REFORESTING DEGRADED LANDS IN CHILE THROUGH THE USE OF MYCORRHIZAL INOCULATION VERIFICATION REPORT

Document Prepared By: Environmental Services, Inc.
Project/Report Number (ID): VO12072.00ver

Project Title	REFORESTING DEGRADED LANDS IN CHILE THROUGH THE USE OF MYCORRHIZAL INOCULATION
Version	Report Version 03
Report ID	VO12072.00ver

Report Title	Reforesting Degraded Lands In Chile Through The Use Of Mycorrhizal Inoculation-Validation Report
Client	Mikro-Tek Inc., P.O. Box 2120, 115 Sandy Falls Rd., Timmins, Ontario P4N7X8, Canada
Pages	32
Date of Issue	26 February 2015
Prepared By	Environmental Services, Inc. – Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division
Contact	7220 Financial Way, Suite 100, Jacksonville, Florida 32256 – USA Phone: 904-470-2200 Fax: 904-470-2112 www.esicarbon.com
Approved By	Shawn McMahon (Lead Verifier) / Janice McMahon (Regional Technical Manager)
Work Carried Out By	Lead Verifier: Shawn McMahon; Verification Team Members: Caitlin Sellers, Stewart McMorrow, Rich Scharf, Chris DeRolph, and James Moody; Verification Trainee: Terese Walters and Jonathan Pomp; and QA/QC: Janice McMahon

Summary:

Environmental Services, Inc., (ESI) was contracted by Mikro-Tek Inc. (Mikro-Tek) on 30 July 2012 to conduct the project validation and verification of Reforesting Degraded Lands In Chile Through The Use Of Mycorrhizal Inoculation (Project Description (PD) dated 19 April 2013).

As stated in the PD, "Mikro-Tek works with local land owners and provides an advanced propagation technology, mycorrhizal inoculation; to help restore and convert degraded grassland (Figure 1.1) into productive forests in several regions of Chile. The application of this technology, funded by Mikro-Tek's investment, permits successful plantation establishment on sites that would otherwise not be sufficiently productive to incentivize reforestation efforts by landowners. This grouped project promotes reforestation of land that would remain as degraded grassland in the absence of carbon finance."[1]

This PD is for a subset of the Mikro-Tek project in Chile and initially applies to 48 instances comprising approximately 3,007 hectares (ha). The main species planted are Eucalyptus globulus and Pinus radiata.

The verification objective included an assessment of compliance with Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) (Version 3 and associated updates) criteria, the selected methodology (Clean Development Mechanism Methodology AR-ACM0003 Version 1.0), and the validated PD. The verification process closely followed ESI's procedures for VCS verifications outlined within our Management System Manual. This included utilizing VCS documents and ISO 14064-3 to develop and implement a sampling plan. A total of approximately 36% of the total acreage in the project was sampled. 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 GHGs; and time periods covered. The geographic verification scope was defined by the project boundary, which included multiple project areas (grouped), the carbon reservoir types, management activities, growth and yield models, inventory program, and contract periods.

The verification criteria followed the guidance documents provided by VCS and included the following: VCS Program Guide (04 October 2012, v3.4), VCS Standard (04 October 2012, v3.3), Program Definitions (04 October 2012, v3.4), Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Requirements (04 October 2012, v3.3), AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (04 October 2012, v3.2), the grouped project PD entitled Reforesting Degraded Lands In Chile Through The Use Of Mycorrhizal Inoculation (Project Description (PD) dated 19 April 2013), and Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Methodology AR-ACM0003 Version 1.0.

A summary of all findings is included in Appendix A. There are no restrictions of uncertainty.

ESI confirms all verification activities, including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance, monitoring, adherence to the validated PD, and the project documentation are complete and in adherence to the VCS Version 3 and all associated updates as documented in this report. ESI concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that the project has been implemented in accordance with the validated PD, Reforesting Degraded Lands In Chile Through The Use Of Mycorrhizal Inoculation dated 19 April 2013 and meets the requirements of VCS Version 3 and all associated updates.

The GHG assertion provided by Mikro-Tek, Inc. and verified by ESI has resulted in the net GHG emissions reduction or removal of 447,152 tCO2 equivalents by the project during the verification/reporting period (01 June 2003 to 31 May 2012). As permitted by the methodology, emissions are reported as zero. This does not include the 10% buffer withholding.

[1] Mikro-Tek, *Reforesting Degraded Lands In Chile Through The Use Of Mycorrhizal Inoculation*, Version 1.2, dated 19 April 2013.

Table of Contents

1 Introduction 5
1.1 Objective 5
1.2 Scope and Criteria 5
1.3 Level of assurance 6
1.4 Summary Description of the Project 6
2 Validation Process, Findings and Conclusion 6
2.1 Validation Process 6
2.2 Validation Findings 6
2.2.1 Gap Validation 6
2.2.2 Methodology Deviations 6
2.2.3 Project Description Deviations 7
2.2.4 New Project Activity Instances 7
2.3 Validation Conclusion 7
3 Verification Process 7
3.1 Method and Criteria 7
3.1.1 Verification under AR-ACM0001 and AR-ACM0003 8
3.2 Document Review 8
3.3 Interviews 8
3.4 Site Inspections 9
3.5 Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy 10
4 Verification Findings 10
4.1 Project Implementation Status 10
4.2 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations 10
4.3 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals 11
4.4 Management and Operational System 11
5 Verification conclusion 11

Appendix A – NCR/CL/OFI Summary 13

appendix B – Documents Received / Reviewed 27

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The verification objective included an assessment of compliance with Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) (Version 3 and associated updates) criteria, the selected methodology (Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Methodology AR-ACM0003 Version 1.0), and the validated Project Description (PD): *Reforesting Degraded Lands In Chile Through The Use Of Mycorrhizal Inoculation* (dated 19 April 2013). This verification assessed the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emission removals through an Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) project – specifically, an Afforestation, Reforestation and Revegetation (ARR) grouped project.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

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 GHGs
- time periods covered

The geographic verification scope was defined by the project boundary, which will include multiple project areas (grouped), the carbon reservoir types, management activities, growth and yield models, inventory program, and contract periods. The scope of *Reforesting Degraded Lands In Chile Through The Use Of Mycorrhizal Inoculation* project was outlined by the project developer prior to the verification initiation and is re-defined as follows:

Baseline Scenario	Degraded land: abandoned pasture
Activities/Technologies/Processes	VCS Grouped ARR
Sources/sinks/Reservoirs	Carbon Pools: Above-ground biomass Below-ground biomass Soil organic carbon Emission Sources: None included
GHG Type	CO_2
Time Period (verification period)	01 June 2003 – 31 May 2012
Project Boundary	48 parcels (initial instances) – approximately 3,007 ha (7,426 acres) located in Chile in Regions VI, VII, and VIII in the communes of Lolol, Estrella, Vichuquen, Pumanque, Quilleco, Hualane, and Chepica. Grouped project geographic boundary includes Regions RM, V, VI, VII, and VIII.

1.3 Level of assurance

The level of assurance was used to determine the depth of detail that the verifier placed in the Verification and Sampling Plan to determine if there are any errors, omissions, or misrepresentations (ISO 14064-3:2006). Environmental Services, Inc., (ESI) assessed the project (general principles, data, sampling descriptions, documentation, calculations, etc.) to provide reasonable assurance to meet the project level requirements of the VCS Program. The evidence used to achieve a reasonable level of assurance is specified in the following sections.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

As stated in the Project Description (PD*),* in 2003, Mikro-Tek initiated the grouped project "Reforesting Degraded Lands in Chile through the use of Mycorrhizal Inoculation". In this reforestation project, Mikro-Tek works with local land owners and provides an advanced propagation technology, mycorrhizal inoculation, to help restore and convert degraded grassland (Figure 1.1) into productive forests in several regions of Chile. The application of this technology, funded by Mikro-Tek's investment, permits successful plantation establishment on sites that would otherwise not be sufficiently productive to incentivize reforestation efforts by landowners. This grouped project promotes reforestation of land that would remain as degraded grassland in the absence of carbon finance"[2].

This PD is for a subset of the grouped Mikro-Tek project in Chile and initially applies to 48 instances comprising approximately 3,007 hectares (ha). The main species planted are *Eucalyptus globulus* and *Pinus radiata*.

2 VALIDATION PROCESS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

2.1 Validation Process

Please refer to Section 2 of the VCS Validation Report (Report ID VO12072.00val, version 02) dated 23 April 2013 prepared by ESI and submitted to Verified Carbon Standard Association (VCSA).

2.2 Validation Findings

2.2.1 Gap Validation

Not Applicable.

2.2.2 Methodology Deviations

No methodology deviations from AR-ACM0003 were requested or identified during the validation.

[2] Mikro-Tek, *Reforesting Degraded Lands In Chile Through The Use Of Mycorrhizal Inoculation*, Version 1.2, dated 19 April 2013.

2.2.3 Project Description Deviations

The Monitoring Report meets all of the requirements of the methodology and does not deviate from the baseline scenario, additionality determination or inclusion of project GHG sources, sinks and reservoirs defined in the PD.

2.2.4 New Project Activity Instances

Although this is a grouped project, this is the initial group of instances.

2.3 Validation Conclusion

ESI confirmed all validation activities including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance and the PD are complete and in adherence to the VCS Version 3 and all associated updates as documented in ESI's Validation Report, version 02 (dated 23 April 2013). ESI concluded without any qualifications or limiting conditions that the PD *Reforesting Degraded Lands In Chile Through The Use Of Mycorrhizal Inoculation* (dated 19 April 2013) meets the requirements of VCS Version 3 and all associated updates.

3 VERIFICATION PROCESS

3.1 Method and Criteria

The verification process closely followed ISO 14064-3, ISO 14065, and ESI's procedures for VCS verifications outlined within our Management System Manual. In addition, the verification process was detailed in a separate Verification and Sampling Plan, which was approved by the Project Proponent on 12 November 2012. As defined by ISO 14064-3:2006 (E), "verification is the systematic, independent and documented process for the evaluation of a greenhouse gas assertion against agreed verification criteria verification criteria".

For this verification, the sample size for the desktop portion of the verification included a complete review of the PD and supporting documents.

The field verification included an onsite review of a sample of project parcels, or initial instances, within the Grouped Project geographic boundary. A risk-based approach was used to select the parcels in order to review multiple ownerships across a wide geographic range of sites sufficient to provide the necessary sample size to meet a reasonable level of assurance, as directed by the professional judgment of the Lead Verifier.

Eight parcels were selected for field verification during the site visit for a total of approximately 36% of the total acres in the project. This exceeded our established minimum field verification sampling threshold of 5% of the total acreage in the PD. Each parcel was visited and photographed to ensure tree planting activities occurred as stated in the PD.

The verification criteria followed ISO 14064-3, the guidance documents provided by VCS, and included the following:

- VCS Program Guide (04 October 2012, v3.4)
- VCS Requirements Document (04 October 2012, v3.3)
- Program Definitions (04 October 2012, v3.4)
- AFOLU Requirements (04 October 2012, v3.3)
- AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (04 October 2012, v3.2)
- Grouped Project Description (PD) entitled *Reforesting Degraded Lands In Chile Through The Use Of Mycorrhizal Inoculation* (dated 19 April 2013)

- Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Methodology AR-ACM0003 Version 1.0 (23 November 2012) (see Section 3.1.1 below for additional information related to the verification process and this methodology)

3.1.1 Verification under AR-ACM0001 and AR-ACM0003

The *Reforesting Degraded Lands in Chile Through The use Of Mycorrhizal Inoculation* project was initially (11 March 2013) verified by ESI under the CDM Methodology AR-ACM0001 (Version 5.2). However, after submittal to the VCS, the project proponent was informed that this methodology was no longer valid as of 22 November 2012 and had passed the two month grace period which expired on 12 January 2013, after which the methodology could not be used. As of 23 November 2012, AR-ACM0003 Version 1.0 became the only valid and applicable CDM Approved Consolidated Methodology for Afforestation/Reforestation (A/R) project activities.

Initial review indicated many parallels in the requirements and procedures of AR-ACM0003 and AR-ACM0001. As such, the project proponent updated the initially verified Monitoring Report (dated 18 February 2013) to conform to AR-ACM0003 (Monitoring Report Dated 18 April 2013). ESI then carefully examined the two methodologies to determine any critical differences and reviewed the Monitoring Report to ensure there were no potential errors, omissions, or misrepresentations related to AR-ACM0003. The critical differences between AR-ACM0001 and AR-ACM0003 were identified (refer to Section 2.1.1 of the VCS Validation Report (Report ID VO12072.00val, version 02) dated 23 April 2013 prepared by ESI and submitted to the VCSA). However, no material discrepancies were found in the Monitoring Report (Dated 18 April 2013) related to the identified differences.

3.2 Document Review

A detailed review of all project documentation was conducted to ensure consistency with, and identify any deviation from, VCS program requirements, the methodology (CDM AR-ACM0003 Version 1.0: “Afforestation and reforestation of lands except wetlands”), and the validated PD. Initial review focused on the validated PD and monitoring report and included an examination of the project details, implementation status, data and parameters, and quantification of GHG emission reductions and removals. Along with a review of the monitoring report, documentation for the selected sample was requested, provided and subsequently reviewed for consistency, accuracy, and appropriateness with regard to VCS program requirements, methodological requirements, and the PD. Documents reviewed include, but are not limited to, land ownership documentation, legal support for customary tenure, carbon rights contracts, property boundaries, maps and aerials, data from monitoring, biomass and carbon calculation spreadsheets, and responses to corrective action/clarification requests. Please see Appendix C for a complete list of documents received and reviewed by ESI.

The verification also included a review of the validated Project Description (PD) and Monitoring Report, relative to the field conditions observed and interviews with project management staff.

3.3 Interviews

Interviews were conducted at multiple levels of the Mikro-Tek program to assess understanding of program requirements and to determine if monitoring conducted in the field was implemented in accordance with the PD. Interviews included discussions with senior management, field managers, and foresters. The following is a list of the main interviewees:

Name	Title
Mark Kean	President Mikro-Tek, Inc./ Project Proponent
James Eaton	Senior Manager, TerraCarbon, LLC./ Consultant
Alfredo Unda	Chile Project Manager/ Forester
Italo Fazzi	Project Forester

3.4 Site Inspections

Site inspections occurred on 26 November – 1 December 2012. Site inspections were performed to verify existence of sites, confirm boundaries, corroborate baseline, and confirm tree age, species, density of plantings, and confirmation of application of SOPs. Site inspections were also conducted to assess the consistency of sampling technique with the PD. GPS was utilized to confirm project location and boundaries. Inventory data (both digital and hard copy) were utilized to confirm the age, species, and density of plantings. As indicated previously, eight (8) of the project areas were visited in the field for a total of approximately 36% of the total acres in the Grouped Project geographic boundary were sampled/ visited during the field verification. The project areas visited during the verification included MikroTek0003, MikroTek0009, MikroTek0025, MikroTek0037, MikroTek0039, MikroTek0041, MikroTek0046 and MikroTek0048.

3.5 Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy

During the verification process, there was a risk that potential errors, omissions, and misrepresentations would be found. The actions taken when errors, omissions, and misrepresentations were found included: notifying the client of the issue(s) identified, and expanding our review/sample to the extent that satisfied the Lead Verifier's professional judgment.

During the course of the verification, fifteen (15) Non-conformance Reports (NCRs) /Clarifications (CLs) were identified. One Opportunity for Improvement (OFI) was also identified. All NCRs/CLs were satisfactorily addressed. The NCRs/CLs provided necessary clarity to ensure the project was in compliance with the requirements of the VCS for GHG projects. For a complete list of all NCRs/CLs and their resolutions, please refer to Appendix A.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

The project activities and monitoring plan, as described in the validated PD, have been fully implemented. There are no remaining issues from the previous validation, and this is the initial verification.

4.2 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations

ESI conducted an intensive review all input data, parameters, formulas, connections, conversions, statistics and resulting uncertainties and output data to ensure consistency with the VCS standard, the project PD and the methodology. Further, ESI reproduced calculations for selected samples to ensure accuracy of the results. All data, conversion factors, formulas, and calculations were provided by the project proponent in spreadsheet format to ensure all formulas were accessible for review. The project proponent also provided a step-by-step overview of calculations to ensure ESI understood the approach and could confirm its consistency with the methodology and PD.

ESI also conducted a comprehensive assessment of all data collection and storage procedures to ensure all opportunities for error in transposition of data between data were minimized.

Uncertainty was assessed as set out in the CDM tool "Estimation of carbon stocks and change in carbon stocks of trees and shrubs in A/R CDM project activities" version 3.0 and allowed by AR-ACM0003. A confidence deduction of 6 % was applied to the mean biomass carbon stock. ESI recalculated the statistics independently to confirm the accuracy of the reported precision.

Field data collection was consistent with the SOP's for the project and utilized appropriate principles of forestry data collection, including appropriate tools and methods. Collected data was handled appropriately, including a structured process for quality check. Analysis of collected data used appropriate formulas, conversions, and parameters, supported by scientific literature. Where ranges of parameters exist, or other types of formulaic uncertainty, appropriately conservative values were used in data analysis.

4.3 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals

During ESI's verification, the evidence provided by the project proponent was more than sufficient in both quantity and quality to support the determination of GHG emission removals reported by the project. Throughout the verification, Mikro-Tek's team demonstrated a strong commitment toward conservativeness and took all measures appropriate to ensure the reliability of all evidence provided. Interviews conducted (oral evidence) are outlined in Section 3.3, and the final documents received from Mikro-Tek, Inc. are outlined in Appendix B.

4.4 Management and Operational System

The management system employed by Mikro-Tek, Inc. utilizes appropriate field measurement methods (systematic, appropriate measurement tools and techniques), high quality data collection and management techniques (web-based, controlled data entry system; clearly identified responsibilities for data accuracy; appropriate data quality control), and data analysis (web-based calculation system). Staff is thoroughly familiar with their responsibilities and is appropriately trained for these responsibilities. Accordingly, in the process of the verification, ESI confirmed the suitability and appropriateness of Mikro-Tek's management system for monitoring and reporting.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

After review of all project information, procedures, calculations, and supporting documentation and selected site visits, ESI confirms that the monitoring conducted by Mikro-Tek, along with the supporting Monitoring Report, are accurate and consistent with all aforementioned VCS criteria, the validated PD, and the selected methodology.

ESI confirms all verification activities, including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance, monitoring, adherence to the validated PD, and the project documentation are complete and in adherence to the VCS Version 3 and all associated updates as documented in this report. ESI concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that the *Reforesting Degraded Lands In Chile Through The Use Of Mycorrhizal Inoculation* project has been implemented in accordance with the validated PD, dated 19 April 2013 and meets the requirements of VCS Version 3 and all associated updates.

The GHG assertion provided by Mikro-Tek and verified by ESI has resulted in the GHG emissions reduction or removal of 447,152 tCO_2 equivalents by the project during the verification/reporting period (01 June 2003 to 31 May 2012). As permitted by the methodology, emissions are reported as zero. This does not include the 10% buffer withholding.

GHG Emission Reductions or Removals	tCO_2e
Baseline Emissions	0
Project Emissions	0
Leakage	0
Net GHG emission reductions or removals	**447,152**

Report Submitted to:	Voluntary Carbon Standard Association 1730 Rhode Island Ave. NW, Suite 803 Washington, D.C. 20036 Mikro-Tek Inc. 115 Sandy Falls Road Timmins, Ontario P4N7X8 Canada
Report Submitted by:	Environmental Services, Inc. Corporate Office 7220 Financial Way, Suite 100 Jacksonville, FL 32256
ESI Lead Verifier Name and Signature:	Shawn McMahon Lead Verifier
ESI Division Regional Technical Manager Name and Signature:	Janice McMahon Vice President and Forestry, Carbon and GHG Division Regional Technical Manager
Date:	26 February 2015

SMM/JPM/CS/RMB/VO12072.00.00 VERIF REPORT_Final_v3.DOC
K: PF 02/26/15f

APPENDIX A – NCR/CL/OFI SUMMARY

Item No.	VCS Standard 3.3 Requirements (04 October 2012)	Round 1 NCR/ CL / OFI	Response from Client	Round 2 NCR/LC/OFI	Response from Client	Satisfied (Y or N)
	3.6 PROJECT DESCRIPTION DEVIATIONS					
	3.6.1 Deviations from the project description are permitted at verification. The procedures for documenting the deviation depend on whether the deviation impacts the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario. Interpretation of whether the deviation impacts any of these shall be determined consistent with the CDM Guidelines on assessment of different types of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD, mutatis mutandis. The procedures are as follows:					
1	2) Where the deviation does not impact the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario, and the project remains in compliance with the applied methodology, the deviation shall be described and justified in the monitoring report. This shall include a description of when the changes occurred and the reasons for the changes. The deviation shall also be described in all subsequent monitoring reports. Examples of such deviations include changes in the procedures for measurement and monitoring, or project design changes that do not have an impact on the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario.	CL: Monitoring report Section 2.2: Please identify and describe the origin of the data used to construct DBH to basal diameter relationships	The following sentence was added to Section 2.2 of the Monitoring Report: "This relationship was developed by measuring both diameter at breast height and basal diameter for 68 trees in the EUC-2003/2004 strata or the “pre-harvested” strata." We also added the following footnote: "This information was collected during the course of the 2012 forest inventory."	Addressed.		y
	3.10.1 Project location shall be specified in the project description as follows:					

2	2) Project location for grouped projects shall be specified using geodetic polygons to delineate the project's geographic area or areas (see Section 3.4.2 for further information on geographic areas for grouped projects) and provided in a KML file.	NCR: Please provide a KML file of the project's geographic area. Please address the boundary issues identified in the on-site visit.	The boundaries of project instances, MikroTek0003, MikroTek0007, and MikroTek0039, (i.e., those site found in UTM Zone 18S) have been revised in response to this finding. These boundary delineation were ground truthed using a series of GPS boundary points collected by Italo Fazzi, a local forester, on January 12th, 2013. Maps of the revised project boundary, GIS shape files of the revised project boundary (MikroTek_PA_20130116.shp) and groundtruthing points (GPSgroundtruth2013.01.12.shp), and a google earth file of the project boundary (MikroTek_PA_20130116.kmz) have also been provided as part of the response to this finding. A kmz file and shapefile for the project region has also been added to the project database as part of the response to this finding. The project area has been updated throughout the PD as a result of the revised project boundary. GHG quantification calculations will also be updated as a result of this change.	The changes in area for the three affected instances are not included in Table 1.1 of the monitoring report. Please address. The changes in area in Monitoring report Section 1.1 do not match those in PD Section 1.1. Please modify text in Monitoring report to match.	Table 1.1 in the monitoring report has been updated to reflect the change in the project area. The text in section 1.1 of the monitoring report in relation to area has been revised to match that in the PD.	y
	3.11 OWNERSHIP AND OTHER PROGRAMS					
	Right of Use					
	3.16 MONITORING					
	Data and Parameters					
	Monitoring Plan					

3	3.16.3 The project proponent shall establish a GHG information system for obtaining, recording, compiling and analyzing data and information important for quantifying and reporting GHG emissions and/or removals relevant for the project (including leakage) and baseline scenario.	OFI: Incorporate Section 1.13.1.3 to Section 4.3 (Description of the monitoring plan)	The following text has been added to Section 4.3.5.3 of the PD "Each new grouped project instance will be given a unique identifier and incorporated into the overall project accounting tracking system. The project maintains an electronic database of GIS coverages detailing parcel boundaries and monitoring plot locations (once established), and maps archived in both digital and hard copy form. Original field monitoring data sheets, GIS data layers, reports of analyses and supporting spreadsheets will be stored in both hard copy and digital form at the Mikro-Tek Office in Timmins, Ontario for at least 2 years beyond the project crediting period."	Addressed.		y
	Monitoring Report					
4	3.16.6 The monitoring report shall include all the data and information as set out in the monitoring requirements of the project description and the applied methodology. It shall be prepared using the VCS Monitoring Report Template and shall include the following:	NCR: Please revise PD Section 4.3.1.3 to include a description of the ex post stratification	The text in Section 4.3.1.3 of the PD has been revised from "The project area will be initially stratified by planting year and species" to the following "The project area will be stratified in the ex-ante and ex-post case by planting year and species."	Addressed.		y
	Content of Project Description					
	3.5 PARTICIPATION UNDER OTHER GHG PROGRAMS					
	3.5.1 Projects registered under both the VCS Program and an approved GHG program shall comply with the rules set out in the VCS Standard, in addition to the following:					

5	1) All and any (VCS) monitoring and verification reports shall state the total amount of credits (GHG credits and, where applicable, buffer credits) issued under the other GHG program.	NCR: Please include a statement in monitoring report regarding the number of credits issued (or lack of) under the CDM.	The following statement was added to Section 1.1 of the monitoring report: "While project instances MikroTek0041 and MikroTek0048 has been registered under the CDM, no emission reductions (tCERs or lCERs) have been issued or will be applied for."	Addressed.		y
Item No.	**VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 3.2 04 Oct 2012**	**Round 1 NCR/ CL / OFI**	**Response from Client**	**ESI Final Response**	**Response from Client**	**Satisfied (Y or N)**
	Table 1 Project Management					
6	Management team does not include individuals with significant experience in all skills necessary to successfully undertake all project activities (i.e., any area of required experience is not covered by at least one individual with at least 5 years' experience in the area).	NCR: Please provide additional description of the teams experience to demonstrate that all areas of required experience is covered by at least one individual with at least 5 years' experience in the project area.	Risk Factor C of Project Management in Appendix A has been revised to read: "The management team responsible for the day-to-day project management includes Mark Kean, Marilyn Wood, and Alfredo Unda, each with significant experience in their respective fields. Mark Kean founded Mikro-Tek in 1990 and has since led Mikro-Tek in its development of commercial mycorrhizal strains, its application of this biotechnology in both domestic and foreign markets, and use of the technology as an integral part of forest carbon projects. Mark has over ten years' experience managing reforestation projects which incorporate the use of mycorrhizal inoculation in Chile. Marilyn Wood has over 20 years' experience in small business management. She is responsible for maintenance of Mikro-Tek's strategic organizational plans, accounting and management information systems; development and execution of marketing efforts including licensing and distribution agreements in foreign markets; and, international and domestic project management. Alfredo Unda has been working with Mikro-Tek on projects in Chile since	Addressed.		y

			1998. Alfredo is a Santiago based forester who has an extensive background in environmental consulting, natural resource management, and FSC auditing. Alfredo's primary role is as a project manager for Mikro-Tek's carbon sequestration projects and also acts as a liaison between Mikro-Tek and Chilean forestry partners." Further, a more detailed CV for Mark Kean, Marilyn Wood, and Alfredo Unda has been included as a response to this finding. In the course of this response, we have also revised the text in Risk E of Project Management in Appendix A to read: "The management team has experience in AFOLU project design and implementation. Mark Kean of MikroTek has developed a forest carbon project under the CDM, and has been working in the forest carbon arena for over 5 years with experiences including managing the project design, implementation, and financing. The project proponents work alongside and have access to experts in carbon accounting and reporting (i.e., TerraCarbon) who have significant experience in all aspects of AFOLU project design and implementation, carbon accounting and reporting under the VCS Program. TerraCarbon has successfully validated and verified numerous projects under the VCS, including validation and verification of the VCS ARR project "Reforestation Across the Lower Mississippi Valley"			
	Table 2 Financial Viability					

7	Project cash flow breakeven point is greater than 10 years from the current risk assessment	NCR: Please show that the cash flow is based on generally accepted accounting principles: future values are not discounted to the present - please provide a discussion justifying this approach. Also, please correct the values for planting area. Please add costs for validation in 2012. Please include repayment of CONAF loans in analysis. Also, please provide evidence that the CONAF subsidies are provided two years after planting.	Analysis was done by Mikro-Tek team, and reviewed by Marilyn Wood (MBA), using generally accepted accounting standards. Net Present Value comparison was done to compare NPV with and without carbon credit revenue. Modification to spreadsheet was done to reflect actual hectares that were measured under current monitoring plan for 2003 to 2008 plantings, as opposed to CONAF forest plan projections. Validation costs and CONAF loan repayments were also added to spreadsheet. The Forest Law 701 subsidy pays 75% of the planting costs on a 90% survival assessment done one year after planting (see section 5.1.5 in attached report "ICF Feasibility Study"). We stated two years in the PD to be conservative as some of the projects are planted over two seasons, so the application for the subsidy assessment is sometimes done in the second year, which delays the field assessment until the second year. Revised Financial analysis spreadsheet is attached in document: Mikro-Tek Chile Cash Flow...	Could not locate the "ICF Feasibility Study". Please provide.	The ICF Feasibility study has been added to the project database and provided as an email attachment as part of this response.	y

8	Project has secured 80% or more of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven	NCR: Please provide evidence that the funding is secured as per VCS AFOLU Risk tool Section 2.2.2.4. Also, clarify differences in cash flow file vs. what PD claims.	See revised cash flow analysis as outlined in NCR#18. All expenditures up to the year 2012 have already accrued and have been paid by the respective project partners, with the exception of items Val PDD of $41,086 and Val/Ver &Monitoring of $135,000 as listed in 2012 column. These two items are currently ongoing and Mikro-Tek has already made partial payments of $132,000 on these two items to date, and have the funds in place for the remaining amount owed. Together the expense covered from 2003 to 2012 are over the 90% of total expenses that will have been occurred up until the project break-even year of 2013.	Addressed.		
	Table 8: Political Risk					
9	Governance score of 0.82 or higher	CL: Please confirm that the most recent five years of data were used to quantify the governance score	The governance score has been recalculated for the most recent 5 years. The revised value (1.16) and data table has been incorporated in to the Political Risk section of Appendix A.	Addressed.		
	Natural Risks: See Page 15					

10	Fire Risk	NCR: Please briefly describe in the PD how the likelihood was calculated for Risk of Fire and justify the significance level. Also, Regions RM and V should be included in the data.	The following text had been added as a footnote to the Section on Fire Risk "The return interval is calculated as 100 years divided by 1.7% = 58.8 years" The following text had been added to the Section on Fire Risk "Due to the geographic spread of the project instances and the fact that fires rarely affect more than 50% of biomass on site, fires are unlikely to result in greater than a 50% loss of carbon stocks in the project area and the significance has been assessed as major." Inclusion of Region RM and V in the assessment of natural risk is not warranted at this time as there are no project instances in these regions, and hence no GHG emissions reductions are at risk. As project instances in these regions are added to the PD, the risk analysis will be expanded to include these regions.	Please clarify the calculation as it is not understood why 100 is divided by 1.7%. Further the statement says that 100 divided by 1.7% is 58.8 which is not accurate. Please address.	Fire affects 1.7% of plantation forests in Region VI, VII, and VIII. What is the likelihood of any given stand being affested by fire? For any given forest stand, it is likely to be affected 1.7% of the time. Over a 100 year period, it is likely to be affected for 1.7 years. Hence the average return interval for any given stand is 100/1.7. The following text had been revised as a footnote to the Section on Fire Risk "The return interval is calculated as 100 years divided by 1.7 = 58.8 years"	y

11	Pest/Disease Risk	NCR: Please briefly describe in the PD how the likelihood was calculated for Risk of Pest/Disease outbreak and justify the significance level chosen	The following text had been added as a footnote to the Section on Pest Risk "The return interval is calculated as 100 years divided by 8.3% = 12 years." The following text was also added to the Section on Pest Risk "Due to the geographic spread of the project instances and the fact there are no pest species that lead to full stand replacement currently in Chile" The following text has been added to the risk and disease risk section of the PD: "Chile is largely a pest free country due in part to its natural conditions and in part to the strict pest control and surveillance program of SAG (Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero), the entity responsible for the permanent monitoring of pests in fruit and forestry plantations. Risks of pests and disease found in plantation forests in the project region are mitigated by correctly siting plantation species and close oversight and management. Further, local foresters have access to pest and disease management expertise at the local SAG office."	Please clarify the calculation as it is not understood why 100 is divided by 8.3%. Further the statement says that 100 divided by 1.7% is 12 which is not accurate. Please address.	8.3% of Chilean forests are affected by pests annually. What is the likelihood of any given stand being affested by pests? For any given forest stand, it is likely to be affected 8.3% of the time. Over a 100 year period, it is likely to be affected for 8.3 years. Hence the average return interval for any given stand is 100/8.3. The following text had been revised as a footnote to the Section on Pest Risk "The return interval is calculated as 100 years divided by 8.3 = 12 years."	y
12	Extreme Weather Risk	NCR: Please briefly describe in the PD the evidence used to determine that drought is the only significant extreme weather events and the evidence that support the selection of the likelihood category for extreme weather and justify the significance level chosen.	The text in the PD related to extreme weather risk has been revised to the below text. Further the risk rating has been raised to 2.5. "Extreme weather risks affecting the project area include blowdown due to strong winds, rain induced flooding and erosion, and drought, A local forester who has worked in Chile's central valley for over ten years has confirmed that he does not know	Addressed.		y

			of any instances of blowdown affecting plantations in the planting region (I. Fazzi, pers. comm.). As such the likelihood of an extreme wind event is thought to be in the range of once in every 100 years or more which corresponds to a score of zero risk. While the risk of severe rain events include flooding and erosion, flooding in not an issue as the project areas are on slopes or the top of mountains and are not prone to flooding. When water is channelized due to natural topography, rain events can lead to erosion and mortality of planted trees. While the return interval of gully erosion is not known, the effect is likely to be insignificant with less than 1% of the project area being affected in a way that leads to tree mortality. In 2011, Núñez et al, estimated that significant droughts have a return period of 22 years in the project region. Given that the geographic spread of the project stands and their various ages (with the knowledge that drought effects decrease with stands establishment and development), any drought is unlikely to lead to significant (>50%) loss in carbon stocks and the significance level has been assessed as major. The highest likelihood and greatest significance (that of drought) was used to assess the risk of extreme weather. A mitigation measure used to lessen the influence of drought has been built into the project design whereby the susceptibility of all trees planted to drought is reduced because of the increased water uptake capacity of the mycorrhizal inoculated seedlings."			

13	Geologic Risk	NCR: Please identify the evidence supporting the statement that there are no active volcanoes in the project region	The PD has been revised to note there are active volanos in the project region, yet they are unlikely to affect the carbon stocks given their distance. The closest volcano to a project area would be the Antuco Volcano which is approximately 65 km from the site Mikrotek 0040 in Region VIII. All the active volcanoes in Chile are located in the Andes Mountains in the eastern half of the country along the border with Argentina. See list of volcanoes at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_volcanoes_in_Chile#Subduction_volcanoes_in_Central_and_Southern_Chile. The elevation of these volcanoes are all over 1,100 meters at an altitude that would not support the growth of plantation forests, and thus would not be able to abtain the required CONAF approval designation of "preferred forestry aptitude" as outlined in NCR # 25 below. All of the Mikro-Tek projects are in the central vale or in the eastern costal mountain range well away from the active volcano ranges within the Andian mountain range.	Addressed.		y
Item No.	**AR-ACM0001-Consolidated afforestation and reforestation baseline and monitoring methodology AR-ACM0001 Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land" (Version 05.2.0) (25 November 2011)[3]**	**Round 1 NCR/ CL / OFI**	**Response from Client**	**Round 2 NCR/LC/OFI**	**Response from Client**	**Satisfied (Y or N)**
	5. Actual net GHG removals by sinks					

[3] AR-ACM0003 equivalent requirement is identified in parentheses.

	The actual net GHG removals by sinks shall be calculated as:					
14	See Equation 3 Page 6 (See AR-ACM0003, Equations 2 and 3, paragraphs 15 and 16)	CL: In the tables in Section 3.2.3, please provide clarity as to the use of equations 3, 4, and 5 of AR-ACM0001	Ex-ante, equation 3, 4, and 5 of the CDM methodology AR-ACM0001 can be simplified. As GHGE=0 and litter (ΔCLI_PROJ,t), shrub biomass (ΔCSHRUB_PROJ,t) and dead wood biomass (ΔCDW_PROJ) are not included in the project boundary. The simplfied and combined equation 3, 4, and 5 can be written ΔCACTUAL = ΔCP = Sum(ΔCT) = Sum(ΔCTREE_PROJ,t + ΔCSOC_AL,t) ΔCTREE_PROJ,t is broken out separately between live tree biomass and belowground biomass in Table 3.5 and 3.6. In summary in Table 3.5 and 3.6 the columns entitled "Metric tons of CO2 (t CO2e/ha)"= ΔCACTUAL = ΔCP = Sum(ΔCT)	Please add the last statement from your response to the PD as this will help clarify to other readers what the values in the table represent.	The following sentence "In summary in Table 3.5 and 3.6 the columns entitled "Metric tons of CO2 (t CO2e/ha)"= ΔCACTUAL = ΔCP = Sum(ΔCT) " has been added to Section 3.2.3 of the PD.	y
	2.2 Precision requirements					
15	Maximum allowable relative margin of error of the mean for estimation of tree biomass is ± 10% at 90% confidence level. (See CDM Tool "Estimation of carbon stocks and change in carbon stocks of trees and shrubs in A/R CDM project activities," Section 10)	NCR: Please provide evidence that the applied Confidence Deduction is conservative as per VCS Section 4.1.4 or Install more sample plots in order to meet the precision requirements of AR-ACM0001	The VCS Standard (v3.3) states in Section 4.1.4 that "Confidence deductions shall be applied using conservative factors such as those specified in the CDM Meth Panel guidance on addressing uncertainty in its Thirty Second Meeting Report, Annex 14." As the factor used in Annex 14 of the Thirty Second Meeting Report are only suggested for use and are only applicable for estimating uncertainty at a 95% confidence level they are not mandated nor appropriate for use on this project. As the mean biomass carbon stock 49.49 t C/ha was estimated with a precision level of +/- 12.6% of the mean at the 90% confidence, this	We contacted VCS (Ben Block) by phone regarding the requirement in VCS Standard 3.3 section 4.1.4 to ensure that VCS rules would take precedence over the CDM methodology. While they stated that this is indeed the case (typically VCS rules trump CDM meth requirements) the section 4.1.4 of the Standard is for development of methodologies and therefore does not take precedence. Accordingly we are left with the requirement in the methodology which states that the maximum allowable	Submitted the following text to ESI via email on 2/15/2013 We understand from your last response that the CDM methodology takes precedence over VCS guidance provided in Section 4.1.4 of the standard. As you then state "we are left with the requirement in the methodology which states that the maximum allowable relative margin of error of the mean for estimation of tree biomass is ± 10% at 90% confidence level." We therefore would like to	y

			value has been revised downward to 48.22 t C/ha. This value is calculated as: mean biomass carbon stock – ((90% confidence interval as percentage of mean - allowable error (i.e. 10%))* mean biomass carbon stock). In this instance, the conservatively reduced mean = 49.49 t C/ha – ((12.6%-10%)*49.49 t C/ha = 48.22 t C/ha. This value is conservative as it is 2.6% less than the mean.	relative margin of error of the mean for estimation of tree biomass is ± 10% at 90% confidence level. If you can provide a demonstration that the confidence deduction is permitted by VCS somewhere else in their rules we will be glad to consider.	propose the following deviation to the AR-ACM0001 CDM methodology: “In the event that monitoring of biomass yields a precision of the estimates exceeding ± 10% of the mean at a 90% confidence level, as required by the methodology, an appropriate confidence deduction will be applied. This confidence deduction will be in line with VCS guidance provided in Section 4.1.4 of the VCS Standard. The confidence deduction will be calculated as: mean biomass carbon stock – ((90% confidence interval as percentage of mean – 10%)* mean biomass carbon stock).” This methodology deviation is warranted because variability is often quite high in young forest stands and monitoring to required precision levels is impractical. Use of the confidence deduction is warranted and does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals. The conservativeness of the GHG emission accounting is maintained because the conservatively reduced tree biomass value is the lower bound of the desired confidence level minus the allowable error (10%), as explained below.	

					As the mean biomass carbon stock 49.49 t C/ha was estimated with a precision level of +/- 12.6% of the mean at the 90% confidence, this value has been revised downward to 48.22 t C/ha. This value is calculated as: mean biomass carbon stock – ((90% confidence interval as percentage of mean - allowable error (i.e. 10%))* mean biomass carbon stock). In this instance, the conservatively reduced mean = 49.49 t C/ha – ((12.6%-10%)*49.49 t C/ha = 48.22 t C/ha. This value is conservative as it is 2.6% less than the mean. Further, this methodology deviation should be allowed as this represents a deviation from a criteria and parameter related to monitoring (in line with section 3.5.1 of the VCS Standard) and the resulting value is conservative as a reduction from the mean is applied. Uncertainty or the margin of error is a monitoring parameter generated using data gathered in the course of the forest inventory.	

APPENDIX B – DOCUMENTS RECEIVED / REVIEWED

Documents Received 19 October 2012

- MikroTek_PD_2012.10.19 clean.doc

Documents Received 24 October 2012

- Agreement Template
  - Voluntary Participation Form (Eng) Nov 2 05.pdf
  - Template Legal agreement (Eng) Dec 08.doc
- GIS Database
  - MikroTek_PA_20121018.shx
  - MikroTek_PA_20121018.dbf
  - MikroTek_PA_20121018.prj
  - MikroTek_PA_20121018.sbn
  - MikroTek_PA_20121018.sbx
  - MikroTek_PA_20121018.shp
  - MikroTek_PA_20121018.shp.xml
- Project Document
  - MikroTek_PD_2012.10.19.xlsx
  - MikroTek_PD_2012.10.19 clean.doc
- References
  - Validation_Report_Nerquihue [Final upload, version 6 Jan 27 2010].pdf
  - Annex 1 Growth curves E globulus and P radiata MikroTek.docx
  - Carbon Sequestration through Mycorrhizal Inoculation Draft Concept Outline 2002.pdf
  - CONAF Law DL-701.pdf
  - CONAF Subsidy Info.pdf
  - FAO 2009 Review of Pests and Disease Forestry Paper 156.pdf
  - Gayoso, J. 2008a. Eucalyptus sp. Resultados Proyecto FONDEF D98i1076.pdf
  - Gayoso, J. 2008b. Pinus radiata. Resultados Proyecto FONDEF D98i1076.pdf
  - GTZ and CONOMA 2003 National Strategy Study for the CDM in Chile.pdf
  - Kean et al 2002 Mikro-Tek Original Year One.pdf
  - MikroTek 2006 Carbon Sink in Chilean Forests - Years 1 - 3.pdf
  - MikroTek 2007 Mycorrhizal Inoculation Concept Paper.pdf
  - Morales E. 2003 [Ownership & Management of Forest Plantations Chile].pdf
  - OFRI & Mikro-Tek Forest Research Report No. 145.PDF
  - PDD Mikro-Tek Nerquihue V7.doc
  - Prado and Weber 2003 Implementation of Sustainable Forest Management Chile.pdf
  - Chile Landuse Stats
    - Chile Land Use Statistics.xls
    - Chile 1997 Agricultural Statistics.xls
    - INE Statistics 2007
      - 17.xls
      - 2.xls
      - 3.xls
      - 10.xls
      - 11.xls
      - 16.xls
- Risk
  - World Bank 2011 WGI Dataset.xls
  - Chile Political Risk 2006-2010.xls
  - CONAF 2011 historico-conaf_empresas-85_11.xls
  - CONAF 2011 Occurrences of Fire by Region.xls
  - Mikro-Tek Chile Cash Flow Analysis 2012.10.08.xls
- Supporting Documents (CDM, VCS)
  - VCS Standard, v3.3.pdf

- AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v3.2.pdf
- AFOLU Requirements v3.3_0.pdf
- AR-ACM0001 AR of degraded land AR-ACM0001 AR of degraded land V5.2.pdf
- CDM 2009 Estimation increase GHG emissions attributable to displacement in AR.pdf
- CDM 2009 GUIDELINES ON CONSERVATIVE CHOICE AND APPLICATION OF DEFAULT DATA.pdf
- CDM Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality.pdf
- CDM PROCEDURES TO DEMONSTRATE THE ELIGIBILITY OF LANDS FOR AFFORESTATION AND REFORESTATION.pdf
- CDM Tool for the identification of degraded lands for AR project.pdf
- Tool for estimation of SOC due to AR CDM V1.1.pdf

Documents Received 13 November 2012

- MikroTek 2012 Monitoring Data 2012.11.13.xls

Documents Received 20 November 2012

- MikroTek_2012_Monitoring_Report_2012.11.20.docx
- MikroTek 2012 Monitoring Data and Results 2012.11.13.xls
- Mikro-Tek 2012 Monitoring Report 2012.11.15.xlsx
- Field Data
  - Mikro-Tek_InventoryData_2012.10.16.pdf
  - Mikro-Tek_InventoryData_2012.09.14.pdf
- MikroTek 2012 Monitoring Plots
  - MikroTekMonitoringPlots_2012.09.28.shx
  - MikroTekMonitoringPlots_2012.09.28.dbf
  - MikroTekMonitoringPlots_2012.09.28.prj
  - MikroTekMonitoringPlots_2012.09.28.sbn
  - MikroTekMonitoringPlots_2012.09.28.sbx
  - MikroTekMonitoringPlots_2012.09.28.shp
  - MikroTekMonitoringPlots_2012.09.28.shp.xml
- SOPs
  - Mikro-Tek_SOPs_2012.09.19 Espanol.doc
  - Mikro-Tek SOPs 2012.09.19 English.doc

Documents Received 29 November 2012

- MikroTek Polygon Check 2012.10.15.xls

Documents Received 25 January 2013

- MikroTek_PD_2013.01.22.doc
- 2012-12-27_Mikro-Tek_Chile_Responses_2013.01.22.xls
- MikroTek_2012_Monitoring_Report_2013.01.22.docx
- MikroTek_PD_2012.01.22.xls

Documents Received 29 January 2013

- Support for Validation Findings 2013.01.21
  - Section 3.5 Gayoso et al 2002.doc
  - Batjes 2010 IPCC Soils Classes.pdf
  - Chile Import Permits 2002.pdf
  - CONAF Procedures - EN translation.pdf
  - CV for Mikro-Tek Team.docx
  - FAO_2006a.pdf
  - Gayoso 2002 Contenido de carbono y funciones de biomasa

en especies nativas y exoticas.pdf
- Gayoso, J. 2008a. Eucalyptus sp. EN version.doc
- Gayoso, J. 2008b. Pinus radiata EN version.doc
- Mikro-Tek Chile Project_Cash_Flow_Analysis_& NPV Comp. (2003 to 2008) Dec 2012.xlsx
- MikroTek_IPCCSoilTypes.jpg
- Morales E. 2003 [Ownership & Management of Forest Plantations Chile].pdf
- Nunez 2011 Mapping drought events in north-central Chile.pdf
- Sanhueza, E. et al. 2003 [Chile's National Strategy Study CDM - english summary].pdf
- Chile Landuse Stats
  - Chile Landuse Stats\Chile Statistics Revised 2013.01.17.xls
  - INE Statistics 1997
    - Chile 1997 Agricultural Statistics.xls
  - INE Statistics 2007
    - 17.xls"
    - 2.xls
- Revised Boundary
  - Revised Boundary-MikroTek0039.jpg
  - MikroTek_PA_20130116.kmz
  - Revised Boundary-MikroTek0003.jpg
  - Revised Boundary-MikroTek0007.jpg
  - Ground Truthing Points
    - GPSgroundtruth 2013.01.12.shx
    - GPSgroundtruth 2013.01.12.dbf
    - GPSgroundtruth 2013.01.12.prj
    - GPSgroundtruth 2013.01.12.sbn
    - GPSgroundtruth 2013.01.12.sbx
    - GPSgroundtruth 2013.01.12.shp
  - Revised Project Boundary
    - MikroTek_PA_20130116.shx
    - MikroTek_PA_20130116.dbf
    - MikroTek_PA_20130116.prj
    - MikroTek_PA_20130116.sbn
    - MikroTek_PA_20130116.sbx
    - \MikroTek_PA_20130116.shp
    - MikroTek_PA_20130116.shp.xml

Documents Received 30 January 2013
- MikroTek_GeographicRegion.kmz

Documents Received 04 February 2013
- MikroTek_PD_2013.02.04.xls
- \2012-12-27_Mikro-Tek_Chile_Responses_2013.02.01.xls
- Mikro-Tek 2012 Monitoring Report 2013.02.04.xls
- MikroTek_2012_Monitoring_Report_2013.02.04.docx
- MikroTek_PD_2013.02.04.doc

Documents Received 10 February 2013
- VCS PD Partner Files
  - Ulloa
    - 1. Ulloa Voluntary Participation Form.pdf
    - 1. Ulloa Business Collaboration Agreement.pdf
    - 1. Ulloa CONAF Maps

        - 1. Ulloa Rol #16-10.tif
        - 1. Ulloa Rol # 16-119.tif
    - Nitsche
        - 2. Nitsche Voluntary Participation Form.pdf
        - 2. Nitsche Business Collaboration Agreement.pdf
        - 2. Nitsche CONAF Maps
            - Nitsche - Rol #18-22, 23.pdf
            - Nitsche - Rol # 38-90.pdf
            - Nitsche - 18-216.pdf
            - Nitsche - AD Rol # 18-22, 23.pdf
            - Nitsche - AD Rol # 38-90.pdf
            - Nitsche - Rol # 18-20.pdf
            - Nitsche - Rol # 18-216.pdf
    - Harris-Correa
        - 3. Harris-Correa Voluntary Participation Form.pdf
        - 3. Harris-Correa Business Collaboration Agreement.pdf
        - 3. Harris-Correa CONAF Maps
            - Harris-Correa Rol # 592-57 (592-110).jpg
            - Harris-Correa 1 Rol # 15-13.JPG
            - Harris-Correa 2 Rol # 15-13.JPG
            - Harris-Correa Rol # 15-12.JPG
            - Harris-Correa Rol # 15-14.JPG
            - Harris-Correa Rol # 15-18.JPG
            - Harris-Correa Rol # 52-10.JPG
            - Harris-Correa Rol # 62-15.JPG
    - Garces
        - 4. Garces Voluntary Participation Form.pdf
        - 4. Garces Business Collaboration Agreement.pdf
        - 4. Garces CONAF Maps
            - 4. Garces Rol # 16-50 b.tif
            - 4. Garces Rol # 16-50 a.tif
    - Giglio
        - 5. Giglio Voluntary Participation Form.pdf
        - 5. Giglio Business Collaboration Agreement.pdf
        - 5. Giglio CONAF Maps
            - 5. Giglio Rol # 18-389.tif
    - Bulnes
        - 7. Bulnes Planting Summary.xls
        - 7. Bulnes Business Collaboration Agreement.pdf
        - 7. Bulnes Voluntary Participation Form.pdf
        - 7. Bulnes CONAF Maps

        - Bulnes 35-89 (ex 35-63) (2).pdf
        - 7. Bulnes Rol # 45-21 b.tif
        - 7. Bulnes Rol # 45-21.tif
    - Catalan
        - 8. Catalan, Voluntary Participation Form.jpg
        - 8. Catalan Business Collaboration Agreement.pdf
        - 8. Catalan CONAF Maps
            - 8. Catalan Rol #27-40 p.tif
            - 8. Catalan Rol #27-40 map.pdf
    - Barroilhet
        - 9. Barroilhet Voluntary Participation Form.pdf
        - 9. Barroilhet Business Collaboration Agreement.pdf
        - 9. Barroilhet CONAF Maps
            - 9. Barroilhet Rol #56-6.pdf
            - 9. Barroilhet Rol #35-21.pdf
    - Toledo
        - 10. Toledo Business Collaboration Agreement.pdf
        - 10. Toledo Voluntary Participation Form.pdf
        - 10. Toledo, Voluntary Participation Form (2).jpg
        - 10. Toledo CONAF Maps
            - 10. Toledo Rol #61-24.tif
    - Cuevas
        - 11. Cuevas Voluntary Participation Form.pdf
        - 11. Cuevas Business Collaboration Agreement.pdf
        - 11. Cuevas CONAF Maps
            - 11. Cuevas Rol #144-22.tif
    - Hernandez
        - 12. Hernandez Voluntary Participation Form.pdf
        - 12. Hernandez Business Collaboration Agreement.pdf
        - 12. Hernandez CONAF Maps
            - Hernandez 57-6.pdf
            - 12. Hernandez, Rol #57-25.tif
            - Hernandez 57-4.pdf
    - Baztan
        - 13. Baztan Business Collaboration Agreement.pdf
        - 13. Baztan Voluntary Participation Form.pdf
        - 13. Baztan CONAF Maps
            - Sector C 2 001.jpg
            - 13. Baztan Rol #1523-20 & 21.pdf
            - Sector B 2 000.jpg
    - Vera
        - 14. Vera Voluntary Participation Form.pdf
    - Guzman – Vera
        - 15. Guzman-Vera Voluntary Participation Form.pdf

        - 15. Guzman-Vera Business Collaboration Agreement Rol #136-7.pdf
        - 15. Guzman-Vera Business Collaboration Agreement, Rol #136-2.pdf
        - 15. Guzman-Vera CONAF Repts. Rol #136-7.pdf
    - Undurraga (Julio Covarrubias)
        - 16. Undurraga-Covarrubias CONAF Maps
            - Nerquigue 2.pdf
            - 16. Undurraga-Covarrubias Rol # 16- 60 ....pdf
            - 6. Undurraga-Covarrubias Rol #16-60....pdf

Documents Received 18 February 2013

- ProjectRegionTemp_2013.02.18.xls
- Anuario_Agro_ 2007-2008(Agrometeorologia).pdf
- ICF Feasibilty Study on Chile CDM Project.pdf
- MikroTek_2012_Monitoring_Report_2013.02.18 Clean.docx
- MikroTek_PD_2013.02.18 Clean.doc
- Post Round 1 Clarifications Responses 2013.02.18.xls
- POST-ROU.XLS

Documents Received 05 April 2013

- MikroTek_PD_2013 03 29.doc

Documents Received 17 April 2013

- Gayoso 2002 Contenido de carbono y funciones de biomasa.pdf
- Inf Chile July 2012 Stem Density.xls
- MikroTek_PD_2013.04.17 clean.doc
- MikroTek_PD_2013.04.17 track change.doc

Documents Received 18 April 2013

- Mikro-Tek 2012 Monitoring Report 2013.04.18.xls
- MikroTek_2012_Monitoring_Report_2013.04.18 clean.docx
- MikroTek_2012_Monitoring_Report_2013.04.18 track changes.docx

Documents Received 19 April 2013

- MikroTek_PD_2013.04.19.doc