



ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance Project Validation / Verification Report (v3)

TIST Program In Kenya
CCB-001

9 March 2012

Project No. FV10009.02

Validation and Verification Conducted by:

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



ANSI ACCREDITED PROGRAM
GREENHOUSE GAS
VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION
0800



Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Contact Information	4
Validation /Verification Details	5
Validation/Verification Standard	5
Validation/Verification Criteria	5
Level of Assurance	5
Validation/Verification Date(s)	5
Materiality	5
Validation/Verification Team	6
Final Documents from Client.....	6
Project Description.....	7
Executive Summary of Validation/Verification Results.....	7
Validation/Verification Findings	8
G1 Original Conditions in the Project Area.....	8
G2 Baseline Projections	13
G3 Project Design and Goals	16
G4 Management Capacity and Best Practices	22
G5 Legal Status and Property Rights.....	27
CL1 Net Positive Climate Impacts	30
CL2 Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”).....	33
CL3 Climate Impact Monitoring	35
CM1 Net Positive Community Impacts.....	36
CM2 Offsite Stakeholder Impacts	38
CM3 Community Impact Monitoring.....	39
B1 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts.....	41
B2 Offsite Biodiversity Impacts	44
B3 Biodiversity Impact Monitoring.....	45
Gold Level Section	47
GL1 Climate Change Adaptation Benefits	47
GL2 Exceptional Community Benefits.....	47
GL3 Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits	49



Public Shareholder Comments.....	49
Update for Report Version 3.....	53
Validation/Verification Conclusion.....	53
Submittal Information.....	53



Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance TIST Program In Kenya CCB-001 Validation/Verification Report (v3)

Introduction

This report presents the findings of an audit conducted by Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI), to validate the claim made by the TIST program in Kenya that the CCB-001 conforms to the Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (Second Edition- December 2008). ESI has been accredited by the Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) to perform such validations.

Please note: This updated Report (v3) serves as an update for final qualification with Gold Level requirements for **Exceptional Community Benefits**.

Contact Information

Client Name	Clean Air Action Corporation
Address	7134 South Yale Avenue, Suite 310 Tulsa, OK 74136
Phone	918-747-8749
Website	www.tist.org/
Contact Name	Charlie Williams
Address	Clean Air Action Corporation 7134 South Yale Avenue, Suite 310 Tulsa, OK 74136
Phone	918-747-8749
3 rd Party Auditors	Environmental Services, Inc.
Lead Validator/Verifier	Shawn McMahan Environmental Services, Inc. 3800 Clermont Street NW North Lawrence, Ohio 44666 330-833-9941



Validation /Verification Details

Validation/Verification Standard	Climate Community and Biodiversity Standard (Second Edition – December 2008)
Validation/Verification Criteria	<p>The criteria will follow the validation guidance documents provided by CCBA located at www.climate-standards.org. These documents include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>Project Design Standards (Second Edition, December 2008)</i> b) <i>Rules for the use of the Climate, Community, & Biodiversity Standards, Version June 21, 2010.</i>
Level of Assurance	<p>The level of assurance was used to determine the depth of detail that the validator/verifier placed in the validation/verification plan to determine if there were any errors, omissions, or misrepresentations (ISO 14064-3:2006). ESI selected samples of data and information to be validated and verified, to provide <i>reasonable assurance</i>.</p>
Validation/Verification Scope	<p>The scope of the validation included the review of all project documentation provided by the project developer and the appropriate level of fact finding by the validator during the on-site visit. The validator used evidence such as, but not limited to, interviews with stakeholders and project proponents, review of supporting records and reports.</p> <p>The scope of the verification, included the GHG project and baseline scenarios; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHG's; periods covered; and the evaluation of the project's net climate, community, and biodiversity benefits. Period of evaluation: 1 January 2004 to 31 December 2010.</p>
Validation/Verification Date(s)	5 November 2010 – 19 April 2011
Materiality	<p>Materiality is a concept that errors, omissions and misrepresentations could affect the project design assertions and influence the intended users. CCB does not specifically outline a materiality threshold; however, ESI used a 5% threshold for evidence. If a non-conformance was discovered, the project developer was given the opportunity to correct the non-conformity to the project design document within a reasonable timeframe (within 30 days).</p>
Site Visits	7 December 2010 – 14 December 2010



<p>Validation/Verification Team</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shawn McMahon – Lead Validator/Verifier (330-833-9941/ smcmahon@esinc.cc) • Scott Sager – Validation/Verification Team Member (ssager@esinc.cc / 904.370.4678) • Rich Scharf – Validation/Verification Team Member (rscharf@esinc.cc / 252-402-7354) • Janice McMahon – QA/QC (jcmahon@esinc.cc / 330.833.9941)
<p>Final Documents from Client</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIST KE PD-CCB-001a PD Text 110214.doc • TIST KE PD-CCB-001f App05 Implementation Rpt 110428.pdf • TIST KE PD-CCB-001g App06 Monitoring Plan 110214.doc • TIST KE PD-CCB-001h App07 Monitoring Report 110314.doc • TIST KE PD-VCS-001j App07 Monitoring Data 100826.xls • TIST KE PD-VCS-002j App07 Monitoring Data 100826.xls • TIST KE PD-VCS-003j App07 Monitoring Data 100826.xls • TIST KE PD-VCS-004j App07 Monitoring Data 100826.xls • TIST KE PD-CCB-Sept 19 GL2 Community Survey Result.pdf
<p>Timeline</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24 June 2010 - ESI Internal Conflict of Interest (COI) process completed and approved (no issues). CAAC notification. • 5 November 2010 – Signed validation /verification plan received from CAAC • 12 November 2010 – 12 December 2010 – Project listing on CCB for public comment • 7 December 2010 – 14 December 2010 – Site visits and stakeholder meetings • 7 January 2011 – 1st Round CAR’s issued to TIST • 2 February 2011 - CAR responses issued by TIST • 15 February 2011 – 27 March 2011 – Posting of Project Implementation Plan and Monitoring Report • 19 April 2011 - Closing Meeting • 30 January 2012 – guidance from CCBA received about re-evaluating Gold Level for Community • 9 March 2012 revised report issued
<p>Public Comment Period</p> <p>Number of Comments Received</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 November 2010 – 12 December 2010 – Project listing on CCB for public comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments • 15 February 2011 – 27 March 2011 – Posting of Project Implementation Plan and Monitoring Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13 comments (4 comments through CCB site, 9 comments from public hearing and email solicitation)



Project Description

The International Small Group and Tree Planting Program (TIST) empower Small Groups of subsistence farmers in India, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Nicaragua, and Honduras to combat the devastating effects of deforestation, poverty and drought. Combining sustainable development with carbon sequestration, TIST already supports the reforestation and biodiversity efforts of over 63,000 subsistence farmers. Carbon credit sales generate participant income and provide project funding to address agricultural, HIV/AIDS, nutritional and fuel challenges. As TIST expands to more groups and more areas, it ensures more trees, more biodiversity, more climate change benefit and more income for more people.

Since its inception in 1999, TIST participants organized into over 8,900 TIST Small Groups have planted over 10 million trees on their own and community lands. GHG sequestration is creating a potential long-term income stream and developing sustainable environments and livelihoods. TIST in Kenya began in 2004 and has grown to nearly 50,000 TIST participants in over 6,700 Small Groups.

As a grassroots initiative, Small Groups are provided a structural network of training and communications that allows them to build on their own internal strengths and develop best practices. Small Groups benefit from a new income source; the sale of carbon credits that result from the sequestration of carbon from the atmosphere in the biomass of the trees and soil. These credits are expected to be approved under the Voluntary Carbon Standard and/or CDM and, because they are tied to tree growth, will be sustainable. The carbon credits create a new ‘virtual’ cash crop for the participants who gain all the direct benefits of growing trees and also receive quarterly cash stipends based on the GhG benefits created by their efforts. The maturing trees and conservation farming will provide additional sustainable benefits that far exceed the carbon payments. These include improved crop yield, improved environment, and marketable commodities such as fruits, nuts, and honey. TIST utilizes a high-tech approach to quantify the benefits and report the results in a method transparent to the whole world, which includes palm computers, GPS, and a dynamic “real time” internet based database.

This project description is for a subset of the TIST Kenya program and corresponds to TIST VCS project descriptions VCS-001, VCS-002, VCS-003 and VCS-004. It applies to 1,078 Small Groups and 8,047 members.

Executive Summary of Validation/Verification Results

	Criterion	Required/ Optional	Conformance Y/N N/A
G1	Original Conditions in the Project Area	Required	Y
G2	Baseline Projections	Required	Y
G3	Project Design and Goals	Required	Y
G4	Management Capacity and Best Practices	Required	Y
G5	Legal Status and Property Rights	Required	Y
CL1	Net Positive Climate Impacts	Required	Y
CL2	Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”)	Required	Y



CL3	Climate Impact Monitoring	Required	Y
CM1	Net Positive Community Impacts	Required	Y
CM2	Offsite Stakeholder Impacts	Required	Y
CM3	Community Impact Monitoring	Required	Y
B1	Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts	Required	Y
B2	Offsite Biodiversity Impacts	Required	Y
B3	Biodiversity Impact Monitoring	Required	Y
GL1	Climate Change Adaptation Benefits	Optional	N/A
GL2	Exceptional Community Benefits	Optional	Y
GL3	Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits	Optional	N/A

Validation/Verification Findings

G1 Original Conditions in the Project Area

Indicator 1 – The location of the project and basic physical parameters (e.g. soil, geology, climate).	The Project Description (PDD) provides a detailed description of the location of the TIST project in the region surrounding Mt. Kenya, outlining the four major project areas. These are located in the Laikipia District and northern Nyeri District in the Nanyuki region, and the Meru District and Kirinyaga District in the Meru region of Kenya. The PDD also provides a detailed narrative soils, geology, hydrology, and climate. This information is further supported by the Project Implementation Report (PIR).
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit and discussions/demonstration of project location with field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. After review of the PIR, verification results were found to be consistent with the validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 2 – The types and condition of vegetation within the project area.	The PDD provides a description of the existing vegetation, which is primarily cropland and grassland with a few scattered trees. Pre-project trees were identified and counted, and the ground cover was estimated as a percent of pre-project conditions, and is detailed in the supporting “grove summary” worksheet document provided with the PDD. This is further supported by the PIR.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, grove summary worksheet, field visit and



	discussions with the project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. After review of the PIR, verification results were found to be consistent with the validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a
Indicator 3 – The boundaries of the project area and the project zone.	The PDD discusses the 4,264 individual project areas in the project boundaries. The specific location and boundaries for each project area has been located through GPS and are presented in four different GIS formats, sufficient to confirm location and boundary extent. This is further supported by the PIR.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PDD Appendix 1 – 3, TIST website, PIR, field visit, discussions/ demonstration of parcel boundaries with field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. After review of the PIR, verification results supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 4 - Current carbon stocks within the project area(s), using stratification by land-use or vegetation type and methods of carbon calculation (such as biomass plots, formulae, default values) from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s 2006 Guidelines for National GHG Inventories for Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use5 (IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU) or a more robust and detailed methodology.	The PDD and PIR detail how the baseline carbon stocks were estimated based on the approved Clean Development Mechanism methodology AR-AMS0001, Version 05: <i>Simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism implemented on grasslands or croplands</i> . Additional inputs required included visual confirmation of cropland hectares, direct measurement of all baseline trees, and established IPCC factors. An additional aboveground biomass equation specifically developed by Brown et al. for dry forests in the region (Estimating biomass and biomass change of tropical forests: a primer) was also utilized.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, Grove Summary worksheet, Baseline Strata worksheet, IPCC 2006GL, IPCC GPG, field visit to



	confirm baseline trees, and discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. After review of the PIR, verification results supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 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 ⁸ and describes any community characteristics.	The PDD and PIR include a description of the ethnicity of the people in the project zone (Meru and Kikuyu) and provided a basis for the community origins. Additional data is provided regarding distribution by gender, distribution by age, marital status, illiteracy levels, occupational status, and annual income.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, TIST KE CCB Spt-01 Indigenous People.PDDf, discussions with project proponent, field staff, and stakeholder interviews.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. After review of the PIR, verification results were found to be consistent with the validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	#1 Based upon the CCBA a definition, "Indigenous Peoples' are defined as distinct, vulnerable, social and cultural groups whose members identify themselves as belonging to an indigenous cultural group." Please describe how the Meru and Kikuyu do not qualify as indigenous under this definition.
Date issued	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions and date	The basis for this statement is the UN Indigenous People Fact sheet which focuses people with distinct characteristics from the national population. Meru and Kikuyu are part of the national population. (See TIST KE CCB Spt-01 Indigenous People.PDDf)
Evidence used to close CAR	TIST KE CCB Spt-01 Indigenous People.PDDf
Date closed	2 February 2011

Indicator 6 - A description of current land use and customary and legal property rights including community property in the project zone, identifying	The PDD and PIR describes the land use as agricultural and details the current ownership type as approximately 80% under title ownership and 20% customary tenure, and states that the land has long been settled and has not been
--	--



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).	subject to the unresolved disputes/conflicts that other regions of Kenya have experienced. The TIST documents further detail the relationship between the land owners, TIST members and project participants.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, land ownership documentation, field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholder interviews.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. In the verification process the PIR was reviewed and additional investigation was conducted to confirm the location of historical conflicts in Kenya. Verification results supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 7 - A description of current biodiversity within the project zone (diversity of species and ecosystems) and threats to that biodiversity, using appropriate methodologies, substantiated where possible with appropriate reference material.	The PDD and PIR provide a description of the current biodiversity within the project areas and project zone, and how it has been drastically impacted by human habitation. Additional detail is provided to demonstrate why the large mammals historically native to the region are only infrequently present, largely due to the long history of human habitation and active methods (such as elephant fencing) to exclude these animals. Additional discussion with numerous field staff and landowners confirmed absence of most native mammals in the project areas.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, World Wildlife Fund profiles (listed below), field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholder interviews.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. In the verification process review of the PIR and additional investigation was conducted to confirm the absence of native mammals. Verification results supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide independent reference material supporting the information provided in the PDD regarding this section.
Date issued	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions and date	Foot notes added: World Wildlife Fund. http://www.worldwildlife.org/wildworld/profiles/



	terrestrial/at/at0108_full.html World Wildlife Fund. http://www.worldwildlife.org/wildworld/profiles/terrestrial/at/at0711_full.html
Evidence used to close CAR	Revised PDD
Date closed	2 February 2011

<p>Indicator 8 - An evaluation of whether the project zone includes any of the following High Conservation Values (HCVs) and a description of the qualifying attributes.</p> <p>Indicator 8.1 - Globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> protected areas threatened species endemic species areas that support significant concentrations of a species during any time in their lifecycle (e.g. migrations, feeding grounds, breeding areas). <p>Indicator 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.</p> <p>Indicator 8.3 Threatened or rare ecosystems.</p> <p>Indicator 8.4 - Areas that provide critical ecosystem services (e.g., hydrological services, erosion control, fire control).</p> <p>Indicator 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).</p> <p>Indicator 8.6 - Areas that are critical for the traditional cultural identity of communities (e.g., areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR provide a discussion of how the project zone meets high conservation values for nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (protected areas include Mt. Kenya, a designated UNESCO World Heritage Site and biosphere reserve) and areas that provide critical ecosystem services (project zone serves as water catchment area for Nairobi and central Kenya, and portions serve as a corridor between Mt. Kenya and Aberdare National Park and Forest). TIST documents further detail the rare and endangered species found in the project zone.</p>
--	---



significance identified in collaboration with the communities).	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussion with project proponent, and field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. After review of the PIR, verification results were found to be consistent with the validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

G2 Baseline Projections

Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR provide justification for the likely-land use scenario in the absence of the project consistent with the selected CDM methodology. Given field observations, coupled with the history of land use, location of project lands, demand for wood/fuel, agriculture, and increasing population, the PDD determines the most likely land-use scenario is grassland/cropland. This was supported by observations and stakeholder discussions in the field.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, Grove Summary worksheet, field visit, discussion with project proponent, and field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. In the validation and verification process, the PIR, stakeholder meetings and direct observation supported the findings. Verification results supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 2 - Document that project benefits would not have occurred in the absence of the project, explaining how existing laws or regulations would likely	The PDD and PIR detail how the “Assessment of Additionality” tool within the approved CDM methodology was used to demonstrate that project benefits would not have occurred in the absence of the project.
---	--



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.	This was supported through documentation provided by FAO and the Green Belt Movement, showing that despite forest policies currently in place, deforestation has soared due to demands for fuel, crop and grazing lands.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussion with project proponent, and field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. In the validation and verification process, the PIR, stakeholder meetings and direct observation supported the findings. Verification results supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	In this section please provide specific reference to the baseline project methodology (tool) used to assess additionality, and the results of this assessment. Please also discuss the forest policies referenced and the impact (or lack thereof) on the project areas.
Date issued	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions and date	The following sentence was added to Section 2.2: Additionality of TIST is proven using the "Assessment of Additionality" contained in Appendix B of Clean Development Mechanism Methodology AR-AMS0001, which demonstrates that the project activity would not have occurred in the absence of the proposed project activity. The issue about the forest policies was discussed with the DOE and after a review of the references, it was withdrawn. No further action required.
Evidence used to close CAR	Revised PDD
Date closed	2 February 2011

Indicator 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	The carbon stock is based on CDM small scale afforestation reforestation methodology AR-AMS0001 Version 05: <i>Simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism implemented on grasslands or croplands</i> . As stated in the PDD and PIR, the required data and calculations are located in the Baseline Strata, Baseline Tree and Baseline Growth worksheets, demonstrating that the conservative change in carbon stocks without the project is estimated to be 80,627 tons (gross ex post).
--	--



<p>emissions such as CH₄ and N₂O in the ‘without project’ scenario. Non-CO₂ gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of CO₂-equivalent) of the project’s overall GHG impact over each monitoring period.</p> <p>Projects whose activities are designed to avoid GHG emissions (such as those reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), avoiding conversion of non-forest land, or certain improved forest management projects) must include an analysis of the relevant drivers and rates of deforestation and/or degradation and a description and justification of the approaches, assumptions and data used to perform this analysis. Regional-level estimates can be used at the project’s planning stage as long as there is a commitment to evaluate locally-specific carbon stocks and to develop a project-specific spatial analysis of deforestation and/or degradation using an appropriately robust and detailed carbon accounting methodology before the start of the project.</p>	
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>PDD, PIR, Baseline Strata, Baseline Tree and Baseline Growth worksheets, discussion with the project proponent</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.</p>
<p>Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Date issued</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Project proponent response/actions and date</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Evidence used to close CAR</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Date closed</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Indicator 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.</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate how the without project scenario would affect communities in the project zone, outlining the anticipated impacts from lack of benefits from carbon income, soil erosion, water quality and retention, and habitat and biodiversity (further described in G2.5 below).</p>



Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 5 - Describe how the ‘without project’ reference scenario would affect biodiversity in the project zone (e.g., habitat availability, landscape connectivity and threatened species).	The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate how the without project scenario would affect biodiversity in the project zone, providing that the indigenous trees and additional forest cover will have a positive effect by improving connectivity and corridors among the protected areas, and by reducing the pressure on protected high biodiversity areas.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

G3 Project Design and Goals

Indicator 1 - Provide a summary of the project’s major climate, community and biodiversity objectives.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently state the projects major climate, community and biodiversity objectives to be: increase biomass and carbon sequestered in project areas, provide a sustainable fuel wood supply for the members, provide a new source of revenue to the members from the sale of carbon credits, provide training in important social and health related subjects, and improve the biodiversity of the area by adding canopy and indigenous trees.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD and PIR.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of PIR in the verification



	process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 2 - Describe each project activity with expected climate, community and biodiversity impacts and its relevance to achieving the project's objectives.	The PDD and PIR sufficient detail the project activities, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nursery training and development • Tree planting • Selective use of tree products • Provide training social and health training
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD and PIR.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 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).	The PDD and PIR provide maps sufficient to identify project locations/boundaries, the project zone. The methodology allows for leakage to be excluded so no map is provided for surrounding communities.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, Appendix 01 – 03.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a



Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR identify the project life and GHG accounting period as 60 years. Key dates and milestones in the projects development are also provided.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD and PIR.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently describe natural and human-induced risks. Natural risks provided include drought, fire and pestilence, which are mitigated by the number and dispersion of individual project areas. Human-induced risks include the risk that VCS would in the future propose rules excluding smaller ownerships from participating, removing the financial incentive to participate in the program. TIST's has mitigated this by keeping development costs low, using local in-country experts and relies on capacity building within the small group members, and the fact that the project provides benefits additional to the financial incentives from carbon. Another risk is that farmers will drop out of the program, which is mitigated by the substantial number of farmers in the program.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD and PIR.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 6 - Demonstrate that the project design includes specific measures	The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate that the project design includes specific measure to ensure
---	--



to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes identified in G1 consistent with the precautionary principle.	maintenance/enhancement of HCV's. This is accomplished through planting of deforested areas, creating wildlife corridors and improving habitat.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussion with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the revised PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	In this section please specifically describe how each of the HCV aspects will be maintained/enhanced through the project activities (ex. species on the IUCN threatened/endangered list, areas that provide critical ecosystem services such as buffer, etc).
Date issued	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions and date	Paragraph added: TIST trees are planted on the lands of small hold farmers, so the maintenance of HCV areas is indirect. TIST trees are being planted where deforestation has taken place. The addition of indigenous trees, tree cover and fruit trees enhance biodiversity by providing an expanded range for some of the animals that rely on the HVC area. In addition, the many discrete project areas help improve the wild life corridors between HCV areas needed for healthy animal populations.
Evidence used to close CAR	Revised PDD
Date closed	2 February 2011

Indicator 7 - Describe the measures that will be taken to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently describe the measures implemented to ensure benefits continue beyond the project lifetime. This is primarily accomplished through training in the benefits of planting specific tree species, maintenance of sustainable woodlots, and the benefits of biodiversity.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussions with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a



Date closed	n/a
Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently outline what measures were proposed and implemented to ensure the local communities and stakeholders were properly identified, consulted and that their input was considered in project development. TIST documents the meetings and seminars that were held prior to project initiation to customize the project for the region. To disseminate information TIST has regular newsletters provided to the community and holds ongoing small group meetings and interviews with landowners and community members to gain continual feedback. Specific feedback from the stakeholder process is provided in both the PDD and PIR.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, TIST.org website, field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a
Indicator 9 - Describe what specific steps have been taken, and communications methods used, to publicize the CCBA public comment period to communities and other stakeholders and to facilitate their submission of comments to CCBA. Project proponents must play an active role in distributing key project documents to affected communities and stakeholders and hold widely publicized information meetings in relevant local or regional languages.	The PDD and PIR provide sufficient detail to demonstrate that appropriate methods have been utilized to publicize the CCBA public comment period. Specifically a meeting was held between 10:00 AM and 1:00 PM on 10 March, 2011 at the Gitoro Conferences Center in Meru, Kenya. Notice was given in 2 leading Kenya papers. Additionally, emails advertizing the public meetings were sent to stakeholders and local organizations in Kenya.



Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, TIST KE PDD-CCB-Spt 14 Public Comments.doc, discussion with project proponent, field staff, and stakeholder meetings.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR, the details and findings from the public meetings during the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide specific details regarding the attendance and results of the meeting referenced.
Date issued	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions and date	Details of public meetings (dates, attendees, comments, publication notices, etc.) provided in TIST KE PDD-CCB-Spt 14 Public Comments.doc
Evidence used to close CAR	TIST KE PDD-CCB-Spt 14 Public Comments.doc
Date closed	14 March 2011

Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate that a clear process for handling unresolved conflicts exists. Specifically, all grievances are first brought to the attention of the Kenya Staff where the issues are compared to standard TIST policy, TIST values ¹ and/or the Greenhouse Gas agreement among the Small Group members and CAAC. The policies and values are the subject of training at seminar, cluster meetings, Small Group meetings and are published in the newsletter. Unresolved issues are presented to TIST Management. Where precedence or policy exists, they are used in final decision making. Where new issues arise that are outside the existing precedence, or policy, the issue is brought to the next seminar or Leadership Council meeting, where decisions are made by representatives of the Small Groups, Kenya Staff and TIST Management. This information is publically available to individuals through the public meetings and newsletters.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a

¹ TIST Values: We are Honest. We are Accurate. We are Mutually Accountable. We are Transparent. We are Servants to each other.



Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a
Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR, along with the financial plan, sufficiently demonstrate that financial mechanisms are likely to provide an adequate flow of funds for implementation and to achieve the anticipated climate, community and biodiversity benefits.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, TIST KE PDD-VCS-001i App04 Ex6 Financial Plan.xls, and discussion with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and financial plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

G4 Management Capacity and Best Practices

Indicator 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.	<p>The PDD and PIR sufficiently outlines the party responsible for the project's design, and further outlines all other entities involved in project development and implementation, as outlined below:</p> <p>The project proponent is Clean Air Action Corporation (CAAC). The role of CAAC and other parties involved with TIST are summarized:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clean Air Action Corporation (CAAC) is a for profit US corporation that manages the GhG component of TIST. CAAC is TIST's largest contributor, provides technical assistance and uses its host country subsidiaries to manage operations. • Institute of Environmental Innovation (I4EI), a US based non-profit organization, manages the TIST sustainable development program components. I4EI provides funding from government agencies, foundations, and private donors. • Unites States Agency for International Development (USAID) has committed to provide
--	---



	<p>financial assistance to TIST through I4EI to improve sustainable development activities and biodiversity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thousands of TIST Farmers make up the Small Groups, plant the trees on their lands, manage their own trees and make up the core of TIST.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussion with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please describe the role of other organizations associated with the project (e.g. USAID).
Date issued	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions and date	Project proponent revised PDD to include more detail on the role of the additional organizations involved.
Evidence used to close CAR	Revised PDD
Date closed	2 February 2011

<p>Indicator 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.</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR sufficiently outline the key technical skills required for, and possessed by, TIST to implement the project successfully. The documents also outline TIST extensive project experience in implementing land management projects at sufficient scale.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussion w project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide a representative list of previous projects undertaken in tree planting/agro forestry/natural resource management, and in carbon project development.
Date issued	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions and date	Revised PDD to include list of previous relevant projects.
Evidence used to close CAR	Revised PDD.
Date closed	2 February 2011

<p>Indicator 3 - Include a plan to provide orientation and training for the project's</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR sufficiently outline a plan to provide orientation and training for the employees and relevant</p>
--	---



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.	people from the communities to build useful skills and knowledge and increase participation. The plan includes orientation seminars, training for local staff and small group members, and ongoing training seminars for staff and small group members at least once per year.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussion w project proponent, field staff, and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide a representative list of previous projects undertaken in tree planting/agro forestry/natural resource management, and in carbon project development.
Date issued	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions and date	Revised PDD to include a more specific/detailed training schedule.
Evidence used to close CAR	Revised PDD
Date closed	2 February 2011

Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate that people from the local communities are given an equal, indeed preference, to fill all employment positions. Specifically, TIST does not have an expatriate staff. Although the main management staff and computer development are in the US, the Kenya program is run by Kenyans from the Meru and Nanyuki area. The 50 plus quantifiers are TIST farmers trained to use the monitoring system. The land and trees planted belong to the TIST farmers. The TIST farmers work together to establish the best practices for their area (whereas the Ugandan and Indian farmers establish their own best practices more suitable to their areas). TIST farmers are trained as trainers. Cluster meetings and Small Group meetings are run by Kenyans. All TIST members have an opportunity to be group leaders, regardless of education or gender. TIST members are utilized as volunteers, independent contractors and employees based on achievement, not gender, education or social status. TIST holds regular training seminars for quantifiers and conducts regular audits to make sure their skills are honed.
--	---



Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff, and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR and discussions with TIST staff and membership in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	
Date issued	
Project proponent response/actions and date	
Evidence used to close CAR	
Date closed	

<p>Indicator 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.</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR sufficiently detail all relevant laws and regulations covering worker's rights in the host country, describe how the project will inform workers about their rights, and provide assurance that the project meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering worker rights. Specifically, the relevant laws are:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Employment Act, 2007. Regulation of Wages and Conditions of Employment Act National Hospital Insurance Fund Act, 1998</p> <p>Most of the Kenyans working for TIST knew their rights before starting employment. Even so, CAAC uses an employment contract that was vetted by local counsel that reiterates the more important parts of the relevant employment law such as salary, types of leave, rest days and termination. Quantifiers are independent contractors. Their contract has been reviewed by local counsel. Workers are given the contract to read well in advance of signing and the opportunity to ask any questions about the terms.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussions with project proponent, field staff, and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR and discussions with TIST staff and membership in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide a copy (representative example) of an employment contract(s).
Date issued	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions and	Provided TIST KE PD-CCB-Spt 02 Employment



date	Contract.doc
Evidence used to close CAR	TIST KE PD-CCB-Spt 02 Employment Contract.doc
Date closed	2 February 2011

<p>Indicator 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.</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR provide sufficient assessment of situations and occupations that pose a substantial risk to worker safety, including a plan 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. Specifically, TIST members are conducting activities that they normally do, i.e. farming using manual labor. TIST workers walk or use public transportation. They do not engage in activities that are inherently unsafe. The risks facing TIST workers are minimal and no different than those affecting anyone living in the area. Such risks include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • riding in a matatu (the local mini bus transportation) where there is risk of crash or robbery; • venomous or constricting snakes, which, although have been mostly eradicated from the farm lands, still can be encountered; • elephants, which are present in the Meru area. <p>TIST has a Standard Operating Procedure to address safety. To ensure that safety policy and safety issues are understood, each quantifier will be briefed on the following safety policy annually.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussions with project proponent, field staff, and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR and discussions with TIST staff and membership in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide a plan describing the process through which TIST advises workers of the potential risks, and describes steps which can be taken to minimize these risks.
Date issued	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions and date	Revised PDD and provided TIST SOP (TIST KE PD-CCB-Spt 13 Quantifier Safety 110110.doc)
Evidence used to close CAR	Revised PDD, TIST KE PD-CCB-Spt 13 Quantifier Safety 110110.doc
Date closed	2 February 2011



Indicator 7 - Document the financial health of the implementing organization(s) to demonstrate that financial resources budgeted will be adequate to implement the project.	The PDD and PIR, in conjunction with financial statements provided, are sufficient to demonstrate that the financial resources will be adequate to implement the project. Further, the project has been implemented for some years, which demonstrates TIST financial health.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, TIST KE PDD-VCS-001i App04 Ex6 Financial Plan.xls, and discussion with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and financial plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

G5 Legal Status and Property Rights

Indicator 1 - Submit a list of all relevant national and local laws and regulations in the host country and all applicable international treaties and agreements. Provide assurance that the project will comply with these and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.	The PDD and PIR provide sufficient detail to demonstrate that all relevant national/ local laws and regulations in the host country and all applicable international treaties and agreements have been considered and that the project is compliant.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, and discussion with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide additional discussion regarding compliance with the Environmental Co-ordination and Management Act of 1999.
Date issued	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions and date	Revised PDD to demonstrate compliance.
Evidence used to close CAR	Revised PDD
Date closed	2 February 2011

Indicator 2 - Document that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, including the established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the	The PDD and PIR sufficiently details that the project activities (planting trees) requires no approvals on the scale being conducted. Additionally, the program has received the following approvals:
---	---



communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A letter from the Chief Conservator of the Forest to the Director General of the National Environment Management Authority dated 08 January 2007 requesting that TIST be allowed to operate. • A letter from the National Environment Management Authority dated 19 March 2007 confirming they have no objection to the further development of the TIST project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, and discussion with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently discuss that the TIST project, by nature, cannot encroach uninvited on private property as CAAC and TIST do not own or lease any of the project lands. TIST takes place on the existing land of farmers and their families. CAAC enters into contracts with the Small Group members. In the contract, the members attest in that they have the rights to plant on these lands.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 4 - Demonstrate that the project does not require the involuntary relocation of people or of the activities important for the livelihoods and culture	The PDD and PIR sufficiently discuss that the TIST project does not require the involuntary relocation of people or of the activities important for the livelihoods and culture of the communities. CAAC and TIST do not
--	--



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.	own or lease any of the project lands. TIST takes place on the existing land of farmers and their families. Participation is strictly voluntary. CAAC has no authority to relocate any of the members or land owners.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate the illegal activities that could affect the projects efficacy, and how the project will reduce these activities. Illegal harvesting of trees and charcoal making exist in the protected forests of the project zone. This is an ongoing problem for the Kenya Forest Service and is not related to TIST or caused by TIST. TIST, through its development of on-farm, sustainable, wood lots, will have a positive impact on these activities by providing an alternate, sustainable source of fuel to some of the population.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a



<p>Indicator 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.</p>	<p>Through the PDD, PIR and other supporting documentation TIST has demonstrated that they have clear, uncontested title to the carbon rights. Greenhouse Gas Agreements among all the Small Groups, with each member as a signatory, and CAAC exist. Under the terms of the contract, all rights and title to the carbon is transferred to CAAC. The members retain the land and trees. There is not a national law that governs carbon, per se. However, the ownership of tree and tree products can be subject to contract and transferred to others.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, supporting documentation (contracts), field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

CL1 Net Positive Climate Impacts

<p>Indicator 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. The net change is equal to carbon stock changes <i>with</i> the project minus carbon stock changes <i>without</i> the project (the latter having been estimated in G2). This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about how project activities will alter GHG emissions of carbon stocks over the duration of the project or the project</p>	<p>The PDD demonstrates that the methodology (AS-AMS0001 V5) was applied accurately and appropriately to estimate the net change in carbon stocks due to the project activities. The process is clearly defined and well defended, with a net change in carbon stocks of 1,699,076 MtCO₂e.</p>
--	---



GHG accounting period.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, Strata, Ex-Ante Carbon Est, Ex-Ante Strata Est, and Table CL1.1.worksheets, and discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please justify the use of the root-to-shoot ratio identified, including justification of not using the value identified in the IPCC AFOFLU Table 3.1.8.
Date issued	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions and date	Revised PDD and calculations to utilize GPG-LULUCF Table 3.1.8.
Evidence used to close CAR	Revisions to PDD and calculations.
Date closed	2 February 2011

<p>Indicator 2 - Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO2 GHG emissions such as CH4 and N2O in the <i>with</i> and <i>without</i> project scenarios if those gases are likely to account for 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>The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate that, as permitted by the methodology (AS-AMS0001 V5), the change in emissions of non-CO2 carbon stocks are expected to be below 5% and can be ignored. The potential source of methane is burning of biomass. Because the farmers planting the trees are subsistence farmers that rely on wood for cooking food, they are not expected to engage in widespread burning; available wood will be used for domestic fuel and would just offset fuel wood gathered from outside the project area. In addition, the burning of biomass is neither necessary for the project, nor promoted. Any methane emission will be de minimis and well below the 5% threshold.</p> <p>N2O is a potential source from chemical fertilizers. The policy of TIST is for the farmers to refrain from using chemical fertilizers, and instead, to rely on dung and plant material. Neither of these is the result of project activity and need not be considered.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, and discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a



Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate that, in accordance with the methodology, ex ante leakage is assumed to be zero. TIST does not own any vehicles or fossil fuel equipment. Planting and site preparation is done manually. TIST promotes the use of natural fertilizers and does not supply any chemical fertilizers. N-fixing species will not be left to degrade. Any dead wood will be used by the farmers for fuel wood.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, and discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 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).	The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate that in the ex-ante estimate TIST trees will sequester over 1.6 million net tonnes of CO ₂ e and will, therefore, have a net positive impact on the climate. In addition, planting the trees will benefit the overall ecosystem and, through the use of deadwood from the project, result in reduced deforestation outside the project boundaries. As the monitoring has already been conducted, the monitoring report was reviewed in the verification process and confirms that the net climate impact was indeed positive.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, monitoring report, and discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR and the monitoring report in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a



Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate that appropriate measures have been taken to prevent double counting of GHG removals. Specifically, the project areas included in the CCB PD make up four PDs that have recently been validated and verified under VCS. VCS will issue VERs that will be entered on one registry. The registry rules will prevent these VERs from being sold twice.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

CL2 Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”)

Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently outline the types of potential leakage sources and demonstrate why no leakage is anticipated from these sources. These include activity shifting displacement and market effects.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 2 - Document how any leakage will be mitigated and estimate the extent to which such impacts will be reduced by these mitigation activities.	As the PDD and PIR illustrate, leakage is demonstrated to be zero, so no mitigation for leakage is necessary.
---	---



Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 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).	As the PDD and PIR illustrate, leakage is demonstrated to be zero, so the amount to be subtracted from the net climate impact of the project is zero.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 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.	As the PDD and PIR illustrate, there is no anticipated leakage of non-CO2 gasses in excess of 5%.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a



date	
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

CL3 Climate Impact Monitoring

<p>Indicator 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.</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR outline a detailed monitoring plan sufficient to address the appropriate carbon pools as allowed within the methodology. The methods utilized include direct field measurements using scientifically robust sampling, and utilizes data suitable to the project and forest type.</p> <p>Because TIST was designed as a climate change project and has been operational since 2004, the monitoring plan in this section is operational, and has demonstrated its efficacy.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>PDD, PIR, monitoring plan, monitoring report, discussions with project proponent and field staff.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR and monitoring report in the verification process supported validation findings.</p>
<p>Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to</p>	<p>n/a</p>



address non-conformance:	
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 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.	The PDD outline a detailed monitoring plan sufficient to address the appropriate carbon pools as allowed within the methodology. Because TIST was designed as a climate change project and has been operational since 2004, as stated in the PIR, the monitoring plan in this section is operational, and has demonstrated its efficacy. It was posted on the CCB and TIST website for distribution, and made available through public meetings in country.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, monitoring plan, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

CM1 Net Positive Community Impacts

Indicator 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-	The PDD and PIR sufficiently estimate the impacts on communities, resulting from the planned project activities. The estimate is 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. Some of the community benefits resulting from the project activities include new job opportunities, direct effects to small groups, empowerment through small group structure, fruits and nuts from tree plantings, sustainable wood supply, wood products and (limited) timber from trees, natural medicines, insecticides, capacity building on ag improvements, business skills, nursery development, and
--	--



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.	reforestation, organization of small groups to address other social and economic issues, improved beauty of the landscape. While negative impacts were considered, none were identified as appropriate.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, monitoring plan, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 2 - Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.4-6 will be negatively affected by the project.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrated that the project will have no negative impact on HCV areas. This is primarily because the project takes place on private lands that have been under human habitation for generations. Project activities (planting of trees) does not cause displacement or move activities to the HCV areas, instead helping to reduce pressure from fuelwood and other wood product demand on HVC areas in the project zone.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, monitoring plan, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a



Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

CM2 Offsite Stakeholder Impacts

Indicator 1 - Identify any potential negative offsite stakeholder impacts that the project activities are likely to cause.	<p>The PDD and PIR sufficiently consider potential negative impacts on stakeholders. Because the project takes place on private lands and the tree planting is by the landowners, and because the planting of trees is akin to the farming that has taken place on the lands for generations, there are few negative potential impacts to offsite stakeholders.</p> <p>One that has been identified is the effect of eucalyptus trees on ground water and water courses. As stated, the farmers get to choose the type of trees they plant on their own lands. During training, TIST has been clear about some of the negative effects of eucalyptus trees. However, the Kenya Forest Department (now Kenya Forest Service) has historically encouraged the planting of eucalyptus, for years, to meet local needs for timber and utility poles. Kenya Power and Lighting Company have been very vocal about their need for poles. Because of this, there are many eucalyptus trees in the project.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, monitoring plan, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 2 - Describe how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite social and economic impacts.	<p>The PDD and PIR proposed an appropriate plan to mitigate the negative impact identified (eucalyptus trees). In order to reduce the number of eucalyptus trees, TIST has been requiring all Small Groups to reduce their percentage of eucalyptus to under 30% of their total trees and file forest plans that show how they are going to achieve this reduction. In addition, TIST is now offering a higher per tree incentive to encourage the planting of</p>
---	--



	indigenous trees in riparian areas.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, monitoring plan, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 3 - Demonstrate that the project is not likely to result in net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate that the project is not likely to result in net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups. The multitude of listed benefits to the community members and benefits to the environment are much greater than the potential negative impact from the eucalyptus. Quantified, there are 384 ha of eucalyptus, out of 1,579 total project areas. This can be compared to the thousands of square kilometers that make up the project zone.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, monitoring plan, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

CM3 Community Impact Monitoring

Indicator 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	The PDD and PIR propose an initial plan sufficient for selecting community variables to be monitored and the frequency of monitoring and reporting.
---	---



objectives and to anticipated impacts (positive and negative).	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, monitoring plan, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently described how effectiveness is assessed. Because the project takes place on private lands that have been under human habitation and agriculture for generations, there is no direct monitoring of the Mt Kenya HCV. Instead the impact is addressed by the number of indigenous trees planted by the project and the numbers of hectares that contain indigenous trees.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, monitoring plan, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 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	The PDD commits to developing a full plan within the required 6 month timeframe. At this time a full monitoring plan has been developed and was disseminated on the CCB and TIST.org websites, and made available through public meetings in country.
---	---



communities and other stakeholders.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, monitoring plan, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

B1 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts

<p>Indicator 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.</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate that appropriate methodologies were utilized to estimate changes in biodiversity. The project areas are grasslands or croplands on private lands owned by subsistence farmers. They have a history of farming and as such, the baseline biodiversity is extremely low. Natural wildlife populations were eliminated or driven off long ago and are currently restricted to transient animals. As such, the approach to improving biodiversity in the project areas must start with the basics and, in this case, means to planting indigenous trees. Isolated woodlots with indigenous trees will improve the connectivity of wildlife between natural forests. Indigenous tree planting data are based on an evaluation of data provided from the monitoring plan, including tree counts by species and by project area.</p> <p>The PDD and PIR appropriately compare the project scenario to the baseline without project scenario, demonstrating a positive change. The tree planting would not occur without the project. In the case of the indigenous trees, the biodiversity benefit is clearly positive.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, EIA, monitoring report, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR and monitoring report in the verification process sufficiently supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to	Please provide referenced the referenced Environmental



address non-conformance:	Impact Assessment (EIA).
Date issued	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions and date	EIA provided.
Evidence used to close CAR	TIST KE CCB Spt 04 EIA Report NAREDAR 100506.doc
Date closed	2 February 2011

<p>Indicator 2 - Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.1-3 will be negatively affected by the project.</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate that no HCV's will be negatively affected by the project.</p> <p>The project areas are on individual farms, with an extensive history of farming and land use, other than natural forest or long-term forestry. As such, any negative effect caused by human activity at the project sites has already happened. Project activity will have a positive effect on HCVs.</p> <p>Mt Kenya and surrounding highlands are one of Kenya's five main water towers. The planting of trees will prevent water from running off, and help the water seep into the ground and back into the water table. In addition, 21 hectares are in riparian areas and help provide corridors for animals to move from forest to forest.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, monitoring report, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR and monitoring report in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

<p>Indicator 3 - Identify all species to be used by the project and show that no known invasive species will be introduced into any area affected by the project and that the population of any invasive species will not increase as a result of the project.</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR sufficiently identify all species to be used by the project and show that no known invasive species will be introduced into any area affected by the project and that the population of any invasive species will not increase as a result of the project.</p> <p>All listed species have been screened against the global database of invasive species. While two on the list are</p>
---	---



	included for Kenya, they are high value trees in Kenya, and, according to the Kenya Forest Service, are not invasive.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, monitoring plan, monitoring report, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR and monitoring report in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide the letter from the Kenya Forest Service dated 28 October 2010.
Date issued	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions and date	Letter from the Kenyan Forest Service provided.
Evidence used to close CAR	TIST KE CCB Spt 05 KFS Invasive Species 101028.jpg
Date closed	2 February 2011

Indicator 4 - Describe possible adverse effects of non-native species used by the project on the region's environment, including impacts on native species and disease introduction or facilitation. Project proponents must justify any use of non-native species over native species	The PDD and PIR sufficiently 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. TIST has developed specific protocols to discourage use of non-native trees and reduce the impacts these species when utilized. Further, they sufficiently justify use of non-native species.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, monitoring report, monitoring plan, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR and monitoring report in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 5 - Guarantee that no GMOs will be used to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently guarantee that no GMO's will be used to generate GHG emission removals.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.



Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

B2 Offsite Biodiversity Impacts

Indicator 1 - Identify potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts that the project is likely to cause.	<p>The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate that no potential for offsite impacts to biodiversity exist. Evidence that there has not been any displacement of members has been provided in the form of a survey of the land owners and project participants during baseline monitoring. They owned the land before the project and own the land during the project.</p> <p>In addition, the program is designed to allow sustainable harvest within the project boundary by the members, which will reduce the need for fuel wood from external sources. The trees are owned by the Small Group members and as the trees die, either naturally or through selective harvest, they can be used as fuel wood by the members. The project activity will have a beneficial effect on area deforestation; instead of causing it, it will ameliorate it.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 2 - Document how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite biodiversity impacts.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate that mitigation is not applicable, since no negative offsite biodiversity impacts are expected.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in



	the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate no negative offsite biodiversity impacts are anticipated. Therefore net effect of the project on biodiversity is positive.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

B3 Biodiversity Impact Monitoring

Indicator 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).	The PDD and PIR sufficiently present the initial plan for selecting biodiversity variables to be monitored. Trees will be the main focus of biodiversity impact monitoring since they provide important habitat diversity and structural features for biodiversity.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, and discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please discuss if potential monitoring variables include trends in landscape connectivity and forest fragmentation.
Date issued	7 January 2011



Project proponent response/actions and date	Revised PDD to discuss trends in landscape connectivity.
Evidence used to close CAR	Revised PDD
Date closed	2 February 2011

Indicator 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.	The PDD and PIR sufficiently demonstrate that appropriate monitoring (indirect) is in place for maintaining HCV. Because there is no direct interaction with the HCV, the monitoring is indirect and based on monitoring direct project achievements per B3.1 and B3.3.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a

Indicator 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.	The PDD provides a full commitment to develop a full monitoring plan. As the project has already been implemented, the PIR provides the full monitoring plan for review.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, monitoring plan, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	n/a
Date issued	n/a
Project proponent response/actions and date	n/a
Evidence used to close CAR	n/a
Date closed	n/a



Gold Level Section

GL1 Climate Change Adaptation Benefits

Conformance: N/A

GL2 Exceptional Community Benefits

Conformance: Yes

Indicator 1 - Demonstrate that the project zone is in a low human development country OR in an administrative area of a medium or high human development country in which at least 50% of the population of that area is below the national poverty line.	TIST sufficiently demonstrated that the project zone is in a HDI with greater than 50% of the population below the national poverty line.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, TIST KE CCB Spt 06 UN Human Dev Rpt 2009.pdf, discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	The web link to access the UNDEP report does not work. Please check the link and revise the reference accordingly so it can be verified.
Date issued:	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions	The UN changed their web site. Please see "TIST KE CCB Spt 06 UN Human Dev Rpt 2009.pdf." page 178, Kenya is listed as HDI 147. The 52% comes from that line under "Population below income poverty line," National Poverty Line.
Evidence used to close CAR:	TIST KE CCB Spt 06 UN Human Dev Rpt 2009.pdf.
Date closed:	2 February 2011

Indicator 2 - Demonstrate that at least 50% of households within the lowest category of well-being (e.g., poorest quartile) of the community are likely to benefit substantially from the project.	TIST sufficiently demonstrated that greater than 50% of the households within the lowest category of well-being of the community are likely to benefit substantially from the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide more detail supporting the case that there are substantial benefits to 50% of the lowest quartile (e.g. studies, literature, etc.).
Date issued:	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions	See new section rewritten with supporting reference. (too extensive for this table)
Evidence used to close CAR	Revised PDD
Date closed	2 February 2011

Indicator 3 - Demonstrate that any barriers or risks that might prevent	TIST sufficiently demonstrated that any barriers or risks that might prevent benefits going to poorer households
--	--



benefits going to poorer households have been identified and addressed in order to increase the probable flow of benefits to poorer households.	have been identified and addressed.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please revise the title of this section to read "GL2.3 Barriers to benefits addressed" as it currently reads "GL2.2 Barriers to benefits addressed"
Date issued:	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions	Change made.
Evidence used to close CAR	Revised PDD
Date closed	2 February 2011

Indicator 4 - Demonstrate that measures have been taken to identify any poorer and more vulnerable households and individuals whose well-being or poverty may be negatively affected by the project, and that the project design includes measures to avoid any such impacts. Where negative impacts are unavoidable, demonstrate that they will be effectively mitigated.	TIST sufficiently demonstrated that measures have been taken to identify any poorer and more vulnerable households and individuals whose well-being or poverty may be negatively affected by the project, and that the project design includes measures to avoid any such impacts.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussions with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please revise the title of this section to read "GL2.3 Barriers to benefits addressed" as it currently reads "GL2.2 Barriers to benefits addressed"
Date issued:	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions	Change made.
Evidence used to close CAR	Revised PDD
Date closed	2 February 2011

Indicator 5 - Demonstrate that community impact monitoring will be able to identify positive and negative impacts on poorer and more vulnerable groups. The social impact monitoring must take a differentiated approach that can identify positive and negative impacts on poorer households and individuals and other disadvantaged groups, including women.	TIST is currently in the process of conducting social impact monitoring utilizing a differentiated approach.
---	--



Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, PIR, field visit, discussions with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	The PDD does not currently meet this requirement.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide a detailed description of how the proposed monitoring plan employs a "differentiated" approach to identify positive and negative impacts on poorer households, individuals and other disadvantaged groups.
Date issued:	7 January 2011
Project proponent response/actions	<p>In discussion with ESI it was agreed that CAAC would leave this pending until the data has been collected. In the meantime, CAAC will proceed with a standard CCB application (i.e. not gold level). When and if a monitoring plan that satisfactorily addresses the "differentiated" approach is implemented, the project can be bumped up to gold level. PDD states that it will develop an additional monitoring plan to demonstrate that it meets the requirements of Gold Level Exceptional Community benefits. Monitoring plan dated 5 Nov 2011 has been made available to verifier.</p> <p>As of March 7, 2012 CAAC has demonstrated that community impact monitoring was able to identify positive and negative impacts on poorer and more vulnerable groups. The social impact monitoring used a differentiated approach that identified positive and negative impacts on poorer households and individuals and other disadvantaged groups, including women.</p>
Evidence used to close CAR	Monitoring report, TIST KE PD-CCB-Spt 17 GL2 Survey Overview.doc, and TIST KE PD-CCB-Spt 18 GL2 Community Benefits Survey.doc, and TIST KE PD-CCB-Sept 19 GL2 Community Survey Result.pdf
Date closed	7 March 2012

GL3 Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits

Conformance: N/A

Public Shareholder Comments

Due to the timing and release of documents from the client, two public comment periods were conducted. The first was 12 November 2010 – 12 December 2010, during which no comments were received. The second public comment period was 15 February 2011 – 27 March 2011, during which 4 comments were received. The entities included Anthony King, Executive Director, Laikipia Wildlife Forum Ltd., Rodney Portman, Chair, Berkeley Reafforestation Trustees, David Hewett, Director, AWF Heartland, and Robert Delve, Senior Technical Advisor - Agriculture and Environment, Catholic Relief Services. All comments were in support of the project with no critiques or recommendations. Comments of support focused on TIST's work to improve the quality of life for small farmers/landowners through planting trees, providing



education and support for issues like conservation farming, and TIST's efforts to benefit the environment in the region.

Additional comments were solicited directly by TIST during their in-country stakeholder meetings held 10 March 2011 in Meru, Kenya. The meeting was publicized in two leading Kenyan newspaper and an email solicitation was sent to various stakeholders and pertinent organizations. The list of those emailed is as follows:

- Africa Wildlife Foundation, Kenya, David Hewett. dhewett@awfafrica.org
- Africa Wildlife Foundation, Kenya, Per Karlsson. pkarlsson@awfke.org
- Agriculture Office, Maara District. Agnes Mwenda. mwenda.agnes@yahoo.com
- Agriculture Office Meru Central District, Laban Muringi. rintuaralaban@gmail.com
- ARD, Inc. Kevin Doyle. kdoyle@ard-kenya.com
- Berkeley Reafforestation Trust, Rodney Portman. rodneyportman@thebrt.org
- Care International, Communications Officer. jotieno@care.or.ke
- Catholic Relief Services, Shaun Ferris. sferris@crs.org
- Catholic Relief Services, Robert Delve. rdelve@earo.crs.org
- Catholic Relief Services, Mwende Kusewa. mkusewa@ke.earo.crs.org
- Catholic Relief Services, Charles Njue. cnjue@ke.earo.crs.org
- Desert Edge, Susan Wren. susie@biotrade.co.ke
- EcoAgriculture Partners, Seth Shames. sshames@ecoagriculture.org
- Environmental Services Inc., Shawn McMahon. smcmahon@ESINC.CC
- Fintrac, Timothy Mwangi. timothy@fintrac.com
- Government of Kenya, Chief Erustus Munene Kiramiti. ekiramiti@yahoo.com
- Greenbelt Movement, Njogu Kahare. nkahare@greenbeltmovement.org
- Kenya Forestry Research Institute. Directors Office. director@kefri.org
- Kenya Forestry Service, Directors Office. director@kenyaforestservice.org
- Kenya Forestry Service, Evans Maneno, Zonal Manager, Meru. evansalwenam@yahoo.com
- Kenya Forestry Service, Daniel Mbithi, Asst. Director. dmbithi@kenyaforestservice.org
- Kenya Forestry Society. keforsoc@yahoo.co.uk
- Kenya Wildlife Service. munira@kws.go.ke
- Kenya Wildlife Service, Kenneth Esau. kesau@kws.go.ke
- Laikipia Wildlife Forum, Anthony King. director@laikipia.org
- National Environmental Management Authority (Meru), Damaris Maina. damarismaina@gmail.com
- Methodist Church, Dr. Rev. Lawi Imathiu. thiiri.lawi@gmail.com
- National Environmental Management Authority (Laikipia), Simon Weru. wellrows@gmail.com
- Northern Rangelands, Tom Lalampaa. tom@nrt-kenya.org
- Northern Rangelands, Ryan Luster. ryan.luster@nrt-kenya.org
- Northern Rangelands, Julie King. julietking@nrt-kenya.org
- Pact (worldwide), Steven Sharp. SSharp@pactworld.org
- Pact Kenya, Anthony Kariuki. anthony.kariuki@pactke.org
- Paradigm Project, Neil Bellefeuille. neil@theparadigmproject.org
- Pyrethrum Growers Association, Justus Mochache Monda. pyrethrumgrowers@yahoo.com
- Resource Projects Kenya, Kennedy Njenga. kennedynjenga@yahoo.com
- Rural Development Institute, Deborah Espinosa. deboraha@rdiland.org



- TIST, Martin Weru. martinweru@tist.org
- US Agency for International Development (USAID), Enoch Kanyanya. ekanyanya@usaid.gov
- US Agency for International Development, Wamalwa, Beatrice. bwamalwa@usaid.gov
- US Agency for International Development, Carol Douglis. cdouglis@usaid.gov
- US Agency for International Development, Mervyn Farroe. mfarroe@usaid.gov
- US Agency for International Development, Charles Oluchina. coluchina@usaid.gov
- World Agroforestry Center, Michael Misiko. m.misiko@cgiar.org
- World Wildlife Fund, Doris Ombara. Dombara@mara.wwfearpo.org
- World Wildlife Fund, Mohamed Awer. MAwer@wwfearpo.org

There were a total of 19 attendees at the public hearing and 9 formal public comments were provided. As was the case with comments received by CCB, the comments received were all in support of the TIST project, speaking primarily to the economic and social benefits from project activities. A list of the comments received is as follows:

1. **Henry Gituma, Farmer and retired Teacher, Local leader, Methodist Church circuit men's fellowship chairman.**

Contact: +254 -720 – 970 145

Our area has benefitted a lot in tree planting since TIST was introduced in our area. It was an arid region and now it has environmentally improved. I support TIST in CCBA standards.

2. **Francis Anampiu, Farmers, Church Leader , retired educationist and community opinion leader, trained volunteer paralegal by (international commission of jurists – Kenya (ICJ), trained counselor.**

Contact: +254 -722 – 332 686

I am Impressed with TIST having helped our community increase their productivity in food production through conservation farming, increased income and providing job opportunities for our youth. We are assured of long-term sustainable benefits including income, shade, within the project areas. We also benefit from medicinal value out of TIST trees like neem – used by community members

3. **Julius Ndereba: Retired health worker , farmers , businessman, Local opinion leader, STD, HIV and Aids Counselor, Alcohol and drug abuse treatment/ counselor**

Contact: +254 -726 – 343 743

I support TIST. It has trained us on CF – hence improved food productivity, lower costs of production. We sell of surplus of crop and this support us with income. CF helps enhance soil fertility- good for even tree planting. Through TIST activities we have experienced improved environment conditions- cooler climate, controlled soil erosion. Attracted bees and other pollinators. I support TIST in CCBA standards.

4. **Margaret Mwari Mburugu: Farmer (dairy, fruits farming) retired teacher trainer, community counseling – youth counseling, church leader and preacher, women leadership and empowerment leader (positive living and home economics)**

Contact: +254 -721 – 882 113



I support TIST. Rainfall – I have practically seen variant weather conditions in two different areas. One area where farmers plant trees get rainfall and another area where are no trees lack rainfall. I am therefore a testimony that where TIST activities are, including our area, those areas receive more rain than areas where tree planting activities do not take place. TIST enables mass and collective planting of trees through organized small groups. This helps positive environmental changes to happen quicker. Our trees provide fruits supply hence improved household income. Supply of firewood through pruning and thinning. Attracted birds in the area. Fodder for our goats and cows. Environment is now conducive for bee keeping hence honey supply which give income. Looking forwards for more environment services from tree planting including incentives from carbon credits.

5. **Erastus Munene Kiramiti, Small holder farmer, Administrator (chief)**

Contact: +254 -722 – 938 797

I support TIST fully. TIST program has benefited our community. Restored weather pattern as a result of tree planting. Community benefits through empowerment, firewood supply, fruits, and other crops. I support TIST in CCBA standards.

6. **Sabella M. Ringera, Poverty eradication and family matters community trainer, Official, Poultry Framers Association – Kenya,**

Contact: +254 -722 – 88 24 18

I support TIST. We are happy because TIST has employed our youth. We now have supply of wood fuel – women not tracking long distances to the forest hence additional benefit in reduced wood fuel strain from the nearby (Mt Kenya forest). We wish TIST well in CCBA standards. TIST should continue support us especially women and farmers with small lands.

7. **Dorothy Muriuki, TIST Trainer, Community Forest Association (CFA) coordinator**

Contact: +254 -726 – 788 662

TIST has empowered the community through local trainings – educating the community on how to utilize locally available resources. Established woodlots for community members hence curbing desertification. Birds species have been attracted once more as more framers plant trees. There is reduced pressure on natural forest nearby (Mt. Kenya). TIST is giving incentives to farmers hence improved household incomes - economic empowerment. TIST has employed 70+ local people. CF has resulted to soil erosion control, increased farm productivity and protection of river banks. Women are empowered in leadership as they are encouraged to lead in their own small groups and in clusters and other TIST leadership positions. Program encourages participatory community contribution and independent decision making. I support TIST in CCBA standards.

8. **Jeniffer Kithure, a farmer, TIST trainer**

Contact: +254 -726 – 31 95 39

I support TIST. I come from a semi arid area – lee way side of Mt Kenya. Since TIST started farmers have been encouraged to plant different species of trees – fodder trees, fruit trees and wood fuel trees. Also trained on CF. A lot of people have been trained on tree planting best practices in dry areas, how to harvest seeds and raise trees nurseries. Many people have benefited from trainings on leadership and group dynamics – rotational and servant leadership. TIST members have been



encouraged to protect and conserve their rivers. This is resulted to increased water quality and quantity as well as soil erosion control. TIST should continue. I support TIST in CCBA standards.

9. **Jane Kanja, TIST trainer and local farmer**

Contact: +254 -713 – 436 028

I support TIST program. Group dynamic in sharing and working together to develop income generating activities such as bee keeping, chicken keeping, cattle rearing, goat keeping, fish keeping. Technology transfer – palm computers. Employment creation to the youth. created business in TIST expansion. Improved rainfall hence increased crop yield. Trees have created beauty in our area. Birds are coming back as a result to new trees being planted. I support TIST in CCBA standards.

Update for Report Version 3

As of March 7, 2012 CAAC has demonstrated that community impact monitoring was able to identify positive and negative impacts on poorer and more vulnerable groups. The social impact monitoring used a differentiated approach that identified positive and negative impacts on poorer households and individuals and other disadvantaged groups, including women. This updated Version 3 Report serves as an update for final qualification with Gold Level requirements for **Exceptional Community Benefits**.



Validation/Verification Conclusion

ESI confirms all validation and verification activities including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance and the PDD adherence to the CCB Standard, Second Edition as documented in this report are complete and concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that the CCB Project Design Documentation *TIST Program in Kenya, CCB-001* (14 February 2011), CCB Project Implementation Report *TIST Program in Kenya, CCB-001* (28 April 2011), CCB Monitoring Plan *TIST Program in Kenya, CCB-001* (14 February 2011) and the CCB Monitoring Report *TIST Program in Kenya, CCB-001* (14 February 2011) meets the requirements of the CCB Standards (Second Edition – December 2008) and Gold Level for Exceptional Community Benefits.

Submittal Information

Report Submitted to:	Charlie Williams Clean Air Action Corporation 7134 South Yale Avenue, Suite 310 Tulsa, OK 74136 Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance
Report Submitted (CCBA-Approved Verifier) by:	Environmental Services Inc. 7220 Financial Way, Suite 100 Jacksonville, Florida 32256



<p>Lead Validator/Verifier and Regional Technical Manager (QA/QC) Names and Signatures:</p>	<p> Shawn McMahon- Lead Validator/Verifier</p> <p> Janice McMahon – Vice President and Regional Technical Manager Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division</p>
<p>Date:</p>	<p>9 March 2011</p>

SPM/JPM/rmb/FV10009.00 Valid/Verif Report v3.doc
K pf 3/9/12f