



ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance Project Validation / Verification Report Version 2

The International Small Group & Tree Planting Program, Uganda, CCB-001

11 May 2012

Project No. VO11074.00

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
Validation/Verification Findings	8
G1 Original Conditions in the Project Area	8
G2 Baseline Projections	12
G3 Project Design and Goals	14
G4 Management Capacity and Best Practices.....	18
G5 Legal Status and Property Rights	20
CL1 Net Positive Climate Impacts	22
CL2 Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”)	24
CL3 Climate Impact Monitoring	25
CM1 Net Positive Community Impacts	26
CM2 Offsite Stakeholder Impacts	27
CM3 Community Impact Monitoring.....	28
B1 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts	29
B2 Offsite Biodiversity Impacts.....	31
B3 Biodiversity Impact Monitoring	31
Gold Level Section.....	33
GL1 Climate Change Adaptation Benefits	33
GL2 Exceptional Community Benefits.....	33
GL3 Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits	36
Public Shareholder Comments	36



Validation/Verification Conclusion	36
Submittal Information	37

Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance TIST Program in Uganda CCB-001 Validation/Verification Report

Introduction

This report presents the findings of an audit conducted by Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI), to validate and verify the claims made by the TIST program in Uganda that the CCB-001 project conforms to the Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (Second Edition- December 2008). ESI is accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) under ISO 14065:2007 for greenhouse gas validation and verification bodies and is an approved auditor for the Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) to perform such validations and verifications.

Contact Information

Client Name Address Phone Website	Clean Air Action Corporation 7134 South Yale Avenue, Suite 310 Tulsa, OK 74136 918-747-8749 www.tist.org
Contact Name Address Phone	Charlie Williams Clean Air Action Corporation 7134 South Yale Avenue, Suite 310 Tulsa, OK 74136 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>ESI followed the criteria and validation/verification guidance documents provided by CCBA located at www.climate-standards.org. These documents included the following:</p> <p>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></p>
Level of Assurance	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> .
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 2003 to 31 December 2011.</p>
Validation/Verification Date(s)	16 November 2011 – 01 May 2012
Materiality	Materiality is a concept that errors, omissions and misrepresentations could affect the project design assertions and influence the intended users. CCB does not specifically outline a materiality threshold; however, ESI used a 5% threshold for evidence. If a non-conformance was discovered, the project developer was given the opportunity to correct the non-conformity to the project design document within a reasonable timeframe (within 30 days).
Site Visits	01 December 2011 – 09 December 2011



<p>Validation/Verification Team</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shawn McMahon – Lead Validator/Verifier (330-833-9941/ smcmahon@esinc.cc) • Caitlin Sellers – Validator/Verifier Team Member (csellers@esinc.cc/ 904-361-8227) • Rich Scharf – Validation/Verification Team Member (rscharf@esinc.cc / 252-402-7354) • Stewart McMorrow – Validation/Verification Trainee (smcmorrow@esinc.cc /530-412-1221) • James Moody – Validation/Verification Trainee (jmoody@esinc.cc / 904-627-6877) • Janice McMahon – QA/QC (jmcmahon@esinc.cc / 330.833.9941)
<p>Final Documents from Client</p>	<p>TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 14a Public Comments CCB-001.doc TIST UG PD-CCB-001f App05 Implementation Rpt 120229.doc" TIST UG PD-CCB-001a PD Text 120221.doc" TIST UG PD-CCB-001b App01 LSat1990 Map.jgw TIST UG PD-CCB-001b App01 LSat1990 Map.jpg TIST UG PD-CCB-001c App02 LSat2090 Map.jgw TIST UG PD-CCB-001c App02 LSat2090 Map.jpg.part TIST UG PD-CCB-001d App03 PA Plots.kml TIST UG PD-CCB-001e App04 Data 111006.xls TIST UG PD-CCB-001g App06 Monitoring Plan 120221.doc TIST UG PD-CCB-001h App07 Monitoring Report 120427.doc TIST UG PD-CCB-001i App08 Monitoring Data 120221.xls TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 22 GL2 Community Survey Result.doc TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 21 GL2 Community Survey Template.doc</p>
<p>Timeline</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23 November 2011 – Project Development Document-CCB received • 01 December 2011 – Opening Meeting • 01 December-09 December 2011 – on-site inspection, including stakeholder meetings • 03 January 2012– initial review of PDD, PIR, and Monitoring Report – submittal to CCBA for public posting • 04 January 2012– 1st round of NCRs/OFIs, produced and submitted • 09 January 2012 – project posted for 30-day public comment period) • 16 March 2012– Draft validation/verification report prepared • 20 March 2012 (tentative) – Closing meeting • 01 May 2012 (tentative) – Final validation/verification report submitted to CAAC and CCB
<p>Public Comment Period</p>	<p>09 January to 08 February 2012 – Project listing on CCBA website for public comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One comment in support of project listed (8 Feb 2012)
<p>Number of Comments Received</p>	<p>20 January, 2012- Public meeting at the Kirigime Guest House in Kabale, Uganda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nine comments in strong support of TIST

Project Description

The International Small Group and Tree Planting Program (TIST) empower Small Groups of 6-to-12 subsistence farmers in India, Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda 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 65,000 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 Uganda began in 2003 and has grown to nearly 65,000 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 Uganda program and corresponds to TIST VCS project descriptions VCS-001, VCS-002, VCS-003 and VCS-004. It applies to 456 Small Groups 2,932 members, 1,645 project areas and 1,487.5 ha.

Executive Summary of Validation/Verification Results

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



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

Validation/Verification Findings

G1 Original Conditions in the Project Area

Indicator G1.1 – The location of the project and basic physical parameters (e.g. soil, geology, climate).	PDD gives a detailed description of the soils, climate and geology, as well as of the general locations of the participating farmer areas.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, field visit and discussions/demonstration of project location with field staff.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings supported the information provided in the PDD.

Indicator G1.2 – The types and condition of vegetation within the project area.	The PDD provides a description of the existing regional vegetation, which is broadly described as cropland and grassland with a few scattered residual trees.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, Grove summary worksheet, field visit and discussions with the project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. VERIFICATION: The PDD states “The individual project areas are generally cropland and grassland with a few scattered trees.”
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	VERIFICATION: Please change the text in the PDD to indicate what the project areas consist of now or that they “were” generally etc...”
Date issued	4 January 2012
Project proponent response/actions and date	Text has been changes as requested.
Evidence used to close CAR	PDD
Date closed	27 February 2012

Indicator G1.3 – The boundaries of the project area and the project zone.	The PDD discusses the project area and greater project zone. The boundaries for these areas are mapped in GIS format and are sufficient to confirm location and boundaries.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD page 6, field visit, discussions/demonstration of parcel boundaries with field staff.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings supported the information provided in the PDD.

Indicator G1.4 - Current carbon stocks within the project area(s), using stratification by land-use or vegetation type and methods of carbon calculation (such as biomass plots, formulae, default values) from the	The PDD states that the baseline carbon stocks were estimated based on the approved Clean Development Mechanism methodology AR-AMS0001, Version 06: <i>Simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale A/R CDM project activities implemented on grasslands or croplands with limited displacement of pre-project activities</i> . Table G.1.4 shows the strata selected for the
--	---



Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's 2006 Guidelines for National GHG Inventories for Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use ⁵ (IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU) or a more robust and detailed methodology.	baseline calculation, the hectares and percent of area of each stratum and the appropriate factors needed to determine the baseline carbon stocks. PDD also lists assumptions made for the calculations of carbon.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD page 8, table G1.4. Appendix 04 "Baseline Strata" worksheet.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support compliance with indicator.

Indicator G1.5 - A description of communities located in the project zone, including basic socio-economic and cultural information that describes the social, economic and cultural diversity within communities (wealth, gender, age, ethnicity etc.), identifies specific groups such as Indigenous Peoples ⁸ and describes any community characteristics.	The PDD includes a description of the ethnicities of the communities in the project zone and provided info regarding literacy, income rates as well as occupation.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD page 8, table G1.5, discussions with project proponent, residents and site visit.
Findings:	This section needs a more robust description of the other suggested aspects of the communities being benefitted.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	VALIDATION: Please add a more robust description of the other suggested attributes of the communities located in the project zone. These include gender diversity, age, marital status and identification of indigenous peoples. Exhibit 13 is referenced but is not available on TIST website.
Date issued	4 January 2012
Project proponent response/actions and date	Marital status, gender, age groups, identification of indigenous groups all added. NCR satisfied.
Evidence used to close CAR	PDD
Date closed	27 Feb 2012

Indicator G1.6 - A description of current land use and customary and legal property rights including community property in the project zone, identifying any ongoing or unresolved conflicts or disputes and identifying and describing any disputes over land tenure that were resolved during the last ten years (see also G5).	The PDD describes the land as being owned in several different systems, those being customary tenure, leasehold tenure, freehold tenure and mailo land.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD page 9, site visit and discussions with quantifiers and project managers.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and appendices, however no info was presented regarding any possible land conflicts or disputes.



Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	VALIDATION: Please describe if any land disputes or conflicts exist.
Date issued	4 January 2012
Project proponent response/actions and date	No land use disputes identified.
Evidence used to close CAR	PDD
Date closed	27 Feb 2012

Indicator G1.7 - A description of current biodiversity within the project zone (diversity of species and ecosystems) and threats to that biodiversity, using appropriate methodologies, substantiated where possible with appropriate reference material.	PDD offers a description of some of the major forest types and gives details for several insect, birds, amphibian, plant and other animal types. PDD uses common references easily found on line.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD page 10, referenced information websites, site visit and discussions with quantifiers and project managers.
Findings:	PDD does not mention if there are any threats to these plants and animals.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	VALIDATION: Please add a discussion of threats to biodiversity and appropriate methodologies used.
Date issued	4 January 2012
Project proponent response/actions and date	All of these natural ecosystems are under threat. A review of WWF's findings, local environmental reports, field visits and satellite imagery document how human activity has expanded to shrink these systems to a point they only exist in protected lands such as the national parks. Continued human illegal encroachment to take wood and bush meet continues to threaten and affect the protected areas.
Evidence used to close CAR	PDD
Date closed	27 Feb 2012

Indicator G1.8 - An evaluation of whether the project zone includes any of the following High Conservation Values (HCVs) and a description of the qualifying attributes. Indicator G1.8.1 - Globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values: a. protected areas b. threatened species c. endemic species d. areas that support significant concentrations of a species during any time in their lifecycle (e.g. migrations,	PDD describes 8.1 as the sole biodiversity element that is qualifying the project under this indicator. PDD offers a description and discussion of high conservation values in the form of plants and animals that are considered rare, threatened, endangered and the various national parks that support those species. The guidance on the HCV website suggests HCV's are internally determined based on a few guidelines. However, it is unclear if HCV guidance was followed, specifically for Indicators 8.1 – 8.6.
---	---

<p>feeding grounds, breeding areas).</p> <p>Indicator G1.8.2 - 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 G1.8.3 Threatened or rare ecosystems.</p> <p>Indicator G1.8.4 - Areas that provide critical ecosystem services (e.g., hydrological services, erosion control, fire control).</p> <p>Indicator G1.8.5 - 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 G1.8.6 - Areas that are critical for the traditional cultural identity of communities (e.g., areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in collaboration with the communities).</p>	
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>PDD page 11, referenced material, discussions with local farmers and project managers.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Section G.1.8 generally address HCV's for the project, but the PDD/PIR do not appear to adhere to the guidelines set forth in the HCV Network.</p>
<p>Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:</p>	<p>VALIDATION/VERIFICATION: Please address each HCV indicator specifically in the PDD/PIR.</p>
<p>Date issued</p>	<p>4 January 2012</p>
<p>Project proponent response/actions and date</p>	<p>PDD now lists reasons why both Queen Elizabeth National Park and Bwindi Impenetrable National Park qualify for globally, regionally and nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values.</p>
<p>Evidence used to close CAR</p>	<p>PDD</p>
<p>Date closed</p>	<p>27 Feb 2012</p>



G2 Baseline Projections

<p>Indicator G2.1 - Describe the most likely land-use scenario in the absence of the project following IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU or a more robust and detailed methodology, describing the range of potential land use scenarios and the associated drivers of GHG emissions and justifying why the land-use scenario selected is most likely.</p>	<p>The PDD states that the most likely scenario without TIST is for the project areas to continue to be grasslands and cropland. PDD uses CDM small scale afforestation reforestation methodology AR-AMS0001 Version 06: <i>Simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale A/R CDM project activities implemented on grasslands or croplands with limited displacement of pre-project activities</i>. PDD also offers reason why there are little other options for alternative land uses in absence of the project.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Page 13 of PDD, site visit and discussions with TIST farmers.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support compliance with indicator.</p>
<p>Indicator G2.2 - Document that project benefits would not have occurred in the absence of the project, explaining how existing laws or regulations would likely affect land use and justifying that the benefits being claimed by the project are truly ‘additional’ and would be unlikely to occur without the project.</p>	<p>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 barriers selected were "investment barrier" and "barriers due to social conditions, lack of organization". The PDD describes the various challenges faced by the community members who are participating in the TIST program, who have little access to credit needed to establish groves and organizational structure to see them planted. PDD also describes Ugandan forest policy that further outlines deforestation.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Page 13-16 of PDD, sited references, site visit.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with the indicator.</p>
<p>Indicator G2.3 - Calculate the estimated carbon stock changes associated with the ‘without project’ reference scenario described above. This requires estimation of carbon stocks for each of the land-use classes of concern and a definition of the carbon pools included, among the classes defined in the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU. The timeframe for this analysis can be either the project lifetime (see G3) or the project GHG accounting period, whichever is more appropriate. Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO2 GHG emissions such as CH4 and N2O in the ‘without project’ scenario. Non-CO2 gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of</p>	<p>PDD uses the CDM small scale afforestation reforestation methodology AR-AMS0001 Version 06: <i>Simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale A/R CDM project activities implemented on grasslands or croplands with limited displacement of pre-project activities</i>. As described in section G2.1, the most likely scenario for the project lands is to continue as agricultural land, subject to ongoing intervention through human habitation. As described in section G2.2 (Forest Policies), the project zone is undergoing a decrease in forest cover and therefore carbon stocks. PDD calculates that the without project estimation is 4,394 tons and that there are no non-CO2 emissions.</p>



<p>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 page 16-17, Baseline tree worksheet.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Information presented in PDD supports validation/verification and compliance with indicator.</p>
<p>Indicator G2.4 - Describe how the ‘without project’ reference scenario would affect communities in the project zone, including the impact of likely changes in water, soil and other locally important ecosystem services.</p>	<p>PDD discusses all of the elements of the TIST program that would not be occurring if the TIST program was not in place. These include training in health, agriculture and leadership. Illegal tree harvest and resulting water and soil degradation would continue to be the normal situation and living conditions would not improve in the communities where TIST is present.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Page 17 of PDD site visit, interviews with farmers in project area.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification conformance with indicator is confirmed.</p>
<p>Indicator G2.5 - Describe how the ‘without project’ reference scenario would affect biodiversity in the project zone (e.g., habitat availability, landscape connectivity and threatened species).</p>	<p>The PDD discusses the improvements to biodiversity that has and will result from the addition of two million additional trees to an area where increasing populations of humans have led to declines. Although the threatened species in the project zone are long gone from the project areas, the indigenous trees and additional forest cover will have a positive effect on them by improving connectivity and corridors among the protected areas.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Page 18 of PDD and site visit. G2.2</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.</p>



G3 Project Design and Goals

<p>Indicator G3.1 - Provide a summary of the project’s major climate, community and biodiversity objectives.</p>	<p>The objectives of TIST are to: 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.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Page 18 of PDD, discussions with TIST staff.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with indicator.</p>
<p>Indicator G3.2 - Describe each project activity with expected climate, community and biodiversity impacts and its relevance to achieving the project’s objectives.</p>	<p>Activities include Nursery Training and development, tree planting, selective use of tree products and training on social and health issues. PDD describes the climate, community and biodiversity impacts of these activities.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Pages 18 and 19 of PDD, site visit and discussions with TIST farmers.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with indicator.</p>
<p>Indicator G3.3 - Provide a map identifying the project location and boundaries of the project area(s), where the project activities will occur, of the project zone and of additional surrounding locations that are predicted to be impacted by project activities (e.g. through leakage).</p>	<p>PDD presents three maps that show the project zone and individual project areas.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Site visit and PDD page 19 and appendix 01, 02, and 03.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.</p>
<p>Indicator G3.4 - Define the project lifetime and GHG accounting period and explain and justify any differences between them. Define an implementation schedule, indicating key dates and milestones in the project’s development.</p>	<p>PDD states a lifetime and GHG accounting period being the same, at 30 years starting on January 1, 2003.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Pages 19-21 of PDD, associated charts, field visit.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.</p>
<p>Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:</p>	<p>Clarification: In the implementation schedule, please clarify why “periodic verification” will occur until 2063. We understand this is a 30 year project period with the opportunity to extend, but would be helpful to re-word to be consistent with crediting period.</p>



Date issued	4 January 2012
Project proponent response/actions and date	Corrected PDD to indicate 2012-2033 for periodic verification.
Evidence used to close CAR	PDD
Date closed	27 Feb 2012

Indicator G3.5 - Identify likely natural and human-induced risks to the expected climate, community and biodiversity benefits during the project lifetime and outline measures adopted to mitigate these risks.	PDD discusses risks associated with the carbon market and sales of credits, farmers dropping out of the program, natural risks and programmatic limitations on eligibility. PDD describes adequate mitigations for each.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 21 of PDD.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

Indicator G3.6 - Demonstrate that the project design includes specific measures to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes identified in G1 consistent with the precautionary principle.	TIST trees are planted on the lands of small hold farmers, so the maintenance of HCV areas is indirect. The proximity of the Project Areas to the HCV forests will reduce illegal wood harvesting. 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 HCV area. TIST trees are being planted where deforestation has taken place and the addition of many discrete project areas helps improve the wild life corridors between HCV areas needed for healthy animal populations.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 22 of PDD
Findings:	Information presented in PDD and site visit confirm validation/verification compliance with this indicator.

Indicator G3.7 - Describe the measures that will be taken to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.	TIST is a comprehensive program that includes training in climate change and biodiversity. The PDD describes some of the training and their benefits
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 22 of PDD and site visit discussions with trainers.
Findings:	Information presented in PDD and site visit confirm validation/verification compliance with this indicator.

Indicator G3.8 - Document and defend how communities and other stakeholders potentially affected by the project activities have been identified and have been involved in project design through effective consultation, particularly with a view to optimizing community and stakeholder benefits, respecting local customs and values and maintaining high	PDD details actions taken when starting a new TIST program in an area and in ongoing program management. TIST advertises these meetings on the radio and in local newspapers. TIST welcomes input from local leaders as well as TIST farmers and outsiders. Several recent comments are presented.
---	--



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.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Pages 22-26 of PDD and site visit.
Findings:	While the PDD covers this indicator well, it does not appear to mention any revisions or return comments on the public input presented.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	VALIDATION/VERIFICATION: Please indicate in the PDD/PIR if and how the project proposal was revised based on community input.
Date issued	4 January 2012
Project proponent response/actions and date	TIST has included responses for all of the comments received from the public. TIST also has included the statement, "Based on the comments and responses above, no changes are necessary for the project. "
Evidence used to close CAR	PDD
Date closed	27 Feb 2012

Indicator G3.9 - Describe what specific steps have been taken, and communications methods used, to publicize the CCBA public comment period to communities and other stakeholders and to facilitate their submission of comments to CCBA. Project proponents must play an active role in distributing key project documents to affected communities and stakeholders and hold widely publicized information meetings in relevant local or regional languages.	TIST will announce the intent to apply for a CCBA validation in Kampala papers, announcing a public meeting and a public meeting will be held. In addition, emails will be sent to stakeholders announcing the public meeting, announcing the intent to apply and providing a link to the CCBA website where the project description is posted. Specifics regarding the announcements, public meeting, emails and email recipients are in support document "TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 14 Public Comments PD-001.doc."
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 26 of PDD and discussions with project participants.
Findings:	PDD describes process for publicizing CCB application.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Additional Evidence Request: Please provide copy of announcement of CCB public comment period and public meeting scheduled for January 20 th .
Date issued	4 January 2012
Project proponent response/actions and date	"TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 14 Public Comments PD-001.doc." Provided to verifiers.



Evidence used to close CAR	"TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 14 Public Comments PD-001.doc."
Date closed	27 Feb 2012

<p>Indicator G3.10 - Formalize a clear process for handling unresolved conflicts and grievances that arise during project planning and implementation. The project design must include a process for hearing, responding to and resolving community and other stakeholder grievances within a reasonable time period. This grievance process must be publicized to communities and other stakeholders and must be managed by a third party or mediator to prevent any conflict of interest. Project management must attempt to resolve all reasonable grievances raised, and provide a written response to grievances within 30 days. Grievances and project responses must be documented.</p>	<p>All grievances are first brought to the attention of the Uganda Staff where the issues are compared to standard TIST policy, TIST values and/or the Greenhouse Gas agreement among the Small Group members and CAAC. The policies and values are the subject of training at seminars, in the field, 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, decisions are made by Uganda Staff and TIST Management.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 26 of PDD and references.
Findings:	PDD does not list any form of third party dispute resolution entity in the conflicts and grievances process.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	VALIDATION: Please describe how TIST will use a third party or mediator to prevent any conflict of interest.
Date issued	4 January 2012
Project proponent response/actions and date	If conflicts or grievances cannot be resolved internally, CAAC will submit to arbitration in accordance with the Arbitration and Conciliation Act 2000 of Uganda.
Evidence used to close CAR	PDD
Date closed	27 Feb 2012

<p>Indicator G3.11 - Demonstrate that financial mechanisms adopted, including projected revenues from emissions reductions and other sources, are likely to provide an adequate flow of funds for project implementation and to achieve the anticipated climate, community and biodiversity benefits.</p>	<p>PDD describes the financial situation with regards to this project and the CAAC and TIST relationship.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 26 of PDD and references and discussions with project management.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.



G4 Management Capacity and Best Practices

<p>Indicator G4.1 - Identify a single project proponent which is responsible for the project’s design and implementation. If multiple organizations or individuals are involved in the project’s development and implementation the governance structure, roles and responsibilities of each of the organizations or individuals involved must also be described.</p>	<p>The project proponent is Clean Air Action Corporation (CAAC). The role of CAAC and other parties involved with TIST are summarized.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Page 27 of PDD and meeting with CAAC.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.</p>

<p>Indicator G4.2 - Document key technical skills that will be required to implement the project successfully, including community engagement, biodiversity assessment and carbon measurement and monitoring skills. Document the management team’s expertise and prior experience implementing land management projects at the scale of this project. If relevant experience is lacking, the proponents must either demonstrate how other organizations will be partnered with to support the project or have a recruitment strategy to fill the gaps.</p>	<p>The PDD details an extensive breadth of knowledge and experience of the founders and staff of TIST as well as details their experience with numerous similar projects across the globe.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Pages 27 and 28 of PDD</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>PDD and site visit confirm validation/verification compliance with this indicator.</p>

<p>Indicator G4.3 - Include a plan to provide orientation and training for the project’s employees and relevant people from the communities with an objective 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</p>	<p>The PDD describes “TIST begins in an area with a series of orientation seminars such as identified in G3.8. TIST members are introduced to the program and participate in the customization of the program to the locale. Most of the local staff is hired from the TIST membership. All quantifiers and trainers are from the local membership. Staff and quantifiers are hired based on ability, not gender, tribe, cultural background, or level of education. However, all effort is made to ensure a balance in gender and tribal affiliation. Training is passed on to new workers through the seminars and working with an experienced TIST member. As needed, the US team holds seminars to provide new information”.</p>
---	--

not be lost.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 28 and 29 of PDD and site visit.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.
Indicator G4.4 - Show that people from the communities will be given an equal opportunity to fill all employment positions (including management) if the job requirements are met. Project proponents must explain how employees will be selected for positions and where relevant, must indicate how local community members, including women and other potentially underrepresented groups, will be given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained.	PDD describes the hiring opportunities of the program, and where the employees are hired from. TIST states that all members have an opportunity to be group leaders, contractors, employees and volunteers regardless of gender education or social status.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 29 of PDD and site visit.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

Indicator G4.5 - Submit a list of all relevant laws and regulations covering worker's rights in the host country. Describe how the project will inform workers about their rights. Provide assurance that the project meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering worker rights and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.	<p>The employment laws are listed below. CAAC uses Uganda counsel for advice on issues relating to employment. CAAC claims it is not in violation of these laws.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Employment Act, 2006 • National Social Security Fund Act, Cap 222
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 29 of PDD and interviews.
Findings:	PDD does not give detail as to how workers are made aware of their rights.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	VALIDATION: Describe how the project will inform workers about their rights.
Date issued	4 January 2012
Project proponent response/actions and date	All employees are given an overview of their rights when hired or at training meetings. The contents of Exhibit 16, "TIST Uganda: Employee Rights" are provided to them either verbally or in writing.
Evidence used to close CAR	PDD
Date closed	27 Feb 2012

Indicator G4.6 - Comprehensively assess situations and occupations that pose a substantial risk to worker safety.	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
--	---



<p>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>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 and bota-botas (the local mini bus transportation and motor bike, respectively) 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; <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>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>PDD, safety policy regarding quantifier safety and site visit.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.</p>

<p>Indicator G4.7 - Document the financial health of the implementing organization(s) to demonstrate that financial resources budgeted will be adequate to implement the project.</p>	<p>CAAC has been in business since 1993 and has operated TIST for over 10 years. CAAC is profitable after all TIST expenses. Financial statements and a financial plan have been made available to the Validator/Verifier.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Page 30 of PDD and financial plan provided to validator.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.</p>

G5 Legal Status and Property Rights

<p>Indicator G5.1 - Submit a list of all relevant national and local laws and regulations in the host country and all applicable international treaties and agreements. Provide assurance that the project will comply with these and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.</p>	<p>PDD lists several laws that in some way may be relevant to TIST and the PDD describes their compliance or lack of a need to for each law listed.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Page 30 of PDD and references.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.</p>

<p>Indicator G5.2 - Document that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, including the established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the communities.</p>	<p>There are no approvals necessary for a farmer to plant trees on his/her lands. However, TIST has engaged the Uganda Forest Service and local forest and environmental offices to seek their approval.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Page 31 of PDD and site visit</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this</p>



	indicator.
Indicator G5.3 - Demonstrate with documented consultations and agreements that the project will not encroach uninvited on private property, community property, or government property and has obtained the free, prior, and informed consent of those whose rights will be affected by the project.	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:	Page 31 of PDD and site visit discussions with farmers and locals.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.
Indicator G5.4 - Demonstrate that the project does not require the involuntary relocation of people or of the activities important for the livelihoods and culture of the communities. If any relocation of habitation or activities is undertaken within the terms of an agreement, the project proponents must demonstrate that the agreement was made with the free, prior, and informed consent of those concerned and includes provisions for just and fair compensation.	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. Participation is strictly voluntary. CAAC has no authority to relocate any of the members or land owners.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 31 of PDD and site visit discussions with farmers.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.
Indicator G5.5 - 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.	Illegal harvesting of trees and charcoal making exist in the protected forests of the project zone. This is an ongoing problem for Ugandan forestry 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:	Page 31 of PDD and site visit observations.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.
Indicator G5.6 - Demonstrate that the project proponents have clear, uncontested title to the carbon rights, or provide legal documentation demonstrating that the project is	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



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.	products can be subject to contract and transferred to others.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Pages 31 and 32 of PDD as well as site visit discussions with farmers.
Findings:	Validation findings support conformance with this indicator.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	VERIFICATION: Please provide samples of executed GHG agreements (see VCS NCR's Round 1 for list of selected sample).
Date issued	4 January 2012
Project proponent response/actions and date	Samples provided via a web site link for all the VCS samples requested. An English version was also provided.
Evidence used to close CAR	Samples provided.
Date closed	28 Feb 2012

CL1 Net Positive Climate Impacts

Indicator CL1.1 - Estimate the net change in carbon stocks due to the project activities using the methods of calculation, formulae and default values of the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU or using a more robust and detailed methodology. The net change is equal to carbon stock changes <i>with</i> the project minus carbon stock changes <i>without</i> the project (the latter having been estimated in G2). This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about how project activities will alter GHG emissions of carbon stocks over the duration of the project or the project GHG accounting period.	The change with the project is based on the ex-ante estimation required of the methodology. The trees to be planted are stratified by major species and year planted and each strata is grown over time, based on accepted annual volume increments. The PDD lists the major species and the factors used to estimate the carbon that will result from TIST trees. The PDD uses the AR-AMS0001 Version 6 methodology. Due to the methodology, the change in baseline carbon is ignored and the ex-ante net change in carbon stocks is 1,487,293 tonnes of CO ₂ e in PDD.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Pages 33 and 34 of PDD, AR-AMS0001 worksheet and other references and site visit.
Findings:	Project is in compliance with this indicator; however, there is one additional reference to provide.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	VALIDATION and VERIFICATION: Please review the reference for the <i>Pinus patula</i> annual increment in volume. The reference made is for <i>grevillia</i> .
Date issued	4 January 2012
Project proponent response/actions and	Correct reference made for <i>pinus</i> and <i>grevillia</i> reference has been



date	removed.
Evidence used to close CAR	PDD and reference
Date closed	27 Feb 2012

Indicator CL1.2 - Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO2 GHG emissions such as CH4 and N2O in the <i>with</i> and <i>without</i> project scenarios if those gases are likely to account for 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.	The change in emissions of non-CO2 carbon stocks are expected to be below 5% and are ignored. Sources of these emissions would be broadcast burning or fertilization, both of which do not occur on these types of projects or in this area due to local needs and conditions.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 35 of PDD and site visit observations.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

Indicator CL1.3 - Estimate any other GHG emissions resulting from project activities. Emissions sources include, but are not limited to, emissions from biomass burning during site preparation, emissions from fossil fuel combustion, direct emissions from the use of synthetic fertilizers, and emissions from the decomposition of N-fixing species.	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:	Pages 35 and 36 of PDD and site visit observations.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

Indicator CL1.4 - Demonstrate that the net climate impact of the project is positive. The net climate impact of the project is the net change in carbon stocks plus net change in non-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 ex-ante estimate is that TIST trees will sequester 1,487,293 tonnes of CO2e over the 30 years 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.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 34 of PIR and site visit
Findings:	Project is in compliance with this indicator, however the PIR makes a statement that requires a reference.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	VERIFICATION: Please reference the source of the statement "At the time of the first verification about 145,000 tonnes had been sequestered."
Date issued	4 January 2012



Project proponent response/actions and date	Referenced statement has been removed. Sequestered amounts have been corrected.
Evidence used to close CAR	PDD
Date closed	27 Feb 2012

Indicator CL1.5 - Specify how double counting of GHG emissions reductions or removals will be avoided, particularly for offsets sold on the voluntary market and generated in a country with an emissions cap.	The PDD states that “the project areas that make up this CCB PD are being validated and verified under VCS. If they are validated and verified, VCS will issue VERs that will be entered on one registry. The registry rules will prevent these VERs from being sold twice. Uganda is not subject to an emissions cap.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 36 of PDD and site visit
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

CL2 Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”)

Indicator CL2.1 - Determine the types of leakage that are expected and estimate potential offsite increases in GHGs (increases in emissions or decreases in sequestration) due to project activities. Where relevant, define and justify where leakage is most likely to take place.	While no leakage is expected to result from the project, the potential sources of leakage are reviewed and the reasons why these don't apply to the project are presented.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD page 36 and site visit observations and discussions with TIST farmers.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

Indicator CL2.2 - Document how any leakage will be mitigated and estimate the extent to which such impacts will be reduced by these mitigation activities.	Because no leakage sources have been identified, no mitigation is necessary.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 36 of PDD and site visit discussions with TIST farmers.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

Indicator CL2.3 - Subtract any likely project-related unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts from the climate benefits being claimed by the project and demonstrate that this has been included in the evaluation of net climate impact of the project (as calculated in CL1.4).	Because there is no expected leakage, the amount to be subtracted from the net climate impact of the project is zero.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 37 of PDD and site visit observations.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.



<p>Indicator CL2.4 - 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.</p>	<p>None have been identified.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Page 37 of PDD and site visit.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.</p>

CL3 Climate Impact Monitoring

<p>Indicator CL3.1 - Develop an initial plan for selecting carbon pools and non-CO2 GHGs to be monitored, and determine the frequency of monitoring. Potential pools include aboveground biomass, litter, dead wood, belowground biomass, wood products, soil carbon and peat. Pools to monitor must include any pools expected to decrease as a result of project activities, including those in the region outside the project boundaries resulting from all types of leakage identified in CL2. A plan must be in place to continue leakage monitoring for at least five years after all activity displacement or other leakage causing activity has taken place. Individual GHG sources may be considered ‘insignificant’ and do not have to be accounted for if together such omitted decreases in carbon pools and increases in GHG emissions amount to less than 5% of the total CO2-equivalent benefits generated by the project. Non-CO2 gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of CO2-equivalent) of the project’s overall GHG impact over each monitoring period. Direct field measurements using scientifically robust sampling must be used to measure more significant elements of the project’s carbon stocks.</p>	<p>TIST has developed and put into practice an extensive monitoring plan that measures standing carbon stocks on a yearly basis. Field methods include measuring 100% of all countable carbon stocks.</p>
---	---

Other data must be suitable to the project site and specific forest type.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Pages 37-43 of PDD and site visit, including discussions with field crews.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

Indicator CL3.2 - Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.	TIST developed a full monitoring plan and it was available for review.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 43 PDD, PIR Appendix 06, and site visit.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.
	Opportunity for Improvement: The PDD should state that TIST has developed and implemented the monitoring plan and include the monitoring plan as an Appendix of the PDD. "A full monitoring plan was developed and is available as Appendix 06." Added to the PDD. 27 Feb 2012

CM1 Net Positive Community Impacts

Indicator CM1.1 - Use appropriate methodologies to estimate the impacts on communities, including all constituent socio-economic or cultural groups such as indigenous peoples (defined in G1), resulting from planned project activities. A credible estimate of impacts must include changes in community well-being due to project activities and an evaluation of the impacts by the affected groups. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about how project activities will alter social and economic well-being, including potential impacts of changes in natural resources and ecosystem services identified as important by the communities (including water and soil resources), over the	PDD lists several positive community benefits that will arise as a result of the project. Assumptions are presented as well as before and after project information. TIST has a well-developed capacity building program that promotes rotating leadership within the Small Groups that focuses on gender equality and is made available to all members, regardless of education or social standing. TIST provides training in subjects such as conservation farming, nursery development reforestation, climate change, biodiversity, building and using more fuel-efficient stoves and runs the program like a business.
---	--



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.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Pages 44-46 of PDD and site visits with farmers.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

Indicator CM1.2 - Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.4-6 will be negatively affected by the project.	Demonstration has been made that no HCV will be negatively affected.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 46 of PDD, site visit, and interviews with TIST farmers.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Complete approval of this indicator is pending based on the response provided for NCR G1.8
Date issued	4 January 2012
Project proponent response/actions and date	Response to G1.8 satisfies the indicator.
Evidence used to close CAR	PDD
Date closed	27 Feb 2012

CM2 Offsite Stakeholder Impacts

Indicator CM2.1 - Identify any potential negative offsite stakeholder impacts that the project activities are likely to cause.	<p>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, and there is ongoing training about alternatives to eucalyptus.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 47 of PDD and site visit interviews with TIST farmers and CAAC.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

Indicator CM2.2 - Describe how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite social and economic impacts.	In order to reduce the number of eucalyptus trees, TIST has been training members and trainers on indigenous trees and their benefits, as well as the negative effects of eucalyptus in sensitive areas.
---	--

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 47 of PDD and site visit.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

Indicator CM2.3 - Demonstrate that the project is not likely to result in net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups.	PDD states “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 314.8 ha of eucalyptus, out of 1,613.6 ha total project areas. This can be compared to the thousands of square kilometers that make up the project zone”
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 47 of PDD and site visits.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

CM3 Community Impact Monitoring

Indicator CM3.1 - Develop an initial plan for selecting community variables to be monitored and the frequency of monitoring and reporting to ensure that monitoring variables are directly linked to the project’s community development objectives and to anticipated impacts (positive and negative).	PDD outlines several relevant community monitoring metrics. In addition, “monitoring will be done annually as part of the overall monitoring of TIST. Data will be collected by TIST quantifiers as they visit each Small Group to count trees by species. Contracts will be collected and recorded by the administrative staff. The number of people employed or under contract with TIST and the amount of GHG payments to Small Groups will be obtained from administrative records.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Pages 47-48 of PDD, site visit and interviews.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

Indicator CM3.2 - Develop an initial plan for how they will assess the effectiveness of measures used to maintain or enhance High Conservation Values related to community well-being (G1.8.4-6) present in the project zone.	Because the project takes place on private lands that have been under human habitation and agriculture for generations, there will be no direct monitoring of HCV areas. Instead the impact will be 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:	Page 48 of PDD and site visit.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

Indicator CM3.3 - 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	TIST developed a full monitoring plan that is available for review.
---	---

other stakeholders.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD page 48 and Appendix 06.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.
	Opportunity for Improvement: The PDD should state that TIST has developed and implemented the monitoring plan and include the monitoring plan as an Appendix of the PDD. "A full monitoring plan was developed and is available as Appendix 06." Added to PDD. 27 Feb 2012

B1 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts

Indicator B1.1 - Use appropriate methodologies to estimate changes in biodiversity as a result of the project in the project zone and in the project lifetime. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions. The 'with project' scenario should then be compared with the baseline 'without project' biodiversity scenario completed in G2. The difference (i.e., the net biodiversity benefit) must be positive.	PDD details several aspects of the project area before and after the project. PDD describes expert opinion on the project areas and the effect the project will have on biodiversity. PDD outlines several native tree species that it is promoting and gives a listing of number and Ha of native trees planted so far. PDD also describes the adjacent areas that will be positively affected by the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD pages 49-53 and site visit.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.

Indicator 2 - Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.1-3 will be negatively affected by the project.	<p>The HCVs discussed in G1.8 have not been negatively affected by the project. The project areas are in the vicinity of HCVs and provide vital resources that reduce pressure on these important areas, and through the planting of indigenous trees, expands the range of biodiversity in these forests.</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 has had a positive effect on HCVs.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 53 of PDD and site visit
Findings:	Pending based on response received for NCR G1.8
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Pending based on response received for NCR G1.8
Date issued	4 January 2012
Project proponent response/actions and date	Indicator satisfied for G1.8.
Evidence used to close CAR	PDD and G1.8

Date closed	27 Feb 2012
Indicator B1.3 - Identify all species to be used by the project and show that no known invasive species will be introduced into any area affected by the project and that the population of any invasive species will not increase as a result of the project.	Because TIST does not provide seeds or seedlings, TIST farmers collect seeds from locally existing trees that have a history of being grown in the country and regionally. Farmers are trained on how to harvest seeds from local trees for their nurseries and tree planting, and on benefits of varied species. Because the farmers own the trees that they plant, the species are selected by the Small Groups based on their needs and the benefits which they desire to obtain. As a result, numerous species and varieties have been selected. Table B1.3 lists the species present in the project areas and indicates whether they are indigenous to Uganda. Additional species may be added over the life of the project as additional planting takes place. All listed species have been screened against the global database of invasive species. None of the species above are included as invasive species in Uganda.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD pages 53 and 54, Table B1.3 and site visit and selected references.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.
Indicator B1.4 - Describe possible adverse effects of non-native species used by the project on the region's environment, including impacts on native species and disease introduction or facilitation. Project proponents must justify any use of non-native species over native species	PDD details how trees are selected for planting, where the seeds come from and the overall benefits to the local farmers from the trees they have historically planted and grown. The TIST contract asks the farmers not to grow trees that are harmful to the environment and offers training in identifying the difference, as well as planting and grown indigenous trees. PDD makes a strong case for the continued planting of non-native trees that provide agricultural crops and additional resources for farmers in areas where generations of impacts have created little to no natural plant cover. Uganda National Forestry Authority promotes pine and eucalyptus for their fast growth to conserve biodiversity since cultivated wood can replace indigenous species otherwise harvested for fuel-wood degrading natural forests. No fast growing indigenous alternatives have been identified.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Pages 54 and 55 of PDD, site visit and references.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.
Indicator B1.5 - Guarantee that no GMOs will be used to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals.	No GMOs will be used by the project to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Page 55 of PDD and interviews.
Findings:	Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.



B2 Offsite Biodiversity Impacts

<p>Indicator B2.1 - Identify potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts that the project is likely to cause.</p>	<p>No negative offsite biodiversity impacts are expected. As pointed out in section CL2.1, 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 thinning, 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>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Page 55 of PDD and site visit.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.</p>

<p>Indicator B2.2 - Document how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite biodiversity impacts.</p>	<p>Not applicable, since no negative offsite biodiversity impacts are expected.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Page 55 of PDD and site visit discussions with local farmers.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.</p>

<p>Indicator B2.3 - 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.</p>	<p>No negative offsite biodiversity impacts are anticipated. Therefore net effect of the project on biodiversity is positive.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>PDD pages 55 and 56, site visit discussions with TIST farmers.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Due to the fact that project areas had no trees and were cultivated with agricultural products prior to TIST, the project will have positive biological impact due to the presence of trees. Therefore the project is considered to be in compliance with this indicator.</p>

B3 Biodiversity Impact Monitoring

<p>Indicator B3.1 - Develop an initial plan for selecting biodiversity variables to be monitored and the frequency of monitoring and reporting to ensure that monitoring variables are directly linked</p>	<p>TIST has been operation in Uganda since 2003 and has deployed a monitoring system that collects data for, among other things, biodiversity. The monitoring plan described in described in the PDD.</p> <p>“The plan uses TIST’s strength in gathering, verifying, and analyzing</p>
---	--



<p>to the project’s biodiversity objectives and to anticipated impacts (positive and negative).</p>	<p>field data to measure critical biodiversity metrics in the farms and groves where TIST farmers work and live. Trees will be the main focus of biodiversity impact monitoring since they provide important habitat diversity and structural features for biodiversity. Tree biodiversity is expected to increase as a result of awareness raising, training and incentives. We will monitor and report on the TIST website the species planted, number of trees of each species planted in each area, and, as the trees grow, the age and circumference of these trees. Quantification is a constant process and as a project area is monitored, new data will populate the website. Annual monitoring of each site is expected and a minimum of every two years will be achieved.”</p> <p>At a landscape level, TIST will monitor the number of hectares of land improved with indigenous tree planting by TIST farmers and their location.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>PDD page 56 and site visit as well as discussions with TIST staff.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.</p>

<p>Indicator B3.2 - Develop an initial plan for assessing the effectiveness of measures used to maintain or enhance High Conservation Values related to globally, regionally or nationally significant biodiversity (G1.8.1-3) present in the project zone.</p>	<p>Because there is no direct interaction with the HCV, the monitoring will be indirect and based on monitoring direct project achievements per B3.1 and B3.3.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Page 56 of PDD and site visit discussions with project proponent and field staff.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.</p>

<p>Indicator B3.3 - Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.</p>	<p>TIST developed a full monitoring plan that was available for review.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Page 56 of PDD, PIR Appendix 06, and site visit.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation/Verification findings support conformance with this indicator.</p>
	<p>Opportunity for Improvement: TIST should state in PDD that the monitoring plan has been developed and it should be added as an Appendix. “A full monitoring plan was developed and is available as</p>

	Appendix 06.” Added to PDD. 27 Feb 2012
--	---

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.	Uganda meets the requirements of being a low human development country. According to the UNEP, Uganda's HDI is 0.446, which gives the internet country a rank of 161 out of 187 countries with comparable data and places it in the category of low human development country.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD, site visit and reference to UNDP Human Development report. HDI scores page.
Findings:	Indicator confirmed.

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.	The project has been designed to benefit the poorest of the poor and in this case the subsistence farmers of rural Uganda. To join TIST, a farmer only needs to the join a Small Group and while most of the rural poor already have land to plant trees, they don't even need that. If they work with their friends, family or neighbors, they can plant trees on those lands and benefit. PDD goes on to discuss barrier elimination for the project entry. To demonstrate that 50% of the lower quartile in the entire community will benefit substantially from the project requires looking at the overall benefits of the program, because while TIST is open to all, 50% voluntary participation in a project zone of thousands of square kilometers is beyond the ability of any project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD and site visit. Discussions with project participants.
Findings:	It is understood that TIST does not present any barriers for the poorest of individuals to participate. From the site visit it was evident that any class and income level could participate, regardless of land ownership or other hardships. As evidenced by the site visit, this program occurs over such a wide area that it would be nearly impossible to quantify let along prove that over 50% of the lowest category of well being of the community are benefiting. The project creates no obstacles to participation and the entire region benefits from tree planting. Indicator is satisfied.

Indicator 3 - Demonstrate that any barriers or risks that might prevent benefits going to poorer households have been identified and addressed in order to increase the probable flow of benefits to	See PDD description for indicator GL2.2
---	---



poorer households.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD and site visit, as well as discussions with project participants.
Findings:	Indicator is satisfied.

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 was developed through visioning sessions with poor small-hold subsistence farmers in Tanzania in 1998 and 1999. The Small Group seminar, however, did not stop with identifying the local problems; participants established the goals of starting hundreds of Small Groups to plant trees, reduce poverty, improve health, and prevent famine. TIST Uganda adopted this approach and was designed to do as much of this as possible at the subsistence farmer level. Because this was the approach to the project, no poorer and more vulnerable households and individuals whose well-being or poverty may be negatively affected by the project have been identified.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD and site visit. Discussions with project participants.
Findings:	TIST does not appear to have any negative impacts to the communities where it is operating. The small group seminars were used to have those poorest individuals identified what would help their plight and TIST has acted on those ideas. Further, the public comments do not reflect any impacts to any groups.

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 in the process of developing a differentiated monitoring plan to identify positive and negative impacts of poorer and more vulnerable groups. The social impact monitoring will take a differentiated approach that can identify positive and negative impacts on poorer households and individuals and other disadvantaged groups, including women.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PDD and site visit.
Findings:	Because TIST is in the process of developing the plan, GL2.5 cannot be demonstrated at this time.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	Please submit a differentiated community impact monitoring plan.
Date issued:	27 Feb 2012
Project proponent response/actions	PDD states that it will develop an additional monitoring plan to demonstrate that it meets the requirements of Gold Level Exceptional Community benefits. The social impact monitoring will take a differentiated approach that can identify positive and negative impacts on poorer households and individuals and other disadvantaged groups, including women. The survey developed will be administered to randomly chosen TIST members in the first half of 2012.
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	In discussion with ESI it was agreed that CAAC would leave this pending until the data has been collected. In the meantime, CAAC



	<p>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.</p>
Date Issued:	15 March 2012
Project proponent response/actions	<p>The project proponent has developed and implemented an additional monitoring plan to demonstrate that it meets the requirements of Gold Level Exceptional Community benefits. The social impact monitoring has taken a differentiated approach that has identified positive and negative impacts on poorer households and individuals and other disadvantaged groups, including women. The survey developed was administered to randomly chosen 46 TIST members in the first half of 2012. The monitoring of the exceptional community benefits was conducted using a survey. The survey was developed by an independent contractor for TIST Kenya, who trained TIST personnel how to implement it in the field. Hakim Buchwa was designated the host country team leader and trained six TIST members on how to conduct the survey. The interview tool consisted of 37 questions within five main topic areas, including demographic/basic information, TIST membership information, benefits from TIST activities, and specific questions on Conservation Farming and food security, and Progress out of Poverty questions developed by the Grameen Foundation, to assess poverty likelihood based on simple, non-financial indicators. The total sample size was 46 TIST project participants. While there were a very few members who identified negative impacts from their voluntary participation in TIST, the overwhelming majority of respondents indicated a positive outcome from their participation with TIST. The differentiated survey has demonstrated that TIST is an overall positive effect on all members, including women and the most poor and vulnerable.</p>
Findings:	<p>The monitoring report appears to satisfy most all of the requirements needed for this indicator, but there was some individual negative responses from TIST members that need to be addressed.</p> <p>The CCBA Standards section on Gold Level for Community states “Furthermore, this criterion requires that the project will ‘do no harm’ to poorer and more vulnerable members of the communities, by establishing that no member of a poorer or more vulnerable social group will experience a net negative impact on their well-being or rights.”</p>
Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) to address non-conformance:	<p>1- In the monitoring report presented to verifiers, there were a few members who indicated negative impacts from their participation</p>

	with TIST. Please explain if any mitigation has been instigated that would serve to mend these negative impacts. 2- Given the size of the overall project, please justify the relatively small sample size used for the monitoring effort.
Date Issued:	May 1, 2012
Project proponent response/actions and date	Project proponent provided a response via email demonstrating: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sample was of sufficient size to represent the population of TIST members. 2. Though 4 TIST survey respondents in the sample did respond "yes" to the statement "my family has less to eat because of TIST.", three of those individuals contradicted that statement by answering "very true" to the question "my family has more food to eat because of TIST activities.", demonstrating there was likely confusion when the question was asked. TIST further described the positive financial benefits and increase in fruit and animal production received by the fourth negative respondent from the TIST project, demonstrating there was no net negative impact on any single individual in the survey.
Evidence used to close CAR	Email response dated 2 May 2012
Date closed	May 11, 2012
Indicator Met	Yes

GL3 Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits
Conformance: N/A
Public Shareholder Comments



Comments were solicited/received for the project in three ways. The first was through the CCB public comment period for the posting of the PDD and PIR. One comment was received which was in strong support of the project. The second was through comments received through public stakeholders meetings. Two formal public meetings were held, one at the Katungu Mothers Union in Bushenyi on 12 February 2009 and one at the Kirigime Guest House in Kabale on 16 February, 2009. Notice was given in two Uganda newspapers, the New Vision and Orumuri. Announcements were made on the radio in Bushenyi on 2, 3 and 6 February 2009. Announcements were made on the radio in Kabale on 3, 4 and 5 February 2009. Letters of invitation were also sent to selected stakeholders and interested parties. There were 29 comments were received, all of which were in support of the TIST project. The final way comments were solicited was through the verifiers field meetings with TIST grove owners. Approximately 44 interviews were conducted. The vast majority of comments were in support of the TIST program, through there were several requests to increase the price paid for trees and to improve the process and timing for distribution of payments. Additional comments included requests for more seedlings, inclusion of a broader range of tree species, and to reduce the minimum spacing between trees.

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 Uganda, CCB-001* (21 February 2012), CCB Project Implementation Report *TIST Program in Uganda, CCB-001* (29 February 2012), CCB Monitoring Plan *TIST Program in Uganda, CCB-001* (21 February 2012) and the CCB

Monitoring Report *TIST Program in Uganda, CCB-001* (27 April, 2012) meets the requirements of the CCB Standards (Second Edition – December 2008) and for Gold Level for Community Benefit.

Submittal Information

Report Submitted to:	<p>Charlie Williams Clean Air Action Corporation 7134 South Yale Avenue, Suite 310 Tulsa, OK 74136</p> <p>Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance</p>
Report Submitted (CCBA-Approved Verifier) by:	<p>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> <p>Shawn McMahon- Lead Validator/Verifier</p> <p></p> <p>Janice McMahon – Vice President and Regional Technical Manager Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division</p>
Date:	11 May 2012

SPM/SMM/JPM/rmb/VO11074.01 CCBA Final Valid/Verif Report.doc
K: pf 05/11/12f