



ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (Second Edition – December 2008) Project Verification Report

Kariba REDD+ Project

24 July 2014

Project No. VO14013.00

Verification Conducted by:

Environmental Services, Inc.
Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division
Corporate Offices at:
7220 Financial Way, Suite 100
Jacksonville, Florida 32256
Phone: 904-470-2200; Fax: 904-470-2112



ANSI ACCREDITED PROGRAM
GREENHOUSE GAS
VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION
0800



Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Contact Information	3
Verification Team	3
Verification Details.....	4
Verification Standard.....	4
Verification Criteria.....	4
Level of Assurance	4
Verification Date(s)	4
Materiality.....	4
Final Documents from Client.....	4
Project Description.....	5
Executive Summary of Verification Results.....	5
Verification Findings	6
Public Comment Period	6
Public Shareholder Comments.....	70
Local Shareholder Comments.....	71
CCB Public Comment Period.....	71
Public Meetings	71
Verification Conclusion	71
Submittal Information.....	71
Appendix A – Documents Reviewed / Received.....	73
Appendix B – Stakeholder Meeting Announcements and Comments.....	78

Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance Kariba REDD+ Project Verification Report

Introduction

This report presents the findings of an audit conducted by Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI), to verify the claims made by the Kariba REDD+ Project conform to the Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (Second Edition - December 2008). ESI is accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) under ISO 14065:2007 for greenhouse gas validation and verifications bodies and is approved by the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) to perform such validations/verifications.

Contact Information

Client Name Address Phone Website	Carbon Green Investments 18-20 Le Pollet Street St. Peter Port, Guernsey UK, GY1 1WH +41 43 501 35 50 http://www.carbongreenafrica.net/
Contact Name Consultant Address Email Website	Robert Hume – Carbon Green Investments Tilmann Silber – South Pole Carbon Asset Management Ltd. +41 43 501 35 50 Technoparkstrasse 1 8003 Zurich, Switzerland t.silber@southpolecarbon.com http://www.southpolecarbon.com
3 rd Party Auditors Website	Environmental Services, Inc. http://www.esicarbon.com/
Lead Verifier	Caitlin Sellers Environmental Services, Inc. 3800 Clermont Street NW North Lawrence, Ohio 44666 330-833-9941
Verification Team	Team Members: Shawn McMahon, Stewart McMorrow, Rich Scharf, Jonathan Pomp, Matthew Perkowski, Guy Pinjuv, Eric Jaeschke, Katie Talavera, McArd Joseph Mlotha, Beth A. Kaplin, and Jean Kayira; QA/QC: Janice McMahon



Verification Details

Verification Standard	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (Second Edition – December 2008)
Verification Criteria	The criteria will follow the verification guidance documents provided by CCBA located at www.climate-standards.org . These documents include the following: a) <i>Project Design Standards (Second Edition, December 2008)</i> b) <i>Rules for the use of the Climate, Community, & Biodiversity Standards, Version December 2013.</i>
Level of Assurance	The level of assurance was used to determine the depth of detail that the verifier placed in the verification plan to determine if there were any errors, omissions, or misrepresentations (ISO 14064-3:2006). ESI selected samples of data and information to be verified, to provide <i>reasonable assurance</i> .
Verification Scope	The scope of the verification, included the GHG project and implementation; baseline scenarios; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHG's; periods covered; the validated PDD; and the evaluation of the project's net climate, community, and biodiversity benefits. Period of evaluation: 01 July 2011 to 31 January 2014.
Verification Date(s)	17 February - 16 July 2014
Materiality	Materiality is a concept that errors, omissions and misrepresentations could affect the project design assertions and influence the intended users. CCB does not specifically outline a materiality threshold; however, ESI used a 5% threshold for evidence. If a non-conformance was discovered, the project developer was given the opportunity to correct the non-conformity to the project design document within a reasonable timeframe (within 30 days). If the non-conformance is corrected, the level of assurance has been met, the project design is recommended for validation/verification approval. If the non-conformance cannot be met, the project design will not be verified. For this project, all non-conformances were corrected, so the PIR is herewith verified.
Site Visits	25 March – 02 April 2014
Final Documents from Client	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CCB Monitoring Report for Kariba REDD+ Project, v.3, 07 July 2014 Please see Appendix A for a complete list of documents received/reviewed during this verification.
Public Comment Period Number of Comments Received	14 January – 13 February 2014: Project Implementation Plan listing for public comment ○ No comments



Project Description

The *Kariba REDD+ Project*, located in the provinces of Matabeleland North, Midlands, Mashonaland West, and Mashonaland Central in Zimbabwe, is a project aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions by minimizing deforestation and degradation in those areas. Baseline conditions for these areas consists of extreme poverty causing conversion of forestland to cropland/grazing for small-scale subsistence farming, logging of timber for domestic use, fuelwood collection, and vast forest (bush) fires.

Four Rural Development Councils (RDCs) compose the project area. Binga is 211,041 hectares, Nyaminyami is 369,931 hectares, Hurungwe is 150,018 hectares, and Mbire is 346,941 hectares – for a total project area of 1,077,930 hectares being benefitted by the project. The project timeline is 30 years, starting on 01 July 2011 and ending on 30 June 2041.

In addition to the benefits of GHG emissions reductions, funds from the project are filtered back into the communities to improve the community, educational and medical facilities. Infrastructure, such as bridges, has been improved and restored. Alternative and sustainable sources of wood products have been promoted. Financial opportunities have been improved through beekeeping and direct employment through the project activities. The local communities continue to be educated on sustainable natural resource management and the causes and solutions to climate change. By reducing the pressure on vegetation from promoting conservation farming, floral and faunal biodiversity has been protected. Finally, wildlife in danger of extinction from poaching has been protected by patrols created and reinforced by project activities.

Executive Summary of Verification Results

	Criterion	Required/ Optional	Conformance Y/N N/A
G1	Original Conditions in the Project Area	Required	Y
G2	Baseline Projections	Required	Y
G3	Project Design and Goals	Required	Y
G4	Management Capacity and Best Practices	Required	Y
G5	Legal Status and Property Rights	Required	Y
CL1	Net Positive Climate Impacts	Required	Y
CL2	Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”)	Required	Y
CL3	Climate Impact Monitoring	Required	Y
CM1	Net Positive Community Impacts	Required	Y
CM2	Offsite Stakeholder Impacts	Required	Y
CM3	Community Impact Monitoring	Required	Y
B1	Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts	Required	Y
B2	Offsite Biodiversity Impacts	Required	Y
B3	Biodiversity Impact Monitoring	Required	Y



GL1	Climate Change Adaptation Benefits	Optional	Y
GL2	Exceptional Community Benefits	Optional	N/A
GL3	Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits	Optional	Y

Verification Findings

G1 Original Conditions in the Project Area

<p>Indicator G1.1 – The location of the project and basic physical parameters (e.g. soil, geology, climate).</p>	<p>The reader is referred to the validated PDD (validated 08 February 2012). The project area is located in northwestern Zimbabwe and spans four provinces: Matabeleland North, Midlands, Mashonaland West and Mashonaland Central. The project is administered by four Rural District Councils (RDCs): Binga, Nyaminyami, Hurungwe and Mbire. The boundaries of four Rural Development Councils in their entirety were detailed in the validated PDD as follows:</p> <p>Binga – 211,041 hectares Nyaminyami – 369,931 hectares Hurungwe – 150, 018 hectares Mbire – 346,941 hectares</p> <p>Total – 1,077,930 hectares</p> <p>Basic physical parameters were also detailed in the validated PDD, and it is reasonably expected that there have been no changes to aspects such as geology, soils, and overall climate since the project was validated on 08 February 2012.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section II (G1 of the PIR & G1.1 of the validated PDD)</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>The PDD details the location of the project and basic physical parameters. None of these aspects have changed since the original validation.</p>

<p>Indicator G1.2 – The types and condition of vegetation within the project area.</p>	<p>The reader is referred to the validated PDD. The PDD describes the vegetation types as Mopane woodland and Miombo woodland and includes other vegetation species that are typically found in those forest types.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section G1.2 of the PDD; Section II G1 of the PIR</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Section G1.2 of the validated PDD addresses this indicator. However, it is reasonable to assume that there</p>



	<p>may have been some changes to the types and/or condition of vegetation within the project area since PDD validation (wildfire outbreaks, elephant damage, species composition, deforestation, invasive pests, etc.).</p> <p>The PDD G1.2 explains that clearing for cultivation and cutting trees for firewood are threatening woodlands. This implies that there is change in forest cover but no spatial statistics are given</p>
<p>Non-conformance Request (NCR):</p>	<p>CL: Please include consideration of potential changes in vegetation, or include a statement that proves no changes. Please include spatial statistics where applicable.</p> <p>Please include a calculated rate of change and if the forest is classified, specify which category is changing faster than the other.</p>
<p>Date Issued:</p>	<p>23 April 2014</p>
<p>Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:</p>	<p>There have been no changes in the vegetation apart from what is described in the monitoring section. There, also the results of the forest cover change analysis are included. A clarifying statement is now included in the PIR.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>The PIR G1.2 now includes an explicit statement of no change in types and condition of vegetation and refers the reader to the monitoring section where supporting documentation is referenced. A remote sensing supplement (140214_Kariba PIR RS Annex.docx) was supplied which outlines the revised remote sensing techniques now employed. Wall-to-wall classification (per VM0009 v1.1) is no longer being used in favor of an industry standard approach of reference areas and a confusion matrix based accuracy assessment. Project proponents redesigned reference areas for all years of landcover maps to differentiate between training and validation areas. Spatial statistics, specifically confusion matrices, were included in the remote sensing annex referenced above.</p> <p>Monitoring was performed by comparing the validated 2011 landcover map and the new 2013 landcover map. However, only transitions to non-forest in the period were</p>



	considered and not transitions among open woodland or woodland stratum, nor the addition of forest. Verifiers accept this approach as it is inherently conservative despite the fact that it does not account for forest re-growth and encroachment. However, a calculated rate of change from 2011 to 2013 has not been included.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	CL: The previous CL stands as written, please include a calculated rate of change for landcover transitions to non-forest.
Date issued:	05 June 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The calculated rate of change for forest loss is given in the results of the forest cover analysis in the supporting documents (updated version including annual average values “140625_CCBS def Verif_2011-2013 Results”). The results are now also specifically stated in section CL1.1, a clear reference to CL1.1 is now included in section G1.2.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Verifiers accept this response and recognize the limitations of the remote sensing methods employed in the project for determination of forest cover loss over the monitoring period. Average annual forest cover loss is not explicitly noted in section CL1.1 of the PIR and calculations are correct. Finding closed.
Date:	08 July 2014

Indicator G1.3 – The boundaries of the project area and the project zone.	The reader is referred to the validated PDD, which describes the Project Area as follows: Binga – 211,041 hectares Nyaminyami – 369,931 hectares Hurungwe – 150, 018 hectares Mbire – 346,941 hectares Total – 1,077,930 hectares The Project Zone was described/defined in the validated PDD as equivalent to the Project Area, as all affected communities live within the Project Area.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section II G1.1 of the PDD; 140205_Community & Project Sustainability Fund Distributions.xlsx
Findings:	It is reasonable to assume that there have been no changes to the Project Area or Project Zone since PDD validation.



	<p>However, it is possible that some of these boundaries were modified after alterations from final VCS verification.</p> <p>Additionally, it is unclear if the Project Proponent has considered whether any effects of the Project have filtered to other communities outside of the original Project Area.</p> <p>Finally, the land of Songo is included in the financial analyses but mentioned only briefly in the PDD in Footnotes 27 & 47. It is understood that this is in reference to Songo Wildlife Management Area, a leased land in Binga. However, it is unclear why this is listed separately in the file “140205_Community & Project Sustainability Fund Distributions.xlsx,” while other safari leaseholders are not included in the financial analysis.</p>
<p>Non-conformance Request (NCR):</p>	<p>CL: Please confirm none of the Project Areas (mentioned above) have changed since CCB validation. If not, please include a statement confirming this in the PIR. Please include a description of how the leased lands of Songo fit into the project area, and clarify why the other safari leaseholders were not included in the 140205_Community & Project Sustainability Fund Distributions.xlsx file.</p>
<p>Date Issued:</p>	<p>23 April 2014</p>
<p>Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:</p>	<p>The project area has not changed since validation. This is now also stated in the PIR, section G1.3.</p> <p>Songo being part of Binga RDC is split due to the fact that there is a leaseholder on the Songo area, and the remaining area in Binga does not. Therefore, we are required to settle the leaseholder for Songo area and not for the remaining land. The leaseholders in the other areas being Nyaminaymi and Hurungwe have lease over the entire area and are paid as per the revenue distribution agreement, and there is non-split share as for Binga.</p> <p>It is shown in the file “140205_Community & Project Sustainability Fund Distributions.xlsx” due to the fact of the split, for internal explanation and calculation.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Section G1.3 now states that there have been no changes to the project area and zone since validation. The clarification, explained above, is reasonable, but does not</p>



	appear in the updated PIR.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	CL: Please address the finding as written.
Date Issued:	24 June 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	A clarifying statement is now included in the PIR.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The clarifying statement regarding the Songo Wildlife Management Area is included in version 3 of the PIR. Finding is sufficiently closed.
Date Closed:	07 July 2014

<p>Indicator G1.4 - Current carbon stocks within the project area(s), using stratification by land-use or vegetation type and methods of carbon calculation (such as biomass plots, formulae, default values) from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s 2006 Guidelines for National GHG Inventories for Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use5 (IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU) or a more robust and detailed methodology.</p>	<p>Referring to PDD G1.4, Current carbon stock in project area at start of project was 206 MtCO₂ and currently is about 90MtC. Similar unit measures are needed to compare the carbon stocks at different times.</p> <p>Carbon stocks were assessed via permanent sampling plots and 2011 satellite imagery, using VCS methodology VM0009 v1.1. PIR states “Carbon stocks at project start were about 206 MtCO₂.”</p> <p>C stocks for individual strata – woodland, open woodland and non-forest – are provided in Table 1.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	G1.4 of the PIR.
Findings:	<p>The provision of carbon stocks estimates based on field measurements and satellite imagery is unclear. Based on conversations in the field, it appears that additional aerial imagery was used to estimate carbon stocks from mid-2012 to the end of this reporting period. Also, the units of MtCO₂ should be MtCO₂e (per hectare?).</p> <p>This section is not clear as noted. It should be stated (a) how the project start carbon estimate was determined. The PDD G1.4 indicate that values of carbon stock were derived from a study done in Mozambique by Ryan et al 2011, waiting for in-situ measurements, while the PIR G1.4 indicates that there are permanent sample plots and also they used satellite images. It is important to specify which satellite images were used, e.g. SPOT, Landsat, ASTER, or MODIS, (b) the unit value used for carbon stock is “Metric tons of carbon dioxide (MtCO₂)” while the carbon stocks values derived from Ryan et al are</p>



	presented as “biomass in carbon tons per hectare ($tC\ ha^{-1}$), (c) there is no mention of routine assessment which is important to monitor cover changes.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	<p>NCR: It appears the method described to estimate carbon stocking is unclear in Section G1.4 of the PIR. Please clarify. Please indicate here what carbon stocking was at start date. Please correct the units of carbon dioxide equivalents. Please respond to the additional findings noted above.</p> <p>CL: Please include $mtCO_2e/hectare$ for ease in verifier’s comparison to monitoring results and baseline reporting, or provide one consistent unit for all reported figures.</p>
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	<p>The given carbon stock is for the time at project start and replaces the less accurate estimate given in the PDD (using Ryan et al data). The paragraph is now revised in order to clarify this.</p> <p>The applied method is described in detail in the VCS PD, which is submitted in the Annex. This approach has been approved by the CCBS. In the CCBS PDD, the relevant statement is “<i>The method follows methodology VM0009 v1.1 of the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS), has been described in detail in the project’s VCS project description (PD) and audited independently</i>” in section G1.4.</p> <p>The use of Landsat imagery is now mentioned. The units have been corrected to tCO_2e. The “$MtCO_2$” stood for “mega tonnes” and has now been changed to “$10^6\ tCO_2e$” to avoid confusion. Table 1 now includes the carbon density in tCO_2e/ha.</p>
Findings:	The updated PIR explains the carbon stock assessment is based on sampling plots and satellite imagery, replacing the one based on literature that was made for the PDD. It is said that two classes were considered – woodland and open woodland. It is unclear which category is regeneration or what is the description of those two classes, woodland and open woodland. Are there tree planting programs in project area, or is there fallow land



	<p>or villages shifting from one place to another allowing regeneration?</p> <p>Units were adjusted and tCO₂e/ha was reported for the project start.</p> <p>The statement “based on 2011 satellite imagery...” needs additional clarification. Prior to that statement, Landsat imagery was mentioned, but a description of which Landsat sensor was used is needed. For example: Landsat MSS, or Landsat 7 ETM, or Landsat 8, and identify them by Path and row. Please include the acquisition date, which helps to determine vegetation status by seasons of the area.</p> <p>“MtCO₂” would be more clear if it was written in full and in brackets abbreviated form when introduced first time, e.g., 206 Mega tonnes equivalent carbon dioxide (MtCO₂e).</p>
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	CL: Please include additional details of the Landsat satellite used in estimating carbon.
Date issued:	23 June 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section G1.4 is now updated with detailed information on the type of satellite imagery used and information on the applied forest classes. The abbreviation MtCO ₂ e is used and introduced as suggested by the auditor.
Evidence Used to Close NCR/Expert Comments:	Version 3 of the PIR now includes, “Historic observation of forest cover loss, stratification of forest areas and change monitoring was based on imagery coming from Landsat 5 TM, Landsat 7 ETM+ and Landsat 8 OLI sensors.” Finding addressed.
Date Closed:	07 July 2014

<p>Indicator G1.5 - A description of communities located in the project zone, including basic socio-economic and cultural information that describes the social, economic and cultural diversity within communities (wealth, gender, age, ethnicity etc.), identifies specific groups such as Indigenous Peoples and describes any community characteristics.</p>	<p>The reader is referred to the validated PDD. The PDD states the local population belongs to the Tonga or Shona ethnic groups and further describes the basic socio-economic and cultural information. It is reasonable to assume there are no changes to these descriptions, which was also confirmed during the site visit.</p> <p>Section G1.5 of the PDD does contain many tables of information that was updated during the validation</p>
--	---



	process.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.5 of the PDD; 140205_Kariba_REDD+_social_impacts_survey_2014.pdf
Findings:	Although the general community descriptions have not changed since validation, the information presented in the PDD tables is slightly different. This information has been presented in the file 140205_Kariba_REDD+_social_impacts_survey_2014.pdf, but this is not detailed in the PIR.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	CL: Please include the information from the file 140205_Kariba_REDD+_social_impacts_survey_2014.pdf in the PIR, or refer the reader of the PIR to the exact file name in the supporting documents.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	A reference to the project's social impact survey is now included in section G1.5.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Section G1.5 now refers to the social impact survey, as requested. Finding closed.
Date Closed:	05 June 2014

Indicator G1.6 - A description of current land use and customary and legal property rights including community property in the project zone, identifying any ongoing or unresolved conflicts or disputes and identifying and describing any disputes over land tenure that were resolved during the last ten years (see also G5).	The reader is referred to the validated PDD, which fully describes this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.6 of validated PDD
Findings:	It is unclear if there have been any new conflicts since validation. The PIR should address this, or if no new conflicts, the PIR should include a comment indicating that this aspect was fully vetted for the new verification reporting period.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	CL: Per the finding above, please include additional information in this section of the PIR.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Clarification included in G1.6 of the PIR.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Section G1.6 now states no disputes have arisen since



	validation. Finding closed.
Date Closed:	05 June 2014

Indicator G1.7 - A description of current biodiversity within the project zone (diversity of species and ecosystems) and threats to that biodiversity, using appropriate methodologies, substantiated where possible with appropriate reference material.	The reader is referred to the validated PDD, which thoroughly describes the biodiversity as of validation (08 February 2012). No new information or biodiversity data is referenced.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.7 of the PDD; 140214_Kariba_biodiversity_wildlife_data_final.xlsx
Findings:	The PDD is referenced for information pertaining to this indicator, but the verifier believes that more updated biodiversity data is available, as shown in the file “140214_Kariba_biodiversity_wildlife_data_final.xlsx”
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	CL: Please include information from the file “140214_Kariba_biodiversity_wildlife_data_final.xlsx” in the PIR, or refer the reader of the PIR to the exact file name in the supporting documents.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Reference is now made to the mentioned file.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Section G1.7 now references the new biodiversity data.
Date Closed:	05 June 2014

Indicator G1.8 - An evaluation of whether the project zone includes any of the following High Conservation Values (HCVs) and a description of the qualifying attributes. Indicator HCV 1 - Globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values: a. protected areas b. threatened species c. endemic species d. areas that support significant concentrations of a species during any	The reader is referred to the validated PDD. The PDD claims the project includes HCVs 1, 5 & 6. The verifier recognizes that only one HCV is required to pass this indicator.
--	---



<p>time in their lifecycle (e.g. migrations, feeding grounds, breeding areas).</p> <p>Indicator HCV 2 - Globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape-level areas where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.</p> <p>Indicator HCV 3 Threatened or rare ecosystems.</p> <p>Indicator HCV 4 - Areas that provide critical ecosystem services (e.g., hydrological services, erosion control, fire control).</p> <p>Indicator HCV 5 - Areas that are fundamental for meeting the basic needs of local communities (e.g., for essential food, fuel, fodder, medicines or building materials without readily available alternatives).</p> <p>Indicator HCV 6 - Areas that are critical for the traditional cultural identity of communities (e.g., areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in collaboration with the communities).</p>	
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>PDD Section G1.8; site visit; 140214_Kariba_biodiversity_wildlife_data_final.xlsx; 140210_Kariba_biodiversity_tree_species_data_analysis.xlsx</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>HCV-1: The PDD details the HCVs located in the Project Area. The PIR supporting file “140214_Kariba_biodiversity_wildlife_data_final.xlsx” shows that several IUCN species were observed during project monitoring.</p>



	<p>HCV-5: During the site visit, the verifier observed the prevalence of the musasa tree (<i>Brachystegia spiciformis</i>) and the moringa tree (<i>Moringa oleifera</i>). The musasa tree is also identified in the 140210_Kariba_biodiversity_tree_species_data_analysis.xlsx monitoring data. The moringa tree does not exist in sampling plot data for biodiversity, but during the site visit, it was evident that the tree exists on-site and is becoming a critical species for nutrition in the communities. There is a campaign to encourage planting wherever possible, and several trees were observed on-site.</p> <p>HCV-6: The site visit observations confirmed that the baobab tree (<i>Adansonia digitata</i>) is prevalent on-site and is recognized by the communities for traditional use.</p>
--	--

G2 Baseline Projections

<p>Indicator G2.1 - Describe the most likely land-use scenario in the absence of the project following IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU or a more robust and detailed methodology, describing the range of potential land use scenarios and the associated drivers of GHG emissions and justifying why the land-use scenario selected is most likely.</p>	<p>The reader is referred to the validated PDD. The validated PDD describes the most-likely land-use scenario in the absence of project activities. This was essentially “locked-in” at validation, and it is reasonable to assume that no changes have occurred to the most likely land-use scenario. Site Visit observations also confirm this.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section G2.1 of the PDD and Section G2 of the PIR.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>The most likely land-use scenario remains unchanged from validation, as further observed during the site visit.</p> <p>Expert review has resulted in additional questions. It is unclear what the percentage of land-use change would have been by the change period and where it would have taken place. With Landsat images, change detection can be done to locate and determine land cover change, so if there were images used, this process can be extracted from two different dates in time to determine change and change direction either positive or negative.</p>
<p>Non-conformance Request (NCR):</p>	<p>Please see finding above and provide clarifying statement.</p>
<p>Date Issued:</p>	<p>15 May 2014</p>



Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	This is fully reflected in section G2.3, where the percentage of land-use change as well as the resulting carbon stock development as the output of the used baseline model is given in Table 2. Note that in-line with the applied VCS methodology and the CCBS PDD, the baseline model is NOT spatially explicit, which implies that the baseline deforestation cannot be located within the project area.
Finding:	<p>Verifiers acknowledge this response as land-use change, represented by % deforestation. Change can be from Woodland class to Open woodland class or from woodland class to clear cut agricultural cultivation from the baseline linear model, is presented in table 2 of the PIR. The model is not spatially explicit and monitoring efforts measure deforestation for the period.</p> <p>The VCS Methodology VM0009 v1.1 does not require spatially explicit monitoring and instead applies a baseline spatial model which assumes deforestation occurs across the landscape from lower to higher stocked strata (see sections 8.1.2.1 and A.3 of meth). Further, the quantity of deforestation estimated in the baseline does not change after verification. This method of monitoring deforestation is insufficient to capture deforestation as these pressures seldom follow a stocking trend and instead are spatially explicit.</p> <p>The remote sensing methods were overhauled after verification, and the PIR RS annex (140214_Kariba PIR RS Annex.docx) describes new monitoring methods entailing a map comparison of two wall-to-wall classifications. It is unclear if the new methods are to be implemented for this CCBS verification.</p>
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	CL: Please justify the use of the baseline model for estimates of deforestation over another method utilizing available Landsat imagery for change detection. Please also indicate whether the new and improved remote sensing monitoring methods as seen in the PIR RS annex will be implemented for this verification.
Date Issued:	23 June 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and	The baseline model is in full compliance with VCS



Date:	<p>methodology VM0009 v1.1, which does not demand spatially explicit prediction of future deforestation. Please also note that the VM0009 v1.1 does not contain a section 8.1.2.1 or A.3 (auditor refers to a later version of the methodology?). The baseline model given in the CCBS PDD was not spatially explicit and used literature values for carbon density. The now applied baseline model uses measured values for carbon density, which is an improvement in accuracy. In line with VCS requirements, the baseline model will be re-validated after 10 years.</p> <p>The monitoring of actual changes in land-cover is indeed done by using Landsat imagery for change detection. This is described in detail in the RS Annex. The described approach has been applied for this current verification.</p>
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	<p>Verifiers accept this response as sufficient to address the clarification request. The methodology does not require spatially explicit modelling of baseline deforestation, which was not understood fully by the experts upon initial review. Finding closed.</p>
Date Closed:	08 July 2014

<p>Indicator G2.2 - Document that project benefits would not have occurred in the absence of the project, explaining how existing laws or regulations would likely affect land use and justifying that the benefits being claimed by the project are truly ‘additional’ and would be unlikely to occur without the project.</p>	<p>The reader is referred to the validated PDD. The validated PDD describes the likelihood of occurrence of project activities in the absence of the project. This was essentially “locked-in” at validation, and it is reasonable to assume that no changes have occurred to the validated scenario. Site visit observations also confirm this, as the verifier asked several community members if other activities (not related to the project) had occurred. They would reply that the project is basically the only source of assistance, and that historically, other NGOs would come in and provide a one-time input and would then be gone “forever,” with no follow-up.</p> <p>The Kariba REDD+ Project provides activities, benefits, inputs, on-the-ground teams (OGM teams), monitoring, and follow-up at least for the life of the project, which is substantially different from other attempted projects in the area.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G2.2 of the PDD and Section G2 of the PIR.
Findings:	The likelihood of occurrence of project benefits in the



	absence of the project remains unchanged from validation, as further observed during the site visit.
--	--

<p>Indicator G2.3 - Calculate the estimated carbon stock changes associated with the ‘without project’ reference scenario described above. This requires estimation of carbon stocks for each of the land-use classes of concern and a definition of the carbon pools included, among the classes defined in the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU. The timeframe for this analysis can be either the project lifetime (see G3) or the project GHG accounting period, whichever is more appropriate. Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO₂ GHG emissions such as CH₄ and N₂O in the ‘without project’ scenario. Non-CO₂ gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of CO₂-equivalent) of the project’s overall GHG impact over each monitoring period.</p> <p>Projects whose activities are designed to avoid GHG emissions (such as those reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), avoiding conversion of non-forest land, or certain improved forest management projects) must include an analysis of the relevant drivers and rates of deforestation and/or degradation and a description and justification of the approaches, assumptions and data used to perform this analysis. Regional-level estimates can be used at the project’s planning stage as long as there is a commitment to evaluate locally-specific carbon stocks and to develop a project-specific spatial</p>	<p>The ‘without project’ scenario was updated because a more accurate approach from the VCS methodology was used since the CCB PDD was validated.</p> <p>The result of the baseline model, following the VCS approach, consists of a linear deforestation model which is more conservative than the logistic model. (See figure 1.) The more conservative, linear model predicts carbon stocks to drop from “206,704,612” (no units provided) in 2011 to “8,988,508” (no units provided), in 2041 which amounts to a loss of over 95% of present day carbon stocks in the ‘without project’ scenario.</p> <p>Expert review concluded that an “estimation of carbon stocks for each of the land-use classes of concern and a definition of the carbon pools included, among the classes defined in the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU” was not shown in the without project scenario.</p>
--	--



analysis of deforestation and/or degradation using an appropriately robust and detailed carbon accounting methodology before the start of the project.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G2.3 of the PIR.
Findings:	Table 2 and Table 12 provide no units for carbon stocks.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	<p>NCR: Please provide the units for carbon stocks in section G2.3 and any other sections or supporting tables/documents where units are not given. Please ensure consistent units throughout the project documents.</p> <p>Please clarify or show where an “estimation of carbon stocks for each of the land-use classes of concern and a definition of the carbon pools included, among the classes defined in the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU” occurs per expert comment above.</p>
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	<p>The unit (tCO₂e) of the carbon stock is now included in Table 2. The PIR does not include a table 12. Through the entire PIR, carbon stocks and emissions are now given in tCO₂e and carbon densities in tCO₂e/ha.</p> <p>As a conservative assumption, all baseline emissions result from parts of the project area, which have been classified as forest at the time of the project start. Selected carbon pools are given in the VCS PD, but are now also re-stated in the PIR for clarification. The section is now revised to provide clarification.</p>
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Units were added to Table 2 in the latest version of the methodology. Units for carbon stocks and emissions formalized in other places in the document, as well. Finding closed.
Date Closed:	16 June 2014
Indicator G2.4 - Describe how the ‘without project’ reference scenario would affect communities in the project zone, including the impact of likely changes in water, soil and other locally important ecosystem services.	The reader is referred to the validated PDD. The validated PDD describes how ‘without project’ reference scenario would affect communities in the project zone. This was essentially “locked-in” at validation, and it is reasonable to assume that no changes have occurred to this ‘without project’ scenario. Site Visit observations also confirmed this.



Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G2.4 of the PDD and Section G2 of the PIR.
Findings:	The ‘without project’ reference scenario remains unchanged from validation, as further observed during the site visit.

Indicator G2.5 - Describe how the ‘without project’ reference scenario would affect biodiversity in the project zone (e.g., habitat availability, landscape connectivity and threatened species).	The reader is referred to the validated PDD. The validated PDD describes how ‘without project’ reference scenario would affect biodiversity in the project zone. This was essentially “locked-in” at validation, and it is reasonable to assume that no changes have occurred to this ‘without project’ scenario. Site Visit observations also confirmed this.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G2.5 of the PDD and Section G2 of the PIR.
Findings:	The ‘without project’ reference scenario remains unchanged from validation, as further observed during the site visit.

G3 Project Design and Goals

Indicator G3.1 - Provide a summary of the project’s major climate, community and biodiversity objectives.	The reader is referred to the validated PDD. The main goals of the project have not changed since validation, as further confirmed during the site visit observations.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.1 of the PDD and Section G3 of the PIR.
Findings:	The goals of the project have not changed since project validation. Refer to Section G3.1 of the PDD for the list of project goals.

Indicator G3.2 - Describe each project activity with expected climate, community and biodiversity impacts and its relevance to achieving the project’s objectives.	<p>The PIR discusses progress in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation Farming (CF) • Beekeeping • Fuelwood plantations • Social forestry • Fire management • Alternative brick making • On the Ground Management teams (OGMs) • Community/Project Sustainability Fund • Newsletter <p>The report on CF included the number of workshop training sessions (48), including “training the trainers” workshops. 1000 community-selected beneficiaries across</p>
---	---



the 4 project areas were registered to receive “inputs” for a 25m x 25m plot in 2012. In 2013, this number was increased to 1040, and plot sizes were increased to 50m x 50m. 2012 harvests were increased 20-30% across the board, but in comparison to what is not stated. Some unspecified number of non-participants adopted techniques they saw participants use. This is not quantified. There are 1,300 beneficiaries now, “including nutritional gardening.”

There are over 200 beneficiaries of the beekeeping activity. Nine workshops were conducted on beekeeping and hive construction. 650 startup kits distributed. About 4000 kg of honey was produced and sold locally. There was some issue with the “top bars” of the hive that affected some kits, but the problem was discovered and is currently being rectified. Although, specific numbers were not included in the PIR. The swarming season should also be specified in the PIR.

Fuelwood plantations have not yet been implemented. More information is needed as to why not and when this activity will occur.

The social forestry project activity has been partially implemented. Some “grass roots” research has been done, a number of trees have been identified as having “potential of value adding to the communities.” Thirty “traditional shrines” have been identified and mapped in the project area. More detail is needed in the PIR as to the progress on this activity and future goals for achievement. In addition, clarification is needed on the terms “grass roots” and “traditional shrines” in the PIR.

Twelve firefighting workshops were held and 24 community fire awareness meetings conducted. 12 community firefighting committees were formed and equipped with fire suppression tools (not described or quantified). Approximately, 1,200 kilometers of bush roads/fire breaks were repaired and maintained. OGM teams estimate a 20-25% reduction in fires. More detail is



	<p>needed on the approximate linear distance burned and how the reduction in fire was estimated. Were there any incidents?</p> <p>Alternative brick-making has not yet been implemented. More information is need as to why not and when this activity will occur.</p> <p>Four OGM teams “successfully managed to fulfill its obligations as supplied reported to the CGA head office on a regular basis.” This statement is unclear and needs to be clarified. Did they report on problems that need to be addressed or on problems that have been addressed? The obligations include borehole and pump maintenance, fire prevention, road maintenance, community relations facilitation and project monitoring. Site visit discussions proved the OGM teams did not have the exact team set-up as described in the validated PDD. This difference must be explained and shown whether or not this is a “substantial” change.</p> <p>Community and project sustainability fund is being “scaled up.” Twenty six schools and 8 clinics were supplied with stationary, books, teaching and medical supplies for common illnesses and injuries. Research into certain teaching materials has been done. It is unclear if this fund also covers other activities, or just the schools and health clinics. A health officer was mentioned in the PDD, but was not mentioned or discussed in the PIR.</p> <p>The newsletter has been publishing monthly and has had 15 issues by the date of the PIR. There is a different newsletter for each project area. Distribution was handled by OGM teams.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.2 of the PIR, section G3.2 of the PDD.
Findings:	This indicator was thoroughly discussed during the site visit on 31 March 2014. The verifier asserted that this section required more detail and supporting information to back its claims on several points.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: Pending corrections identified during site visit discussion on 31 March 2014 (also refer to above



	summary, where additional issues were highlighted).
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	A full update of section G3.2, clarifying all requests of the auditor is now included in the PIR.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	<p>The updated version of the PIR explains that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 300 non-participants adopted CF techniques • Crop yield increase of 20 – 30% is in comparison to a random sampling of conventionally grown plots • Top bars were replaced in 54 hives, • Swarming season occurs from April to June, and a second one occurs from October to December, • Fuelwood plantation establishment has not been implemented yet because limited funding required a judgment to be made regarding which activities are most immediately important to the communities. Development of these plantations will commence after CF is established, or when additional funding becomes available. • Progress in social forestry activities is now more fully described. • Estimates of reduced fire damage were made by the professional judgment of the OGM teams. • As with the fuelwood plantation activities, improved brick making was judged to be of less immediate importance than other activities. As other activities progress and funds become available, improved brick making activities will begin. • The makeup of an OGM team is now 1 team leader, 1 assistant/tracker, one game scout and two camp attendants. Originally they were to consist of two trackers and one camp attendant. Three OGM teams are operational, and one is in training. Financial restrictions are cited as the reasons for the new OGM team makeup, and the delay in getting all four teams up and running. No mention on whether these changes are "substantial," but the PIR states the teams have been successfully managing to fulfill their obligations.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The duties of the healthcare officer, mentioned in the PDD, was found to be more efficiently carried out by engaging the existing provincial and district healthcare officers. These officers carry out activities on behalf of the project and report back to OGM teams. <p>These revisions are sufficient to show that changes in planning are not considered substantial, and that the project is still undertaking activities to effectively reduce the cause of deforestation and thus achieve the inherent community, climate and biodiversity objectives. Finding closed.</p>
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

<p>Indicator G3.3 - Provide a map identifying the project location and boundaries of the project area(s), where the project activities will occur, of the project zone and of additional surrounding locations that are predicted to be impacted by project activities (e.g. through leakage).</p>	<p>The reader is referred to the validated PDD. The PDD Section G1.1 Map 2 shows the project area and reference area, as well as the RDC areas. There is a statement in the validated PDD (Section G3.3) that the project activities are expected to cover the entire project area, and thus the activities were not specifically delineated on Map 2. While this would have been acceptable for validation, as the project was still in the implementation process, the project has now undertaken several of the activities and should demonstrate the location with a map.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.1 & 3.3 of the PDD and Section G3.3 of the PIR.
Findings:	The activities are not specifically delineated on Map 2 of the PDD. While this would have been acceptable for validation, as the project was still in the implementation process, the project has now undertaken several of the activities and should demonstrate their general locations on a map.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: Please provide a map in the PIR that depicts the location of the project activities.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section G3.3 of the PIR is now updated and includes maps show the locations of the different project activities and the respective beneficiaries.
Findings:	The PIR now includes 5 maps, depicting locations of project activities. Maps 1 and 2 are not legible.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	CL: Please ensure the information provided by maps 1 and



	2 is legible.
Date Issued:	06 June 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Maps 1 and 2 are now provided in larger size and higher resolution for improved legibility.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Maps 1 and 2 in version 3 of the PIR are now legible. Finding closed.
Date Closed:	07 July 2014

<p>Indicator G3.4 - Define the project lifetime and GHG accounting period and explain and justify any differences between them. Define an implementation schedule, indicating key dates and milestones in the project's development.</p>	<p>The project lifetime is 30 years, starting 01 July 2011 and ending on 30 June 2041. The original PDD states the start date is 01 October 2011.</p> <p>This is explained by the desire to have the VCS lifetime and the CCB lifetime the same. However, project activity took place in July 2011 and earlier.</p> <p>Evidence for an earlier start includes numerous invoices for consultation work done between May 2011 and September 2011.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G3.4 of the PIR and PDD, invoices supplied by the project developer.
Findings:	<p>There is evidence indicating project work began prior to 01 October 2011, and even prior to July 2011, as also confirmed in the VCS validation and verification process.</p> <p>Further, the verifier reviewed the Third Edition Rules "Changes to project design" section, which further dictated the gap validation section should be considered for any changes.</p> <p>The revision to the start date did not appear to trigger any of the criteria for a gap validation, in the opinion of the verifier. Further, the verifier confirmed that the start date of 01 July 2011 was truly "the start of implementation of activities that will directly cause the project's expected climate, community or biodiversity benefits," in accordance with CCB definitions.</p> <p>Finally, in relation to the public's ability to comment on this change to start date, the revised (earlier) start date was listed in the PIR that was published on the CCB website</p>



	for the required 30-day public comment period. No comments were received.
<p>Indicator G3.5 - Identify likely natural and human-induced risks to the expected climate, community and biodiversity benefits during the project lifetime and outline measures adopted to mitigate these risks.</p>	<p>The reader is referred to section G3.2 of the PIR for a discussion of fire management activities, which does not discuss risks to project benefits or changes to risks since validation. The reader is also referred to read the minutes of an adaptive management process meeting that took place on 31 January 2014 (incorrectly dated 2013). The section also claims no newly emerging risks were identified.</p> <p>During the on-site visit (31 March 2014), the Project Proponent provided ESI with the adaptive management plan that was considered in validation.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G3.5 and G3.2 of the PIR; Adaptive management Plan_final.pdf; 140205_CGA_Adaptive management_minutes.pdf
Findings:	Although the PDD discussed initial risks to the benefits of the project, the PIR should thoroughly discuss how past risks identified have been mitigated during the reporting period, any new risks identified, how the adaptive management plan was completed, etc. Further, the adaptive management plan provided in validation should be revised, as much of it relies on a third-party that is no longer involved in the project. Finally, the date of the minutes of the adaptive management meeting should be corrected from 2013 to 2014.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: Please address indicator G3.5, per the above findings.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	<p>Section G3.5 in the PIR is now updated and provides more detailed information on identified risks and mitigation activities.</p> <p>The Adaptive management plan has been updated and the no longer involved third party has been excluded from the plan. The updated plan is provided in file “140520_Adaptive management Plan_final_update.pdf” in the supporting documents.</p> <p>The minutes of the adaptive management meeting have been corrected. See file “140520_Adaptive management</p>



	Plan_final_update.pdf’.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The PIR now explains how the adaptive management policy worked to address lack of community commitment in three of the eleven community gardens and the problem with the beehive top bars. New adaptive management plans was provided. This shows that the adaptive management plan is being followed to address issues. Finding closed.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

Indicator G3.6 - Demonstrate that the project design includes specific measures to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes identified in G1 consistent with the precautionary principle.	The reader is referred to the validated PDD where this information was previously detailed and confirmed at validation.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3 of the PIR & Section G3.6 of the PDD
Findings:	The verifier believes the demonstration completed in validation is sufficient to address this. The results of the project on HCVs will be further reviewed in CM1.2, CM3.2, B1.2 & B3.2 below.

Indicator G3.7 - Describe the measures that will be taken to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.	The PIR states that the project activities are designed to be financially self-sufficient in the long run. New sources of income are being opened and initial investments established. Project activities will perpetuate, because it is in the participants’ “self-interest” to do so. The sustainability fund is set up to be used to continue basic project activities for 100 years.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.7 of the PIR, files provided by project developer: 140205_Community & Project Sustainability Fund Distributions.xlsx, 140205_Kariba_Financials_Auditor.xlsx; interviews during the site visit
Findings:	Since much of the project activity involves educating and empowering the communities in techniques that prove to provide major benefits, it is likely they will continue. The site visit confirmed that those participating in project



	<p>activities were very happy with the results and would continue what they have learned in perpetuity, also teaching their children the new techniques.</p> <p>While credit prices are not up to expectations, sales covered costs of project. This was confirmed in review of financial documentation.</p>
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	OFI: Consider re-wording “it will be in their self-interest to do so.” This connotation implies that they should have done this all along and does not really explain why the communities are now accepting these practices in a more concrete, tangible explanation. Also, please remove the word “to” between “includes to a Community and Project Sustainability Fund.”
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The paragraph has been re-phrased and the “to” has been removed.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Changes to this section were made.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

<p>Indicator G3.8 - Document and defend how communities and other stakeholders potentially affected by the project activities have been identified and have been involved in project design through effective consultation, particularly with a view to optimizing community and stakeholder benefits, respecting local customs and values and maintaining high conservation values. Project developers must document stakeholder dialogues and indicate if and how the project proposal was revised based on such input. A plan must be developed to continue communication and consultation between project managers and all community groups about the project and its impacts to facilitate adaptive management throughout the life of the project.</p>	<p>The PIR states that during the monitoring period, a summary of the PIR was translated into Shona and made available in local RDC offices and on the CCB website. Communities were notified of the auditor’s visit 30 days before the site visit.</p> <p>No grievances have been received from any community member regarding the project – only requests for additional support, awareness, training and inputs.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.8 of the PIR, Tonga & Shona summary



	translations of PIR; site visit interviews and observations; August 2013 and February 2014 newsletters
Findings:	<p>The project activities keep community members in contact with project staff on a regular basis. Tonga language PIR & summary provides evidence of outreach. Shona PIR summary was provided, but the verifier did not receive the full Shona PIR version.</p> <p>The verifier confirmed the PIR summaries in Shona and Tonga and the full PIR in English were provided to CCB for listing on their website before the 30-day public comment period.</p> <p>The verifier interviewed several people while on-site to gauge whether they had seen the project documents and newsletters. Most replied “yes”, and any who had not were generally new to the area and did not appear to be intentionally left out.</p> <p>Further, while on-site, the verifier randomly requested, received and reviewed the newsletters for all four RDCs for the months of August 2013 and February 2014. The newsletters appeared to provide sufficient information to keep the reader up-to-date on the project. Also, the verifier confirmed that the newsletters had been translated by asking community members, who also replied with “yes.”</p> <p>Although the Tonga summary was confirmed on the website and to be provided to stakeholders, it is not mentioned in the PIR.</p> <p>Also, the PIR description does not appear to specifically address the Indicator G3.8, which mentions “A plan must be developed to continue communication and consultation between project managers and all community groups about the project and its impacts to facilitate adaptive management throughout the life of the project.” The PIR should report on the results of implementing this plan throughout the project lifetime.</p>
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: 1. Please include mention of the Tonga summary in Section G3.8 of the PIR.



	2. Please include information of the efficacy of the communication plan that was developed and progress of the adaptive management plans and actions.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The Tonga summary is now mentioned in the PIR. Information on the project's communication plan (included in the adaptive management plan), its efficacy and measures taken as a result of it are now described in the PIR.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The Tonga summary is now mentioned. The latest version of the adaptive management plan was provided, which explains communications methods. The structure is said to provide continuous contact between communities, chiefs and OGM teams.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

Indicator G3.9 - Describe what specific steps have been taken, and communications methods used, to publicize the CCBA public comment period to communities and other stakeholders and to facilitate their submission of comments to CCBA. Project proponents must play an active role in distributing key project documents to affected communities and stakeholders and hold widely publicized information meetings in relevant local or regional languages.	The PIR states the summary of the PIR was translated into Shona and distributed through the CCB website and RDC offices. Local communities were notified of auditor's visit 30 days in advance.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.9 of the PIR; Tonga and Shona summary translation of the PIR; CCB website; site visit
Findings:	The verifier confirmed that the Tonga and Shona PIR summaries were listed on the CCB website and further distributed to Counsel members in the communities, who then passed the documents to their constituents. The summaries explain the audit process, describe the timeframe of when it was occurring, and point to the CCB website or the OGM team members if they wish to provide comments. The verifier did not find a detailed explanation of the distribution of the PIR summaries in the main PIR, when the summaries were distributed, when



	<p>meetings occurred to describe the PIR, or documentation of local advertising/notification for the PIR or the site visit. These should be described in the PIR.</p> <p>The PIR specifically mentions meetings to publicize the PIR and site visit, but it does not specifically mention publication of the 30-day public comment period (though embedded in the summaries).</p> <p>Also, the verifier did not note any description or summary of any official public comments received as a result of the distribution of the PIR summaries on-the-ground.</p>
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	<p>NCR: Please describe the publication of the 30-day comment period to stakeholders in the PIR.</p> <p>Please include more description of the exact process (dates, how many copies, etc.) to publicize the information.</p> <p>Please clarify if any official public comments (non-digital) were received by the OGM team during the official 30-day public comment period.</p>
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section G3.9 in the PIR has been updated and now includes the requested information.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The PIR explains the distribution of the PIR and PIR summaries. No comments were received. Finding closed.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

<p>Indicator G3.10 - Formalize a clear process for handling unresolved conflicts and grievances that arise during project planning and implementation. The project design must include a process for hearing, responding to and resolving community and other stakeholder grievances within a reasonable time period. This grievance process must be publicized to communities and other stakeholders and must be managed by a third party or mediator to prevent any</p>	<p>The reader is referred to the validated PDD, which mentions the grievance procedure in G3.10 and further points to a visual detail of the grievance process in Annex 2.</p>
--	--



<p>conflict of interest. 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>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section G3 of the PIR; Section G3.10 of the PDD; Annex 2 of the PDD; newsletters reviewed; site visit interviews in each community with community leaders and members; verifier observed notices informing community members of the verifiers on-site meetings and believes all members generally had an equal chance to participate</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>The verifier asked community members at random if they had any grievances on the project, and the verifier did not hear any grievances while conducting interviews on-site. Further, the verifier noted in the newsletters reviewed that no grievances were received by the project, which showed that the community is generally aware of the fact that grievances can be presented. The verifier is reasonably assured that no official grievances exist for the project at current time.</p> <p>Although the validated PDD contains a general description of the grievance process, the verifier would like assurance that community members are aware of <i>how</i> they can present a grievance. How do they know that they can bring a grievance through one of the four mechanisms described in the PDD?</p>
<p>Non-conformance Request (NCR):</p>	<p>NCR: Please provide assurance that the community members and other stakeholders are aware of <i>how</i> they can present a grievance, not just that the process exists.</p>
<p>Date Issued:</p>	<p>23 April 2014</p>
<p>Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:</p>	<p>This is now described in the PIR.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Close NCR:</p>	<p>The updated PIR states that community members know how to register a grievance through the personal relationships they have with the OGM teams. It describes the relationships between the OGM teams and their local communities. They are in daily contact, the team members come from the communities, and are encouraged to submit grievances in writing.</p>



	To date, no grievances have been received. Only requests for additional inputs or help. This is sufficient to address the finding.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

Indicator G3.11 - Demonstrate that financial mechanisms adopted, including projected revenues from emissions reductions and other sources, are likely to provide an adequate flow of funds for project implementation and to achieve the anticipated climate, community and biodiversity benefits.	Project revenues are derived from the sale of carbon certificates, and activities are scaled to the available revenue.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.11 of the PIR, files: 140205_Kariba_Financials_Auditor.xlsx, 140205_Community & Project Sustainability Fund Distributions.xlsx; site visit interviews
Findings:	Provided financials indicate the project is scaled to the available funds and can be sustained at the present level, if need be. The verifier understands a long-term trust has been established, but that is not described in this section.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: Please include a description and current details of the long-term trust that is established as part of this project, relevant to how it provides long-term, adequate supply of funds for the project. If not relevant, please explain why here in your response.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	As the Kariba REDD+ Trust administers the longevity fund, it is able to secure that these funds are managed accordingly, it is also able to raise additional funds if required to ensure the project has adequate finance. The longevity/sustainability is a significant fix share of the sales revenue which is held in trust as per the revenue distribution agreement. For further reference, the Kariba REDD Trust's Trust Deed is now provided in the supporting material ("Kariba REDD Trust.zip", confidential information).
Findings:	A concise description of the trust is provided above, but was not inserted into the PIR.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please include this, or a similar description in the PIR.



	Confidential information need not be revealed to do this.
Date issued:	06 June 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	A clarifying statement is now included in the PIR.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Version 3 of the PIR now states, “In order to ensure long-term longevity of the project, a fix share of the sales revenue is hold back in the Kariba REDD+ Trust.” This is sufficient to address the finding.
Date Closed:	07 July 2014

G4 Management Capacity and Best Practices

Indicator G4.1 - Identify a single project proponent which is responsible for the project’s design and implementation. If multiple organizations or individuals are involved in the project’s development and implementation the governance structure, roles and responsibilities of each of the organizations or individuals involved must also be described.	The reader is referred to the validated PDD, which details Carbon Green Investments Guernsey (CGI) as the single Project Proponent. Further it identifies technical consultants and local partners.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G4 of the PIR
Findings:	The verifier is reasonably assured that the Project Proponent has not changed since project inception. However, the verifier believes this section should describe the role of Carbon Green Africa (CGA) in comparison to Carbon Green Investments (CGI). Also, the PDD mentions that Environment Africa is a local partner of the project, while this is understood to not be the case.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: Please explain CGA’s role in the project. Please explain why EA is no longer involved in the project and what affect that will have on the project.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section G4.1 of the PIR now explains the role of CGA (vs. CGI), why EA is no longer involved and what the results of this decision are on the project.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The relationship between CGI and CGA is explained, as is Environment Africa’s absence from the project. The description is sufficient to address the findings.



Date Closed:	06 June 2014
Indicator G4.2 - Document key technical skills that will be required to implement the project successfully, including community engagement, biodiversity assessment and carbon measurement and monitoring skills. Document the management team's expertise and prior experience implementing land management projects at the scale of this project. If relevant experience is lacking, the proponents must either demonstrate how other organizations will be partnered with to support the project or have a recruitment strategy to fill the gaps.	The reader is referred to the validated PDD.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G4 of the PIR.; Section G4.2 of the PDD; site visit discussions
Findings:	The referenced section of the PDD includes reference to Environment Africa, and the PIR does not specifically list newer staff added to or removed from the project within the last couple of years.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: Please explain why EA is no longer involved in the project and what affect that will have on the project, specifically related to "key technical skills." CL: Please update a listing of the staff with any additions, replacements, or removals of staff since the PDD was validated.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	PIR section G4.2 is now updated to reflect any staff changes.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Updates to project staffing are now provided in section G4.2, sufficient to address the finding.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014
Indicator G4.3 - Include a plan to provide orientation and training for the project's employees and relevant people from the communities with an objective	OGM teams and managers have received training to fulfill their obligations in the various employment positions. Biomass sampling training was done by Black Crystal. Hands-on training is mentioned, but no detail is given.



<p>of building locally useful skills and knowledge to increase local participation in project implementation. These capacity building efforts should target a wide range of people in the communities, including minority and underrepresented groups. Identify how training will be passed on to new workers when there is staff turnover, so that local capacity will not be lost.</p>	<p>To date the project has conducted two different trainings, one lasting three weeks and the second training lasting two weeks. A total of 37 people participated in the two trainings. These trainings were basic to intermediate level and included techniques on patrolling and apprehending or arresting, map reading and GPS use, tracking and identification of animals and signs. Fire-fighting training was also conducted at ward and village level, where members of the communities received a minimum of 19 trainings across all four RDCs and were taught how to suppress fires and make fireguards. They were also assisted in establishing their own fire-fighting teams with committees. According to the implemented social survey provided in the supporting documents, the project's employees report to be sufficiently trained for their tasks.</p> <p>To satisfy this indicator in validation, files from Environment Africa were provided (EA Timeline Plan for Kariba Redd(2).xls & ALL4AP 4wksTraining Scheduling Dundee 2.xlsx).</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section G4.3 of the PIR.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>A significant amount of training was reported during the monitoring period. However, no documentation of these trainings (records, Excel files, etc.) was provided. Also, the training plan in the validated PDD relied heavily on plans produced by Environment Africa, who is no longer involved in the project.</p> <p>It is not clear if/how a wide range of people in the communities, including minority and underrepresented groups were targeted or given an opportunity to participate.</p>
<p>Non-conformance Request (NCR):</p>	<p>NCR: Please provide training records, attendance records or other evidence of these trainings.</p> <p>Please explain how EA's training plan was either followed or removed from the project. If removed, please provide a replacement training plan that sufficiently fulfills Indicator G4.5 and show how it was followed during the verification period.</p>



	NCR: Please document how minority and underrepresented groups, specifically women in the context of this project, were targeted.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section G4.3 of the PIR is now updated. Despite EA now longer being part of the project, the EA training plan was still followed through the monitoring period. This was implemented with the field officers were originally employed by EA, but who maintained their employment in the Kariba REDD+. As further evidence of the trainings, scanned copies of the trainings attendance registers are now provided in the supporting documents (“Training Attendance Registers.zip”). Women, widows as potentially underrepresented groups have been specifically encouraged to join the project as beneficiaries, which manifests in many farmers, beekeepers, and participants in the community gardens being women, and also widows. This is now also clarified in the PIR.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Training records have been provided. Women were clearly in attendance, sometimes in large numbers (e.g., nutrition garden classes). Section G4.3 now explains efforts to include women, including a pilot class on bread baking to increase income among women. EA’s training plan is being followed, using people formerly under the employment of EA. Finding addressed.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

Indicator G4.4 - Show that people from the communities will be given an equal opportunity to fill all employment positions (including management) if the job requirements are met. Project proponents must explain how employees will be selected for positions and where relevant, must indicate how local community members, including women and other potentially underrepresented groups, will be given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained.	<p>A survey showed that 93.3% of project employees are from the project area.</p> <p>The survey also showed that all the employees were men, were younger than average, and had a higher level of education than average for the project areas.</p> <p>The project developer is seeking ways to employ more women and uneducated staff, where possible. Specific strategies are not detailed.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G4.4 of the PIR;



	140205_Kariba_REDD+_social_impacts_survey_2014.pdf
Findings:	The project developer is aware of the differences between the people employed by the project and the population at large. No discussion was noted on why there are no women employed, though the reason few uneducated people are employed is understood because the job requirements require a higher level of education. Strategies to employ more women and uneducated staff are not detailed.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: Please indicate <i>how</i> local community members, including women and other potentially underrepresented groups, were and will be given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained. Please include more detail on the strategies to employ more women and uneducated staff. Also, the questionnaire details the total population of women, but it is unclear if that figure represents the total population in the project or just the total number of women surveyed. Please clarify.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	If vacancies for particular positions are available then postings of these vacancies are advertised at the council offices, community centers, clinics, etc., for all the communities. Both genders, men and women, are free to apply; however women or underrepresented groups will be encouraged to apply and this will be indicated on the advertised vacancy posting, giving these groups an equal opportunity to fill positions which they can be further trained for in the project. This is supported by the number of women who are widows and have already received training in CF, beekeeping and gardening and women who already have leadership roles within these projects. In some project activities we have more women than men. This is now also clarified in the PIR. The results of the social survey (140205_Kariba_REDD+_social_impacts_survey_2014.pdf) only represent information resulting from the interviews, not the total population in the project. The project proponent believes that this is clearly stated in the documents and there are no misleading statements.



Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Strategies for employing more women and other under-represented groups are mentioned. Women will be encouraged to apply, which will be indicated on the vacancy announcements. The PIR also points to the number of women involved in conservation farming, beekeeping and gardening activities, in numbers sometimes greater than men. Due to the active participation of women in the project activities, this finding is addressed. Further employment of women by the project will be further vetted in future verification events.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

Indicator G4.5 - Submit a list of all relevant laws and regulations covering worker's rights in the host country. Describe how the project will inform workers about their rights. Provide assurance that the project meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering worker rights and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.	The reader is referred to the validated PDD.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G4 of the PIR; Section G4.5 of the PDD
Findings:	The verifier is reasonably assured that there has been no change to laws and reference to the validated PDD is appropriate.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	CL: Please state if there have been any changes to labor laws since the PDD was published.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	This is now clarified in the PIR.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Section G4.5 of the PIR now states that there have been no relevant laws or regulation changes since validation. The verifier nor the experts were aware of any law changes during our internal reviews. Finding addressed.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

Indicator G4.6 - Comprehensively assess situations and occupations that pose a substantial risk to worker safety.	The PIR states that safety is important and that OGM teams are trained by experienced members of the project team. Anti-poaching and firefighting are identified as
--	---



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.	significant risks. In the social survey, workers said they were sufficiently trained. It is implied that training will minimize risk.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G4.6 of the PIR, social survey
Findings:	While the project appears to be offering trainings, it does not present the training plans nor the documentation that would prove that the project continues to identify risks to employees and provide adequate training for those. The workers feel that they have had sufficient training, but this may not mean that they have, since they may not be aware of all the elements that make up a complete training program. Further, the verifier did not locate a plan to notify employees of risk.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: Please document in the PIR the details of the plan that is in place that is used to inform workers of risks and explains how to minimize such risks.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Employees have been informed about relevant risks by their supervisory on an ongoing basis, as requested by the PDD. To further improve the risk management for employees in the future, an Employee Risk Management Plan has been developed and will be applied in the future. The plan is provided in the supporting documents in file "140523_CGA Employee Risk Management Plan.pdf".
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	A plan including risk management rules for various employee positions was provided and is mentioned in section G4.6. Finding addressed.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

Indicator G4.7 - Document the financial health of the implementing organization(s) to demonstrate that financial resources budgeted will be adequate to implement the project.	Project activities are scaled depending on the project's revenues, allowing the project to remain viable when revenues are significantly below projections.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G4.7 of the PIR, Community & Project Sustainability Fund Distributions spreadsheet, Kariba financials spreadsheet.
Findings:	It is clear that the project can be sustained with revenues



	far below projections and has been able to do so for this reporting period being verified. The project provided the trust fund spreadsheets showing the current financial health. This element is addressed for this time period being verified.
--	--

G5 Legal Status and Property Rights

Indicator G5.1 - Submit a list of all relevant national and local laws and regulations in the host country and all applicable international treaties and agreements. Provide assurance that the project will comply with these and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.	The PIR states that the project complies with all project-related laws and acts pointed out in the PDD.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G5.1 of the PIR.
Findings:	This is sufficient, provided no additional relevant laws or regulations were implemented since the PDD was published. A revised list of laws and acts would be appropriate to reiterate in the PIR.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: Please provide a refreshed list of relevant laws and acts that are currently in place during this verification period. If not changes have occurred, please provide a statement below indicating how the Project Proponent confirmed this is the case.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	No new laws or regulations were implemented since validation. This is now clarified in the PIR.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Section G5.1 now states that no new relevant laws or regulations went into effect since the PDD was written.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

Indicator G5.2 - Document that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, including the established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the communities.	Reader is referred to the PDD.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G5 of the PIR; site visit
Findings:	This indicator was adequately addressed during validation,



	and does not need to be revisited, given regular community monitoring. Site visit observations and interview with participants further confirms this aspect to be true.
--	---

Indicator G5.3 - Demonstrate with documented consultations and agreements that the project will not encroach uninvited on private property, community property, or government property and has obtained the free, prior, and informed consent of those whose rights will be affected by the project.	Reader is referred to the PDD.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G5 of the PIR.
Findings:	This indicator was adequately addressed during validation and does not need to be revisited. Site visit observations and interview with participants further confirms this aspect to be true.

Indicator G5.4 - Demonstrate that the project does not require the involuntary relocation of people or of the activities important for the livelihoods and culture of the communities. If any relocation of habitation or activities is undertaken within the terms of an agreement, the project proponents must demonstrate that the agreement was made with the free, prior, and informed consent of those concerned and includes provisions for just and fair compensation.	The PIR states that the project includes no involuntary relocations.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G5.4 of the PIR, PDD, assurances during site visit, as no community members indicated this had occurred.
Findings:	The restatement in the PIR of what was found to be the case during the project validation adequately addresses this indicator. Site visit observations and interviews with participants further confirm this aspect to be true.

Indicator G5.5 - Identify any illegal activities that could affect the project's	Reader is referred to the PDD.
---	--------------------------------



climate, community or biodiversity impacts (e.g., logging) taking place in the project zone and describe how the project will help to reduce these activities so that project benefits are not derived from illegal activities.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G5 of the PIR, section G5.5 of the PDD.
Findings:	Logging and poaching were identified as illegal activities. Project activities are designed to mitigate these. No other illegal activities identified. Project benefits are not derived from illegal activities. Site visit observations and interview with participants further confirms these elements have not changed since the validation of the PDD, and thus, no new information is needed to be presented here. Issue is addressed.

Indicator G5.6 - Demonstrate that the project proponents have clear, uncontested title to the carbon rights, or provide legal documentation demonstrating that the project is undertaken on behalf of the carbon owners with their full consent. Where local or national conditions preclude clear title to the carbon rights at the time of validation against the Standards, the project proponents must provide evidence that their ownership of carbon rights is likely to be established before they enter into any transactions concerning the project's carbon assets.	Reader is referred to the PDD. Title to carbon rights has not changed and all elements of this indicator remain constant since the previous validation effort.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G5 of the PIR, section G5.6 of the PDD.
Findings:	This indicator was adequately addressed during the project validation, and does not need to be revisited.

CL1 Net Positive Climate Impacts

Indicator CL1.1 - Estimate the net change in carbon stocks due to the project activities using the methods of calculation, formulae and default values	The PIR states the project generates a net positive climate impact due to avoided deforestation. Based on forest cover analysis and the establishment of
---	---



<p>of the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU or using a more robust and detailed methodology. 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 G2). This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about how project activities will alter GHG emissions of carbon stocks over the duration of the project or the project GHG accounting period.</p>	<p>permanent sampling plots, the net change caused by the project is 5,631,766 tCO₂e.</p> <p>The number reported in the VCS monitoring report, table 6, is 5,503,098 tCO₂. Spreadsheet “Climate Impacts” is in agreement with the figure presented in the PIR.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section CL1.1 of the PIR, VCS PD and VCS monitoring report, Table 6.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>The figure cited in the PIR does not match those in the VCS Monitoring Report document.</p> <p>In addition, the verifier observed new deforestation while on-site, took a GPS point at the location, and further observed while in-office. It appears this area was not included in the captured deforestation for the project.</p>
<p>Non-conformance Request (NCR):</p>	<p>NCR: Please explain or correct the difference between the PIR reported figure and that reported in the VCS Monitoring Report in Table 6.</p> <p>Please review the non-forested areas at the GPS point presented and explain why this was not captured in the CCB monitoring.</p>
<p>Date Issued:</p>	<p>23 April 2014</p>
<p>Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:</p>	<p>The difference in the emission reductions between the figures stated in the CCBS PIR and in the VCS MR is explained by two points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The VCS MR covers the time frame between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012. The PIR however covers the time from July 1, 2011 to January 31, 2014. The latest available Landsat imagery available for the PIR, however is dated from June/July 2013. This means that the emission reductions stated in the PIR actually occurred between July 1, 2011 and June/July 2013. The fact that this does not cover the full CCBS Monitoring



	<p>period is allowable by the CCB Rules, which state on page 15: <i>“All projects seeking approval under the CCB Standards shall be validated to determine that the project design conforms to the Standards, and shall subsequently be verified to determine that the project has been successfully implemented, and whether it has generated, or is on track for generating, net positive climate, social, and biodiversity benefits in accordance with its validated design.”</i></p> <p>2) The difference in the numbers is also explained by the different accounting frameworks applied under CCBS vs. VCS. While the monitoring is the same for both standards, as stated in the PIR, the accounting approach validated under CCBS is somewhat different to what is done under the applied VCS methodology. The project proponent is aware of this and plans to solve the differences through a gap-validation to CCBS v.3, which would include the option for a Climate Section Waiver for projects also registered under VCS. For the sake of this CCBS verification, however, the presented information fulfills the goal of proving a net positive climate impact of the project.</p> <p>For clarity, reference to the results of the remote sensing forest cover analysis is now included in this section of the PIR.</p> <p>The GPS point sent by the auditor appears to be directly next to a road. From 2006 to 2012 there seems to have been no forest cover change in the vicinity identifiable in high-resolution imagery in Google Earth. In the 2013 satellite imagery employed by the project for climate impact monitoring, the point appears still generally forested. The 2013 re-stratification of the project identified the point as forest, but did map forest cover loss to the West and Northwest of the point taken (see file “Map Auditor GPS point.png” provided separately in</p>
--	--



	<p>supporting documents).</p> <p>So the auditor’s perception and the location of the point can be explained by two scenarios:</p> <p>a) The point is actually located in the deforested area in Northwest, but has been inaccurately placed by the GPS device. In this case, the forest cover would have been accurately mapped indeed.</p> <p>b) The point is supposed to show a deforestation that is not visible in the 2013 satellite image. In that case, we would ask the auditor to submit a photo of the location, but it seems to have, if anything, been a forest cover loss that took place after the date of the satellite picture was taken in 2013.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>The difference in the emission reductions between the figures stated in the CCBS PIR and in the VCS MR is sufficiently explained. Although the CCBS goal may be met, this gap validation exemption needs to be explicitly stated in the PIR where applicable.</p> <p>The single point provided to project developers and re-submitted back to verifiers indicates that the point did indeed demonstrate no change in land cover type. This component of the NCR can be closed.</p>
<p>Non-conformance Request (NCR):</p>	<p>CL: Please explicitly state, where applicable in the PIR, the need of a gap validation relating to the differences in carbon accounting. Please also clearly identify in the PIR where there are differences in accounting procedures from the validated CCB approach. Please identify all changes in the PIR.</p>
<p>Date Issued:</p>	<p>24 June 2014</p>
<p>Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:</p>	<p>Compared to the CCBS PDD, the project’s assessment of the current carbon stock (G1.4) as well as the baseline model (G2.3) have been updated by using more accurate approaches consistent with the project’s VCS certification. This is clearly pointed out in both sections in the PIR.</p> <p>According to a communication with CCBS (Email G. Wishart, April 1, 2014, provided to the auditor), this likely (but subject to the auditor’s decision) does not trigger a gap validation, since it does not change the project’s real world impacts on the ground. Based on this we argue that there is no gap validation required.</p>



	<p>The following is to clarify the projects climate monitoring & accounting approach:</p> <p>The project’s monitoring approach follows the applied VCS methodology as described in the validated VCS PD. This has already been stated in the project’s CCBS Monitoring Plan. With regards to the GHG accounting procedures, differences exist between VCS and CCBS, namely the inclusion of non-CO2 GHGs under CCBS, as well as the inclusion of change detection in year 1 under CCBS, which is not required under the applied VCS methodology. These two points are now reflected in the PIR, in sections CL1.1 & CL3.1. Furthermore, clarifying statements are now included in all relevant sections of the PIR (G1.4, G2.3, CL1.1, CL1.2, CL1.4, CL2.1, CL3.1).</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Close NCR:</p>	<p>Verifiers accept this response, the supplied supporting evidence, and further justification for monitoring changes within the PIR. Changes which have occurred to project design during implementation compared with the validated PDD are sufficiently and transparently explained to support the assertion that the changes in monitoring approach are in conformance with the requirements of the CCB Standards.</p> <p>The project does not require a gap validation as changes in the monitoring approach would not have a direct impact on project implementation. During monitoring, the project area did not change and there were no changes in project activities (i.e., on-the-ground) or scope. For these reasons, a gap validation is also not necessary to validate the updated baseline model.</p> <p>Although the new monitoring has resulted in a change of climate credits, the project represents continued positive climate impacts. Finding addressed.</p>
<p>Date Closed:</p>	<p>08 July 2014</p>
<p>Indicator CL1.2 - Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO₂ GHG emissions such as CH₄ and N₂O in the <i>with</i> and <i>without</i> project scenarios if those gases are likely to account for</p>	<p>The PIR states the net change in non-CO₂ GHG emissions is 8,804 tCO₂e.</p>



more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO ₂ -equivalent) of the project's overall GHG emissions reductions or removals over each monitoring period.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CL1.2 of the PIR, Spreadsheet "140213_Climate Impacts.xlsx."
Findings:	The 140213 Climate Impacts spreadsheet shows the correct calculation of this emission reduction. However, it is unclear how this figure was determined.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	CL: Please explain how this figure was determined.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The non-CO ₂ GHG emissions are calculated by applying the fully validated approach described in the CCBS PDD, (sections G2.3 and CL1.2) to the results of the deforestation analysis implemented for this monitoring period. This now clarified in the PIR.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	This response is sufficient to address the finding.
Date Closed:	24 June 2014

Indicator CL1.3 - Estimate any other GHG emissions resulting from project activities. Emissions sources include, but are not limited to, emissions from biomass burning during site preparation, emissions from fossil fuel combustion, direct emissions from the use of synthetic fertilizers, and emissions from the decomposition of N-fixing species.	No biomass burning is called for in the project. No synthetic fertilizers are applied and no increase in the use of N fixing species is expected.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CL1.3 of the PIR, descriptions of the project activities
Findings:	These sources of GHG emissions are not applicable to this project, which was also confirmed at validation.

Indicator CL1.4 - Demonstrate that the net climate impact of the project is positive. The net climate impact of the project is the net change in carbon stocks plus net change in non-CO ₂ GHGs where appropriate minus any other GHG emissions resulting from project activities minus any likely project-related	The net impact of the project, compared to the 'without project' scenario is 5,640,570 tCO ₂ e.
--	--



unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts (see CL2.3).	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CL1.4 of the PIR, file “140213_Climate Impacts.xlsx.”
Findings:	This total matches the totals found in the Climate Impacts spreadsheet. This total is not listed in the VCS Monitoring Report.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: Please explain why this total is inconsistent with the VCS Monitoring Report. Please confirm the total presented here is in alignment with the final calculations. Please state the Buffer Pool contribution percentage for this reporting period in the PIR.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The difference between the emission reductions reported under VCS and CCBS are explained above in the reply to the NCR on section CL1.1. The total presented in the PIR is in alignment with the final calculations, which are presented in the spreadsheet “Climate Impacts”. The CCBS does not issue any credits and also does not maintain a Buffer Pool. This is why there is no related statement in the PIR.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	This response is sufficient and the finding now defers to CL1.1.
Date Closed:	24 June 2014

Indicator CL1.5 - Specify how double counting of GHG emissions reductions or removals will be avoided, particularly for offsets sold on the voluntary market and generated in a country with an emissions cap.	Reader is referred to the PDD since the conditions of this element being addressed have not changed since the previous validation effort.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CL1 of the PIR.
Findings:	This indicator was adequately addressed during project validation and is not revisited during verification.



CL2 Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”)

<p>Indicator CL2.1 - Determine the types of leakage that are expected and estimate potential offsite increases in GHGs (increases in emissions or decreases in sequestration) due to project activities. Where relevant, define and justify where leakage is most likely to take place.</p>	<p>The reader is referred to the PDD for threats from leakage. It is monitored according to the VCS methodology, through permanent sampling plots in the leakage belt.</p> <p>The PDD discusses activity shifting leakage and market leakage. Activity shifting is unlikely, given the size of the project area and mobility of community members, as well as the project activities.</p> <p>Market leakage from fuel wood scarcity may occur, but fuel wood lots are planned as mitigation. (This activity has not been implemented, according to section G3.2 of the PIR).</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section CL2.1 of the PIR, section CL2.1 of the PDD.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Types of leakage that would be expected in a project like this are discussed in the PDD and are not expected to change in this verification period. However, it is unclear if separate leakage accounting occurred for the CCB verification period.</p>
<p>Non-conformance Request (NCR):</p>	<p>CL: Please explain how leakage was accounted for in the entire CCB verification period.</p>
<p>Date Issued:</p>	<p>23 April 2014</p>
<p>Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:</p>	<p>As validated, no leakage is expected. Leakage is monitored under VCS based on a network of permanent sampling plots in the project’s leakage belt. The first monitoring under VCS has confirmed for the first year (July 2011-June 2012) that indeed no leakage occurred. This confirms that the project is on track with the validated assumption of zero leakage and thus qualifies for verification under CCBS (cf. CCBS Rules v3, p. 15).</p> <p>The next VCS monitoring period will likely cover the phase July 2012-June 2014 and include a full leakage assessment. The outcome of this leakage assessment will inform also the next monitoring event under CCBS. Any detected leakage will be reported and accounted for under CCBS. The spreadsheet “Climate Impacts” in the supporting documents has been updated to reflect this.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Close NCR:</p>	<p>Section CL2.1 now states that leakage is monitored through sampling plots in the leakage belt, as required by</p>



	the VCS methodology. No leakage occurred during the first monitoring period. Finding addressed.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

Indicator CL2.2 - Document how any leakage will be mitigated and estimate the extent to which such impacts will be reduced by these mitigation activities.	Reader is referred to the PDD.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CL2 and G3.2 of the PIR, section CL2.2 of the PDD.
Findings:	Activity shifting leakage is expected to be minimal due to the low mobility of the community members and the fact that the project activities are meant to circumvent the need to clear additional land for agriculture. Market leakage (for fuel wood) is expected to be mitigated by the establishment of wood lots. However, woodlot activity has not begun. Since no leakage has been detected yet, mitigation activities, thus far, have been sufficient. Observations and interviews during the site visit confirm these statements to remain accurate and the project remains in compliance with this element.

Indicator CL2.3 - Subtract any likely project-related unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts from the climate benefits being claimed by the project and demonstrate that this has been included in the evaluation of net climate impact of the project (as calculated in CL1.4).	The PIR states that no leakage has been detected. The verified VCS monitoring report agrees. Site visit observations and interviews also confirm this aspect to be accurately reported.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CL2.3 of the PIR, section 4.3 of the VCS monitoring report.
Findings:	The project proponent has shown that no leakage was detected.

Indicator CL2.4 - Non-CO ₂ gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO ₂ -equivalent) of the net change calculations (above) of the project's overall off-site GHG emissions reductions or removals over each	PIR refers the reader to section CL2.3, which shows that no leakage was detected.
---	---



monitoring period.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CL2.4 and 2.3 of the PIR, section 4.3 of the VCS monitoring report.
Findings:	There was no detectable leakage. This indicator has been adequately addressed.

CL3 Climate Impact Monitoring

<p>Indicator CL3.1 - Develop an initial plan for selecting carbon pools and non-CO₂ GHGs to be monitored, and determine the frequency of monitoring. Potential pools include aboveground biomass, litter, dead wood, belowground biomass, wood products, soil carbon and peat. Pools to monitor must include any pools expected to decrease as a result of project activities, including those in the region outside the project boundaries resulting from all types of leakage identified in CL2. A plan must be in place to continue leakage monitoring for at least five years after all activity displacement or other leakage causing activity has taken place. Individual GHG sources may be considered ‘insignificant’ and do not have to be accounted for if together such omitted decreases in carbon pools and increases in GHG emissions amount to less than 5% of the total CO₂-equivalent benefits generated by the project. Non-CO₂ gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of CO₂-equivalent) of the project’s overall GHG impact over each monitoring period. Direct field measurements using scientifically robust sampling must be used to measure more significant elements of the project’s carbon stocks. Other data must be suitable to the project</p>	<p>A full monitoring plan was developed and posted on the CCB website and made available to the RDCs, particularly chiefs and ward councilors through the OGM teams.</p> <p>Climate impact monitoring follows the requirements of the VCS methodology, as well as the CCB PDD requirements as established at validation. The project claims to have taken a conservative deviation from the CCB PDD by not monitoring soil carbon.</p>
--	--



site and specific forest type.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CL3.1 of the PIR, Monitoring Plan, section 4 of the VCS PD.
Findings:	A monitoring plan was developed and is in place. Soil carbon was not monitored, due to the infeasibility of the expense for the project, so no credits will be issued for this pool unless feasible in the future.

Indicator CL3.2 - Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.	Full monitoring plan was developed and published on the CCB website. The project claims to be using the requirements for monitoring as prescribed in the VCS methodology, which was also laid out in the VCS PD.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CL3.2 of the PIR, Monitoring Plan, section 4 of VCS PD.
Findings:	A full monitoring plan was developed and is in use. However, it is clear that there is a disconnect in how the current CCB monitoring period extends well past the last VCS monitoring period. It is unclear how the project has covered this time period in this section of the PIR.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: Please explain here how the non-monitored time period extending past VCS monitoring was covered in this CCB period.
	23 April 2014
	The VCS MR covers the time frame between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012. The PIR however covers the time from July 1, 2011 to January 31, 2014. The latest available Landsat imagery available for the PIR, however is dated from June/July 2013. This means that the emission reductions stated in the PIR actually occurred between July 1, 2011 and June/July 2013. The fact that this does not cover the full CCBS Monitoring period is allowable by the CCB Rules, which state on page 15: <i>“All projects seeking approval under the CCB Standards shall be validated to determine that the project design conforms to the Standards, and shall subsequently be</i>



	<p><i>verified to determine that the project has been successfully implemented, and whether it has generated, or is on track for generating, net positive climate, social, and biodiversity benefits in accordance with its validated design.”</i></p> <p>Cf. also the comment to CL1.1.</p>
Findings:	The response suffices to address the overlap between VCS and CCBS monitoring periods. However, as monitoring efforts differ from the original CCB-validated monitoring plan, this should have triggered a CCB “gap validation”.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	CL: Please explicitly state in the PIR, wherever applicable, the presence of a CCB “gap validation” to account for the difference in present monitoring from the CCB-validated monitoring plan. Please identify all changes in the PIR.
Date Issued:	24 June 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The monitoring plan states that the project will be monitored according to the monitoring procedures described in the VCS PD. This is now implemented in the CCBS PIR. The project proponent is of the opinion that no gap validation is required. Please also refer to the comment to section CL1.1.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Please see response finding to Indicator CL1.1 above, which addresses gap validation. The verifier does not believe that a gap validation has been triggered. Finding addressed.
Date Closed:	08 July 2014

CM1 Net Positive Community Impacts

<p>Indicator CM1.1 - Use appropriate methodologies to estimate the impacts on communities, including all constituent socio-economic or cultural groups such as indigenous peoples (defined in G1), resulting from planned project activities. A credible estimate of impacts must include changes in community well-being due to project activities and an evaluation of the impacts by the affected groups. This estimate must be based on</p>	<p>The project’s impacts on the local communities have been monitored according to the project’s monitoring plan and SOP. The PIR lists the number of trainings, workshops, participants, etc., and refers to them as “direct effects.” These were confirmed as being part of the original monitoring plan.</p> <p>Indirect effects were monitored through a survey in January of 2014. Most participants expressed satisfaction with the project as reported in the PIR.</p>
--	---



<p>clearly defined and defensible assumptions about how project activities will alter social and economic well-being, including potential impacts of changes in natural resources and ecosystem services identified as important by the communities (including water and soil resources), over the duration of the project. The ‘with project’ scenario must then be compared with the ‘without project’ scenario of social and economic well-being in the absence of the project (completed in G2). The difference (i.e., the community benefit) must be positive for all community groups.</p>	<p>Several tables, showing survey results for satisfaction with the project and reported impacts are shown. The majority were satisfied, very few unsatisfied. No negative impacts were reported.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section CM1.1 of the PIR, monitoring plan.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>The monitoring plan was followed and indicated positive impacts on community members. The categories of questions asked in the indirect monitoring appear broad. It is unclear why some members of the community were unsatisfied but that dissatisfaction was not explained or clarified on the other surveys.</p> <p>It is not clear how the criterion [“identified as important by the communities (including water and soil resources)”] is met. The PDD doc presents the SLA framework the project used. However, it is not clear how the communities were involved in the process. Similarly the PIR doc explains the monitoring of direct and indirect impacts on the local communities according to the project’s monitoring plan and SOP. Again, there is no explanation as to how the communities were/are involved. Are benefits and impacts presented “identified as important by the communities”?</p> <p>The project impact (Tables 4-7 in the PIR doc) reported only for “Beneficiaries and Employees” and not “Community Members”.</p>
<p>Non-conformance Request (NCR):</p>	<p>NCR: While it appears the project has conducted a viable survey effort to attempt to gain some information about</p>



	<p>the affect the project is having on the local communities, it is not clear if these questions are giving the desired level of information. This is evidenced by some members of the community reporting dissatisfaction. However, there is no other information that provides any further clarification of why. Please explain why the survey effort did not provide further details on the reason for the dissatisfaction in 2.5% of the community members (over 18 people).</p> <p>Please review expert comment above and clarify.</p> <p>Please explain why the project impact (Tables 4-7 in the PIR doc) reported only for “Beneficiaries and Employees” and not “Community Members”.</p>
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	<p>Of the eight people who were interviewed and stated that they were unsatisfied by the project, seven were from the general community (2.5% of 270) and one was a project beneficiary. The reason given by the one beneficiary for his dissatisfaction was because he wanted more inputs for CF and bees wax to dress his hives with. His comment is available in the summary of results of the community impact survey. The seven community members stated that because they had not received any inputs or benefits i.e. they were not registered beneficiaries, they were not satisfied with the project.</p> <p>The SLA framework has been used at PDD stage to identify likely impacts of the project. In order to base the project’s design and monitoring on community needs, an extensive Public Rural Appraisal has been implemented at design stage and validated (cf. PDD its and supporting documents). Extensive stakeholder meetings have been conducted in order to identify the communities’ needs and interest in the project. Namely, also HCV 5 and 6 have been identified at design stage and thus included into the monitoring approach. Further identified relevant impacts include food security, healthcare and education. The community monitoring approach is based on these identified impacts.</p> <p>Table 4-7 represent information gathered through sections of the questionnaire, which were only posed to Employees</p>



	<p>and Beneficiaries (cf. social monitoring SOP). This is because these questions are very specific and thus would not result in relevant information when posed to community members, which are not directly affected by the project.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the Social Monitoring SOP includes questions to get an understanding of the general community's opinion about the project, namely Questions 7-12.</p>
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The additional information about stakeholder dissatisfaction and explanation regarding stakeholder involvement in identifying important project benefits and HCVs in the project area, as well as the clarification regarding community members at large adequately addresses this NCR.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

<p>Indicator CM1.2 - Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.4-6 will be negatively affected by the project.</p>	<p>The project area provides for the fundamental basic needs of the communities, and the cultural identity HCV.</p> <p>Five questions on the social impact survey address the HCVs. 100% of respondents said they were not restricted from the community-related HCVs.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CM1.2 of the PIR.
Findings:	The survey and the nature of the project activities are good indicators that these HCVs have not been negatively affected. Further evidence was gained from direct observations and personal interviews conducted during the site visit.

CM2 Offsite Stakeholder Impacts

<p>Indicator CM2.1 - Identify any potential negative offsite stakeholder impacts that the project activities are likely to cause.</p>	Reader is referred to the PDD. The PDD states there are no offsite stakeholder impacts expected.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CM2.1 of the PIR and PDD.
Findings:	It is unlikely that there would be negative offsite stakeholder impacts from a project of this nature. However, this element needs to be reviewed at each verification event and reported on by the project.



	Additionally, the PDD did not provide a thorough explanation of why no off-site stakeholder impacts are likely.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: Please report in the PIR as to what actions were taken to confirm this aspect. Additionally, since the PDD did not provide a thorough explanation of why no off-site stakeholder impacts are likely, please provide a concise explanation in this section of the PIR.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section CM2.1 of the PIR has been fully updated. The only potentially affect offsite stakeholders are the communities of wards outside the project, but within participating RDCs. The project is in a close dialogue with these communities in order to identify and mitigate any negative impacts. To-date, no negative report has been made by these stakeholders.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The PIR explains the position that no offsite stakeholder impacts are expected, because the project offers attractive alternatives to livelihoods that put pressure on forests and wildlife. Only positive incentives are offered. Limited mobility of the population makes them unlikely to move to areas outside the project area. The PIR also mentions that aside from outsiders coveting project activities, negative impacts are unlikely. Ample opportunities to voice concerns exist through full RDC meetings.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

Indicator CM2.2 - Describe how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite social and economic impacts.	The PIR refers the reader to the PDD. The PDD states that this is not applicable to the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CM2 and CM2.1 of the PIR, CM2.1 and CM2.2 of the PDD.
Findings:	Since there are no negative offsite stakeholder impacts, this indicator is not applicable. This element may be reopened should the results of the NCR in indicator CM2.1 be found to need further investigation.

Indicator CM2.3 - Demonstrate that the project is not likely to result in net	The PIR refers the reader to the PDD. The PDD states this indicator is not applicable, because no other stakeholders
--	--



negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups.	have been identified.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CM2 of the PIR, sections G3.8 and CM2.3 of the PDD.
Findings:	No other stakeholders were identified in the validated PDD. No demonstration is necessary.

CM3 Community Impact Monitoring

Indicator CM3.1 - Develop an initial plan for selecting community variables to be monitored and the frequency of monitoring and reporting to ensure that monitoring variables are directly linked to the project's community development objectives and to anticipated impacts (positive and negative).	The reader is referred to the PDD. The validated PDD includes an initial monitoring plan. A full monitoring plan has since been implemented. The PIR indicates that the monitoring plan was printed and made available to the RDC's and distributed to the community chiefs and ward councilors.
--	--

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CM3 of the PIR, section CM3.1 of the PDD, monitoring plan and report.
--------------------------------------	---

Findings:	This indicator was adequately addressed during validation and it is not necessary to re-examine it, given that any initial plan has been superseded by the full monitoring plan. Given that all of this was validated, this element is addressed.
-----------	---

Indicator CM3.2 - Develop an initial plan for how they will assess the effectiveness of measures used to maintain or enhance High Conservation Values related to community well-being (G1.8.4-6) present in the project zone.	Reader is referred to the PDD. Assessment of the maintenance of access to community-related HCVs is part of the monitoring survey.
--	--

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CM3 of the PIR, Section CM3.2 of the PDD, social impacts survey, monitoring plan.
--------------------------------------	---

Findings:	The project has a full plan in place which is being implemented. Given that all of this was validated, this element is addressed.
-----------	---

Indicator CM3.3 - Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation	The PIR points out that the full monitoring plan was developed and posted on the CCB website. Copies were made available in the RDCs by the OGMs. An SOP for the monitoring plan was also created.
--	--



against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CM3.3 of the PIR, monitoring plan, SOP for monitoring plan.
Findings:	The commitment to the full monitoring plan has come to fruition. It is not clear if the results have been shared with the communities, as per the requirement.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: Please discuss how the results of the monitoring have been made available to the public or available on the internet, as per the requirements of this indicator.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The following clarifying statement is now included in the PIR. This should satisfy the requirements of CM3.3. “The results of the monitoring are published in the PIR, which is not only published online for public consultation, but also distributed locally through the PIR summaries, which have been translated to Tonga and Shona and distributed in the project area. Community members have also been invited to comment on the PIR and the project (cf. section G3.8).”
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Section CM3.3 now includes the above language, which satisfies the finding.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

B1 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts

<p>Indicator B1.1 - Use appropriate methodologies to estimate changes in biodiversity as a result of the project in the project zone and in the project lifetime. 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 G2. The difference (i.e., the net biodiversity benefit) must be</p>	<p>The PIR points out that in the without project scenario, habitat continues to decline due to deforestation, and poaching pressure on wildlife is not reduced through project anti-poaching measures.</p> <p>Results of biodiversity monitoring show a significant presence of many wildlife species. Monitoring records show an increase in sightings in 2012 over 2013, but the significance of this difference is not known.</p> <p>Anti-poaching efforts are summarized in table 10 and are</p>
--	---



<p>positive.</p>	<p>at the center of the project’s positive impact on biodiversity through reductions of poaching. The project’s anti-poaching efforts are the driver for why monitoring species such as lion, elephant and rhino is relevant.</p> <p>Tree diversity is also monitored and a simple list is presented.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Sections B1.1 and G3.2 of the PIR, file “140214_Kariba_wildlife_data_final.xlsx.”</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Monitoring may show an increase in wildlife populations. However, it is difficult to say within such a short timeframe. Anti-poaching efforts play a tangible role in the increase in wildlife, which is being monitored according to the validated plans. Anecdotal observations of increase in biodiversity of small animals were presented in the PIR. Give the ‘without project’ scenario, it is clear that biodiversity impacts of the project are favorable in comparison.</p> <p>However, the difference in wildlife populations would be better measured if the census was conducted systematically to quantify wildlife sightings. This would be a more effective way to monitor biodiversity. In Table 8 of the PIR, the number of days conducting the census was much higher in 2013, while numbers of wildlife were higher. A more systematic procedure may be needed for the monitoring protocol to actually measure changes in wildlife based on census work.</p> <p>Monitoring here should include a reduction in rates of snare removal, so this should be quantified. It would be useful to clarify the source of the poaching (local or external) in this section.</p> <p>It is unclear what value the tree monitoring is having, nor what conclusion can be drawn from the tree monitoring and the simple list presented in the PIR.</p>
<p>Non-conformance Request (NCR):</p>	<p>NCR: Please explain the relevance of the tree species monitoring and how biodiversity is positive because of the tree species shown. Please explain the assumption behind this monitoring, and please summarize the methodology</p>



	used.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	<p>With regards to the wildlife monitoring approach, the team-days spent doing the census are indeed higher in 2013 compared to 2012 and this is obviously a major factor determining the outcomes. In order to correct for this effect, Table 8 also shows the results normalized per day spent monitoring in the last two rows.</p> <p>Going forward, the project team is considering to improve the monitoring approach further, e.g. by defining transects in the area which would be repeatedly visited. A full update on any improvements will be given at the next verification.</p> <p>The removal of snares in itself represents a reduction of the pressure on wildlife. Therefore, the project proponent believes that a continued removal of snares is to be seen as a positive impact on the area's biodiversity. An increase in the removal of snares per year could either be a sign of increased poaching activities, but it could also be seen as a sign of improved training of the anti-poaching scouts. Therefore in the project proponent's view, the proof for the project's positive impact on biodiversity lays in the fact that snares are removed at a significant scale, rather than in the long-term development of the number of removed snares. Having stated this, the number of removed snares per team-day spent patrolling actually decrease from 2.17 in 2012 to 1.76 in 2013 (data can be calculated from Table 10).</p> <p>A clarifying statement on the source of poaching is now included in the PIR.</p> <p>Tree monitoring was done as part of the VCS carbon monitoring on 142 plots throughout the project area and will help to detect mid- to long-term changes in the area's vegetation. It's a cost-efficient yet effective tool to discover any effects (e.g. of climate change or a changing fire or grazing regime), which would otherwise not have been discovered. However, this data will only become available in the PIR.</p> <p>This is now clarified in the PIR.</p>
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The PIR now states that the tree species monitoring will



	generally inform project management of changes in vegetation, whether due to grazing, fire or climate change, to help assess biodiversity impacts.
Expert's Comments:	The expert agrees that snares per team-day spent patrolling is a more valuable statistic than the number of snares removed per year, and agrees that tree monitoring is also a valuable source of data for monitoring habitat. Finding addressed.
Date Closed:	18 June 2014.

Indicator B1.2 - Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.1-3 will be negatively affected by the project.	The PIR notes the wildlife-related HCVs (several endangered and vulnerable species are identified in the PDD, section G1.8) are a major focus of the project. Reduced habitat loss and increased anti-poaching patrols will positively affect the wildlife HCV.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B1.2 of the PIR, Section G1.8 of the PDD.
Findings:	There is no reason to believe the endangered and threatened species of the project zone would be negatively affected by the project.

Indicator B1.3 - Identify all species to be used by the project and show that no known invasive species will be introduced into any area affected by the project and that the population of any invasive species will not increase as a result of the project.	<p>The project uses several different species for its woodlots and agricultural activities. The species identified are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i>) - Peanuts (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i>) - Chilli Peppers (<i>Capsicum spp.</i>) - Eucalyptus (<i>Eucalyptus robusta</i> & <i>E. tereticornis</i>; fire wood, tobacco curing) - Soy Bean (<i>Glycine max</i>) - Jatropha (<i>Jatropha curcas</i>; oil, life fences) - Cassava (<i>Manihotes culenta</i>) - Moringa (<i>Moringa oleifera</i>; vegetable, fodder) - Sugar Bean (<i>Phaseolus lunatus</i>) - Sorghum (<i>Sorghum bicolor</i>) - Cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i>) - Maize (<i>Zea mays</i>) <p>No species likely to have negative effects will be used.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B1.3 of the PIR, invasive species database.
Findings:	None of the species used are invasive in Zimbabwe. This indicator has been adequately addressed.



Indicator B1.4 - Describe possible adverse effects of non-native species used by the project on the region's environment, including impacts on native species and disease introduction or facilitation. Project proponents must justify any use of non-native species over native species	The reader is referred to the PDD. The PDD states that no species are being used that are not already cultivated in Zimbabwe.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B1 of the PIR, section B1.4 of the PDD.
Findings:	Since no problems have been recorded in Zimbabwe in regard to these species, it is unlikely adverse effects will occur.

Indicator B1.5 - Guarantee that no GMOs will be used to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals.	The PIR reiterates that no GMOs are used in any project activity.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B1.5 of the PIR.
Findings:	The declaration adequately addresses this indicator.

B2 Offsite Biodiversity Impacts

Indicator B2.1 - Identify potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts that the project is likely to cause.	The reader is referred to the PDD. The PDD states there will be none. The project lands are also wildlife corridors between adjacent national parks. Other than the well-guarded parks, wildlife is sparse outside the project areas.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B2 of the PIR, section B2.1 of the PDD.
Findings:	There are no negative offsite biodiversity impacts from the project. Offsite biodiversity exists in the parks only, and these lands now provide a more protected corridor. This element was assessed at validation and has not changed at verification.

Indicator B2.2 - Document how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite biodiversity impacts.	Reader is referred to the PDD. No negative impacts are envisioned, so there is no mitigation.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B2 of the PIR, section B2.2 of the PDD.
Findings:	It is unreasonable to expect negative biodiversity impacts, on or offsite, from this project. This element was assessed at validation and has not changed at verification.

Indicator B2.3 - Evaluate likely	Reader is referred to the PDD. The PDD states that no
---	---



unmitigated negative offsite biodiversity impacts against the biodiversity benefits of the project within the project boundaries. Justify and demonstrate that the net effect of the project on biodiversity is positive.	negative impacts are envisioned. If they occur, adaptive management will address it.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B2 of the PIR, section B2.3 of the PDD.
Findings:	It is not reasonable to expect negative offsite biodiversity impacts from this project, given the nature of the project. This element was assessed at validation and has not changed at verification.

B3 Biodiversity Impact Monitoring

Indicator B3.1 - Develop an initial plan for selecting biodiversity variables to be monitored and the frequency of monitoring and reporting to ensure that monitoring variables are directly linked to the project's biodiversity objectives and to anticipated impacts (positive and negative).	Reader is referred to the PDD. The PDD provides an initial monitoring plan.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B3 of the PIR, section B3.1 of the PDD
Findings:	The initial monitoring plan was provided in the PDD. A full monitoring plan has since been developed and is being implemented. This indicator was adequately addressed in the PDD and no longer has relevance, given the full monitoring plan is now in place.

Indicator B3.2 - Develop an initial plan for assessing the effectiveness of measures used to maintain or enhance High Conservation Values related to globally, regionally or nationally significant biodiversity (G1.8.1-3) present in the project zone.	Reader is referred to the PDD. The PDD states that HCVs are accounted for in the initial plan described in section B3.1 of the PDD.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B3 of the PIR, section B3.2 of the PDD.
Findings:	The initial plan described in section B3.1 of the PDD will adequately monitor the threatened and endangered species of the project area. It has been since superseded by the full monitoring plan. This indicator has been thoroughly addressed.



<p>Indicator B3.3 - Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.</p>	<p>The PIR states that the full monitoring plan was developed and posted on the CCB website. They were made available to local communities through the OGM teams. An SOP for biodiversity monitoring was also prepared and supplied to the auditors.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section B3.3 of the PIR, the monitoring plan, the Kariba Biodiversity monitoring SOP.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>The commitment has been fulfilled with the development of the monitoring plan. This indicator has been adequately reported on in B1.1. It is unclear how the results were shared with the communities and in what documentation this information was available on the internet.</p> <p>It is not clear how the feedback was solicited from the community members (not clear in the document in this section). Simply sharing information is not true collaboration with the community. The documents are on the internet, but what about people with no access to internet there?</p>
<p>Non-conformance Request (NCR):</p>	<p>NCR: Please confirm how the results were shared with the community and if they were made available on the internet, as per the requirements of this indicator.</p>
<p>Date Issued:</p>	<p>23 April 2014</p>
<p>Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:</p>	<p>The following clarifying statement is now included in the PIR. This should satisfy the requirements of B3.3.</p> <p>“The results of the monitoring are published in the PIR, which is not only published online for public consultation, but also distributed locally through the PIR summaries, which have been translated to Tonga and Shona and distributed in the project area. Community members have also been invited to comment on the PIR and the project (cf. section G3.8).”</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Close NCR:</p>	<p>Section B3.3 now states that aside from the online publication of the PIR, PIR summaries in Shona and Tonga are distributed by the OGM teams. It refers to G3.8</p>



	to explain the apparently frequent and informal contact between the communities and the OGM teams. Tonga translation was provided to the auditors. Finding addressed.
Date Closed:	24 June 2014

Gold Level Section

GL1 Climate Change Adaptation Benefits

Indicator GL1.1 - Identify likely regional climate change and climate variability scenarios and impacts, using available studies, and identify potential changes in the local land-use scenario due to these climate change scenarios in the absence of the project.	Reader is referred to the PD. The PDD states that the country is very likely to heat up during this century, according to the IPCC. Rainfall is expected to decline. Agricultural production is likely to decrease. Local people would be forced to adapt in ways that are not discussed.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section GL1.1 of the PDD.
Findings:	This element was validated and has not changed at this point of verification. Issue is addressed.

Indicator GL1.2 - Identify any risks to the project's climate, community and biodiversity benefits resulting from likely climate change and climate variability impacts and explain how these risks will be mitigated.	<p>The PIR states that risks from climate change are addressed by the project's adaptive management process. No new risks have been identified in the adaptive management meeting in January, 2014.</p> <p>The PDD says that climate change will affect both vegetation and biodiversity, but the project's community and biodiversity activities will not be threatened. Vulnerability will not increase as a result of project activities, and will increase the capacity to absorb the impacts of climate change.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections GL1.2 of the PIR and PDD.
Findings:	New risks were not found since the PDD was published. Project activities are likely to enhance the communities' abilities to cope with change. Adaptive management is the good way to address future unknown scenarios, at this time. This indicator has been adequately addressed.

Indicator GL1.3 - Demonstrate that current or anticipated climate changes are	The reader is referred to the PDD. The PDD states that temperatures are expected to increase by 2°C by 2030.
--	--



having or are likely to have an impact on the well-being of communities <i>and/or</i> the conservation status of biodiversity in the project zone and surrounding regions.	Productivity of the main crops of corn and wheat are expected to decrease substantially. Climate change is expected to have a significant influence on ecosystems and human communities in the project areas.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section GL1.3 of the PDD.
Findings:	A 2°C increase in temperatures will likely have a negative impact on biodiversity and communities. This finding does not appear to have changed since the project was validated. This indicator does not need to be revisited at verification.

Indicator GL1.4 - Demonstrate that the project activities will assist communities <i>and/or</i> biodiversity to adapt to the probable impacts of climate change.	Training farmers in more drought adapted techniques, the introduction of beekeeping and direct employment by the project will help communities adapt to expected climate change. The PIR directs the reader to sections CM1.1 and G3.2 for more information on the project activities.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections GL1.4 of the PIR and PDD.
Findings:	Conservation farming techniques and opening up new opportunities for income should serve to assist communities in adjusting to climate change. This section does not explain much in that the indicator is requesting for a demonstration, rather than a short summary and directing the reader to a listing of current activities.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	NCR: Please use the information in sections CM1.1, and G3.2 and other information to explain and demonstrate that these project activities will assist communities to adapt to probable impacts of climate change. This requires a description of what the probable impacts to climate change may be in the region and how the project activities may be a benefit as the climate changes. Please add more description to this indicator as to exactly how the project <u>has</u> assisted to-date.
Date Issued:	23 April 2014
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The revised section now includes a summary of the effects of climate change in the region, based on the PDD. It also now clarifies in more detail how the project activities help communities to adapt to climate change. For details on the implementation of the mentioned activities, the reader is referred to sections CM1.1 and G3.2, where these activities are described in all detail.
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Section GL1.4 now includes expected effects of climate



	change in the area and how the project activities address the consequences of climate change.
Date Closed:	06 June 2014

GL2 Exceptional Community Benefits

GL2 indicators were not subject to validation and are not examined here.

GL3 Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits

<p>Indicator GL3.1 – Vulnerability Regular occurrence of a globally threatened species (according to the IUCN Red List) at the site:</p> <p>1.1 - Critically Endangered (CR) and Endangered (EN) species - presence of at least a single individual; or</p> <p>1.2 - Vulnerable species (VU) - presence of at least 30 individuals or 10 pairs.</p>	<p>The PIR states that the project area has African wild dogs, a now endangered species, and many elephants, lions, leopards and cheetahs, which are listed as vulnerable, all listed as such according to the IUCN.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section GL3 of the PIR, biodiversity wildlife data spreadsheet; observations during field visit
Findings:	The project area includes habitat for both endangered and vulnerable species. Vulnerable species number over 30 individuals, as the verifier observed more than 30 individuals of elephants and hippopotamus, as well as evidence of several lion during the site visit. This indicator has been adequately addressed given the continued occurrence and monitoring of VU and EN species.

Public Comment Period

Public Shareholder Comments

Public comments for CCBA were solicited through posting of the PIR to the CCBA website, making the PIR available at RDC offices (council offices and satellite offices), and distribution of the PIR summaries in local languages. OGM teams personally delivered documents and also notified the communities of the auditor’s upcoming site visit. Documents were distributed between 14-24 February 2014. No public comments were received.



Local Shareholder Comments

The PIR was made available as described above. No public comments were received.

CCB Public Comment Period

The project PIR was posted to the CCBA website for the formal 30-day public comment period 14 January 2014 – 13 February 2014. No comments were received.


Public Meetings

During the site visit, the verifier participated in several public meetings, which were advertised prior to the site visit. The verifier asked questions during meetings to sufficiently gauge the efficacy of the project and to determine the awareness and participation of the communities. Although several community members expressed that they would like wider application of the project and more benefits distributed, all comments received were in favor of the project.

Verification Conclusion

ESI confirms all verification activities – including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance, the project’s adherence to the validated PDD, and implementation as outlined in the PIR – adhere to the CCB Project Design Standards, Second Edition, as documented in this report are complete. ESI concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that the Kariba REDD+ Project, CCB Project Implementation Report, v3, (07 July 2014), meets the requirements of the CCB Project Design Standards (Second Edition – December 2008) and two Gold Level Benefits, including Climate Change Adaptation and Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits.

Submittal Information

Report Submitted to:	Carbon Green Investments 18-20 LePollet Street St. Peter Port, Guernsey UK, GY1 1WH Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance
Report Submitted (CCBA-Approved Verifier) by:	Environmental Services Inc. 7220 Financial Way, Suite 100 Jacksonville, Florida 32256
Lead Verifier and Regional Technical Manager (QA/QC) Names and Signatures:	 Caitlin Sellers – Lead Verifier



	<p><i>Janice McMahon</i></p> <p>Janice McMahon – Vice President and Regional Technical Manager Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division</p>
Date:	24 July 2014

CLS/RS/SM/JPM/RMB VO14013.00 CCB Ver Report-final.doc
K:pf 07/24/14f



Appendix A – Documents Reviewed / Received

Documents received 17 February 2014

- PIR 1st submission
 - Supporting documents
 - 130816_Kariba VCS PD_V11.pdf
 - 130816_MR_Kariba_M1_V8.pdf
 - 131031_Kariba_Biodiversity monitoring_SOP_Final.pdf
 - 140107_Kariba_social monitoring_SOP_Final.pdf
 - 140205_CGA_Adaptive management_minutes.pdf
 - 140205_Community & Project Sustainability Fund Distributions.xlsx
 - 140205_Kariba_Financials_Auditor.xlsx
 - 140205_Kariba_REDD+_social_impacts_survey_2014.pdf
 - 140205_Social monitoring direct effects.xlsx
 - 140205_Trust Fund overview.xlsx
 - 140210_CDM and Leakage Model_V5_CCBS.xlsx
 - 140210_Kariba_biodiversity_tree_species_data_analysis.xlsx
 - 140213_CCBS def Verif_2011-2013 Results.xlsx
 - 140213_Climate Impacts.xlsx
 - 140214_Kariba PIR RS Annex.docx
 - 140214_Kariba_biodiversity_wildlife_data_final.xlsx
 - Evidence for project start date July 1 2011
 - 1.Expenses April 2011 - December 2011.pdf
 - 2.Black Crystal Invoices
 - 111231_research.pdf
 - 110401_research & fieldwork.pdf
 - 110530_vegetation study.xls
 - 110630_research & fieldwork.xls
 - 110731_research & fieldwork.xls
 - 110831_research & fieldwork.pdf
 - 110930_research.pdf
 - 3.EA invoices
 - 110408_CGI Baseline Survey Invoice.xls
 - 4.Invoices project areas
 - 110713_Aeroplane transport & surveliance.pdf
 - Binga
 - 110811_office equipment.pdf
 - 110714_office equipment & transport
 - IMG_0004.pdf
 - Binga Wilwyn Office Equip.xls
 - IMG.jpg
 - IMG_0001.pdf
 - IMG_0002.pdf



- IMG_0003.jpg
 - 111026_medicine,school-equip.,bikes
 - Transportation (bikes).pdf
 - Equip.for schools.jpg
 - IMG.jpg
 - Medicine.jpg
 - 110629_truck.xls
 - Hurungwe
 - 111110.pdf
 - 110714_office equipment
 - Hurungwe Wilwyn Office equip.xls
 - 14.07.2011h.pdf
 - Hurungwe Acknowledge Reciept.docx
 - 111026_medicine,school-equip.,bikes.pdf
 - Mbire
 - 120228_Chikafa Fence Labour.pdf
 - 110712_office equipment
 - office equipment.pdf
 - 14.07.2011_acknowledgement of receipt.pdf
 - 110831_Spirit Medium Costs.docx
 - 111024_bikes.pdf
 - 111024_medicine.pdf
 - 111025_school-equip.pdf
 - 111026_acknowledgement of receipt.pdf
 - 111109_acknowledgement of receipt.pdf
 - 111125_Mbire Scout Training & Clothing.pdf
 - 111208_Scout Wages.docx
 - 111208_Spirit Medium Consult.pdf
 - Naminyami
 - 111021_bikes.jpeg
 - 111007_medicine,school-equip.,bikes
 - school-equip.jpeg
 - 111024_bikes.pdf
 - medicine.jpeg
 - office equipment.pdf
 - 110721_acknowledgement of receipts.pdf
 - OGM & Marketing Clothing
 - 111111_.pdf
 - 111021.pdf
 - 111025.pdf
 - 111104.pdf
 - 111111.pdf
 - OGM receipts



- IMG_0016.pdf
- 111031.pdf
- 111116.pdf
- 111201.pdf
- 111202.pdf
- 111220.pdf
- 120214.pdf
- 120215.pdf
- 120309.pdf
- 120427.pdf
- IMG_0001.pdf
- IMG_0005.pdf
- IMG_0007.pdf
- IMG_0009.pdf
- IMG_0010.pdf
- IMG_0012.pdf
- 140214_Kariba REDD+ PIR_V1.docx
- 140214_Kariba REDD+ PIR_V1.pdf
- 140214_Summary_CCBS PIR_final.pdf
- 140217_Summary CCBS PIR_Shona.pdf

Documents received 18 February 2014

- PIR Summary_Tonga version_final.pdf

Documents received 26 February 2014

*Duplicate documents originally received by ESI on 17 & 18 February 2014 were resent by the client on 26 February 2014. Not listed again here for conciseness.

Documents received 17 March 2014

- GIS Data files
 - Reference Areas 2013 landcover classification
 - 2013 Complete
 - 2013 ground truth points
 - 2013 Training Areas
 - 2013 Validation Area
 - 2013 strata after re-stratification
 - Kariba 2013 forest cover
 - NF strata

Documents received 26 March 2014

- Nyaminyami February Update.pdf
- 130624_Monitoring Plan_Kariba_CCBS_final.pdf
- BRDC February Update 2014.pdf



- Hurungwe February Update.pdf
- MRDC February Update.pdf

Documents received 31 March 2014

- NRDC August 2013.pdf
- Adaptive management Plan_final.pdf
- ATT00001.htm
- ATT00002.htm
- ATT00003.htm
- ATT00004.htm
- BRDC August 2013.pdf
- HRDC August 2013.pdf
- MRDC August 2013.pdf

Documents received 01 April 2014

- Q4 2013 REDD Price Report.pdf
- Community Direct Inputs Record_2014-Caitlin.xlsx

Documents received 29 May 2014

- PIR 2nd submission
 - 140529_Kariba REDD+ PIR_V2.pdf
 - Supporting documents
 - Map Auditor GPS point.png
 - Kariba REDD Trust
 - Scan 66.jpeg
 - Scan 67.jpeg
 - Scan 68.jpeg
 - Scan 69.jpeg
 - Scan 70.jpeg
 - Scan 71.jpeg
 - Scan 73.jpeg
 - Scan 74.jpeg
 - Scan 75.jpeg
 - Scan 76.jpeg
 - Scan 77.jpeg
 - Scan 78.jpeg
 - Scan 79.jpeg
 - Scan 81.jpeg
 - Scan 83.jpeg
 - Scan 84.jpeg
 - Scan 85.jpeg
 - Scan 86.jpeg



- Training Attendance Registers
 - Trainings Attendance Registers.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0001.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0002.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0003.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0004.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0005.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0006.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0007.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0008.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0009.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0010.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0011.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0012.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0013.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0014.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0015.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0016.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0017.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0018.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0019.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0020.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0021.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0022.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0023.jpg
 - Trainings Attendance Registers_0024.jpg
- 130526_Fire tools distributed.xlsx
- 140106_Kariba_Biodiversity monitoring_SOP_Final.pdf
- 140516_Climate Impacts.xlsx
- 140520_Adaptive Management meeting 31 01 14_minutes.pdf
- 40520_Adaptive management Plan_final_update.pdf
- 140523_CGA Employee Risk Management Plan.pdf
- 013-Kariba_REDD+_CCBA_NCR_Round1_Final_for Client_tsi.docx
- 140529_Kariba REDD+ PIR_V2.docx

Documents received 07 July 2014

- Supporting documents
 - 140625_CCBS def Verif_2011-2013 Results.xlsx
- 013-Kariba_REDD+_CCBA_NCR_Round2_Final_for_client_reply_SP.docx
- 140707_Kariba REDD+ PIR_V3.docx
- 140707_Kariba REDD+ PIR_V3.pdf



Appendix B – Stakeholder Announcements

The following summary of the PIR, notification of the auditor’s site visit, and invitation to provide comments and/or grievances was translated in Shona and Tonga and distributed to the communities on 14 January 2014. No formal public or stakeholder comments were received.

Kariba REDD+ Project, Zimbabwe

Project Implementation Report (PIR)

Summary



Project Proponent

Carbon Green Investments (CGI)
Robert Hume,
robert@carbongreenafrica.net,
+263 77 802 05 39

Auditor

Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI)
Caitlin Sellers, csellers@ESINC.CC,
+1-772-834-8571

Developed by

South Pole Carbon Asset Management
Tilman Silber,
t.silber@southpolecarbon.com,
+41 43 501 35 50

January 14, 2014



Project information

Name	Kariba REDD+ Project
Location	Northern Zimbabwe, provinces Matabeleland North, Midlands, Mashonaland West and Mashonaland Central
Project start date	July 1, 2011
GHG accounting period & lifetime	July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2041
Project Implementation period covered by this PIR	July 1, 2011 – January 31, 2014
History of CCB Status	Validation Approved - CCB Standards Second Edition, Climate Adaptation & Biodiversity Gold Level (February 8, 2012)
Edition of CCB Standards used under this verification	Second Edition, December 2008
Date of the CCBS verification site visit	March 24 to March 28, 2014

Project summary

The *Kariba REDD+ Project* was started on July 1, 2011. The project aims to reduce the local deforestation in the RDCs Mbire, Hurungwe, Nyaminyami and Binga through a range of community activities and fire management. Wildlife is particularly protected through anti-poaching activities in close cooperation with the RDC administrations. The project is certified under two standards, the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) and the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards (CCBS). For both standards, the project management creates regular monitoring reports and external auditors visit the project area to confirm the reports. This project summary is part of the verification audit under the CCBS, for which the site visit with the auditor will take place in March.

Since its start, the project has proven successful in reducing deforestation in the project area. Since project start, the conversion of several thousand of hectares of forest has been avoided.

With regards to community benefits, the project includes a wide range of activities, which have direct positive effects on communities. Farmers are trained for conservation agriculture and necessary material inputs are provided. Community gardens are established and provided improved nutrition. Until January 2014, over 1'300 participants benefited from several workshops, and 11 community gardens have been established in the area.

The project also promotes beekeeping as an alternative and environmental friendly source of income. To-date, nine beekeeping workshops have been hold across the project area, with a total of 233 participants and over 650 beekeeping starter kits handed out. Schools and hospitals are supported through the provision of direct inputs. A monthly project newsletter is produced and distributed through the local RDC offices. Wildfires are actively managed in order to reduce the loss of forest. The projects impacts on communities, biodiversity and climate are monitored through regular surveys, ongoing wildlife monitoring and regular measurement of forest sampling plots, respectively.

Further activities including sustainable fuelwood plantations and brick making are planned and subject to the availability of funding.

The indirect social effects of the project have been assessed in a community survey covering all participating RDCs in January 2014. In the survey, 280 community members, 77 direct beneficiaries and 15 employees were interviewed.

Most interview partners reported to be satisfied or very satisfied with the project only 2.5% reported to be not satisfied. For employees and direct beneficiaries, the project has a positive impact on livelihoods, food security, children's education and healthcare. No participant reported to be restricted in his use of the forest for basic livelihoods or cultural needs.

No grievances have been received to-date through the survey or other channels. The OGM management teams serve as primary entry point for any grievances.

The project's biodiversity benefits include a reduction of the poaching pressure on wildlife through regular patrolling, in close cooperation with the local RDCs. Until January 2014, roughly 350 team-days where spent patrolling, and over 600 snares have been removed from the bush, which means a substantial relieve of the pressure on the local wildlife. As part of the project's biodiversity monitoring, 171 trees species have been identified and many threatened wildlife species have been sighted. The most common ones include Elephant, Common Hippo and Southern Ground Hornbill. Also painted dogs have been sighted by RDC scouts. To-date, no Black Rhino has been encountered during the wildlife monitoring.

The *Kariba REDD+ Project* maintains two CCBS Gold Level criteria, Climate Change Adaptation Benefits and Exceptional Biodiversity benefits. The project's activities provide substantial contributions to climate change adaptation through its activities in conservation farming and beekeeping. Conservation farming techniques are more drought-adapted than conventional agriculture and beekeeping provided alternative livelihoods, which is a broadly accepted measure to adapt to climate change. Both conservation farming and beekeeping have been successfully promoted by the project during the first implementation phase.

The exceptional Biodiversity Benefits are based on the broad range of endangered animal, which occur in the project area. These include Painted Dogs, Elephants, Lions, Southern Ground Hornbills and others.

If you wish to see the project's entire CCBS Project Implementation Report, please visit the CCBS website under <http://www.climate-standards.org/?s=kariba> or find a hardcopy at your RDC office.

You can also contact the Auditor, Environmental Services Inc. through the contact details given on the title page, or in person during the site visit in March.

Also the project's On-the-ground management teams are happy to receive any comments or grievances you might have.