablished on the site.

The project areas are mainly degraded grassland and fallow land. The carbon stock of these areas is decreasing due to depletion of nutrients in the soil caused by cropping.

Soil erosion data produced by the World Bank indicated that the project area is losing an average of between 4 and 10 tonnes of topsoil erosion per hectare per year due to erosion. Due to their steep terrain, the sites are subject to higher levels of erosion and as a consequence, the soil carbon levels in the baseline scenario are expected to show a gradual decline. Due to anthropogenic pressures, the dead wood and litter levels are also expected to decrease in the baseline scenario (see PRA workshop report- Annex 6 of the PDD). While in the project scenario, the deadwood, litter and soil carbon pools are expected to increase. Therefore, not accounting their changes in the project scenario is conservative.

No fertilizer is applied.

Without-project, loss of biomass and further degradation is expected to continue and this would adversely affect biodiversity in the project area. In addition to that water catchment area and water quality will be reduced. Over-clearing has led to significant soil erosion problems, with mudslides occurring on the site.

### G3. Project Design & Goals

In the PDD;

- Scope of the project and a summary of the major climate, community and biodiversity goals are described.
- Major activity is described in the PDD A.2 as a regeneration of a degraded 2728 ha by mainly native tree species.
- a map for the project. Boundary information is also provided.
- risk analysis and countermeasures are described.
- It is indicated in the section H of the PDD and its Annex 7 about Document and defend how local stakeholders have been or will be defined.
- All project documents will be available to communities and local stakeholders in English and in local language.

### G4. Management Capacity

The management of the enclosed areas will be undertaken by the 7 cooperatives in the respective sites with support given by the project proponent, World Vision Ethiopia, as well as the woreda Agricultural, Rural Development and Forestry Development Coordination Office (ARDFCO). Along the preparation of this project, the communities have organized themselves as cooperative societies in accordance with the cooperatives law of Ethiopia in order to attain legal entity for the management of the project as well as to enter into contractual agreements for selling the sequestered carbon as a result of the reforestation project or, before reaching full capacity to do so, to enter into subcontractual agreements with World Vision Ethiopia (WVE) which will manage the emission reductions during the initial period of the project and will hand over the authority to do so to the community organizations. At present all communities have organized themselves as cooperatives. World Vision Ethiopia will act on behalf of the cooperatives until end of September 2012, when the latter are expected to attain sufficient capacity to manage the financial and administrative aspects of the project.

PDD A.5.4 describes key technical skills, FMNR and supplemental planting by seedlings. Technical training is described in section G of the PDD.

Preliminary financial report is provided in the "Annual Activity Accomplishment Report for FY'08, prepared by World Vision Ethiopia". The report shows good accomplishment of the budget for the year 2008.

### G5. Land Tenure

The project area is a closed and certified by local government (SNNPRS) for the co-operatives

## Validation Report

to utilize for the project. There is no private property and government property. As described in PDD Annex 7 §2, the project area had been commonly used by some members of the communities living around the project sites as a source for fuel wood, fodder, charcoal making, etc. The selected project site is transferred to the local communities as community holdings. For that purpose each kebele (sub-district) has formed a cooperative under the cooperative law and title deeds with enhanced user rights are provided to the cooperatives for the areas reforested in the project.

There are no people living in the boundary of the project. The land tenure is certified to the cooperatives of the project by the local government.

The validation team confirmed at the on-site assessment that the project does not require the relocation of people.

It was confirmed that the project area will be managed by communities and protected from “in-migration” of people from surrounding areas. During the implementation phase, the project takes measures, with the active participation of the communities, to prevent new human settlement inside the project area and ensure that there will be no encroachment such as grazing or woodcutting.

The user’s right is protected by relevant by-laws.

### **G6. Legal Status**

The project has approval from local government (the woreda Agricultural, Rural Development and Forestry Development Coordination Office (ARDFCO)) and land is protected by by-laws. Refer to Annex 7 of the PDD.

The project is approved as a CDM project by the government of Ethiopia.

### **G7. Adaptive Management for Sustainability**

During the implementation stage, the World Vision Ethiopia (WVE) is managing the project on behalf of the cooperatives until end of September 2012. In this stage, the validation team confirmed by the annual report of WVE that the management actions and monitoring programs are designed to generate reliable feedback that is used to improve project outcomes.

### **G8. Knowledge Dissemination (Option)**

As for the knowledge dissemination, experience sharing has been conducted between neighboring communities. For the purpose of inside and outside communication, communications by documentation has been done and, in future, other mass media will be introduced for information such as user rights, FMNR, experience of farmers.

Project documentation about the relevant or applicable lessons learned was discussed. **(CL 3)**

## **3.1.2. Findings**

### **CCB Clarification Request 1**

Project operational lifetime is 60 years and the fixed crediting period is 30 years. The reason of the difference is to be explained.

#### **Response:**

Project operational lifetime will be 60 years. Some of the reasons are; not to lose the carbon being sequestered after 30 years, not to lose the biodiversity being rehabilitating, to sustain the co-benefits of the project and give more time for the ecologically friend indigenous tree species. Moreover, the community can benefit from biodiversity, improved micro climate, improved down stream soil productivity due to arrested flooding coming from project site, etc while contributing towards global emission reduction.

### **CCB Clarification Request 2**

Please provide information of management after the cooperatives take over the management from WVE in 2012 as shown as CL2 (1) - (4) below.

(1) Demonstrate how management actions and monitoring programs are designed to generate reliable feedback that is used to improve project outcomes.

## Validation Report

- (2) Provide a management plan for documenting decisions, actions and outcomes and sharing this information with others within the project team, so experience is passed on rather than being lost when individuals leave the project.
- (3) Flexibility of the project design to accommodate potential change is to be clarified.
- (4) The condition of the project funding is to be clarified. (Is the project funding a long term funding which covers the operational lifetime of the project 60 years?)

### **Response:**

(1) The project management after 2012 will be done by Union of Seven Cooperatives, which is being under formation. To this end WVE is giving training to all seven cooperatives leaders. WVE believes putting Cooperatives into Union is a legal provision in Ethiopia, which has been successfully working for Coffee, input, etc in the form of unions across country.

To prepare community & local Gov't staff for monitoring and generate feedback training on SMART tool is delivered by WV staff after being trained by World Bank. Moreover, WVE remain playing advisory role for monitoring & generating reliable feedback for union and District Government from WVE head Office than basing at ADP. About capacity of the union, the union leader will be competent. The District government staff are at least B.SC degree with extensive experience. The WVE advisory role will ensure the union capacity, determine monitoring indicator (being/to be agreed by partners) & follow up the monitoring is done and documented. To ensure this process there will be bi-annual stakeholders review.

(2) So far WVE has been documenting decisions, actions & outcomes in minting, picturing, capturing many more information in biannual & annual reports. More over, the official conversations letters (out going & incoming) with Coops, District, EPA and others have been documented at WVE.

Sharing the experiences has been carried out by publications, media (paper & audio). Those documents are present in WVE. In 2010 WVE produced a documentary video and archived.

All seven Coops have got office, registration book, minute logbook and data/outgoing/incoming conversations letter filing boxes. The coops have been already practicing well. Many of these were visited by DOE in Coops office.

WVE continued capacitating the community to reach to the level they can document every decisions, actions & outcomes. For sharing the experiences the District Agriculture & Rural Development Office remain supportive while WVE supporting as advisor to ensure the documentation of decisions, actions & outcomes and experience is shared. WVE will deliver the indicated support from Head Office level after 2012. This existing trend get consolidated at Union. During the bi-annual meetings with stakeholders

(3) The project design remains flexible to accommodate potential change provided the change is acceptable by project participant, World Bank and UNFCCC based on recommendation of verifier.

(4) The condition of project funding plan is already submitted to World Bank since finance plan is one of the condition in ERPA required to be submitted to trustee. (/28/) The submitted project financing covers for ten years. WVE plan for after 2017 is the project owner community will cover project finance from the forest & non-forest benefits, ecosystem service payments, economic development projects the union will be running, etc. After 2017 the Union financial capacity keep on growing since all revenue to be collected will be put to economic development projects such apiculture, fattening, etc. The community will also get finance from timber, grass, ecotourism and so on. These all will improve the finance base and enable the union to fund the project operation. Obviously, the project operation cost will get minimum over time once the project implemented. For instance, any guarding will be done by the community themselves since it is community project.

### **CCB Clarification Request 3**

It is to be clarified how the PP will document the relevant or applicable lessons learned.

### **Response:**

## Validation Report

The documentation will be in hard and soft copies all at Union and WVE Head offices and remain accessible for users/visitors. Hard copies are logbooks, minutes, correspondences, reports, monitoring reports, pictures, etc. The soft copy will be in computer with backup. The knowledge management use publications. WVE anticipates to work with Forestry & associated Universities in Ethiopia as well as over sea so as to have scientific analysis and publications. On top of publications the ongoing use of medias such as radio, TV and newspaper plus hosting various visitors will continue and feedbacks get documented.

### 3.1.3. Conclusion

**Clarification 1:** It was confirmed that;

- (1) The project participants do not apply the other carbon crediting scheme after 30 years, and do not at this point intend to apply for any carbon crediting scheme after 30 years, but this may change depending on the development of markets at that time.
- (2) The project participants are aware of dual certification of CCB combined with CDM can provide carbon buyers more certainty around the co-benefits which make forest carbon projects more interesting, meaning not direct payment. One of the ecosystem services would be conserving biodiversity.

**Clarification 2:**

- (1) The organization and management by Union, District Government and WVE is essential for the Project. Also, ensuring the process by bi-annual stakeholders meeting is important. The bi-annual stakeholders review will be organized by Union & District Government.
- (2) The validation team visited the project sites, cooperatives' offices and met representatives of 4 cooperatives in each office. Also, the validation team visited the local government. The validation team considers that the cooperatives are well organized and the local government representatives are experienced in forestry and very supportive to the project
- (3) It was confirmed that the project design is flexible to accommodate potential change.
- (4) The project funding is not covering 60 years. The anticipation is that part of the forest and non-forest benefits, such as from apiculture, ecotourism, designing a new project that builds on initial project outcomes; promoting micro-enterprise; and establishing alliances with organizations or companies to continue sustainable land management.

The outline condition of the project financing and the plan of the WVE are clearly explained.

**Clarification 3 :**

The validation team visited WVE and 4 cooperatives and it was confirmed that the record of the project and store of the documentation are appropriate.

All Clarifications are clarified.

The project complies with the CCB Standard requirements.

## 3.2 Climate Section

### 3.2.1 Discussion

#### CL1. Net Positive Climate Impacts

The project applies approved AR CDM methodology, AR-AMS0003 version 04.

It is demonstrated in the PDD that the net climate impact of the project will give a positive result in terms of overall GHG benefits delivered. The validation team confirmed by the on-site assessment that the trees in the earliest part of the project (started in 2006) are growing as expected in the PDD.

#### CL2. Offsite Climate Impacts (Leakage)

There is no potential offsite decrease in carbon stocks due to the project activities. Also, there is no displacement of activities as described in the CDM validation report. (ref. CDM validation report No. 2712.)

#### CL3. Climate Impact Monitoring

## Validation Report

Monitoring is carried out in accordance with the approved CDM methodology AR-AM0003 version 04.

### **CL4. Adapting to Climate Change and Climate Variability (Option)**

No negative regional climate change is likely.

According to the midterm evaluation in March 2010 conducted by WV, some of the findings from the evaluation indicated forested catchments provided more gradual run-off which slowed down the flow of floodwater onto agricultural fields during heavy rainfall. Reduced flooding in turn reduces loss of topsoil. (ref. : Response to Clarification 6)

### **CL5. Carbon Benefits Withheld from Regulatory Markets (Option)**

WVE respect the CDM laws. Even at this stage WVE signed with BioCarbon Fund only for half of tCER being sequestered for 10 years.

#### **3.2.2. Findings**

**None**

#### **3.2.3. Conclusion**

The project complies with the CCB Standard requirements.

### **3.3. Community Section**

#### **3.3.1. Discussion**

##### **CM1. Net Positive Community Impacts**

PDD section G describes the net benefits to communities from the project such as income generation, sharing of benefits including water, creating employment, sustainable fuel wood supply and technical capacity building of the FMNR.

There had been many barriers as follows.

- Investment barriers
- Institutional barriers
- Technological barriers
- Barriers related to prevailing practice
- Lack of organization of local communities

The project is a community-based AR project.

In the PDD § A.2, local stakeholder participation is clearly described that this project seeks to undertake the following activities:

- Restoration of approximately 2728 hectares of biodiverse natural forest in the Humbo Woreda, using indigenous and naturalized species.
- Community management of public land with multiple objectives of promoting natural resource management, poverty alleviation and biodiversity enhancement
- Development of a model of community land use that would enhance GHG removals by sinks from regenerating native vegetation, which can be replicable in other regions of Ethiopia.
- Formation of seven community cooperative societies and securing legal title to manage the proposed regeneration area, and adopting a constitution and by-laws to manage the project.
- Establishment of institutional structure with right to the Certified Emissions Reductions (CERs) generated from the site.
- Establishment of a system to monitor the carbon stocks and recording and reporting on the changes in carbon stocks.
- Establishment of a system to monitor the environmental and social issues relevant to the project.

## Validation Report

As indicated in PDD section G, a Social Mitigation Action Plan was prepared. This plan includes followings.

- Ensure that the project fully benefits the local communities and is culturally appropriate and acceptable to the participating communities and other concerned stakeholders.
- Undertake adequate consultations with the communities living around the project area in order to ensure that the project is undertaken with their full consent and active participation.
- Identify and carry out full consultations with all members of the community that would be disproportionately affected by restricted access.
- Create appropriate mechanisms to avoid, minimize or mitigate the potential adverse impacts on the vulnerable members of the communities as a result of restricted access to the project area.
- Ensure that the members of the community that are affected by restricted access to the natural resources in the project area themselves define and propose activities as mitigation measures.

### CM2. Offsite Community Impacts

By the on-site assessment and interview to local government, the validation team confirmed that there are no negative offsite community impacts.

### CM3. Community Impact Monitoring

Communities will monitor and evaluate the implementation of the mitigation action plan. Refer to PDD Annex 7.

### CM4. Capacity Building (Option)

The PDD § G.1(5) describes the management structure and the technical capacity building of communities in the application of the FMNR technique during project establishment. The capacity building is targeted to community representatives from all the kebeles participating in the project. The community representatives comprised elders, women, youth, and the landless.

### CM5. Best Practices in Community Involvement (Option)

The validation team confirmed by the on-site assessment following;

- (1) During the project preparation, considerable time and resources was invested to ensure that the communities living around the project area are fully informed about the project objectives and the benefits accruing from it. The project proponent, World Vision Ethiopia, started the process of community consultations from the inception of the project. A World Bank team of multi-disciplinary experts visited the project area in January 2006 to assess the feasibility of the project and to ascertain the fact that the communities living around the project area are willing to actively participate in the project. A series of subsequent consultations and focus group discussions was undertaken with the communities living around the project area to ascertain their commitment and readiness to participate in the project and to identify problems and potential impacts that may arise as a result of restricted access to the natural resources in the project area. The results of the community consultations as evidenced in all focus group discussions indicated that the communities are willing to participate in the project.
- (2) Consultation and participation are undertaken with the communities participating in the project as well as with all potentially affected people and all other stakeholders including local authorities. The communities themselves play the major role in the decision-making process from project planning up to the implementation phase and in monitoring and evaluation of all activities in the project.
- (3) Detailed information regarding the rights and duties of project beneficiaries is disseminated in the appropriate local language and in an accessible manner.

### 3.3.2. Findings

#### **CCB Clarification Request 4**

It is to be clarified how PPs are explaining about workers safety.

## Validation Report

### Response:

Project workers have been working in capacitating field workers of seedling raising, planting, weeding, pruning and other forest management roles. Besides, project workers mostly involved in empowering the community and concerned local government staff. Therefore, there is no risk associated with workers safety identified so far.

### **3.3.3. Conclusion**

Through the interviews to communities' representatives and local government representatives during on-site assessment, the validation team confirmed that the communities positively participate in the project and they are well organized for the implementation of the project by the local government support to the project.

Clarification 4 was clarified.

The project complies with the CCB standard requirements.

## **3.4. Biodiversity Section**

### **3.4.1. Discussion**

#### **B1. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts**

This project is a reforestation for the degraded land and mainly native species will be used.

The project is considered to have net biodiversity benefit.

As non-native species, mixed naturalized trees (*Eucalyptus and Grevilla*) will be planted to the project in 500ha among total 2728ha.

The impacts by these naturalized species are small and there is no possible adverse effects considered.

Surrounding area of the project boundary contains a IUCN Red List threatened species.

The project will help to improve the condition of bio diversity.

No genetically modified organisms will be used.

### **3.4.2. Findings**

#### **CCB Clarification Request 5**

Please explain about the monitoring of biodiversity monitoring and its frequency.

#### **Response**

WVE plan is to conduct monitoring of biodiversity every five years. To implement this plan WVE budgeted for training of field level staff and selected community members in 2010. As per WVE plan this training will be given Ethiopia Biodiversity Institute professionals. The schedule is for September 15-17, 2010. After training in 2011, these trainees will continue data collection, reporting and documentation.

#### **CCB Clarification Request 6**

Please provide the evidences or literatures demonstrating the improvement of water and soil resources.

#### **Response**

WVE conducted an interview for those who are around the project site elder community members to learn about improvement in water, soil resources plus other resources such as biodiversity. In this process WVE got evidences from community interview. This story is done in 2009 and documented. Moreover, WVE is witnessing particularly the soil erosion improvements since all erosion coming from project site mountain is arrested and the downstream farmland itself is saved from sedimentation. Professionals are witnessing that much water infiltration is happening due to the trees intercepting the run off.

In March 2010 WV conducted midterm evaluation employing a mixed methods approach in a *Triangulation including* a broad scale household survey (380 respondents from the project area and 50 from outside the project area within Humbo district), key informant interviews and focus group discussions with community groups. Some of the findings from the evaluation indicated forested catchments provided more gradual run-off which slowed down the flow of floodwater onto agricultural fields during heavy rainfall. Reduced flooding in turn reduces loss of topsoil.

## Validation Report

The majority of respondents in the household survey (73%) said that erosion in the communal forest had decreased while 12% thought it had not changed and 12% thought it had increased. One of the studies conducted in Ethiopia is in line with above finding. Eg. Munro, R, Deckers, J, Haile, M, Grove, A, Poesen, J, Nyssen, J, 2008, Soil landscapes, land cover change and erosion features of the Central Plateau region of Tigray, Ethiopia: Photo-monitoring with an interval of 30 years, Journal of Hydrology, Volume 275, Issue 1-2, Pages 55-64. (/30/)

### 3.4.3. Conclusion

Clarification 5 and Clarification 6 were clarified.

The project complies with the CCB requirements.

### 3.5 CCBA Scores card

General Section		Required	Extra score	Conclusion
G1	Original Conditions at Project Site	✓		✓
G2	Baseline Projections	✓		✓
G3	Project Design & Goals	✓		✓
G4	Management Capacity	✓		✓
G5	Land Tenure	✓		✓
G6	Legal Status	✓		✓
G7	Adaptive Management for Sustainability (Option)		1	1
G8	Knowledge Dissemination (Option)		1	1

Climate Section		Required	Extra score	Conclusion
CL1	Net Positive Climate Impacts	✓		✓
CL2	Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”)	✓		✓
CL3	Climate Impact Monitoring	✓		✓
CL4	Adapting to Climate Change and Climate Variability (Option)		1	1
CL5	Carbon Benefits Withheld from Regulatory Markets (Option)		1	1

Community Section		Required	Extra score	Conclusion
CM1	Net Positive Community Impacts	✓		✓
CM2	Offsite Community Impacts	✓		✓
CM3	Community Impact Monitoring	✓		✓
CM4	Capacity Building (Option)		1	1
CM5	Best Practices in Community Involvement (Option)		1	1

Biodiversity Section		Required	Extra score	Conclusion
B1	Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts	✓		✓
CM2	Offsite Biodiversity Impacts	✓		✓
CM3	Biodiversity Impact Monitoring	✓		✓
CM4	Native Species Use (Option)		1	1
CM5	Water an Soil Resource Enhancement (Option)		1	1

Complying with the 15 mandatory criteria, the project receives the status “Approved”. For the silver standard, approved projects need to receive at least one additional point from three different sections (general, climate, community, biodiversity). For a gold evaluation, six extra points have to be made with at least one point from each of the four sections.



## Validation Report

Final conclusion on CCBA status	
<b>Approved</b>	<b>15</b>
Silver	
<b>Gold</b>	<b>8</b>

#### 4. COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS

The PDD was made public on the CCBA web site on June, 2009.

A comment was received from an expert of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development of University of Pretoria stressing the significance of "Humbo Ethiopia Assisted Natural Regeneration Project" as the CCB project from national and international prospective.

#### 5. VALIDATION OPINION

JACO CDM., Ltd has been ordered by the World Bank (the Client) to perform the CCB - validation of A/R project "Humbo Ethiopia Assisted Natural Regeneration Project" (hereinafter the Project)

This CCB - validation report summarizes the findings of the validation.

The purpose of this validation is an independent assessment by a Third Party (JACO CDM) of the proposed project activity against the CCB standards First Edition.

The validation consisted of the following three steps:

- iv) desk review of the project design, the baseline and the monitoring plan etc.,
- v) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders
- vi) the resolution of outstanding issues and issuance of the final validation report and the opinion.

The CCB - Validation was performed using CCB standard checklist and also using approved A/R CDM methodology AR-AM0003 version 04. The validation team pointed out 6 Clarifications.

The responses to the 6 Clarifications to the original PDD version 01 (August 18, 2008) were satisfactorily provided by the Project participants.

In our opinion, the project as described in the PDD version 03 (June 19, 2009) meets all relevant requirements of CCBA Standards First Edition.

According to the scorecard approach introduced by CCBA, JACO CDM considers the project to comply with Gold level.

## Validation Report

### 6. REFERENCES

#### Category 1 Documents:

*Documents related directly to the GHG components of the project,*

- /1a/ PDD version 01, August 18, 2008
- /1b/ PDD version 02. May 5, 2009
- /1c/ PDD version 03, June 19, 2009
- /2a/ PDD Annex 5: Legal and Institutional Aspects
- /2b/ PDD Annex 6: Project PRA Report (Participatory Rural Appraisal), April, 2008
- /2c/ PDD Annex 7: Social Aspects Study during Pre-Feasibility Study & Social Mitigation Action Plan, (1st version, Sept. 14, 2007, updated, May 5, 2009)
- /2d/ PDD Annex 8: Project Boundary map, GPS MAP
- /2e/ PDD Annex 9: Results of Consultations with Communities
- /2f/ PDD Annex 10: Forest Fire Management Plan
- /2g/ PDD Annex 11: Additional Information on Leakage
- /2h/ PDD Annex 12: Statement by United Bank S.C., Ethiopia, dated May 8, 2009
- /2i/ PDD Annex 13 (1): Foresters Report on Forest and Plantation Growth, Dr. Deribe Gurmu Benti
- /2j/ PDD Annex 13 (2): TARAM (Tool for Afforestation and Reforestation Approved Methodologies)
- /2k/ PDD Annex 13 (3): Justification of Figures presented in TARAM – Stand Model 1 & 2
- /2l/ PDD Annex 14: Environmental Analysis by Greenhouse Balanced
- /3/ Host Country Approval to “Humbo Ethiopia Assisted Natural Regeneration Project” CDM project (October 09, 2007)
- /4/ Written Approval for “Humbo Ethiopia Assisted Natural Regeneration Project” by the DNA of Canada (22, 06, 2009)
- /5/ Humbo Community Managed Natural Regeneration Forest Project, World Vision Ethiopia, “Design Document”; published February 2007
- /6/ Humbo/Soddo Community Managed Forestry Project; Activity Plan for FY 2007. (World Vision)
- /7/ Humbo and Sodo budgets 2007 (World Vision)
- /8/ Forests and CO2 Flows (Annual Report for 2006) (World Vision)
- /9/ Annual Activity Accomplishment Report for FY’07 (World Vision)
- /10/ Annual Activity Accomplishment Report FY’08 (World Vision)
- /11/ Federal Proclamation No. 456/2005; Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Rural Land Administration and Use Proclamation
- /12/ SNNPR Proclamation No. 53/2003; The Southern Nation, Nationalities and People Region Rural Land Administration and Utilization Proclamation
- /13/ Confirmation of Land user right certificate (Permanent user right certificate), August 6, 2007
- /14/ Land use certificates (for 7 cooperatives), April 4, 2007
- /15/ Registration Certificate of 7 Co-operatives, June 27, 2007
- /16/ Cooperative bye – laws (Example)
- /17a/ Summary of trainings (2006 – 2008)
- /17b/ CDM work shop, April 10-12, 2006
- /17c/ Participants list to CDM Work shop of April 10-12, 2006

## Validation Report

- /18/ Forest Fires in Ethiopia (UNDP, 2001)
- /19a/ Sourcebook for Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry Projects, Winrock
- /19b/ Project sample size calculation sheet
- /20a/ E-mail communications record of World Vision Australia (WVA) (Sept. 13, 2004, Sept. 22, 2004, May 23, 2005)
- /20b/ E-mail communication in World Bank (Oct. 18, 2005, Oct. 24, 2005)
- /20c/ E-mail communication between WVA and the World Bank (December 1, 2006)
- /21/ Trip report and Recommendations by Tony Rinaudo of WVA (June, 2008)
- /22/ CBD Report, Ethiopia (<http://www.cbd.int/doc/world/et/et-nr-03-en.doc>)
- /23/ Soil erosion in Ethiopia  
(World Bank, Country Economic Memorandum, Background Report, April 22, 2004;  
<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTETHIOPIA/Resources/PREM/Technical%20Note2.revised%20April13..pdf>)
- /24/ Farmer managed Natural Revegetation (FMNR):  
[www.irinnews.org/report.asp?ReportID=55911&SelectRegion=West\\_Africa](http://www.irinnews.org/report.asp?ReportID=55911&SelectRegion=West_Africa)
- /25/ Draft Operations Monitoring Plan for the Humbo Ethiopia Assisted Regeneration Project (Second Version: May 2009 by the World Bank)
- /26/ Ethiopia Humbo Reforestation Carbon Project, Project Concept Note (PCN) (World Bank, 11/01/2005)
- /27/ World Bank Carbon Finance Business, Carbon Finance Document (CFD) "Humbo Community Based Forest Management Project, Ethiopia" (Revised Oct. 14, 2005)
- /28/ BioCarbon Fund, Clean Development Mechanism, Verified Emission Reductions Purchase Agreement (November 15, 2007)
- /29/ Sustainable Land management Sourcebook, World Bank 2008 (pp30-31)
- /30a/ Soil landscapes, land cover change and erosion features of the Central Plateau region of Tigray, Ethiopia: Photo-monitoring with an interval of 30 years, Journal of Hydrology, Volume 275, Issue 1-2, Pages 55-64
- /30b/ Humbo Regeneration Project is becoming glimmer of hope for the community, 2007, by WVE

### Category 2 Documents:

*Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents.*

- /31/ Decision 16/CMP.1 & Annex
- /32/ Decision 5/CMP.1
- /33/ AR-AM0003, version 04
- /34/ Tool for the Demonstration and assessment of Additionality in A/R CDM project Activities (EB 35, Annex 17)
- /35/ Procedures to Demonstrate the Eligibility of Lands for Afforestation and Reforestation CDM Project Activities (EB 35, Annex 18)
- /36/ AR methodological tool " Calculation of the number of sample plots for measurements within A/R CDM project activities" (EB46 Annex 19)
- /37/ IPCC Good Practice Guidance / LULUCF
- /38/ FAO Eucalyptus:  
<http://www.fao.org/docrep/004/ac121e/ac121e04.htm#bm04.3>Species
- /39/ FAO technical note: Yield model of plantations in the tropics:  
<http://www.fao.org/docrep/s4550e/s4550e0b.htm>
- /40/ VVM
- /41/ Validation Report (UNFCCC ref.No.2712)

## Validation Report

### Persons interviewed:

*Persons interviewed during the validation, or persons contributed with other information that are not included in the documents listed above.*

- /45a/ Mikko Ollikainen, Carbon Finance Specialist, Carbon Finance Unit, World Bank
- /45b/ Daigo Koga, Carbon Finance Specialist, Carbon Finance Unit, World Bank
- /46/ Rama Chandra Reddy, Senior Methodology Specialist, World Bank
- /47/ Edward Dwumfour, World Bank
- /48/ Yiigeru Sedi, Director World Vision Ethiopia
- /49/ Assefa Tofu, World Vision Ethiopia
- /50/ Asrat Yirgu Senato, World Vision Ethiopia
- /51/ Hailu Tefera Ayele, World Vision Ethiopia
- /52/ Abdi Ahiferaw, World Vision Ethiopia
- /53/ Paul Dettmann, World Vision Australia
- /54/ Tewolde B. G. Egziabher, Director General, EPA Ethiopia
- /55/ Meskir Tesfaye, EPA Ethiopia
- /56/ Yalew Belete, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MoARD)
- /57/ Kiflu Segu, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MoARD)
- /58/ Taye Buke, Humbo ADP
- /59/ Kebede Ryassa, Humbo ADP
- /60/ Temesge Aduew, Humbo ADP
- /61/ Yohannes Maham, Chairperson of Forest div. of Hobicha Bongota Cooperative
- /62/ Wlmedhin Shanko, Chairman of Abela Longena Cooperative
- /63/ Leka Lencha, secretary of Abela Longena Cooperative
- /64/ Demeke Muna, Accountant of Abela Longena Cooperative
- /65/ Beyene Agebo, Chairman of Abela Longena Cooperative
- /66/ Taddese GAAlcha, Assistant Chairman of Abela Longena Cooperative
- /67/ Daniel Unke, Chairman of Abela Shoya Cooperative
- /68/ Matusal Dea, Secretary of Abela Shoya Cooperative
- /69/ Matewos Meskele, Secretary (Audit Committee) of Abela Shoya Cooperative
- /70/ Debisa Dea, Chaiman of Bosa Wanche Cooperative
- /71/ Tademe Wana, Secretary of Bosa Wanchee Cooperative

**JACO CDM**

**CCB STANDARDS CHECKLIST**

**Humbo Ethiopia Assisted  
Natural Regeneration Project**

**Table 1 CCB Standard Requirements Checklist**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<b>GENERAL SECTION</b>					
<b>G1.Original Conditions at Project Site</b>					
<b>G1.1. General Information</b>					
G1.1.1. The <b>location</b> of the project and basic physical parameters (e.g., soil, geology, climate).	PDD	DR I	The location of the project of the project and the physical parameters are clearly indicated in the PDD.	OK	OK
G1.1.2. The <b>types and condition of vegetation</b> at the project site.	PDD	DR I	The types and conditions of vegetation are indicated for each strata in the PDD, C.4 and attached paper "Humbo Site Forest Area Stratification.	OK	OK
<b>G1.2. Climate Information</b>					
G1.2.1. <b>Current carbon stocks at the project site(s)</b> , using methodologies from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Good Practice Guidance (IPCC GPG) or other internationally-approved methodologies (e.g., from the CDM Executive Board).	PDD	DR I	According to the CDM methodology AR-AM0003 applied to the project, the current carbon stocks are above-ground biomass and below-ground biomass.	OK	OK
<b>G1.3. Community Information</b>					
G1.3.1. <b>A description of communities</b> located in and around the project area, including basic socio-economic information (using appropriate methodologies such as the livelihoods framework).	PDD, /46/	DR I	7 Communities located in and around the project area are described in the PDD and its Annex 7.  Socio-economic study was conducted for communities around the project area.	OK	OK

G1.3.2. A description of <b>current land use and land tenure</b> at the project site. (See also G5)	PDD /2a/ /13/ /15/	DR I	Current land use is grass land, shrub and scattered trees.  Land tenure is described in the PDD A.6.	OK	OK
<b>G1.4. Biodiversity Information</b>					
G1.4.1. A description of <b>current biodiversity</b> in the project area and threats to that biodiversity, using appropriate methodologies (e.g., key species habitat analysis, connectivity analysis), substantiated where possible with appropriate reference material.	PDD /2b/	DR I	There is a description about several threatened species, identified in IUCN red list in the PDD A5.1& A5.2. This project is a regeneration of native species for the degraded land. Major tree species are native species and 500ha among 2728 ha are mixed naturalized species.	OK	OK
G1.4.2. A list of <b>all IUCN Red List threatened species</b> (which encompasses endangered and vulnerable species) and species on nationally recognized list (where applicable) found within the project boundary. (See also B1)	PDD	DR I	This region contains several threatened species, identified in the World Conservation Union (IUCN) red list, associated with the temperate and tropical mountain forest habitats which are anticipated to benefit directly from the proposed project. (Ref. PDD table-A-1)	OK	OK
<b>G2. Baseline Projections</b>					
G2.1. Description of <b>the most likely land-use scenario in the absence of the project</b> , identifying whether the scenario assumes that existing laws or regulations would have required that project activities be undertaken anyway.	PP /2b/	DR	The results of baseline study carried out by PP are included in the PDD.  The proposed project areas have been denuded and anthropogenic pressures prohibit natural regeneration. This is attested to in the PRA workshops, which have been held in the region (see PDD annex 4). Without a change in ownership and forest management (FMNR), as proposed in this project the forest vegetation is not expected to get reestablished on the site.	OK	OK

<p>G2.2. A projection of <b>future carbon stock changes in the absence of the project</b>, based on the land-use scenario described above. The timeframe for this analysis can be either the project lifetime (see G3) or the project accounting period, whichever is more appropriate. If there is evidence that non-CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions such as CH<sub>4</sub> or NO<sub>2</sub> are more than 15% of the baseline GHG fluxes at the project site ( in terms of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents), they must be estimated.</p>	<p>PDD /2b/ /2f/ /2i/ /5/ /8/ /14/ /22/ /23/</p>	<p>DR I</p>	<p>The project areas are mainly degraded grassland and fallow land. The carbon stock of these areas is decreasing due to depletion of nutrients in the soil caused by cropping.</p> <p>Soil erosion data produced by the World Bank indicated that the project area is losing an average of between 4 and 10 tonnes of topsoil erosion per hectare per year due to erosion. Due to their steep terrain, the sites are subject to higher levels of erosion and as a consequence, the soil carbon levels in the baseline scenario are expected to show a gradual decline. Due to anthropogenic pressures, the dead wood and litter levels are also expected to decrease in the baseline scenario (see PRA workshop report-Annex 6 of PDD). While in the project scenario, the deadwood, litter and soil carbon pools are expected to increase. Therefore, not accounting their changes in the project scenario is conservative.</p> <p>No fertilizer is applied.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>G2.3. Description of how the “<b>without-project</b>” scenario would affect local communities in the project area.</p>	<p>PDD /2c/ /2e/ /5/8/</p>	<p>DR</p>	<p>Without-project, loss of biomass and further degradation is expected to continue.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>G2.4. Description of how the “<b>without-project</b>” land-use scenario would affect biodiversity in the project area.</p>	<p>PDD /2b/ /14/</p>	<p>DR</p>	<p>As mentioned in the PDD A.5.1, without-project, degradation is expected to continue and this would adversely affect biodiversity in the project area.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>G2.5. Description of how the “<b>without-project</b>” land-use scenario would affect water and soil resources. (See also B5)</p>	<p>PDD /2b/ /5/8/ /14/ /30/</p>	<p>DR I</p>	<p>PDD B.3.2: Without project, water catchment area and water quality will be reduced (PDD A.2). Also, the ground will be reduced. (PDD A.5)</p> <p>Over-clearing has led to significant soil erosion problems, with mudslides occurring on the site. (PDD A.5)</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>



<b>G3. Project Design &amp; Goals</b>						
G3.1.	Provide a description of the <b>scope</b> of the project and a summary of the major <b>climate, community and biodiversity goals</b> .	PDD/ /5/	DR	In PDD A.2, scope of the project and a summary of the major climate, community and biodiversity goals are described.	OK	OK
G3.2.	Describe each <b>major project activity</b> (if more than one) and its relevance to achieving the <b>project's goals</b> .	PDD /5/	DR	Major activity is described in the PDD A.2 as a regeneration of a degraded 2728 ha by mainly native tree species.	OK	OK
G3.3.	Provide a <b>map</b> identifying the project location, where the major project activities will occur, and geo-referenced boundaries of the project site(s).	PDD	DR	PDD A.4.1, A.4.2 and its Annex 8 provide a map for the project. Boundary information is also provided.	OK	OK
G3.4.	Provide a <b>timeframe for the project's duration</b> and the rationale used for determining the project lifetime. If the accounting period for carbon credits differs from the project lifetime, explain.	PDD	DR	<b><u>CCB Clarification Request 1</u></b> Project operational lifetime is 60 years and the fixed crediting period is 30 years.  Please explain about the reason of the difference.	<b>CCB CL1</b>	OK
G3.5.	Identify <b>likely risks to climate, community and biodiversity benefits</b> during the project lifetime. Outline measures that the project plans to undertake to mitigate these risks.	PDD /5/	DR	In F.1 of the PDD, risk analysis and countermeasures are described.	OK	OK
G3.6.	Document and defend how <b>local stakeholders</b> have been or will be defined.	PDD /2c/	DR	It is indicated in the section H of the PDD and its Annex 7 about Document and defend how <b>local stakeholders</b> have been or will be defined.	OK	OK
G3.7.	Demonstrate <b>transparency</b> by: making <b>all project documentation publicly accessible</b> at, or near, the project site; only withholding information when the need for confidentiality is clearly justified; informing local stakeholders how they can access the project documentation; and by making key project documents available in local or regional languages, where applicable.	/48/ /52/ /58/ /71/	DR  I	All project documents will be available to communities and local stakeholders in English and in local language.  The validation team confirmed by visiting the offices of co-operatives at site visit.	OK	OK

<b>G4. Management Capacity</b>						
G4.1.	Document the <b>management team's experience implementing land management projects</b> . If relevant experience is lacking, the proponents must demonstrate how other organizations will be partnered with to support the project.	PDD /2c/	DR  I	<p>Yes, it is demonstrated in Annex 7 of the PDD, as below.</p> <p>The management of the enclosed areas will be undertaken by the 7 cooperatives in the respective sites with support given by the project proponent, World Vision Ethiopia, as well as the woreda Agricultural, Rural Development and Forestry Development Coordination Office (ARDFCO). Along the preparation of this project, the communities have organized themselves as cooperative societies in accordance with the cooperatives law of Ethiopia in order to attain legal entity for the management of the project as well as to enter into contractual agreements for selling the sequestered carbon as a result of the reforestation project or, before reaching full capacity to do so, to enter into subcontractual agreements with World Vision Ethiopia (WVE) which will manage the emission reductions during the initial period of the project and will hand over the authority to do so to the community organizations. At present all communities have organized themselves as cooperatives. World Vision Ethiopia will act on behalf of the cooperatives until end of September 2012, when the latter are expected to attain sufficient capacity to manage the financial and administrative aspects of the project.</p>	OK	OK
G4.2.	Demonstrate that <b>management capacity</b> is appropriate to the scale of the project.	PDD /2c/	DR  I	Ditto	OK	OK
G4.3.	Document <b>key technical skills</b> that will be required to successfully implement the project and identify members of the management team or project partners who possess the appropriate skills.	PDD /5/ /24/	DR  I	PDD A.5.4 describes key technical skills, FMNR and supplemental planting by seedlings. Technical training is described in section G of the PDD.	OK	OK

<p>G4.4. Document the <b>financial health of the implementing organization(s)</b>.</p>	<p>PDD /10/</p>	<p>DR I</p>	<p>Preliminary financial report is provided in the “Annual Activity Accomplishment Report for FY’08, prepared by World Vision Ethiopia”. The report shows good accomplishment of the budget for the year 2008.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p><b>G5. Land Tenure</b></p>					
<p>G5.1. Guarantee that the project will <b>not encroach</b> uninvited on private property, community property, or government property.</p>	<p>PDD /2c/ /13- /16/</p>	<p>DR I</p>	<p>The project area is a closed and certified by local government (SNNPRS) for the co-operatives to utilize for the project. There is no private property and government property.</p> <p>As described in PDD Annex 7 §2, the project area had been commonly used by some members of the communities living around the project sites as a source for fuel wood, fodder, charcoal making, etc. The selected project site is transferred to the local communities as community holdings. For that purpose each kebele (sub-district) has formed a cooperative under the cooperative law and title deeds with enhanced user rights are provided to the cooperatives for the areas reforested in the project.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>G5.2. Guarantee that the project does not require the <b>relocation</b> of people or any relocation is 100% voluntary and fundamentally helps resolve land tenure problems in the area.</p>	<p>PDD /2c/ /13- /16/ /58- /71/</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>There are no people living in the boundary of the project. The land tenure is certified to the cooperatives of the project by the local government.</p> <p>The validation team confirmed at the on-site assessment that the project does not require the relocation of people.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>

<p>G5.3. Describe potential <b>“in-migration”</b> of people from surrounding areas, if relevant, and explain how the project will respond.</p>	<p>Ditto</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>It was confirmed that the project area will be managed by communities and protected from “in-migration” of people from surrounding areas. During the implementation phase, the project takes measures, with the active participation of the communities, to prevent new human settlement inside the project area and ensure that there will be no encroachment such as grazing or woodcutting. The user’s right is protected by relevant by-laws.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p><b>G6. Legal Status</b></p>					
<p>G6.1. Guarantee that no <b>laws</b> will be broken by the project.</p>	<p>/48/ /52/ /58/ /71/</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>The project is considered not to oppose any law.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>G6.2. Document that the project has, or expects to secure, <b>approval from the appropriate authorities.</b></p>	<p>/2c/ /3/ /13/ /16/ /54/ /60/</p>	<p>DR I</p>	<p>The project has approval from local government (the woreda Agricultural, Rural Development and Forestry Development Coordination Office (ARDFCO)) and land is protected by by-laws. Refer to Annex 7 of the PDD.  The project is approved as a CDM project by the government of Ethiopia.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p><b>G7. Adaptive Management for Sustainability (Option)</b></p>					

<p>G7.1. <b>Demonstrate how management actions and monitoring programs are designed</b> to generate reliable feedback that is used to improve project outcomes.</p>	<p>PDD /5/ /8/ /25/</p>	<p>DR I</p>	<p>During the implementation stage, the World Vision Ethiopia (WVE) is managing the project on behalf of the cooperatives until end of September 2012. In this stage, the validation team confirmed by the annual report of WVE that the management actions and monitoring programs are designed to generate reliable feedback that is used to improve project outcomes.</p> <p><b><u>CCB Clarification Request 2</u></b></p> <p>Please provide information of management after the cooperatives take over the management from WVE in 2012 as shown as Clarification 2 (1) - (4) below.</p> <p>(1) Demonstrate how management actions and monitoring programs are designed to generate reliable feedback that is used to improve project outcomes..</p>	<p><b>CCB CL 2 (1)</b></p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>G7.2. Have a <b>management plan</b> for documenting decisions, actions and outcomes and sharing this information with others within the project team, so experience is passed on rather than being lost when individuals leave the project.</p>	<p>PDD /25/</p>	<p>DR I</p>	<p><b><u>CCB Clarification Request 2</u></b></p> <p>(2) Provide a management plan for documenting decisions, actions and outcomes and sharing this information with others within the project team, so experience is passed on rather than being lost when individuals leave the project.</p>	<p><b>CCB CL 2 (2)</b></p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>G7.3. Demonstrate how the <b>project design</b> is sufficiently <b>flexible</b> to accommodate potential changes and that the project has a defined process in place to adjust project activities as needed.</p>	<p>PDD /45- /53/</p>	<p>DR I</p>	<p><b><u>CCB Clarification Request 2</u></b></p> <p>(3) Flexibility of the project design to accommodate potential change is to be clarified.</p>	<p><b>CCB CL 2 (3)</b></p>	<p>OK</p>

<p>G7.4. Demonstrate an early commitment to the long-term sustainability of project benefits once initial project funding expires. Potential activities may include: designing a new project that builds on initial project outcomes; securing payments for ecosystem services; promoting micro-enterprise; and establishing alliances with organizations or companies to continue sustainable land management.</p>	/48/ /49/	DR I	<p><b><u>CCB Clarification Request 2</u></b></p> <p>(4) The condition of the project funding is to be clarified. (Is the project funding a long term funding which covers the operational lifetime of the project 60 years?)</p> <p>Title of ERPA is: Biocarbon Fund Clean Development Mechanism Verified Emission Reductions Purchase Agreement (Ethiopia Humbo Assisted Regeneration project). It is signed between World Vision Australia &amp; World Vision Ethiopia and The International Bank for Reconstruction &amp; Development, as Trustee of the Biocarbon Fund in 2007. The crediting period is 30 (thirty) years fixed crediting period.</p>	<p><b>CCB CL 2 (4)</b></p>	<p>OK</p> <p>Ref. Table 2.</p> <p>The outline condition of the project financing and the plan of the WVE is clearly explained.</p>
<p>1 Point? : <b>YES</b> NO</p>					
<p><b>G8. Knowledge Dissemination (Option)</b></p>					
<p>G8.1. Describe how they will document the relevant or applicable lessons learned.</p>	/48/ /49/	DR I	<p><b><u>CCB Clarification Request 3</u></b></p> <p>It is to be clarified how the PP will document the relevant or applicable lessons learned.</p>	<p><b>CCB CL 3</b></p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>G8.2. Describe how they will disseminate this information in order to encourage replication of successful practices. Examples include: undertaking and disseminating research that has wide-reaching applications; holding training workshops for community members from other locales; promoting “farmer to farmer” knowledge-transfer activities; linking to regional databases; and working with interested academic, corporate, governmental or non-governmental organizations to replicate successful project activities.</p>	/48/ /71/	DR I	<p>The information includes planning, monitoring, evaluation systems etc.</p> <p>Experience sharing has been conducted between neighboring communities</p> <p>For the purpose of inside and outside communication, communications by documentation has been done and, in future, other mass media will be introduced for information such as user rights, FMNR, experience of farmers.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>1 Point? : <b>YES</b> NO</p>					

Climate Section					
CL1. Net Positive Climate Impacts					
CL1.1. Use the methodologies of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Good Practice Guidance (IPCC GPG) to estimate the net change in <b>carbon stocks</b> due to the project activities. The net change is equal to carbon stock changes <i>with</i> the project minus carbon stock changes <i>without</i> the project (the latter having been estimated in <b>G2</b> ). Alternatively, any methodology approved by the CDM Executive Board may be used. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about how project activities will alter carbon stocks and non-CO <sub>2</sub> GHG emissions over the duration of the project or the project accounting period.	PDD	DR I	The project applies approved AR CDM methodology, AR-AMS0003 version 04.	OK	OK
CL1.2. Factor in the <b>non-CO<sub>2</sub> gases</b> CH <sub>4</sub> and NO <sub>2</sub> to the net change calculations (above) if they are likely to account for more than 15% (in terms of CO <sub>2</sub> equivalents) of the project's overall GHG impact.	PDD	DR I	NA (No fertilizer is used.)	OK	OK
CL1.3. Demonstrate that the <b>net climate impact</b> of the project (including changes in carbon stocks, and non-CO <sub>2</sub> gases where appropriate) will give a <b>positive result</b> in terms of overall GHG benefits delivered.	PDD	DR I	It is demonstrated in the PDD that the the net climate impact of the project will give a positive result in terms of qverall GHG benefits delivered. The validation team confirmed by the on-site assessment that the trees in the earliest part of the project (started in 2006) are growing as expected in the PDD.	OK	OK
CL2. Offsite Climate Impacts ("Leakage")					
CL2.1. Estimate <b>potential offsite decreases in carbon stocks</b> (increases in emissions or decreases in sequestration) due to project activities.	PDD /41/	DR I	There is no potential offsite decrease in carbon stocks due to the project activities. (ref. CDM validation report No. 2712.)	OK	OK
CL2.2. Document how <b>negative offsite impacts</b> resulting from project activities will be mitigated, and estimate the extent to which such impacts will be reduced.	Ditto	DR I	There is no displacement of activities as described in the CDM validation report No.2712.)	OK	OK

CL2.3. <b>Subtract</b> any likely project-related unmitigated <b>negative offsite</b> climate impacts from the climate benefits being claimed by the project. The total net effect, equal to the net increase in onsite carbon stocks (calculated in the third indicator in <b>CLI</b> ) minus negative offsite climate impacts, must be positive.	Dito	DRI	Ditto	OK	OK
<b>CL3. Climate Impact Monitoring</b>					
CL3.1. Have an <b>initial plan</b> for how they will <b>select carbon pools and non-CO<sub>2</sub> GHGs to be monitored, and the frequency of monitoring</b> . Potential pools include aboveground biomass, litter, dead wood, belowground biomass and soil carbon. Pools to monitor must include any pools expected to decrease as a result of project activities. Relevant non-CO <sub>2</sub> gases must be monitored if they account for more than 15% of the project's net climate impact expressed in terms of CO <sub>2</sub> equivalents.	PDD	DR I	Monitoring is carried out in accordance with the approved CDM methodology AR-AM0003 version 04.	OK	OK
<b>CL4. Adapting to Climate Change and Climate Variability (Option)</b>					
CL4.1. Identify <b>likely regional climate change</b> and <b>climate variability impacts</b> , using available studies.	PDD /2I/	I	No negative regional climate change is likely.	OK	OK
CL4.2. Demonstrate that the project has anticipated such <b>potential impacts</b> and that <b>appropriate measures</b> will be taken to minimize these negative impacts.	—	I	Not applicable.	—	—
<b>1 Point? : YES NO</b>					
<b>CL5. Carbon Benefits Withheld from Regulatory Markets (Option)</b>					
CL5.1. <b>Not sell at least 10%</b> of the total carbon benefits generated by the project into <b>regulated GHG markets</b> (e.g., CDM, New South Wales GHG Abatement Scheme, and Oregon Standard). Projects can sell these carbon benefits in a voluntary market or retire them.	/48/ /49/		WVE respect the CDM laws. Even at this stage WVE signed with BioCarbon Fund only for half of tCER being sequestered for 10 years.	Pending	OK
<b>1 Point? : YES NO</b>					



COMMUNITY SECTION					
CM1. Net Positive Community Impacts					
<p>CM1.1. Use appropriate methodologies (e.g., the livelihoods framework) to estimate the <b>net benefits to communities</b> resulting from planned project activities. A credible estimate of net benefits must include changes in <b>community wellbeing</b> given project activities. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about how project activities will alter social and economic wellbeing over the duration of the project. The "with project" scenario must then be <b>compared with the baseline scenario of social and economic wellbeing in the absence of the project</b> (compared in <b>G2</b>). The difference (i.e., the net community benefit) must be positive.</p>	<p>PDD /2c/ /2e/ /10/</p>	<p>DR  I</p>	<p>PDD G describes the net benefits to communities from the project such as income generation, sharing of benefits including water, creating employment, sustainable fuel wood supply and technical capacity building of the FMNR.</p> <p>There had been many barriers as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Investment barriers</li> <li>- Institutional barriers</li> <li>- Technological barriers</li> <li>- Barriers related to prevailing practice</li> <li>- Lack of organization of local communities</li> </ul> <p>It is described in the validation report of the project 2712, in detail.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>

<p>CM1.2. <b>Document local stakeholder participation</b> in the project's planning. If the project occurs in an area with significant local stakeholders, the project must engage a <b>diversity of stakeholders</b>, including appropriate sub-groups, underrepresented groups and women living in the project vicinity. Stakeholders in the project's area of influence must have an <b>opportunity</b> before the project design is finalized, to <b>raise concerns</b> about potential negative impacts, express desired outcomes and provide input on the project design. Project developers must document stakeholder dialogues and indicate if and how the project proposal was revised based on such input.</p>	<p>PDD /2c/ /2e/ /10/</p>	<p>DR  I</p>	<p>The project is a community-based AR project.</p> <p>In the PDD § A.2, local stakeholder participation is clearly described that this project seeks to undertake the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restoration of approximately 2728 hectares of biodiverse natural forest in the Humbo Woreda, using indigenous and naturalized species.</li> <li>• Community management of public land with multiple objectives of promoting natural resource management, poverty alleviation and biodiversity enhancement</li> <li>• Development of a model of community land use that would enhance GHG removals by sinks from regenerating native vegetation, which can be replicable in other regions of Ethiopia.</li> <li>• Formation of seven community cooperative societies and securing legal title to manage the proposed regeneration area, and adopting a constitution and by-laws to manage the project.</li> <li>• Establishment of institutional structure with right to the Certified Emissions Reductions (CERs) generated from the site.</li> <li>• Establishment of a system to monitor the carbon stocks and recording and reporting on the changes in carbon stocks.</li> <li>• Establishment of a system to monitor the environmental and social issues relevant to the project.</li> </ul>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
--	---------------------------------------	----------------------	---	-----------	-----------

<p>CM1.3. <b>Formalize a clear process for handling unresolved conflicts and grievances that arise during project planning and implementation.</b> The project design must include a process for hearing, responding to and resolving community grievances within a reasonable time period. This grievance process must be publicized to local stakeholders. Project management must attempt to resolve all reasonable grievances raised, and provide a written response to grievances within 30 days. Grievances and project responses must be documented.</p>	<p>PDD /2c/ /2e/</p>	<p>DR I</p>	<p>As indicated in PDD section G, a Social Mitigation Action Plan was prepared. This plan includes followings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure that the project fully benefits the local communities and is culturally appropriate and acceptable to the participating communities and other concerned stakeholders.</li> <li>- Undertake adequate consultations with the communities living around the project area in order to ensure that the project is undertaken with their full consent and active participation.</li> <li>- Identify and carry out full consultations with all members of the community that would be disproportionately affected by restricted access.</li> <li>- Create appropriate mechanisms to avoid, minimize or mitigate the potential adverse impacts on the vulnerable members of the communities as a result of restricted access to the project area.</li> <li>- Ensure that the members of the community that are affected by restricted access to the natural resources in the project area themselves define and propose activities as mitigation measures.</li> </ul>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p><b>CM2. Offsite Community Impacts</b></p>					
<p>CM2.1. Identify <b>potential negative offsite community impacts</b> that the project is likely to cause.</p>	<p>PDD /2c/ /2e/</p>	<p>DR I</p>	<p>No negative offsite community impacts have been identified. Refer to PDD Annex 7.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>CM2.2. Describe how the project plans to <b>mitigate</b> these negative offsite social and economic impacts.</p>	<p>Ditto</p>	<p>DR</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>—</p>	<p>—</p>
<p>CM2.3. <b>Evaluate likely unmitigated negative offsite social and economic impacts</b> against the social and economic benefits of the project within the project boundaries. Justify and demonstrate that the net social and economic effect of the project is positive.</p>	<p>Ditto</p>	<p>DR I</p>	<p>No negative offsite social and economic impacts have been identified.  Refer to PDD Annex 7.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>

<b>CM3. Community Impact Monitoring</b>					
CM3.1. Have an initial plan for how they will select <b>community variables to be monitored</b> , and the <b>frequency</b> of monitoring. Potential variables include income, health, roads, schools, food security, education and inequality. Community variables at risk of being negatively impacted by project activities should be monitored.	PDD /2c/ /25/	DR I	Communities will monitor and evaluate the implementation of the mitigation action plan.  Refer to PDD Annex 7.	OK	OK
<b>CM4. Capacity Building (Option)</b>					
CM4.1. <b>Structured</b> to accommodate the needs of communities, not only of the project;	PDD /2a/ /2c/ /2e/ /25/	DR I	PDD Annex 5 shows a management structure. Also, PDD § G.1(5) describes about the technical capacity building of communities in the application of the FMNR technique during project establishment.	OK	OK
CM4.2. Targeted to a <b>wide range of groups</b> , not just elites;	Ditto	DR I	PDD annex 7 §4: The approach taken in conducting the assessment was to have focus group discussions with community representatives from all the kebeles participating in the project. The community representatives comprised elders, women, youth, and the landless.	OK	OK
CM4.3. Targeted to <b>women</b> to increase their participation;	Ditto	DR I	Ditto	OK	OK
CM4.4. Aimed to increase <b>community participation in project implementation</b> .	Ditto	DR I	Ditto	OK	OK
<b>1 Point? : <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO</b>					
<b>CM5. Best Practices in Community Involvement (Option)</b>					

<p>CM5.1. Demonstrate that the project was developed with a strong knowledge of <b>local customs</b> and that, where relevant, project activities are compatible with local customs.</p>	<p>PDD /2a/ /2c/ /2e/ /5//8/ /48-/ /53/ /58-/ /60/</p>	<p>DR  I</p>	<p>PDD Annex 7 §4:  During the project preparation, considerable time and resources was invested to ensure that the communities living around the project area are fully informed about the project objectives and the benefits accruing from it. The project proponent, World Vision Ethiopia, started the process of community consultations from the inception of the project.  A World Bank team of multi-disciplinary experts visited the project area in January 2006 to assess the feasibility of the project and to ascertain the fact that the communities living around the project area are willing to actively participate in the project.  A series of subsequent consultations and focus group discussions was undertaken with the communities living around the project area to ascertain their commitment and readiness to participate in the project and to identify problems and potential impacts that may arise as a result of restricted access to the natural resources in the project area. The results of the community consultations as evidenced in all focus group discussions indicated that the communities are willing to participate in the project.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>CM5.2. Show that <b>local stakeholders</b> will fill <b>all employment positions</b> (including management) if the job requirements are met. Project proponents must explain how stakeholders will be selected for positions and where relevant, must indicate how traditionally underrepresented stakeholders and women, will be given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained.</p>	<p>PDD /2c/</p>	<p>DR  I</p>	<p>PDD Annex 7 §3.2: Consultation and participation are undertaken with the communities participating in the project as well as with all potentially affected people and all other stakeholders including local authorities. The communities themselves play the major role in the decision-making process from project planning up to the implementation phase and in monitoring and evaluation of all activities in the project.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>

<p>CM5.3. Show that the project will <b>inform workers</b> about <b>their rights</b>, and that the project complies with <b>international rules on worker rights</b>.</p>	Ditto	DR I	<p>PDD Annex 7 §3.2: Detailed information regarding the rights and duties of project beneficiaries is disseminated in the appropriate local language and in an accessible manner.</p>	OK	OK
<p>CM5.4. Comprehensively assess <b>situations and occupations that pose a substantial risk to worker safety</b>. A plan must be in place to inform workers of risks and to explain how to minimize such risks. Where worker safety cannot be guaranteed, project proponents must show how the risks will be minimized using best work practices.</p>	Ditto	DR I	<p><b>.CCB Clarification Request 4</b> It is to be clarified how PPs are explaining about workers safety.</p>	<b>CCB CL 4</b>	OK
<p>1 Point? : <b>YES</b> NO</p>					
<p><b>BIODIVERSITY SECTION</b></p>					
<p><b>B1. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts</b></p>					
<p>B1.1. Use appropriate <b>methodologies</b> (e.g., key species habitat analysis, connectivity analysis) to <b>estimate changes in biodiversity</b> as a result of the project. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions. The “with project” scenario should then be compared with the baseline “without project” biodiversity scenario completed in <b>G2</b>. The difference (i.e., the net biodiversity benefit) must be positive.</p>	PDD /25/	DR I	<p>This project is a reforestation for the degraded land and mainly native species will be used.</p> <p>The project is considered to have net biodiversity benefit.</p>	OK	OK
<p>B1.2. Describe <b>possible adverse effects of non-native species</b> on the area’s environment, including impacts on native species and disease introduction or facilitation. If these impacts have a substantial bearing on biodiversity or other environmental outcomes, the project proponents must justify the necessity of using non-native species over native species.</p>	PDD	DR I	<p>As non-native species, mixed naturalized trees (<i>Eucalyptus and Grevilla</i>) will be planted to the project in 500ha among total 2728ha.</p> <p>The impacts by these naturalized species are small and there is no possible adverse effects considered.</p>	OK	OK

B1.3.	Identify <b>all IUCN Red List threatened species and species deemed threatened</b> on nationally recognized lists that may be found within the project boundary. Project proponents must document how project activities will not be detrimental in any way to these species.	PDD /25/	DR 	Surrounding area of the project boundary contains a IUCN Red List threatened species.  The project will help to improve the condition of bio diversity.	OK	OK
B1.4.	Identify <b>all species to be used by the project</b> and show that no known <b>invasive species</b> will be used.	PDD	DR 	It is identified all species used by the project in the PDD. Non-native species is only Eucalyptus and Grevilla and this is not invasive.	OK	OK
B1.5.	Guarantee that no <b>genetically modified organisms</b> will be used to generate carbon credits.	PDD	DR 	No genetically modified organisms will be used.	OK	OK
<b>B2. Offsite Biodiversity Impacts</b>						
B2.1.	Identify <b>potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts</b> that project are likely to cause.	PDD	DR 	This project is a natural regeneration project for the degraded land using mainly native tree species.  The project is considered to cause no negative offsite biodiversity impacts.	OK	OK
B2.2.	Describe how the project plans to <b>mitigate</b> these negative offsite biodiversity impacts.	—	DR 	Not applicable	—	—
B2.3.	Evaluate <b>likely unmitigated negative offsite biodiversity impacts against the biodiversity benefits of the project</b> within the project boundaries. Justify and demonstrate that the net effect of the projection biodiversity is positive.	—	DR 	Not applicable	—	—
<b>B3. Biodiversity Impact Monitoring</b>						
B3.1.	Have an initial plan for how they will select <b>biodiversity variables to be monitored</b> , and the <b>frequency of monitoring</b> . Potential variables include species abundance and diversity, landscape connectivity, forest fragmentation, habitat area and diversity, etc. Biodiversity variables at risk of being negatively impacted by project activities should be monitored.	/25/ /49/	DR 	<b><u>CCB Clarification Request 5</u></b>  Please explain about the monitoring of biodiversity monitoring and its frequency.	<b>CCB</b>  <b>CL 5</b>	OK

<b>B4. Native Species Use (Option)</b>						
B4.1.	Show that the project will <b>only use species that are native to the region.</b>  Or  Justify that any non-native species used by the project are superior to native species for generating concrete biodiversity benefits (e.g., for rehabilitating degraded areas unlikely to support natives, or for producing fuel wood that reduces logging pressure on intact ecosystems.)	PDD /25/	DR I	It is identified all species used by the project are indicated in the PDD.  Non-native species is only Eucalyptus and Grevilla for 500ha out of total 2728ha. These non-native species are naturalized species and planted for producing fuel woods, construction, fencing, etc.	OK	OK
<b>1 Point? : YES NO</b>						
<b>B5. Water an Soil Resource Enhancement (Option)</b>						
B5.1.	Identify project activities that are likely to <b>enhance water and soil resources.</b>	PDD /21/ /30/	DR I	Yes	OK	OK
B5.2.	Credibly demonstrate that these activities are likely to <b>improve water and soil resource</b> compared to the baseline, using justifiable assumptions about cause and effect, and relevant studies.	/21/ /30/		<b><u>CCB Clarification Request 6</u></b> Please provide the evidences or literatures demonstrating the improvement of water and soil resources.	<b>CCB CL 6</b>	Ref. Table 2, Clarification 6
<b>1 Point? : YES NO</b>						



**Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<p><b><u>CCB Clarification Request 1</u></b></p> <p>Project operational lifetime is 60 years and the fixed crediting period is 30 years.</p> <p>Please explain about the reason of the difference.</p>	<p>G3.4</p>	<p>Project operational lifetime will be 60 years. Some of the reasons are :not to lose the carbon being sequestered after 30 years, not to lose the biodiversity being rehabilitating, to sustain the co-benefits of the project and give more time for the ecologically friendly indigenous tree species. Moreover, the community can benefit from biodiversity, improved micro climate, improved down stream soil productivity due to arrested flooding coming from project site, etc while contributing towards global emission reduction.</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>It was confirmed that;</p> <p>(1) The project participants do not apply the other carbon crediting scheme after 30 years, and do not at this point intend to apply for any carbon crediting scheme after 30 years, but this may change depending on the development of markets at that time.</p> <p>(2) The project participants are aware of dual certification of CCB combined with CDM can provide carbon buyers more certainty around the co-benefits which make forest carbon projects more interesting, meaning not direct payment. One of the ecosystem services would be conserving biodiversity.</p>
<p><b><u>CCB Clarification Request 2</u></b></p> <p>Please provide information of management after the cooperatives take over the management from WVE in 2012 as shown as Clarification 2 (1) - (4) below.</p> <p>(1) Demonstrate how management actions and monitoring programs are designed to</p>	<p>G.7.1 G.7.2 G.7.3 G.7.4</p>	<p>(1) The project management after 2012 will be done by Union of Seven Cooperatives, which is being under formation. To this end WVE is being giving training to all seven cooperatives leaders. WVE believes putting Cooperatives into Union is a legal provision in Ethiopia, which has been successfully working for Coffee, input, etc in the form of unions across country.</p> <p>To prepare community &amp; local Gov't staff for monitoring</p>	<p>(1) OK</p> <p>The organization and management by Union, District Government and WVE is essential for the Project. Also, ensuring the process by bi-annual stakeholders meeting is important.</p>

<p>generate reliable feedback that is used to improve project outcomes.</p> <p>(2) Provide a management plan for documenting decisions, actions and outcomes and sharing this information with others within the project team, so experience is passed on rather than being lost when individuals leave the project.</p>	<p>and generate feedback training on SMART tool is delivered by WV staff after being trained by World Bank. Moreover, WVE remain playing advisory role for monitoring &amp; generating reliable feedback for union and District Government from WVE head Office than basing at ADP. About capacity of the union, the union leader will be competent. The District government staff are at least B.SC degree with extensive experience. The WVE advisory role will ensure the union capacity, determine monitoring indicator (being/to be agreed by partners) &amp; follow up the monitoring is done and documented. To ensure this process there will be bi-annual stakeholders review.</p> <p>(2) So far WVE has been documenting decisions, actions &amp; outcomes in minting, picturing, capturing many more information in biannual &amp; annual reports. More over, the official conversations letters (out going &amp; incoming) with Coops, District, EPA and others have been documented at WVE.</p> <p>Sharing the experiences has been carried out by publications, media (paper &amp; audio). Those documents are present in WVE. In 2010 WVE produced a documentary video and archived.</p> <p>All seven Coops have got office, registration book, minute logbook and data/outgoing/incoming conversations letter filing boxes. The coops have been already practicing well. Many of these were visited by DOE in Coops office.</p> <p>WVE continued capacitating the community to reach to the level they can document every decisions, actions &amp; outcomes. For sharing the experiences the District Agriculture &amp; Rural Development Office remain supportive while WVE supporting as advisor to ensure the documentation of decisions, actions &amp; outcomes and experience is shared. WVE will deliver the indicated support from Head Office level after 2012. This existing trend get consolidated at Union. During the bi-annual meetings with stakeholders</p>	<p>The bi-annual stakeholders review will be organized by Union &amp; District Government.</p> <p>(2) OK</p> <p>The validation team visited the project sites, cooperatives' offices and met representatives of 4 cooperatives in each office. Also, the validation team visited the local government. The validation team considers that the cooperatives are well organized and the local government representatives are experienced in forestry and very supportive to the project</p>
--	--	---

<p>(3) Flexibility of the project design to accommodate potential change is to be clarified.</p> <p>(4) The condition of the project funding is to be clarified. (Is the project funding a long term funding which covers the operational lifetime of the project 60 years?)</p>		<p>(3) The project design remains flexible to accommodate potential change provided the change is acceptable by project participant, World Bank and UNFCCC based on recommendation of verifier.</p> <p>(4) The condition of project funding plan is already submitted to World Bank since finance plan is one of the condition in ERPA required to be submitted to trustee. The submitted project financing covers for ten years. WVE plan for after 2017 is the project owner community will cover project finance from the forest &amp; non-forest benefits, ecosystem service payments, economic development projects the union will be running, etc. After 2017 the Union financial capacity keep on growing since all revenue to be collected will be put to economic development projects such as apiculture, fattening, etc. The community will also get finance from timber, grass, ecotourism and so on. These all will improve the finance base and enable the union to fund the project operation. Obviously, the project operation cost will get minimum over time once the project implemented. For instance, any guarding will be done by the community themselves since it is community project.</p>	<p>(3) OK</p> <p>(4) OK</p> <p>The project funding is not covering 60 years. The anticipation is that part of the forest and non-forest benefits, such as from apiculture, ecotourism, designing a new project that builds on initial project outcomes; promoting micro-enterprise; and establishing alliances with organizations or companies to continue sustainable land management.</p> <p>The outline condition of the project financing and the plan of the WVE are clearly explained.</p>
<p><b><u>CCB Clarification Request 3</u></b></p> <p>It is to be clarified how the PP will document the relevant or applicable lessons learned.</p>	<p>G8.1</p>	<p>The documentation will be in hard and soft copies all at Union and WVE Head offices and remain accessible for users/visitors. Hard copies are logbooks, minutes, correspondences, reports, monitoring reports, pictures, etc. The soft copy will be in computer with backup. The knowledge management use publications. WVE anticipates to work with Forestry &amp; associated Universities in Ethiopia as well as over sea so as to have scientific analysis and publications. On top of publications the ongoing use of medias such as radio, TV and newspaper plus hosting various visitors will continue and feedbacks get documented.</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>The validation team visited WVE and 4 cooperatives and it was confirmed that the record of the project and store of the documentation are appropriate.</p>
<p><b><u>CCB Clarification Request 4</u></b></p> <p>It is to be clarified how PPs are explaining about workers safety.</p>	<p>CM5.4</p>	<p>Project workers have been working in capacitating field workers of seedling raising, planting, weeding, pruning and other forest management roles. Besides, project workers mostly involved in empowering the community</p>	<p>OK</p>

		and concerned local government staff. Therefore, there is no risk associated with workers safety identified so far.	
<p><b><u>CCB Clarification Request 5</u></b></p> <p>Please explain about the monitoring of biodiversity monitoring and its frequency.</p>	B3.1	WVE plan is to conduct monitoring of biodiversity every five years. To implement this plan WVE budgeted for training of field level staff and selected community members in 2010. As per WVE plan this training will be given Ethiopia Biodiversity Institute professionals. The schedule is for September 15-17, 2010. After training in 2011, these trainees will continue data collection, reporting and documentation.	OK
<p><b><u>CCB Clarification Request 6</u></b></p> <p>Please provide the evidences or literatures demonstrating the improvement of water and soil resources.</p>	B5.2	<p>WVE conducted an interview for those who are around the project site elder community members to learn about improvement in water, soil resources plus other resources such as biodiversity. In this process WVE got evidences from community interview. This story is done in 2009 and documented. Moreover, WVE is witnessing particularly the soil erosion improvements since all erosion coming from project site mountain is arrested and the downstream farmland itself is saved from sedimentation. Professionals are witnessing that much water infiltration is happening due to the trees intercepting the run off.</p> <p>In March 2010 WV conducted midterm evaluation employing a mixed methods approach in a <i>Triangulation including</i> a broad scale household survey (380 respondents from the project area and 50 from outside the project area within Humbo district), key informant interviews and focus group discussions with community groups<sup>(#2)</sup>. Some of the findings from the evaluation indicated forested catchments provided more gradual run-off which slowed down the flow of floodwater onto agricultural fields during heavy rainfall. Reduced flooding in turn reduces loss of topsoil. The majority of respondents in the household survey (73%) said that erosion in the communal forest had decreased while 12% thought it had not changed and 12% thought it had increased.</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>The validation team was provided with the evidence literatures demonstrating the improvement of water and soil resources. (/30/)</p>

	<p>One of the studies conducted in Ethiopia is in line with above finding. Eg. Munro, R, Deckers, J, Haile, M, Grove, A, Poesen, J, Nyssen, J, 2008, Soil landscapes, land cover change and erosion features of the Central Plateau region of Tigrai, Ethiopia: Photo-monitoring with an interval of 30 years, Journal of Hydrology, Volume 275, Issue 1-2, Pages 55-64<sup>(#3)</sup></p>	
--	--	--