



Industrie Service

Choose certainty.
Add value.

Validation Report

VALIDATION OF THE CCBA-PROJECT:
REFORESTATION IN GRASSLAND AREAS OF
UCHINDILE, KILOMBERO, TANZANIA & MAPANDA,
MUFINDI, TANZANIA

REPORT NO. 600501038-20

04 June 2013

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
Carbon Management Service
Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich – GERMANY

Report No.	Date of first issue	Revision No.	Revision Date	Certificate No.
6005001038-20	26 Apr 2013	03	04 June 2013	-

Subject: Validation of the CCBA Project Reforestation in Grassland Areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania

<p>Accredited TÜV SÜD Unit: TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH Certification Body "climate and energy" Westendstr. 199 80686 Munich, Germany</p>	<p>TÜV SÜD Contract Partner: TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH Carbon Management Service Westendstr. 199 80686 Munich, Germany</p>
---	--

<p>Project Participant: Green Resources AS Strandveien 35 1366 Lysaker, Oslo, Norway Green Resources UK Ltd. 8/11 St John's Lane City of London EC1M 4BF United Kingdom</p>	<p>Project Site(s): The project sites are located in in the districts of Kilombero, Morogoro Region and Mufindi, Iringa Region in Tanzania The PDD includes information on geographic boundary. Digital boundary files are provided jointly with this report.</p>
---	---

Applied Methodology / Version: CCBS / Version No. 2

<p>First PDD Version: Date of issuance: 05 November 2012 Version No.: 01</p>	<p>Final PDD version: Date of issuance: 20 February 2013 Version No.: 02</p>
---	---

<p>Assessment Team Leader: Sebastian Hetsch Assessment Team Members: Martin Opitz, Serah Kiragu</p>	<p>Technical Reviewer Zhang Rachel, Martin Seitz Certification Body responsible: Eric Tolcach</p>
--	--

<p>Summary of the Validation Opinion:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant requirements for the CCB Standards. Hence, TÜV SÜD is recommending the project for registration by CCBA.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews did not provide TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. Hence, TÜV SÜD will not recommend the project for registration by CCBA and will inform the project participants and CCBA on this decision.</p>
--



Abbreviations

AR-AM	Approved Methodology for Afforestation and Reforestation
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CCBA	Climate Community and Biodiversity Alliance
CCBS	Climate Community and Biodiversity Standards
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CR	Clarification Request
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
FAR	Forward Action Request
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
GHG	Greenhouse Gas(es)
GIS	Geographic Information System
GPS	Global Positioning System
GRL	Green Resources Ltd
GSP	Global Stakeholder Process
IRL	Information Reference List
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
SOP	Standard Operational Procedure
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard



Table of Contents		Page
INTRODUCTION.....		4
1.1	Objective	4
1.2	Scope	4
2 METHODOLOGY		5
2.1	Appointment of the Assessment Team	6
2.2	Review of Documents	7
2.3	Follow-up Interviews.....	7
2.4	Further cross-check.....	8
2.5	Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests	8
2.6	Internal Quality Control.....	8
3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....		9
4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS.....		10
5 VALIDATION OPINION.....		11

ANNEX 1: VALIDATION PROTOCOL

- General Section
- Climate Section
- Community Section
- Biodiversity Section
- Gold Level Section

ANNEX 2: INFORMATION REFERENCE LIST

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The validation objective is an independent assessment by a Third Party of the proposed project activity against all defined criteria as defined by the Climate Biodiversity and Community Alliance (CCBA). In line with the framework for the validation of a CDM project, corresponding tasks are carried by an independent Designated Operational Entity (DOE). TÜV SÜD is a certification company that is accredited by UNFCCC and under VCS to certify climate change projects. CCBA recognizes this accreditation.

Validation will finally result in a conclusion by the certification company whether a project activity is complying with the CCB Standards and whether this project should be submitted for registration with CCBA. The ultimate decision on the registration of a proposed project activity rests with CCBA.

The project activity covered by this validation report was submitted under the project title "Reforestation in Grassland Areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania".

A validation of the CCBS and a combined verification between CCBS and the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) was conducted. The CDM methodology AR-ACM0005 Version 03 was applied. The VCS Validation Report (No. 600501037) describes the findings of the VCS verification process and demonstrates the compliance of the same project with the CDM methodology respectively the VCS requirements. The VCS Verification Report is considered an integral part of the present CCBA audit. The present report is intended to cover only those criteria, in which the CCBA differ and exceed the requirements of VCS.

1.2 Scope

For any CCBS project activity the scope is set by:

- CCB standards second edition, as published at www.climate-standards.org
- CCBS Rules for the use of the CCBS (Version June 21, 2010)
- Technical and methodological guidelines and information for best practice in land use based mitigation projects

In case of a CCB project that is also designed to comply with the requirements of a CDM project or methodology the scope includes furthermore the following:

- The Kyoto Protocol, in particular § 12 and modalities and procedures for the CDM
- Decision 2/CMP1 and Decision 3/CMP.1 (Marrakech Accords)
- Further COP/MOP decisions with reference to the CDM (e.g. decisions 4 – 8/CMP.1)
- Decisions and specific guidance by the EB published under <http://cdm.unfccc.int>
- Guidelines for Completing the Project Design Document (CDM-AR-PDD), and the Proposed New Baseline and Monitoring Methodology (CDM-AR-NM)
- Baselines and monitoring methodologies (including GHG inventories)
- Management systems and auditing methods
- Environmental issues relevant to the applicable sectoral scope
- Applicable environmental, social impacts, and aspects of CDM project activity
- Sector specific technologies and their applications
- Current technical and operational knowledge of the specific sectoral scope and information on best practice

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

Once TÜV SÜD received the first PDD version, it is made publicly available on the internet at CCBA's webpage for a global stakeholder consultation process (GSP). In case of a request the PDD is revised (under certain conditions the GSP will be repeated) and the final PDD will form the basis for the final evaluation as presented by this report. Information on the first and on the final PDD version is presented on page 2.

The purpose of a validation is to demonstrate compliance or non-compliance of the project with all stated and valid CCBA requirements. Additionally, the purpose of validation is to enable the registration of CCBS projects, which is only a part of the total CCBS project cycle.

2 METHODOLOGY

The project assessment applies standard auditing techniques to assess the correctness of the information provided by the project participants. The assessment is based on the VCS "Validation and Verification Manual". The work starts with the appointment of the team covering the technical scope(s), technical area(s) and relevant host country experience for evaluating the CCBA project activity. Once the project is made available for the stakeholder consultation process, members of the team carry out the desk review, follow-up actions, resolution of issues identified, and finally preparation of the validation report. The prepared validation report and other supporting documents then undergo an internal quality control by the CB "climate and energy" before submission to the CCBA.

In order to ensure transparency, assumptions are clear and explicitly stated; the background material is clearly referenced. TÜV SÜD developed methodology-specific checklists and protocol customised for the project. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), the discussion of each criterion by the assessment team, and the results from validating the identified criteria.

The validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- To organize the details and provision of clarifications on the requirements of which a CCBA project is expected to meet
- To elucidate how a particular requirement has been validated as well as to document the results of the validation and any adjustments made to the project design document.

The validation protocol consists of three tables. The different columns in these tables are described in the figure below.

Validation Protocol Table 1: Conformity of Project activity and PDD

Checklist Question	Reference	Comments	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
<i>The checklist is organised in sections following the arrangement of the applied PDD version. Each section is then subdivided. The lowest level</i>	<i>Gives reference to documents where the answer to the checklist question or item is found in case the comment</i>	<i>The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist question and/or the conformance to the question. It is used to explain the conclusions reached. In some cases sub-checklist are applied indicating yes/no de-</i>	<i>Conclusions are presented based on the assessment of the first PDD version. This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (✓), or a Corrective Action Request (CAR) due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below). Clarification Request (CR) is used when the validation team identified a need for</i>	<i>Conclusions are presented in the same manner based on the assessment of the final PDD version and further documents including assump-</i>



<i>constitutes a checklist question / criterion.</i>	<i>refers to documents other than the PDD.</i>	<i>isions on the compliance with the stated criterion. Any Request has to be substantiated within this column</i>	<i>further clarification. Forward Action Request (FAR) to highlight issues related to project implementation that requires review during the first verification.</i>	<i>tions presented in the documentation.</i>
--	--	--	---	--

Validation Protocol Table 2: Compilation and Resolutions of CARs, CRs and FARs

Validation Protocol Table 2: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests			
Clarifications and corrective action requests	Ref. to PDD	Summary of Response	Validation team conclusion
<i>If the conclusions from table 1 are a Corrective Action, a Clarification or a Forward action Request, these should be listed in this section.</i>	<i>Reference to the checklist question number in Table 1 where the issue is explained.</i>	<i>The responses given by the client or other project participants during the communications with the validation team should be summarised in this section.</i>	<i>This section should summarise the discussion on and revision to project documentation together with the validation team's responses and final conclusions. The conclusions should be reflected in Table 1, under "Final PDD".</i>

In case of a denial of the project activity more detailed information on this decision will be presented in Table 3. Table 3 is also used for listing of any Forward Action Request.

Validation Protocol Table 3: Unresolved Corrective Action, Clarification Requests, Forward Action Requests

CCBS Requirements	Unresolved Corrective Action Request	Forward Action Request
<i>Detailed CCBS requirement as per Standard.</i>	<i>Referenced request if conclusions from table 2 resulted in a denial.</i>	<i>Detailed explanation of why the project is considered non-compliant with a criterion and a clear reference to the criterion</i>

The completed validation protocol is enclosed in Annex 1 to this report.

2.1 Appointment of the Assessment Team

According to the technical scopes and experiences in the sectoral or national business environment, TÜV SÜD has composed a project team in accordance with the appointment rules of the TÜV SÜD certification body "climate and energy".

The composition of an assessment team has to be approved by the Certification Body (CB) to assure that the required skills are covered by the team. The CB TÜV SÜD operates the following qualification levels for team members that are assigned by formal appointment rules:

- Assessment Team Leader (ATL);
- Validator (V);
- Validator Trainee (T);
- Technical Experts (TE);
- Country Expert.

It is required that the sectoral scope(s) and the technical area(s) linked to the methodology and project have to be covered by the assessment team. For this particular project the assessment team members are presented in the table below.

Assessment Team:

Name	Qualification	Coverage of scope	Coverage of technical area	Coverage of financial aspect	Host country experience
Sebastian Hetsch	ATL, V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (14.1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Martin Opitz (onsite)	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Serah Kiragu (onsite)	CE				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Technical Reviewer:

- Zhang Rachel (Technical Reviewer)
- Martin Seitz (support for coverage of respective Technical Area)

2.2 Review of Documents

The PDD for the publication at CCBA was submitted by the PP to TÜV SÜD in November 2012. This PDD version and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline were reviewed to verify the correctness, credibility, and interpretation of the presented information. As a further step of the validation process, information provided by the PP was cross-checked with information from other sources (if available). A complete list of all documents and proofs reviewed is attached as Annex 1 to this report.

2.3 Follow-up Interviews

Between 09 and 14 December 2012, TÜV SÜD performed interviews onsite with project stakeholders and physical site inspection to confirm relevant information, and to resolve issues identified in the first document review. The table below provides a list of all persons interviewed in this context.

Persons Interviewed:

Name	Function, Organisation
Sangito Sumari	General Manager GRL
Eliya Mtupile	Carbon Certification Associate GRL
Christian Constantine	Chief Accountant GRL
Isaac B. Mapunda	Inventory Officer GRL
Peter Nguyeje	Inventory Officer GRL
Jakob Sandven	Mapping and Inventory Manager GRL
Ana Meyer	Carbon Associate GRL
Nicholas Embden	Carbon Manager GRL
John Chekure	District Plantation Manager GRL
Geofrey Kurianganga	Building Manager GRL
Veneranda Msemwa	Head of Planning Unit GRL
Byela Kahangwa	Forester GRL
Lucy Delton	Human Resource Officer GRL

Victor Kimey	FSC Associate GRL
Christel Kiweha	Human Resource Officer GRL
Hamisi Iddi Malinga	Community Development & Public Relation Manager GRL
Anthony A. Kisondeella	GIS & Mapping Manger GRL
Joseph Masongo	Plantation Manager Mapanda GRL
Emmanuel Munisi	Plantation Manager Uchindile GRL
Elizabeth Mussami	Community Development Officer – Uchindile GRL
13 village members	Chogo Village
18 village members	Uchindile Village
24 village members	Mapanda Village

2.4 Further cross-check

During the validation process the team made reference to available information related to similar projects or technologies as the proposed CCBA project activity. The documentation was also reviewed against the approved methodology applied to confirm the appropriateness of formulae and correctness of calculations.

2.5 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the validation is to resolve the requests for corrective actions, clarifications, and any other outstanding issues which needed to be clarified for TÜV SÜD's conclusion on the project design. The CARs and CRs raised by TÜV SÜD were resolved during communication between the client and TÜV SÜD. To guarantee the transparency of the validation process the concerns raised and responses that were given are documented in more detail in the validation protocol in Section 3.

The final PDD version submitted in Februar 2013 served as the basis for the final assessment presented. Changes are not considered to be significant with respect to the qualification of the project as a CCBA project.

2.6 Internal Quality Control

Internal quality control is the final step of the validation process and is conducted by the CB "climate and energy" who checks the final documentation, which includes the validation report and annexes. The completion of the quality control indicates that each report submitted has been approved either by the head of the CB or the deputy. In projects where either the Head of the CB or his/her deputy is part of the assessment team, the approval is given by the one not serving on the project team.

After confirmation of the PP, the validation opinion and relevant documents are submitted to CCBA.

3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Each of the CCBS and VCS criteria was assessed based on the project design documentation review, follow-up interviews with relevant stakeholders and the review of the background information.

The main findings of the project audit in regards to the project design and CCB Standards compliance are detailed in the validation protocol in annex 1 of this report.

A summary of findings is presented in the table below:

Section	required
General Section	
G1. Original Conditions in the Project Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G2. Baseline Projections	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G3. Project Design and Goals	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G4. Management Capacity and Best Practices	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G5. Legal Status and Property Rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Climate Section	
CL1. Net Positive Climate Impacts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CL2. Offsite Climate Impacts ("Leakage")	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CL3. Climate Impact Monitoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Community Section	
CM1. Net Positive Community Impacts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM2. Offsite Community Impacts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM3. Community Impact Monitoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Biodiversity Section	
B1. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B2. Offsite Biodiversity Impacts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B3. Biodiversity Impact Monitoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Gold Level Section	
GL1. Climate Change Adaptation Benefits	n/a
GL2. Exceptional Community Benefits	n/a
GL3. Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits	n/a
Approved Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Gold Status	n/a



4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS

The project documents have been published on the CCBA websites. Comments by stakeholders were invited (19 November - 18 December 2012). No comments were received for this project during the public comment period.

The following table presents all key information on this process:

webpage: http://www.climate-standards.org/2007/08/16/reforestation-in-grassland-of-uchindile-kilombero-tanzania-mapanda-mufindi-tanzania/	
Comment submitted by: No comments received.	Issues raised: None
Response by TÜV SÜD: -	

5 VALIDATION OPINION

TÜV SÜD performed a validation of the proposed CCBA project activity “Reforestation in Grassland Areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania”.

Standard auditing techniques have been used for the validation of the project. A methodology-specific protocol for the project has been prepared to conduct the audit in a transparent and comprehensive manner.

The review of the project design documentation, subsequent follow-up interviews and further verification of references provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria in the protocol. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant requirements of the CCBS second edition. Therefore, TÜV SÜD recommends the project for registration by CCBA. According to the scorecard approach introduced by CCBA (second edition), TÜV SÜD considers the project to comply with requirements of CCBS.

An analysis as provided by the applied methodology demonstrates that the proposed project activity is not a likely baseline scenario. GHG removals attributable to the project are additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. Given that the project is implemented as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated amount of GHG removals as specified within the final PDD version.

In this context it is underlined that from the auditor’s perspective a combined certification according to the CCB Standards and VCS is feasible as CCBA does not foresee the actual issuance of carbon credits. Thus, no immediate risk of double counting is considered to exist. However, TÜV SÜD refrains from liabilities related to ownership of carbon rights and credit issuance.

The validation is based on the information made available to us, as well as the engagement conditions detailed in this report. The single purpose of this report is its use during the registration process as part of the CCBA project cycle.

Munich, 04 June 2013

Munich, 04 June 2013



Eric Tolcach

Certification Body “climate and energy”
TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH

Sebastian Hetsch

Assessment Team Leader
TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH

ANNEX 1: VALIDATION PROTOCOL

General Section

G.1. Original Condition in the Project Area

G1. Original Conditions in the Project Area:

Standard Requirement:

General Information

1. The location of the project and basic physical parameters (e.g., soil, geology, climate).
2. The types and condition of vegetation within the project area.
3. The boundaries of the project area and the project zone.

Finding:

1. A description of the physical parameters (location, hydrology, climate and soil) is included in the PDD, as well as a map of the project location. The physical parameters were also confirmed during the onsite visit of the audit team.
2. Information on the present vegetation is provided in the PDD and detailed information is included in the "Ecological Survey in the Kilombero Forest Project at Uchindile Kilombero District, Tanzania" (2006). The information on the vegetation was also confirmed during the onsite visit of the audit team.
3. The boundaries of the project area are indicated, respective maps/GIS-files of the project area have been provided. As project zone the surrounding villages that gave land for the project area and/or whose residents work at the plantations are defined. During on-site visit the project zone was discussed and found to be in compliance with the standard

References (IRL): 10, 21, 22, 23, 65

Requests:

Corrective Action Request 1.

Provide and reference the information source on hydrology, climate, soil and the ecosystem (G1.1) the description provided is based on.

Provide maps clearly illustrating the project zone.

Response by PPs:

PDD updated with: "EIA, SEIA Orgut Consulting 1999" for Uchindile and "EIA ENATA 2008" for Mapanda. Map updated clearly showing the Project Zone.

Final Conclusion:

Information source was provided and referenced correctly. The audit team assessed the documents provided and found them in compliance with the requirements of the standard. Maps clearly illustrating the project zone were added in the PDD as required.

Request closed



G1. Original Conditions in the Project Area:

Standard Requirement:

Climate Information

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 Use (IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU) or a more robust and detailed methodology.

Finding:

The project aims to sequester GHG emissions by planting exotic species. The project is successfully registered under VCS; the methodology applied is AR-AM0005 / version 03.

At time of validation the project is verified under VCS for the second time.

The methodology upon which the calculation of the GHG emissions is based was assessed by the audit team and found to be in compliance with the requirements.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirement is met.

G1. Original Conditions in the Project Area:

Standard Requirement:

Community Information

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.
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).

Findings:

5. Communities surrounding the project area are mainly Hehe and Bena tribes from Iringa and Morogoro region. A description is provided in the VCS PDD. EIA/ SEIAs have been conducted to generate appropriate data. EIA/SEIAs were conducted by governmental approved consultancies for Mapanda in 1999 and for Uchindile in 2006. The studies were discussed during onsite and found to be in compliance with the standard.
6. According to studies provided the land was used only on very little sites for subsistence farming which was verified during onsite visit in the course of interviews with the villagers.
The land of the project area at the (Uchindile Forest Project) UFP and the (Mapanda Forest Project) MFP belongs to the villages and is leased by GRL. Since late 2008 there is an on-going dispute regarding the land tenure at the UFP. The area of the UFP is partly located in the districts of Mufindi and Kilombero. In total the area covers 12,121 ha and was approved by the Lands Commission with the Title deed No. 50742. Nevertheless the area in the Mufindi district, in total 5,045 ha is falling under the Government forest reserve (Saohill forest project) which was not clear at the time of the issuance of the Land title deed. Thus GRL remains with 7076 ha for the UFP. At present GRL is not utilizing the area in dispute and thus the area is not covered by the validation/verification. During onsite visit the PPs presented Land dispute correspondence between GRL and the Ministry of natural Resources and Tourism of the Republic of Tanzania, documenting that GRL is in correspondence with the respective Ministry in these matters. A new land lease title for the remaining 7076 ha is in the process of being issued meanwhile the old Land lease title is valid. The audit team reviewed the information and documentation provided and found that the area covered by the on-going verification is 100% under control of the PPs.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 28

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirements are met.



G1. Original Conditions in the Project Area:

Standard Requirement:

Biodiversity Information

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.

Findings:

The current biodiversity is described in the PDD. Biodiversity has been assessed by the PPs via ecological studies which prove the presence of endangered species listed on the IUCN/Red list.

Ecological studies used to be conducted every 3 years. The frequency was changed to 5 years as it has proven that the changes of the biodiversity are not significant enough to retain the 3 year period.

The studies were assessed by the audit team and found to be in compliance with the standard.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 65, 66, 67

Requests:

Corrective Action Request 2.

Ensure to provide all ecological studies conducted and referenced.

Naming, authors and year of the cited study in the PD do not match the studies provided

Response by PPs:

This has been rectified in the document, particularly the study "Ecological survey, Munishi and Wambura, 1996" was misquoted and should be referred to as "Ecological survey, Munishi, 2006"; the studies have been provided.

Final Conclusion:

Ecological studies were provided and referenced correctly. The Audit team assessed the studies provided and found them in compliance with the requirements of the standard.

Request closed



G1. Original Conditions in the Project Area:

Standard Requirement:

8. An evaluation of whether the project zone includes any of the following High Conservation Values (HCVs) and a description of the qualifying attributes:

8.1. 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 time in their lifecycle (e.g. migrations, feeding grounds, breeding areas).

8.2. 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;

8.3. Threatened or rare ecosystems;

8.4. Areas that provide critical ecosystem services (e.g., hydrological services, erosion control, fire control);

8.5. 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); and

8.6. 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).

Findings:

8.1 The project zone contains threatened and endemic species can be found in the project area. Respective proof in form of a study is referenced

8.2 The project zone does not contain globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape-level area exists within the project zone which was confirmed during onsite visit.

8.3 Following a precautionary approach the HCVF Report contains HCV 3 which is not listed in the PD as Grassland Areas are widely spread in the region. The audit team discussed HCV 3 during onsite visit and verified the description provided in the PD assessing the region while travelling to the plantation sides.

8.4 Not applicable, as the surrounding villages do not depend on the water supply from the project area/zone which could be verified during onsite visit.

8.5 Not applicable, as the residents of the surrounding villages moved from the project area in the 1970ies due to governmental direction and was only on small parts utilizing the project area for subsistence farming which could be verified during onsite visit.

8.6 Ritual sides and grave yards have been identified and mapped. During onsite visit the sides and maps were assessed and found to be in compliance with the standard.

Further the project is FSC certified. A long with the certification HCVs have been identified and management strategies elaborated/put in place.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 33

Requests: -

Final Conclusion: Requirement is met.

G.2. Baseline Projections

<p>G2. Baseline Projections:</p> <p>Standard Requirement:</p> <p>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>Finding:</p> <p>The A/R CDM methodology “Afforestation and reforestation project activities implemented for industrial and/or commercial uses” (AR-AM0005, version 3) is used to determine and quantify the baseline scenario in the project area.</p> <p>The most likely land-use scenario is “Continuation as degraded grasslands”, as detailed described in the CCBA PDD and VCS PD. Detailed assessment is provided in the VCS Validation Report.</p>
<p>References (IRL): 21, 22, 23</p>
<p>Requests: -</p>
<p>Final Conclusion:</p> <p>Requirement is met</p>

<p>G2. Baseline Projections:</p> <p>Standard Requirement:</p> <p>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>Finding:</p> <p>The PP demonstrated additionality by applying the additionality tool “Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in ARR VCS Project Activities.’ Version 2. VCS additionality tool and a barrier analysis, showing that investment, technological, institutional and market barriers exist.</p> <p>Details are listed in the CCBA PDD and VCS PD. Detailed assessment is provided in the VCS Validation Report</p>
<p>References (IRL): 21, 22, 23</p>
<p>Requests: -</p>
<p>Final Conclusion:</p> <p>Requirement is met</p>



G2. Baseline Projections:

Standard Requirement:

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.

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 analysis of deforestation and/or degradation using an appropriately robust and detailed carbon accounting methodology before the start of the project.

Finding:

The VCS methodology "Afforestation and reforestation project activities implemented for industrial and/or commercial uses", AR-AM0005 Version 3 is used to determine and quantify the carbon stock changes associated with the 'without project'.

Non-CO₂ GHG emissions in the without project scenario are set zero in compliance with EB 46 annex 16 as fire due to natural or anthropogenic causes, including due to slash-and-burn activities, is a common occurrence in the region the project is located in. Fire has occurred at least once in the area in the 10 years prior to project commencement. The existing woody vegetation does not comprise a fire-adapted ecosystem.

Further details on the calculation of the estimated carbon stock changes are listed in the CCBA PDD and VCS PD and the respective VCS Validation Report

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirement is met.

G2. Baseline Projections:

Standard Requirement:

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.
5. Describe how the 'without project' reference scenario would affect biodiversity in the project zone (e.g., habitat availability, landscape connectivity and threatened species).

Finding:

4. A description is provided in the PDD. It is expected that in the without project scenario the poorly life conditions would not have been changed and people in the vicinity of the project area would continue to live under the poverty line.
This was verified during onsite visit via interviews with residents of the surrounding villages that gave land for the plantation project and a transect drive through a village that has not providing land but whose residents work in the plantations.
5. A description is provided in the PDD. It is expected that degradation of the project area would continue with all negative impacts on the soil due to erosion. Further it is expected that the uncontrolled fires would continue with respective negative impacts for the Red list species found at the project area.
This was verified during onsite visit while measuring the sample plots and by observations of the surrounding land when travelling to the plantations sides

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirement is met.

G.3. Project Design and Goals

G3. Baseline Projections:

Standard Requirement:

1. Provide a summary of the project's major climate, community and biodiversity objectives.
2. Describe each project activity with expected climate, community and biodiversity impacts and its relevance to achieving the project's objectives.

Finding:

1. A summary is provided in the PDD. Major objectives amongst others are to contribute to the demand of wood from sustainable plantations, sequester CO₂, promote environmental conservation and facilitate socio-economic development. During onsite visit the described objectives were discussed and inspected in the plantations and villages.
2. A description of the project activity is provided to achieve its climate, community and biodiversity related objectives. Activities in the fields of:
 - Reforestation
 - Fire prevention and protection
 - Education
 - Health
 - Infrastructure
 - Community carbon money
 - Tree Growers Associations and seedlingshave been conducted by the PPs. During onsite visit the activities were discussed and documentation and infrastructure build was inspected. Further a crosscheck via interviews was conducted.

References (IRL): 15, 17, 21, 22, 23, 27, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42,

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirement is met.

<p>G3. Baseline Projections:</p> <p>Standard Requirement:</p> <p>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>Finding:</p> <p>The project location and geographic boundaries are indicated in the PD as well as illustrated with a respective map. Further respective shape-files were provided.</p>
<p>References (IRL): 10, 21, 22, 23</p>
<p>Requests:</p> <p>See CAR 1</p>
<p>Final Conclusion:</p> <p>Requirement is met. See also conclusion on requirement G1.3</p>

<p>G3. Baseline Projections:</p> <p>Standard Requirement:</p> <p>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>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>Finding:</p> <p>4. GHG accounting period and project lifetime will be 99 years</p> <p>5. Risks identified are fires, diseases/plagues, health and safety risks and biodiversity risks. Mitigations measures are described. The measures were discussed onsite, respective documentation was assessed and crosschecked via interviews. The measures described follow good practice.</p>
<p>References (IRL): 12, 21, 22, 23, 39, 40, 41, 42</p>
<p>Requests:</p> <p>-</p>
<p>Final Conclusion:</p> <p>Requirements are met.</p>



G3. Baseline Projections:

Standard Requirement:

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.
7. Describe the measures that will be taken to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.

Finding:

6. As shown in cited studies the majority of red list species are to be found along the rivers. Accordingly a buffer zone has been identified along the rivers. Further have there been areas of riverine vegetation as well as natural forest been identified and put under protection. Also grasslands have been identified which are of importance for the *Blue Swallow* (red list species) and put under protection. The size of area put under protection is considered sufficient according to a referenced study. During onsite visit sample plots in riverine vegetation and respective buffer zone as well as natural forest remaining and grasslands were visited and inspected.
7. It is expected that the project with its positive impact on climate, community and biodiversity will be continued after the 99 year project period is finished. Further it is expected that knowledge transfer in terms of plantation implementation and maintenance and rising of awareness regarding health issues will lead to benefit beyond the project lifetime. During onsite visit it was verified that many villagers interviewed are participating in the TGA (Tree Growers Associations) and own respective wood lots.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 37, 38, 41, 43

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirement is met.

G3. Baseline Projections:

Standard Requirement:

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.

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.

Finding:

8. In the course of the project planning and implementation affected communities have been identified and integrated in the design of the project. Respective SEIA and EIA have been conducted. Further have there been PRAs such as villages meetings and focus group discussions been undertaken during the implementation of the project to ensure to adapted the implementation accordingly. During onsite visit interviews were conducted with villagers clarifying how stakeholders could participate during the planning and implementation of the project. Further a community development officer was interviewed clarifying the ongoing interaction of the PPs with the stakeholders. The onsite visit also revealed that the plantation managers take an important part in the stakeholder communication process.

9. The final PDD and relevant documents will be communicated and made accessible for local communities. During onsite visit it was verified via interviews that respective information in form of meetings and translated documents was provided. Further, the PDD was made available on the CCBA-webpage for stakeholder comments.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 44, 45, 46, 60

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirements are met.



G3. Baseline Projections:

Standard Requirement:

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 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.

Finding:

A process for handling unresolved conflicts and grievances has been elaborated and put in place (SOP 03). It is ensured, that also local stakeholder not capable of reading and writing have a chance to express conflict and grievances via regular meetings held with the local communities. As third party moderator the Tanzanian Plantation Workers Union / commission of mediation and arbitration is foreseen. Further, it is stated that the management learnt that improving the communication with local communities improves the management, helps to reduce conflicts and early reaction of the management.

During onsite visit the implementation of the grievance processes was verified via interviews held with stakeholders.

References (IRL): 12, 21, 22, 23

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirement is met.



G3. Baseline Projections:

Standard Requirement:

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.

Finding:

GRS is securing the financing at the group level across all subsidiaries which enables the company to become cash flow positive within 5 years.

The funding is loan financing from Norfund and Finfund and explicitly covers financing of Uchindile/Mapanda.

Respective documentation was provided and assessed by the audit team during onsite visit.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 30

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirement is met.

G.4. Management Capacity and Best Practices

G4. Management Capacity and Best Practices

Standard Requirement:

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.

Finding:

GRS Ltd. is responsible for the design and implementation of the project activity.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirement is met.

G4. Management Capacity and Best Practices

Standard Requirement:

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.

Finding:

Technical skills needed for project implementation have been provided and found to be adequate for the project activity. The staff involved in the project has long term experience in the respective activity (foresters, surveyors, ecologists, environmentalists, human resource personnel, social workers, engineers, accountants, GIS specialist, and health careers). During onsite visit interviews were held with the responsible staff of the different areas of the plantation enterprise. The interviews gave no reason to question the technical skills on community engagement, biodiversity assessment, carbon measurement and monitoring skills.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirement is met.



G4. Management Capacity and Best Practices

Standard Requirement:

3. Include a plan to provide orientation and training for the project's employees and relevant people from the communities with an objective 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.

Finding:

Job opportunities (permanent/ non permanent) for local people are provided. There is an employ training plan, an employ handbook as well as a worker advancement plan in place. Workers will be trained before the fieldwork.

Where special skills are needed, external specialist are hired.

Respective documentation was provided and assessed respectively discussed by the audit team with the responsible personal. Further interviews were conducted to crosscheck the documentation provided.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 47, 48, 49

Requests: -

Final Conclusion: Requirement is met.

G4. Management Capacity and Best Practices

Standard Requirement:

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.

Finding:

SOPs are in place ensures no discrimination when employing local people. According to the PD the GRL encourages local people to fill higher positions in the project management/activity.

During onsite visit the audit team verified via interviews with locals of different gender that they suffer no discrimination by GRL

References (IRL): 13, 21, 22, 23

Requests: -

Final Conclusion: Requirement is met.

G4. Management Capacity and Best Practices

Standard Requirement:

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.

6. Comprehensively assess situations and occupations that pose a substantial risk to worker safety.

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.

Finding:

5. GRS is committed to comply with local, regional and national laws and regulations. In order to ensure the compliance with the legal framework and workers rights GRS is FSC certified.

A list of relevant laws was provided to the audit team but is missing in the PDD. Permanent workers are informed via employee handbooks, non permanent workers are informed in the field. A respective description how workers are informed about their rights is missing in the PDD. Workers interviewed were aware of their rights.

6. GRS has occupational health and safety (OHS) policy in place to ensure a safe and healthy workplace is provided. Personal Protection Equipment is provided. Dangerous situations are assessed to design a training scheme for safety instructions of the workers. Respective documentation was provided and crosschecked by the audit team via interviews during the site visit.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 47, 48, 49, 50

Requests:

Corrective Action Request 3.

Provide a list of relevant laws to the PDD

Provide a description how workers (permanent/non permanent) are informed about their rights

Respond by PP:

Workers are informed of their rights through:

1. Awareness sessions – the HR together with the union secretary holds meetings to workers about their rights. There was a meeting on the CBA and workers awareness where by workers were informed of their rights as stipulated in the CBA. (Minutes provided, see "CBA Meeting Minute 120514")
2. Seminars – workers representatives attends seminars on labour laws and pass on the information to their fellow workers
Eg . 2011 & 2012 - The Chairman and Secretary of the Union attended seminar on labour laws in Mbeya.

3. See list of relevant laws provided ("List of Laws")

Final Conclusion:

A list of all relevant laws is provided in the PDD.

A description on how workers and employees are informed about their rights are added an in line with information acquired during onsite visit.

Request closed

G4. Management Capacity and Best Practices

Standard Requirement:

7. Document the financial health of the implementing organization(s) to demonstrate that financial resources budgeted will be adequate to implement the project.

Finding:

According to the PD GRS is securing the financing at the group level across all subsidiaries which enables the company to become cash flow positive within 5 years.

The funding is loan financing from Norfund and Finfund and explicitly covers financing of Uchindile/Mapanda. Respective documents were provided and assessed by the audit team.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 30

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirement is met.



G.5. Legal Status and Property Rights

<p>G5. Legal Status and Property Rights</p> <p>Standard Requirement:</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Finding:</p> <p>A description is provided stating that GRL as a Tanzanian company is complying with government legal procedures. It is further stated that an EIA/SEIA has been conducted as required by a governmental approved consultancy and that GRL is applying for ISO 9901 and 14001 and FSC.</p> <p>A list of relevant laws and regulations was provided to the audit team but is missing in the PDD.</p>
<p>References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 26, 28, 50</p>
<p>Requests:</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request 4.</u></p> <p>Provide a list of relevant laws to the PDD</p>
<p>Respond by PP:</p> <p>See list of relevant laws provided (“List of Laws”)</p>
<p>Final Conclusion:</p> <p>A List of all relevant laws is provided in section G4.5 of the PDD.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Request closed</p>

<p>G5. Legal Status and Property Rights</p> <p>Standard Requirement:</p> <p>2. Document that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, including the established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the communities.</p>
<p>Finding:</p> <p>GRL hold LoA for EIAs by NEMC, title deeds for the land, approval from Tanzania Investment Centre and water use rights from the Ruaha River Basin’s Headquarters. All these documents are needed for the issuance of the land lease title by the government.</p>
<p>References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 28</p>
<p>Requests: -</p>
<p>Final Conclusion:</p> <p>Requirement is satisfied</p>



G5. Legal Status and Property Rights

Standard Requirement:

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.

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.

Finding:

3. Project activities are only conducted within the project boundaries. The boundaries are marked and legally leased for reforestation activities.

Recently there have been legal quarrel about the land lease title due to erroneous allocation of the land by the government. During onsite visit the PPs presented land dispute correspondence between GRL and the Ministry of natural Resources and Tourism of the Republic of Tanzania, documenting that GRL is in correspondence with the respective Ministry in these matters. Meanwhile GRL decided to exclude the respective area from the CCBA and VCS certification.

4. No settlement was located in the project area only minor agricultural activities have been conducted. The replacement and respective compensation was negotiated with the affected local people and compensation was paid. During onsite visit documents proving the compensation payments were provided. Further the compensation payments were crosschecked via interviews with the villagers affected. Grave yards located in the project area are maintained by GRL. Villagers have full excess to those.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 25, 30

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirements are met



G5. Legal Status and Property Rights

Standard Requirement:

5. Identify any illegal activities that could affect the project's 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.

Finding:

No illegal activities are expected in the area. Nevertheless a big fire occurred in 2009 on the Uchindile Forest Project by arson.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23

Requests:

Clarification Request 1.

Clarify if arson can be considered an illegal activity

Respond by PP:

Arson can be considered an illegal activity and in fact that was the cause attributed to the 2009 fire; this was corrected in the PD.

Final Conclusion:

The arson leading to a great fire event in 2009 is correctly considered as illegal activity and respectively described in the PD.

Request closed

G5. Legal Status and Property Rights

Standard Requirement:

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.

Finding:

Documents/Deeds are listed upon which the title to the carbon rights is clearly given to GRL on the area utilized by GRL. See also findings in G1.6. Further carbon credits have been successfully issued by GRL during the 1st monitoring period.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 30

Requests: -

Final Conclusion: Requirement is met

Climate Section

CL.1. Net Positive Climate Impacts

<p>CL1. Net Positive Climate Impacts</p> <p>Standard Requirement:</p> <p>1. Estimate the net change in carbon stocks due to the project activities using the methods of calculation, formulae and default values of the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU or using a more robust and detailed methodology.</p> <p>The net change is equal to carbon stock changes with the project minus carbon stock changes without 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 or carbon stocks over the duration of the project or the project GHG accounting period.</p>
<p>Finding:</p> <p>The project is successfully registered under VCS; https://vcsprojectdatabase2.apx.com/myModule/Interactive.asp?Tab=Projects&a=2&i=142&lat=-8.747652&lon=35.44974&bp=1 The methodology applied is AR-AM0005 / version 03.</p>
<p>References (IRL): 21, 22, 23</p>
<p>Requests: -</p>
<p>Final Conclusion: Requirement is met.</p>

<p>CL1. Net Positive Climate Impacts</p> <p>Standard Requirement:</p> <p>2. Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO₂ GHG emissions such as CH₄ and N₂O in the with and without project scenarios if those gases are likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO₂-equivalent) of the project's overall GHG emissions reductions or removals over each monitoring period.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Finding:</p> <p>2. See VCS PD and respective VCS Validation Report 3. See VCS PD and respective VCS Validation Report</p>
<p>References (IRL): 21, 22, 23</p>
<p>Requests: -</p>
<p>Final Conclusion: Requirements are met.</p>



CL1. Net Positive Climate Impacts

Standard Requirement:

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-CO₂ GHGs where appropriate minus any other GHG emissions resulting from project activities minus any likely project-related unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts (see CL2.3).

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.

Finding:

4. See VCS PD and respective VCS Validation Report

5. See VCS PD and respective VCS Validation Report

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23

Requests: -

Final Conclusion:

Requirements are met.

CL.2. Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”)

CL2. Offsite Climate Impacts (‘Leakage’)

Standard Requirement:

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.

2. Document how any leakage will be mitigated and estimate the extent to which such impacts will be reduced by these mitigation activities.

Finding:

1. Not applicable. See VCS PD and respective VCS Validation Report

2. Not applicable.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23

Requests: -

Final Conclusion:

Requirements are met.

CL2. Offsite Climate Impacts ('Leakage')

Standard Requirement:

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).
4. Non-CO₂ gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO₂-equivalent) of the net change calculations (above) of the project's overall off-site GHG emissions reductions or removals over each monitoring period.

Finding:

3. Not applicable
4. Non-CO₂ gases will be emitted as a result of planting activities and controlled burning of the fire lines but are unlikely to exceed 5% of the net change calculations of the overall off-site GHG emissions reductions or removals.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirements are met.

CL.3. Climate Impact Monitoring

CL3. Climate Impact Monitoring

Standard Requirement:

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 site and specific forest type.

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.

Finding:

1. Monitoring for carbon is conducted in line with the applied VCS methodology. See VCS MR and respective VCS Verification Report

2. Monitoring for carbon is conducted in line with the applied VCS methodology. See VCS MR and respective VCS Verification Report which are made publicly available on the VCS webpage.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirements are met.

Community Section

CM1. Net Positive Community Impacts

CM1. Net Positive Community Impacts

Standard Requirement:

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 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.

2. Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.4-6 will be negatively affected by the project.

Finding:

1. EIAs have been conducted in order to identify local communities affected by the project activity and to analysis impacts for those. On the basis of the EIA a Community monitoring plan has been developed to quantify major impact (negative/positive) on the identified communities. A with and without scenario is described showing that without the project the communities surrounding the project area would continue to live in prevalent poverty based in subsistence agriculture due to a lack of employment opportunities. Further is described, that the PPs developed a community development plan containing activities to create employment, a Tree Growers Associations, Education, Infrastructure and Health. According to the provided CCBA Implementation Report the mentioned activities have been established.

The audit team assessed the EIAs and crosschecked them during onsite visit via interviews with the residents of the villages affected. The positive impacts identified are judged as plausible for the project activity.

2. Respective buffer zone and signs have been established around areas of cultural importance for the communities and maintained. Thus no negative effect can be expected on the HCVs 4-6.

During onsite visit the buffer zones around the grave yards were inspected and found in compliance with the description in the PDD.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 26, 51

Requests: -

Final Conclusion:

Requirements are met.

CM.2. Offsite Community Impacts

CM2. Offsite Stakeholder Impacts

Standard Requirement:

1. Identify any potential negative offsite stakeholder impacts that the project activities are likely to cause.
2. Describe how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite social and economic impacts.
3. Demonstrate that the project is not likely to result in net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups.

Finding:

1. Potential negative offsite impacts have been identified in the course of the VCS Validation and are described in the respective VCS PD and the Validation Report. The negative impacts are not listed in the CCBA PDD as required.
2. Mitigation measures have been identified in the course of the VCS Validation and are described in the respective VCS PD and the Validation Report. The mitigation measures are not listed in the CCBA PDD as required. Further a statement is missing that the PP is planning to mitigation potential negative offsite impacts with the respective mitigation measures identified respectively if and how far the mitigation measures have already been implemented.
3. If the identified mitigation measures are conducted no negative impacts on the well-being of the stakeholders can be expected. During onsite visit the audit team observed the overall net positive impact of the project activity on the affected villages and sustained the observation via interviews with the residents of the villages visited.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 58

Requests:

Corrective Action Request 5.

Provide a list of potential negative impacts as required by the standard.

Provide a list of the mitigation measures identified and information if or to what extend these have been implemented already.

Respond by PP:

Potential negative impacts included along with mitigation measures

Final Conclusion:

Potential negative impacts are listed and in line with the information acquired during onsite visit.

Mitigation measures are described as required. The measures are in line with the observations/information obtained during onsite visit and respective interviews.

Request closed

CM.3. Community Impact Monitoring

CM3. Community Impact Monitoring

Standard Requirement:

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).
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.
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.

Finding:

1. A Monitoring Plan has been provided and assessed by the audit team. The following parameters will be monitored:

- a. Community location
- b. Demographics
- c. Employment
- d. Local economy/household income
- e. Community wood lots
- f. Education
- g. Infrastructure
- h. Health and Medication
- i. Water quantity and quality
- j. Housing
- k. Grievances
- l. Cultural aspects
- m. Community Carbon Money
- n. Capacity Building

The plan was developed upon the aspects that were identified for monitoring in the course of the EIAs conducted. Checklists were developed based on the indicators that had been identified for each aspect to be monitored.

The indicators/parameters were monitored via e.g. semi-structured interviews or discussions with Focus groups. Further the monitoring plan partly foresees to identify new parameters to improve/develop the monitoring of the above mentioned parameters.

The monitoring plan was discussed during onsite visit with the respective personal. Indicators/Parameters identified and approach chosen is found to be appropriate to monitor the aspects identified. Nevertheless guidance and definitions for the proper implementation of the monitoring and clearly described parameters are missing. 2.

2. The provided monitoring plan contains no information on how to monitor the HCV 6 (Areas critical for the traditional cultural identity of communities).

3. A monitoring plan was provided.



References (IRL): 12, 21, 22, 23, 58

Requests:

Corrective Action Request 6.

Provide information/guidance for monitoring of the parameters (e.g. semi-structured interviews / group discussions).

Provide further definitions where needed (e.g. quality of wood lots/quality of water/focus groups/key informant/ etc.).

Provide a verifiable set of parameters for the monitoring plan

Provide information how to monitor HCV6.

Response from PP:

SOP for consultations provided.

MP updated and simplified in places - for example, for woodlots, just the number of woodlots and number of members in the TGAs are monitored for this verification.

HCV6 is covered through graves and ritual site monitoring – the key parameters are monitoring of buffer distance and implementation of sign posts. The monitoring data is stored in the graves and ritual sites database excel file.

Conclusion Audit Team:

SOPs for consultations processes are provided. The Audit team assessed the procedures and found them in line with the standard.

Further definitions where needed are not provided

A verifiable set of parameters for the monitoring plan is not provided

Parameters for the monitoring of HCV6 is neither provided in the PD nor in the respective Monitoring Plan

Response from PP:

Definitions and parameter have been provided in Monitoring Plan and results.

Final conclusion Audit Team:

A verifiable set of parameters for the monitoring of the community impact are provided and assessed by the audit team. The parameters are found to be feasible to provide reliable conclusions on the development of the communities of the project zone and the overall impact of the project activity on those. The scopes covered by the monitoring are:

- Demographics in the project zone
 - Population
 - Numbers of households
 - Numbers of females/males and children
- Employment
 - Number of permanent workers
 - Number of seasonal
 - Rate of payment for permanent and seasonal workers
- Local economy/household income
 - Number of households with corrugated iron sheet roofs



- Number and consumer goods (e.g. solar panels, milling machines, sewing machines, etc.) and its distributors (e.g. groceries, kiosks, butchers etc.)
- Woodlots
 - Number and Location of woodlots
 - Number of members in each TGA (Tree Growers Association)
- Education
 - Conditions of school facilities
 - Development of pupils (qualitative assessment)
- Infrastructure
 - Length of roads constructed or maintained
- Water quantity and quality (covered by monitoring of the biodiversity)
- Health and medication
 - Condition of the sanitary facilities
- Cultural aspects
 - Maintenance of buffer zone and sign post of the grave yards and ritual sides

Instruction respectively SOPs are provided.

Further the monitoring plan contains adaptive elements as parameters to be monitored in the future are already added. These parameters focus on the fluctuation of educational and sanitary personal.

The MP also contains parameters for monitoring HCV6 (grave yards/ritual sides)

Request closed

Biodiversity Section

B.1. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts

B1. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts

Standard Requirement:

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 positive.
2. Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.1-3 will be negatively affected by the project.

Finding:

1. Two EIAs has been conducted in order to analyse biodiversity aspects before project and provide respective recommendations. On basis of the outcome of the EIAs a monitoring plan was designed. The monitoring plan includes regular ecological surveys collecting data to generate information regarding flora and fauna in the project area. The monitoring plan was discussed during onsite visit with the respective personal.

The PD list project activities that lead to a net benefit for the biodiversity. Activities listed are:

- Conservation of wetlands and natural forests
- Buffer along water sources
- Fire control
- Establishment of plantations
- Establishment of woodlots
- Research and monitoring
- Capacity building / training

The activities listed were discussed during onsite visit with the respective personal and were inspected during onsite visit and partly crosschecked via interviews.

Further is the project successfully FSC certified.

2. Due to the presence of RTE species HCV 1 was identified in the Project Area. Measures are described to mitigate potential negative impacts (conservation of wetlands and natural forests). The audit team assessed the measures described and found them to most likely lead to a positive impact on the RTE species identified.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 26, 51, 58

Requests:

-

Final Conclusion:

Requirements are met.

B1. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts



Standard Requirement:

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.
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.
5. Guarantee that no GMOs will be used to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals.

Finding:

3. Species planted are Eucalypt and Pine which could not be found on national lists of invasive species. The national list of invasive species was not provided
4. Often discussed adverse effects of the species (mainly Eucalypt) planted such as water and soil degradation are discussed. The PPs expect that the mentioned negative impacts will not take place. The assumption is based on cited scientific studies as well as the experiences of the PPs with these species until now. Further the monitoring plan foresees to analyse the soil as well as to monitor the water-level regularly in order to sustain the expectations of the PPs. During onsite visit the monitoring of the water-level was assessed the results give no reason for water degradation.
5. No GMOs are used to generate GHG emissions. Nothing contrary was observed during the onsite visit.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58

Requests:

Corrective Action Request 7.

Provide the national list of invasive species

Respond by PP:

There is no national list of invasive species in Tanzania; this was confirmed by Professor Munishi a specialist in Ecology. The species were screened against the Global Invasive Species Database. This was updated in the MR.

Final Conclusion:

The PPs clarified that there is no national list of invasive species in Uganda. Nevertheless the species planted were screened against the Global Invasive Species Database. The audit team crosschecked the data provided and found them in compliance with the requirements.

Request closed

B.2. Offsite Biodiversity Impacts

B2. Offsite Biodiversity Impacts

Standard Requirement:

1. Identify potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts that the project is likely to cause.
2. Document how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite biodiversity impacts.
3. Evaluate likely 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.

Finding:

1. Negative impacts on biodiversity are not expected. Nevertheless the PD refers to the EIA/SEIA respectively the VCS PDD were negative impacts are listed. The potential negative impacts were discussed onsite
2. Mitigation measures have been identified in the course of the VCS Validation and are described in the respective VCS PD and the Validation Report. The mitigation measures are not listed in the CCBA PDD as required. Further a statement is missing that the PP is planning to mitigation potential negative offsite impacts with the respective mitigation measures identified respectively if and how far the mitigation measures have already been implemented.
3. Unmitigated negative offsite biodiversity impacts are not expected. During onsite visit the audit team could not observed any negative impact of the project activity on the biodiversity.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 26, 51, 57, 58

Requests:

Corrective Action Request 8.

Provide a list of the mitigation measures identified and information if or to what extend these have been implemented.

Respond by PP:

Potential negative impacts included along with mitigation measures

Final Conclusion:

Negative impacts as well as mitigation measures are listed as required. Information regarding the implementation of the mitigation measures described see CCBA Verification Report.

Request closed



B.3. Biodiversity Impact Monitoring

B3. Biodiversity Impact Monitoring

Standard Requirement:

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).49
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.
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.

Finding:

1. A monitoring plan has been provided and assessed by the audit team. The following parameters will be monitored:

- a. General data
- b. Maintenance of conservation areas
- c. Ecological Survey
- d. HCVF
- e. Invasive Species
- f. Water quantity and quality
- g. Soil
- h. Awareness campaigns/ capacity building

The parameters are to be monitored. Procedures are briefly mentioned. The monitoring plan was discussed during onsite visit with the respective personal. Indicators/Parameters identified and approaches chosen are found to be appropriate to monitor the aspects identified. Nevertheless guidance and definitions for the proper implementation of the monitoring and clearly described parameters are partly missing in the monitoring plan also other documentation exist that provide the respective guidance.

2. The provided monitoring plan contains also information on how to monitor HCVs 1-3.

3. A monitoring plan was provided.

References (IRL): 21, 22, 23, 57, 58, 59

Requests:

Corrective Action Request 9.

Provide an verifiable set of parameters for the monitoring plan

Provide further definitions where needed (e.g. what type of high resolution image to use /change of riverine forest/etc.)

Respond by PP:

Monitoring plan updated and further detail and definitions included.

Conclusion Audit Team:



The MP was updated.

An verifiable set of parameters for the monitoring plan is not fully provided

Definitions where needed are not fully provided (e.g. frequency, time of the year, SOPs, QA/QC, etc.)

Response from PP:

Monitoring Plan and results updated: verifiable parameters, as well as definitions have been provided.

Final Conclusion Audit Team:

A verifiable set of parameters for the monitoring of the biodiversity impact are provided and assessed by the audit team. The parameters are found to be feasible to provide reliant conclusions on the development of the biodiversity in the project zone and the overall impact of the project activity on it. The scopes covered by the monitoring are:

- Distribution of differing area types inside the project area (planations, grassland, riverine forest, water bodies, topography, fire belts)
- Development of conservation areas
 - via remote sensing analysis
 - Area of grassland (grasslands are identified as habitat for HCV 1 [blue swallow])
 - Crown cover development of natural tree species in the riverine areas
 - Development of area of water bodies
 - via field assessment
 - appearance of birds via bird counts
 - Occurrence and development of natural tree species in the riverine areas via measurements of sample plots
 - Water quality and flow via external laboratory examination
- Occurrence of invasive species

Instruction respectively SOPs and further definitions where needed are provided. Further the monitoring plan contains adaptive elements as advancements of the methods to be used for future a monitoring are already added. These advancements concern the bird counts in the Grassland Areas as well as the enquiry of invasive species.

Request closed

Gold Level Section

GL.1. Climate Change Adaptation Benefits

The section “climate change adaptation benefits” is not applied.

GL.2. Exceptional Community Benefits

The section “exceptional community benefits” is not applied.

GL.3. Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits

The section “exceptional biodiversity benefits” is not applied.

Annex 2: Information Refernce List

CCBA Project: Reforestation in grassland areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania

Page 1 of 6



Industrie Service

ANNEX 2: INFORMATION REFERENCE LIST

Ref. No.	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title, Type of Document	Date																																																																								
1.		<p><u>Interviewed Persons:</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Name</th> <th>Position, Organisation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.</td> <td>Sangito Sumari</td> <td>General Manager GRL</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.</td> <td>Eliya Mtupile</td> <td>Carbon Certification Associate</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.</td> <td>Christian Constantine</td> <td>Chief Accountant</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.</td> <td>Isaac B. Mapunda</td> <td>Inventory Officer</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.</td> <td>Peter Nguyeje</td> <td>Inventory Officer</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6.</td> <td>Jakob Sandven</td> <td>Mapping and Inventory Manager</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7.</td> <td>Ana Meyer</td> <td>Carbon Associate</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8.</td> <td>Nicholas Embden</td> <td>Carbon Manager</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9.</td> <td>John Chekure</td> <td>District Plantation Manager</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10.</td> <td>Geofrey Kurianganga</td> <td>Building Manager</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11.</td> <td>Veneranda Msemwa</td> <td>Head of Planning Unit</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.</td> <td>Byela Kahangwa</td> <td>Forester</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13.</td> <td>Lucy Delton</td> <td>Human Resource Officer</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14.</td> <td>Victor Kimey</td> <td>FSC Associate</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15.</td> <td>Christel Kiweha</td> <td>Human Resource Officer</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16.</td> <td>Hamisi Iddi Malinga</td> <td>Community Development & Public Relation Manager</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17.</td> <td>Anthony A. Kisondella</td> <td>GIS & Mapping Manger</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18.</td> <td>Joseph Masongo</td> <td>Plantation Manager Mapanda</td> </tr> <tr> <td>19.</td> <td>Emmanuel Munisi</td> <td>Plantation Manager Uchindile</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20.</td> <td>Elizabeth Mussami</td> <td>Community Development Officer - Uchindile</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21.</td> <td>13 village members</td> <td>Chogo Village</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22.</td> <td>18 village members</td> <td>Uchindile Village</td> </tr> <tr> <td>23.</td> <td>24 village members</td> <td>Mapanda Village</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Name	Position, Organisation	1.	Sangito Sumari	General Manager GRL	2.	Eliya Mtupile	Carbon Certification Associate	3.	Christian Constantine	Chief Accountant	4.	Isaac B. Mapunda	Inventory Officer	5.	Peter Nguyeje	Inventory Officer	6.	Jakob Sandven	Mapping and Inventory Manager	7.	Ana Meyer	Carbon Associate	8.	Nicholas Embden	Carbon Manager	9.	John Chekure	District Plantation Manager	10.	Geofrey Kurianganga	Building Manager	11.	Veneranda Msemwa	Head of Planning Unit	12.	Byela Kahangwa	Forester	13.	Lucy Delton	Human Resource Officer	14.	Victor Kimey	FSC Associate	15.	Christel Kiweha	Human Resource Officer	16.	Hamisi Iddi Malinga	Community Development & Public Relation Manager	17.	Anthony A. Kisondella	GIS & Mapping Manger	18.	Joseph Masongo	Plantation Manager Mapanda	19.	Emmanuel Munisi	Plantation Manager Uchindile	20.	Elizabeth Mussami	Community Development Officer - Uchindile	21.	13 village members	Chogo Village	22.	18 village members	Uchindile Village	23.	24 village members	Mapanda Village	
	Name	Position, Organisation																																																																									
1.	Sangito Sumari	General Manager GRL																																																																									
2.	Eliya Mtupile	Carbon Certification Associate																																																																									
3.	Christian Constantine	Chief Accountant																																																																									
4.	Isaac B. Mapunda	Inventory Officer																																																																									
5.	Peter Nguyeje	Inventory Officer																																																																									
6.	Jakob Sandven	Mapping and Inventory Manager																																																																									
7.	Ana Meyer	Carbon Associate																																																																									
8.	Nicholas Embden	Carbon Manager																																																																									
9.	John Chekure	District Plantation Manager																																																																									
10.	Geofrey Kurianganga	Building Manager																																																																									
11.	Veneranda Msemwa	Head of Planning Unit																																																																									
12.	Byela Kahangwa	Forester																																																																									
13.	Lucy Delton	Human Resource Officer																																																																									
14.	Victor Kimey	FSC Associate																																																																									
15.	Christel Kiweha	Human Resource Officer																																																																									
16.	Hamisi Iddi Malinga	Community Development & Public Relation Manager																																																																									
17.	Anthony A. Kisondella	GIS & Mapping Manger																																																																									
18.	Joseph Masongo	Plantation Manager Mapanda																																																																									
19.	Emmanuel Munisi	Plantation Manager Uchindile																																																																									
20.	Elizabeth Mussami	Community Development Officer - Uchindile																																																																									
21.	13 village members	Chogo Village																																																																									
22.	18 village members	Uchindile Village																																																																									
23.	24 village members	Mapanda Village																																																																									

Annex 2: Information Reference List

CCBA Project: Reforestation in grassland areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania

Page 2 of 6



Industrie Service

Ref. No.	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title, Type of Document	Date
2.	GRL	Project Design Document: Reforestation in grassland area of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania	07 Jul 2009
3.	GRL	VCS Monitoring report: (01.12.2008 – 01.09.2012) Reforestation in Grassland Areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania	04 Nov 2012
4.	Tüv-Süd	Verification Report : Report No. 1261941	04 Aug 2010
5.	GRL	NON-PERMANENCE RISK REPORT: Reforestation in grassland area of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania	05 Nov 2012
6.	GRL	UMFP Inventory Carbon Model 121104.xlsx	Nov 2012
7.	IPCC	IPCC 03 Annex 3A.1	
8.	J.M.Bryce	The Commercial Timbers of Tanzania	1999
9.	GRL	Loss event report, Reforestation in Grassland Areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda Mufindi, Tanzania Ver. 01	20 Oct 2011
10.	GRL	GIS shapefiles	Nov 2012
11.	Tüv-Süd	Verification Report : Report No. 1261941	17 Jul 2009
12.	GRL	SOPs	Nov 2012
13.	GRL	Inventory Guidelines for Green Resources AS, Version 5	17 Jul 2011
14.	GRL	Community Monitoring Plan, Version 1	Sep 2012
15.	GRL	Community Monitoring Results, 1st Jan 1997 to 1st Sep 2012	Sep 2012
16.	GRL	Biodiversity Monitoring Plan, Version 1	Sep 2012
17.	GRL	Biodiversity Monitoring Results, 1st Jan 1997 to 1st Sep 2012	Sep 2012
18.	UN_REDD	http://www.un-redd.org/UNREDDProgramme/CountryActions/Tanzania/tabid/1028/language/en-US/Default.aspx	
19.	REDD+ Social&Environmental Standard	http://www.redd-standards.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=22&Itemid=131	

Annex 2: Information Reference List

CCBA Project: Reforestation in grassland areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania

Page 3 of 6



Industrie Service

Ref. No.	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title, Type of Document	Date
20.	World Bank	http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wqi/sc_country.asp	
21.	GRL	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards project design document (first edition) / Reforestation in Grassland Areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania, Version 05	02 Oct 2009
22.	TüvSüd	Validation Report No. 1031163-CCBA; CCBA Project Reforestation in Grassland Areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania	16 Oct 2009
23.	GRL	CCBA Implementation Report for Verification under the climate, community and Biodiversity alliance second edition, Version 01	04 Nov 2012
24.	GRL	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards project design document (second edition) / Reforestation in Grassland Areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania, Version 01	05 Nov 2012
25.	GRL	Physical Verification and Assessment of Compensation Value (Mapanda) (two versions covering different people)	Oct 2010
26.	Orgut Consulting Tanzania Branch	Environmental Impact of the Forest plantation project at Uchindile and Lugala villages in Kilombero district Tanzania	Aug 1999
27.	GRL	Bank transfer statements; sustaining the Payment of “carbon money” to village bank accounts (checked onsite)	Dec 2012
28.	GRL	Land dispute correspondence between GRL and the Ministry of natural Resources and Tourism of the Republic of Tanzania. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders meeting to discuss and resolve land dispute covering about 5.474 ha between Sao Hill Forest Plantations and Green Resources Limited Held on 24th June 2009 at Green Resources Limited Headquarter Office (signed by: Chairman of the Kilombero District Council, Director of Forestry and Beekeeping Division, Representative of the Mufindi District Council, Director of Green Resources Limited) Summary of the above mentioned stakeholder meeting, 26th June 2009 (signed by the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism) Letter of Green Resources Limited to the Director of Forest and Beekeeping (DFB) regarding planting activities of the DFB on the land in dispute with a copy to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, 14th March 2011 Answer by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism requesting the DFB to stop the plant- 	from June 2009 onwards

Annex 2: Information Reference List

CCBA Project: Reforestation in grassland areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania

Page 4 of 6



Industrie Service

Ref. No.	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title, Type of Document	Date
		ing activities on the land in dispute, 18 th March 2011 (Ref.NoFD/33/15/47)	
29.	GRL	Thinning and Harvesting.Operations by Location 2011&12_121010	Nov 2012
30.	GRL	Loan contracts with Scandinavian development funds (Finfund & Norfund)	Dec 2012
31.	GRL	UMFP Cash Flow for NPRRI 121102.xlsx	Nov 2012
32.	GRL	Maps showing villages in 20 km extent from project area	Dec 2012
33.	GRL	HIGH CONSERVATION VALUE FOREST (HCVF) FOR GRL PLANTATIONS	2012
34.	GRL	Graves and Ritual Sites Report 2012	Jul 2012
35.	SACCOS; Chris Constantine	MBAO SACCOS – AN OVERVIEW	Jun 2012
36.	Government of the Republic of Tanzania	Subsidiary Legislation, Government Notice No. 172, published 30/4/2010	Apr 2010
37.	GRL	TGA (Tree Growers Association) Farm Forests Summary; Green Resources Company Report	Oct 2012
38.	GRL	TGA Gender report	Oct 2010
39.	GRAS	Environmental Policy	May 2011
40.	GRL	Report of Training of GRAS Staff on the Application of Community Monitoring Guidelines for Green Resources Forestry Projects	Oct 2010
41.	GRL	TRAINING ON RTE SPECIES, INVASIVE SPECIES AND HCV FORESTS (Report on trainings held in adjacent villages)	May-Mar 2010
42.	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism Division of Forestry and Bee Keeping	Compendium on Education for Fire Fighting, Mufindi District	Aug 2009
43.	Evans, Steven W. et al	Habitat selection by blue swallows <i>Hirundo atrocaerulea</i> Sundevall, 1850 breeding in South Africa and its implications for conservation, <i>African Journal of Ecology</i> 48, 871–879	2009
44.	GRL	Minutes of the Focus Group, Key Informant Interviews	Sep 2011

Annex 2: Information Reference List

CCBA Project: Reforestation in grassland areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania

Page 5 of 6



Industrie Service

Ref. No.	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title, Type of Document	Date
45.	GRL	Signed document receiving forms	Jun 2011
46.	GRL	Stakeholder comments summarized	Dec 2012
47.	GRL	Human Resource Training Report	Dec 2012
48.	GRL	GRL Training Matrix 2012	Dec 2012
49.	GRAS	Employee Handbook (English/Swahili)	Aug 2011
50.	GRL	List of relevant laws	Dec 2012
51.	National environmental management council (NEMC)	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT ON PROPOSED MAPANDA AND IDETE FOREST PROJECTS IN MUFINDI DISTRICT IRINGA REGION, TANZANIA (REVISED REPORT)	Jan 2008
52.	Munishi PKT	The eucalyptus Controversy in Tanzania; Paper Presented at TAF Annual General Meeting (AGM), 23rd – 24th 2007 Dodoma Tanzania	2007
53.	Colin Smith	Sustainability of forest plantations, South African Forestry Handbook	
54.	Gessesse Dessie et al	Planted Forests and Trees Working Papers Eucalyptus in East Africa Socio-economic and environmental issues, Working Paper FP46/E, FAO, Rome, Italy	May 2011
55.	Nshubemuki, L.	ANTITHETICAL VIEWS ON EUCALYPTS CULTIVATION: PREJUDICIAL DISPOSITION VERSUS UNTAPPED PROSPECTS?, Paper presented to the 14th Annual Scientific Meeting of the Tanzania Association of Foresters, TAF; Dodoma	Oct 2007
56.	Davidson, John	Ecological Aspects of Eucalyptus Plantations; http://www.fao.org/docrep/005/ac777e/ac777e06.htm	Accessed Jan 2013
57.	Munishi PKT	ANNUAL ECOLOGICAL SURVEY AND MONITORING IN GRL AFFORESTATION PROJECTS IN IDETE, MAPANDA AND UCHINDILE	Mar 2010
58.	Serah Kiragu; University Bayreuth	Summary Report: Verification of a CCBA and VCS Project – Reforestation in Grassland Areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania.	Jan 2012
59.	GRL	Biodiversity Monitoring Plan	Dec 2012
60.	GRL	Translated document containing main contents of PDD as information for the communities (checked onsite)	Dec 2012

Annex 2: Information Reference List

CCBA Project: Reforestation in grassland areas of Uchindile, Kilombero, Tanzania & Mapanda, Mufindi, Tanzania

Page 6 of 6



Industrie Service

Ref. No.	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title, Type of Document	Date
61.	Nomogaia	Green Resources Human Rights Impact Assessment	Dec 2010
62.	Timberwatch	CDM Carbon Sink Tree Plantations - A case study in Tanzania	Mar 2011
63.	GRAS	Directors Report 2010	2010
64.	GRAS	Annual Report 2008	2008
65.	Munishi PKT	Ecological survey in the Kilombero Forest Project at Uchindile Kilombero district Tanzania	Jun 2006
66.	WILDLIFE CONSERVATION SOCIETY OF TANZANIA	CONSULTANCY REPORT ON ECOLOGICAL SURVEY OF UCHINDILE AND MAPANDA REFORESTATION PROJECTS IN THE SOUTHERN HIGHLANDS – TANZANIA	Mar 08
67.	Tanzania Tree Seed Agency	REPORT ON BOTANICAL SURVEY, GREEN RESOURCES LIMITED, IRINGA – TANZANIA	Feb 2006
68.	GRL	Uchindile Fire 2009 – Lessons learnt	Nov 2009
69.	INDUFOR Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism	Tanzania Forest Conservation and Management Project; Provision of Consultancy Services for Implementation of Private Sector Involvement Activities; Part V YIELD MODELS	07 May 2008
70.	Geological Survey of Tanzania	http://www.gst.go.tz/geohazards.html	Accessed 29 Apr 2013
71.	Eliya Mtupile and Samson Msilu,	Faecal Ecoliform Survey Report for the Uchindile, Mapanda and Idete Forest Projects	Aug 2012