

VERIFICATION REPORT FOR THE REDUCTION OF DEFORESTATION AND DEGRADATION IN TAMBOPATA NATIONAL RESERVE AND BAHUAJA- SONENE NATIONAL PARK WITHIN THE AREA OF MADRE DE DIOS REGION – PERÚ PROJECT



Document Prepared By Alexa Dugan

Project Title	Reduction of deforestation and degradation in Tambopata National Reserve and Bahuaja-Sonene National Park within the area of Madre de Dios region –Perú
Version	1-0
Report ID	1-0

Report Title	Verification Report for the Reduction of deforestation and degradation in Tambopata National Reserve and Bahuaja-Sonene National Park within the area of Madre de Dios region –Perú Project
Client	Asociación para la Investigación y Desarrollo Integral – AIDER
Pages	130 pages
Date of Issue	5 August 2021
Prepared By	SCS Global Services (SCS)
Contact	2000 Powell Street, Suite 600, Emeryville, CA 94608, USA http://www.scsglobalservices.com Email: cpollet-young@scsglobalservices.com

	Telephone: +1 (510) 452-8000
Approved By	Christie Pollet-Young
Work Carried Out By	Lead Auditor: Alexa Dugan Auditor: Letty Brown In-country technical experts: Diana Vasquez, Juan Carlos Huayllapuma Technical Reviewer: Francis Eaton

Summary

This report describes the verification of the Reduction of deforestation and degradation in Tambopata National Reserve and Bahuaja-Sonene National Park within the area of Madre de Dios region –Perú project (“the project”), a REDD+ project located in the Madre de Dios region in Peru, that was conducted by SCS. The purposes of the verification audit were (1) to conduct, in accordance with the VCS Program rules, an ex-post independent assessment of the GHG emission reductions and removals that have occurred as a result of the project during the monitoring period from 01 January 2019 to 31 December 2019 (“the verification period”) and (2) to conduct, in accordance with the CCB rules, an ex-post independent assessment of the climate, community and biodiversity impacts that have occurred or are on track to occur as a result of the project during the same period. The verification engagement was carried out through a combination of document review, interviews with relevant personnel and on-site inspections. As part of the verification engagement 69 findings were raised: 41 Non-Conformity Reports, 27 New Information Requests and 1 Observation. These findings are described in Appendix A of this report. The project complies with the verification criteria, and SCS holds no restrictions or uncertainties with respect to the compliance of the project with the verification criteria.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Objective	4
1.2	Scope and Criteria	4
1.3	Level of Assurance.....	5
1.4	Summary Description of the Project	5
2	Verification Process.....	5
2.1	Audit Team Composition (<i>Rules 4.3.1</i>)	5
2.2	Method and Criteria.....	6
2.3	Document Review	6
2.4	Interviews	9
2.5	Site Inspections	10
2.6	Resolution of Findings.....	11
2.7	Eligibility for Validation Activities	13
3	Validation Findings	14
3.1	Participation under Other GHG Programs	14
3.2	Methodology Deviations.....	14
3.3	Project Description Deviations (<i>Rules 3.5.7 – 3.5.10</i>)	17
3.4	Minor Changes to Project Description (<i>Rules 3.5.6</i>).....	18
3.5	Monitoring Plans (CL3.2, CM3.3, B3.3)	18
4	Verification Findings.....	18
4.1	Public Comments (<i>Rules 4.6</i>)	18
4.2	Summary of Project Benefits.....	18
4.3	General.....	18
4.4	Climate	31
4.5	Community	50
4.6	Biodiversity	57
4.7	Additional Project Implementation Information	63
4.8	Additional Project Impact Information	63
5	Verification Conclusion	63
	Appendix A: List of Findings	66

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The objectives of the verification engagement were set out as follows.

1.1.1 Verification Objectives Under the Verified Carbon Standard

In accordance with Section 4.1 of the VCS Standard (see the below Section 1.2.2 for full reference), SCS carried out an ex-post independent assessment of the GHG emission reductions and removals that have occurred as a result of the project during the verification period, conducted in accordance with the VCS Program rules. In accordance with Section 2.1.2 of the VCS Validation & Verification Manual, V3.2, the objectives of the verification engagement were to evaluate the monitoring report and assess

- The extent to which methods and procedures, including monitoring procedures, have been implemented in accordance with the validated project description (this included ensuring conformance with the monitoring plan).
- The extent to which GHG emission reductions and removals reported in the monitoring report are materially accurate.

The other objective of the verification engagement was to assess the non-permanence risk analysis.

1.1.2 Verification Objective Under the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards

In accordance with Section 4.1 of the CCB Program Rules (see the below Section 1.2.3 for full reference) SCS carried out an ex-post independent assessment of the climate, community and biodiversity impacts that have occurred or are on track to occur as a result of the project during the verification period, conducted in accordance with the CCB rules.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

1.2.1 Scope

In accordance with Section 4.3.4 of ISO 14064-3:2006, the scope was defined to include

- The project and its activities.
- The carbon pools and/or greenhouse gases included in the project boundary.
- The verification period.

1.2.2 Criteria Under the Verified Carbon Standard

In accordance Section 4.1.8(2) of the VCS Standard (see the following for full reference), the criteria for verification was the VCS Version 4, including the following documents:

- VCS Program Guide, V4.0
- VCS Standard, V4.0
- VCS Non-Permanence Risk Tool, V4.0

1.2.3 Criteria Under the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards

In accordance with Section 1.1 of the CCB Program Rules (see below for full reference) the criteria for verification was CCB Version 2, but including the following documents:

- The most recent validated project description using the same edition of the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards (in this case, the second edition) that was used for that validation
- CCB Program Rules, V3.1
- CCB Program Definitions, V3.0

1.3 Level of Assurance

1.3.1 Level of Assurance Under the Verified Carbon Standard

In accordance with Section 4.1.8(1) of the VCS Standard, the level of assurance of this report, insofar as it describes work performed under the Verified Carbon Standard, is reasonable.

1.3.2 Level of Assurance Under the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards

The concept of “level of assurance” was not relevant to work performed under the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The project is located in the Tambopata National Reserve and the sector of Bahuaja-Sonene National Park located in the Madre de Dios District in Peru and is aimed at implementing effective measures to avoid deforestation and forest degradation in the Natural Protected Areas. To achieve this the project promotes sustainable economic activities and establishes conservation agreements at previously identified critical areas.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Audit Team Composition (*Rules 4.3.1*)

A table indicating how the audit team meets each of the requirements of the CCB Program Rules is below.

Area of required expertise	Individual(s) on audit team containing required expertise	Summary of relevant qualifications
Proficiency in a relevant local or regional language for the project location	Juan Carlos Huayllapuma, Diana Vasquez	Native Spanish speakers
Relevant agriculture, forestry and/or other land use experience in the project country or region	Letty Brown, Alexa Dugan, Juan Carlos Huayllapuma, Diana Vasquez	Familiar with common agricultural practices and corresponding deforestation pressures in the project country
Relevant social and cultural expertise	Juan Carlos Huayllapuma, Diana Vasquez	Familiar with established social norms in the Amazon region of Peru
Relevant ecological and biodiversity expertise	Letty Brown, Juan Carlos Huayllapuma	Familiar with ecology and biodiversity concepts, measurements and best practices

2.2 Method and Criteria

The verification engagement was conducted through a combination of document review, interviews with relevant personnel and on-site inspections, as discussed in Sections 2.3 through 2.5 of this report. At all times, an assessment was made for conformance to the criteria described in Sections 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 of this report. As discussed in Section 2.6 of this report, findings were issued to ensure conformance to all requirements.

The audit team created a sampling plan following a proprietary sampling plan template developed by SCS. The audit team identified areas of “residual risk”—those areas where there existed risk of a material discrepancy (either in terms of non-conformance to the verification criteria or in terms of errors, omissions and misrepresentations that, in aggregate, exceeded the materiality threshold established for the project as a percentage of the total reported GHG emission reductions and/or removals) that was not prevented or detected by the controls of the project. Sampling and data testing activities were planned to address areas of residual risk. The audit team then created a verification plan that took the sampling plan into account. This approach is justified as it has been designed in accordance with Section 4.4.3 of ISO 14064-3:2006 and the guidance provided in Annex A.2.4.6 of the same document.

2.3 Document Review

The monitoring report (version 3.0 dated 5 August 2021; “MR”) and non-permanence risk report (dated 07 July 2021; “NPRR”) were carefully reviewed for conformance to the verification criteria. The following additional documentation, provided by project personnel in support of the aforementioned documents, was also reviewed by the audit team:

Document	File Name	Ref.
Peru’s submission of a Forest Reference Emission Level (FREL) for reducing emissions from deforestation in the Peruvian Amazon	FREL__submission_peru_modified.pdf	/1/
Letter for IT REDD+ extension	Anidación REDD+ _EnvironmentalMinistry.pdf	/2/
Emissions calculation workbooks	Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero _dic2019 _05.08.21.xlsx;	/3/
Leakage calculation workbook	Hoja de calculo - Fugas por desplazamiento de actividades _11-12-2020 _AC (2).xlsx	/4/
Baseline & uncertainty calculation workbooks	Hoja de calculo-LINEA BASE Y CASO DEL PROYECTO-actualizada-20-4-12.xlsx; Calculos Incertidumbre-26-11-14.xlsx	/5/
Post deforestation calculation workbook	Hoja de calculo-Post-desforestacion.xlsx	/6/
Deforestation reports	Informe_Final_Deforestación_Enero_Junio_2019(1) Informe_Final_Deforestación_Julio_Diciembre_2019	/7/
Standard operating procedure for deforestation mapping	POE para el monitoreo de la deforestación.pdf	/8/
Spatial products related to deforestation	Incremento_Def_Enero_Junio_2019_CA_CF.shp Def_jul_dic_2019.shp	/9/
Degradation monitoring reports	Anexo 5. Monitoreo de Degradación periodo (2015-2017)_24_11_2018.docx	/10/
Standard operating procedure for degradation mapping	POE para el monitoreo de la degradación forestal	/11/
Spatial products related to degradation	transectos_evaluados.shp, Areas_evaluada_degradacion_24112018.shp	/12/
Degradation calculations workbooks	Degradación_BD y procesamiento_24_11_2018.xlsx Calculos Transectos_24112018.xlsx	/13/

Document	File Name	Ref.
Degradation monitoring reports from the 2011 monitoring period	Anexo VI – Monitoreo de deforestaci_2011.docx	/14/
Standard operating procedure for fire monitoring	POE para el monitoreo de quemas.pdf	/15/
Spatial products related to fire	Quema_Enero_Junio_2019_CA_CF.shp Quema_jul_dic_2019	/16/
Project team experience & responsibilities	AnnexA_AIDER_Technical_Team.pdf	/17/
Cashflow workbook	AnnexB_Cashflow_tambopata_updated_2019.xlsx	/18/
Governance score calculation	AnnexD_Governance_Score_Tambo_2019.xlsx	/19/
Fire management manual	AnnexE_MANUAL PEQUEÑOS DE QUEMAS.pdf	/20/
2019 activity reports	[Varios files in folder: Anexo_4-Reporte de Actividades Enero-Diciembre2019]	/21/
Results of social impact monitoring	[Varios files in folder: Anexo_5-Resultados_monitoreo_de_impactos_sociales]	/22/
Park ranger contracts	[Various files in folder: Anexo_6-Contrato_de_guardaparques]	/23/
Monitoring report for Blue-headed Macaw	Reporte_monitoreo_de_collpas.pdf	/24/
Chestnut protocol documents	[Various files in folder Anexo_8-Protocolo de castaña]	/25/
SERNANP trademark license	SERNANP_Licencia_de_marca.pdf	/26/
Control post implementation documents	[Various files in folder Anexo_10-Implementación de puestos Control]	/27/
Agroforestry cooperative workshop documents	[Various files in folder Anexo_11-Talleres COOPASER]	/28/
Results of biological monitoring	[Various files in folder: Anexo_12-Resultados_monitoreo_biológico]	/29/
deforestation documentation provided	Lista_de_anexos.xlsx	/30/
Maps for site visit	Mapa de puestos de Control RNTMB.pdf Mapa de lago Sandoval.pdf VERIFICACION RNTAMB.jpg	/31/
Spatial products related to accessible areas for site visit	defo_de_acceso.shp	/32/
Control post locations	Coordenadas Puesto de Control.xlsx	/33/
Project area spatial products	deforest_de_fugas.shp, Contrato_administracion.shp, Region_de_referencia.shp	/34/
Spatial product related to stratification	Estrato_2008.shp	/37/
Spatial product of accumulated deforestation	deforestación_acumulada_Dic2018_ok.shp	/38/
Validated VCS project description (PD), as uploaded to VCS project database	PROJ_DESC_1067_24MAY2012	/39/
Validated CCB project description (PD), as uploaded to VCS project database	CCB_PROJ_DESC_1067_00OCT2011	/40/
Monitoring report for the 1 July 2013-30 June 2014 monitoring period, as uploaded to VCS project database	MONIT_REP_1067_01JUL2013_30JUN2014	/41/
Monitoring report for the 1 July 2014-30 June 2015 monitoring period, as uploaded to VCS project database	MONIT_REP_1067_01JUL2014_30JUN2015	/42/
Monitoring report for the 1 July 2015-30 June 2017 monitoring period, as uploaded to VCS project database	MONIT_REP_1067_01JUL2015_30JUN2017	/43/

Document	File Name	Ref.
Monitoring report for the 1 July 2017-31 December 2018 monitoring period, as uploaded to VCS project database	MONIT_REP_1067_01JUL2017_31DEC2018	/44/
Monitoring report for the 1 July 2011-30 June 2013 monitoring period, as uploaded to VCS project database	MONIT_REP_1067_01JUL2011_30JUN2013	/45/
Monitoring report for the 1 July 2010-30 June 2011 monitoring period, as uploaded to VCS project database	MONIT_REP_1067_01JUL2010_30JUN2011	/46/
Site visit opening meeting presentations	CCB-VCS-cap-clima_MB.ppt presentación Investigación-REED AUDITORIA (1).ppt Presentación Verificación REDD+ Tambopata_ene-dic_2019-SSEE.ppt	/47/
Verra approval of remote site visit	Remote site visit exemption request response 1067.pdf	/48/
Verra guidance on sampling for degradation	RE_Guidance regarding the sampling of forest degradation.pdf	/49/
Spatial products related to leakage	AVFOR.shp, MANFOR.shp, PROTFOR.shp	/50/
AIDER Technical Team qualifications	AnnexA_AIDER_Technical_Team.pdf	/51/
Project Cash Flow	AnnexB_Cashflow_tambopata_updated_2019_v1	/52/
Governance Score calculation	AnnexD_Governance_Score_Tambo_2019	/53/
Fire prevention manual	AnnexE_MANUAL PEQUEÑOS DE QUEMAS.pdf	/54/
Illegal logging monitoring reports, logs, and maps	informe cuarto trimestre de tala ilegal 2019.pdf; Bd_actividad_humana.xlsx, smart 4to trimestre sil.xlsx; TALA.xlsx, Tala Ilegal.jpg	/55/
Fire Risk report	REPORTE-COMPLEMENTARIO-Nº-2180-18SEP2019-INCENDIO-FORESTAL-EN-EL-DISTRITO-DE-TAMBOPATA-MADRE-DE-DIOS-01.pdf; REPORTE-COMPLEMENTARIO-Nº-2238-21SEP2019-INCENDIO-FORESTAL-EN-EL-DISTRITO-DE-TAMBOPATA-MADRE-DE-DIOS-02	/56/
Fire-fighting course documentation	Informe_Capacitación_RNTAMB; Lista_GuardaparquesRNTAMB_Incendios Forestales_6-09-2019; Lista_GuardaparquesRNTAMB_Incendios_5-09-2019; Fotos_Capacitación_Guardaparques_RNTAMB	/57/
Agroforestry training – pest and disease prevention and mitigation documentation	Informe_Módulo_Establecimiento_sp_forestales.docx, PLANTACIONES.ppt; 2019-Reporte de taller Producción de abonos orgánicos.docx; INFORME TALLERES DE CAPACITACION; Plan de acción Infierno. Gestión del bosque; Taller_22-07-2019... various additional files.	/58/
Extreme weather event documentation	INDECI-Friaje_2016; INDECI-Friaje_2017; INDECI-Friaje_2018; Deslizamientos_2015a; Deslizamientos_2015b; INDECI-2018-inundación; REPORTE-COMPLEMENTARIO-Nº-2063-10SEP2019-VIENTOS-FUERTES-EN-EL-DISTRITO-DE-LAS-PIEDRAS-MADRE-DE-DIOS-1.pdf; REPORTE-COMPLEMENTARIO-Nº-2239-18JUL2020-VIENTOS-FUERTES-EN-EL-DISTRITO-DE-MANU-MADRE-DE-DIOS-1; various additional files.	/59/
Forest Cover Monitoring data at the end of each monitoring period – Project area	Revisión_áreas_Tambopata-02.08.21.xlsx;	/60/

Document	File Name	Ref.
Forest Cover Monitoring Map – End of 2018 monitoring period (project area and leakage belt)	Bosque_remanente_Dic2018.shp; CF_6_5_21.shp	/61/
Forest Cover Monitoring Map – End of 2019 monitoring period (project area)	Bosque_remanente_Dic2019.shp	/62/
Project Area Forest Cover Benchmark Map	Bosque_Validacion_TAMBOPATA.shp	/63/

2.4 Interviews

2.4.1 Interviews of Project Personnel

The process used in interviewing project personnel was a process wherein the audit team elicited information from project personnel regarding (1) the work products provided to the audit team in support of the MR and NPRR; (2) actions undertaken to ensure conformance with various requirements and (3) implementation status of the project activities.

The following personnel associated with the project proponent and/or implementing partner were interviewed.

Individual	Affiliation	Role	Date(s) Interviewed
Percy Recavarren Estares	AIDER	Technical director of monitoring and implementation	Throughout audit
Rodrigo Recavarren	AIDER	GIS specialist	Throughout audit
Sylvia Mayta D'Ugard	AIDER	Technical coordinator of the project	Throughout audit
Lis Cantaro	AIDER	Site Coordinator	12 August 2020 14 August 2020 17 August 2020
Sandra Ancasi Lazo	AIDER	Technical expert – Ecosystem services	12 August 2020
Juan Carlos Lara Rivas	AIDER	Technical expert – Biodiversity monitoring	12 August 2020 14 August 2020 17 August 2020
Jorge Luis Sanchez	AIDER	Technical expert – Social	12 August 2020
Vanessa Hilares	AIDER	Technical expert – Research	12 August 2020

2.4.2 Interviews of Other Individuals

The process used in interviewing individuals other than project personnel was a process wherein the audit team made inquiries to confirm the validity of the information provided to the audit team. The following personnel not associated with the project proponent and/or implementing partner were interviewed.

Individual	Affiliation	Role	Date(s) Interviewed
Gilberto Vera	Cooperativa Agraria de Servicios Múltiples Tambopata Candamo (COOPASER)	Agroforestry specialist	13 August 2020

Individual	Affiliation	Role	Date(s) Interviewed
Cirilo Sanchez	COOPASER	President of the Cooperative	13 August 2020 14 October 2020
David Aranibar	Bahuaia Sonene National park	Chief, biologist	13 August 2020
Alfredo García	Federación Nativa del Río Madre de Dios y Afluentes (FENAMAD)	Assessor	13 August 2020
José Carlos Nieto	Servicio Nacional de Areas Naturales Protegidas por el Estado (SERNANP)	Forest engineer	14 August 2020
Deyvis Huamán Encargado	SERNANP	Biologist	14 August 2020
Norma Salinas	Pontifical Catholic University of Peru (PCUP)	Researcher	14 August 2020
Fabian Limonchi	PCUP	Researcher	14 August 2020
Cesar Augusto Yojaje	Native Community of Palma Real	Member, Chief	1 September 2020
Ernesto Fernández	Tambopata National Reserve	Biologist	15 September 2020
Ruhlier Mishaja	Native Community of Infierno	Member	17 September 2020
Yuri Cáceres Tello	Tambopata National Reserve	Park Ranger	14 October 2020
Patty Cadenas Ccoacollo	Tambopata National Reserve	Park Ranger	14 October 2020
Rodolfo Pereyra Solórzano	COOPASER	Member	14 October 2020
Froilan Jaime Aliaga Condori	COOPASER	Member	14 October 2020
Ronald Espinoza Cruz	COOPASER	Head of cacao processing plant	14 October 2020
Ambrosio Ramos	COOPASER	Cacao processing facility plant manager	14 October 2020
Isabel Yalico López	COOPASER, Tambopata National Reserve	Coordinator of the Tambopata National Reserve Management committee, Member of COOPASER education committee	26 October 2020
Isabel Cachira Condori	COOPASER	Member	26 October 2020
Gian Carlos Inga	CONVIVE	Coordinator of CONVIVE project	23 October 2020

2.5 Site Inspections

The verification has taken place during a global pandemic (COVID19); and some areas of the project area and local communities were restricted to outside visitors. The audit team received approval from Verra to conduct remote site-visit in support of the CCB verification /48/. The audit team conducted limited on-site inspections and employed remote site-visit techniques through the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT), based on guidance in the ANSI National Accreditation Board's Heads Up #1, dated 23 March 2020. The objectives of the on-site inspections were as follows:

- Select samples of data and information from field observations in order to meet a reasonable level of assurance and to meet the materiality requirements of the project, as required by Section 4.1.2 of the VCS Standard.
- Perform a risk-based review of the project area and project activities to ensure that the monitoring and quantification of GHG emission reductions and removals for the verification period conforms to the verification criteria.
- Perform a risk-based review of the project area and project activities to ensure that the project conformed to the requirements of the verification criteria throughout the verification period.
- Confirm the validity of information presented in the non-permanence risk report.

In fulfilment of the above objectives, the audit team performed an on-site inspection of the project area on the dates 13 October 2020 through 14 October 2020 as well as remote inspections and interviews throughout the course of the audit. The main activities undertaken by the audit team were as follows:

- Interviewed project personnel (see Section 2.3.1 of this report) to gather information regarding the monitoring procedures and project implementation
- Interviewed residents and project beneficiaries in several communities (Palma Real, Infierno, and Nueva America II) and members of the agroforestry cooperative, who are residents of several communities located in the immediate vicinity of the project area, to confirm the claims of the project proponents with respect to the extent of community and stakeholder engagement, and claimed benefits and impacts.
- Interviewed affiliated researchers, park rangers, government and environmental authorities and other relevant stakeholders to confirm project and monitoring implementation.
- Carried out on-site and remote inspections of the project's measurement and/or monitoring methodologies through the following activities:
 - Independent check of deforestation and disturbance using high resolution imagery from the PlanetScope satellites (3.7-m resolution). Independent on-site check of randomly selected areas for deforestation and disturbances in both the project area and leakage belt.
 - Carried out on-site inspections of agroforestry operations and associated cacao processing plant to confirm project and monitoring implementation and claimed benefits and impacts.
 - Carried out on-site inspections of national reserve control post to verify surveillance and patrolling activities as well as monitoring operations carried out by park rangers.

The primary forms of Information and Communication Technology used to conduct the remote assessments and interviews were (1) videoconferencing software packages such as Skype and Zoom and (2) remotely sensed imagery from the PlanetScope satellites. The framework set out in the Heads Up #1 document was used to confirm that the required level of assurance could be reached (see Section 1.3, above) and that any potential impacts to confidentiality and the integrity of the verification engagement could be mitigated. In the end, Information and Communication Technology was found to be highly effective as a tool to replace some in-person meetings. This is due to the generally good quality of internet connection available in Peru, as well as the experience and familiarity of the in-country technical specialists which contributed to a highly efficient audit process. Additional information is contained in SCS' proprietary sampling plan document (see Section 2.1, above, for more details).

2.6 Resolution of Findings

Two forward action requests were outstanding from the previous verifications.

Outstanding	Assessment
-------------	------------

Forward Action Request	
Parameter CF	The audit team reviewed the forward action request (FAR 1) and concluded that the FAR has not been addressed. However, the parameter CF is not monitored per the requirements in section 6.1 of the M-REDD module. Thus, maintaining a value of 0.5 tC for CF is in conformance with the methodology. Furthermore, CF is only used in the quantification of emissions from biomass burning, which are excluded as they are insignificant per the T-SIG tool. However, when the baseline is updated, the most up-to-date value of CF must be used.
Parameter R	The audit team reviewed the forward action request (FAR 2) and found that the value of parameter R, root to shoot ratio has not been updated. However, section 6.1 of the module CP-AB indicates this is a parameter available at validation, and thus not monitored. The audit team concludes that the root to shoot ratio specified in the PD has been applied and is in conformance with the methodology. However, when the baseline is updated, the most up-to-date value of the root to shoot ratio must be used.

Any potential or actual discrepancies identified during the audit process were resolved through the issuance of findings. The types of findings typically issued by SCS during this type of verification engagement are characterized as follows:

- **Non-Conformity Report (NCR):** An NCR signified a discrepancy with respect to a specific requirement. This type of finding could only be closed upon receipt by SCS of evidence indicating that the identified discrepancy had been corrected. Resolution of all open NCRs was a prerequisite for issuance of a verification statement.
- **New Information Request (NIR):** An NIR signified a need for supplementary information in order to determine whether a material discrepancy existed with respect to a specific requirement. Receipt of an NIR did not necessarily indicate that the project was not in compliance with a specific requirement. However, resolution of all open NIRs was a prerequisite for issuance of a verification statement.
- **Observation (OBS):** An OBS indicates an area where immaterial discrepancies exist between the observations, data testing results or professional judgment of the audit team and the information reported or utilized (or the methods used to acquire such information) within the GHG assertion. A root cause analysis and corrective action plan are not required, but highly recommended. Observations are considered by the audit team to be closed upon issuance, and a response to this type of finding is not necessary.

As part of the audit process, 40 NCRs, 27 NIRs, 1 OBS were issued. In addition, two Forward Action Requests (FARs) have been issued which are described below. All findings issued by the audit team during the audit process have been closed. In accordance with Section 4.1.14 of the VCS Standard, all findings issued during the audit process, and the impetus for the closure of each such finding, are described in Appendix A of this report.

2.6.1 Forward Action Requests

The audit team has issued the following forward action requests (FAR) detailed in the table below

Forward Action Request	Finding Number	Description of FAR
------------------------	----------------	--------------------

Interview with Sonene community	NA	- This verification took place during the during the global COVID19 pandemic. As a result the audit team applied remote-site visit techniques to verify the stakeholder engagement components of VCS (section 4.3.5 below) and community components of CCB (section 4.5 below). This involved remote interviews using information communication technology (ICT) (described in section 2.5 above) and required that communities have internet or cellular connection to make contact. The audit team was able to interview stakeholders from COOPASER (agriculture cooperative) as well as the Palma Real and Infierno, native communities who are closely involved in the project. However, we were unable to establish contact with the Sonene community given their remote location and lack of internet or phone service. - Therefore, at the subsequent verification, if contact with the Sonene community is possible, either remotely or in-person, the VVB should conduct further interviews with the Sonene Native Community to verify the stakeholder engagement criteria and community component of the CCB.
Degradation Monitoring	53	- Degradation was not monitored through systematic field sampling for this monitoring period due to a misunderstanding of the methodology and then the fact that the project area was closed off due to the COVID19 quarantine. Verra has provided an exception /49/ that the project proponent can use previous degradation emissions from 2015-2017, which represents a 2 year period, and apply it to this monitoring period (1 year). However, for the subsequent monitoring period, degradation must be sampled in the field. If there are major discrepancies for the 2019 period, these may need to be resolved and amended. - Therefore, at the subsequent verification, the VVB shall review the results of the field sampling for degradation for the 2019 period in addition to the verification period under review, to determine if there are any material discrepancies for the 2019 monitoring period (i.e., an underestimate of degradation during this monitoring period) discovered which would result in a potential reversal in VCU. As stated in the email from Verra /49/ "Should they need to adjust any values after monitoring we will expect that any corrections needed be made at that verification."

2.7 Eligibility for Validation Activities

This section is not applicable, as SCS holds accreditation for validation for the relevant sectoral scope (scope 14; AFOLU).

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

This section is not applicable, as the project is not, at this time, seeking registration under the VCS Program and an approved GHG program.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

Four methodology deviations were described in Section 2.2.2 of the monitoring report, which requires that all methodology deviations applied during this monitoring period be included. Two other methodology deviations are described in the PD, but were previously validated and verified (see Section 4.3.1.2 of this report for list), and are considered outside the scope of this verification as they relate to activities performed to set the baseline during the validation process, or to monitoring activities that were not performed again, considering each of the parameter's monitoring frequency. The verification team confirmed that each was analyzed and approved in previous auditing events, using prior audit reports on the project webpage in the VCS project database (<http://www.vcsprojectdatabase.org/#/ccb-all-project-details/PL1382>.)

Two deviations are new to the verification event and are described below. For each, the verification team assessed 1) whether the deviation meets the criteria and specifications for permitted methodology deviations, as set forth in VCS Standard Section 3.17.1, and 2) whether the deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals (except where they result in more accuracy), as set forth in VCS Standard Section 3.17.2:

- Parameters PROPRES and PROPIMM were monitored using information from the most recent 2018 national census. However the values of urban populations from the 2007 census were used to determine these parameters, as it results in a more conservative estimation of leakage emissions.

In conclusion, the audit team finds that the two new methodology deviations meet the requirements of VCS Standard 3.5.1. The deviations do not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reduction or removals, and only relate to the criteria and procedures contained within the monitoring report used for monitoring or measurement.

The below table identifies each methodology deviation applied to the project that was validated as part of the verification engagement described in this report. The audit team concludes, in summary, that all such deviations are valid.

Identification of deviation	Assessment column 1*	Assessment column 2**
-----------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

Identification of deviation	Assessment column 1*	Assessment column 2**
1 – Degradation sampling	- This deviation which was introduced at validation pertains to the sampling of degradation within the project area. Rather than conducting a PRA, the project uses reports created by forest rangers regarding illegal activities. - The deviation was introduced at validation and maintained for all monitoring periods since then. - Reviewed the methodology deviation and confirmed that the deviation only impacts the procedures for measurement of carbon emissions outside the leakage belt. The deviation does not impact any other component of the methodology.	The audit team confirmed through interviews and review of the reports that the deviation does not impact the conservativeness of the quantification GHG emission reductions. It likely results in greater accuracy and a higher likelihood of reporting illegal harvesting as forest rangers are patrolling the project area thoroughly and daily as part of their job requirements.
2 – PROPRES and PROPIMM	- This deviation pertains to the quantification of leakage emissions outside of the leakage belt. While both parameters were monitored using the latest 2017 Census data, the previous 2007 Census values were used to determine the proportions. - Reviewed the methodology deviation and confirmed that the deviation only impacts the procedures for measurement of carbon emissions outside the leakage belt. The deviation does not impact any other component of the methodology.	The audit team confirmed through independent quantification of leakage emissions outside of the leakage belt that this deviation results in a more conservative quantification of leakage emissions quantification of GHG emission reductions.

Identification of deviation	Assessment column 1*	Assessment column 2**
3 – TOTFOR Area	- This deviation which was introduced at validation pertains to the quantification of leakage emissions outside of the leakage belt. The area used for TOTFOR was reduced the total national forest area available for unplanned deforestation the special conditions of accessibility make it highly unlikely the immigration agents' displacement of deforestation from Madre de Dios to other forested areas outside the region. - The deviation was introduced at validation and maintained for all monitoring periods since then. - Reviewed the methodology deviation and confirmed that the deviation only impacts the procedures for measurement of carbon emissions outside the leakage belt. The deviation does not impact any other component of the methodology.	The audit team confirmed through independent quantification of leakage emissions outside of the leakage belt that this deviation does not impact the conservativeness of the quantification of leakage emissions quantification of GHG emission reductions.
4 – Frequency of degradation sampling	- This deviation relates to FAR 2 described in section 2.6.1. and approved by Verra /49/ - The deviation was introduced due to a misinterpretation of the M-REDD module pertaining to the frequency of sampling for degradation, resulting in degradation to only be sampled every 5 years rather than at every verification. - We reviewed the deviation and confirmed that it only impacts the frequency of the measurement of degradation (illegal logging). The deviation does not impact any other component of the methodology.	- Given that the degradation which was sampled over a two year period is being applied to a one year period, it is likely that this deviation results in a more conservative estimate of GHG emissions from degradation. - Verra has approved this deviation to be applied for this monitoring period /49/

- *Assessment column 1 describes the steps taken to confirm that the deviation meets with the criteria and specifications for permitted methodology deviations.
- **Assessment column 2 describes the steps taken to confirm that the deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals (except where it results in increased accuracy)

3.3 Project Description Deviations (*Rules 3.5.7 – 3.5.10*)

The below table identifies each project description deviation applied by the project were validated as part of the verification engagement described in this report. The audit team concludes, in summary, that all such deviations are valid.

Identification of deviation	Assessment column 1*	Assessment column 2**	Assessment column 3***
Landsat 8 – OLI	The deviation only relates to the version of the Landsat satellite imagery used and does not impact the applicability of the methodology.	The deviation only relates to the version of the Landsat satellite imagery used for monitoring and does not impact additionality.	The deviation only relates to the type of the satellite imagery used for monitoring and does not impact the appropriateness of the baseline scenario.
Sentinel-2 Images	The deviation relates to the type of the satellite imagery used and does not impact the applicability of the methodology.	The deviation only relates to the type of the satellite imagery used for monitoring and does not impact additionality.	The deviation only relates to the type of the satellite imagery used for monitoring and does not impact the appropriateness of the baseline scenario.
Software equipment for monitoring	The deviation relates to the type of the software versions used for monitoring and does not impact the applicability of the methodology.	The deviation relates to the type of the software versions used for monitoring and does not impact additionality.	The deviation relates to the type of the software versions used for monitoring and does not impact the appropriateness of the baseline scenario.
Forest Cover Benchmark map and area	This deviation relates to the area of forest in each strata in the Project Area at the start of the project. It was found during this verification engagement that the area reported in Table 25 the PD /39/ was incorrect and did not correspond to the spatial files used as the Project Area Forest Cover Benchmark map /63/ and determination of remaining forest cover in the project area at the end of each monitoring period /61/	This deviation on relates only to the area of forest reported in the PD /39/ and does not impact additionality.	This deviation on relates only to the area of forest reported in the PD and does not impact the appropriateness of the baseline scenario.

- *Assessment column 1 contains information regarding assessment of whether the proposed deviation impacts the applicability of the methodology.
- **Assessment column 2 contains information regarding assessment of whether the proposed deviation impacts additionality

- ***Assessment column 3 contains information regarding assessment of whether the proposed deviation impacts the appropriateness of the baseline/without-project scenario

Each of the deviations identified above is appropriately described and justified and, in respect of each of the above deviations, the project remains in compliance with the VCS rules.

3.3.1 Project Description Deviations for Purposes of CCB Rules

This section is not applicable, as no project description deviations applied to the project were validated under the CCB rules as part of the verification engagement described in this report.

3.4 Minor Changes to Project Description (Rules 3.5.6)

This section is not applicable, as no minor changes applied to the community and biodiversity elements of the project design were validated under the CCB rules as part of the verification engagement described in this report.

3.5 Monitoring Plans (CL3.2, CM3.3, B3.3)

Not applicable.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Public Comments (Rules 4.6)

Not applicable; no public comments were submitted during the public comment period (24 June 2020 to 24 July 2020) as confirmed by review of the project on the Verra registry after the public comment period.

4.2 Summary of Project Benefits

The summary of project benefits has been correctly provided in Section 1 of the MR. The audit team has reasonable assurance that the all applicable and quantifiable information has been provided in an appropriate manner. The section is completed appropriately, according to the template requirements. The audit team can verify that all achievements reported are substantiated with information provided in the body of the document.

4.3 General

4.3.1 Implementation Status (G3.4, CL1.5)

4.3.1.1 Implementation Status of the Project Activity(s)

The implementation status of the project activities can be identified as follows:

- Integral biological monitoring system consisting of the use of satellite imagery to monitor land use change, fires, and degradation, and the continued support of biological research initiatives.
- Installation and maintenance of sustainable agroforestry operations within the leakage belt to prevent the advance of agricultural frontier
- Strengthening of organizations and communities in the buffer zone through the support of rural tourism, environmental education, training opportunities, and sustainable economic planning.

- Continued support and expansion of control and surveillance mechanisms within the Tambopata National Reserve and the Bahuaja-Sonene National Park.
- Promotion of sustainable mining

The steps taken by the audit team to assess each of the following items is specified below.

Item	Verification findings
Existence of any material discrepancies between project implementation and the project description	Through site visit observations, interviews conducted with project personnel and project communities, and document assessment, the audit team confirmed no material discrepancies between project implementation and the project description. • Specifically the assertions made about project activities implemented during the monitoring period were directly confirmed through interviews with members of COOPASER and native communities (see section 2.4.2 above).
The implementation status of the monitoring plan and the completeness of monitoring, including the suitability of the implemented monitoring system (i.e., process and schedule for obtaining, recording, compiling and analyzing the monitored data and parameters)	• The audit team reviewed the monitoring system's appropriateness for assessing deforestation, degradation, community impacts, and biodiversity. The supporting documentation of these monitoring activities is thorough and consistent throughout various reports. The parameters are suitable for the project activities and forest management generally. Interviews with project personnel determined that appropriate processes were in place for the recording, compiling, and analyzing of data. The audit team compared reported deforestation with high-resolution remotely sensed imagery and conducted on-site checks of deforested areas. Audit team reviewed data processing procedures to determine that land use change monitoring systems are consistent with described practices and result in accurate mapping.

The existence of any material discrepancies between the actual monitoring system, and the monitoring plan set out in the project description and the applied methodology	The audit team reviewed the MR and supporting documentation to determine whether there were any inconsistencies with the monitoring plan and applied methodology. While four deviations were noted (see Section 3.3, above) they were justified and deemed not to negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals. Calculation worksheets required by the methodological elements were reviewed and where there were non-conformances, they were addressed by project personnel.
Whether the GHG emission reductions or removals generated by the project have become included in an emissions trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading	- Through the application of professional judgment, the audit team is reasonably assured that the GHG emission reductions reported in the MR have not been included in an emissions trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading - In 2021, Peru will be shifting to a jurisdictional REDD+ program in which individual, sub-national projects like this one can be nested into the broader jurisdictional program.
Whether the project has received or sought any other form of environmental credit, or has become eligible to do so since validation or previous verification	Through the application of professional judgment, the audit team is reasonably assured that project has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit, not has it become eligible to do so since the previous verification
Whether the project has participated or been rejected under any other GHG programs since validation or previous verification	Through the application of professional judgment, the audit team is reasonably assured that the project has not participated or been rejected under any other GHG programs since the previous verification

Sustainable development contributions	- The audit team confirmed through interviews with project personnel and review of meeting/presentation documents that a variety of social programs have been implemented during the monitoring period - The project has been actively monitoring to meet requirements for the Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Standards, and has identified High Value Conservation Forest Areas to limit potential loss
---------------------------------------	---

4.3.1.2 Previously Validated Methodology Deviations

Four methodology deviations are described in the MR (section 2.2.2). Section 3.2 of this report described the two new methodology deviations and how they were verified. The four that were previously verified are described below.

Number of Deviation	Methodology Deviation
1	This deviation pertained to the use of periodic park ranger reports to determine the ongoing risk of illegal timber extraction (degradation), as described in /11/ in place of a participatory rural appraisal (PRA) and was reported during the validation of the project. Section 2.2.1 of the PD /40/ indicates that “This sampling procedure shall be repeated every 5 years and the results annualized by dividing the total emissions by five.” The VVB determined it was permissible under the VCS standard as it applied to a monitoring procedure rather than deviation in the methods for quantification of GHG emission reductions. Previous VVBs confirmed during several verification engagements via interviews with park rangers that park rangers have been gathering data and generating reports to determine degradation potential in the project area. This methodology deviation remains relevant for this monitoring period and is therefore described in section 3.2 above.
2	Version 2.0 of the BL-UP module that was used at validation requires that the “reference region for projecting rate of deforestation (RRD) does not need to be contiguous with and shall not encompass the project area or the leakage belt.” A methodology deviation was implemented to include the project area and the leakage belt in the RDD to more accurately project the rate of deforestation to include the pressures from mining and expansion of agriculture around the interoceanic highway, which are part of the leakage belt. The latest version of the BL-UP module (3.3.) does not prohibit the inclusion of the project area or leakage belt from the RRD, therefore this methodology deviation is no longer relevant.
3	The LK-ASU module defines the parameter TOTFOR as the total national forest area available for unplanned deforestation. A methodology deviation was applied that reduced the TOTFOR to only include on the area in the Madre de Dios region due to the spatial constraints of immigration agents to move operations outside of the Madre de Dios region. Likewise, the presence of gold mining in the region makes it unlikely that people

Number of Deviation	Methodology Deviation
	will immigrate outside of the province. This methodology deviation remains relevant for this monitoring period and is therefore described in section 3.2 above.
4	Section 1.1.2 of the BL-UP module indicates that “The minimum leakage belt area must be equal to at least 90% of the project area. However, if identification of a forested area of this size (meeting criteria a to g) is impossible then the following guidelines shall be followed:...” In the PD a methodology deviation was applied to delineate a leakage belt that is approximately 49% of the project area, as it was not possible to achieve 90% of the project area requirement ‘without affecting the 4.6.1 criteria of the AFOLU Requirements.’ As a result, the leakage belt was delimited using the maximum possible area considering the principle of conferral of leakage due to the project activity.

4.3.1.3 Previously Validated Project Design Deviations

Four project design deviations are described in the MR (section 2.2.4. Section 3.3 of this report described the two new methodology deviations and how they were verified. The four that were previously verified are described below.

Identifier of Deviation	Project Design Deviation
01 – Claslite software	This deviation remains relevant as the Claslite software is still not being used for degradation mapping. This is discussed in Section 3.3. above.
02 – Monitoring of Hot spots	This deviation remains relevant as the monthly hotspot monitoring with FIRMS data is not being utilized. This is discussed in Section 3.3 above.
03 - Tambopata - Bahuaja REDD+ Strategy	This deviation remains relevant as the updated version of the Tambopata-Bahuaja REDD+ Strategy remains in effect. This is discussed in Section 3.3 above.
04 – Imagery used for validation of deforestation maps	In the 2014-2015 monitoring report /41/, a PD deviation was made pertaining to the validation of deforestation maps. While the PD /40/ indicates that forest cover monitoring maps are validated in the field, it was determined to be too dangerous to verify mapping in the field, thus the validation process was carried out through the visual interpretation of satellite imagery including RapidEye and Landsat. This project description deviation remains relevant. Note this was previously identified as methodology deviation, but it is actually a PD deviation as the methodology does not explicitly require field-based validation of mapping.

4.3.1.4 Previously Validated Minor Changes to the Project Description

As there exist no previously validated minor changes to the project description, this section is not applicable.

4.3.1.5 Overall Conclusion

In summary, with the exception of the deviations to the project description as discussed above, the audit team can confirm that the project has been implemented as described in the validated project description.

4.3.2 Risks to the Project (G3.5)

The audit team took the following steps to verify the natural and human-induced risks to the expected project benefits identified by the project proponent.

- Through site visit observations, interviews conducted with project personnel and project community members, and through document assessment, the audit team confirmed the natural and human-induced to the expected project benefits are as stated in the MR.
- Through site visit observations, interviews with agroforestry members, the audit team confirmed that the productivity of the agroforestry and chestnut systems associated with climate pressures are a risk to the project and it could cause individuals to abandon the sustainable agroforestry production in favor of unsustainable activities. However the project team continues to mitigate this risk by providing additional training and assistance to the agroforestry producers and has worked with the producers to implement irrigation.
- Other risks are human induced such as the invasion of land by migrants due to the expansion of gold mining, agriculture, and logging extraction. However, the state has implemented strict measures to stop the invasion of land for illegal activities. The audit team confirmed this via interviews with government officials (see section 2.4.2).
- The superposition of concessions and rights of communities living within the project area also presents the risk of increased deforestation. This was observed within the project area during the site visit. Again monitoring and strict measures to reduce illegal activities has been an ongoing mitigation strategy.
- Given these risks, the audit team agreed that project activities, like regular monitoring from the control posts, are designed to mitigate risks.

In summary, in the ways outlined above, the audit team concludes that reasonable steps have been taken to mitigate the natural and human-induced risks to the expected project benefits identified by the project proponent.

4.3.3 Enhancement of High Conservation Values (G3.6)

The audit team took the following steps to verify the actions needed or implemented to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes identified in the project description.

- Through site visit observations, interviews conducted with project personnel and project community members, and through document assessment (e.g., /21/, /24/, /29/), the audit team confirmed the measures to maintain and enhance high conservation values are as stated in the MR.
- Through site visit observations and interviews with the project team and associated stakeholders, and review of documentation /21/ the audit team confirmed that the project has provided fairly significant technical and operational support to management committees (park rangers, biological specialists, agroforestry producers, etc), researchers such as those from the Pontifical Catholic University of Peru, and for the monitoring of biological and human activities.

- The audit team also reviewed documentation related to the volunteer and scholarship fund opportunities that the project supports in order to conduct the monitoring and maintenance of high conservation values within the project areas /21/.
- Through the interview with a program coordinator from CONVIVE (see section 2.4.2) and review of project documentation /21/, the audit team confirmed that the project has provided support to the CONVIVE program that intends to reduce the conflicts between wildlife and humans, particularly agricultural and rancher communities. During the site visit, the audit team observed that the good of being able to approach the community and work from within them to solve the human-wildlife conflicts that have existed since the beginning and which has led to dialogues and implementation of solutions to reduce the problems of the project area.
- During presentations /47/, document review /21/, and interviews with project personnel, we confirmed that the project has supported numerous research projects including Giant Otter behavior, carbon in agroforestry, mercury in wild birds, among others, all aimed at enhancing high conservation values include flora and fauna within the project area.
- During interviews with the project team, we confirmed that camera traps have been widely used to monitor for biodiversity both within the project area and in the agroforestry plots. We reviewed reports on biodiversity monitoring during the monitoring period and visually inspected camera trap images which included dates of acquisition.
- The audit team confirmed during interviews and through review of park ranger contracts /21/ that the project has supported the salaries of seven park rangers for the purpose of surveillance and control to ultimately protect HCVs in the project area.
- We also confirmed through interviews and document review that the project has supported strengthening of control post infrastructure, equipment, and personnel through the purchase of a motor-pump, a GPS, and park ranger uniforms /21/
- We confirmed through review of documentation /21/ and interviews with communities that the project has provided environmental education to community members to support the protection of HCVs
- The audit team also reviewed evidence of trainings intended to monitor species and human interactions at the landscape level.

In summary, in the ways outlined above, the audit team concludes that the measures taken to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes are consistent with the precautionary principle.

4.3.4 Benefit Permanence (G3.7)

The audit team took the following steps to verify actions needed or implemented to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime, as identified by the project proponent.

- Through on-site observations and interviews with project personnel and communities and review of documentation (e.g., /21/), the audit team confirmed that project activities focus on establishing sustainable alternative economic activities to cattle ranching, maintaining surveillance and monitoring of deforestation and biodiversity, reducing the occurrence of illegal activities, and working directly with native communities to enhance livelihoods.
- During interviews with a range of community members, local government officials, park rangers, and agroforestry producers, the audit team confirmed that beneficiaries are pleased with benefits of the project and plan to continue their engagement.
- Through interviews with project personnel, audit team confirmed that the project proponent and their funding mechanisms plan to continue the project for many years to come.

In summary, since in the ways outlined above, the audit team concludes that reasonable measures have been taken to enhance project benefits beyond the project lifetime in accordance with the validated project description.

4.3.5 Stakeholder Engagement (G3.8 – G3.9)

The audit team took the following steps to verify that the project proponent communicated with and consulted stakeholders on project implementation in accordance with G3.8 – G3.9.

Steps taken to verify that...	
Communication and consultation was carried out in accordance with the communication and consultation plan.	- Through interviews conducted with project communities and project personnel, the audit team confirmed that project information has been made available through direct consultation with project team representatives; it was confirmed that the consultation process was implemented as described in the MR. - Community members, agroforestry members, and other stakeholders involved in the project (e.g., park rangers) all indicated that channels of communication with the project personnel have remained open and strong. - It was indicated during interviews with community members that consultations occur annually through a community assembly in which all members of the community are encouraged to participate and that turnout is typically high. - We also reviewed attendance logs and photo evidence of community meetings, educational outreach to children, and trainings that accompany the project proponents activity reports /21/
If needed, adjustments were made to the communication and consultation plan.	Adjustments to the communication and consultation plan have not been needed.
The public comment period for verification was publicized to communities and other stakeholders using the communication methods identified in the validated project description and their submission of comments to VCS was facilitated.	During interviews with communities and stakeholders as well as conversations with the project team, it was indicated that parties were informed about the public comment period.
Project implementation and monitoring information, and other key documents, were distributed to communities and other stakeholders during the verification period.	- The audit team reviewed trimestral reports regarding project implementation and monitoring that have been distributed and made available to stakeholders during this monitoring period (/21/ /22/ /24/, /27/-/29/ - During interviews with communities and other stakeholders, it was indicated that implementation and monitoring information has been distributed during

	the verification period.
Widely publicized information meetings were held in relevant local or regional languages.	- Through interviews with communities and agroforestry cooperative members, it was confirmed that workshops, trainings, and informational meetings are regularly held and that adequate notification about such meetings are provided. - See above responses

In summary, given interviews conducted and review of documentation, the audit team concludes that the project carried out effective stakeholder engagement.

4.3.6 Stakeholder Grievance Redress Procedure (G3.10)

The audit team took the following steps to verify that the project proponent has implemented the project's grievance redress procedure.

- The audit team reviewed the CCB PD /40/ and this MR, which outlines the Grievance and Redress Mechanism, and agreed that it outlines a clear procedure for receiving, hearing, responding to and attempting to resolve grievances within a reasonable time period.
- During interviews with project personnel, regional government officials, project beneficiaries, the native people's rights organization, and community members, the audit did not learn about any conflicts that required the use of this redress procedure during the monitoring period.

In summary, since there were no grievances received but a procedure remains in place for responding to grievances, the audit team concludes that the grievance redress procedure has been implemented according to the project's validated design.

4.3.7 Worker Relations (G4.3 – G4.6)

The audit team took the following steps to verify that the project proponent has taken actions and implemented measures to ensure that the relationship between the project and workers meet the requirements of G4.3 – G4.6.

Steps taken to verify that actions were taken or measures implemented that...	
Build the capacity of the communities through job training and employment.	- The audit team confirmed during interviews with community members, agroforestry cooperative members, and park rangers serving the project that the project has supported training and employment opportunities. - The audit team also reviewed training materials and associated attendance logs to conclude that capacity building was conducted during this monitoring period. - Through the review of reports documenting the training and education opportunities, the audit team further confirmed that capacity building has been a central component of the project.
Ensure people from the communities are given an equal opportunity to fill work positions.	Through onsite observations, interviews, and document review the audit team

	confirmed that employment opportunities include temporary contracts (e.g. park rangers) /23/, support of research initiatives that result in hiring of local students and volunteers /21/, positions on park and reserve management committees, and positions associated with the agroforestry cooperative (cacao facility operators, management committee, etc). • The audit team confirmed that equal treatment is given to people in communities to fill work positions. However, the nature of some positions may preclude women from performing them (e.g. ranger positions), but other project-related positions are filled by women (e.g., agroforestry cooperative and reserve management committee positions) /21/. • Lastly the audit team reviewed the monitoring report and confirmed that the project proponent has a policy of gender equality and interculturality to provide equal employment opportunities.
Ensure the project is in compliance with all relevant laws and regulations regarding worker's rights and workers are informed of their rights.	• The audit team conducted interviews with project personnel and confirmed that the project's worker's laws meet applicable laws and/or regulations covering worker rights. • The audit team also confirmed that the monitoring report contains a detailed description along with relevant updates of Peru's worker rights laws and regulations.
Inform workers of risks and how to minimize risk.	• During interviews with communities and cooperative members, it was indicated that they feel safe in their workplace and that are given the proper equipment, training on equipment, and protective gear to minimize workplace risks.
Minimize workplace risk using best work practices.	• The audit team confirmed during interviews and review of documentation that the project has provided new uniforms for park rangers, as well as new tools (motor pump, GPS) to enhance the safety of control posts and ability for park rangers to more effectively do their work. • Also, see above.

In summary, given the interviews conducted and documentation reviewed, the audit team concludes that the relationship between workers and the project upholds the intent and design presented in the validated project description.

4.3.8 Technical and Management Capacity (G4.2, G4.7)

The audit team took the following steps to verify that the project proponent has taken actions and implemented measures to ensure the capacity exists to implement the project over the project lifetime.

Steps taken to verify information provided or measures implemented that...	
Demonstrate(s) the project possesses, or is acquiring through partnerships, and is maintaining the key technical and management skills required to implement the project successfully.	- Through interviews with project personnel, the audit team confirmed that the project proponent has extensive technical capacities to successfully implement this project which requires broad conservation, community development, biodiversity, remote sensing, and other technical capacities. - During interviews with management committee personnel for both the Reserve and Park as well as the agroforestry cooperative, it was confirmed that the project possesses the necessary technical and management skills to effectively conduct this project.
Demonstrate(s) the financial health of the implementing organization is adequate to support project implementation.	- The audit team reviewed project documentation including the cash flow analysis /18/ and outside sources (https://althelia.com/tambopata-2/) to confirm that the financial health of the project remains strong to continue to support the project implementation. - The financial health as described in section 2.4.6 in the MR and /18/ have been confirmed by the audit team.

In summary, given the above description, the audit team concludes that the project has the capacity to implement the project in accordance with the validated project design.

4.3.9 Legal Status (G5.1)

The audit team has the following conclusions regarding (1) the assurances provided by the project that it is complying with all national and local laws and regulations relevant to project activities and (2) where relevant, how compliance is achieved:

- The audit team conducted interviews with representatives from the Peruvian government, National Service of Natural Areas Protected by the State (SERNANP), to confirm that the project complies with national and local laws and regulations.
- The project proponent holds a Partial Administration Agreement for both protected areas within the project area, with the government. This agreement was ratified in July 2010 and is effective

for another 20 years. During the interview with the SERNANP representatives, it was confirmed that this agreement is still in effect and that the project remains in compliance with the agreement.

- The audit team confirmed that section 2.5.6 of the MR contains a comprehensive list of relevant laws and regulations and has concluded via interviews and document review that the project is in compliance with the relevant laws and regulations.

4.3.10 Rights Protection and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (G5.3-G5.5)

The audit team took the following steps to verify actions taken and measures implemented by the project proponent to protect the rights of Indigenous Peoples, communities and other stakeholders.

Steps taken to verify actions taken or measures implemented that demonstrate...	
Existing property rights are recognized, respected and supported.	• The audit team carefully reviewed the validated PD and the MR for this reporting period and confirmed that they contain descriptions of rights as they relate to land, territory and resources in the project. • The audit team confirmed via interviews with government officials that existing property rights in the project area are respective and in compliance with the Partial Administration Agreement. • During an interview with an indigenous rights organization that represents communities within the project area, we confirmed that the property rights of these communities are respected and that no conflicts exist in this regard. • During the site visit, the audit team observed that there are two communities living within the project area (Nueva America and Sandoval). However, we confirmed during interviews and onsite observations that Nueva America does not hold title or rights to the land. Despite this, the project does not encroach on the rights of these communities, but rather allows them to continue to utilize the land they inhabit. Further the project proponent has engaged in working with these communities and Nueva America even has beneficiaries that are part of the project.
The project does not encroach uninvited on private, community or government property.	• The audit team confirmed via interviews with government officials from SERNANP that the project area is under government control but that the Partial Administrative Agreement that gives the project proponent the right to share in management functions and conduct this REDD project is valid for another 20 years.

	• See above.
The free, prior and informed consent has been obtained of those whose property rights are affected by the project.	• The audit team carefully reviewed the validated PD and the MR for this reporting period and confirmed that they contain descriptions of rights as they relate to land, territory and resources in the project. • Through the processes listed above, the audit team was able to confirm that this is not applicable as project area land is owned by the government, and parties were not affected by the project.
Appropriate restitution or compensation has been allocated to any parties whose lands have been or will be affected by the project.	• Through the processes listed above, the audit team was able to confirm that this is not applicable as project area land is owned by the government, and parties were not affected by the project.
Project activities do not lead to the involuntary removal or relocation of property rights holders from their lands or territories, and does not force them to relocate activities important to their culture or livelihood.	• Through the processes listed above, the audit team was able to confirm that this is not applicable as project area land is owned by the government, and parties were not affected by the project.

In summary, since extensive onsite and remote interviews, as well as document review,, the audit team concludes that the project has protected the rights of Indigenous Peoples, communities and other stakeholders in accordance to the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards and the validated project design.

4.3.11 Identification of Illegal Activities (G5.5)

The audit team took the following steps to verify actions taken and measures implemented (if necessary) by the project proponent to reduce illegal activities that could affect the project's impacts.

- The monitoring report indicates that several illegal activities continue to exist within the project area (e.g., gold mining, extraction of wood, burning, expansion of agriculture). During interviews and through onsite observations the audit team confirmed that these are relevant illegal activities in the project area.
- During interviews with park rangers, government officials, and the project team, the audit team confirmed that there has been increased surveillance and control activities, particularly by the government which is targeted at illegal gold mining.
- The park rangers employed by the project indicated that a fundamental pillar of their work is to provide surveillance and control functions by surveying and documenting any instances of illegal activities. This information is then turned over to SERNANP who is in charge of enforcement.
- A key component of the project is the providing alternative employment opportunities to generate equal or higher incomes that prevent people from illegal resource use. This was confirmed during interviews with the project team and the agroforestry cooperative members who are beneficiaries of this alternative livelihood. Many of them were previously ranchers or agricultural producers who are transitioning into more sustainable agroforestry production.

- The audit team also confirmed through review of documentation and interviews with community members that the project implements environmental education targeted at younger generations with the hopes of preventing further illegal activities resulting in deforestation and degradation in the future.

4.4 Climate

4.4.1 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

With the exception of any project description deviations and/or methodology deviations described in the above Sections 3.2-3.4 and/or 4.3.1, the GHG emission reductions and/or removals have been quantified correctly in accordance with the project description and the applied methodology.

The GHG emission reductions and/or removals have been quantified correctly in accordance with the project description and with the applied methodology.

For all instances in which values were transcribed between datasets (e.g., transcription from the project description to reporting workbooks, or between reporting workbooks), the audit team carefully traced values to ensure the absence of manual transposition errors.

An identification of the data and parameters used to calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals, and a description of the steps taken to assess each of them, follows.

4.4.1.1 Data and Parameters Available at Validation

	Steps taken by audit team to assess...		
Data/Parameter	Accuracy of GHG emission reductions and removals	Whether methods/formulae set out in project description have been followed	Appropriateness of default values
Regional Forest / Non-forest Cover Benchmark Map	N/A (assessed at validation)	N/A (not used for monitoring)	N/A (not used for monitoring)
Leakage Belt Forest Cover Benchmark Map	N/A (assessed at validation)	N/A (not used for monitoring)	N/A (not used for monitoring)

	Steps taken by audit team to assess...		
Data/Parameter	Accuracy of GHG emission reductions and removals	Whether methods/formulae set out in project description have been followed	Appropriateness of default values
Project Forest Cover Benchmark Map,	Evaluated this parameter due to the PD deviation described in section 3.3. above. Confirmed through the review of the forest benchmark map provided /63/, the maps of forest cover loss and the corresponding loss reported in each monitoring report /41/-/46/ across all monitoring periods since the project start date, as well as through the review of satellite imagery that the map provided and the summary statistics of forest area /61/ represent the forested area in each strata at the start and end of each monitoring period.	Confirmed that the values have now been correctly transcribed from the shapefile /63/ to the Table reported in the monitoring report and the corresponding calculation workbooks. Confirmed during interviews with the project team that the mapping methods set out in the Section 2.4 of the PD.	N/A
$\Delta C_{BSL,unplanned}$ Net greenhouse gas emissions in the baseline from unplanned deforestation.	N/A (assessed at validation)	Confirmed that the values were correctly transcribed from Table 44 of the validated PD /39/ and utilized in the quantification of emissions reductions for this monitoring period /3/	N/A (not used for monitoring)
A_i (Area of stratum i)	N/A (assessed at validation)	Visual inspection of spatial products displaying strata and review of calculations workbooks /3/ to confirm that the validated stratification system has been used (through comparison to data shown in Table 26 of PD /39/ and other sources provided at validation)	N/A (not used for monitoring)
$ARRD_{unplanned,hrp}$ (Total area deforested during the historical reference period in the RRD)	N/A (assessed at validation)	N/A (not used for monitoring)	N/A (assessed at validation)
CF (Carbon fraction of dry matter)	N/A (assessed at validation)	Confirmed through review of the monitoring report and the calculations workbooks /3/ that a value of 0.50 t C-1 was utilized.	N/A (assessed at validation)

	Steps taken by audit team to assess...		
Data/Parameter	Accuracy of GHG emission reductions and removals	Whether methods/formulae set out in project description have been followed	Appropriateness of default values
$f_j(X,Y)$ (Allometric equation for species)	N/A (assessed at validation)	Confirmed through the review of monitoring report and calculations workbooks /13/ that the allometric equations as specified on page 62 of validated PD have been utilized for quantification of GHG emissions.	N/A (assessed at validation)
R (Root to shoot ratio)	N/A (assessed at validation)	Confirmed through review of the monitoring report and calculations workbooks that the root to shoot ratio of 0.37 as specified on page 63 of the validated PD /39/ has been utilized.	N/A (assessed at validation)
$COMFi$ (Combustion factor for stratum i (vegetation type))	N/A (assessed at validation)	Confirmed through review of calculations workbooks /3/ and previous monitoring reports /41/-/46/ that the combustion factor of 0.5 as specified in the validated was used for the quantification of GHG emissions.	N/A (assessed at validation)
G_{gi} (combustion emission factor for CH_4 and N_2O)	N/A (assessed at validation)	Confirmed through review of calculations workbooks /3/ and previous monitoring reports /41/-/46/ that the combustion emission factors for CH_4 and N_2O as specified at validation has been utilized in quantification of GHG emissions.	N/A (assessed at validation)
$C_{AB,tree,l}$ (Carbon stock in aboveground biomass in trees)	N/A (assessed at validation)	Confirmed through review of the monitoring report and calculations workbooks that the carbon stock in aboveground biomass for strata as set out in Table 26 of the PD /39/ has been utilized for quantification of GHG emissions /3/	N/A (assessed at validation)

	Steps taken by audit team to assess...		
Data/Parameter	Accuracy of GHG emission reductions and removals	Whether methods/formulae set out in project description have been followed	Appropriateness of default values
<i>C_{BB,tree,l}</i> (Carbon stock in belowground biomass in trees)	N/A (assessed at validation)	Confirmed through review of the monitoring report and calculations workbooks that the carbon stock in belowground biomass for strata as set out in Table 26 of the PD /39/ has been utilized for quantification of GHG emissions /3/	N/A (assessed at validation)

4.4.1.2 Data and Parameters Monitored

	Steps taken by audit team to assess...		
Data/Parameter	Accuracy of GHG emission reductions and removals	Whether methods/formulae set out in project description have been followed	Appropriateness of default values
Project Forest Cover Monitoring Map, Leakage Belt Forest Cover Monitoring Map	Review of relevant remote sensing documentation and spatial products /9/ to ensure adherence to criteria documents, conducted interviews with GIS/Remote Sensing specialists in charge of conducting latest analysis.	Reviewed the process /8/ /9/ against sections 4.2 and 4.3 of the PD to confirm that procedures set out have been generally followed, excepting the project description deviation validated during this monitoring period and described in section 3.3 above.	N/A

	Steps taken by audit team to assess...		
Data/Parameter	Accuracy of GHG emission reductions and removals	Whether methods/formulae set out in project description have been followed	Appropriateness of default values
Degradation PRA Results	As a result of the methodology deviation 1 described in section 4.3.1 above, review of park ranger and specialist reports are used in lieu of a PRA. The audit team reviewed documentation /10/ /11/ to ensure adherence to criteria documents. We also conducted interviews with project personnel. Lastly, we reviewed park ranger and specialist reports confirmed that they indicated degradation had occurred in the project area. As a result of the methodology deviation 1 described in section 4.3.1 above, a review of the park ranger and specialist reports was conducted but for degradation occurring from 2015-2017 (also see FAR 2 in section 2.6.1).	Reviewed the process as described in /10/ /11/ against sections 4.2 and 4.3 of the PD to confirm that the procedures and monitoring frequency as set out have been generally followed. Due to the methodology deviation #5 described in section 4.3.1 above as well as in the FAR #2 (section 2.6.1), the project proponent used results of the specialist reports for the period 2015-2017, and not for the 2019 period.is deviation was approved by Verra /49/.	N/A
Result of Limited Degradation Survey	The audit team reviewed documentation /11/ /13/ to ensure adherence to criteria documents and confirm that the result of the limited degradation survey indicated that degradation had occurred. We independently checked the spatial datasets /12/ of the area potentially impacted by degradation to confirm accuracy. We also conducted interviews with project personnel to confirm sampling procedures.	Reviewed the process as described in /10/ /11/ against sections 4.2 and 4.3 of the PD to confirm that the procedures and monitoring frequency as set out have been generally followed. Due to the methodology deviation #5 described in section 4.3.1 above as well as in the FAR #2 (section 2.6.1), the project proponent used results of the specialist reports for the period 2015-2017, and not for the 2019 period.is deviation was approved by Verra /49/.	N/A

	Steps taken by audit team to assess...		
Data/Parameter	Accuracy of GHG emission reductions and removals	Whether methods/formulae set out in project description have been followed	Appropriateness of default values
$A_{burn,i,t}$	Through the independent recalculation of area burned, using the maps of burning provided /16/, review of documentation on mapping burned areas /15/ and interviews with project personnel, the audit team confirmed that the quantification of the area burned in the project area was free of material error. Emissions due to the burning have been omitted as a result of significance testing.	N/A; no particular methods set out in PD for quantification of area burned area from burned areas maps /15/	N/A
$A_{DefPA,i,u,t}$, $A_{DefLB,i,u,t}$	Through independent recalculation using the spatial deforestation products /8/ and independent review of high resolution remotely sensed imagery, audit team confirmed that quantification of area deforested in the project area and leakage belt was free of material error	N/A; no particular methods set out in PD for quantification of deforested area from Forest Cover Monitoring Maps /7/	N/A
$A_{DegW,i}$	Through the independent recalculation of the potential area degraded, using the maps of potential area degraded /12/, the audit team confirmed that the quantification of the area potentially impacted by degradation was free of material error.	N/A; no particular methods set out in PD for quantification of potential area degraded from the spatial products /12/	N/A
$A_{DistPA,q,i,t}$	Confirmed through independent review of government data and through interviews with project personnel that no natural disturbances had occurred in the project area during the monitoring period.	Confirmed through review of the PD and interviews with project personnel that the methods for quantifying the area impacted by natural disturbances as set out in section 4.3 has been followed.	N/A

	Steps taken by audit team to assess...		
Data/Parameter	Accuracy of GHG emission reductions and removals	Whether methods/formulae set out in project description have been followed	Appropriateness of default values
$C_{DegW,i,t}$	Confirmed through independent recalculation of the carbon emissions due to degradation that the quantification of the biomass carbon of trees cut and removed through illegal logging was free of material error.	Confirmed through independent recalculation and review of calculation workbooks /13/ that equation 8 of the M-REDD module was applied to calculate this parameter.	N/A
AP_i	Confirmed through independent recalculation of the degradation sampling transects /12/ that the quantification of the sampling area is free of material error and represents the 3% of the area potentially subject to degradation as required by the methodology.	N/A; no particular methods set out in PD for quantification of potential area degraded from the degradation transects /12	N/A
$TOTFOR$	The audit team reviewed the shapefiles submitted /50/ and confirmed that the parameter TOTFOR was calculated /4/ in accordance with the methodology and the methodology deviation which was previous verified for TOTFOR. Despite being monitored, the value of TOTFOR has no impact on the ex-post estimation of leakage emissions as the result of equation 9 of the LK-ASU module indicates no leakage outside the leakage belt as occurred.	N/A; no particular methods set out in PD for quantification of the total area national forestland.	N/A

	Steps taken by audit team to assess...		
Data/Parameter	Accuracy of GHG emission reductions and removals	Whether methods/formulae set out in project description have been followed	Appropriateness of default values
<i>PROTFOR</i>	The audit team reviewed the shapefiles submitted and confirmed that the parameter PROTFOR /50/ was calculated in accordance with the methodology /4/ and the methodology deviation which was previous verified for PROTFOR. Despite being monitored, the value of PROTFOR has no impact on the ex-post estimation of leakage emissions as the result of equation 9 of the LK-ASU module indicates no leakage outside the leakage belt as occurred.	N/A; no particular methods set out in PD for quantification of the total area protected forestland.	N/A
<i>MANFOR</i>	The audit team reviewed the shapefiles submitted /50/ and confirmed that the parameter MANFOR was calculated /4/ in accordance with the methodology and the methodology deviation which was previous verified for MANTFOR. Despite being monitored, the value of MANFOR has no impact on the ex-post estimation of leakage emissions as the result of equation 9 of the LK-ASU module indicates no leakage outside the leakage belt as occurred.	N/A; no particular methods set out in PD for quantification of the total area managed forestland.	N/A

	Steps taken by audit team to assess...		
Data/Parameter	Accuracy of GHG emission reductions and removals	Whether methods/formulae set out in project description have been followed	Appropriateness of default values
<i>PROPIMM</i>	Through review of the calculation of this parameter in the leakage workbook /4/, the audit team confirmed that it was conservatively calculated using census data. Although new census data was released in 2017, due to the methodology deviation 1 described in section 3.2 above, the parameter was calculated from the 2007 census as it results in a more conservative estimate of potential leakage emissions.	Audit team confirmed through the review of past monitoring reports /41/-/46/ and quantification of this variable for those monitoring reports, that the procedures to quantify Propimm during this monitoring have been followed.	N/A
<i>PROPRES</i>	Through review of the calculation of this parameter in the leakage workbook /4/, the audit team confirmed that it was conservatively calculated using census data. Although new census data was released in 2017, due to the methodology deviation 1 described in section 3.2 above, the parameter was calculated from the 2007 census as it results in a more conservative estimate of potential leakage emissions.	Audit team confirmed through the review of past monitoring reports /41/-/46/ and quantification of this variable for those monitoring reports, that the procedures to quantify Propres during this monitoring have been followed.	N/A

	Steps taken by audit team to assess...		
Data/Parameter	Accuracy of GHG emission reductions and removals	Whether methods/formulae set out in project description have been followed	Appropriateness of default values
COLB	Through recalculation, the audit team confirmed that this value was correctly calculated using an official, published source. Despite being monitored, the value of COLB has no impact on the ex-post estimation of leakage emissions as the result of equation 9 of the LK-ASU module indicates no leakage outside the leakage belt as occurred.	The audit team confirmed that the parameter has been calculated in conformance with section 5.1.5.3 of the LK-ASU module.	N/A

4.4.2 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

4.4.2.1 Nature of Data and Information Supporting GHG Quantification

Certain data and information supporting the quantification of GHG emission reductions and/or removals were hypothetical, projected and/or historical in nature, as described in more detail below.

- Project emission reductions were derived using a baseline rate of deforestation which is based on projections.

4.4.2.2 Quality and Quantity of Evidence Used to Determine GHG Quantification

The evidence used to determine the GHG reductions and removals for the verification period was of sufficient quantity and appropriate quality. An identification of the categories of evidence used to determine the GHG emission reductions and removals, and a description of the steps taken to assess the sufficiency of quantity, and appropriateness of quality, of each category of evidence, follows.

See prior verification reports for examples of how this table is to be filled out.

	Steps taken by audit team to assess...		
Category	Reliability of the evidence, and source and nature of evidence (external or internal, oral or documented) for determination of GHG emission reductions or removals	Information flow from data generation and aggregation, to recording, calculation and final transposition into the MR	Appropriateness of implemented calibration frequency of monitoring equipment
Calculation workbooks	Replication of calculations to verify that workbooks are free of material error and, thus, reasonably reliable	Tracing of information through workbooks to source data (/3/ - /6/, /13/).	N/A

Category	Steps taken by audit team to assess...		
	Reliability of the evidence, and source and nature of evidence (external or internal, oral or documented) for determination of GHG emission reductions or removals	Information flow from data generation and aggregation, to recording, calculation and final transposition into the MR	Appropriateness of implemented calibration frequency of monitoring equipment
Analysis of remotely sensed imagery	Through review of procedures and independent review of satellite imagery, audit team can confirm this evidence is highly reliable	Through review of spatial analysis processes, audit team confirmed that data were appropriately transcribed into the calculation workbooks (see above)	Audit team confirmed that source data for this analysis is the Landsat program, an official program of the United States government that can be assumed to have industry-standard calibration procedures in place to ensure high-quality data.

Overall, the evidence used to determine the GHG reductions and removals for the verification period is of sufficient quantity (i.e., all necessary information has been provided to allow the audit team to trace and, as necessary, recalculate the quantification of GHG reductions and removals), and of appropriate quality (i.e., information presented is free of misstatements, whether material or immaterial) to allow the audit team to render a verification opinion.

4.4.3 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

The reported value of the overall risk rating, as determined based on the risk analysis documented in the NPRR, was 10%.

The audit team did not perform a re-assessment of the risk analysis from first principles, but did assess

- Whether any circumstances or conditions may have transpired since the previous risk analysis such that a previous determination having bearing on the risk rating is no longer valid.
- Whether items meant to address certain risks are in place and functioning as intended.

The audit team's conclusions regarding the risk analysis are two-fold. The audit team concludes that

- The assignment of risk scores to risk factors that did not change from the previous risk analysis remains appropriate and in conformance to the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, to the extent that such assignment was appropriate and in conformance to the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool at the time of the prior risk analysis.
- The assignment of risk scores to risk factors that did change from the previous risk analysis is appropriate and in conformance to the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool.

A detailed review of the audit team's conclusions may be found below.

4.4.3.1 Internal Risk - Project Management

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
(a)	Through interviews with project personnel, the audit team confirmed that the planting of species that are “not native or proven to be adapted to the same or similar agro-ecological zone(s) in which the project is located” continues to be excluded from the scope of the project activity.	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(b)	The audit team confirmed through interviews with project personnel and park rangers, and as well as degradation reports /10/ and illegal logging reports /55/ that the project area continued to be have control posts and patrol supervisions	Park Ranger reports and logs (e.g., /55/) which are summarized in the degradation report /10/ are official documents submitted to the government and are considered to be of high quality.	Risk rating is appropriate
(c)	- The audit team was able to confirm, through review of project personnel experience documented in Annex A /51/, as well as the AIDER website which includes numerous publications by project personnel, as well as interviews with project personnel that the management team continues to include individuals with significant experience in each of the skills required for effective project implementation. - This same management team has been relatively constant throughout the duration of the project and has successfully guided the project through validation and several verifications as indicated on the VCS Project Database https://registry.terra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/1067	Publications on the AIDER website appear to be of high quality.	Risk rating is appropriate

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
(d)	The audit team can confirm through Google Maps searches that the base of operations of AIDER is located in Puerto Maldonado, Madre de Dios, which is within a day's travel from the project area. There are forest worker headquarters quite close to the project area	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(e)	- The audit team can affirm that the management team includes individuals that have already guided this project through successful validation, verification and issuance of GHG credits of the project under the VCS Program, as demonstrated by credit issuance relating to GHG emission reductions attributable to prior monitoring periods (the management team has remained largely constant over time). - Evidence of successful validation and several verifications as indicated on the VCS Project Database https://registry.terra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/1067	Evidence of prior credit issuance may be found on the VCS Project Database https://registry.terra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/1067, which is presumed to be of high quality	Risk rating is appropriate
(f)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate

4.4.3.2 Internal Risk – Financial Viability

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
(a)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(b)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(c)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
(d)	The audit team determined through review of financial information in the cash flow workbook /52/ and determined that the project has indeed already reached its breakeven point through the sale of VCU's and timber. We confirmed the sale of VCU's by reviewing the Verra registry https://registry.verra.org/app/search/VCS?programType=ISSUANCE&exactResId=1067	Evidence of prior credit issuance may be found on the VCS Project Database https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/1067, which is presumed to be of high quality	Risk rating is appropriate
(e)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(f)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(g)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(h)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(i)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate

4.4.3.3 Internal Risk – Opportunity Cost

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
(a)	The audit team reviewed the Mosquera et al. 2009 study which concludes that costs and incomes generated from gold mining, which would be the most productive alternative to the project activity in this region. The audit team confirmed that the values for the NPV reported in the risk report are supported by the literature.	Mosquera et al. 2009 is a peer-reviewed scientific publication and considered of high quality.	Risk rating is appropriate
(b)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(c)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(d)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(e)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
(f)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(g)	The audit team confirmed by reviewing the AIDER webpage that the project proponent is a non-profit organization.	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(h)	The audit team confirmed during interviews with government officials from SERNANP that the project is protected by a legally binding agreement to continue conservation-based management practices over 100 years.	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate

4.4.3.4 Internal Risk – Project Longevity

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
(a)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(b)	- Reviewed the Peruvian Law No. 26834 of Protected Natural areas, which states that protected areas are established in perpetuity from development, logging, etc, which indicates that the carbon stocks in the project area are protected in perpetuity as well. - This was also confirmed during an interview with SERNANP representatives.	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate

4.4.3.5 External Risk – Land Tenure and Resource Access/Impacts

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
(a)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
(b)	Confirmed during interviews with SERNANP officials that the project area is a Natural Protected Area which is owned by the Peruvian State under management by SERNANP.	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(c)	The audit team confirmed during interviews with representatives from local communities, SERNANP officials, and project personnel that disputes over land tenure and ownership do not exist in the project area.	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(d)	The audit team confirmed during interviews with representatives from local communities, SERNANP officials, and project personnel that disputes over resource use do not exist in the project area.	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(e)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(f)	- Reviewed the Peruvian Law No. 26834 of Protected Natural areas, which states that protected areas are established in perpetuity from development, logging, etc, which indicates that the carbon stocks in the project area are protected in perpetuity as well. The law serves as a legally binding agreement to continue conservation-based management over the length of the project crediting period. - This was also confirmed during an interview with SERNANP representatives.	N/A	
(g)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate

4.4.3.6 External Risk – Community Engagement

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
(a)	The audit team confirmed during interviews with communities within the project area, project personnel, and that over 50% of the households living within the project area have been consulted.	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(b)	There are approximately 53 communities that are living within 20 km of the project boundary. Although resource use within the project area is illegal, the audit team confirmed during interviews and observations during the site visit, that some of these communities are in fact reliant on the project area. It was confirmed that <20% of these communities have been consulted.	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(c)	The audit team confirmed through this CCB verification and by reviewing past CCB verification reports that the project has been certified against the CCB standards.	N/A/	Risk rating is appropriate

4.4.3.7 External Risk – Political Risk

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
(a)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(b)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(c)	Through independent calculation Governance Score from the World Bank Governance Indicators over the past 5 years downloaded from http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/#home, as -0.1086., the audit team confirmed that a value of -0.11 is correct /53/	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(d)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
(e)	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
(f)	Audit team confirmed that Peru is also receiving REDD+ readiness funding from the World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership facility (https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/country/peru)	The Forest Carbon Partnership site is considered high quality.	Risk rating is appropriate

4.4.3.8 Natural Risk

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
Fire			
L	- The audit team independently reviewed the fire reports from the national emergency center /56/ provided and confirmed that fires are infrequent, generally isolated to agricultural areas and do not spread into the surrounding forests. - The audit team also confirmed during interviews with researchers from PCUP as well as biologists from the Tambopata Reserve and Bahuaja-Sonene National Park that fire risk is extremely low in this wet tropical system.	The fire reports are from a government agency and considered to be of high quality.	Risk rating is appropriate
S	N/A	N/A	
M	- The audit team confirmed that the project proponent has produced a fire prevention manual /54/that is distributed to communities. - The audit team also reviewed documentation pertaining to fire prevention courses given to park personnel /57/ - However, given that the risk of fires is extremely low, this mitigation credit does not have an impact.	- The fire prevention manual /56/ has been published by USAID, AIDER (the project proponent), Rainforest Alliance, and EcoLex and is therefore considered to be of high quality. - The fire course attendance sheets /57/ contain signatures by participants and are on official letterhead. Photos also correspond to the trainings.	
Pest and Disease Outbreaks			

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
L	low risk for the natural forests, there is a risk of pest and disease for the agroforestry operations with COOPASER and chestnut trees. Given that these operations represent a small fraction of the carbon in the project area and the majority exist outside of the project area, however, during interviews with the agroforestry produces it was confirmed that pests and disease are encountered rather frequently, thus the score is appropriate.	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
S	Pest and diseases are generally a low risk for the natural forests, there is a risk of pest and disease for the agroforestry operations with COOPASER and chestnut trees. Given that these operations represent a small fraction of the carbon in the project area and the majority exist outside of the project area, the significance level is considered conservative.	N/A	
M	The audit team reviewed the documentation related to the training and education of local communities on sustainable agroforestry practices including mitigation and prevention of pest and disease outbreaks among their crops /58/	Documentation includes workshop attendance sheets, official agroforestry training reports, as well as photographs all printed on official letterhead and deemed to be of high quality /58/	
Extreme Weather			
L	- Independently reviewed INDECI reports which were submitted /59/ and indicate that the likelihood and significance of extreme weather events (frost, flooding, wind, etc) is rare in the Tambopata region. - The audit team also confirmed during interviews with SERNANP representatives and biologists from PCUP and the park and reserve that extreme weather events are extremely rare and have not impacted forests or carbon stocks.	The documentation is from official government websites and is considered of high quality.	Risk rating is appropriate
S	N/A	N/A	

Risk	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification	Assessment of quality of documentation and data provided	Conclusion regarding appropriateness of risk rating
M	N/A	N/A	
Geological Risk			
L	The audit team also confirmed during interviews with SERNANP representatives and biologists from PCUP and the park and reserve that geologic events are insignificant in this region.	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
S	N/A	N/A	
M	N/A	N/A	
Other natural risk			
L	N/A	N/A	Risk rating is appropriate
S	N/A	N/A	
M	N/A	N/A	

4.4.4 Dissemination of Climate Monitoring Plan and Results (CL3.2)

The audit team took the following steps to verify the actions taken to disseminate the climate monitoring plan and results.

- The audit team confirmed during interviews with the project team and with SERNANP officials that every quarter, AIDER presents the results of the monitoring plan to SERNANP. The monitoring results may include biodiversity components, climate components, etc. The results of the climate monitoring for this monitoring period are to be submitted when the emissions reductions are verified and finalized.

In summary, since SERNANP confirmed that submission of the climate monitoring plan and results are a required component of the Administrative Contract, the audit team concludes that the results of climate monitoring have been and will continue to be disseminated in accordance with the validated project design.

4.4.5 Optional Gold Level: Climate Change Adaptation Benefits (GL1.4)

Not applicable; the project is not being validated against the optional Gold Level indicator GL1.4.

4.5 Community

4.5.1 Community Impacts (CM1.1)

The steps taken to verify the reported impacts of project activities on each identified community group are described below.

Community Group	Assessment column 1*	Assessment column 2**	Assessment column 3***
-----------------	----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------

Community Group	Assessment column 1*	Assessment column 2**	Assessment column 3***
Infierno Native Community	Reviewed section 4.1.1 and section 4.3.2 of the MR and confirmed it includes a detailed assessment of expected impacts on the well-being this community as a result of project activities including assisting in the development of a new life plan, supporting community monitoring of fauna, facilitating the registration of new boards of directors, and providing direct transfer of funds to support community development needs.	The audit team reviewed signed invoices showing the direct transfer of funds from AIDER to Infierno, reports showing notes and signed attendance logs from meetings between the project proponent and the community /21/. This documentation is thorough, on official letterhead, and contains dates and signatures of participants and is therefore considered to be high quality. During interviews with the project team (see section 2.4.1), we also reviewed photo evidence of community meetings and environmental education activities.	Due to restricted access as a result of COVID19, the audit team was unable to visit this community during the site visit. Through remote interviews and reviews of documentation audit team confirmed that the project has provided the following: supported the update of the community life plan, provided advice to agroforestry operations, provided the use of equipment for monitoring needs, supported women artisans, and supported environmental education in the community. Through the remote interviews with representatives from FENAMAD (an indigenous rights advocacy nonprofit in the region), it was confirmed that the project provided support including assisting in the development of the life plan, supporting community management by providing direct investments and facilitating coordination of activities.

Community Group	Assessment column 1*	Assessment column 2**	Assessment column 3***
Sonene Native Community	Reviewed section 4.1.1 and section 4.3.2 of the MR and confirmed it includes a detailed assessment of expected impacts on the well-being this community as a result of project activities including assisting in the update and socialization of the life plan, providing cash, fuel, a printer, cement, food, and materials and loans for various community needs, support the monitoring of illegal activities around the community.	The audit team reviewed signed invoices showing the direct transfer of funds from AIDER to Sonene, reports showing notes and signed attendance logs from meetings between the project proponent and the community /21/. This documentation is thorough, on official letterhead, and contains dates and signatures of participants and is therefore considered to be high quality. During interviews with the project team, we also reviewed photo evidence of community meetings.	Due to restricted access as a result of COVID19 pandemic, the audit team was unable to visit this community during the site visit. Due to lack of internet and phone connection, the audit team was unable to conduct remote interviews with this community. However, during interviews with FENAMAD (an indigenous rights advocacy nonprofit in the region), it was confirmed that the project provided support for this community including assisting in the socialization of the life plan, supporting community management by providing direct investments and facilitating coordination of activities.

Community Group	Assessment column 1*	Assessment column 2**	Assessment column 3***
Palma Real Native Community	Reviewed section 4.1.1 and section 4.3.2 of the MR and confirmed it includes a detailed assessment of expected impacts on the well-being this community as a result of project activities including assisting in the update and socialization of the life plan, providing cash, fuel, materials and loans for various community needs, supporting rural community tourism, and participating in coordination meetings with the community and local authorities (i.e., FENAMAD, government representatives).	The audit team reviewed signed invoices showing the direct transfer of funds from AIDER to Palma Real, reports showing notes and signed attendance logs from meetings between the project proponent and the community /21/. This documentation is thorough, on official letterhead, and contains dates and signatures of participants and is therefore considered to be high quality. During interviews with the project team, we also reviewed photo evidence of community meetings and the handicrafts.	Due to restricted access as a result of the pandemic, the audit team was unable to visit this community during the site visit. Through remote interviews and reviews of documentation audit team confirmed that the project has supported strengthening in tourism activities, the sale of handicrafts, persistence of cultural values, and supporting the overall health and wellbeing of the community. Through the remote interviews with representatives from FENAMAD (an indigenous rights advocacy nonprofit in the region), it was confirmed that the project provided support including assisting in the development of the life plan, supporting community management by providing direct investments and facilitating coordination of activities.
Agroforestry cooperative (COOPASER)	Reviewed section 4.1.1 and section 4.3.2 of the MR and confirmed it includes a detailed assessment of expected impacts on the well-being of the agroforestry cooperative members by providing technical trainings and workshops, support for the sale of products, assessment of operations, financial state, and registration of new cooperative members, and achieving organic certifications.	The audit team reviewed technical training materials, workshop reports, and signed attendance logs for both trainings and workshops. During interviews with the project team, we also reviewed photo evidence of the COOPASER training workshops. This documentation is thorough, uniform, on official letterhead, and contains dates and signatures of participants and is therefore considered to be high quality /21/	The audit team visited several agroforestry operators and the cacao processing facility onsite. During interviews with the COOPASER members, the audit team confirmed that the project provided extensive training opportunities and technical assistance to help enhance productivity, has supported the implementation of organic certification and fair trade certification, and provided direct transfer of funds to hire a cooperative manager.

Community Group	Assessment column 1*	Assessment column 2**	Assessment column 3***
Native Federation of Madre de Dios (FENAMAD)	Reviewed section 4.1.1 and section 4.3.2 of the MR and confirmed it includes an assessment of how the project has supported the functions of FENAMAD to further support the native communities involved in the project.	The audit team reviewed signed invoices showing the direct transfer of funds from AIDER to FENAMAD for transportation to community meetings /21/.	Through the remote interview of a FENAMAD representative, the audit team confirmed that the project has supported travel to meetings between FENAMAD and the native communities for the coordination of community management and support.
Chestnut families	Reviewed section 4.1.1 and section 4.3.2 of the MR and confirmed it includes an assessment of how the project has supported the chestnut families who are permitted to operate within the project area. One area support has been the commitment of providing the fair-trade and organic certification training. Likewise, the MR indicates a commitment to raising awareness and providing trainings for sustainable management of chestnuts, supporting the revision of the chestnut protocols.	The audit team reviewed the report for the chestnut protocol workshop which was detailed, on official letterhead and contains dates and signatures of participants and is therefore considered to be high quality /8/	Onsite the audit team visually inspected areas within the project area where chestnuts are harvested. We confirmed that the harvesting of chestnuts appears to be sustainable as it has not resulted in deforestation in the project area, suggesting that the commitment to sustainable management of chestnuts harvesting has been successful.

- *Assessment column 1 contains details of documentation assessed in order to verify the reported impacts of project activities on the community group in question.
- **Assessment column 2 describes methods used to assess the quality of data provided in order to verify the reported impacts of project activities on the community group in question.
- *** Assessment column 3 describes observations made during the site visit in order to verify the reported impacts of project activities on the community group in question.

In summary, since through community interviews, interviews with project personnel, on-site observations, and documentation review, the audit team concludes that the assessment of impacts, as reported in Section 4.1 of the MR, is accurate.

4.5.2 Net Positive Community Well-being (CM1.1)

The steps taken to verify that the net impacts of project activities on all identified community groups are positive are described below.

- See section 4.4.1 above for details.

In summary, through community interviews, on-site observations, and documentation review, the audit team concludes that the net impact of project activities on community groups is positive.

4.5.3 Protection of High Conservation Values (CM1.2)

The steps taken to verify that no high conservation values related to community well-being in the project zone identified in the project's validated design have been negatively affected by the project are described below.

- The audit team reviewed the CCB PD to confirm the identified high conservation values related to community well-being, which include Aguajales, timber forest use, streams for water consumption, and areas for hunting, fishing, chestnut extraction and ecotourism.
- The audit team confirmed during interviews with local communities that the high conservation values related to community well-being in the project zone have not been negatively affected by project activities.
- Confirmed that section 4.1.3 of the monitoring report includes a detailed description of the protection of high conservation values.

In summary, by interviewing communities in the project zone, the audit team concludes that the high conservation values have not been negatively affected by the project.

4.5.4 Other Stakeholder Impacts (CM2.2-CM2.3)

The steps taken to verify the measures implemented to mitigate the negative well-being impacts on other stakeholders are described below.

- The project team identified other stakeholders primarily as communities living outside of the project area, in the buffer zone. Many of the community members have been involved in illegal gold mining operations and unsustainable ranching which lead to deforestation. Through providing alternative livelihoods with the creation of the agroforestry cooperative and continued support of it, these other stakeholders have an alternative livelihood.
- The audit team confirmed by reviewing the monitoring report, project documentation, and by interviewing individuals from these outside communities regarding measures implemented to mitigate any negative well-being impacts.
- By providing for alternative economic livelihoods through the continued support of the agroforestry cooperative, including technical assistance and by attracting new members to join the cooperative, the project has mitigation potential negative economic impacts. See the COOPASER row in the table in section 4.4.1 above.

The steps taken verify that the net impact of project activities on other stakeholders is not negative are described below.

- The audit team interviewed these other stakeholders to determine how the shift in livelihoods has impacted them and we have confirmed that they have not experienced negative impacts, although the agroforestry operations are not yet at full productivity. Members acknowledged that it will take time and continued work and expansion to see a significant profit from this alternative livelihood. Most of the members are engaged in other activities to support their well-being including ecotourism, fishing, and cattle ranching.

In summary, through interviews with other stakeholders involved in the agroforestry cooperative, the audit team concludes that the net impacts of project activities on the well-being of other stakeholders are not negative.

4.5.5 Community Monitoring Plan (CM3.1, CM3.2, GL2.5).

The steps taken to verify that the community impact monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the project's validated design are described below.

Steps taken to verify that...	
Monitoring includes communities, community groups, other stakeholders, and HCVs related to community well-being identified in the monitoring plan.	- The audit team thoroughly reviewed the MR Section 4.3.1. and confirmed that community monitoring is being described in accordance with the validated design and is very detailed and well described. - The audit team conducted interviews both onsite and remotely with community members, community groups, other stakeholders, and project personnel and confirmed that the appropriate communities and groups are identified in the monitoring plan.
Community variables monitored are selected in accordance with the validated project design.	The project set out in the CCB PD four community variables to monitor: control and surveillance, support of forest governance, promotion of conservation agreements, and promotion of sustainable economic activities. By reviewing section 4.3.2 of the monitoring report and interviewing community members, the audit team confirmed that these variables are monitored in accordance with the PD.
The dates, frequency and sampling methods used are in accordance with the validated project design.	- Through interviews with project personnel, and communities, the audit team confirmed the dates, frequency and sampling methods used are in accordance with the validated project design. - The audit team also cross-referenced the dates and frequency with community reports, invoices of direct payments, training materials, and participate attendance sheets /21/
The results of monitoring are in accordance with the validated project design.	The audit team confirmed the results of monitoring through remote and onsite interviews and observations. Specifically, during these interviews the audit team inquired about the monitoring results listed in section 4.3.1 to confirm their validity.

In summary, since through review of project documentation and interviews with community members, the audit team concludes that the community monitoring plan was carried out in accordance to the validated project design.

4.5.6 Community Monitoring Plan Dissemination (CM3.3)

The steps taken to verify the actions taken to disseminate the results of community monitoring in accordance with the monitoring plan are described below.

- Confirmed during interviews with community stakeholders and SERNANP that the community monitoring plan and results have been made available at the headquarters of the Tambopata Reserve and the Bahuaja Sonene National Park.
- As indicated in the monitoring report and was confirmed with the project proponent, the audit team confirmed during interviews with the project proponent that the final report will be disseminated to the community stakeholders and to SERNANP once this verification has been completed.
- The audit team confirmed that section 4.3.3 of the monitoring report contains a description of the dissemination of the community monitoring plan.

In summary, through interviews with community stakeholders and government officials overseeing the national protected areas, the audit team concludes that the results of community monitoring were disseminated in accordance with the validated project design.

4.5.7 Optional Gold Level: Barriers to Benefits (GL2.3)

Not applicable; the project was not validated to the Exceptional Community Benefits Gold Level.

4.5.8 Optional Gold Level: Protections for Poorer and the more Vulnerable (GL2.4)

Not applicable; the project was not validated to the Exceptional Community Benefits Gold Level.

4.6 Biodiversity

4.6.1 Biodiversity Changes (B1.1)

The steps taken to verify the reported changes in biodiversity in the project zone due to project activities are described below.

Steps taken to verify...	
The accuracy and appropriateness of monitored data.	• The audit team confirmed the accuracy and appropriateness of monitored data (e.g. remotely sensed and satellite imagery used to monitor and report changes in forest cover) and through on site observations. • The audit team was able to independently confirm the accuracy of the GIS and remote sensed image analysis performed by the remote sensing specialist with the use of high resolution PlanetScope

	imagery /7/- /9/, and through a detailed walk-through of steps performed by the remote sensing specialist (Section 2.4.1). • The audit team also interviewed project stakeholders including biologist from the Tambopata Reserve, researchers from the PCUP, the director of CONVIVE, and project personnel responsible for biodiversity monitoring to confirm that biodiversity monitoring as indicated in the monitoring report is accurate and appropriate. • Furthermore during interviews with park rangers, the audit team learned that rangers conduct routine species patrols and surveys across the trails or paths adjacent to their control post or by moving to the areas under their jurisdiction such as the tourist use zones. The results are documented in biological monitoring forms, which the audit team was able to view during a remote interview with the project team. • During interviews with agroforestry producers, the audit team confirmed that camera traps have been set up across agroforestry parcels for tracking of fauna. • The audit team reviewed also reviewed project documentation including trimestral reports and camera trap images to further confirm the monitoring has been appropriately conducted /21/, /24/, /29/.
The justification used to attribute biodiversity changes to the project's activities.	• The audit team agrees that the most likely without-project scenario, which is conversion to a large cattle ranch, would substantially reduce biodiversity within the project area. The project, through its activities, has therefore reduced forest loss and biodiversity loss.
The overall accuracy of the reported impacts.	• Overall, the reported impacts of the project on biodiversity have been extensively documented and confirmed by multiple sources, which supports its accuracy.

In summary, given the steps indicated in the table above, the audit team concludes that the project's assessment of changes in biodiversity resulting from project activities in the project zone during the verification period are accurate.

4.6.2 High Conservation Values Protected (B1.2)

The steps taken to verify that no high conservation values were negatively affected by the project are described below.

- Through onsite observations within the project area, the audit team was able to confirm benefits of the project activities
- The audit team interviewed several project stakeholders including biologist from the Tambopata Reserve, researchers from the PCUP, the director of CONVIVE, as well as project team members in charge of biological monitoring who confirmed that high conservation values have continued to be protected during this monitoring period and that project activities do not have negative impacts on these HCVs.
- During interviews with park rangers, it was confirmed that surveillance and patrol of illegal activities that are risks to high conservation values are a main purpose of their work.
- Through review of project documentation related to the monitoring of high conservation values identified in the CCB PD, the audit team confirmed that no high conservation values were negatively affected by the project.

4.6.3 Invasive Species (B1.3)

The audit team has the following conclusions as to whether any known invasive species has been introduced into any area affected by the project:

- The audit team independently confirmed with outside peer-reviewed research that the statements made in the monitoring report regarding the invasive species introduced in agroforestry plots are accurate.
- We confirmed that species identified included Mucuna and Kudzu are commonly used as cover crops in the region and that tropical fruit species have existed within the region for some time.

The audit team has the following conclusions as to whether the population of any invasive species has increased as a result of the project:

- The audit team confirmed that no additional agroforestry producers have been added to the project during this monitoring period, thus the invasive species used on agroforestry parcels would have not increased.
- However, during interviews with several COOPASER members, it was indicated that they have expanded their agroforestry operations which would lead to the potential for additional invasive cover crops or fruit trees.

4.6.4 Impacts of Non-native Species (B1.4)

The steps taken to verify the impacts of non-native species due to the project are described below.

Species	Assessment column 1*	Assessment column 2**
Pueraria phaseoloides	• The audit team reviewed independent sources	• The audit team reviewed independent sources and confirmed kudzu can fan fire although it is unlikely to spread fire

	regarding the use and prevalence of this species in the region. It was confirmed that this is a common cover group used in agroforestry operations and has already existed in the region prior to the project. We also confirmed with the in-country technical expert on the team that Kudzu is a common cover crop in the region.	given its high water content.
Stylobolus deeringianum	- The audit team reviewed independent sources regarding the use of this species in the region. It was confirmed that this is a common cover group used in agroforestry operations and has already existed in the region prior to the project. - We also confirmed with the in-country technical expert on the team that Mucuna is a common cover crop in the region.	The audit team reviewed independent sources and confirmed that no adverse affects on the region's environment due to the use of citrus trees.
Citrus spp.	We confirmed with the in-country technical expert on the team that citrus trees are an important source of revenue and food for small producers in the region.	No adverse affects on the region's environment due to the use of citrus trees.
Ananas comosus	We confirmed with the in-country technical expert on the team that pineapple are an important source of revenue and food for small producers in the region.	No adverse affects on the region's environment due to the use of pineapple.

- *Assessment column 1 describes the steps taken to verify the project's justification of use of the species in question.
- **Assessment column 2 describes the steps taken to verify the description of the possible adverse effects on the region's environment due to the use of the species in question.

In summary, given the assessment indicated in the above table, the audit team concludes that the use of each non-native species is justified and will not pose harm to the region's environment.

4.6.5 GMO Exclusion (B1.5)

The steps taken to verify that no GMOs are used to generate GHG emission reductions or removals are described below.

- The audit team confirmed that no GMO's were used to generate GHG emission reductions or removals during the verification period.
- The in-country members of the audit team confirmed that there has been a moratorium on GMOs in Peru since 2011, as indicated in the monitoring report.

4.6.6 Negative Offsite Biodiversity Impacts and Mitigation (B2.2)

Not applicable; no negative impacts on biodiversity outside the project zone due to the project have been identified.

4.6.7 Net Biodiversity Benefits (B2.3)

The steps taken to verify that the project's net biodiversity impacts are positive, taking into account positive and negative impacts on biodiversity within the project zone and unmitigated negative impacts on biodiversity outside the project zone, are described below.

- The audit team reviewed the monitoring report along with corresponding documentation regarding the biodiversity monitoring /7/- /9/ to confirm that the biodiversity has been maintained and enhanced in the project area due to the reduction in deforestation and degradation as a result of the project.
- The audit team also interviewed project personnel involved in the monitoring of biodiversity to confirm that net biodiversity impacts in the project zone have been positive during this monitoring period. It was concluded that positive impacts of the project are evidenced in the biodiversity monitoring results from 2019 as compared to previous years as indicated in section 4.5.8 below.
- As indicated in section 4.5.6 no negative impacts on biodiversity outside the project zone due to the project have been identified.

In summary, since given the above, the audit team concludes that the net biodiversity impacts of the project are positive.

4.6.8 Biodiversity Monitoring Results (B3.1, B3.2)

The steps taken to verify that the biodiversity impact monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the project's validated design are described below.

Steps taken to verify that...	
The dates, frequency, biodiversity variables and sampling methods used are in accordance with the validated project design.	• The audit team reviewed and confirmed that the biodiversity monitoring plan selected biodiversity indicators that are directly linked to the project's biodiversity objectives, and that the sampling methods, dates, frequencies, and variables monitored are in accordance

	with the validated project design. • The audit team confirmed that the monitoring matrix specified in table 48 of the CCB PD has been applied during this monitoring period. • The audit team also interviewed project stakeholders including a biologist from the Tambopata Reserve, researchers from the PCUP, the director of CONVIVE, and project personnel responsible for biodiversity monitoring to confirm that that monitoring was conducted in accordance with the validated project design. • Furthermore during interviews with park rangers, the audit team confirmed that rangers conduct routine species patrols and surveys across the trails or paths adjacent to their control post or by moving to the areas under their jurisdiction such as the tourist use zones. The results are documented in biological monitoring forms, which the audit team was able to view during a remote interview with the project team. • During interviews with agroforestry producers, the audit team confirmed that camera traps have been set up across agroforestry parcels for tracking of fauna. • The audit team was able to independently confirm the accuracy of the GIS and remote sensing work performed by the remote sensing specialist.
The dates, frequency and sampling methods used are in accordance with the validated project design.	• As stated in previous sections, the audit team interviewed project personnel involved in wildlife surveys and deforestation monitoring. • The audit team confirmed that the monitoring matrix specified in table 48 of the CCB PD has been applied during this monitoring period.
The results of monitoring are in accordance with the validated project design.	• As stated in previous sections, the audit team interviewed project personnel involved in wildlife surveys and deforestation monitoring. •
The monitoring of the effectiveness of measures taken to maintain or enhance all identified high conservation values is in accordance with the	• The audit team confirmed through the review of the monitoring report and discussions with the project team that the

validated project design.	effectiveness measures specified in the validated CCB PD have been monitored during this period.
---------------------------	--

In summary, given the steps described in the table above, the audit team concludes that the biodiversity monitoring plan was carried out in accordance to the validated project design.

4.6.9 Biodiversity Monitoring Plan Dissemination (B3.3)

The steps taken to verify the actions taken to disseminate the biodiversity monitoring plan and results are described below.

- The audit team visited the Administration Contact webpage that is described in section 5.3.3 of the monitoring report to confirm that reports and booklets pertaining to the biodiversity monitoring plan and results have been digitally disseminated on the webpage (e.g., <https://www.tambopata-bahuaja.info/assets/cartilla-proyecto-huanganas-20.03.19.pdf>)
- During interviews with the project team, biologists and researchers affiliated with the park, and SERNANP representatives, we confirmed that the four dissemination events described in section 5.3.3.
- Lastly, we reviewed printed official reports (e.g., /24/, /29/), including the 2019 trimestre monitoring reports to SERNANP and confirmed that they have been made available at the park and reserve headquarters.

In summary, through review of webpages, printed reports, and interviews with relevant stakeholders, the audit team concludes that the results of biodiversity monitoring were disseminated in accordance with the validated project design.

4.7 Additional Project Implementation Information

Not applicable; no additional information was provided in Section 6 of the MR that explains how the project has been implemented in accordance with the validated project design for all CCB indicators that require implementation of an activity or process.

4.8 Additional Project Impact Information

The steps taken to verify any additional monitoring results that demonstrate how the project meets all CCB indicators that require demonstration of impacts are described below.

- During interviews with project personnel, the audit team confirmed that additional wildlife-human conflict species are being monitored within the project area.
- The audit team also interviewed the project coordinator of CONVIVE, an organization that among other objectives works to prevent human-wildlife conflicts and hunting of these species, and confirmed that the project has supported the CONVIVE program.

In summary, through interviews with relevant stakeholders and project personnel, the audit team concludes that the additional project impact information provided is suitable for the verification of the project's impacts.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

The audit team asserts, with no qualifications or limitations, that:

- The project complies with the verification criteria for projects set out in CCB Version 2.
- The project complies with the verification criteria for projects set out in VCS Version 4.
- The project has been implemented in accordance with the validated project description and any subsequently validated variations.

Furthermore, the audit team asserts, specifically in respect of those aspects of the project assessed as part of the validation activities described in Section 3 above, that the project complies with the validation criteria for projects set out in CCB Version 2 and VCS Version 4.

Verification/monitoring period: From 01-01-2019 to 12-31-2019

In summary, the audit team concludes the following regarding the validity of the net positive climate change adaptive capacity and resilience (if any), community and biodiversity benefits achieved by the project during the project implementation period.

Summary comments regarding validity of the following achieved by the project during the project implementation period	
Net positive climate benefits	• The project has resulted in the net emissions reductions of approximately 828,770 tCO₂e during the 2019 monitoring period. • The hectares of forest cover loss as a result of the project are significantly lower than the projected baseline deforestation levels and associated emissions.
Net positive community benefits	• The community stakeholders involved in the project activities such as the agroforestry cooperative have received a number of trainings opportunities resulting in increased skills and knowledge leading to enhanced livelihoods. • Native communities engaged in the project have received support in the form of updating their life plans, promotion of rural ecotourism, and direct support such as fuel and transportation.
Net positive biodiversity benefits	• The project has conserved forest land in the project area thus preventing the loss of critical habitat for a range of species that depend on the area. • Biodiversity monitoring through the use of camera traps, surveys, and population studies has indicated the maintenance of key species such as Guacamayo and other birds, and Lobo de Rios in and around the project area.

In summary, the audit team concludes the following regarding whether the project has achieved, or is on track to achieve, its stated climate, community and biodiversity objectives.

Objectives	Achieved or on track to achieve?	
Climate objectives	☒ Yes	☐ No
Community objectives	☒ Yes	☐ No
Biodiversity objectives	☒ Yes	☐ No

Verified GHG emission reductions and removals in the above verification period:

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Buffer pool allocation	VCUs eligible for issuance
2019	851,473	22,702	0.0	828,771	82,877	745,894
Total	851,473	22,702	0.0	828,771	82,877	745,894

- Net change in carbon stocks: 828,771 tCO₂e
- Non-permanence risk rating (see Section 4.6 above): 10%
- Total number of buffer credits to be deposited into AFOLU pooled buffer account: 82,877 credits

APPENDIX A: LIST OF FINDINGS

Please see the above Section 2.6 for a description of the findings issuance process and the categories of findings issued. It should be noted that all language under “Project Personnel Response” is a verbatim transcription of responses provided to the findings by project personnel.

NCR 1 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: Verified Carbon Standard, version 4.0;

CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4.docx

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx

Finding: Section 3.4.3 of the standard states that “The project proponent shall use the VCS Monitoring Report Template or an approved combined monitoring report template available on the Verra website, as appropriate, and adhere to all instructional text within the template.

The joint CCB/VCS Monitoring Report template requires the following information on the report’s title page:

- Validation/Verification body: Organization and contact name with email address and phone number
- GHG Accounting/Crediting Period: Indicate the (CCB) GHG accounting/(VCS) crediting period, specifying the day, month and year for the start and end dates and the total number of years DD Month YYYY – DD Month YYYY; X-year total period
- Monitoring Period of this Report: Specify each if the CCB and VCS periods are different DD Month YYYY – DD Month YYYY; Specify each if the CCB and VCS periods are different"

The title page of the monitoring report indicates SCS as the validation/verification body but does not indicate the contact name with email address and phone number. The title page also indicates the monitoring period and crediting period but not in the correct format as indicated on the template.

Project Personnel Response: The changes indicated for the title page were made.

Auditor Response: Confirmed that version 2 of the monitoring report has been updated with the complete contact information and the correct format of the dates. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 2 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4.docx

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx

Finding: Section 2.3.4 of the Monitoring Report templates states "Provide information about how grievance(s) have been received, resolved and documented using the project's grievance redress procedure during the monitoring period." This section of the monitoring report states "In order to continue supporting the management and resolution of conflicts in communities and/or surrounding populations, has been trained in the subject of "Biological monitoring, human activities and management of socio - environmental conflicts for good management of the protected natural area" , with the participation of park rangers from the Tambopata National Reserve and specialists from AIDER."

However, this does not provide information regarding if and how any conflicts of grievances during the monitoring period were received, resolved, or documented. Please provide more information regarding how this process was carried out during the monitoring period and also more information on the training mentioned (dates, attendees, topics covered).

Project Personnel Response: During the follow-up period, no complaints were received nor have there been conflicts, for which reason it has not been necessary to apply the complaints and claims format available to the project.

Regarding the participation of park rangers and specialists, the lists of the workshops that were carried out are attached, as well as some photos taken during the training.

Auditor Response: Given the finding response that no complaints or conflicts have occurred during the monitoring period, section 2.3.4 is not in conformance with the template requirements. Thus this finding has been closed and upgraded to an NCR. See finding 58 below.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 3 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4.docx

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaia_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx

Finding: Section 2.3.3 of the Monitoring Report Template states "Describe the process of distributing information on project implementation, monitoring and other key project documents pertaining to the monitoring period to communities and other stakeholders. Describe the actions taken to ensure that informational meetings held to inform the local stakeholders were widely publicized and conducted in relevant local or regional languages."

The monitoring report states "The dissemination of the results of this report, as in the case of the previous reports, is carried out in a timely manner with the populations and key actors participating in the project, guaranteeing an informative process that gathers the opinions of all the actors involved. The results of the project have been available to the actors interested in different meetings maintained with them, the SERNANP know this information as we prepare quarterly reports with the advances of the activities in the project."

The audit team requests that more specific information be provided regarding the process of how information about the project is distributed during the monitoring period, such as if there are quarterly meetings (when and where), how stakeholders are notified about meetings, who conducts such meetings, etc.

Project Personnel Response: The existing information in the monitoring report has been supplemented, noting that quarterly reports are delivered to both SERNANP headquarters, and that follow-up meetings are held with them.

The minutes of the follow-up meetings and the delivery letters of the quarterly reports are attached.

Auditor Response: The audit team reviewed section 2.3.3 of the Monitoring Report and confirmed that additional information has been provided. The section now provides information about how the monitoring reports are distributed to SERNANP and that follow up meetings are held with management committees. However, this section does not include information regarding the distribution of project documentation to the communities (e.g., Native Communities, communities located within the project area) or COOPASER members, who are key project stakeholders. This section requires "Describe the process of distributing information on project implementation, monitoring and other key project documents pertaining to the monitoring period to communities and other stakeholders." This finding remains open.

Project Personnel Response 2: It has been mentioned in the indicated section that although no people live within the project area, there are management committees, where representatives of the different populated centers and native communities that are settled in the buffer zones of the RNTAMB and the PNBS; the representatives of these committees participate in the meetings that are held with SERNANP, and in this way they are kept informed about the progress and results of the project.

Auditor Response 2: The audit team confirmed that the required information has been added to section 2.3.3 of the monitoring report (v3 03.06.21). This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 4 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4.docx

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx; Anidación REDD+_EnvironmentalMinistry.pdf

Finding: Section 2.1.10 of the Monitoring Report states that "As part of this, for the pre-nesting process, in June 24th, 2018, the Environmental Ministry established that initiatives that are developed in Natural Protected Areas can continue with their REDD+ initiatives on the use of non-nested baselines at the reference level of forest emissions in the Amazon; with this, the projects validated until this date, can: a) use until December 31st 2020 the base lines; b) Carry out and finalize until December 31, 2025 the verification process of the emission reduction until December 31, 2020; and c) Sell verified emission reductions until December 31, 2025 until December 31, 2020." It is not clear from the above statement how the dates December 31st 2020 and December 31, 2025 are related. Please provide more information and evidence of the statement made on June 24, 2018. The Anidación REDD+_EnvironmentalMinistry.pdf document provided dates to 2019.

Project Personnel Response: The relationship between 2020 and 2025 was clarified in relation to the letter sent by MINAM.

Attached is the letter sent by MINAM (2019) and the informative bulletin generated by MINAM to respond to the most frequent queries about the nesting process.

Auditor Response: The audit team reviewed the additional information regarding the nesting process. It is clearer that the nesting process does not impact the 2019 monitoring period, but will impact the monitoring periods after 2020. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 5 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool Version version 4.0

Document Reference: AnnexB_Cashflow_tambopata_updated_2019.xlsx; VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v3.2-REDDProject-RNTAMB-PNBS_Vintage2019.docx

Finding: The Project Management Risk Factor (b) states "Ongoing enforcement to prevent encroachment by outside actors is required to protect more than 50% of stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued."

For this risk factor, the risk report states "The project has already issued carbon credits" as a description for the risk factor and/or mitigation. However, whether the project was already issued credits does not justify the need or lack of need for enforcement to protect more than 50% of the carbon stocks on which GHG credits have been issued. The audit team requests evidence that ongoing enforcement is not required to protect more than 50% of the carbon stocks on which credits have been issued.

Project Personnel Response: The information corresponding to the historical verification data is attached, in relation to the deforestation that occurred and avoided, with this it seeks to demonstrate that there are no losses of carbon stocks within the PA, this due to the control and surveillance activities that perform the park rangers and the actions that are carried out outside the PA, which protect the PA and its carbon stocks.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that illegal logging is a threat and that on-going enforcement is necessary and effective. However, the on-going enforcement is not needed to protect 50% of the carbon stocks because the threat of illegal logging is not so pervasive in the project area, which is evidenced by the low rates of deforestation in PA over the last 9 years (Datos_deforestación-AP.docx) and how isolated and inaccessible much of the carbon stocks are. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

OBS 6 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool Version version 4.0

Document Reference: AnnexB_Cashflow_tambopata_updated_2019.xlsx; VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v3.2-REDDProject-RNTAMB-PNBS_Vintage2019.docx

Finding: Section 2.2.2 of the Non Permanence Risk Tool indicates that "The cash flow breakeven point is the year in which the cumulative cash flow is positive (i.e., cash flow in exceeds cash flow out) and stays positive. Breakeven should be calculated on a cash flow basis based on generally accepted accounting principles."

Risk Factors (a) through (d) of the Financial Viability section of the Risk Report submitted state "Not applicable. The project have a 10 years cashflow. The project reach the breakpoint in year 3." While it is clear from the Cashflow worksheet that the project did reach a point where the annual cash flow was positive in year 3. The cumulative cash flow did not become positive until year 4. Furthermore, it did not stay positive, but rather went back to negative for years 5-8. According Annex B, the breakeven point was not reached until year 9 or the project. Nonetheless this does not impact the financial viability score applied and therefore this finding is issued as an observation.

Project Personnel Response: It has been reviewed and will be taken into account for future planning within the project.

Auditor Response: This was an observation. However it appears that changes to the breakeven point where made. Therefore see new finding below.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 7 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool Version version 4.0

Document Reference: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v3.2-REDDProject-RNTAMB-PNBS_Vintage2019.docx

Finding: Section 2.2.2 of the Non Permanence Risk Tool indicates that "The percentage of needed funding secured shall be calculated by adding up all funding and revenue already secured and dividing this by the total cash out up to and including the year the project reaches breakeven." This section also indicates that "The cash flow breakeven point is the year in which the cumulative cash flow is positive (i.e., cash flow in exceeds cash flow out) and stays positive."

Risk Factor (g) of the Financial Viability section of the Risk Report submitted states "The project has secured between 40 to 80% of the funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven." However Annex B indicates that the project reached the breakeven point in year 9 of the project, thus Risk Factor (g) is not applicable to the project.

Project Personnel Response: Annex B of the risk report was updated and changes were made in the indicated section.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the appropriate financial viability risk score corresponding to the fact that 100% of the funding needed to cover the total cash out has been achieved. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 8 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool Version version 4.0

Document Reference: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v3.2-REDDProject-RNTAMB-PNBS_Vintage2019.docx

Finding: Section 2.2.4 of the Non Permanence Risk Tool states "Evidence shall be provided that project ownership (see the VCS Standard for specification with respect to project ownership) can be maintained for the entire project longevity (e.g., where control is secured through a concession that is shorter than the project longevity, such concession is renewable for the full longevity period being claimed)."

Risk Factors (a) and (b) of the Project Longevity section of the Risk Report submitted state "AIDER has the Partial Administration Agreement of the Tambopata National Reserve and Bahuaja Sonene – Madre de Dios for 20 years, renewable for another 20 years, which would ensure the continuity of the project for at least 40 years".

The audit team requests evidence of these Partial Administration Agreements.

Project Personnel Response: The partial administration agreements between AIDER and SERNANP are attached.

Auditor Response: The audit team reviewed the partial administration agreements between AIDER and SERNANP and confirmed that AIDER has the Partial Administration Agreement of the Tambopata National Reserve and Bahuaja Sonene – Madre de Dios for 20 years, renewable for another 20 years, which would ensure the continuity of the project for at least 40 years. Furthermore, during interviews with SERNANP officials it was confirmed that the project area is protected by legal statutes to continue management and protection practices of these protected areas in perpetuity. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 9 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool Version version 4.0

Document Reference: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v3.2-REDDProject-RNTAMB-PNBS_Vintage2019.docx

Finding: Section 2.2.3 (h) of the Non Permanence Risk tool states “Mitigation: Project is protected by legally binding commitment (see Section 0) to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period.” Section 2.2.3 (h) of the Non Permanence Risk tool states “Mitigation: Project is protected by legally binding commitment (see Section 0) to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over at least 100 years.”

The Description for Risk Factor (h) of the Opportunity Cost Section of the Risk Report submitted states “Mitigation: The project is protected by legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over at least 100 years (see project longevity).” Under Risk Factor (i) in that same section is states “Not applicable.”

However, given that the risk report specifies that the legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protects credited carbon stocks over at least 100 years, Opportunity Cost Risk Factor (i) was not given the correct Risk/Mitigation Rating.

Project Personnel Response: The opportunity cost risk factor (i) has been corrected, as indicated, with this change the risk has changed.

Auditor Response: The audit team reviewed the partial administration agreements between AIDER and SERNANP and confirmed that AIDER has the Partial Administration Agreement of the Tambopata National Reserve and Bahuaja Sonene – Madre de Dios for 20 years, renewable for another 20 years, which would ensure the continuity of the project for at least 40 years. Furthermore, during interviews with SERNANP officials it was confirmed that the project area is protected by legal statutes to continue management and protection practices of these protected areas in perpetuity. As a result "Project is protected by legally binding commitment (see Section 0) to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over at least 100 years" and the selection of mitigation options (h) and (i) under Opportunity costs is accurate. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 10 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool Version version 4.0

Document Reference: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v3.2-REDDProject-RNTAMB-PNBS_Vintage2019.docx

Finding: Per Section 2.2.4(5) of the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, "Any project with a legally binding agreement that covers at least a 100 year period from the project start date shall be assigned a score of zero for project longevity."

Risk Factor (b) of the Project Longevity section of the submitted Risk Report states "AIDER has the Partial Administration Agreement of the Tambopata National Reserve and Bahuaja Sonene – Madre de Dios for 20 years, renewable for another 20 years, which would ensure the continuity of the project for at least 40 years, likewise, law No. 26834 of Protected Natural Areas, states that protected areas are established in perpetuity. These law is a legal agreement for continue management practices for at least a 100 years period." Likewise the Description for Risk Factor (h) of the Opportunity Cost Section of the Risk Report submitted states "Mitigation: The project is protected by legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over at least 100 years (see project longevity)." As a result, the assigned project longevity score of 10 is not in conformance with the Risk Tool.

Project Personnel Response: Project Longevity risk factor has been fixed.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the project longevity risk factor was updated to 0, given that "any project with a legally binding agreement that covers at least a 100-year period from the project start date shall be assigned a score of zero for project longevity." This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 11 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool Version version 4.0

Document Reference: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v3.2-REDDProject-RNTAMB-PNBS_Vintage2019.docx

Finding: Section 2.3.1(8) of the Risk Tool states that “Evidence shall be provided that due process has been undertaken to discover any disputes over ownership and land/resource access/usage rights, including to determine whether there are overlapping boundaries or competing claims on the land or resources that may place carbon stocks in pools included in the project boundary at risk of reversal. The onus is upon the project proponent to demonstrate such process has been undertaken, failing which the project shall fail the risk assessment and shall not be eligible. Evidence may include survey responses, correspondence with relevant land title agencies/departments or evidence that project has secured title insurance. “

Risk Factor (c) of the Land Tenure and Resource Access/Impacts section of the submitted Risk Report states “There are no disputes over land tenure or property as it is a state property, although there are human settlements within RNTAMB, the area they occupy is less than 5%.

The overlapped areas are: Infierno (970.80 ha), Sandoval (1,1214.18 ha), Nueva America (1712.98 ha). These overlapped areas total 3897.96 ha, when compared to the total project area (541,620.14 ha), they represent 0.72% of the total project area.”

Section 2.3.1.(9) of the Risk Tool states that “It shall be demonstrated, in addition to the VCS Program requirements for project ownership, that the project has endorsement (such as a legal agreement or memorandum of understanding) from all entities with credible ownership claims or land/resource access/use rights (such as customary rights holders), including from formal and/or traditional authorities.”

The audit team requests that evidence that the project has endorsement of these settlements that overlap the project area.

Project Personnel Response: Both the Tambopata National Reserve and the Bahuaja Sonene National Park, in their Master Plans, mention which are the populations with whom they work and who are allowed to equal their territories, such as the native communities that have the right of ancestral use and the populations that they were settled in the territory before the ANP existed.

Documents are attached. In the case of the PNBS, the list of actors with whom it is related can be seen starting on page 38. In the case of the RNTAMB, starting on page 41.

Likewise, a letter issued by SERNANP in 2015 is attached, in this letter they indicate which actors we can work with in the Nueva América area.

Likewise, in the case of the Infierno Native Community, in 2013 an overlapping space with the RNTAMB was recognized, having that area as a special use.

SERNANP letter is attached where the superposition is recognized to CN Infierno.

Auditor Response: The audit team reviewed the master plan documentation and confirmed that they include agreements with populations living within the protected areas and the buffer zone, granting the right to the ancestral use of the land for which they were previous settled before the area became protected. This evidence indicates that a process was implemented to discover and reconcile any competing claims to the project area lands and that the government has agreements in place with these communities. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 12 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool Version version 4.0

Document Reference: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v3.2-REDDProject-RNTAMB-PNBS_Vintage2019.docx

Finding: Section 2.3.2(1) of the Risk Tool state “Community engagement shall be assessed for projects where local populations, including those living within or surrounding the project area (given as within 20 km of the project boundary), are reliant on the project area, such as for essential food, fuel, fodder, medicines or building materials. Where local populations are not reliant on the project area, the risk is not relevant to the project and the risk rating for community engagement (CE) shall be zero. Evidence may include social assessments such as household surveys and participatory rural appraisals.”

Section 2.3.1 (2) of the risk tool further states that “Households can be determined as consulted and involved in participatory planning where there have been direct meetings and planning with associations or community groups that are legally recognized to represent the households.”

Risk Factor (a) in the Community Engagement section of the Risk Report states “Not applicable. Almost all populations within the project area (Loero, Jorge Chavez, Nuevo América and Apaylom) were consulted.” Further Risk Factor (b) in the Community Engagement section of the Risk Report states “We applied consultations in 9 of 53 identified populations outside the project boundaries.”

The audit team requests evidence of the consultations with the populations living within and outside of the project boundary.

Project Personnel Response: Both protected natural areas, in their Master Plans, identify the different actors with whom they have a relationship. Documents are attached. In the case of the PNBS, the list of actors with whom it is related can be seen starting on page 38. In the case of the RNTAMB, starting on page 41.

Likewise, it should be noted that communication with the majority of residents was direct, via telephone calls and / or meetings, due to the trust we already had in the projects we have developed in the area with these actors.

Auditor Response: The audit team reviewed the master plan documentation provided and confirmed that these document the agreement and community engagement between the two protected areas and the communities, including native communities within the project area. This was further confirmed with interviews with project personnel and communities. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 13 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool Version version 4.0

Document Reference: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v3.2-REDDProject-RNTAMB-PNBS_Vintage2019.docx

Finding: Section 2.4.1(1) of the Risk tool states “Natural risk is based on likelihood (i.e., the historical average number of times the event has occurred in the project area over the last 100 years) and significance (i.e., the average significance of each event). Any significant natural risk (i.e., a risk affecting more than 5% of the project area) that has occurred over the past 100 years in the project area shall be considered applicable to the project. The frequency and significance of events shall be estimated based on historical records, probabilities, remote sensing data, peer-reviewed scientific literature and/or documented local knowledge, such as survey data in project areas, and may include projected climate change impacts. Where data are available for at least 20 years, but less than 100 years, projects shall conservatively extrapolate using available data. Where such data are not available for the project area, likelihood and significance shall be determined based on conservative estimates (i.e., not underestimating the possible frequency or severity) of historical events in the region in which the project is located.” Section 2.4.1(2) of the risk tool states “The significance of natural risks shall be determined by the damage that the project would sustain if the event occurred, expressed as an estimated percentage of average carbon stocks in the project area that would be lost in a single event.”

Section 3 of the Risk Report indicates “No Loss” from fire, extreme weather, and geological risk and an insignificant or transient loss for Pest and Disease Outbreaks.

Also, section 2.2.5 of the monitoring references “Information provided by INDECI through its SINPAD platform (National Information System for the prevention of Disasters), as a source of information for making decisions regarding the occurrence of possible natural disasters that affect the project. Information provided by SENASA -MDD on the occurrence of pests and diseases in the region.” However specific information from these sources is not provided as evidence supporting the assessment of natural risks.

The audit team requests justification and evidence be provided supporting the assessment of the significance and likelihood each natural risk.

Project Personnel Response: The INDECI and SENASA platforms have been reviewed, evidence is attached on the reports that both platforms contain.

Likewise, a report is attached containing the types of events that have been found on the website about the natural risks to which the project area is subjected.

Auditor Response: The audit team reviewed the document Evaluación de riesgos naturales.docx which provides explanation and justification of the natural disturbance risk scores applied using evidence from INDECI. We confirmed that the fire reports provided (e.g., REPORTE-COMPLEMENTARIO-Nº-2180-18SEP2019-INCENDIO-FORESTAL-EN-EL-DISTRITO-DE-TAMBOPATA-MADRE-DE-DIOS-01.pdf) which indicate that fires only occurred on agriculture land and did not affect forest land in the area. We also confirmed fire suppression training has been provided to the park rangers during the monitoring period. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 14 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool Version version 4.0

Document Reference: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v3.2-REDDProject-RNTAMB-PNBS_Vintage2019.docx

Finding: Section 2.4.1 (3) of the Risk tool states that “Mitigation of natural risk factors may be applied where evidence is provided that prevention measures are in place and/or the project has a proven history of effectively containing natural risk. Examples of mitigation/prevention measures include, inter alia, the following: a) Fire risk: Fuel removal, establishment of fire breaks and fire towers, and ready access to adequate fire-fighting equipment.”

In section 3 of the Risk Report, in the table titled Fire, a score of 0.25 is applied to fire mitigation. The report also states “AIDER developed the communal plan of burning (Annex E).” While the audit team verified that the fire prevention manual exists, this is not an example of a mitigation or prevention measure indicated by the Risk Tool. The audit team requests that additional evidence of fire mitigation/prevention actions or measures taken in the project area be provided.

Project Personnel Response: In the case of forest fires and burns, with the aim of strengthening park rangers in relation to burning, workshops or trainings related to this issue are held periodically. For the year 2019, it was held on September 5 and 6 on the subject of fire management. Workshop report and photographs of the workshop are attached.

Auditor Response: The audit team reviewed the evidence provided that there have been fire suppression trainings and workshops for park rangers. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 15 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: VCS Program Guide version 4.0; AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool Version version 4.0

Document Reference: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v3.2-REDDProject-RNTAMB-PNBS_Vintage2019.docx

Finding: Section 1.1 of the VCS Program Guide states “VCS Program editions are labeled with a version number and program documents are correspondingly version controlled. VCS Version 4 is the fourth working version of the VCS, having been preceded by VCS Version 1 (the initial version), VCS 2007 and VCS 2007.1 (which were two releases of the same version, but with the latter version incorporating the agriculture, forestry and other land use (AFOLU) specifications), and VCS Version 3. VCS Version 4 was released on 19 September 2019 and becomes the applicable version with immediate effect, except where grace periods were set out for particular requirements. VCS Version 4 is comprised of all the program documents labeled v4.x, where x is a running number starting at zero.”

Furthermore, the AFOLU Non-permanence risk tool states “This document shall be updated from time-to-time and readers should ensure that they are using the most current version of the document.”

Section 3.2.4 of the monitoring report indicates that “The amount of Voluntary Carbon Units (VCUs) can be seen in Table 31. According to the AFOLU Non-permanence Risk Tool (VCS Version 3) has been subtracted a 13% to the total net emissions reductions generated, which is the credits reservation for non-permanence risk.” Likewise the version 3.2 of the Non-Permanence Risk Report template was utilized and Version 3.1 of the VCS Risk Report Calculation Tool was also utilized.

Therefore, the NPRR is not in conformance with the standard as an outdated version was used.

Project Personnel Response: Documents were updated in the indicated version

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that version 4.0 of the Risk Report template and the Risk Tool calculation workbook have been utilized. However, section 3.2.4 of the Monitoring Report continues to reference version 3 of the VCS Risk Tool when it states "According to the AFOLU Non-permanence Risk Tool (VCS Version 3) has been subtracted a 10% to the total net emissions reductions generated...". This is not accurate as version 4.0 of the Risk tool was utilized. This finding remains open.

Project Personnel Response 2: The version of the risk tool has been updated in the indicated section.

Auditor Response 2: The audit team confirmed that section 3.2.4 of the Monitoring Report now references the correct version of the Risk Report. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 16 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx

Finding: The VM0007 REDD-MF Framework Methodology, Section 3, states as follows: "This Framework requires the use of the latest approved versions of the following modules and tools". Section 2.18 of the monitoring report states "The modules used for monitoring were the following:
- Module VCS VMD0015 "Methods for Greenhouse Gasses emissions and removals monitoring" (M-MON); noting that the PD was validated using version 1.0 of this module and that the monitoring period 2014-2015 used version 2.1, which was approved on November 20, 2012.
- Module VCS VMD0010 "Emissions estimate for activity displacement due to avoided unplanned deforestation" (LK-ASU), version 1.0.
- Module VCS VMD0013 "Greenhouse gases emissions estimate for burning biomass" (E-BB), version 1.0."

Module VCS WMD0010 (LK-ASU) version 1.0 is out of date. Also, Module VCS WMD0013 is incorrectly named and the version cited is out of date.

Project Personnel Response: The modules were updated with the latest versions and the traceability of the calculations was reviewed, which have not generated a major change. Review the document "CCB-VCS Monitoring Report AIDER REDD TambopataBahuaaja-Enero-Diciembre2019-English_V2" and the "Hoja de cálculo-Emissiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020"

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that section 2.1.8 of the Monitoring Report (version 2) was updated to reference the most recent versions of the modules. However, throughout the monitoring report there are still references to the previous versions of the modules. For instance, in sections 2.2.4, 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.1.2, 3.2.2, and 3.2.4, there are reference to the M-MON module and equations. The M-MON module has been replaced by the M-REDD module, version 2.2, which is not in conformance. This finding remains open.

Project Personnel Response 2: The M-MON module has been changed to M-REDD module according to what was indicated, in the indicated sections.

Auditor Response 2: The audit team confirmed that monitoring report (v3) now only references the M-REDD module and not the M-MON Module. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 17 Dated 15 Jun 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4; VCS VMD0015 "Methods for Greenhouse Gasses emissions and removals monitoring" (M-MON version 2.1)

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx

Finding: Section 5 of the VMD0015 M-MOD module states "Medium resolution remotely sensed spatial data shall be used (30m x 30m resolution or less, such as Landsat, Resourcesat-1 or Spot sensor data). In general, the same source of remotely sensed data and data analysis techniques must be used within the period for which the baseline is fixed. If remotely sensed data have become available from new and higher resolution sources (e.g. from a different sensor system) during this period then it is possible to change the source of the remotely sensed data. Equally if the same source is no longer available (e.g. due to satellites or sensors going out of service) an alternate source may be used. A change in source data may only occur if the images based on interpretation of the new data overlap the images based on interpretation of the old data by at least 1 year and they cross calibrate to acceptable levels based on commonly used methods in the remote sensing community. The data collected and analyzed must cover:

- The entire reference region: data shall be available for the year of baseline renewal or no further in the past than the year prior to baseline renewal.
- The entire project area: data shall be available for the year in which monitoring and verification is occurring
- The entire leakage belt, where required: data shall be available for the year in which monitoring and verification is occurring."

Section 3.1.2 of the monitoring report indicates that the Parameter "Forest cover monitoring map for project area" and "Forest cover monitoring map for the leakage belt" have both been generated from "Landsat 8 – OLI images."

In order to independently verify the selection and processing of the remotely sensed spatial data used, the audit team requests additional information on the imagery including names, location (path/row), dates of each of the Landsat 8-OLI images used.

Project Personnel Response: The information requested on the Landsat8-OLI images is found in the deforestation reports (for the project area and Leak Belt).

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the information regarding the path/row for the LULC maps has been included in the doeforestation reports for the project area and the leakage belt. This finding is closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 18 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx; Hoja de calculo – Emissions del Ry REDD-energo_dic2019_15052020.xlsx

Finding: Section 9.2 of the methodology indicates that the parameter $\Delta\text{CLK-AS}$, unplanned which is the "Net greenhouse gas emissions due to activity shifting for projects preventing unplanned deforestation" must be monitored. This parameter is applied in equation 4 in section 8.4.2 of the VM0007 methodology. The calculations workbook (Hoja de calculo – Emissions del Ry REDD-energo_dic2019_15052020.xlsx, sheet "Emissions -fugas-desplaz-activ" indicates that this parameter is being calculated during this monitoring period. However, this parameter is not included in section 3.1.2 of the Monitoring Report.

Project Personnel Response: The parameter was included in section 3.1.2 of the monitoring report

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that this parameter was added to section 3.1.2 of the Monitoring Report (version 2). This finding is closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 19 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: VCS VMD0010 "Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoiding unplanned deforestationng" (LK-ASU)

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx; Hoja de calculo – Emissions del Ry REDD-energo_dic2019_15052020.xlsx

Finding: Section 6.2 of the LK-ASU module (VMD0010) indicates that several parameters must be monitored: Including: Net greenhouse gas emissions within the leakage belt in the project case, Area of recorded deforestation in the project area in the project case in stratum i in year t (ha), Area of recorded deforestation in the leakage belt in the project case in stratum i in year t, Leakage Belt Forest Cover Benchmark Map. These required monitoring parameters are not included in section 3.1.2 of the Monitoring Report.

Project Personnel Response: The mentioned parameters are included in section 3.1.2, some were already mentioned but the parameter name was not complete / correct, the name has been corrected and those that were not found have been added.

Auditor Response: Confirmed that section 3.1.2 of the Monitoring Report (version 2) was updated and now includes the following required parameters, which are labeled correctly: Net greenhouse gas emissions within the leakage belt in the project case, Area of recorded deforestation in the project area in the project case in stratum i in year t (ha), Area of recorded deforestation in the leakage belt in the project case in stratum i in year t, Leakage Belt Forest Cover Benchmark Map. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 20 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4.docx

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx

Finding: Section 2.1.8 of the Monitoring Report Template states "Provide the title, reference and version number of the methodology or methodologies applied to the project. Include also the title and version number of any tools applied by the project."

Section 3.1.3 of the Monitoring Report states "For the monitoring of the areas subject to deforestation and forest degradation and associated emissions, the VCS VMD0015 module "Methods for GHG emissions and removals monitoring" (M-MON) version 2.1 will be used; likewise, the report of leakages caused by the project due to activity displacement will be prepared according to the VCS VMD0010 module "Emissions estimate for activity displacement due to avoided unplanned deforestation" (LK-ASU) version 1.0. For the estimation of GHG other than CO₂ produced by burning biomass, the VCS VMD0013 module "Greenhouse gases emissions estimate for burning biomass" (E-BB) version 1.0 will be used. The remaining carbon stored in long-lasting wood products reservoir, as a result of logging activities, will be calculated using the VCS VMD0005 module "Estimate of the carbon content in long-lasting wood products" (CP- W) version 1.1; and finally, the "Tool for testing the significance of GHG emissions from A/R CDM project activities" (T -SIG) will be used in order to evaluate if it is correct to rule out emission sources, leakage sources and long-lasting wood products reservoir." However, section 2.1.8 does not indicate that the VCS WMD0005 module (CP-W) or the T-SIG tool were used for monitoring.

Project Personnel Response: All the methodologies used in the project, with their updated versions and tools, were included in section 2.1.8 of the document "CCB-VCS Monitoring Report AIDER REDD TambopataBahuaaja-Enero-Diciembre2019-English_V2".

In section 3.1.3 of the monitoring document, the VCS WMD0005 (CP-W) module has been removed because it has not been used in monitoring. During the validation of the project, it was evident that the deposit of wood products was not significant.

The T-SIG tool was used in the monitoring calculations, it can be evidenced in the "Hoja de cálculo-Emissiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020", sheet (T-SIG-Significance) and the name of the tool is has been included in section 2.1.8 of the report.

Regarding the VCS WMD0005 module, it has not been considered in the monitoring and will be removed from section 3.1.3 of the Monitoring report. During the validation of the project it is evident that the deposit of wood products was not significant.

Auditor Response: Confirmed that in section 3.1.3, reference to the VCS VMD0005 module has been removed as it has not been applied during this monitoring period nor at validation. We also confirmed that the T-SIG tool is now listed in the monitoring section (3.1.3). This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 21 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: Verified Carbon Standard, version 4.0

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaia_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx

Finding: Section 1.2 of the VCS version 4.0 states “The operating language of the VCS Program is English. The project and program description, validation report, monitoring report, verification report and all other documentation (including all and any appendices) required under the VCS Program shall be in English.”

Section 3.3.1 of the monitoring report states “La implementación de sistemas agroforestales continúa siendo una de las alternativas promovidas como mecanismo de adaptación al cambio climático. Es así que, como parte de la implementación de actividades productivas sostenibles para productores y/o comunidades nativas que se asientan en la Zona de Amortiguamiento de la RNTAMB; se continuó con las labores de implementación de las parcelas agroforestales con base en el cultivo de cacao chuncho orgánico para exportación, así como con el fortalecimiento de la Cooperativa Agraria de Servicios Múltiples Tambopata Candamo.

Si bien es cierto aún no se ha logrado obtener la certificación orgánica del cacao, se han realizado importantes avances que contribuyen de manera significativa para su obtención, como es la conformación del Sistema de Control Interno (SIC), cuya finalidad es socializar claramente las reglas y normas en las que se basa el programa orgánico/comercio justo de la cooperativa.

Asimismo, se emitieron informes de alerta temprana sobre el hallazgo o avistamiento de indicios de actividades no permitidas dentro de las ANP (tala ilegal). Por otro lado, AIDER ha apoyado las acciones referentes al monitoreo de la actividad de minería ilegal, a través de la entrega de 03 informes de monitoreo de la actividad minera ilegal al interior de la RNTAMB a la Jefatura del ANP, procedentes del sistema de alerta temprana de geoinformación (SAT-GI) para ANP elaborado por AIDER.”

Given that this section is not written in the operating language of the VCS program, it is not in conformance with the standard.

Project Personnel Response: The information indicated in the section was translated into English.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that section 3.3.1 of the Monitoring Report (version 2) has been translated to English. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 22 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: Verified Carbon Standard, version 4.0;

CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4.docx

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaia_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx

Finding: Section 4.1.3 of the Monitoring Report template states “Demonstrate that none of the HCVs related to community well-being in the project zone that were identified in the validated CCB project description have been negatively affected by the project.”

Section 4.1.3 of the submitted monitoring report states “Work is being done based on what is described for this section in the previous verification report.” This section is not complete and thus not in conformance with the standard.

Project Personnel Response: The indicated section has been completed.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that section 4.1.3 of the Monitoring Report (version 2) has been completed with relevant information related to the protection of HCVs. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 23 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.5; VCS VMD0015 "Methods for Greenhouse Gases emissions and removals monitoring" (M-REDD version 2.2)

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx, Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx, Incremento_Def_Enero_Junio_2019_CA_CF.shp, Def_jul_dic_2019.shp

Finding: Equations 3 and 4 of the M-MON module include the parameters for the "Area of recorded deforestation in the project area stratum i converted to land use u at time t; ha
Area of recorded deforestation in the leakage belt stratum i converted to land use u at time t; ha."

Tables 9, 10, and 11 of the Monitoring Report indicates that 19.50 ha were deforested during the monitoring period. However, the deforestation shapefiles provided indicate that 21.9 ha were deforested during the 2019 monitoring period. Likewise the calculations workbook (Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx), sheet Defo ene-dic2019-AP indicate that 21.9 ha were deforested. Please correct the deforested area so that it is consistent across all documents and calculations.

Project Personnel Response: The tables were corrected with the correct data for the deforested area in the deforestation report

Auditor Response: Table 9 was corrected to show that 21.9 ha were deforested in the project area during the monitoring period. This now matches the shapefiles of deforestation and the calculations workbooks.

However, Section 3.1.2 still indicates that the area of recorded deforestation in the project area was 19.5 ha.

This finding remains open.

Project Personnel Response 2: The deforested area in the project area has been corrected in the indicated section.

Auditor Response 2: The audit team confirmed that section 3.1.2 of the Monitoring Report has been updated to indicate that 21.86 ha was the Area of recorded deforestation in the project case in stratum i in year t. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 24 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4; VCS VMD0015 "Methods for Greenhouse Gasses emissions and removals monitoring" (M-MON version 2.1)

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx; Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx

Finding: Step 2 in the M-MON module indicates that the parameter "ADefLB,u,i,t" is the "Area of recorded deforestation in the leakage belt stratum i converted to land use u at time t; ha" and that "ADefPA,u,i,t" is the "Area of recorded deforestation in the project area stratum i converted to land use u at time t; ha."

The monitoring period is January 2019 to December 2019, which is "time t". In the calculations workbook Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx, Strata worksheet, deforestation is reported for the period July 2017 to December 2018 in the project and leakage area.

Project Personnel Response: The error was in writing, the header of the table was not updated, but the information does correspond to the verification period January-December 2019. It has been corrected in the header of the tables in the spreadsheet

Auditor Response: Audit team confirmed that the Table labeling was updated. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 25 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4; VCS VMD0015 "Methods for Greenhouse Gasses emissions and removals monitoring" (M-REDD version 2.2)

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaia_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx; Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx; PROJ_DESC_1067_24MAY2012.pdf

Finding: Section 6.2 of the M-MON module indicates both the "Project Forest Cover Monitoring Map" and the "Leakage Belt Forest Cover Monitoring Map" "Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event."

In section 3.1.2 of the monitoring report, for the parameter "Forest cover monitoring map for the project area", it states "Map showing the location of forest areas within the project area at the end of every monitoring period. If there were deforested areas within the project area, the comparison with the base map has to show the deforested areas in every monitoring period. " It also states that "The selected image of the previous year serves as a reference, which is updated with the new "non-forest" areas generated by the software and by the knowledge the remote sensing analyst has of the area; thus, the forest area is defined for this monitoring period. The accuracy of the map is calculated by comparing it with the field data.

Furthermore, Section 4.3 of the Project Description states "At the end of each monitoring period:

- The area of categories "forest" and "non-forest" within the project area and leakage belt will be calculated.
- Forest Cover Maps for the project area and leakage belt will be updated."

To verify this forest cover monitoring map, the audit team requests the forest cover maps for the project area and leakage belt from the beginning of this monitoring period.

Project Personnel Response: Information on shapes from the verification period prior to the one we are doing now is attached.

Auditor Response: The shapefile Deforestacion_acumulada_Dic2018_ok.shp was provided which shows the area of accumulated deforestation prior to the monitoring period. This finding has been closed. However the audit team was unable to verify the areas of in the forest cover monitoring maps, thus see finding numbers 66 and 67.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 26 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4; VCS VMD0013 "Estimation of greenhouse gas emissions from biomass and peat burning (E-BPB)"

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx;

Finding: Equation 2 of the Biomass Burning Module calculates the average aboveground biomass stock before burning for a particular stratum as the sum of all aboveground biomass pools (aboveground trees, dead wood, and litter) times the molecular weight of CO₂ to carbon and the fraction of carbon in biomass.

In the calculations workbook Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx; sheet "Ecuaciones – Quemadas", cells D3-D7, the aboveground and belowground carbon stocks are used for the aboveground biomass pool parameter. This is not in conformance with the methodology.

Project Personnel Response: The calculation of the sheet "Ecuaciones-quemas" was corrected, using only the information of the above-ground biomass reservoir in accordance with the VCS VMD0013- (E – BPB) Module, version 1.2. Review the "Hoja de cálculo de emisiones del Py REDD-enero dic 11-12-2020", sheet "Ecuaciones -quemadas".

Auditor Response: Confirmed that the aboveground biomass reservoir is the only pool included in the calculation of carbon stock loss due to burning. The belowground carbon stock was removed. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 27 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4; VCS VMD0013 "Estimation of greenhouse gas emissions from biomass and peat burning (E-BPB)"

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx;

Finding: Section 5.1. of the Biomass Burning Module (E-EPB) states that "Some GHG emissions can be measured, but because of the high spatial and temporal variability, the following method must be used. Based on the IPCC 2006 Inventory Guidelines, estimating greenhouse gas emissions from biomass burning must be determined using the following [equation 1]."

Equation 1 was applied in the workbook Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx; sheet Ecuaciones – Quemadas. However, for the period July to December 2019, why were the biomass burning emissions from only the soft dissected terrace were included.

Project Personnel Response: The sum of the period July to December 2019 of equation 1 was corrected in the calculation sheet "Ecuación-quemas", now the result of the flooded alluvial stratum has been included, which includes the period July to December 2019. Check "Hoja de cálculo-Emisiones_de_Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020".

Auditor Response: Audit team confirmed that the Table labeling was updated. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 28 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4; Tool for testing significance of GHG emissions in A/R CDM project activities (Version 01) (T-SIG)

Document Reference: Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx

Finding: Section 8.3 of the Methodology states "The significance of leakage and the significance of carbon pools may be determined using T-SIG." Section II of the T-SIG tool indicates that the tool is used to "Calculate the relative contributions of the project GHG emissions by sources and possible decreases in carbon pools and emissions by leakage activities according to the following equation (IPCC 2003, Eq. 5.4.1)," which is done by dividing the GHG emissions from each source by the sum of all GHG emission sources.

In the sheet Significancia of the calculations workbook Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx, Column D is labeled as the Net carbon stock change as a result of deforestation in the project area in the project case in stratum i at time t; t CO₂-e. However, the values reported in the table are the Net greenhouse gas emissions within the project area under the project scenario (emission from deforestation plus degradation plus burning). Therefore, the relative contribution calculations in cells E10-E13 are incorrect and not in conformance with the T-SIG tool.

Project Personnel Response: Relative contribution calculations were corrected, complying with the T-SIG tool. Review "Hoja de cálculo-Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020", sheet T-SIG significance.

Auditor Response: The audit team made an error in interpreting the Significancia worksheet. In consulting with technical experts, we concluded that the previous version of the Significancia worksheet in the workbook (Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx) contained the correct calculations for the 'Contribucion relativa' (cells E10-E13) and were in conformance with the T-SIG tool. This calculation showed that the only emission source that is below the 5% threshold are the emissions from burning (0.05% of total emissions). However, it appears that those relative contribution values were not used to determine the inclusion or exclusion of emissions sources. Rather additional calculations were done in cells E14-16 and F21-23, which were not in conformance with the T-SIG tool. In this previous version of the workbook it was stated that "It is noted that the sum of the decreases in the degradation and carbon emissions by burning totaling 1.93% of the net benefits of the project, which both were considered insignificant and excluded from the final calculations of project benefits." These additional calculations and the statement that degradation emissions were excluded led to confusion of the audit team.

The original version of the significance calculation was in conformance with the T-SIG. The audit team requests that the previous version be utilized. This finding will be rescinded accordingly.

Project Personnel Response 2: The previous T-SIG data is maintained, according to what is indicated in the finding

Auditor Response 2: The audit team confirmed that the T-SIG tool was applied correctly in the workbook "Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020_AC.xlsx." This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 29 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx; Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx; Hoja de calculo-LINEA BASE Y CASO DEL PROYECTO-actualizada-20-4-12.xlsx

Finding: Section of 8.4.2 of the methodology indicates that “the total net greenhouse gas emissions reductions of the REDD project activity are calculated” using equation 2, which is the net GHG emissions in the baseline scenario minus the net GHG emissions in the project scenario minus the net GHG emissions from leakage.

The sheet Linea Base in the spreadsheet Hoja de calculo-LINEA BASE Y CASO DEL PROYECTO-actualizada-20-4-12.xlsx indicates that the net GHG emissions in the baseline scenario for the year 2019 are 865,869 t CO₂e. This value is also reported in the Table 44 of the PDD. However in the C-REDD, t sheet of the workbook Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx, the baseline emissions from 2017 and 2018 are instead used. As a result, all other equations that use the baseline emission values such as total net GHG emissions reductions of the REDD project activity, the Significancia, and VCUs, are also not in conformance with the methodology.

Project Personnel Response: The net GHG emissions data was corrected in the base scenario of the “C-REDD, t” spreadsheet, generating compliance with the sequence of equations established by the methodology. Review the “Hoja de cálculo-Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020”.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the baseline emissions from Jan-june 2019 and the baseline emissions from July-December 2019 are now utilized in the calculation of “C-REDD” the total net greenhouse gas emissions reductions of the REDD project activity. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 30 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4; VCS VMD0010 "Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoiding unplanned deforestation" (LK-ASU)

Document Reference: Hoja de calculo - Fugas por desplazamiento de actividades.xlsx, Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx; CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx; PROJ_DESC_1067_24MAY2012.pdf

Finding: Equation 7 in section 5.4.6 of the Module VMD0010 is used to calculate total area deforested by immigrant agents in the baseline and project scenario in year as the proportion of the area deforested by immigrant agents in the leakage belt and project area multiplied by the projected area of unplanned deforestation in the project area in year t.

Table 27 of the Project Description indicates that the projected area of unplanned baseline deforestation in the project area during the 2019 monitoring period is 1923.54 ha. However, in the workbook Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx; worksheet PROPIMM-linea base, values from 2018 and 2017 were used for this parameter. The application of this equation is not in conformance with the module.

Project Personnel Response: The information has been corrected using the data from 2018 and 2019, dividing by 2, because the information being validated comprises the period from January to June 2019 and July to December 2019. As seen in table 27 of the PDD, the periods have been listed including the date of 2 years as an example (2018-2019), (2019-2020), that is, these include from July 2018 to June 2019 and from July 2019 to June 2020), That is why it has been divided by 2 to only consider the half-year data of each period and to be able to fulfill the year that is being verified, which is 2019, established in the methodology. Review "Hoja de cálculo-Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020", sheet (PROPIMM-baseline).

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the correct baseline area of unplanned deforestation in the project area is now being applied in the calculation of Equation 7 from the VMD0010 module. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 31 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4; VCS VMD0010 "Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoiding unplanned deforestation" (LK-ASU)

Document Reference: Hoja de calculo - Fugas por desplazamiento de actividades.xlsx, Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx; CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx;

Finding: Equation 1 in section 5.3.2 of the Module VMD0010 is used to calculate emissions due to unplanned deforestation displaced from the project area to the leakage belt as the net GHG emissions within the leakage belt in the project case minus the emission in the baseline from unplanned deforestation in the leakage belt. This equation is calculated in the calculations workbook Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019 15052020.xlsx, worksheet "Fugas ex-post", cells E3 and E4. However, the emission in the baseline from unplanned deforestation in the leakage belt for the period January to June 2019 (cell D3) makes use of the 2018 -2019 baseline emissions from the leakage belt (cell E20). Therefore, the application of this equation is not in conformance with the module.

Project Personnel Response: The 2018-2019 baseline emissions of the leakage belt (cell E20) are used, because it comprises from July 2018 to June 2019 and has been divided by 2 to only consider the half-year data (January-June of the 2019).

Auditor Response: Thank you for this explanation. The audit team confirmed that the correct baseline leakage emissions have been utilized for this monitoring period. This finding has been rescinded.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 32 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4; VCS VMD0013 "Estimation of greenhouse gas emissions from biomass and peat burning (E-BPB)"

Document Reference: Informe_Final_Deforestación_Enero_Junio_2019(1).docx
Informe_Final_Deforestación_Julio_Diciembre_2019.docx

Finding: Section 5, Step 3c of the M-MON module states "The methodological procedures used in steps 1-2 above must be documented. In particular, the following information must be provided when remotely sensed data are used:... c. Classification accuracy assessment: Accuracy assessment technique used; coordinates and description of the ground-truth data collected for classification accuracy assessment; and final classification accuracy assessment."

Section 4.7.1 of the Informe_Final_Deforestation states "Una vez realizada la interpretación preliminar, se procede a la planificación de la verificación en campo, mediante el cual se establece una ruta establecidas mediante coordinaciones con el personal de campo a cargo de la verificación, con el fin de verificar las zonas, se ubican los puntos a ver en campo que son tres tipos:

- a) Verificación: sitios donde se levanta la información con el objeto de documentar un cambio en la cobertura vegetal.
- b) Observación: sitios donde se realizan observaciones para confirmar una situación detectada en la interpretación preliminar.
- c) Monitoreo: sitios que corresponden a situaciones ecológicas específicas y que corresponden a áreas naturales protegidas, zonas de protección ecológica, áreas de vegetación relictual, y que ameritan una visita en cada actualización de la información con el objeto de ver su comportamiento."

It is unclear if and how the ground-truthing for the classification of deforestation and land use was conducted. The audit team requests more information regarding how these changes in land use were ground-truthed, the coordinates of the ground-truthed sites, and what observations were made at these sites.

Project Personnel Response: The data on the technique used, coordinates and description of the land, as well as the final evaluation are in the deforestation report and in the excel annex.

Once the Forest, Non-forest and Water Bodies layers have been obtained, we proceed to validate, initially it is indicated that it will be validated in the field, but that is only in case there are no Sentinel 2 images available where it cannot be appreciate the study area (a problem that is generally caused by clouds), however, so far there has not been this type of problem, so Sentinel 2 images have been used for validation.

Auditor Response: The locations of the validation points have been provided in the files Anexo_6.1_Análisis_Muestras_Validación_enero_junio_2019.xlsx and Anexo_6.1_Análisis_Muestras_Validación_Julio_diciembre_2019.xlsx. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 33 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: Verified Carbon Standard, version 4.0

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaia_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx; Informe_Final_Deforestación_Enero_Junio_2019(1).docx; Informe_Final_Deforestación_Julio_Diciembre_2019.docx; PROJ_DESC_1067_24MAY2012.pdf

Finding: The VCS Standard section 3.18.2 describes project description deviations and states “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. Note that project proponents may apply project description deviations for the purpose of switching to the latest version of the methodology, or switching to a different methodology. For example, a project proponent may want to switch to the latest version of a methodology where such version includes additional types of carbon pools or project activities.”

Section 4.3 of the Project Description states that “Monitoring of land-use change, based on Landsat 5 imagery, will be conducted annually, involving all the changes in forest coverage. Deforested area will be calculated (in hectares) within the project area and the leakage belt. Likewise, once generated the deforestation map, it will be validated through a systematic non-linear sampling on the field.” In section 4.2 it also indicates that Landsat 5 imagery is used for monitoring of all parameters related to land use.

However section 3.1.3 of the Monitoring Report states that “Monitoring the changes in land use, based on Landsat 8 – OLI satellite images, will be performed annually, involving all the changes in forest cover. The deforested area (in hectares) is calculated for the project area and leakage belt. Also, once the deforestation map is generated, validation was given through the visual interpretation employing high- resolution satellite images like RapidEye images with 6.5 meter spatial resolution and Landsat Panchromatic Pansharpening with 15 m spatial resolution.” Likewise, section 3.1.2 indicates that Landsat 8 imagery is used for monitoring of land use parameters. The deforestation reports also indicate that “A partir del análisis espacializado de las muestras, se prosigue a validar mediante las imágenes de satélite Sentinel 2 B.”

There is inconsistency in the reported imagery used and validation procedures between the PDD, deforestation reports, and monitoring reports. Further, Section 2.2.4 of the Monitoring Report does not list these PDD deviations related to the imagery used and how the imagery is validated.

Project Personnel Response: The descriptions were made in sections 2.2.4, 3.1.3 and 3.1.2. Review the “CCB-VCS Monitoring Report AIDER REDD TambopataBahuaia-Enero-Diciembre2019-English_V2”. A further explanation is given to the audit team about the finding below.

When the project description document was prepared, it was appropriate to use the information from Landsat 5 (since this satellite, compared to Landsat 7, does not have the banding problem) on the other hand, the Landsat 8 satellite was a mission that was launched in February 2013 and which included better characteristics than Landsat 5, it is for this reason that this new satellite was chosen.

Regarding the criteria for the change in the methodology with the use of better resolution images for the validation of the cartographic information generated in the framework of deforestation monitoring, are the following:

- Time, budget and hours of work in the field are reduced.
- The risk for field personnel caused by illegal miners, timber traffickers, etc. is reduced.
- It is an alternative that allows observing the entire work area on dates close to the date of the generation of the deforestation map.
- It allows us to validate the sampling points in the entire scope of work.

The reason why RapidEye images were not used was due to budget and time of delivery of this information by a third institution (at that time MINAM). Also, we were only going to be given images of small areas where the sampling points would be located (to reduce cost).

In addition, the use of the panchromatic band is mentioned (which gives us a better spatial resolution - 15m), initially this option was thought about, however, in 2015 the first Sentinel 2 images were obtained, which reached 10 m of spatial resolution, which is why Sentinel 2 was used for the last monitoring. On the other hand, these images allow us to analyze multitemporal changes due to their short revisit period, they provide 12 bands focused on land cover analysis and are totally free.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that there is now consistency between the imagery used and documented in the PDD, MR, and associated project documentation. The PD deviation to use sentinel imagery is now described in section 2.2.4 of the monitoring report (version 2). This finding is closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 34 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: Verified Carbon Standard, version 4.0

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx; Informe_Final_Deforestación_Enero_Junio_2019(1).docx Informe_Final_Deforestación_Julio_Diciembre_2019.docx; PROJ_DESC_1067_24MAY2012.pdf

Finding: Section 3.18.2 of the VCS Standard states that “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. Note that project proponents may apply project description deviations for the purpose of switching to the latest version of the methodology, or switching to a different methodology. For example, a project proponent may want to switch to the latest version of a methodology where such version includes additional types of carbon pools or project activities.”

Section 3.1.2 of the PD states that the monitoring equipment includes “Softwares ENVI 4.7 and Arc GIS 9.3.” However the monitoring report states that the monitoring equipment is “Software: ENVI 5.1 and Arc GIS 10.1.” For the parameter “Area impacted by natural disturbance in the project area..”, the monitoring equipment listed is “Arc GIS 9.3.1.” Section 2.2. of the Deforestation reports (e.g., Informe_Final_Deforestación_Enero_Junio_2019(1).docx) list the software used as ERDAS IMAGINE and ArcGIS 10.5.

There is inconsistency in the monitoring equipment reported in the in this monitoring report, the deforestation reports, and PDD. Section 2.2.4 of the Monitoring Report does not list these PD deviations related to the monitoring equipment.

Project Personnel Response: The deviation of why the Software: ERDAS IMAGINE and Arc GIS 10.5 is used, instead of those indicated in the PD, has been included.

Auditor Response: A PD deviation has been added to section 2.2.4 of the monitoring report (version 2), describing the different software used (ArcGIS 10.5 and ENVI 5.1) for5 monitoring deforestation and degradation. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 35 Dated 17 Jul 2020

Standard Reference: Verified Carbon Standard, version 4.0

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx;

Finding: Section 2.2.4 of the Monitoring report states “Tambopata Bahuaja REDD+ Strategy has been updated by AIDER staff in order to be more effective and efficient in the activities realization for reduce emissions of greenhouse gases from deforestation and forest degradation in the Tambopata National Reserve (RNTAMB) and Bahuaja Sonene (PNBS). This strategy includes the components of previous strategy and it includes biological monitoring and research activities since these actions also contributed to control and reduce the threat of deforestation and forest degradation in both ANP. Also there has been included environmental education and communication considering the importance of promote forest valoration for their conservation. The zoning of activities has also been updated considering the reality of the area.”

The audit team requests the Tambopata Bahuaja REDD+ Strategy be provided.

Project Personnel Response: The REDD + strategy is attached, according to the request

Auditor Response: The requested document has been provided. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 36 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: VMD0010 Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoiding unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU) version 1.1

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx;

Finding: The monitoring schedule for the parameters in LK-ASU is included in Section 6.2. Parameter PROP(IMM) and Prop(RES) must be “monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event”; as verification has occurred annually, this parameter must be monitored annually, prior to each verification event. In Section 4.2, the Monitoring Report indicates that monitored value for the parameter PROP(IMM) is 0.187 and PROPRES is 0.813. For both parameters the source of the data is indicated as "Calculated based on official data the INEI 2007." According to an independent search by the audit team, the most recent national census published by El Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática (INEI) dates to 2017. The requirement to "monitor" these parameters implies that there is a requirement to actively search for updated information that may be used to update the calculation. The audit team requests a description of how these parameters were actively monitored for the 2019 reporting period as well a demonstration of how each parameter was estimated from the source data.

Project Personnel Response: A description of how the parameters mentioned in the finding were actively monitored for period 2019 is attached.

Auditor Response: The document Respuesta_Hallzago36.docx indicates that data from the 2007 census was used to determine the PROPRES and PROPIMM parameters. However, it does state that the parameters were monitored using the more recent 2017 census data. This finding has been closed but see NCR 65.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 37 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: VMD0010 Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoiding unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU) version 1.1

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx;

Finding: The monitoring schedule for the parameters in LK-ASU is included in Section 6.2. Parameters MANFOR, TOTFOR, and PROTFOR must be “monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event”; as verification has occurred annually, these parameter must be monitored annually, prior to each verification event. In Section 4.2, the Monitoring Report indicates that monitored value is 1,043,273 ha for MANFOR, 138,532 ha for PROTFOR, and 1,799,515 ha for TOTFOR. For these three parameters the source of the data is indicated as "Official data, peer reviewed publications and other verifiable sources." According to an independent search from the audit team, the most recent information on forest area is for 2018, available from MINAM (official government data). The audit team requests a description of how these parameters were actively monitored for the 2019 reporting period as well a demonstration of how each parameter was estimated from the source data.

Project Personnel Response: A description of how the parameters mentioned in the finding were actively monitored for period 2019 is attached.

Auditor Response: The document Respuesta_Hallazgo37.docx provides the information regarding how these parameters were initially determined and how they are monitored. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 38 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4; Verified Carbon Standard, version 4.0

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx; Informe_Final_Deforestación_Enero_Junio_2019(1).docx; Informe_Final_Deforestación_Julio_Diciembre_2019.docx

Finding: Section 3.1.2 of the monitoring report template it states "Complete the table below for all data and parameters monitored during the project crediting period (copy the table as necessary for each data unit/parameter)." In the table, under the QA/QC procedures to be applied, it states "Describe the quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) procedures to be applied, including the calibration procedures where applicable."

Likewise, in section 3.1.3 of the monitoring report template states "Describe the process and schedule followed for monitoring the data and parameters set out in Section 3.1.2 (Data and Parameters Monitored) above during this monitoring period, including details on the following:

- The organizational structure, responsibilities and competencies of the personnel that carried out the monitoring activities.
- The methods used for generating/measuring, recording, storing, aggregating, collating and reporting the data on monitored parameters.
- The procedures used for handling any internal auditing performed and any non-conformities identified.
- The implementation of sampling approaches, including target precision levels, sample sizes, sample site locations, stratification, frequency of measurement and QA/QC procedures. Where applicable, demonstrate whether the required confidence level or precision has been met."

In section 4.2 of the monitoring report, the the parameters "Forest cover monitoring map for the leakage belt, forest cover monitoring map for the project area, Area of recorded deforestation in the leakage belt, area of recorded deforestation in the project area", indicate that the QA/QC procedures to be applied as "The map was be validated through visual interpretation of satellite images of high resolution (RapidEye images with 6.5 meter spatial resolution and Landsat Panchromatic Pansharpening images, with 15 m spatial resolution)..." Likewise in section 3.1.3 it indicates "Monitoring the changes in land use, based on Landsat 8 – OLI satellite images, will be performed annually, involving all the changes in forest cover. The deforested area (in hectares) is calculated for the project area and leakage belt. Also, once the deforestation map is generated, validation was given through the visual interpretation employing high- resolution satellite images like RapidEye images with 6.5 meter spatial resolution and Landsat Panchromatic Pansharpening with 15 m spatial resolution." However, in the Deforestation Reports (Informe_Final_Deforestación_Enero_Junio_2019(1).docx and Informe_Final_Deforestación_Julio_Diciembre_2019.docx) it states "Adicionalmente se descargaron imágenes Sentinel-2 (10m x 10m), la cual cuenta con una resolución superior comparada a las imágenes Lansdat (30m x 30m), con el fin de realizar la validación del mapa." Also, during a meeting with the project team on 23 June 2020, it was indicated the Sentinel-2 was used to validate the deforestation maps.

The audit team requests additional information regarding whether RapidEye imagery or Sentinel-2 imagery was used for validation.

Project Personnel Response: RapidEye images were not used due to a budget issue and delivery time of these by a third institution (at that time MINAM). Furthermore, we were only going to be given

images of small areas where the sampling points would be found.

In addition, it is worth mentioning that it was thought to use the panchromatic band (which gives us a better spatial resolution - 15m), however, in 2015 the first Sentinel images were obtained, which reached 10 m of spatial resolution, that is for this reason, we worked with Sentinel for the last monitoring. On the other hand, these images allow us to analyze multitemporal changes due to their short revisit period, they provide 12 bands focused on land cover analysis and are totally free.

Regarding the use of Landsat 8 images, it must be considered that the document was prepared in January 2012, in this way it was appropriate to use the information from Landsat 5 (since this satellite, compared to Landsat 7, does not have the problem of banded) on the other hand, the Landsat 8 satellite was a mission that was launched in February 2013 and that included better characteristics than Landsat 5, it is for this reason that this new satellite was chosen.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the requested information has been provided. The monitoring report (version 2) has also been updated to remove any reference about Rapid Eye imagery being used. This finding is closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 39 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4; Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, second edition

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaia_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx; CCB_PROJ_DESC_1067_00OCT2011.pdf

Finding: Section 4.1.1 of the monitoring report template requires the following: "Describe all the impacts on each community group (identified in the validated CCB project description in conformance with G1) resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario. Impacts must include all those identified in the CCB project description and any other unplanned impacts. Explain and justify key assumptions, rationale and methodological choices. Provide all relevant references."

The CCB standard states "'Communities' are defined as all groups of people—including Indigenous Peoples, mobile peoples and other local communities—who live within or adjacent to the project area as well as any groups that regularly visit the area and derive income, livelihood or cultural values from the area."

The CCBA Project Description (PD) provided (CCB_PROJ_DESC_1067_00OCT2011.pdf) identified the following groups immediately adjacent to or within of the project area G1.5:

- Comunidades Nativas: Palma Real, Sonene, Infierno, Kotsimba.
- Castaneros (Brazil nut harvesters)
- Familias de productores de Nueva America
- Familias de productores de lago Sandoval
- Asociación de Productores Agrarios y Lavadores Artesanales de Oro del río Malinowsky - APAYLOM
- Intermediarios
- Operadores turisticos

The CCBA Project Description then lists numerous other groups in the project zone including Asociación de productores Las Mercedes, Asociación de productores agropecuarios San Francisco, among several others.

Section 4.1.1 of the monitoring report provides information on the project impacts on the native communities including Palma Real, Sonene and Infierno, the chestnut producers, the association of agricultural produces, and the tour operators. However no information is included regarding the impacts on the Kotsimba community, the families of Nueva America or of Sandoval Lake or the mining concessioners, as well as the numerous other groups in the project zone also listed in the PD. The audit team requests more information and justification for why these other groups listed in section G1.5 of the PD are not included in section 4.1.1 of the monitoring report.

Project Personnel Response: The information was included in the indicated section

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that section 4.1.1 of the Monitoring Report (v2) has been updated to include the community groups specified in the CCB PDD. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 40 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4; Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, second edition

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx; CCB_PROJ_DESC_1067_00OCT2011.pdf

Finding: Section 4.1.2 of the monitoring report template requires the following: "Demonstrate that the net well-being impacts of the project are positive for all identified community groups compared with their well-being conditions under the without-project land use scenario."

Section 4.1.2 of the monitoring report states "The impacts of the activities carried out during the verification period have been in favor of the beneficiary populations and communities of the project, while responding to the objectives of the standard.

In this sense, activities related to the strengthening of resource governance, organizational strengthening, the development of sustainable productive activities, and increased control and surveillance will generate positive impacts on actors inside and outside the project site."

However, this description does not provide information that explicitly demonstrates that the net well-being impacts of the project are positive for all identified community groups in section G1.5 of the CCB PD. This is not in conformance with the standard.

Project Personnel Response: The impacts are better detailed in the indicated section

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the net positive community well-being impacts are described in greater detail in section 4.1.2 of the Monitoring Report (v2) and correspond to the community groups identified (producer groups and native communities). This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 41 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4; Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, second edition

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx; CCB_PROJ_DESC_1067_00OCT2011.pdf

Finding: Section 4.1.3 of the monitoring report templates requires the following: "Demonstrate that none of the HCVs related to community well-being in the project zone that were identified in the validated CCB project description have been negatively affected by the project."

Section 4.1.3 of the monitoring report states "Work is being done based on what is described for this section in the previous verification report."

This section of the monitoring report does not provide a demonstration that none of the HCVs related to community well-being in the project zone that were identified in the validated CCB project description have been negatively affected by the project during this 2019 monitoring period, thus is not in conformance with the template.

Project Personnel Response: The indicated section has been completed.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that section 4.1.3 of the Monitoring Report (version 2) has been completed with relevant information related to the protection of HCVs. The audit team notes that this finding is a duplicate of finding number 22 above. This finding has been retracted.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 42 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4; Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, second edition

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaia_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx;

Finding: Section 2.5.2 of the monitoring report template requires the following: "Demonstrate with documented consultations and agreements that:

- The project has not encroached uninvited on private property, community property or government property.
- The free, prior and informed consent has been obtained of those whose property rights will be or are affected by the project in particular, for any changes in project design and implementation during the monitoring period.
- Appropriate restitution or compensation has been allocated to any parties whose lands have been or will be affected by the project."

Section 2.5.2 of the monitoring report state for the 2019 vintage "AIDER now has a Participatory Consultation Plan to continue reinforcing this process with the native communities and other stakeholders involved in the project."

During the site visit, the audit team spoke to the president of the Nueva America II community living within the boundary of the project area. It was indicated that the community has a dispute with SERNANP (the Peruvian State) over their territory rights within the Reserve. It was explained that this conflict comes from before the creation of Reserve and REDD project, since at that time the institution in charge of the process did not recognize part of the ancient inhabitants of this zone, and that they created the Reserve by overlapping their agricultural lands, which they have been occupying for more than 30 years.

The audit team requests additional information regarding this dispute, such as whether the property rights of this group is or has been affected by the project.

Project Personnel Response: The RNTAMB has been constituted as such on September 4, 2000, by Supreme Decree No. 048-2000-AG of the Peruvian government, it is an area designated for the conservation of biological diversity, flora and fauna resources and their sustainable use , where extractive or anthropic activities cannot be carried out.

Within this zone, there is a pre-existing presence of the inhabitants in the area identified as Nueva América.

This area has been designated as special use by the RNTAMB and, although the population of Nuevo América II cannot extend its territory since the State does not allow it, it has been considered not only in the implementation of agroforestry systems, but also in support through training, which allows adequate management of pastures, supporting in turn each year in the quantification of livestock. Despite this type of support, the disagreement exists because many of the inhabitants want to commercialize the land for other purposes and, being part of the ANP, this is not possible.

There has been a conversation with the president of Nueva América II, during the information gathering process in the field and, indeed, he reminded us that they have this difficulty with SERNANP, regarding the ownership of their territories. He also gave us to understand that the difficulty lies in the fact that the State does not allow them to deforest more areas for agriculture and livestock. This would be the underlying theme.

It is important to mention that this event occurred before the presence of the project, and that AIDER

at all times has encouraged this issue to be resolved peacefully.

Auditor Response: The information provided in response to this finding has helped to clarify the relationship with the Nueva America II community. The audit team further confirmed during interviews with project personnel and on-site that this community has been consulted regarding agroforestry activities and trainings. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 43 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx;

Finding: Section 4.3.1 of the monitoring report template requires the following: "If the monitoring plan had not been developed by the time the project was validated against the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards and has yet to be included in a monitoring report, include it here. If the monitoring plan has already been included in the project description or a previous monitoring report, state "not applicable" in this "Climate Monitoring Plan Development" section."

Section 4.3.1 of the monitoring report states "The community monitoring plan was prepared and approved in the validation of the PDD and is currently being implemented in all verifications. The results of this plan are found in the next section." While the audit team confirmed that the plan was prepared and approved, the template instructions indicate that "Not applicable" should be specified in this section. Thus this section is not in conformance with the requirements of the template.

Project Personnel Response: The section was corrected according to what was indicated in the finding

Auditor Response: Confirmed that section 4.3.1 of version 2 of the monitoring report has been updated to state "Not applicable." This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 44 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4; Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, second edition

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx;

Finding: Section 4.3.3 of the monitoring report template requires the following: "Describe how the monitoring plan (if not disseminated in a previous monitoring period) and any results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan have been disseminated and made publicly available on the internet. Describe how summaries (at least) of the results have been communicated to the communities and other stakeholders."

Section 4.3.3 of the monitoring report states "The results of the Community Monitoring Plan will be socialized in the project communities from May-July 2020, so the results of this process will be reported in the next monitoring report." This section therefore indicates that the COmmunity Monitoring Plan has not been developed or disseminated. However section 4.3.1 of the monitoring report states "The community monitoring plan was prepared and approved in the validation of the PDD and is currently being implemented in all verifications. The results of this plan are found in the next section." This section of the monitoring report does not provide information regarding exactly how the plan and results have been or will be made publically available and communicated to the communities and other stakeholders, thus is not in conformance with the requirements of the template.

Project Personnel Response: How the results of the project's community monitoring plan have been disseminated has been specified in greater detail in the indicated section.

Auditor Response: Confirmed that section 4.3.3 of version 2 of the Monitoring Report has been updated with more extensive information about how the results of the community monitoring have been disseminated to project stakeholders at the ANP headquarters, during meetings, and online. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 45 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4; Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, second edition

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx;

Finding: Section 5.1.1 of the monitoring report template requires the following: "Describe all the changes in and impacts to biodiversity resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario in the project zone during this monitoring period. Impacts must include all those identified in the validated CCB project description and any other unplanned impacts. Explain and justify key assumptions, rationale and methodological choices. Provide all relevant references. "

The validated CCB project description indicates several ecosystems that are not reported on in section 5.1.1 of the monitoring report. For instance, section VI, B1.1 of the CCB PDD includes the following ecosystems: Tipos de bosque: Aluviales, Colinosos y de Terraza, Castaños, Pampas del Health, Humedales, rios, lagos y aguajales, and collpas. The audit team requests additional information regarding why a description of the impacts to biodiversity in these ecosystems resulting from project activities has not been included.

Project Personnel Response: The information was included

Auditor Response: Confirmed that section 5.1.1 of the Monitoring Report (version 2.0) was supplemented with additional information regarding the change in abundance of key species identified in the PDD, in the ecosystems also identified in the PDD. Reference is also made to the SMI 2019 report. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 46 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4; Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, second edition

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx;

Finding: Section 5.3.2 of the monitoring report template requires the following: "Describe how the monitoring plan (if not disseminated in a previous monitoring period) any results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan have been disseminated and made publicly available on the internet. Describe how summaries (at least) of the results have been communicated to the communities and other stakeholders."

Section 5.3.3 of the monitoring report provides information on three activities to disseminate the results of the biological monitoring. However, this section does not state how these results have been "made publically available on the internet." This is not in conformance with the requirements of the template.

Project Personnel Response: Actions taken to disseminate information on the results of biodiversity monitoring have been detailed. Information has been included in the indicated section.

Auditor Response: Confirmed that section 5.3.2 of the monitoring report (Version 2) has been updated to include details about how the biodiversity monitoring results are published online and communicated to stakeholders. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 47 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4; Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, second edition

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx;

Finding: Section 2.3.1 of the monitoring report template requires the following: "Describe how communication and consultation about the project has been conducted between the project proponent(s) and communities and other stakeholders during the monitoring period in accordance with the communication and consultation plan, explaining any adjustments made or needed to the plan. Explain the processes used throughout the life of the project to consider this input and how this communication and consultation has influenced the project during the monitoring period through adaptive management."

Section 2.3.1 of the monitoring report states "Work continues with the Management Committee of the Tambopata National Reserve as a space for consultation and presentation of the project, since, as mentioned above, they are made up of representatives of the different populations surrounding the ANP.

The document of internal communication strategies for the communities of Palma Real, Sonene and Infierno, prepared and previously reported, continues to be a consultation document to support the management of communities for community decision making, under agreed agreements."

This section of the monitoring report does not include the required information on the community consultations including how consultations have been conducting during this monitoring period and how the consultations have influenced the project during the monitoring period, thus is not in conformance with the requirements of the template.

Project Personnel Response: Since the beginning of the project, the communities within the project area have been continuously visited. Likewise, each time a project is presented to be developed in any of the communities, it is communicated that said project is being carried out thanks to the presence of both ANPs (RNTAMB and PNBS) and that the strategies outlined in the REDD + project. The native communities that are in the buffer zone have a representative within the Management Committee of both ANPs, so they are part of these, and it is with who develop strengthening activities during the year of execution.

The verification processes are communicated to both headquarters through quarterly reports and follow-up meetings, in the same way, verbal communications are made in meetings or by telephone to the other actors involved in the project.

Auditor Response: We confirmed that section 2.3.1 of the Monitoring Report (version 2) has been updated to include much greater detail about the process of community consultation throughout the life of the project, which the audit team also confirmed during interviews with stakeholders. This section is now in conformance and this finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 48 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4; Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, second edition

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx;

Finding: Section 2.3.2 of the monitoring report template requires the following: "Describe what specific steps have been taken, and communications methods used, to publicize the public comment period for verification to the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards to communities and other stakeholders to facilitate their submission of comments to the VCS."

Section 2.3.2 of the monitoring report states " The publication of this report is done according to the information protocols of the VCS and CCB standards, as it has been doing to date. "

This section does not include information indicating how specifically the communities and stakeholders are notified about the public comment period and how to submit comments, thus is not in conformance with the requirements of the template.

Project Personnel Response: It has been reported in meetings or assemblies about the project processes, such as verification, gathering information in the field, presentation of reports and public comment period. Also, to a large extent, managers and leaders have collaborated in gathering information.

It is important to bear in mind that AIDER is part of the Management Committee of both ANP, spaces where progress is made known through the meetings in which it participates.

In addition, during the process of initiating the verification process, they are also notified of the start of activities, either through emails or letters.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that section 2.3.2 of the Monitoring Report (version 2) has been updated to include greater detail about how stakeholders and communities are notified about the public comment period. We confirmed that the quarterly reports provided to the stakeholders provide the information as indicated here. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 49 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx

Finding: Section 2.2.4 of the monitoring report template requires the following: "Describe any project description deviations applied during this monitoring period, identify which section(s) of the CCB and/or VCS project description have been updated and explain the reasons for the deviation. Identify whether the deviation impacts the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario and provide an explanation of the outcome. Describe and report on any project description deviations applied in previous monitoring reports."

Section 2.2.4 of the monitoring report indicates 3 project description deviations, one of which is the Tambopata-Bahuaja REDD+ Strategy. It states "Tambopata Bahuaja REDD+ Strategy has been updated by AIDER staff in order to be more effective and efficient in the activities realization for reduce emissions of greenhouse gases from deforestation and forest degradation in the Tambopata National Reserve (RNTAMB) and Bahuaja Sonene (PNBS). This strategy includes the components of previous strategy and it includes biological monitoring and research activities since these actions also contributed to control and reduce the threat of deforestation and forest degradation in both ANP. Also there has been included environmental education and communication considering the importance of promote forest valoration for their conservation. The zoning of activities has also been updated considering the reality of the area."

However, no information is provided regarding which section(s) of the CCB and/or VCS project description have been updated, whether the deviation impacts the applicability of methodology, the additionality or appropriateness of baseline, or when this deviation began such as if it was applicable in previous monitoring reports. The audit team requests that the required information be provided.

Project Personnel Response: The changes made to the REDD+ strategy and the date of the updating have been indicated in the section of the monitoring report.

It is also noted that the new activities added in the update of the REDD + strategy do not affect the methodology used in the project, nor do they affect additionality or the baseline, the activities added are complementary to the existing ones and were added with the in order to reinforce / complement activities to reduce emissions from deforestation and degradation.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the information about the REDD+ strategy has been included in section 2.2.4 of the Monitoring Report. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 50 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaia_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx

Finding: Section 2.2.4 of the monitoring report template requires the following: "Describe any project description deviations applied during this monitoring period, identify which section(s) of the CCB and/or VCS project description have been updated and explain the reasons for the deviation. Identify whether the deviation impacts the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario and provide an explanation of the outcome. Describe and report on any project description deviations applied in previous monitoring reports."

Section 2.2.4 of the monitoring report indicates 3 project description deviations, one of which is "Monthly monitoring of hotspots", indicating "For verification period 2014-2015, monthly monitoring of hotspots was not performed because little information was available. The data source selected for this monitoring and indicated at Project Description, the University of Maryland in agreement with Conservation International Peru, was not available because the reports of hotspots in the Amazon region of Peru were not continuous. Likewise, the available information, provided by INPE from Brazil through their web data base, had errors at hotspot location; these errors were detected when info was contrasted between satellite imagery and field. Therefore, using this data source was dismissed. More trustable sources were sought, choosing data from National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), which were available from user record in 2011. Nevertheless, monitoring of burned areas was performed according to specified in module E-BB."

However, no information is provided regarding which section(s) of the CCB and/or VCS project description have been updated, whether the deviation impacts the applicability of methodology, the additionality or the appropriateness of baseline. The audit team requests additional information.

Project Personnel Response: The response to the request for additional information is attached

Auditor Response: It was confirmed that the monitoring of hot spots was conducted during this monitoring period, thus this PD deviation is not applicable to this monitoring period. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 51 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx

Finding: Section 2.2.2 of the monitoring report template requires the following: Describe and justify any methodology deviations applied during this monitoring period. Include evidence to demonstrate the following:

- The deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals.
- The deviations relates only to the criteria and procedures for monitoring or measurement, and do not relate to any other part of the methodology."

Section 2.2.1 of the monitoring report for the period 01 July 2014-30 June 2015 (MONIT_REP_1067_01JUL2014_30JUN2015.pdf), available on the Verra webpage, indicates that the following methodology deviation occurred: "During the monitoring period, have been made methodology deviations in relation to validation process of maps of deforestation and burning. Due to the risk which represented access to certain zones close of illegal mining areas, making validate some points in field was dangerous for the personnel.

The validation process of deforestation map was carried be out through the visual interpretation of high- resolution satellite images like RapidEye images with 6.5 meter spatial resolution and Landsat Panchromatic Pansharpening images, with 15 m spatial resolution, for the validation process of deforestation map, instead of field verification proposed in the PDD."

This methodology deviation has continued through the current monitoring period. For instance, the section 3.1.2 of the monitoring report indicates the following QA/QC procedures to be applied for the Forest cover monitoring map for the project area and leakage belt: "The map was be validated through visual interpretation of satellite images of high resolution (RapidEye images with 6.5 meter spatial resolution and Landsat Panchromatic Pansharpening images, with 15 m spatial resolution). The precision calculation was conducted through a confusion matrix."

Section 2.2.4 of the monitoring report does not describe and report on this methodology deviation and therefore it is not in conformance with the methodology.

Project Personnel Response: The corresponding deviation has been noted in the indicated section.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the PD deviation to validate deforestation and degradation using high resolution satellite imagery and not field validation has been indicated in section 2.2.4 of the Monitoring Report (version 2.0). This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 52 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx

Finding: Section 2.2.2 of the monitoring report template requires the following: "Describe and justify any methodology deviations applied during this monitoring period. Include evidence to demonstrate the following:

- The deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals.
- The deviations relates only to the criteria and procedures for monitoring or measurement, and do not relate to any other part of the methodology."

Section 2.6 of the PD indicates the following methodology deviation "To monitor forest degradation will not be made participatory rural appraisal methodology required by the (M-MON 2.2.1) to determine if there is potential for forest degradation by logging, since it will be used for reports rangers of Protected Areas on this illegal activity."

Degradation is monitored during this monitoring period. For instance, section 3.1.2 of the monitoring report indicates that for parameter "Area potentially impacted by degradation processes in stratum i" that the source of this information is "Reports from the rangers of the TAMBNR and BSNP regarding illegal extraction of wood. Location map of the physical components of the project area." Although the ranger reports were not reviewed/reported during this monitoring period, the area of potentially impacted by degradation evaluated during this monitoring period was based on these ranger reports. Therefore, the methodology deviation of utilizing ranger reports instead of the PRA to monitor the area impacted by degradation remains applicable during this monitoring period, but it is not included in section 2.2.2 of the monitoring report, which is not in conformance with the methodology.

Project Personnel Response: The deviation that explains the non-use of the PRA methodology of module VMD0015-v2.2 and the use of RNT and PBSN park rangers' reports on illegal extraction of wood was added to section 2.2.2 of the monitoring report.

Check "CCB-VCS Monitoring Report AIDER REDD TambopataBahuaaja-Enero-Diciembre2019-English_V2".

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the methodology deviation to use ranger reports in lieu of a PRA assessment has been included in section 2.2.2 of the monitoring report (version 2.0). This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 53 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4; VCS VMD0015 "Methods for Greenhouse Gases emissions and removals monitoring" (M-REDD version 2.2)

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaia_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_20.05.docx; POE para el monitoreo de la degradacion foresta.pdf; Anexo 5. Monitoreo de degradacion periodo (2015-2017)_24_11_2018 .docx

Finding: Section 6.2 of the M-REDD module indicates that the parameter CDegW_{i,t} which is the "Biomass carbon of trees cut and removed through illegal logging and fuelwood and charcoal extraction degradation process from plots measured in stratum i in year t", "Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event."

Section 3.2.2 of the monitoring report states "Emissions produced due to forest degradation were 13,669.95 for the period January – December 2019 in the project area."

The document Anexo 5. Monitoreo de degradacion periodo (2015-2017)_24_11_2018 .docx details the procedures used to assess degradation for this monitoring period. Under section IV.b, it states "El muestreo limitado dio evidencia de que se están removiendo árboles en el área potencialmente impactada por lo que se implementó un muestreo más sistemático" which indicates that evidence of degradation was found and thus systematic sampling was undertaken. The systematic sampling was last conducted in November 2017. The results of the systematic sampling were then applied to the project emissions for the previous reporting period (July 2017-December 2018). Those same results and emissions due to degradation are currently being applied to this 2019 monitoring period.

Furthermore the standard operating procedures for degradation (POE para el monitoreo de la degradación forestal.pdf) also states "El procedimiento del muestreo sistemático deberá ser repetido cada 5 años como máximo y el resultado final anualizado, dividiendo las emisiones totales entre cinco." indicating that the measurements are only taken every 5 years.

This is not in conformance with the requirements of the M-REDD Module.

Project Personnel Response: There is a positive response from VERRA for the degradation calculation. The information reported in Annex 5. Degradation monitoring period (2015-2017) will be kept in the calculations for the period from January to December 2019.

Auditor Response: The audit team worked with Verra to resolve this issue. Degradation was not monitored through systematic field sampling for this monitoring period due to a misunderstanding of the methodology and then the fact that the project area was closed off due to the COVID19 quarantine. Verra has provided an exception that the project proponent can use previous degradation emissions from 2015-2017 (2 year period) for this monitoring period. However, for the subsequent monitoring period, degradation must be sampled in the field. If there are major discrepancies for the 2019 period, these may need to be resolved and amended. We have included this topic as a Forward Action Request in the Verification report. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 54 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4; VCS VMD0010 "Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoiding unplanned deforestation" (LK-ASU)

Document Reference: Hoja de calculo - Fugas por desplazamiento de actividades.xlsx

Finding: Section 5.1.5.3 of the leakage module (VMD0010) indicates that the parameter COLB is the "Area-weighted average aboveground tree carbon stock for forests available for unplanned deforestation outside the leakage belt (t CO₂e ha⁻¹)" and that the parameter CLB is the "Area-weighted average aboveground tree carbon stock for forests available for unplanned deforestation inside the leakage belt (t CO₂e ha⁻¹). Both parameters have a unit of tCO₂e ha⁻¹.

In the Hoja de calculo - Fugas por desplazamiento de actividades.xlsx, sheet COLB, column G, the parameter COLB has a unit of tCO₂e, and is not area weighted. In the Hoja de calculo - Fugas por desplazamiento de actividades.xlsx, sheet CLB, column E, the parameter CLB has a unit of tCO₂e, and is not area weighted. The COLB and CLB values are then used to calculate PROPCs (The proportional difference in carbon stocks between areas of forest available for unplanned deforestation both inside and outside the leakage belt). These three parameters are not in conformance with the leakage module.

Project Personnel Response: The COLB and CLB parameters were corrected, according to that established by the methodology (module VMD0010- version 1.2). Review "Fugas por desplazamiento de actividades 11-12-2020" spreadsheet.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the parameters COLB and CLB have been calculated as an area-weighted average. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 55 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: AFOLU_Non-Permanence_Risk-Tool_v4.0

Document Reference: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v3.2-REDDProject-RNTAMB-PNBS_Vintage2019

Finding: Section 2.3.1 (9) of the AFOLU non-permanence risk tool states “Where disputes exist over potential ownership, land/resource access/usage rights or where there are overlapping access/usage rights within the project area (including water usage rights that may affect the hydrology and/or sediment in WRC project areas, such as causing the water table in the project area to drop or otherwise impacting the hydrology of the project area, resulting in higher GHG emissions), the project proponent shall apply the risk scores listed in Table 6.”

Table 6(d) then states “There exist disputes over access/use rights (or overlapping rights” with a risk score of 5 to be applied if disputes exist.

Section 2(c) of the non-permanence risk report indicates that “There are no disputes over land tenure or property as it is a state property, although there are human settlements within RNTAMB.” Section 2(d) of the non-permanence risk report states “Not applicable. Although, there is a historical dispute between the state and indigenous people Ese'eja; since the protected areas are part of their ancestral territory; however, the dialogue is growing and natives have more participation on the NPA management, therefore no disputes over the rights and access are reported.”

During the site visit, the audit team spoke to the president of the Nueva America II community living within the boundary of the project area. It was indicated that the community has a dispute with SERNANP (the Peruvian State) over their territory rights within the Reserve. It was explained that this conflict comes from before the creation of Reserve and REDD project, since at that time the institution in charge of the process did not recognize part of the ancient inhabitants of this zone, and that they created the Reserve by overlapping their agricultural lands, which they have been occupying for more than 30 years.

The audit team requests additional information regarding this dispute and justification as to why this dispute over land and resource access/usage rights has not been identified in section 2(d) of the risk report.

Project Personnel Response:

Nueva América is considered a special use zone within the RNTAMB, since the creation of the ANP 20 years ago, this is reflected in the master plans that the RNTAMB has had from the beginning, that is why when we started the process For the implementation of the SAF, a document was obtained from the RNTAMB where a list of the residents who are immersed in the area was sent.

This area of special use of the RNTAMB has been considered not only in the implementation of the SAF, but also in the support of training that allows the adequate management of pastures, supporting in turn each year in the quantification of livestock. Despite this type of support, the disagreement exists because many of the villagers want to commercialize the land for other purposes and being part of the ANP, this is not possible.

In the workshops we carry out, there is an impact on the good management of their agricultural properties to avoid the expansion of crops, most of the inhabitants agree and actively participate in the activities that are carried out (human-fauna conflict and forest fires) It should be noted that we do not have any influence on the titling of their properties, therefore this aspect of the territorial conflict between SERNANP and Nueva América does not generate any risk to the REDD project. It is also worth mentioning that AIDER has been working in a coordinated manner with the RNTAMB

headquarters, training park rangers in preventing forest fires, as well as supporting the RNTAMB team with the monitoring of hot spots and the emission of early warnings with which park rangers can act immediately to give themselves a burn / fire alert.

The president of Nueva América II takes as an element of conflict the issue of the areas of their territory and the areas of the Tambopata National Reserve but, deep down, the conflict lies in the fact that the State does not allow them to deforest more areas with agriculture and livestock purposes. His desire is to have a document that proves that they are owners, thinking that with this he could carry out the felling and raising of cattle.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that Nueva America is included in the Special Use Zone and that the residents of the community are included in that use zone (Padron de socios Nueva America678.pdf). The audit team also confirmed that members of the community have been involved in the training workshops and have participated in project activities. Through discussions with project personnel and interviews we confirmed the history of the dispute with Nueva America which long preceded the start of the project and has been effectively resolved with the establishment of special use zone and implementation of the SAF. However, some member of the community may continue to feel a dispute exists as they have not been granted free title to the land, which is government owned. The audit team confirmed that the risk rating is appropriate. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 56 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: AFOLU_Non-Permanence_Risk-Tool_v4.0

Document Reference: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v3.2-REDDProject-RNTAMB-PNBS_Vintage2019; AnnexB_Cashflow_tambopata_updated_2019.xlsx

Finding: Section 2.2.2(2) of the of the AFOLU non-permanence risk tool states “The cash flow breakeven point is the year in which the cumulative cash flow is positive (i.e., cash flow in exceeds cash flow out) and stays positive. Breakeven should be calculated on a cash flow basis based on generally accepted accounting principles. Cash flow in may include commercial revenue streams associated with the project, secured revenue and conservatively projected revenues from the sale of GHG credits, other funding sources such as donor funds, upfront investments, or carbon prepayments, equity or loans. Cash flow out shall include, at a minimum, project implementation costs, costs associated with GHG credit generation (e.g., validation, verification and registration), and, where applicable, interest expenses, repayment of loans or forward purchase agreements and any required equity distributions.”

The AnnexB_Cashflow_tambopata_updated_2019.xlsx does not include costs associated with GHG credit generation (e.g., validation, verification and registration). Therefore the cash flow analysis is not in conformance with the requirements of the risk tool.

Project Personnel Response: Project verification costs are included in the control and surveillance component.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the costs of verification are included and accurate. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 57 Dated 2 Nov 2020

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4; Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, second edition

Document Reference: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v3.2-REDDProject-RNTAMB-PNBS_Vintage2019; AnnexB_Cashflow_tambopata_updated_2019.xlsx

Finding: In section 1.1., the section reference column of the table is blank for the 3 achievements. Section 1.1 of the monitoring report template requires that "Achievements included in the Monitoring Period column shall be substantiated in this document as denoted by the corresponding section reference."

Thus the section reference must be completed.

Project Personnel Response: The requested information was included.

Auditor Response: Confirmed that the section reference column of the table in section 1.1. has been completed in version 2.0 of the Monitoring Report. The references are accurate and refer to the correct sections. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 58 Dated 26 Jan 2021

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4;

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_V2; Response to NIR2

Finding: This finding relates to finding number 2 above. Section 2.3.4 of the Monitoring Report templates states "Provide information about how grievance(s) have been received, resolved and documented using the project's grievance redress procedure during the monitoring period." This section of the monitoring report states "In order to continue supporting the management and resolution of conflicts in communities and/or surrounding populations, has been trained in the subject of "Biological monitoring, human activities and management of socio - environmental conflicts for good management of the protected natural area", with the participation of park rangers from the Tambopata National Reserve and specialists from AIDER." In the response to finding number 2 above, it was stated that "During the follow-up period, no complaints were received nor have there been conflicts, for which reason it has not been necessary to apply the complaints and claims format available to the project."

Section 2.3.4 of the Monitoring report is not in conformance because the information currently provided is not relevant to the requirements of this section, as it does not explain if or "how grievance(s) have been received, resolved and documented using the project's grievance redress procedure during the monitoring period." This section refers to grievances and conflicts with communities and stakeholders (not with wildlife). If no grievances were received, this must be explained.

Project Personnel Response: In the indicated section it has been mentioned that in the present verification period there were no complaints and / or conflicts with the communities and other interested parties that are settled in the buffer zone.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that section 2.3.4 of the Monitoring Report now contains information regarding conflicts with communities and interested parties during this monitoring period. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 59 Dated 26 Jan 2021

Standard Reference: AFOLU_Non-Permanence_Risk-Tool_v4.0

Document Reference: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v4.0_Tambopata2019; AnnexB_Cashflow_tambopata_updated_2019

Finding: This finding is related to the Observation finding number 5 above. Section 2.2.2 of the Non Permanence Risk Tool indicates that "The cash flow breakeven point is the year in which the cumulative cash flow is positive (i.e., cash flow in exceeds cash flow out) and stays positive. Breakeven should be calculated on a cash flow basis based on generally accepted accounting principles."

In the updated version of the Risk Report, Risk Factors (b) is selected and it states "Not applicable. The project have a 10 years cashflow. The project reach the breakpoint in year 9." Annex B provided does show that the project reached the breakeven point in year 4, then it wen negative for years 5-7, positive again year 8, 9, 10. Therefore, the Risk Factor (b) which refers to "Project cash flow breakeven point is greater than 7 and up to 10 years from the current risk assessment" is not applicable.

Project Personnel Response: The correction has been made in the indicated section of the risk report. The risk report is attached.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the correct score for the Financial Viability section of the Risk Report has been applied and it corresponds with the verified break even point as shown in the Cash flow.xls. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 60 Dated 26 Jan 2021

Standard Reference: AFOLU_Non-Permanence_Risk-Tool_v4.0

Document Reference: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v4.0_Tambopata2019; AnnexB_Cashflow_tambopata_updated_2019

Finding: The Risk Report indicates that "The project has available as callable financial resource at least 50% of total cash out before project reaches breakeven" and has applied a financial risk mitigation score of -2. Section 2.2.2(5) of the Risk tools states "Callable financial resources are those not included in secured funding, but that are readily available to the project. The availability of such resources may be indicated through letters of credit, revolving credit lines or other financial backing, as evidenced by signed agreements and which demonstrate the project's ability to access funding as needed."

The audit team requests evidence of these callable resources.

Project Personnel Response: [Finding addressed outside of this workbook]

Auditor Response: This finding has been closed outside the cover of the workbook. The document Termsheet ACF AIDER.pdf was sent to the audit team on 26 January 2021, which indicates that callable financial resources from the Athelia Fund are available to the project. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 61 Dated 26 Jan 2021

Standard Reference: AFOLU_Non-Permanence_Risk-Tool_v4.0

Document Reference: AnnexD_Governance_Score_Tambo_2019; VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v4.0_Tambopata2019;

Finding: Section 2.3.3(1) of the Risk Tool states "A governance score (of between -2.5 and 2.5) shall be calculated from the mean of Governance Scores across the six indicators of the World Bank Institute's Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI)¹, averaged over the most recent five years of available data. Governance scores shall be translated into risk scores as set out in Table 9."

The Risk report states "The governance score calculated using "World Bank Institute's Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI)" ,average for the years 2012 – 2017 is -0.16." Also Annex D shows that the governance score was calculated for years 2013-2018. However, the 2019 Work Bank Governance Indictors are available. The tool requires that the most recent 5 years of available data be used. Thus the governance score calculation is not in conformance with the Risk Tool as it does not include the most recent available years.

Project Personnel Response: The correction has been made in the indicated section of the risk report. The corrected governance annex is attached.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the governance score calculation used the last 5 years of available WGI data from 2014-2019. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 62 Dated 26 Jan 2021

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4; VCS VMD0015 "Methods for Greenhouse Gases emissions and removals monitoring" (M-REDD version 2.2)

Document Reference: Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020 (1)

Finding: Step 2 in the M-REDD Module states "The net carbon stock change as a result of deforestation is equal to the area deforested multiplied by the emission per unit area" using equation (3) for the project area and equation (4) for the leakage belt. In the emissions calculations workbook, sheet "Equations 3 y 4", it is indicated that 11.91 ha were deforested from July to December 2019 (cell I15). However, net carbon stock change as a result of deforestation occurring in the "soft dissected terrace" stratum (cell K14) is included in the total net carbon stock change as a result of deforestation from Julio-Diciembre 2019. The carbon losses from the Alluvial Floodplain (cell K6) and the High terrace (K11) are not included in the calculation. Similarly, Table 9 in the monitoring report also only includes the carbon stock change as a result of deforestation occurring in the "soft dissected terrace" stratum. This is not in conformance with the equation 3 of the M-REDD module and may result in a material discrepancy.

Project Personnel Response: The spreadsheet and table 9 of the monitoring report were corrected

Auditor Response: The audit team reviewed the Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020_AC.xlsx, and found that on the sheet Equation 3 y 4, cell k15 on the emissions from the strata "soft dissected terrace" – 3,605.02 have been included. The values from the strata Alluvial Floodplain (552.40) and High Terraces (348.26), have not been included in the total project area emissions. Table 11 in the Monitoring Report has also not been updated. This finding remains open.

Project Personnel Response 2:

Auditor Response 2: This finding has been addressed outside the cover of the workbook. We confirmed that the calculation workbook was updated to now include deforestation from all the forest strata in the project area. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 63 Dated 26 Jan 2021

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4; VCS VMD0015 "Methods for Greenhouse Gases emissions and removals monitoring" (M-REDD version 2.2); VMD0010 Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoiding unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU) version 1.2; Estimation of Uncertainty for REDD+ Project Activities (X-UNC)

Document Reference: Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020 (1); Hoja de calculo - Fugas por desplazamiento de actividades 11-12-2020; Calculos Incertidumbre-26-11-14.xlsx

Finding: Quantification of carbon stock changes under the VM0007 methodology are conducted on a cumulative basis. For instance, the following parameter are to be calculated on a cumulative basis (for all years of the project up through the end of this monitoring period):

- $\Delta CWPS-REDD$ is the "Net GHG emissions in the REDD project scenario up to year t^* "
- $\Delta CWPS-REDD, LB$ is the "Net GHG emissions in the leakage belt in the REDD project case up to year t^* "
- $\Delta CP, LB$ is the "Net greenhouse gas emissions within the leakage belt in the project case up to year t^* "
- CREDD, t is "Cumulative total net GHG emission reductions through time t "
- CREDD_ERROR, t^* is the "Cumulative uncertainty for REDD project activity through time t ;" (also known as NERREDD+_error in VMD00017 v 2.2)
- Adjusted_CREDD, t is the "Cumulative total net GHG emission reductions through time t adjusted to account for uncertainty"

(Note this is not an exhaustive list, there are additional parameters calculated on a cumulative basis). As a result, the calculations for these parameters and any others defined as "...through time t^* " or "...up to year t^* " must be presented on a cumulative basis over the number of years elapsed since the project start. In the calculations workbook "Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020 (1).xlsx", "Hoja de calculo - Fugas por desplazamiento de actividades 11-12-2020.xlsx, and "Calculos Incertidumbre-26-11-14.xlsx" the calculations of Net CO2 emissions are presented on annual basis, without inclusion of previous years. Furthermore, in section 3.2 of the Monitoring Report, the calculations are not demonstrated on a cumulative basis, up to the end of year 2019, but rather are only presented on an annual basis, which are not in conformance with the methodology. Please note that in section 3.2.4 of the monitoring report, the net GHG emission reductions and removals as summarized in the table (e.g., Table 17) be presented on an annual basis.

Project Personnel Response: The accumulated information obtained during the life of the project has been included, both in the monitoring report and in the spreadsheet.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the equations for total emissions reductions have been calculated on a cumulative basis in both the workbook Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020_AC.xlsx and in section 3.2.4 (Table 27) of the monitoring report. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 64 Dated 26 Jan 2021

Standard Reference: VM0007 - REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) version 1.4

Document Reference: Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020 (1);
CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_V2;
VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v4.0_Tambopata2019;

Finding: The calculations workbook "Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020 (1).xlsx" sheet "VCUs shows this calculation and the total Buffer credits as 82,967, and the total VCUs as 746,704. However, table 18 of the Monitoring Report and the table in Section 4.2 of the Risk Report, it shows the total buffer credits as 73,139 and the VCUs as 658,249. The audit team requests clarification regarding which buffer pool and VCUs are intended for reporting.

Project Personnel Response: The table in section 4.2 of the risk report has been corrected, the VCUs to be reported are those indicated in table 18 of the monitoring report, as indicated in the emissions calculation sheet.

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that section 4.2 of the Risk Report, Table 26 of the monitoring report and the values in the calculation workbook Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020_AC.xlsx for the total VCUs and Buffer credits are now consistent. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 65 Dated 26 Jan 2021

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4; VMD0010
Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoiding unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU) version 1.2

Document Reference: Respuesta_Hallazgo36.docx

Finding: The monitoring schedule for the parameters in LK-ASU is included in Section 6.2. Parameter PROP(IMM), Prop(RES) must be "monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event"; as verification has occurred annually, these parameter must be monitored annually, prior to each verification event.

In the response to finding #36, it was indicated that these PROP(IMM) and PROP(RES) have been monitored using new Census data from 2017. For instance, the document Hallazgo36.docx states "En el censo del 2017, se evidencia un cambio de los habitantes relacionados a la zona donde habitan (urbana y rural)." However, these updated values have not been applied to the calculations. It states "Con lo expuesto líneas arriba, se mantuvo los datos oficiales del 2007, para ser conservadores." The VMD0010 modules require that these parameters be monitored before every verification. This implies that those monitored values are then applied. By not applying these values, represents a methodology deviation. As indicated in the document Hallazgo36.docx, the audit team agrees that using the previous values (PROPIMM=0.187) is conservative. However, section 2.2.2 of the monitoring report template requires "Describe and justify any methodology deviations applied during this monitoring period. Include evidence to demonstrate the following:

- The deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals.
- The deviations relates only to the criteria and procedures for monitoring or measurement, and do not relate to any other part of the methodology." If the intention is to apply a methodology deviation, this methodology deviation is not described accordingly and thus is not in conformance with the template requirements.

Project Personnel Response: The deviation was incorporated in the indicated section

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that a methodology deviation justifying the use of the 2007 census values for calculating the parameters PROPRES and PROPIMM has been added. The methodology deviation has been described according to the requirements of the template. The audit team confirmed that this deviation is conservative. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 66 Dated 26 Jan 2021

Standard Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4; VMD0010
Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoiding unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU) version 1.2

Document Reference: Respuesta_Hallazgo37.docx, Limite_TOTFOR.shp

Finding: The monitoring schedule for the parameters in LK-ASU is include din Section 6.2. Parameter TOTFOR "Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event." In the response to finding 37, in the document Respuesta_Hallazgo37.docx, it states "Para el caso del área del TOTFOR ha mantenido su tamaño porque es una manera conservadora que permanezca constante durante el período de referencia, así como los otros parámetros monitoreados." The audit team found evidence that forest area has declined within the TOTFOR boundary (e.g., forest loss data from GEOBOSQUES). While the audit team agrees that maintaining the same value for TOTFOR is conservative, VMD0010 modules require that these parameters be monitored before every verification. This implies that those monitored values are then applied. By not monitoring and updating the area of TOTFOR, this introduces a methodology deviation. Section 2.2.2 of the monitoring report template requires "Describe and justify any methodology deviations applied during this monitoring period. Include evidence to demonstrate the following:

- The deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals.
- The deviations relates only to the criteria and procedures for monitoring or measurement, and do not relate to any other part of the methodology."

If the intention is to apply a methodology deviation, this methodology deviation is not described accordingly and thus is not in conformance with the template requirements.

Project Personnel Response: The deviation was incorporated in the indicated section

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that a methodology deviation justifying the use of the 2007 census values for calculating the parameters TOTFOR, PROTFOR, and MANFOR has been added. The methodology deviation has been described according to the requirements of the template. However, the deviation was removed from the final version of the monitoring report as the project team had decided to use the monitored values. In the end it had no bearing on the emissions reductions as leakage outside of the leakage belt did not occur according to the LK-ASU module. This finding has therefore been rescinded as it is no longer relevant.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 67 Dated 26 Jan 2021

Standard Reference: VMD0010 Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoiding unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU) version 1.2

Document Reference: Hoja de calculo - Fugas por desplazamiento de actividades 11-12-2020; Def_CF_al_18.shp; Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020 (1).xlsx; Cinturón_de_fugas.shp

Finding: Section 5.1.5.2 of the Leakage Module (VMD0010) states that the parameter LBFOR is the "Total available forest area for unplanned deforestation in the leakage belt (ha) (calculated from the Leakage Belt Forest Cover Benchmark Map)." The benchmark map must be monitored before every verification. The audit team found several discrepancies between the values of forested area in the leakage belt reported:

- The value leakage calculations workbook (Hoja de calculo - Fugas por desplazamiento de actividades 11-12-2020.xlsx), sheet Paso 4(b)-LBFOR indicates that the total area available in the leakage belt for deforestation is 175,242.41 ha.
 - Table 9 of the previous monitoring report indicates that 189,948.23 ha of forest are available for deforestation in the leakage belt.
 - The workbook "Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020 (1).xlsx" sheet Strata indicates that 192,160.95 ha is the forested area in the leakage belt at the start of the monitoring period.
 - The shapefile Bosque_CF_2018.shp indicates that 176,800.32 ha of forest are in the leakage belt in 2018.
 - The shapefile Def_CF_al_18.shp indicates 81,966.4 ha has been deforested in the leakage belt. The shapefile Cinturón_de_fugas.shp indicates that the area of the leakage belt is 263,766 in total (bosque y no bosque). Therefore, 263,766 ha -81,966.4 ha = 181,799.6 ha
- Thus, there are several discrepancies in the total forested area in the leakage belt at the start of the monitoring period, which is to be used at the LBFOR parameter. The audit team requests clarification regarding why there are discrepancies and how the areas were derived.

Project Personnel Response: The values for the leak excel and in the "Strata" sheet were corrected.

-The value in the previous monitoring report corresponds to a typing error, both in the report and in the "Strata" sheet of the excel. It has been verified that the CVU calculations for the period 2017-2018 have not been affected by this error, since they have been carried out with the correct deforestation values per stratum.

-The correct data of deforested area and remaining forest have been placed in the "Strata" sheet of the excel for the leakage belt

Corrected shp is attached

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that the area of forest available for deforestation in the Leakage belt at the start of this monitoring period is 173,316.66 ha. The shapefile CF_6_5_21.shp, the workbook Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020_AC.xlsx (sheet strata), and the Monitoring Report section 3.1.2 are now consistent. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NIR 68 Dated 26 Jan 2021

Standard Reference: VCS VMD0015 "Methods for Greenhouse Gasses emissions and removals monitoring" (M-REDD version 2.2)

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaja_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_V2; Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020 (1).xlsx; Def_CF_al_18.shp, Deforestacion_acumulada_Dic2018_ok.shp, Defo_CA_CF_jul2017_dic2018_estratos.shp, Bosque_CF_2018; Bosque_CA_201

Finding: This finding relates to finding number 67 and 25 above. Step 1 in the M-REDD module states "For the calculation of each category of change:

a) At the end of each monitoring period:

- Calculate the area of each category within the project area and, where required, the leakage belt.
- Update the Forest Cover Benchmark Maps for the project area and leakage belt." Section 6.2 of the M-MON module indicates both the "Project Forest Cover Monitoring Map" and the "Leakage Belt Forest Cover Monitoring Map" "Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event."

The workbook Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020 (1).xlsx, sheet "Strata" indicates that 541,463.86 ha of forest were in the project area and 192,160.94 ha of forest were in the leakage belt at the start of the 2019 monitoring period. However, Table 9 on page 61 of the monitoring report shows that 541,439.60 ha of forest were in the project area and 189,791.59 ha of forest were in the leakage belt at the start of the 2019 monitoring period. Furthermore, several shapefiles have been provided (e.g., Def_CF_al_18.shp, Deforestacion_acumulada_Dic2018_ok.shp, Defo_CA_CF_jul2017_dic2018_estratos.shp, Bosque_CF_2018; Bosque_CA_2018) but the audit team has not been able to verify these forest areas.

The audit team requests the following:

- (1) Clarification regarding what is the correct area of forest in the project and leakage area at the start of the monitoring period.
- (2) the Project Forest Cover Monitoring Map and the Leakage Belt Forest Cover Monitoring Map corresponding to the area of forest cover in the project and leakage area at the start of the monitoring period.

Project Personnel Response: Table 9 on page 61 indicates the values at the end of the monitoring period. The values have been corrected and are in accordance with the contents previously in the excel (where the values in the "Strata" sheet have been corrected)

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed the forest areas in the Project Forest Cover Monitoring Map and the Leakage Belt Forest Cover Monitoring Maps and confirmed that these areas have been utilized in the calculation workbook and documented in the monitoring report. There is not consistency in the forested areas used. This finding has therefore been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):

NCR 69 Dated 4 Aug 2021

Standard Reference: VCS VMD0015 “Methods for Greenhouse Gasses emissions and removals monitoring” (M-REDD version 2.2); CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Template_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4;

Document Reference: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_AIDER REDD+ TambopataBahuaia_Enero-Diciembre2019-English_V3_0707.docx; Hoja de calculo - Emisiones del Py REDD-enero_dic2019_11-12-2020 (1).xlsx; Bosque_Validacion_TAMBOPATA.shp; Bosque_remanente_Dic2018.shp; Verificaciones_Tambopata.shp

Finding: Section 6.2 of the M-REDD module indicates that the “Project Forest Cover Monitoring Map” “Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event.” The forest cover monitoring map is “Map showing the location of forest land within the project area at the beginning of each monitoring period. If within the Project Area some forest land is cleared, the benchmark map must show the deforested areas at each monitoring event.” The project team provided a forest cover monitoring map for this monitoring period showing the area of forest in the project area at the start of the monitoring period. However, in tracing the area of forest at the start of the project (Table 25 of the PDD) along with all of the forest lost and reported in each of the monitoring reports, the audit team found that the Project Forest Cover monitoring map did not match these values. In discussions with the project team, it was indicated that there was an error in the area of forest reported in Table 25 of the PDD and that a Project Description Deviation would be applied. Section 2.2.4 of the Monitoring Report Template requires the following: “Describe any project description deviations applied during this monitoring period, identify which section(s) of the CCB and/or VCS project description have been updated and explain the reasons for the deviation. Identify whether the deviation impacts the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario and provide an explanation of the outcome. Describe and report on any project description deviations applied in previous monitoring reports.” The monitoring report does not contain a description of this PD deviation and is therefore not in conformance with the template requirements.

Project Personnel Response: [Finding addressed outside of this workbook]

Auditor Response: The audit team confirmed that a PD deviation has been added to section 2.2.4 of the Monitoring Report. The corrected forested area at the start of the project has been confirmed. The project area forest cover monitoring map at the start of this monitoring period has also been confirmed. This finding has been closed.

Bearing on Material Misstatement or Conformance (M/C/NA):