



CCB VERIFICATION
REPORT/ VERIFICATION
STATEMENT

WILDLIFE WORKS KASIGAU
CORRIDOR REDD PROJECT
PHASE II – THE COMMUNITY
RANCHES

Verification Period:
01 January, 2010 to 31 December, 2010

REPORT No. 2011-9220

REVISION No. 01



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 25 May 2011	Project No.: PRJC-297154-2011-CCS-USA	DET NORSKE VERITAS (U.S.A.) INC. <i>Climate Change & Environmental Services</i> One Bush Street, 12 th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 Tel: +1 415-318-3900 Fax: +1 415-318-3901 http://www.dnv.com
Approved by: Miguel Rescalvo Regional Manager, North America	Organizational unit: Sustainability and Innovation Climate Change Services USA	
Client: Wildlife Works Carbon LLC	Client ref.: Jeremy Freund	

Det Norske Veritas (U.S.A.), Inc. (DNV) has performed a verification of the “The Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches” (hereafter called “the project”) in Kenya on the basis of criteria defined by the Climate Biodiversity and Community Alliance (CCBA) Second Edition and approved Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) methodology, “VM0009 – Methodology for Avoided Mosaic Deforestation of Tropical Forests Version 1.0,” as well as criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. This verification report summarizes the findings of the CCBA verification.

The verification consisted of the following four phases: a) desk review of the Project Implementation Report (PDR), monitoring plan and supporting documents, b) site visit, c) follow-up interviews and the issuance of verification findings, and d) the resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the verification report and verification statement.

In our opinion, the GHG emission reductions reported for the project in the Project Implementation Report dated 10 May 2011 (version 4) are fairly stated. The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly on the basis of the approved VCS methodology, VM0009 (Version 1.0), the CCBS Monitoring Plan dated 19 May 2011 and the CCBA Project Document dated 27 April, 2011, and meets all relevant CCBA requirements

DNV is able to certify with a reasonable level of assurance that the emission reductions from the “Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches” during the period 01 January, 2010 to 31 December, 2010 amount to 1 002 870 tonnes CO₂ equivalent after a 20% buffer pool deduction amounting to 250 718 tonnes CO₂ equivalent.

Report No.: 2011-9220	Date of this revision: 25 May 2011	Rev. No. No. 1
Report title: CCB Verification Report – Wildlife Works Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches		
Work carried out by: Sam Stevenson Gordon Smith		
Work verified by: Misheck Kapambwe		

Key words:

**CCB
Project Verification
REDD
Kenya**

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

**Abbreviations**

AFOLU Guidelines	Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Uses section of Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories 2006
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CBO	Community Based Organization
CCBA	Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance
CCB	Climate, Community, and Biodiversity
CL	Clarification Request
CO ₂ e	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
DBH	Diameter at Breast Height
DNV	Det Norske Veritas (U.S.A.) Inc.
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse Gas(es)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HCV	High Conservation Value
MED	Methodology Element Documentation
MHCA	Marungu Hills Conservancy Association
NER	Net Emission Reduction
PDD	Project Design Document
PIR	Project Implementation Report
REDD	Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation
VB	Verification Body
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
VCSA	VCS Association
VCU	Voluntary Carbon Unit
WBCSD	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
WRI	World Resources Institute



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION 3

1.1 OBJECTIVE 3

1.2 SCOPE AND CRITERIA 3

1.3 CCB PROJECT DESCRIPTION 4

1.4 LEVEL OF ASSURANCE 5

2 METHODOLOGY 5

2.1 REVIEW OF DOCUMENTATION 6

2.2 SITE VISIT 6

2.3 REPORTING OF FINDINGS 8

3 VERIFICATION FINDINGS 9

3.1 REMAINING ISSUES, INCLUDING ANY MATERIAL DISCREPANCY, FROM PREVIOUS VALIDATION OR VERIFICATION 9

3.2 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION 9

3.3 COMPLETENESS OF IMPACT MONITORING 9

3.4 ACCURACY OF EMISSION REDUCTION CALCULATIONS 17

3.5 QUALITY OF EVIDENCE TO DETERMINE EMISSION REDUCTIONS 18

3.6 MANAGEMENT CAPACITY AND BEST PRACTICES 19

3.7 NET EMISSION REDUCTIONS 19

4 CCB VERIFICATION CONCLUSION - CERTIFICATION STATEMENT 21

REFERENCES 24

Appendix A: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

1 INTRODUCTION

Wildlife Works Carbon LLC has commissioned Det Norske Veritas (U.S.A.), Inc. (DNV) to verify the “Kasigau Corridor REDD Phase II – The Community Ranches” project in Kenya based on the Project Implementation Report (PIR) Version 4.0, 10 May, 2011 and Monitoring Plan Version 3.0, 19 May, 2011. This report provides a description of the steps involved in conducting the verification and the findings of the verification based on the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards Second Edition, December, 2008 (CCB Standard), as well as criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

1.1 Objective

Verification is the periodic independent review and *ex-post* determination by an accredited verification body (VB) of the monitored reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and benefits received to the community and biodiversity of the project area that have occurred as a result of the registered CCB project activities during a defined verification period.

A verification statement is the written assurance by a VB that, during a specific period in time, a project activity achieved the emission reductions and benefits to the community and biodiversity as verified.

The objective of this verification was to verify and provide a verification statement of emission reductions and benefits to the community and biodiversity reported for the “Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches” (the project) for the period 01 January, 2010 to 31 December, 2010.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of the verification is:

- To verify that actual monitoring systems and procedures are in compliance with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan.
- To evaluate the GHG emission reduction data and express a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emission reduction data is free from material misstatement.
- To verify that reported GHG emission data is sufficiently supported by evidence.
- To verify that the project activities have and are being implemented as scheduled.
- To verify that benefits to the community and biodiversity are being achieved according to the CCB criteria within the verification period.



In particular, the project was assessed against the CCB Standard to determine which of the fourteen required and three optional CCB standards criteria the project satisfies. As specified by CCBA, an “approved” project is one that meets all 14 of the required CCB standards criteria.

1.3 CCB Project Description

Title of project activity:	<i>Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches.</i>
Monitoring methodology for baseline and project activities	<i>WWC Project Implementation Report & Monitoring Plan & VM0009 (Version 1.0).</i>
Location of the project activity:	<i>Kasigau Corridor, Kenya.</i>
Project’s crediting period:	<i>01 January, 2010 to 31 December, 2039.</i>
Period verified in this verification:	<i>01 January, 2010 to 31 December, 2010.</i>

The “Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches” has been developed by Wildlife Works Carbon LLC, a project proponent based in California, USA. The project is implemented on 13 blocks of land known as the Kasigau Corridor, which is owned by Indigenous Community Ownership Groups, each one of the 13 blocks being owned by different legal entities formed in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s by the Communities and the Government of Kenya to hold legal title of the land. The project also includes Marungu Hills Bio-diversity Conservation and Eco-tourism Project and a Wildlife Corridor adjacent to the Nairobi-Mombasa Highway.

The project proponent and the project developer is Wildlife Works Carbon LLC. DNV has confirmed that Wildlife Works Carbon LLC has the right to all and any reductions generated by the project during the Project Crediting Period.

The project is 169 741.4 hectares with an average canopy cover of 34.6%, and with mature tree heights ranging from 5-10 meters, and therefore conforms with the latest VCS definition of “forest.”

The main project activity is to prevent deforestation caused by subsistence farming activities. The objective of the project activity is to prevent the conversion of forest to cropland for annual crops, typically maize that ultimately results in net GHG emissions into the atmosphere.



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

The project start date is 1 January, 2010, which is the date Wildlife Works assumed financial responsibility for the project area and began specific GHG mitigation activities within the project area.

1.4 Level of Assurance

The verification report expresses a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emission reduction data and project activities are free from material misstatement.

2 METHODOLOGY

The verification of the benefits of the project activities assessed for all factors and issues that constitute the basis for emission reductions from the project. These include:

- The emission reduction calculations and the relevant data records.
- The calibration of the Cumulative Deforestation Model and records for the standard operating procedures for measurement.
- The management systems to support the project operation and monitoring.
- Assessment of the benefits of the project activities according to the CCB standard.
- Assessment of the monitoring activities of the project activities according to the monitoring plan.

Table 1 shows the verification team and the roles each of them had in the verification process.



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

Table 1. Verification Team

<i>Role</i>	<i>Last Name</i>	<i>First Name</i>	Administrative	Desk review	Site visit / Interviews	Reporting	Technical review	Expert input
Project manager / CCB Verifier	Stevenson	Samuel	✓	✓	✓	✓		
CCB Verifier / VCS REDD AFOLU Expert	Smith	Gordon		✓	✓	✓		✓
Technical reviewer	Kapambwe	Misheck					✓	

Duration of Verification

Preparations: *7 March, 2011 to 11 March, 2011*

On-site verification: *14 March, 2011 to 25 March, 2011*

Reporting, calculation checks and QA/QC: *28 March, 2010 to 17 April, 2011*

2.1 Review of Documentation

The basis for the verification has been the Project Implementation Report (Version 4.0 of 10 May, 2011) /2/ and CCBA Project Monitoring Plan (Version 3.0 of 19 May, 2011) /3/ from the project for the period 01 January, 2010 to 31 December, 2010, the CCB project design document (CCB PDD) dated 27 April, 2011 /1/, and the approved VCS methodology applied by the project, VM0009, Version 1.0 /48/. The project proponent has provided the verification team with spreadsheets of all data necessary for verification of the emission reductions and project activities /9/ /10/ /11/ /12/ /13/.

2.2 Site Visit

During the site visit of 14 March, 2011 – 25 March, 2011, the personnel listed in Table 2 were interviewed or assisted the verification team. Table 3 shows the topics that were discussed during the visit.

CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

Table 2. Participants at Project Site (Kasigau Corridor, The Community Ranches)

Name	Position	Organization
Jeremy Freund	VP, Carbon Development	Wildlife Works Carbon LLC
Rob Dodson	General Manager	Wildlife Works EPZ, Ltd.
Patrick Kabatha	Biodiversity Specialist	Wildlife Works Sanctuary, Ltd.
Hassan Sachedina	VP, Conservation Enterprise	Wildlife Works Carbon LLC
Laura Cowan	Office Manager	Wildlife Works Sanctuary, Ltd.
Eric Sagwe	Head Ranger	Wildlife Works Sanctuary, Ltd.
Lenjo Laurian	Community Relations, Office Manager	Wildlife Works Sanctuary, Ltd.
Joseph Mwanganda	Greenhouse, Nurseries and Jojoba Project Manager	Wildlife Works Sanctuary, Ltd.
Jamie Hendriksen	Carbon Operations Manager	Wildlife Works Sanctuary, Ltd.
Berhard Mwadime Fumbu	Secretary	Kambanga Ranch
George Mwakideu	Vice Chairman	Kambanga Ranch
Elijah B. Mwakio	Secretary	Dawida Ranch
Edward Chege	Chairman	Dawida Ranch
Benson M. Murwana	Treasurer	Dawida Ranch
Renson Did Mwamodo	Director & Treasurer	Taita Ranch
Angelina Mdari	Director	Taita Ranch
Alfonoeji Mwamghvnda	Secretary	Wangala Ranch
Leonard Mbogho Monge	Secretary & Treasurer	Wangala Ranch
Livingston M. Ikonge	Chairman	Wangala Ranch
Davison M. Jgoda	Director	Washumbu Ranch
Samuel K. Mkungo	Treasurer	Washumbu Ranch
Saul J. Mwamgola	Chairman	Kutima Ranch
Raymond J. Mwangola	Chairman	Choke Ranch
Jones M. Mlolwa	Treasurer	Maungu Ranch
Gerald M. Mbela	Vice Chairman	Maungu Ranch
Dawson Marami	Secretary	Maungu Ranch
Leonard Kapalla	Director	Mgeno Ranch
Anold Msheshe	Treasurer	Mgeno Ranch
Sam Mwammanga	Representative	Sagalla & Ndara Ranch
Babu Kisai Kifuso	Organizing Secretary	Marungu Hills Conserv Asso
Donald M. Konde	Chairman	Marungu Hill Conserv Asso
Andrew Mwdyoho	Project Secretary	Marungu Hill Conserv Asso
Jamis M' Mboge	Project Co-coordinator	Marungu Hill Conserv Asso

Table 3 Interview Topics

Interviewed Organization	Interview Topics
Wildlife Works Carbon LLC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Emission reduction estimates. ✓ Monitoring plan. ✓ Baseline determination. ✓ Buffer determination. ✓ Leakage rates. ✓ Project Implementation Plan. ✓ Disbursement structure and plan. ✓ Environmental monitoring and impacts. ✓ Biodiversity monitoring and impacts. ✓ Community outreach methods.



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

Interviewed Organization	Interview Topics
Marungu Hills Conservancy Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Disbursement methods of carbon revenues to affected communities. ✓ Management structure. ✓ History of organization. ✓ Affiliation with Wildlife Works. ✓ Concerns about potential negative impacts. ✓ Purpose and expected benefits. ✓ Method for prioritizing community projects. ✓ Growth plans for respective organizations.
Ranch Directors of the 13 ranches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Understanding of carbon easement. ✓ Financial records. ✓ Future plan for ranch land. ✓ Free, prior, and informed consent. ✓ Disbursement plans to shareholders.

During the site visit, the following tasks were completed: 1) the data presented in the monitoring plan and Project Implementation Report (PIR) were assessed by reviewing the additional project documentation and records, 2) interviews were held with personnel on-site, 3) observation of established monitoring and reporting practices was conducted by assessing the implementation of the stratification and sampling procedures and benefits of the project activities to the affected communities and stakeholders. This enabled the verification team to assess the accuracy and completeness of the reported monitoring results and to verify the correct implementation of project activities.

2.3 Reporting of Findings

A corrective action request (CAR) is issued where:

- Non-conformities with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in monitoring and reporting, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient.
- Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions that will impair the estimate of emission reductions.
- Issues identified in a forward action request (FAR) during validation have not been resolved by the project participants during verification.

A clarification request (CL) is issued if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CCBA requirements have been met.

A FAR is issued for actions if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.



Two CARs and two CLs were identified. All outstanding issues have been closed, with acceptable corrections implemented by the project proponent.

3 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

This section summarizes the findings from the verification of the emission reductions reported for the project for the period 01 January, 2010 to 31 December, 2010.

3.1 Remaining Issues, Including any Material Discrepancy, from Previous Validation or Verification

This is the first periodic verification. There are no remaining issues from the validation.

3.2 Project Implementation

During the site visits, by observing, reviewing operation records and interviewing relevant staff, community members and affected stakeholders (see **Table 2.**), DNV was able to verify that the project has been implemented and operated as described in the CCB PDD /5/ and PIR for the project.

The procedures to estimate the total carbon stock in selected pools within the project area and the uncertainty of the estimate at a given point in time have been implemented sufficiently. Allometric equations have been used appropriately and the soil sampling methods are sufficient. Carbon stocks for all strata have been estimated as per the requirements of the VCS methodology (VM0009).

3.3 Completeness of Impact Monitoring

During the site visit, through observation, record review and interviews, it could be confirmed that the monitoring arrangement is in line with the monitoring plan /3/, CCB PDD/1/, PIR /2/, and the applied VCS methodology, VM0009 /48/. All of the necessary parameters have been properly monitored to ensure the accuracy of the emission reduction calculations and community and biodiversity impacts. Details for all of the measured metrics are listed in Tables 4-6.



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

Table 4 Assessment of All Climate Impact Monitoring

Data / Parameter	Assessment/Observation
Definition of project area boundary.	Observed control of land appears to match mapped boundaries.
Vegetation cover stratification.	Vegetation cover types observed when traveling the project area were checked against mapped cover types for general correspondence.
Biomass plot cover type stratification.	Cover types of a subsample of vegetation plots were assessed using ALOS imagery and potential discrepancies were referred to project staff for checking/correction.
Tree/shrub diameter measurement.	Reviewers also checked a sample of original tree measurements and found that, adjusting for likely growth, recorded tree measurement data corresponded to measurements made by DNV.
Tree/shrub species identification.	Reviewers observed consistent species identification by Wildlife Works staff, within accuracy requirements.
Soil sampling depth.	Depth of soil sampling was measured and found to be consistent with the protocol.
Soil carbon proportion and bulk density.	Soil carbon proportion and bulk density are measured by Crop Nutritional Services in Nairobi.. Lab reports were checked.
Historical forest state classification.	A subsample of historical forest state classifications were checked by observing satellite imagery and found to be reasonable.
Leakage degradation and deforestation.	Wildlife Works staff were observed making degradation/deforestation assessments and the results were reasonable. A sample of deforestation/degradation data was field checked and the data appears plausible, but exact checking was not possible as additional deforestation appears to have occurred since the data were collected.
Reforestation of Mt. Kasigau.	The project proponent has led the planting of 2 000 seedlings on Mt. Kasigau (an identified HCV area). To date, the project proponent has organized more than 20 000 seedlings. The auditors visited the site and found the techniques used were appropriate. The success of the reforestation efforts will continually be monitored by the project proponent's staff.
REDD Carbon Inventory Monitoring.	The project proponent has completed its initial sampling of biomass plots. As per the VCS methodology, VM0009, the monitoring team will



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

Data / Parameter	Assessment/Observation
	<p>revisit 20% of the forest plots each year.</p> <p>DNV has asked the project proponent to check cruise 5% of the plots as required by VM0009, which resulted in the project proponent revisiting 21 forest plots.</p> <p>While on site, DNV revisited four randomly selected plots to check that the measurements of the forest plots were within the accuracy thresholds required by VM00009. It was found that the biomass team leader, Mwololo Muasa, was highly competent in both DBH measurements and identifying the local species within the project area.</p> <p>The project proponent has also invested in a gyrocopter to perform aerial monitoring each week.</p>
Eco-Charcoal Production Facility.	<p>As the main degradation activity within the project zone is the illegal harvesting of hardwoods to produce charcoal, the project proponent has initiated an eco-charcoal program with the goal to produce enough sustainable charcoal for the communities surrounding the project. The project proponent is funding a local start-up who has agreed to use the methods tested by the project proponent for the purposes of producing eco-charcoal. The auditors visited the plot that will be harvested and confirmed the progress of this project activity /44/.</p> <p>The auditors view the success of this project activity to be critical in mitigating leakage due to the protection of the project area from deforestation and degradation activities.</p>



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

During the site visit, the auditors assessed the progress made by Wildlife Works to implement the project activities outlined in the PDD. DNV also assessed the monitoring activities conducted by the project proponent to ensure that the impact is being effectively measured and managed. Table 5 summarizes all the project activities that are being implemented by the project proponent. As this is the first verification and no carbon revenues have been generated from the project, several project activities are currently being implemented and therefore no data is available yet.. Where the project activity was not fully implemented, DNV assessed the progress (administrative, business plans, financial projections, and stakeholder interviews). A summary of the auditor's assessment is given in the right hand column.

Table 5 Assessment of All Community Impact Monitoring Activities

Project Activity	Assessment/Observation
Organic Greenhouse.	<p>An organic greenhouse has been implemented to grow citrus trees for shade and income. These plants are sold at a discount to local community members. Observations made during the Phase I site visit made it clear that the greenhouse has progressed due to carbon funding. The greenhouse will be doubled in capacity and an additional two greenhouse workers will be employed from the community. Phase II nurseries are currently being sited in the communities of Maungu, Marungu, Sasenyi, Mukamenyi, and Kisamenyi. All of these communities are directly outside of the project area.</p> <p>As the Phase II funding is made available following the verification of the first monitoring period, the project proponent has committed to monitoring the activities of each of the greenhouses it implements. The metrics chosen are appropriate for the project activity.</p>
Jojoba Propagation & Extension.	<p>The project proponent is working in partnership with various Kenyan agricultural groups in a two-year trial period to explore the use of Jojoba as a cash crop. A full business plan is currently being produced prior to the next verification period. Examples of metrics that will be used to track the success of the project activity include: number of full-time jobs, how many employees are local, and financial returns. The metrics that will be tracked are appropriate for the project activity.</p>



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

Project Activity	Assessment/Observation
Marungu Hill Conservancy Association (Financial Aid and Project Proposal System).	The auditors met with the directors of the Marungu Hill Conservancy Association (MHCA). They will be one of the main liaisons for organizing and leading the disbursements of funds for the community projects. The auditors were shown a document of over 80 community projects that the MHCA directors have proposed for the community. The auditors were also able to confirm and assess a strategy document for 2011 for the implementation of these community projects once carbon funding is made available. The auditors confirmed with the board of the MHCA that the strategy was in fact established in 2009 with the help of the project proponent. The success and effectiveness of applying the carbon funds towards community projects will be influenced by the success of the MHCA and the Kasigau Development Trust.
Mushroom Farms from Elephant Dung.	The project proponents work with the Imani Women's Group to provide elephant dung to use in their commercial mushroom farm. While on site, the auditors visited the Imani Women's Group. It was found that the mushroom farm existed but was not in full-fledged production yet. A clear relationship exists between the women's group and the project proponent. Other projects are currently being financed by the project proponent under Phase I.
School Construction and Bursary Scheme.	<p>The project proponent has built over 18 classrooms throughout the districts of the project zone. Once carbon revenues are made available for Phase II, the project proponent plans to build additional schools within the communities affected by the project. The auditors visited one of the schools built by the project proponent under Phase I.</p> <p>The metrics chosen by the project proponent are appropriate for the project activity.</p>
Group Ranch Office Renovations/ Construction.	Wildlife Works has provided funds for ranch office renovations and construction for the purposes of security patrol accommodation and offices. These outposts are used by the rangers to provide climate, community, and biodiversity monitoring and impact assessments. The project proponent has thus far



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

Project Activity	Assessment/Observation
	<p>renovated two ranch headquarters within the Taita and Mgeno ranches. The auditors visited the Mgeno ranch headquarters. The project proponent has used approximately \$35 000 USD for these renovations. In addition, ranger post 6-0, also visited by DNV, is used for Phase II operations and cost the project proponent \$40 000 USD. Ranger post 6-0 is built along a road cutting through Phase II ranches and is used by illegal charcoal producers to export charcoal to the cities of Mombasa and beyond. The existence of the project proponent's rangers, once given full authorization from the Kenyan government, will shut down the road, cutting access to community lands that are currently heavily used for illegal charcoal production activities.</p>
Wildlife Works/Tsavo Soap Factory.	<p>Under Phase I, the project proponent developed an independent organic handmade soap factory. For Phase II, plans are currently underway to implement a new production of soap to provide to UNICEF and the Body Shop. As the expansion of the soap factory is not complete yet, the metrics that will be used to monitor the community impact were assessed. The benefits to the community will largely be measured by the number of jobs it creates for the local communities.</p>
Ecotourism.	<p>The project proponent has directly assisted (financially and organizationally) ecotourism efforts on Taita Ranch and Kasigau Ranch. The auditors interviewed the board of directors for each of these ranches and confirmed the project proponent's support. For the Taita Ranch, they are dealing with contractual issues with Somali cattle operators that are illegally grazing on their lands beyond their contract terms. The project proponent has supported the Taita Ranch financially to overcome the legal fees incurred during litigation.</p> <p>The impact on the community is measured by tracking the number of full-time jobs the project creates for the local community. As the project activities are still being implemented, no data exists. In addition, the project proponent is seeking to train local youth to become guides for eco-tourists.</p>
Wildlife Works REDD Project Product	A new position is being created to market the project



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

Project Activity	Assessment/Observation
Sales and Marketing.	proponent's efforts.
Kasigau Development Trust.	The project proponent has been integrally tied with the development of the Kasigau Development Trust (a Community Based Organization or CBO). Both the Marungu Hills Conservation Association and the Kasigau Development Trust will channel the community portion of the carbon revenues from Phase II to the community projects. To foster trust that these two CBOs will transfer money to the community projects, all financial records will be made public so that the communities can view them.
Project Broad Environmental Impact, Household Income, Support for Conservation.	The indicators are currently being developed in collaboration with two post-graduate students. The indicators will be assessed by means of a Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA). The baseline survey will be conducted in 2011. As of this verification, the PRA has not been conducted and thus the verification of the baseline survey will be completed prior to the next verification cycle.

During the site visit, the auditors assessed the progress made by Wildlife Works to implement the project activities outlined in the PDD. DNV also assessed the monitoring activities conducted by the project proponent to ensure that the impact is being effectively measured and managed. Table 6 summarizes all the project activities that are being implemented by the project proponent. A summary of the auditor's assessment is given in the right-hand column.



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

Table 6 Assessment of All Biodiversity Impact Monitoring

Data / Parameter	Assessment/Observation
Wildlife Works REDD Forest and Biodiversity Monitoring.	<p>The project proponent uses its ranger patrols to monitor illegal charcoal production activities, biodiversity monitoring, and as an additional community relationship building tool. Within this verification period, two ranger recruitment days were held. Nearly 1 000 local community members participated, and 100 were deemed qualified for the positions. Thirty-eight of these individuals have been employed. The head ranger, Eric Sagwe, is also from the local community.</p> <p>Patrick Kabatha, a Kenyan national, manages the biodiversity data collected from the rangers and also conducts monthly animal presence transects. The data is geo-tagged to support spatial distribution analysis. Geo tagging was a suggestion made by auditors during the CCB validation of Phase I. The auditors reviewed the data collected at this preliminary stage and found that the methods used were appropriate. Patrick conducts regular transects within the Phase I project area.</p> <p>Monitoring of poaching incidents, cattle incursions, elephants killed, dead animals discovered, and charcoal timber incursions within the Phase II project area is conducted by the rangers. The rangers are trained to record data on a daily basis and the data is transferred digitally at the Rukinga Headquarters. DNV auditors found that both Patrick and Eric were highly competent for assuming leadership roles to carry out biodiversity monitoring for the project area. The data collected and results shown within the PIR is appropriate at this first verification.</p>
Community Wildlife Scouts.	<p>The project proponent has hired eight scouts to monitor the community areas as a means to create community awareness and increase the knowledge about the value of conservation. These groups work within the Marungu Hills communities to curb deforestation and degradation activities. Wildlife Works seeks to expand such efforts to the Kasigau, Mwatate and Sagalla locations. DNV confirmed this activity through</p>



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

Data / Parameter	Assessment/Observation
	interviews with the Marungu Hills Conservancy Association.
Indigenous Tree Seedling Purchasing Program	A total of 1 310 seedlings were purchased from the community to raise in the nursery. A total of \$176 USD was given to the two focus communities of Kajire and Talio for the seedlings they brought to the nursery. A total of \$250 USD was given for a total of 1 000 tree seedlings purchased from the Nayabingi sports club, a youth group that planted the seedlings. The reported information is appropriate to the project activity. The survival rate for the saplings in the upper Sagalla is 80% at 6 months of age. The project proponent attributes the success rate to the fact that each pupil was assigned 1-3 seedlings in the school compound to take care of.

3.4 Accuracy of Emission Reduction Calculations

The calculations of the emission reduction in the spreadsheet and the the Project Implementation Report of 10 May, 2011) /2/ for the monitoring period were checked by DNV and found to be correct, as detailed below:

- The project area was quantified using commercial GIS software that has been shown to be reliable.
- Vegetation cover typing was performed using two different methods and any differences were reconciled.
- Stratified sampling of vegetation cover types was performed. DNV independently re-measured a subsample of tree measurements, and re-measurements corresponded to the data within required accuracy limits, after adjusting for growth and decomposition since the original measurement.
- Sampling of soil carbon was performed, with carbon content and bulk density measured for the 0-30 cm depth and 31-100 cm depths.
- Soil carbon and bulk density measurements were performed by Crop Nutritional Services in Nairobi..
- Destructive sampling was performed and weights of trees were measured by species and diameter, and this data was used to construct allometric equations that estimate biomass as a function of species and diameter. Various groupings of species and various equation forms were analyzed. Equations were selected that had high R^2 values and that give conservative estimates of biomass. The largest destructively sampled trees used to construct allometric equations were smaller



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

than the largest trees sampled in the baseline forest measurement. Extrapolating biomass estimates to trees larger than the trees used to construct the allometric equations is unreliable. To be conservative, the biomass of trees larger than 35 cm DBH was estimated using a linear relationship of biomass to diameter equal to the rate of change in biomass per unit of change in DBH of measured trees at 35 cm DBH.

- Statistical analysis of the variability of vegetation and soil carbon stocks was performed and sampling uncertainty was found to be less than +/- 15% of the mean estimate with 95% statistical confidence, which is required by the VCS methodology VM0009 and VCS AFOLU guidance to avoid an uncertainty deduction.
- The reference area encompasses lands as similar as possible to project lands.
- The baseline rate of deforestation and the logistic curve describing the rate of deforestation through time were calculated from imagery spanning from 1987 to 2009 (22-year time period), and the forest state was observed at approximately 2 000 points using the written image classification protocol.
- The project proponent searched for points that were classified as having more than one change between forest and non-forest condition, the sequence of observations was reviewed for each point, and inconsistencies were removed.
- DNV reviewed coding of software that calculates weights of each forest state observation, and found that the calculation procedures conform to the methodology.
- The logistic deforestation curve was calculated using commercial software, "R", that has been shown to be reliable.
- Statistical uncertainty of the logistic deforestation curve was calculated and was within the required confidence level.
- The linear deforestation rate selected by the project proponent remains below the logistic curve for the life of the project.
- Calculations that go from field measurements of soil and vegetation to per-hectare carbon stocks were reviewed in detail.
- DNV found no significant project emissions to be included in the calculations.
- Calculations of net emission reductions were reviewed in detail and were found to use proper inputs and coefficients, and the calculations are being performed correctly.

3.5 Quality of Evidence to Determine Emission Reductions

The project performed several kinds of project-specific measurements to ensure that amounts and relationships used in calculations were appropriate to project lands. Tree and shrub biomass equations were developed from trees in the area, rather than using



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

equations developed elsewhere. Land cover image archives were searched and images were gathered and assessed such that each land cover observation point had data for vegetation cover classification at a minimum of two different times.

Multiple strategies were used to obtain data quality and accuracy of numbers. Forest state observations were performed by two staff who coordinated with one another to make consistent observations. Contractors with specialized expertise were engaged when the project participants did not have the necessary expertise on staff. Quality assurance and quality control procedures exist and were used to check and clean data. All calculations were checked by a minimum of two people.

3.6 Management Capacity and Best Practices.

The quality assurance and quality control procedures in terms of sampling, stratification, maintenance and data reporting are appropriate.

An independent Quality Control team not involved in the original plot sampling of each plot is given coordinates for the plot centers for 5% of the original plots. The Quality Control team returns to headquarters with the data sheets, which are analyzed by an analyst that has not been involved with the plots. If discrepancies are found, the Monitoring Team Lead and/or senior carbon staff determines whether a plot needs to be revisited.

The emission calculations and reporting are also completed with a third-party specializing in the appropriate area, such as soil sample analysis.

Where ever possible, the employment of locals have been a priority and DNV was able to confirm such activity during the site visit

3.7 Net Emission Reductions

Applying the calculated project baseline emissions, and the fact that recent assessment shows no deforestation within the project boundary, avoided emissions are calculated using the inputs and methods stated in the project document, and achieved emission reductions are as stated in Table 7. As per VM0009, leakage is measured *post-project* start date from the shifted leakage curve. As there is no shifted curve until the first monitoring period, there can be no leakage until the second monitoring period, and thus for this verification period, the leakage rate is zero.

Table 7 Net Emission Reductions (NERs), Metric Tonnes CO₂e.

Year	NERs	20% Buffer Withholding	NERs Issued
------	------	------------------------	-------------



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

2010	1 253 588	250 718	1 002 870
Total	1 253 588	250 718	1 002 870



4 CCB VERIFICATION CONCLUSION - CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

Det Norske Veritas (U.S.A) Inc. (DNV) has performed the verification of the project activities that have been reported for the “Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches” relative to the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards Second Edition, December, 2008 (CCB Standard) for the period 01 January, 2010 to 31 December, 2010. The project is located in the Kasigau Corridor of Southeastern Kenya, an area of dryland forests that form a wildlife dispersal and migration corridor between Tsavo East and Tsavo West National Parks. The project participants are responsible for the collection of data in accordance with the monitoring plan and the reporting of climate, community and biodiversity benefits. It is DNV’s responsibility to express an independent verification statement on the reported climate, community, and biodiversity benefits from the project.

DNV conducted the verification on the basis of the monitoring methodology VM0009 (Version 1), THE CCBA Project Document dated 27 April, 2011, the CCB monitoring plan dated 19 May, 2011, and the Project Implementation Report dated 10 May, 2011. The verification included: a) checking whether the provisions of the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan were consistently and appropriately applied, b) collecting evidence supporting the reported data, and c) an assessment of whether the project activities that affected the community and biodiversity were having positive benefits.

DNV planned and performed the verification by obtaining evidence and other information and explanations that DNV considers necessary to give reasonable assurance that reported GHG emission reductions are fairly stated and that the project activities are benefiting the various stakeholders, community and biodiversity of the project zone.

The project proponent is Wildlife Works Carbon LLC. DNV has confirmed that Wildlife Works Carbon LLC has the right to all and any reductions generated by the Project during the period 1 January, 2010 – 31 December, 2010.

The main project activity is to prevent deforestation caused by slash and burn and subsistence farming activities by empowering the local communities with employment opportunities and key infrastructure projects. The project results in reductions of GHG emissions that are real, measurable and give long-term benefits to the mitigation of climate change, have clear socio-economic benefits to the communities surrounding the project area, and to biodiversity.

DNV is able to verify with a reasonable level of assurance that the emission reductions from the “Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches” during the period 01 January, 2010 to 31 December, 2010 amount to 1 002 870 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent after a 20% buffer pool deduction amounting to 250 718 tonnes CO₂



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

equivalent and has accomplished the climate, community, and biodiversity benefits for this verification period through its project activities.

In summary, it is DNV's opinion that the "The Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches" as described in the CCBA Project Implementation Report dated 10 May 2011 meets all relevant CCBA requirements, at the Gold level for Climate Change Adaptation Benefits.



5 CCBA COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST – THE KASIGAU CORRIDOR REDD PROJECT PHASE II

General Section

		<i>Conformance</i>	
G1. Original Conditions in the Project Area (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
G2. Baseline Projects (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
G3. Project Design and Goals (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
G4. Management Capacity and Best Practices (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
G5. Legal Status and Property Rights (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Climate Section

CL1. Net Positive Climate Impacts (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
CL2. Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”) (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
CL3. Climate Impact Monitoring (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Community Section

CM1. Net Positive Community Impacts (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
CM2. Offsite Community Impacts (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
CM3. Community Impact Monitoring (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Biodiversity Section

B1. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
B2. Offsite Biodiversity Impacts (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
B3. Biodiversity Impact Monitoring (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Gold Section

GL1. Climate Change Adaptation Benefits (Optional)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
GL2. Exceptional Community Benefits (Optional)	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CL 3. Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits (Optional)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

CCBA Validation Level Attained:

Approved (all requirements met)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gold (all requirements and also at least one optional Gold Level criterion met)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



REFERENCES

Documents provided by the Project Participants that relate directly to the project activities that benefit the climate, community, and biodiversity have been used as direct sources of evidence for the periodic verification conclusions, and are usually further checked through interviews with key personnel.

Following is the list of documentation that was assessed during the verification:

Documents Provided That Relate Directly to the Project

- /1/ Wildlife Works Carbon LLC, *CCB PD for Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches*, Version 9 with supporting document, 27 April, 2011 and previous versions.
- /2/ Wildlife Works Carbon LLC, CCB PIR for “Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches” – Project Implementation Report – Version 4.0, 10 May, 2011.
- /3/ Wildlife Works Carbon LLC, CCB Monitoring Plan for “Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches” – Version 3.0, 19 May, 2011.
- /4/ Wildlife Works Carbon LLC, *VCS PD for “Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches,”* 12 April, 2011.
- /5/ “Carbon Rights Agreement” between Wildlife Works Carbon LLC and each of the 13 ranches.
- /6/ Leasehold titles and ownership structures to each of the 13 ranches.
- /7/ Re: - Management Authority for Rukinga Ranch (1 January, 2005).
- /8/ The National Environment Management Authority (*NEMA Kenya*), Audit Report of Wildlife Works EPZ, December, 2006.
- /9/ Shareholder lists and AGM minutes from each of the 13 ranches.
- /10/ Wildlife Works Carbon LLC financial statements and projections – As of 23 March, 2011.
- /11/ Scientific Certifications Systems, *CCB validation report*, 20 December, 2009.
- /12/ Image Classification Protocol (as of 1 April, 2011).
- /13/ How to Use the Classification Tool (as of 1 April, 2011).
- /14/ Logistic regression model for deforestation (as of 1 April, 2011).
- /15/ Field measurement protocol – Standard Operating Procedure Biomass (as of 1 April, 2011).
- /16/ Field measurement protocol – Standard Operating Procedure Soils (as of 1 April, 2011).



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

- /17/ Soil lab report of measured soil carbon concentrations (1m Soil Analysis, 1 April, 2011).
- /18/ Forest Biomass Data (Forest Inventory Phase II Summary-Strata2_v4.xlsx, 1 April, 2011).
- /19/ Forest biomass sampling quality control comparisons (QC report.xlsx, 23 March, 2011).
- /20/ Data used to develop tree biomass allometric equations (AllometricFormulasEXP.xlsx, 23 March, 2011).
- /21/ Letters to shareholders of the 13 ranches pertaining to an Extraordinary Annual General Meetings.
- /22/ Wildlife Works Carbon LLC *Tool for AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Analysis and Buffer Determination for the Kasigau Corridor REDD Project, Phase II – The Community Ranches* (1 April, 2011).
- /23/ Phase II NERs v5.xlsx (1 April, 2011)
- /24/ Leakage Model Expanded (1 April, 2011).
- /25/ Grid_Data_RefArea_flaggedPoints_Phase2.xlsx (1 April, 2011).
- /26/ *TCA Management Plan Final Draft* Jan 2008 revised 26-03-08.pdf (2008).
- /27/ 2007 Annual Report-Ruk.doc (2007).
- /28/ Patterson, B.D., *Annual Accomplishment Report of 2007 – Lions of Tsavo* (2007).
- /29/ Final Evaluation of Proposal by Wildlife Works Carbon to Taita Ranch-6.docx.
- /30/ Cropnuts Methodology.pdf (2007).
- /31/ Desnaring Manual.doc (August, 2006).
- /32/ Discovery Guide (1999).
- /33/ Kasigau Reforestation Final.doc (2007).
- /34/ Kasigau Reforestation Report 2007.doc (2008).
- /35/ Kasigau Reforestation Report 2008.doc (2008).
- /36/ Kasigau tree farm_Ian.doc (30 November, 2010).
- /37/ Mt Kasigau Biodiversity Report.pdf (June, 2002 – August, 2003).
- /38/ Public Comments Phase II instructions.doc (14 March, 2011).
- /39/ Public Notice CCB Phase II.doc (14 March, 2011).
- /40/ Ruk eles 2006-09.xls (September, 2006).
- /41/ Ruk Wildlife-09.xls (2009).
- /42/ Rukinga Progress Repo #6452D.doc (July, 2007).
- /43/ *TCA Management Plan Final Draft* Jan 2008 revised 26-03-08.pdf (26 March, 2008).



CCB PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT

- /44/ Wildlife Works, *EcoCharcoal Project Activity Design Document*, March, 2011.
- /45/ Wildlife Works Carbon, *Consumer Powered Forest Conservation*, 23 March, 2011.
- /46/ Public Comments Responses to Phase II Kasigau Corridor Project.

Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents are shown below.

- /47/ Climate, Community, and Biodiversity (CCB) *Project Design Standards Second Edition* – December, 2008.
- /48/ Approved VCS methodology, *VM0009 Methodology for Avoided Mosaic Deforestation of Tropical Forests version 1.0*, 11 January, 2011.
- /49/ VCS Association, *Voluntary Carbon Standard 2007.1*, November, 2008.
- /50/ VCSA, VCS Sectoral Scopes (http://www.v-c-s.org/sectoral_scopes.html).
- /51/ VCSA, *Guidance for Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use Projects*, 18 November, 2008.
- /52/ VCSA, *Tool for AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Analysis and Buffer Determination*, 18 November, 2008.
- /53/ VCSA, *Update to the VCS 2007.1: Tool for Non-Permanence Risk Analysis and Buffer Determination*, 8 September, 2010.
- /54/ VCS VT0001 *Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in VCS Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Project Activities Version 1*, 21 May, 2010.



APPENDIX A

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS, CLARIFICATION REQUESTS AND FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS

Table 8 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report corrective action requests and requests for clarifications	Mov	Summary of project participants' response	Final conclusion
<p>CAR 1 Please provide a CCB Project Implementation Report (PIR) that addresses each of the criterion set out in the Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Project Design Standards Second Edition – December, 2008.</p>	Desk Review	<p>Accepted: The PIR has been drafted and was finalized on 10 May, 2011.</p>	<p>The documents were reviewed and are acceptable</p> <p>CAR 1 is closed</p>
<p>CAR 2 Please provide a monitoring plan together with the PIR that documents the metrics and variables the project proponent uses to track the success of each of its project activities.</p>	Desk Review	<p>Accepted: The project monitoring plan has been drafted and was finalized on 10 May, 2011.</p> <p>19 May 2011: Further significant revisions were made to the document in both organization and content, to address each impact monitoring indicator for Climate, Community and Biodiversity as stated in the CCB standards, second edition – December 2008. The final, revised version is version 3, dated May 19th, 2011.</p>	<p>13 May 2011: Please address each criterion required in the monitoring sections of the Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Project Design Standards Second Edition – December 2008</p> <p>20 May 2011: The revised documentation is acceptable</p> <p>CAR 2 is closed</p>
<p>CL 1 PG 54 – Please move the indicators for the reforestation project within the reforestation section.</p>	Desk Review	<p>Accepted: The indicators have been moved accordingly.</p>	<p>The indicators have been moved to the appropriate section</p> <p>CL 1 is closed</p>
<p>CL 2 Please include a date and version for the PIR and monitoring report.</p>	Desk Review	<p>Accepted: A date and version number have been added to the title page on both the PIR and project monitoring report.</p>	<p>The date and version have been added</p> <p>CL 2 is closed</p>