JARI/AMAPÁ REDD+ PROJECT

Document Prepared By RINA Services S.p.A.

Project Title	Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project
Version	Version 1.3Aa
Report ID	2020BQMD39 (VCS) and 2020BQMD40 (CCB)

Report Title	Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project
Client	Biofílica Investimentos Ambientas S.A.
Pages	240
Date of Issue	21 July 2021
Prepared By	RINA Services S.p.A.
Contact	Via Corsica 12, 16128 Genoa, ITALY +3901053851 laura.severino@rina.org www.rina.org
Approved By	Laura Severino (Authorized officer signing for the VVB) Head of Sustainability Compliance & New Scheme Development Coordination Unit
Work Carried Out By	Verification Team members: Geisa Principe (Team Leader) Andrea Leiroz (Verifier) Talita Beck (Technical Expert, Verifier and Local Expert) until 02 July 2021. Gustavo Goes (Technical Expert, Verifier and Local Expert) from 03 July 2021. Technical reviewer team independent of the verification team: Thaís Carvalho (Technical Reviewer) Vinay Singh (Technical Expert Reviewer)

Summary

Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A. has contracted RINA Services S.p.A. (hereinafter referred to as RINA) to verify the project "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project" in the state of Amapá, Brazil with VCS project ID 1115.

Therefore, RINA, acting as an independent third party, has assessed the documents and evidences provided, and performed a remote site assessment, which included a desk review, a remote audit and a series of interviews with the technical and administrative staff as well as local stakeholders.

The purpose of the verification is to confirm that emission reduction claimed by the project during the monitoring period from 15 February 2014 – 15 October 2019 (VCS) and 17 April 2016 – 16 April 2020 (CCB) is appropriate and in line with the validated project description (PD), monitoring report (MR), GHG emission reductions (ER) spreadsheet and is in accordance with the applicable standards, guidelines, procedures and rules.

The project started in the years 2011 consisted of 65,980 ha. The project area is located in the Jari Valley, in the municipalities of Laranjal do Jari and Vitória do Jari, south of the Amapá state, Brazil. The primary objective of the project is to promote forest conservation, stop deforestation and help in climate change mitigation by reducing greenhouse gases emissions (GHGs) under Reducing Emissions Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) project category. The project has been developed using both Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) and Climate, Community and Biodiversity (CCB) standard.

The project has applied VCS methodology VM0015 version 1.1, to quantify the GHG removals achieved in this project. Assuming the project is implemented as described in the PD, the project would achieve net GHG removal of 2,148,755 tCO_2e over the 30-year crediting period. The non-permanence risk rating according to the VCS tool is 17% at validation.

The method used for verification included desk review of the PD, MR, GHG ER, spreadsheets and supporting documents, exchange of information between RINA and the PP, in which a number of clarification and corrective actions were requested. At the time of submission of this report, no pending issues were standing, being all the non-conformities sorted out by the PP.

After performing the verification audit, RINA finds that the Project complies with all the requirements of the VCS & CCB and correctly applies the methodology VCS VM0015 version 1.1 to monitor emission reductions in this monitoring period from 15 February 2014 – 15 October 2019 (VCS) and 17 April 2016 – 16 April 2020 (CCB). The project has generated 1,734,045 tCO_2e net emission reductions (NER) and 1,560,640 tCO2e total tradable VCUs (Verified Carbon Units) during this monitoring period, after discounting 10% for buffer.

During the verification process 9 clarifications, 40 corrective actions and 4 forward action request concerning VCS and CCB verification were raised and closed.

The following points were raised during the verification approval request on 17 May 2021. The CCB & VCS MR (version 4.0 of 25 May 2021) and related documents were updated accordingly. After that, on 18 June 2021, the VCS provided a response for each finding and a second round of responses are provided bellow. The VCS & CCB MR (version 5.0 of 02 July 2021) and related documents were updated accordingly.

Finding 1

In Section 1.1 of the monitoring report monitoring report, row 2 states that the benefits achieved during this monitoring period are "Number of assistances provided in the technical assistance and rural

extension service during the monitoring period in the communities engaged: 2,177" however, the benefits achieved over the lifetime of the project states "Number of services performed in the technical assistance and rural extension service during the project lifetime in the Project Zone: 4,854"

As such, the project proponent is requested to clarify if the benefits of assistance provided and services performed are distinct project benefits or if they are intended to reflect the same project benefit.

RINA response: These benefits indicated are the result of one of the main activities of the project, "Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (TARE)" carried out in the monitored period. As highlighted in section 4.3.1, the main objective of the TARE service is to offer training and capacity building in agricultural and forestry techniques, according to the interest of each family directly involved in the project and also the others placed in the Project Zone.

TARE actions are aimed at all community members present in the Project Zone, regardless of whether they are a community engaged or not in the project during the monitored period. All TARE actions are designed to reflect the same benefit, which is to make rural producers capable of implementing appropriate techniques, enabling them to manage their areas effectively and self-sufficiently, producing food and generating income, without the need to open more forest areas, since the project encourages activities to be carried out in areas of consolidated degradation. Therefore, when describing "assistances provided" and "services performed", the proponents referred to the same activity, which is TARE.

Thus, the data collected for the entire Project lifetime considered all TARE actions carried out in the Project Zone. While for the monitored period, a cut of this information was made focusing only on the communities engaged in the project. To make this clear, section 1.1 has been revised by the PP.

Verra response (2nd round on 18 June 2021): The clarification was provided and Section 1.1 of the monitoring report updated showing that the benefits of assistance and services provided refer to the same activity - TARE actions.

The figures reported under 'Achievements during the Monitoring Period' and 'Achievements during the Project Lifetime' under Table 1 of Section 1.1 of the monitoring report should match because this period is the first CCB monitoring period, unless some of the expected benefits were formally certified under the VCS program such as the 'Climate Change Mitigation' Impact and the project proponent can provide evidence of it.

The project proponent is required to adjust Table 1 under Section 1.1 of the monitoring report to make the figures match between 'Achievements during the Monitoring Period' and 'Achievements during the Project Lifetime' for the different Outcome or Impact reported. The VVB is requested to update the verification report accordingly.

RINA response: The results presented in table 1.1 have been adjusted. For Climate, as this is the third VCS check, the Impact of "Climate Change Mitigation" differs between 'Achievements during the Monitoring Period' and 'Achievements during the Project Lifetime'. For Community, the values presented in 'Achievements during the Monitoring Period' were adjusted to match the impacts presented in 'Achievements during the Project Lifetime', representing all actions taken in the Project Zone, as explained in the previous answer. For biodiversity, the results presented are maintained.

Finding 2

Section 3.2.15 of the *VCS Standard v4.1* states that "Where an event occurs that is likely to qualify as a loss event (see the VCS Program document Program Definitions for definition of loss event), the project

proponent shall notify Verra within 30 days of discovering the likely loss event. Where VCUs have been previously issued, a loss event report shall be prepared and submitted to the Verra registry, as follows…"

Section 2.2.3 of the monitoring report indicates that project participants, and lands that were under project management, are no longer participating in the project. If land was lost removed from the project by a departing participant, any previously verified emission reductions from this land would be considered lost and qualify as a loss event.

However, the project did not account for these losses of participants and/or land in section 3.2 of the monitoring report.

As such, the project proponent is requested to update sections 2.2.3 and 3.2 of the monitoring report with a quantification of the loss events (if they occurred). If no land was removed from the project due to departing participants, please clearly state as much in all relevant sections.

RINA response: There was no loss event in the monitored period due to the families or communities that stopped participating in the activities. Explaining the context, the Project Area is located on the property of Jari Celulose, which, under the terms of the Federal Constitution of Brazil and the Civil Code, by virtue of being the owner of the properties where the Jari Amapá REDD+ Project is carried out, holds the rights of use and economic exploitation of the properties, as well as having the right of access to the natural resources existing therein. All supporting documentation was sent to the VVB, more details in section 2.5.

At no time, in section 2.2.3, is it stated that land has been removed or lost from the project area, but on participants who have decided to leave the project. What happens is that Jari Celulose, as the legitimate owner of the land, recognizes the peaceful occupation of lots of land by communities of small squatters. This is due to a complex context of disordered land occupation in the region. Therefore, none of the families present in the project area have legal documentation of the land. When talking about section 2.2.3 about some squatters known as "adventurers", who sell the property as a sign of a better financial opportunity, what this type of opportunist does is the "sale" of possession, not a legal title to the property. The more detailed context in section 2.5.1 of the MR.

Thus, the withdrawal of community members from the project impacts only on planned social activities, which are directed only to the real interested parties, where appropriate and relevant information on costs, risks and potential benefits to communities are made available. In addition, participation in the project is voluntary and the decision to participate, whether or not, is never final or results in some kind of restriction to interested parties, directly or indirectly impacted. In other words, the decision of a family to no longer participate in the project does not incur loss of land in the project area.

Finding 3

Section 3.6.1 of the *VCS Standard, v4.1* states that "The monitoring report shall be accompanied by one or more of the following types of evidence establishing project ownership accorded to the project proponent(s), or program ownership accorded to the jurisdictional proponent(s), as the case may be (see the VCS Program document Program Definitions for definitions of project ownership and program ownership)."

Section 2.2.4 of the monitoring report states that "In addition, Jari Florestal S.A. (Released Representor), Project Proponent together with Jari Celulose S.A., and Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A., chose not to be a Proponent anymore, giving way to Fundação Jari (Accending Representor)."

However, several of the above reference entities have been included as project proponents in the monitoring report.

As such, the project proponent is requested to clarify which entities are project proponents and which are "other entities." Additionally, if new entities are now the project proponents include evidence of project ownership. Please update all sections accordingly.

RINA response: Section 2.2.4.b "Project Proponents & Financial Management Mechanism" clarifies that Fundação Jari, indicated in the PDD as a developer of social activities, has moved to the position of co-manager and proponent of the project, putting itself in the place of Jari Florestal SA, initially indicated in the PDD as the institution responsible for the co-management of the Project and for the operation of sustainable timber forest management, as well as all related activities. The process of changing Proponents made Fundação Jari "Accending Reresentor" and Jari Florestal "Released Representor".

The other proponents indicated in the PDD, Jari Celulose (holder of land ownership and responsible for the security and patrimonial surveillance) and Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais (responsible for co-managing the project for its entire useful life), continued as proponents. This can even be ascertained in section 2.1.3, where they were defined as proponents of the project: Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais, Jari Celulose S.A. and Fundação Jari.

The formalization of the process of changing Proponents before the Registry has not yet been completed, as the Proponents were waiting for the verification to be completed to send the ascension and release documents, since it is only a registration process at the Registry (according to guidelines that the Proponents received from Verra), in the course of the MR, the role of the aforementioned Proponents becomes clear. With regard to "Other entities", only those institutions that were involved in the project activities during the monitored period were indicated in section 2.1.4 of the MR, and none of them is Jari Florestal or Fundação Jari (now ascended as proponent).

Finding 4

Footnote 91 of the *CCB Standards, v3.1* states that "'Well-being' is defined as people's experience of the quality of their lives and may include environmental, social, economic, psychological, spiritual and medical dimensions. The improvement of well-being may include providing opportunity, ensuring and enhancing security and empowerment."

However, the benefits presented in Section 4.2.2 of the monitoring report are exclusively focused on environmental benefits.

As such, the project proponent is requested to update Section 4.2.2 of the monitoring report with a complete list of all benefits associated with stakeholder well-being.

RINA response: The project proponents updated the entire section 4.2, clarifying in item 4.2.1 all the activities and processes implemented to mitigate the negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholders, which were mentioned in other parts of the MR, and in item 4.2.2, with the project activities that did not result in net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholders and the complete list of all the benefits associated with those activities.

Finding 5

Section 4.3.1 states that "Considering the complaints/demands to surveillance action, there was a monitoring failure of these due to absence of a procedure registering the need to collect this information. However, PP updated current procedure that prescribes patrolling on Jari lands so denunciations and demands must be now registered and forwarded to the Infrastructure Management, preserving the confidentiality of the source."

However, it is unclear what the project proponent intended to communicate in this section.

As such, the project proponent is requested to clarify the above section.

RINA response: The indicated paragraph was reformulated to make it clearer what was being presented. The objective was to clarify the lack of information for the indicator "Number of complaints/demands related to the surveillance action". The information for this indicator was not collected in the monitored period due to the absence of a formal procedure that would guide surveillance professionals on how to collect, record, monitor, and deliberate according to the content of the information collected. This point was also described in section 2.2.4.b. During the audit process, the proponents updated the procedures and made them available to the VVB, and from then on, complaints and demands will be registered and forwarded to the Infrastructure Management (responsible for patrimonial surveillance). In this way, the information for this indicator will be available in the next verification.

Finding 6

Section CM4.1 of the *CCB Standards, v3.1* states that project proponents shall "Develop and implement a monitoring plan that identifies community variables to be monitored, communities, community groups and other stakeholders to be monitored, the types of measurements, the sampling methods and the frequency of monitoring and reporting."

Section 4.3.1 presents the benefits associated with the project as opposed to a comprehensive description and evaluation of the monitoring process.

As such, the project proponent is requested to update Section 4.3.1 with "community variables to be monitored, communities, community groups and other stakeholders to be monitored, the types of measurements, the sampling methods and the frequency of monitoring and reporting."

RINA response: The proponents identified an error in submitting the documentation on the platform, forwarding the monitoring report that did not contain the result of the monitored community variables. Section 4.3.1 has been revised to make it clearer how the monitoring plan was developed and implemented. The activities were numbered to make the description of each one clearer with their respective indicators, which are summarized in table 32 and with the results achieved in detail in the appendix.

Verra response (2nd round on 18 June 2021): Section 4.3.1 was updated; however, Section 4.3.1 of the monitoring report omits what are the communities, community groups and other stakeholders to be monitored. Therefore, the project proponent is required to include what are the communities, community groups and other stakeholders to be monitored under Section 4.3.1 of the monitoring report.

RINA response: Section 4.3.1 has been adjusted again, making it clear who the monitored communities are. In this sense, the PP was careful to make references to other sections of the PDD where this information is presented.

Finding 7

Section 2.5.2 of the CCB Program Rules, v3.1 states that "Validation/verification bodies are organizations that are approved to validate projects and verify climate, community and biodiversity impacts. Validation/verification bodies evaluate whether a project has met each of the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards criteria and any other CCB rules following the process for validation or verification to the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards."

Section 2.1 of the verification report does not present the qualifications of the audit team, especially as it relates to the audit team's expertise in the social benefits associated with environmental REDD projects

As such, the VVB is requested to provide a list of qualifications of the audit team with special attention given to the social expertise required to assess REDD projects.

RINA response: RINA revised the report accordingly to better address the question.

Finding 8

Section G3.1 of the *CCB Standards, v3.1* states that "Describe how full project documentation40 has been made accessible to communities and other stakeholders, how summary project documentation41 (including how to access full documentation) has been actively disseminated to communities in relevant local or regional languages and how widely publicized information meetings have been held with communities and other stakeholders."

Section 4.5.5 of the verification report states that "During the monitoring period, any questions, complaints, dissatisfactions, disagreements and confrontations of opinions on land, environmental or social issues that might occur were reported by the communities through the "Contact Us" channel, or through the "Stakeholders' Comments Form", available at Fundação Jari offices and transported with the technicians during their field activities."

However, the CCB program requires active engagement of communities in order to facilitate both positive and negative feedback.

As such the VVB is requested to clarify Section 4.5.5 with a description of how negative impacts were monitored in the project. Please update all sections accordingly.

RINA response: RINA revised the report and section 4.5.5 was updated accordingly to better address the question.

Finding 9

Verra notes that several CARs in the verification report remain open.

As such, the VVB is requested to clarify these concerns and whether or not they were able to close those findings. If not, the VVB shall continue its assessment of the project, or, if unable to close material findings, report such to Verra.

RINA response: No CARs in the verification report remain open. Please, observe that when it is stated "This CAR is open" just below there is the continuation of the verification conclusion and it is stated "This CAR is closed".

Finding 10 (2nd round on 18 June 2021)

Section 3.3.3 of the CCB Program Rules v3.1 includes that "in order to demonstrate that a project has met the verification requirements of the CCB Program and a recognized GHG program, the combined template for the recognized GHG program and the CCB Program document (e.g., the CCB & VCS Project Monitoring Report Template) shall be used to demonstrate that the project meets the requirements for verification of the recognized GHG program. The time period documented for verification must be the same under both the CCB Program and the recognized GHG program."

The CCB monitoring period ends on April 16 2020 while the VCS monitoring period ends on February 13 2019. The project proponent is required to (i) shorten the CCB monitoring period to end at the same time as the VCS monitoring period Shorten the CCB period or to (ii) provide evidence to show under Section 3 of the monitoring report how the Net Climate benefits are achieved between February 13 2019 and April 16 2020. The VVB is requested to assess the changes and to update the verification report accordingly.

RINA response: The project proponents took the following steps to resolve this point:

1. A new vintage was included for verification in the VCS scope, going until October 2019. The date chosen refers to the final period for collecting satellite images from the PRODES Project, which are the official deforestation data used to calculate the reduced emissions. It is important to clarify that it was not possible to extend the VCS monitoring period until April 2020, to coincide with the CCB, due to the restriction of the PRODES project mapping, which occurs annually, and has the most updated data only until October 2019.

2. The PP prepared an Exemption Request given the extremely advanced stage of project verification and the need for rapid completion of the process for project capitalization, to justify the maintenance of different periods for CCB and VCS contemplated in the same MR document, referring to rules 3.3.3 and 3.3.5 of the CCB Program Rules v3.1.

3. A complementary analysis of the period between October 2019 until April 2020, in which the VCS does not overlap with the CCB, was performed with satellite images, clearly demonstrating that no loss events occurred in the project area. Additionally, when estimating the emissions that occurred in this period, especially when compared to the periods previously monitored, it is noted that the land use and land cover changes found are within the pattern already observed in the area and lower than the expected in the baseline scenario. Thus, the PP understands that this information shows that the project generated positive impacts for the Climate scope in the period without the VCS coverage. This new analysis performed has been added in section 7 of the MR.

Table of Contents

1 Introduction 10
1.1 Objective 10
1.2 Scope and Criteria 10
1.3 Level of Assurance 11
1.4 Summary Description of the Project 11
2 Verification Process 12
2.1 Audit Team Composition (*Rules* 4.3.1) 12
2.2 Method and Criteria 14
2.3 Document Review 15
2.4 Interviews 33
2.5 Site Inspections 38
2.6 Resolution of Findings 38
2.7 Eligibility for Validation Activities 39
3 Validation Findings 39
3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs 39
3.2 Methodology Deviations 39
3.3 Project Description Deviations (*Rules* 3.5.7 – 3.5.10) 39
3.4 Minor Changes to Project Description (*Rules* 3.5.6) 44
3.5 Grouped Project (G1.13 – G1.15, G4.1) 45
4 Verification Findings 45
4.1 Public Comments (*Rules* 4.6) 45
4.2 Summary of Project Benefits 45
4.3 General 46
4.4 Climate 57
4.5 Community 80
4.6 Biodiversity 85
4.7 Additional Project Implementation Information 87
4.8 Additional Project Impact Information 87
5 Verification Conclusion 88
Appendix 1: Abbreviations 90
Appendix 2: List of findings 91
Appendix 3: Monitoring plan - Community 230
Appendix 4: Monitoring plan - Biodiversity 246

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A. has contracted RINA Services S.p.A. (hereinafter referred to as RINA) to verify the project titled "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project" (hereinafter referred to as the project) in the state of Amapá, Brazil.

Verification is the periodic independent review and ex-post determination by an accredited verification body of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred as a result of the registered VCS project activity during a defined verification period and the assessment of the project design against all criteria set out by the CCBA in its CCBA Standard version 3.1. The verification is a requirement for all CCBA projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended climate, community, and biodiversity benefits. The verification objective is to evaluate whether a project has met each of the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards version 3.1 criteria and any other CCB rules following the process for validation or verification to the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards.

A verification statement is the written assurance by a verification body that, during a specific period in time, a project activity achieved the emission reductions as verified.

The objective of this verification was to verify and provide a verification statement of emission reductions reported for the "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project" for the period 15 February 2014 – 15 October 2019 (VCS) and 17 April 2016 – 16 April 2020 (CCB).

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of verification is:

- To verify that actual monitoring systems and procedures are in compliance with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan.
- To evaluate the GHG emission reduction data and express a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emissions reduction data is free from material misstatement.
- To verify that reported GHG emissions data is sufficiently supported by evidence.
- To verify the land-based projects, and the climate, community and biodiversity benefits of such projects.
- To verify that the stakeholder consultation carried out is relevant and there are mechanisms for on-going communication.

The monitoring report (MR) is reviewed against the criteria stated in the VCS Version 4.0 and CCB version 3.0, and the relevant documents and policy announcements made by the VCSA and CCBA, and the criteria stated in the VCS methodology VM0015 "Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation", version 1.1 of 03 December 2012.

The verification is not meant to provide any consulting for the project participants. However, stated requests for clarifications (CL) and/or corrective actions (CAR) may have provided input for improvement of the project design

The verification shall ensure that reported emission reductions are complete and accurate in order to be verified.

1.3 Level of Assurance

RINA provides reasonable assurance that the "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project" meets VCS and CCB criteria. To ensure complete transparency, any clarification or corrective actions raised have been included in the Appendix A. The verification expresses a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emission reduction data is free from material misstatement.

In addition, RINA applies materiality threshold of 5 per cent with respect to omission or misstatement concerning reported quantities as per VCS Standard.

All the revisions of the verification report before being submitted to the client were subjected to an independent internal technical review to confirm that all verification activities had been completed according to the pertinent RINA instructions, with reasonable level of assurance.

The technical review was performed by a technical reviewer(s) qualified in accordance with RINA's qualification scheme for VCS verification.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The project activity is to employ carbon finance in order to avoid unplanned deforestation of tropical forests and therefore reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The project utilizes a Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD+) project methodology, specifically using forest protection and monitoring as well as implementing sustainable development activities among the communities in order to reach emissions reductions goals. During the project lifetime, the project also provides biodiversity conservation and socio-economic benefits to local communities living within and around the project area.

Land use pressures in the area include agricultural and grazing development as well as human settlements and large infrastructure work. Thus, project treatments are aimed at three main areas: forest protection and monitoring, scientific research; especially related to natural resources and biodiversity as well as socio-economic development of communities with a focus on sustainable business chains. Integrating FSC (Forest Stewardship Council) certified low impact forest management and revenue from carbon credits brought about by REDD+ project activities are essential in order to carry out these project treatments so that they are effective.

The "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project" has been developed under a partnership between Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A., Jari Floresta S.A. and Jari Celulose S.A. (the latter two both belonging to Grupo Jari) which are all based in Brazil. In 2018, the proponent Jari Florestal was discontinued by the Grupo Jari, and was withdrew from the activities of the "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project" and Fundação Jari started to act directly in the project, in the role of proponent and manager.

The net emission reductions achieved is 1,734,045 tCO_2e for the monitoring period.

The primary project activity is management of the project area as a private conservation reserve in order to avoid unplanned deforestation. Based on evidence collected during the audit, this type of management constitutes a modification from the baseline scenario expected to result in GHG emissions reductions or removals. Evidence includes interviews with project proponents and community members; examination of data collected by remote sensing, and first hand field observation.

The project sectoral scope is 14 “Agriculture Forestry and Other Land Use” and the project type is Avoided Unplanned Deforestation (AUD). The project is eligible for crediting as it is an AFLOU project, using an approved VCS methodology VM0015. The project is located in the state of Amapá, Brazil. The geodetic coordinates provided for in CCB-PD and section 2.3.2 of the VCS PD and the general project location has been confirmed during the remote audit.

Based on the definitions described in the VCS standard version 4.0, the project is categorized as a large project, as it has an estimated average annual GHG emissions reduction of greater than 300,000 tonnes of CO_2e as evidenced in spread sheets in which the methodology’s quantitative elements are implemented.

The project crediting period start date is 14 February 2011 and the end of the crediting period is 14 February 2041. The project crediting period start date corresponds to the date when the first socioeconomic and environmental assessment planning meeting was held.

The verification team provides reasonable assurance that the emission reduction estimations of the project are conservative and meet the CCB criteria and the approved VCS methodology employed. To ensure complete transparency, the verification team has included any clarification or corrective actions that were raised in this verification report in an appendix 1.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

The verification consisted of the following three phases in accordance with the applied methodology, the VCS Standard version 4.0, the CCBA version 3.1 and other relevant VCS requirements:

- A desk review of the project documents.
- Follow-up interviews with project stakeholders and remote inspection.
- The resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the verification report and opinion.

The following sections outline each step in more detail.

2.1 Audit Team Composition (*Rules* 4.3.1)

The verification team and the technical reviewers consist of the following personnel.

Role	**Last Name**	**First Name**	**Country**
Lead Assessor	Principe Branco Saettoni	Geisa Maria	Rina Brazil

Verifier	Leiroz	Andrea	External Auditor - Rina Brazil
Technical Expert, Verifier and Local Expert until 02/07/2021	Beck	Talita	External Auditor - Rina Brazil
Technical Expert, Verifier and Local Expert from 03/07/2021	Goes	Gustavo	External Auditor - Rina Brazil
Technical Reviewer	Carvalho	Thaís	Rina Brazil
Technical Expert (reviewer)	Singh	Vinay	RINA India

Geisa Principe is the team leader and technical reviewer with experience with more than 200 CDM and VCS carbon projects in Latin America. In addition, she worked as technical expert for UNFCCC for CDM projects for 2 years. In addition, she has large experience with GHG calculation in various scopes and methodologies. She is biologist, post graduated in management environment and environment engineering.

Andrea Leiroz is the verifier with experience with more than 200 CDM, VCS carbon and GS projects in Latin America. She worked as technical reviewer for CDM projects for 5 years and has large experience with GHG calculation in various scopes and methodologies. She speaks Portuguese, the local language in Brazil. She has a Chemical Engineering degree and DSc. In Mechanical Engineering.

Talita C. BECK is the technical expert in the scope 14 with competency confirmed through the qualification process and related documentation in accordance with the UNFCCC CDM Accreditation Standard requirements. She is also the local expert, which means she has in the field experience in Forestry Projects in the region of the project activity and speaks Portuguese, the local language in Brazil. She has an Environmental Science degree and a MSc. in Environmental Technology from Imperial College - London, with a specialisation in Ecological Management (more specifically the mathematical modelling of ecological resources), and a specialisation in Terrestrial Carbon Accounting (REDD accounting of carbon) from UCSD. Furthermore, attended a module of Ethno-ecology as a guest student at UFRGS Brazil.

She has participated as team leader and technical expert in the Verification of the CDM Project *"Reforestation as renewable source of wood supplies for industrial use in Brazil"* in 2020; the Validation and Verification of the VCS project *"Jarí Pará REDD+ Project"* in 2019 and the Validation and Verification of the VCS project *"Agrocortex REDD Project"* in 2017. She also participated as local expert in the Validation of the CDM project *"AES Tietê Afforestation /Reforestation Project"* in the State of São Paulo, Brazil, in 2010 and worked as a climate change mitigation and adaptation consultant in other forestry projects in Brazil for The Nature Conservancy.

Relevant social and cultural expertise was the Validation of the CCB project "*Jarí Pará REDD+ Project*" in 2019; the Validation and Verification of the Social Carbon for the "*Agrocortex REDD Project*" in 2017 and as a consultant in other forestry and climate change mitigation and adaptation projects for The Nature

Conservancy. Some expertise also gained from PRA disciplines during the MSc. Environmental Technology degree and the participation as a guest student in the module Ethno-ecology at UFRGS, Brazil.

Relevant ecological experience came from the Validation of the CCB Project project "*Jarí Pará REDD+ Project*" in 2019, the work as climate change mitigation and adaptation projects for The Nature Conservancy, the Environmental Science degree (several ecology disciplines attended), and the MSc. in Environmental Technology with a specialisation in Ecological Management (more specifically the mathematical modelling of ecological resources) with a thesis in forest biodiversity conservation practices.

Gustavo Goes is the technical expert qualified in the area 14.1 Afforestation and Reforestation in accordance with the instructions of the Sustainability Compliance & New Scheme Development Coordination Unit. He has experience in implementing annual GHG inventories (Brazilian GHG Protocol Standard), carbon offset calculation and CDM & VCS forest projects. He speaks Portuguese, the local language in Brazil. He is a forest engineer graduated from the Federal University of Paraná with a year of studies in France.

Thaís Carvalho is the technical reviewer with experience with more than 200 carbon projects in Latin America (qualified as Team Leader and technical expert in CDM, VCS, GS and Social Carbon Standard). She has large experience with GHG calculation in various scopes and methodologies. She has a Bachelors' degree in Biological Sciences, Masters' degree in Biological Sciences- Genetics and Post Graduate degree in Environmental Pollution Control Engineering.

Vinay Singh is the technical expert (reviewer) with experience of more than 200 carbon projects in India, Africa (Uganda & Kenya), South East Asia (Thailand & Indonesia), Sri Lanka (qualified as Team Leader and technical expert in CDM & VCS). He has vast experience with GHG calculation in various scopes and methodologies. He got Masters' in Forestry from Forest Research Institute, Dehradun and Post Graduate Diploma in Environmental Law & Policy from National Law School, New Delhi.

2.2 Method and Criteria

The verification consisted of the following three phases:

- A desk review of the project documents.
- Follow-up interviews with project stakeholders and remote inspection.
- The resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the verification report and opinion.

The verification process included the following events and activities:

- Opening meeting, introduction and project orientation;
- Desk review of the Project Document (PD), Monitoring Report and supplemental documentation including data, models and maps of project zone;

- Remote audit from 21 September 2020 to 25 September 2020 and 02 October 2020. The remote audit included:
    - Project overview and orientation;
    - Interviews with representatives of the communities Valdomiro e Barbudo, Ramal do Retiro, Ramal França Rocha, Tira Couro, Nova Conquista and Água Azul;
    - Interviews with families of the communities Nova Conquista, Água Azul, Tira Couro, Arapiranga;
    - Interviews with Associação dos Moradores e Produtores Extrativistas da Comunidade de Padaria (AMPECP);
    - Interview with Sindicato dos Trabalhadores Rurais de Vitória do Jari (STTR VJ);
    - Interview with a member of the patrolling team;
    - Interviews with staff of Fundação Jari;
    - Interviews with staff of Biofílica;
    - Closing meeting and presentation of preliminary findings.
- Review of stakeholder comments;
- Review of collected evidence and supporting documentation;
- Issuance of findings and draft report;
- Project proponent responses to findings;
- Preparation of final report;
- Technical review of final report;
- Submission of final report.

2.3 Document Review

The following tables list the documentation that was reviewed during the verification.

Documents provided by the project participant related directly to the VCS and climate portions of the project.

/1/	Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A.: CCB & VCS Monitoring Report for project activity "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project", version 1.0 dated 23 August 2020, version 2.0 dated 18 December 2020, version 3.0 dated 04 March 2021, version 4.0 dated 24 May 2021 and version 5.0 dated 02 July 2021.

/2/	Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A: Emission reductions calculation spreadsheet. VCS Monitoring Report Jari-Amapá Project 2014_2018.xlsx VCS-MR-jariamapa-2014-2018-v2.slsx of 18/11/2020.xlsx VCS-MR-jariamapa-2014-2019.xlsx VCS-MR-jariamapa-2014-2019-v2.xlsx
/3/	Biofílica Investimento Ambientais S.A.: VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v4.0 V1 of 02 September 2020; V2 of 20 November 2020; V2.1 of 04 March 2021.
/4/	Biofílica Land Classification Accuracy Assessment ACCURACYASSESSM.xls, no data.
/5/	Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A. (2013) JARI/AMAPÁ REDD+ PROJECT VCS Project Description version 1.4 of 12/04/2013.

Documents provided by the project participant related directly to the CCBA portion of the project.

/6/	Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A.: CCB & VCS Monitoring Report for project activity "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project", version 1.0 dated 23 August 2020, version 2.0 dated 18 December 2020, version 3.0 dated 04 March 2021, version 4.0 dated 24 May 2021 and version 5.0 dated 02 July 2021.
/7/	Priority project reports for each family assisted in the project; LinhaTempo_ProjetosPrioritarios.xls
/8/	Declaração de compromisso socioambiental com o projeto REDD+ Jari Amapá.
/9/	Deforestation: MICROZONEAMENTO_REDD2019_Final.xls. entradas_ramais_e_comunidades.shp desmatamento_agua_azul.xlsx and desmatamento_agua_azul.shp; desmatamento_fe_em_deus.xlsx and desmatamento_ fe_em_deus.shp; desmatamento_franca_rocha.xlsx and desmatamento_ franca_rocha.shp;

	desmatamento_igarape_das_pacas.xlsx and desmatamento_ igarape_das_pacas.shp; desmatamento_nova_conquista.xlsx and desmatamento_ nova_conquista.shp; desmatamento_tira_couro.xlsx and desmatamento_ tira_couro.shp; comunidade_Agua_Azul.shp; comunidade_Fe_em_Deus.shp; comunidade_Franca_Rocha.shp; comunidade_Igarape_das_Pacas.shp; comunidade_Nova_Conquista.shp; comunidade_Tira_Couro.shp; PRODES_x_Comunid.xlsx and PRODES_x_Comunid.shp; http://www.dpi.inpe.br/prodesdigital/dadosn/mosaicos/2019/; explicacao-dados-desmatamento.pdf; Occurrences and police reports.
/10/	Carbon credit card receipts: Recibo de quitação. ReciboQuitacao_PP.pdf
/11/	Fundação Jari reports: 2013 – 201303_RelFJ.pdf, 201306_RelFJ.pdf, 201309_RelFJ.pdf, 201312_RelFJ.pdf; 2014 - 201403_RelFJ.pdf, 201406_RelFJ.pdf, 201409_RelFJ.pdf, 201412_RelFJ.pdf; 2015 - 201503_RelFJ.pdf, REDD+ RELATÓRIOS DE 2015.pdf, RELATÓRIOS III TRIMESTRE DE 2015.pdf, RELATÓRIOS IV TRIMESTRE DE 2015 PROJETO REDD+.pdf; 2017 – RELATÓRIO BIOFÍLICA 2017.pdf; 2018 – Relatorio Fundacao Jari_Atividades Amapa_2018.pdf, RELATÓRIO DE ATIVIDADES SEMESTRAL EM 2018 - PRESTAÇÃO DE CONTAS.pdf, RELATÓRIO DE ATIVIDADES III TRIMESTRE 2018_Vitória do Jari. parte2.pdf; 2019 – Relatório annual de resultados 2019 F.J_25_05.pdf.
/12/	Grupo Jari integrated policy of the management system: Política Integrada do Grupo Jari.

/13/	Grupo Jari principles and general rules of conduct: Código de Conduta – Princípios e Normas de Gerais de Conduta.pdf.
/14/	Grupo Jari Conflict Management Procedure: procedimento de Gestão de Conflitos.
/15/	Grupo Jari Procedures of Communication with Stakeholders: Procedimento de Comunicação com Partes Interessadas.
/16/	Training: Sistemática de Treinamento & Desenvolvimento dated 13 April 2018, version 0.019. Geração Aprendiz: EVIDENCIAS GERAÇÃO APRENDIZ 2014.pdf, EVIDENCIAS GERAÇÃO APRENDIZ 2015.pdf. Agulhas Versáteis: Evidências Agulhas Versáteis_2014.pdf, Evidências Agulhas Versáteis_2015.pdf and Evidências Agulhas Versáteis_2018.pdf. Magia de Tupã: Evidências Magia de Tupã_2014.pdf, Evidências Magia de Tupã_2015.pdf, Evidências Magia de Tupã_2016.pdf, Evidências Magia de Tupã_2017.pdf, Evidências Magia de Tupã_2018.pdf, Evidências Magia de Tupã_2019.pdf.
/17/	Grupo Jari Human rights and social responsability policies: Política de Direitos Humanos e Responsabilidade Social: corrupção passiva e ativa dentro e fora da empresa.
/18/	Technical assistance and rural extension services: Painel de Monitoramento_REDD 2019_FINAL.xlsx RELAÇÃO DE BENEFICIÁRIOS DOS PROJETOS PRIORITÁRIOS.xls LinhaTempo_ATER.xlsx Documents with the activity register of each producer. indicador-diversidade-produtos.xlsx Diagnose report for each producer. relatorio-credito-rural.pdf
/19/	Technical chambers: 2014 – Technical Chamber Meeting (13 March 2014 and 20 August 2014) Reunião da Câmara Técnica-Audio.mp4; Minutes of the meeting: AtaCTREDD_13032014.pdf and AtaCTREDD_20082014.pdf;

	Invitations for the meeting: MobilizacaoCT_13032014.pdf and MobilizacaoCT_20082014.pdf; Presentation: PPTCTREDD_13032014.pdf and PPTCTREDD_20082014.pdf; Attendance list: ListaFrequenciaCT_13032014.pdf and ListaFrequenciaCT_20082014.pdf 2015 – Tecnical Chamber Meeting: Carbon Credit Card (25 August 2015) Minutes of the meeting: AtaCTREDD_25082015.pdf Attendance list: ListaFrequenciaCT_25082015.pdf 2018 – Tecnical Chamber Meeting: Carbon credit Card (08 September 2018) Invitations for the meeting: MobilizacaoCT_09082018.pdf; Attendance list: ListaFrequenciaCT_09082018.pdf Presentation: SlidesBiofilica_20180809_Cedula_Credito_Carbono.pptx 2019 – Tecnical Chamber Meeting (24 July 2019) Minutes of the meeting: AtaCTREDD_24072019.pdf; Invitations for the meeting: MobilizacaoCT_24072019.pdf; Presentation: PPTCTREDD_24072019.pdf; Attendance list: ListaFrequenciaCT_24072019.pdf OrganizacaoDadosCTs.xlsx.
/20/	Structuring of the socio-environmental fund: HistóricoFinanceiro_JariAmapá_0823.xlsx; Demonstrações Financeiras Fundação Jari (2016-2019) Orçamento Gestão Fundiária e Segurança (2015-2018); JariGroup_Real_2014_CC_1006514/Real-Fiscalizacao-1006514-2014-vf.xlsx JariGroup_Real_2015_CC_1006514/Real-Fiscalizacao-1006514-2015-vf.xlsx

	JariGroup_Real_2016_CC_1006514/Real-Fiscalizacao-1006514-2016-vf.xlsx JariGroup_Real_2017_CC_1006514/Real-Fiscalizacao-1006514-2017-vf.xlsx JariGroup_Real_2018_CC_1006514/Real-Fiscalizacao-1006514-2018-vf.xlsx JariGroup_Real_2019_CC_1006514/Real-Fiscalizacao-1006514-2019-vf.xlsx JariGroup_Real_2020_CC_1006514/Real-Fiscalizacao-006514-2020-1sem-vf.xlsx FJ investments in 2020: GOHOBBY drone.pdf / CCF13112020_00000 196.jpg / CCF13112020_00000 178.jpg / CCF13112020_00000 184.jpg / CCF13112020_00000 190.jpg Community: DFs - Fundação Jari - 2014.pdf DFs - Fundação Jari - 2015.pdf DFs - Fundação Jari - 2016.pdf DFs - Fundação Jari - 2017.pdf DFs - Fundação Jari - 2018.pdf DFs - Fundação Jari - 2019.pdf DFs Fudação Jari - 092020 - resumidas (sem parecer de auditoria).pdf; comprovantes.convenio jari.2014 e 2015.pdf Biodiversity: Nota 916 Fundação Jari.pdf Nota 942 Fundação Jari.pdf FT.19171.QG TURISMO.NOV11-ABATER 100% JARI AMAPA.pdf NF 2786.jpg

	NF 2787.jpg Management: DFs - Fundação Jari - 2014-20.pdf RPAClaraMagalhaes17-07-2015-Biofilica.pdf INVOICE. DNV ZUSUS205 1001255.2016.06.pdf INVOICE.DNV-GL.20141117.pdf INVOICE.ZUSUS205 998966.DNV-GL.DEZ02.pdf ITAU.CONTRATO DE CAMBIO.133269719.inv zusus205 998996 DNV-GL.DEZ02.pdf CONTRATO CAMBIO.137457931.DNV.JUN21.pdf Meetings: ATA_workshop_estrategico_2014.pdf Memórias Workshop Estratégico Jari – 07 de Outubro de 2014.pdf Workshop Estratégico Jari – 07 de Outubro de 2014.pdf ESBOÇO – Fundo REDD+ Jari.pdf; Ata_alinhamentoJari_20191029.pdf Email - Ata - Reunião Grupo Jari.msg
/21/	Communication channels: Follow-up Demanda de Parte Interessadas 2014.xls; Follow-up Demanda de Parte Interessadas 2015.xls; Follow-up Demanda de Parte Interessadas 2016.xls; Follow-up Demanda de Parte Interessadas 2017.xls; Follow-up Demanda de Parte Interessadas 2018.xls; Follow-up Demanda de Parte Interessadas 2019.xls; Follow-up Demanda de Parte Interessadas 2020.xls;

	fwd_follow_up_DPI.msg.
/22/	Seedling: Viveiro de mudas.rar; Producao_e_distribuicao_de_mudas - compilado.xlsx
/23/	Xylotheque: Xiloteca – visitação.pdf; Xiloteca – exemplars.pdf; livro_xiloteca.zip relacao_produtores_dignostico.xlsx. Visitas_Xiloteca 2014_2020 - email.pdf Visitas_Xiloteca 2014_2020.xlsx Photos of the pages of the visit book register; Dados Acervo Florestal Jari – email.pdf; Dados Acervo Florestal Jari - Auditoria REDD.xlsx.
/24/	High conservation value: AGREGUE MF - COLABORADORES POA 01 SAFRA 2020.2.xlsx; TABULAÇÃO REDD 2014_Gráficos Rebeca.xls; RELATÓRIO DE REGISTRO DE DEMANDAS DE PARTES INTERESSADAS 24.06.20.PDF dated 24 June 2020; Relatorio de Visita as Comunidades_Cajari2.pdf; Relatorio de Visita as Comunidades_Cajari 10072014.pdf; Relatorio de Visita as Comunidades_Cajari2 28112014.pdf; Relatorio de Palestra IFAP_2018.pdf; Plano de Ação.pdf. indicador-diversidade-produtos.xlsx PMFS AGREGUE avaliação de danos castanaheiras.xlsx

	Relatório Entrega de madeiras em toras_AGREGUE_COOPMOVEIS_PREFEITURA LARANJAL DO JARI.pdf termo-concessao-uso-bem-publico-07-2019.pdf.
/25/	Property surveillance: Controle de Atividades de Fiscalização Fundiária – 2014 à 2018.pdf; ASA2018_PalestraNovaConquista.pdf; LISTA_PALESTRAINCENDIO.pdf; Nova Conquista.pdf; palestras_incendio_florestal_2018_09_19.pdf; palestras_incendio_florestal_2019.pdf; cartaz_incendios_florestais.pdf; AUD-20201001-WA0127_1.mp3; AUD-20201001-WA0127_2.mp3.
/26/	Inventory carried out by Agregue in the Annual Production Unit 01. AGREGUE MF - INVENTÁRIO FLORESTAL CASTANHEIRAS.xlsx
/27/	Agregue Sustainable Forest Management Plan dated 25 August 2018.
/28/	Map with the nut areas identified in the Ramal do Retiro community. Ficha-danos-retiro.pdf; Ficha-microzoneamento-retiro.pdf; Ficha-mobilização-retiro.pdf.
/29/	Workshops with Ramal do Retiro community: Conselho Comunitario – Retiro, 1º Ata04.01.20.jpg; Conselho Comunitario – Retiro, 1º Ata04.01.20. n 02.jpg; Conselho Comunitario – Retiro, 1º Ata04.01.20 .n02.jpg; ConselhoRetiro_ATA01.pdf;

	ConselhoRetiro_ATA02.pdf; Fwd Reunião no Ramal do Retiro.msg.
/30/	Stakeholder consultation: Writing: Folder_REDDJariAmapa_consulta_v4_0609.pdf, Cartaz-ConsultaReddJariAmapa-420x297mm-v3.pdf, E-mails to stakeholders informing about the project. Oral: Radio. Virtual: Verra and Biofílica websites.
/31/	Biodiversity Monitoring Report dated March 2020: Relatório Monitoramento da Biodiversidade REDDJariAmapá.pdf. Relatório Monitoramento da Biodiversidade ProjetoREDDJariAmapa rev 4.pdf.
/32/	Grupo Jari task risk analysis (ART): ART.Análise de Riscos da Tarefa. Ver 0.0005 ok ecm.doc
/33/	Grupo Jari areas of expertise: PS Áreas de vivência rev 0.001 ok ecm.doc.
/34/	Grupo Jari security dialog: Diálogo de Segurança ver 0.003 ok ecm.doc
/35/	Grupo Jari risk management: PS Gerenciamento de Riscos-rev01.pdf.
/36/	Grupo Jari occupational health and safety management: PCMSO-Programa de controle medico de saúde ocupacional-rev.pdf
/37/	Grupo Jari safety inspection IS: IS – Inspeção de Segurança ver 0.004 ok ecm.doc
/38/	Grupo Jari planned observance of unsafe acts OPAI: OPAI – Observação Planejada de Atos Inseguros ver 0.003 ok ecm.doc
/39/	Grupo Jari hazards and risks – accidents: PS Acidente rev 0.002.doc.
/40/	Grupo Jari plan for emergency care: PA – Plano de atendimento a emergências – Operações Florestais ver 0.000 ok ecm1.doc.
/41/	Grupo Jari procedure for emergency response: PA – Procedimento Atendimento Emergencia rev QMA-SSO.pdf.
/42/	Rural activity license dated 02 January 2016: Jari_Agregue-Contrato de Arrendamento Rural.pdf.
/43/	Approval of the sustainable forest management plan dated 28 September 2018: comunicacao-aprovação-PMFS.pdf

/44/	Training in forest management for the years 2018, 2019 and 2020: Frente treinamentos 2018.pdf and Verso treinamentos 2018.pdf; Treinamentos Safra 2019.pdf; treinamento frente 1-2020.pdf, treinamento frente 2.2020.pdf, treinamentos safra 2020.pdf, treinamento verso 1.2020.pdf and treinamentos verso 2-2020.pdf.
/45/	Registry of forest management activity: AGREGUE - ARRASTE GERAL POA 01 16.09.20.xlsx; AGREGUE - FICHA ARRASTE.jpg; AGREGUE - CORTE GERAL POA 01 16.09.20.xlsx; AGREGUE - FICHA CORTE.jpg; dados-parcela-perm-POA01.xlsx; inventario-100-POA01.xlsx; AGREGUE - TRAÇAMENTO GERAL POA 01 16.09.20.xlsx; AGREGUE - FICHA TRAÇAMENTO.jpg; AGREGUE - TRANSPORTE GERAL POA 01 16.09.20.xls; AGREGUE - FICHA ROMANEIO TORAS TRANSPORTE.jpg.
/46/	Sustainable forest management: Maps: Castanhais Comunidade Retiro; Castanhais Comunidade Retiro-Daizia Moreira de Sousa; Castanhais Comunidade Retiro-Francisco Lopes de Aquino; Castanhais Comunidade Retiro-Izanor Braga; Castanhais Comunidade Retiro-Luiz Alves; Castanhais Comunidade Retiro-Odecias Moreira da Silva; Castanhais Comunidade Retiro-Oseias Moreira da Silva; Castanhais Comunidade Retiro-Renan Almeida; Castanhais Comunidade Retiro-Rosi da Silva Sousa; Castanhais Comunidade Retiro-Sergio Almeida; Castanhais Comunidade Retiro-Sobreposição Wilson e Odecias; Castanhais Comunidade Retiro-Wilson Carneiro; Mapa-POA01-microzoneamento.pdf; Shapefiles: Castanheiras.shp; Castanheiras_CastRetiro.shp; 01-shapefile-estradas.rar;

	Estradas_em_linha.shp; Autorizacao-ambiental-207-2018.pdf.
/47/	Workshops and trainings: 2014: cursos_2014_1o_sem.pdf cursos_2014_2o_sem_palestra_credito_rural.pdf relatorio_agente_agroextrativista_2014.pdf (p. 22 - 24, 36 -43) 2015: relatorio_iv_trimestre_redd_2015.pdf (p. 50 - 54) 2017: cursos_2017_1o_sem.pdf cursos_2017_2o_sem.pdf relatorio_biofilica_2017.pdf (p. 29 - 33, 35 - 36) evidencia_relatorio_biofilica_2017_apicultura.pdf 2018: cursos_2018_1o_sem.pdf cursos_2018_2o_sem.pdf 2019: cursos_2019_1o_sem_curso_defensivo_agricola.pdf
/48/	Development of property use plans: Report for each producer;

	Future maps for each producer: 01-sem-2014-mapasfuturo.pdf, 02-sem-2014-mapasfuturo.pdf and monit-mapa-futuro.xls; Soil analysis: arquivo-analisesolo-2014.pdf, arquivo-analisesolo-2015.pdf and arquivo-analisesolo-2018.pdf; Properties microzoning: 2014 - memorial-descritivo-2014.rar: DomingoLimaRamos_Memorial.pdf FranciscoSantosCardoso_Memorial.pdf JoseLuizSilvaPinto_Memorial.pdf MarliSantosBarbosa_Memorial.pdf OsvaldoPintoSilva_Memorial.pdf QuintinoFreitasBarbosa_Memorial.pdf 2018: Microzoneamento_AtendFichas.pdf DeclaracaoCompromisso_PP.pdf ReciboQuitacao_PP.pdf
/49/	Family assessment: Questionário dos Produtores rurais TABULAÇÃO REDD 2014.xls Questionário REDDAmapa_2020.V4-vf.pdf
/50/	Ambiens: Resumo de Condições_Pag 1 a 4.pdf (Summary) Resumo de Condições_Pag 5 a 7.pdf (Item 3.1 e 3.1.4) Embrapa: CONTRATO FJ e EMBRAPA - Dez2013.pdf

	Email de interesse em renovacao de acordo de cooperacao - Embrapa e FJ.pdf Carta de Interesse em renovacao de acordo de cooperacao - Embrapa.pdf
/51/	GMO: Embrapa technical communications: Comunicado Técnico nº60 - cultivar de banana brs conquista.pdf; Comunicado Técnico nº67 - cultivar de banana prata anã.pdf; comunicado técnico nº144 - cultivar de açaí brs pará.pdf; Comunicado Técnico nº218 - cultivar de banana pacovanken.pdf; comunicado técnico nº232 - cultivar de cupuaçu brs carimbó.pdf; Walter Paixao – email.pdf; Pacova (Terra Maranhao) - Noticia.pdf or https://nordesterural.com.br/voce-sabe-o-que-e-platano-no-brasil-ja-existem-duas-variedades-registradas-oficialmente/; http://sistemas.agricultura.gov.br/snpc/cultivarweb/cultivares_registradas.php; Cultivo e o manejo de organismos geneticamente modificados (OGM).pdf.
/52/	Grupo Jari emergency plan in case of forest fire: Emergence Attendance Plan for Forest Fires and Prevention and Controlling of Forest Fires.
/53/	Trigger Species Population: POA-AGREGUE-FINAL.pdf venda-prodmadeira.rar Decreto nº 5975-2006.pdf Dados Cancelamentos Corte POA 01 Agregue.xlsx Email_Especie-gatilho_Aratinga-solstitialis_mudanca de nome.pdf PIACENTINI et al. Annoted checklist of the birds of Brazil by the Brazilian Ornithological Records Committee. Revista Brasileira de Ornitologia. 2015, 23(2), 91-298.
/54/	Community level workshops: 2016: maio_2016_relatorio_diagnostico_familiar_participativo.pdf; out_2016_relatorio_assistencia_tecnica_social_as_familias_remanejadas_pela_UHE.pdf; listas_atividades_para_demandas_atendidas.rar.

	2018/19:ATA_ASPRUENC_04.052018_marc.pdf; ATA_ASPRUENC_28.06.2019.pdf; 20201019_163312.jpg. 2020: Demand form Carliane Pereira de Oliveira and Ismael Carvalho Freire.

Standards, methodologies, and other guidance by the VCSA and CCBA

/55/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Standard version 4.0 dated 19 September 2019.
/56/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Validation and Verification Manual, version 4.0 dated 19 September 2019.
/57/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Program Definitions version 4.0 dated 19 September 2019.
/58/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Guidance for Standardized Methods version 3.3 dated 08 October 2013.
/59/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Program Guide version 4.0 dated 19 September 2019.
/60/	Verified Carbon Standard and CCBA: CCB & VCS Verification Report Template CCB version 3.0, VCS version 3.4 dated 21 June 2017.
/61/	Verified Carbon Standard and CCBA: CCB & VCS Monitoring Report Template CCB version 3.0, VCS version 3.4 dated 21 June 2017.
/62/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS AFOLU Non-Permanent Risk Tool version 4.0 dated 19 September 2019.
/63/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Non-Permanent Risk Report Template version 4.0 dated 19 September 2019.
/64/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation version 1.1 dated 3 December 2012.
/65/	CDM: Guidelines on Assessment of Different Types of Changes from the Project Activity as Described in the registered PD.
/66/	CCBA: Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standard version 3.1 dated 21 June 2017.
/67/	CCBA: CCB Program Rules version 3.1 dated 21 June 2017.

Documentation used by RINA to validate / cross-check the information provided by the project participant

/68/	VCS approved Validation Report for the “Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project”. Available at: https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/1115.

/69/	VCS approved Verification Reports for the "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project". Available at: https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/1115.
/70/	CCB approved Validation Report for the "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project". Available at: https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/CCB/1115.
/71/	VCS approved Project Design for the "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project". Available at: https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/1115.
/72/	CCB approved Project Design for the "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project". Available at: https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/CCB/1115.
/73/	VCS approved Monitoring Reports for the "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project". Available at: https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/1115.
/74/	Speak with us forms.
/75/	Federal legislation and regulations: • Decree-Law No. 5,452, dated 01 May 1943: Approves the Consolidation of Labor Laws. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/decreto-lei/del5452.htm. • Law No. 6,514, dated 22 December 1977: Amendments to Chapter V of Title II of Consolidation of Labor Laws, on occupational safety and medicine and other measures. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l6514.htm.
/76/	International agreements ratified by Brazil: Convention of the International Labor Organization No. 29 of 1930, ratified by Brazil on 25 April 1957: Provides for the abolition of forced labor. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/brasilia/convencoes/WCMS_235021/lang--pt/index.htm. International Labor Organization Convention No. 87 of 1940: Provides for freedom of association. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/brasilia/convencoes/WCMS_235021/lang--pt/index.htm. Convention of the International Labor Organization No. 97 of 1949, ratified by Brazil on 18 June 1965: Provides for migrant workers. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/brasilia/convencoes/WCMS_235021/lang--pt/index.htm. Convention of the International Labor Organization No. 98 of 1949, ratified by Brazil on 18 November 1952: Provides for the right to organize unions and collective bargaining. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/brasilia/convencoes/WCMS_235188/lang--pt/index.htm. Convention of the International Labor Organization No. 100 of 1951, ratified by Brazil on 25 April 1957: Provides for equal pay for men and women. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/brasilia/convencoes/WCMS_235190/lang--pt/index.htm.

	International Labor Organization Convention No. 105, ratified by Brazil on 18 June 1965: Provides for the abolition of forced labor. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/brasilia/convencoes/WCMS_235195/lang--pt/index.htm. Convention of the International Labor Organization No. 111 of 1958, ratified by Brazil on 01 March 1965: Provides for discrimination in respect of employment and occupation. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/brasilia/convencoes/WCMS_235325/lang--pt/index.htm. Convention of the International Labor Organization No. 131 of 1970, ratified by Brazil on 04 May 1983: Provides for minimum wage setting, especially in developing countries. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/brasilia/convencoes/WCMS_235860/lang--pt/index.htm. Convention of the International Labor Organization No. 138 of 1973, ratified by Brazil on 28 June 2001: Provides for the minimum age for admission. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/brasilia/convencoes/WCMS_235872/lang--pt/index.htm. Convention of the International Labor Organization No. 142 of 1975, ratified by Brazil on 24 November 1981: Provides for the development of human resources. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/brasilia/convencoes/WCMS_236115/lang--pt/index.htm. International Labor Organization Convention No. 143 of 1975: Provides for illegal immigration and the promotion of equal opportunities for migrant workers. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/brasilia/convencoes/WCMS_242707/lang--pt/index.htm. Convention of the International Labor Organization No. 155 of 1981, ratified by Brazil on 18 May 1992: Provides for the workers safety and health. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/brasilia/convencoes/WCMS_236163/lang--pt/index.htm. Convention of the International Labor Organization No. 169 of 1989, ratified by Brazil on 25 July 2002: Provides for indigenous and tribal rights. Available at: http://www.mpf.mp.br/atuacao-tematica/ccr6/documentos-e-publicacoes/legislacao/legislacao-docs/convencoes-internacionais/convecao169.pdf/view. International Labor Organization Convention No. 182, ratified by Brazil on 02 February 2000: Provides for the prohibition of the worst forms of child labor and immediate action for its elimination. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/brasilia/convencoes/WCMS_236696/lang--pt/index.htm.
/77/	Federal law No. 12,846, dated 01 August 2013: Anti-corruption law. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2011-2014/2013/lei/l12846.htm.
/78/	Brazilian Federal legislations. Available at: http://www4.planalto.gov.br/legislacao/.
/79/	State legislation COEMA No. 0001 dated 20 January 1999. Available at: https://www.semace.ce.gov.br/resolucoes-coema-1999/.
/80/	Financial audit reports of Fundação Jari audited by PricewaterhouseCoopers:

	DFs - Fundação Jari - 2014.pdf; DFs - Fundação Jari - 2015.pdf; DFs - Fundação Jari - 2016.pdf; DFs - Fundação Jari - 2017.pdf; DFs - Fundação Jari - 2018.pdf; DFs - Fundação Jari - 2019.pdf.
/81/	Termo de Diretrizes Financeiras-REDDJARI.pdf dated 01 July 2020.
/82/	ESBOÇO - Fundo REDD+ Jari.pdf
/83/	Convenio_Conta_REDD+.doc
/84/	Financial audit reports of Biofílica: Biofilica.BP.2014.pdf; Biofilica.BP.2015.pdf; Biofilica.BP.2016.pdf audited by KPMG. DFs Auditadas Biofilica.2017-compressed.pdf; DFs Biofilica.2018.assinada_compressed.pdf; Biofilica-DFs 2019 auditadas.pdf audited by Parker Randall Brasil.
/85/	Version 2 of the map with planned deforestation in annual production unit 1 (from the Portuguese UPA 1) including coordinates doc “mapa-POA01-microzoneamento.pdf” dated 13 November 2020.
/86/	Estradas_em_area.shp and Patios_POA_1.shp
/87/	Pimentel et al. Economic and environmental threats of alien plant, animal, and microbe invasions. Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment, 84, 2001, pp. 1-20.
/88/	IUCN Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP). Available at : https://www.gisp.org.
/89/	Biodiversity research: Master thesis: DINÂMICA DE ESPÉCIES ARBÓREAS E ARBUSTIVAS SOB MANEJO FLORESTAL MADEIREIRO, DURANTE 27 ANOS, EM UMA FLORESTA OMBRÓFILA DENSA NO ESTADO DO AMAPÁ, BRASIL. Fernanda da Silva Mendes. Universidade Federal do Paraná. 2016; Ph.D. thesis: MODELAGEM E SIMULAÇÃO DO CRESCIMENTO E PRODUÇÃO DE FLORESTA TROPICAL MANEJADA NA AMAZÔNIA ORIENTAL. Rodrigo Geroni Mendes Nascimento. Universidade Federal do Paraná. 2016. Ph.D. thesis: RESILIÊNCIA FLORESTAL PÓS-COLHEITA NA AMAZÔNIA ORIENTAL BRASILEIRA. Francimary da Silva Carneiro. Universidade Federal Rural da Amazônia. 2016. Ph.D. thesis: A castanha-da-Amazônia (*Bertholletia excelsa* Bonpl.) no contexto dos novos padrões internacionais de qualidade e segurança dos alimentos. Walter Paixâo de Sousa. Universidade Federal de Santa Maria. 2108.
/90/	Griffiths et al. Biodiversity and environmental context predict dung beetle-mediated seed dispersal in a tropical forest field experiment. Ecology. 96, June 2015, pp 1607-1619.

/91/	CARNEIRO, F. S. et al. Resilience of wood volume of commercial species in different experimental areas in the Eastern Amazon. Ibero-American Journal of Environmental Sciences. 2019, vol. 10, no. 6, pp 15 – 31.
/92/	Silvane VATRAZ; Denis ALDER; José Natalino Macedo SILVA. Distance dependent indexes of the arboreal stratum in the Brazilian Amazon. Revista Espacios. 2016, vol. 37, no. 27 pp 3.
/93/	Court of Justice of the State of Amapá – Consultation Court Cases – Parts, date 04/03/2021 (from the Portuguese Poder Judiciário Tribunal de Justiça do Estado do Amapá – Consulta – Processos – Partes de 04/03/2021).
/94/	Court Case 0003484-38.2018.8.03.0000 Court Case - 0003608-70.2013.8.03.0008 Court Case - 0000088-61.2011.8.03.0012 Court Case - 0001640-15.2007.8.03.0008 Court Case - 0002561-22.2017.8.03.0008
/95/	INPE: Methodology for calculating the annual Rate deforestation in the Legal Amazon. Câmara, G., et. al. September 2006.
/96/	Deforestation from October 2019 to April 2020: Desmatamento-abril2020-AP-CV.xlsx; Shapefiles for April 2020; Satellite images; Deforestation maps.

2.4 Interviews

From 21 September 2020 to 25 September 2020 and on 02 October 2020, the verification team from RINA conducted the remote audit to the "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project" based on videoconference (Zoom meeting) and performed interviews with community members, families involved in the project, project proponents' staff and other project stakeholders. The remote audit video has been provided by client and is available with Audit team.

	Date	Name / Organization	Community / Locality	Role	Topic
/97/	21 - 25 September 2020 02 October 2020	Caio Gallego – Biofílica	São Paulo	Project manager	Verification of actual implementation as per VCS PD, satellite data acquisition and processing, calibration data, records and
/98/	21 September 2020	Plínio Ribeiro – Biofílica	São Paulo	Executive director	

/99/	21 - 25 September 2020 02 October 2020	Luana Cordeiro – Biofílica	São Paulo	Project analyst	storage of data, ER calculations, comparison between recorded data and calculation spreadsheets. Monitoring plan, register of the qualification of workers in the forest management, sustainable forest management implementation. Impact of the forest management in the communities. Communities high conservation value areas. Monitoring plan, impact of the monitoring of deforestation, property surveillance, Technical Board Meetings and community level workshops, technical assistance and rural extension, agro-extractive techniques training, property use plans and its implementation, family assessment, improvement of community channels, impact of the structuring of the socio-environmental Fund REED+ Jari, seedling nursery,
/100/	21 - 25 September 2020 02 October 2020	Susane Rasera – Biofílica	São Paulo	Project analyst	
/101/	21 - 25 September 2020 02 October 2020	Aline Ribeiro – Biofílica	São Paulo	-	
/102/	21 - 25 September 2020 02 October 2020	Jorge Rafael Barbosa Almeida – Fundação Jari	Monte Dourado	General coordinator	
/103/	21 September 2020	Patrick Nogueira – Grupo Jari	Monte Dourado	Executive director	
/104/	21 September 2020	Robson Mello – Fundação Jari	Monte Dourado	-	

					xylotheque, identified high conservation value. Impact of the biodiversity and scientific research.
/105/	22 September 2020	Roberto Gonçalves Baia - Associação de Moradores e produtores extrativistas da comunidade de Padaria (AMPECP)	Padaria	President	Impact on forest management in the communities.
/106/	22 September 2020	Jerry Adriane	Padaria	Secretary of the Associação de Moradores	Impact on forest management in the communities.
/107/	22 September 2020	Luis Claudio Prist	Padaria	Treasure of the Associação de Moradores	Impact on forest management in the communities.
/108/	22 September 2020	Antônio Maria do Nascimento	Ramal França Rocha	-	Community impacts.
/109/	22 September 2020	Diva	Valdomiro e Barbudo	-	Community impacts.
/110/	22 September 2020	Natalina Ferreira de Sousa	Tira Couro	-	Community impacts.
/111/	23 September 2020	Rosinei Silva de Sousa	Ramal do Retiro	Community leader	Impact on forest management in the communities.
/112/	23 September 2020	Oseas Moreira da Siva	Ramal do Retiro	Community leader	Impact on forest management in the communities.

/113/	23 September 2020	Arlindo da Silva	Nova Conquista	Nova Conquista Association	Community impacts.
/114/	23 September 2020	Tales	Nova Conquista	Nova Conquista Association	Community impacts.
/115/	23 September 2020	Osvaldo Pinto da Silva	Água Azul	Community leader	Community impacts.
/116/	23 September 2020	Carliane Pereira de Oliveira	Tira Couro	-	Community impacts.
/117/	23 September 2020	Humberto Pereira de Oliveira	Tira Couro	-	Community impacts.
/118/	23 September 2020	Raquel dos Santos Araújo	Tira Couro	-	Community impacts.
/119/	23 September 2020	Maria de Fátima dos Santos	Tira Couro	-	Community impacts.
/120/	23 September 2020	Raimundo Nonato Ferreira dos Santos	Tira Couro	-	Community impacts.
/121/	24 - 25 September 2020	Sônia Varela – Fundação Jari	Monte Dourado	Monitoramento/ Desenvolvimento Comunitário	Monitoring plan, impact of the technical assistance and rural extension, agro-extractive techniques training, property use plans and its implementation, family assessment, improvement of community channels, impact of the structuring of the socio-environmental Fund REED+ Jari, seedling nursery, xylotheque, identified

					high conservation value. Impact of the biodiversity and scientific research.
/122/	24 September 2020	Edson Lanes – Grupo Jari	Monte Dourado	Patrolling team	Property surveillance.
/123/	24 September 2020	Walter Paixão de Souza – Embrapa (Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária)	Macapá	Research	Biodiversity monitoring and scientific research.
/124/	24 September 2020	Ivanildo Rodrigues Fonseca – Sindicato dos trabalhadores rurais de Vitória do Jari (STTRVJ)	Vitória do Jari	President	Community impacts.
/125/	25 September 2020	Nilson Pedreiro Torriel	Nova Conquista	-	Community impacts.
/126/	25 September 2020	Luis Carlos Freire	Nova Conquista	-	Community impacts.
/127/	25 September 2020	Domingos Lima Ramos	Água Azul	-	Community impacts.
/128/	25 September 2020	Raimundo Ramon dos Santos	Água Azul	-	Community impacts.
/129/	25 September 2020	Arnaldo Barbosa dos Santos – Fundação Jari	Monte Dourado	Planejamento	Implementation of CCB Project.

2.5 Site Inspections

A complete desk review of the submitted MR (version 1.0) /1/ and supportive evidences have been checked by the Verification Team.

In addition, audit team has conducted calls/interviews (telephonic) with PP on different topics as mentioned under section C.3 of this report.

Based on the videoconference, MR review, as the review of VCS and CCB procedures and guidelines, RINA Verification team has proceeded to skip the presential site visit due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Verification team has used the following alternative means for its assessment and to justify that they are sufficient for the purpose of verification.

- By review of MR;
- By taking follow up actions by conducted interview with PP, to gather information about knowledge of project design, current situation via videoconference. Cross-checked evaluation under the scope of all information and references provided in MR. Details of interviews, topics covered and additional information presented in the above section “2.4 – Interviews”.

2.6 Resolution of Findings

The objective of this phase of the verification was to resolve any outstanding issues that needed be clarified prior to RINA’s positive conclusion on the monitoring report and the project design.

A corrective action request (CAR) is issued if one of the following occurs:

- The project participants have made mistakes that will influence the ability of the project activity to achieve real, measurable additional emission reductions.
- The VCS requirements have not been met.
- There is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated.
- Non-conformities with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in monitoring and reporting, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;
- Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions which will impair the estimate of emission reductions.

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

40 CARs and 9 CLs were raised and have been adequately addressed by the project participant (refer to Appendix 1).

2.6.1 Forward Action Requests

A forward action request (FAR) is raised during verification to highlight issues related to project implementation that require review concerning monitoring and reporting during the next monitoring period and subsequent verification of the project activity.

A forward action request (FAR) should be issued, where:

1. the actual project monitoring and reporting practices requires attention and /or adjustment for the next consecutive verification period, or

2. an adjustment of the MP is recommended.

Four forward action requests (FAR) were identified. The FARs are listed in Appendix 1 of this report.

2.7 Eligibility for Validation Activities

RINA is accredited for validation and verification for the scopes 1-11 and 13-15 by CDM UNFCCC and as well as by the VCS board.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

The project has not participated or been rejected under any other GHG programs since validation or previous verification.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

No methodology deviations were found in this monitoring period.

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

Throughout the verification process for this monitoring period (15 February 2014 to 16 April 2020), some project description deviations were identified.

Deviation 1: Project Proponents & Financial Management Mechanism

Recently, proponents decided to make an internal change in the management process of the Jari Amapá REDD+ Project. The applied change was to bring Fundação Jari from the position of the developer of social activities to the position of co-manager and proponent. In addition, Jari Florestal S.A. (Released Representor), Project Proponent together with Jari Celulose S.A., and Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A., chose not to be a proponent anymore, giving way to Fundação Jari (Accending Representor).

As described in the MR /1/, this change does not interfere in any way with the Project's management and governance process, as it only aims to reflect and formalize the process that has already been implemented in practice since the Fundação Jari has already taken on more responsibilities in recent years. This process

also aims to give the Fundação Jari greater autonomy and independence, in addition to strengthening the institution in its mission to promote sustainable socio-economic development in the Jari Valle.

As described in the MR, another minor change related to the Project Management occurred in relation to the financial management mechanism. During this period, the project underwent some transformations, and the management model previously envisaged was also reformulated. As described in the MR, Fundação Jari became a proponent, manager, and catalyst of the project's resources and some procedures initially planned needed to be updated.

The deviation did not impact the applicability of the methodology or the appropriateness of the baseline/without-project scenario. RINA was also able to verify that the change in the project proponent and financial management mechanism does not impact the additionality of the project /81/ /82//83/.

Deviation 2: FSC certified Forest Management

During the validation period of the project, it was foreseen that an FSC certified Forest Management would be conducted starting in 2016 with Annual Production Units - APU 01 as described in the CCB PD. The area was divided in 25 large Annual Production Units (APU) representing the potential forest areas managed each year. The certification was not obtained as stated in the registered CCB PD /72/.

The Forest Management operation started in Amapá in 2018, without FSC certification. Although not yet certified, the project proponents understand that the REDD+ Project certifications, especially the CCB, ensure the continuity of essential procedures such as effective communication with stakeholders, the prevention and mitigation of socio-environmental impacts, the monitoring of biodiversity, the maintenance of carbon stocks, that is, the effective management of forest assets.

As described in the MR, investments and additional actions foreseen in the project scenario did not stop being realized due to the absence of FSC certification, by contrast, Agregue operates the timber forest management in line with the certification guidelines. In addition, as described by the analysis of alternative land-use scenarios in the PD, obtaining FSC certification is not an additional action to contain deforestation in the project scenario. Therefore, it does not constitute a deviation or non-appropriateness in relation to the with-project scenario.

Thus, this deviation did not impact the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline/without-project scenario.

Deviation 3: Community monitoring indicators

As mentioned in the MR /1/, throughout the monitored period, it was perceived that some indicators, initially established in the CCB PD /72/, had difficulties in being quantified. The following indicators were not monitored correctly:

Monitoring of deforestation: For the indicator “Area deforested per family attended” the frequency of monitoring is not as per registered CCB PD. This indicator was only monitored once instead of annually, as it depended on the completion of microzoning process.

Property surveillance:

The indicator "Number of complaints/demands regarding the surveillance action" was not collected because there was no registered procedure to stimulate the collection of this data. The collection procedure has been updated and made available to VVB, including that complaints, denunciations and demands must be registered and forwarded to the Infrastructure Management, preserving the confidentiality of the source.

Indicator "Number of fire control and prevention workshops implemented per communities engaged was not monitored as per registered CCB PD. This indicator was only collected in 2018 and 2019 reaching just one community instead of annually and reaching all communities involved in the project activity. PP explained that exist the commitment to increase the reach with other engaged communities until the next verification. Considering 2020, due to the pandemic situation, it was necessary to adapt the communication with communities to ensure health and safety of all. Thus, information's on fire control and prevention were carried out through the distribution of posters and by radios.

- Technical Board Meeting: The monitoring of all indicators except for "Public Policies communities are accessing" was not carried out every 6 months as per registered CCB PD.
- Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (TARE):

Indicators "Number of families attended", "Number of communities engaged", "Frequency of visits" and "Gender and age of the producers attended": The frequency of monitoring is not as per registered CCB PD. These indicators were monitored yearly instead of every 6 months. To improve the survey of this information, for the next verifications, the project proponents are committed to adjusting the tools needed for the field survey of these indicators, making them clearer and answering all the PD's directions.

Indicator "Percentage of families with access to loans": The frequency of monitoring is not as per registered CCB PD. This indicator was monitored only in 2018 instead of every 2 years. In 2014, no actions were taken on this topic, because the project was focused mainly on choosing and starting the development of activities with community members, while 2016 was the year that the Grupo Jari went through a crisis that affected all sectors of the company, so between 2014 and 2016 this activity was not carried out, being started only in 2017. Between 2019 and 2020, the focus was on monitoring the 2017 and 2018 beneficiaries, verifying the effectiveness of the investments made. In addition, this activity was also impacted by the delay in the effective implementation of the Priority Projects, due to budgetary problems, and by the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020, thus having no new community members with access to credit in these years. Therefore, for 2014, 2016 and 2020 the values of families that had access to loans were zero.

Indicators "Familiar Income" and "Final market achieved": These indicators were not considered because the main source of this information is the Family Assessment, which during the monitored period was not carried out. The Family Assessment was directly impacted by the delay in the effective implementation of the Priority Projects due to budget problems and the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020.

Indicator "Time invested by the communities' members": This indicator was not considered, as no proper way of recording this data to be accounted for was found. Although the Fundação Jari prepared a new field sheet in 2020 that presents the time data, the filling out of this information was not effective. For the next verification, the proponents committed themselves to improving this methodology.

- Workshops and trainings in agro-extractive techniques: Indicator "Gender and age of farmers attended" was not monitored as an adequate way of recording this data to be accounted for was not found either. For the next verification, the proponents committed themselves to improving this methodology.

- Development of Property Use Plans: The indicator “Time invested by the communities’ members” was not considered, as an adequate way of recording this data to be accounted for was not found. For the next verification, the proponents committed themselves to improving this methodology.
- Community Level Workshops (Participatory Organizational Workshops, Community Development Plans and Risks and Impacts Assessment): the indicators “Number of demands identified per community” and “Number of demands addressed per community” for 2014 were not collected, because the activity held this year - called "Meeting of the 50" - was a special technical board between the proponents and the producers that had as its objective the presentation and discussion about the "Plan of the Use of Property" methodology. Thus, the activity allowed the communication and openness for discussion about the project's progress among the stakeholders, not necessarily focusing only on raising or addressing demands by community members.
- Family Assessment:

Indicators “Number of families interviewed”, “Number of communities contemplated” and “Frequency” were not monitored according to the frequency stated in the registered PD. These indicators were only monitored in 2014 as explained in the MR due to financial problems.

Indicator “Time invested by the communities’ members” was not considered, as an adequate way of recording this data to be accounted for was not found. For the next verification, the proponents committed themselves to improving this methodology.

- Biodiversity Monitoring and Scientific Research: None of the indicators of this activity were collected, they are qualitative analyses, covering the communities' perception of the availability of natural resources and the importance of the forest, and during the monitoring of the biodiversity carried out in the monitored period this scope was not registered, as well as in any activity carried out with the communities. For the next verification, the proponents committed themselves to improve the methodology of collection and storage of this information, mainly joining the survey conducted for the Family Assessment.

The verification team concluded that the lack of presentation of these indicators did not prevent the demonstration of the impacts of the project on communities, which were illustrated by the other indicators filled in.

This deviation did not impact the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline/without-project scenario.

Deviation 4: Biodiversity monitoring indicators

As mentioned in the MR /1/, throughout the monitored period, it was perceived that some indicators, initially established in the CCB PD /72/, had difficulties in being quantified. The following indicators were not monitored correctly:

- Biodiversity Monitoring and Scientific Research: The frequency of monitoring for all indicators is biannual as per registered CCB PD. However, the biodiversity indicator monitoring was only done for the year 2019.

  As stated in the MR, there are three main fronts associated with the monitoring of biodiversity: i) fauna monitoring, in which data are obtained by field expeditions; ii) monitoring of flora through data obtained from the inventory of permanent plots of sustainable forest management areas (based, in this case, on the Post-exploratory Report); and iii) the non-realization of the "Validation workshops/knowledge return events".

  - Fauna monitoring:

    As stated in the CCB PD /72/, the indicators for monitoring fauna biodiversity and scientific research were constructed considering the existing partnership between the Grupo Jari and the Universities of Lancaster and Lavras. With the end of the partnership and the economic crisis that the Grupo Jari faced, it was not possible to hire an outsourced company to monitor fauna biodiversity before 2019.

    PP explained that as for activities associated with biodiversity, priority was given to actions to curb deforestation, aiming not to impact the biodiversity of the project area due to the loss of forest cover and fragmentation of habitats. The positive results of containing deforestation in this monitoring period, associated with the excellent results found by the company Ambiens (contracted for the monitoring of biodiversity), validate the efforts made during this period of financial instability and readjustment of the project's priorities.

    Therefore, it was not possible to comply with the frequency of fauna monitoring and the indicators associated with this monitoring, including those related to production and scientific dissemination.

    Therefore, it is stated in the MR the possibility of a reevaluation of the frequency of these indicators in the revalidation of the PD, considering the costs and other difficulties associated with such frequent monitoring of biodiversity.

- Flora monitoring:

  The monitoring of flora is based on the Post-exploratory Report of the Permanent Plots of sustainable forest management. Thus, the monitoring is linked to the occurrence of sustainable forest management operations in the Project Area.

  As explained in the MR, forest management operations only started in 2018 and have not yet been completed. Thus, there is still no explored Post-Exploratory Report for UPA01 and, consequently, there was no monitoring of the indicators “Diversity of plant community in Permanent Plots” and “Richness of the plant community in Permanent Plots” using data from the Post-Exploratory Report in this period of monitoring.

It is noteworthy, however, that analysis of pre-exploratory data (using the census carried out on the permanent plots of UPA01 in operation) was performed by Ambiens and can serve as a basis for comparison with the data to be generated in the PP forest census to be carried out at the end of the exploration of UPA01.

Therefore, it is stated in the MR the possibility of a reevaluation of the frequency of these indicators in the revalidation of the PD as forest management activities are subject to change.

Indicator "Validation workshops/knowledge return events": This indicator was not monitored during the whole monitoring period. PP explained that the data analysis and delivery of the monitoring report by Ambiens was finalized in March 2020, a period in which the Covid-19 pandemic was already occurring in Brazil. For stakeholder protection measures, it was decided to postpone the presentation workshops only with the end of the pandemic.

The verification team concluded that the lack of presentation of these indicators did not prevent the demonstration of the impacts of the project on the biodiversity.

This deviation did not impact the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline/without-project scenario.

3.4 Minor Changes to Project Description (*Rules* 3.5.6)

The following minor changes applied to the community and biodiversity elements of the project design were identified:

1. Communities engaged in the Project

As described in the MR /1/, initially, 8 communities located in the Project Zone were selected, for a total of 61 families participating in the proposed activities, as can be seen in the first reports of the Fundação Jari /11/, where the first Technical Chambers and DOP Workshops are described. Since the beginning, appropriate and relevant information about costs, risks and potential benefits to the communities has been presented to the participants, as well as the fact that participation in the project has always been voluntary and the decision to participate, or not, has never been final or would result in any kind of restriction to the interested parties, directly or indirectly impacted. In this way, throughout the monitored period, some communities and families decided to stop participating in the project and a new community was inserted as beneficiary.

Regarding the Sombra da Mata community, only one producer was participating in the project, but as this one passed away and did not develop the project on his property, and he was not counted anymore as a beneficiary of the project. The communities of Ramal do Valdomiro and Barbudo, on the other hand, only gave up participating, still in 2013 (fact cited in the CCB PD /72/). Like other families, the reasons for giving up were diverse. Other participants have only lost interest in the project proposal.

However, just as there were withdrawals, two new producers were included during the monitoring period, one from Nova Conquista and the other from Tira Couro community. Thus, the project concluded this monitoring period with 6 communities directly impacted, where 33 priority projects were developed.

2. Biodiversity Monitoring

As described in the MR /1/, initially, the biodiversity monitoring would be done by assessing the diversity and richness of flora and groups of mammals, birds and beetles. However, the monitoring of fauna biodiversity involved groups of birds and medium and large mammals and the monitoring of flora biodiversity was made using data obtained from the pre-harvest inventory carried out at the Annual Production Unit number 01.

3.5 Grouped Project (G1.13 – G1.15, G4.1)

This is not a grouped project.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Public Comments (*Rules* 4.6)

The project was open for public comment from 07 August 2020 to 06 September 2020 (https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/CCB/1115). There was no comment during the commenting period as verified from the VCS pipeline web interface.

4.2 Summary of Project Benefits

The climate benefit described is that the Project aims to assist mitigation of climate change with total avoided emissions of 2,377,110 tCO_2e throughout the project lifetime.

The benefits to the local community and other actors will be focused on the aspects of associative strengthening, improvement of family farming, provision of technical assistance and improvement in energy and communication systems. With this, it is intended to influence the social issues and the living conditions of the communities around the Project Area, reducing social vulnerability and rural exodus, increasing the level of socioeconomic conditions and the life quality of the families, helping to obtain goods and services that promote economic and social well-being. The VVB confirms that during verification it has seen that Fundação Jarí and Biofílica have the know how and strong experience with the community areas to be able to do so.

The benefits to biodiversity are expected to be the maintenance and monitoring of the forest cover in the Project Area, ensuring the protection and conservation of habitats and local biodiversity, including species with some degree of threat according to IUCN. In addition, the Project Area plays an “ecological corridor” role, which connects several Conservation Units and assists in the generation of knowledge through the development of scientific research related to the theme.

4.3 General

4.3.1 Implementation Status (G1.9)

The project crediting period start date is 14 February 2011 and the end of the crediting period is 14 February 2041. The project crediting period start date corresponds to the commencement of the first monitoring period. There is no time difference between project start date, life time and GHG accounting period. However, there is time difference between biodiversity and community benefits assessment period.

During the remote audit, through observations of project activities and interviews with project personnel (see /97/ - /129/) RINA confirmed that the project has been implemented throughout this monitoring period as it was described in the monitoring report /1/ including all documented project description deviations.

The GHG emission reductions or removals generated by the project have not become included in an emissions trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading.

The project has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit, or has not become eligible to do so since validation or previous verification.

The project has not participated or been rejected under any other GHG programs since validation or previous verification.

The project sustainable development contribution was assessed and confirmed by the VVB through remote assessments and interviews with project management team and communities and with supporting documents provided by PP.

Regarding the VCS, validated methodologies deviations remain and no new deviations have been observed during this verification period. The following validated methodology deviations were described in the validation report /68/ and verification report issued by SCS Global Services /69/:

- The reference region has not been stratified, even though the current situation is expected to change within the project area, due to construction of the hydroelectric Santo Antonio dam. As described more fully in Section 3.2.3.1 of the validation report /68/, this deviation was a deviation to the criteria and procedures for measurement of area deforested in the baseline scenario. It is most likely that this led to conservative measurements of deforestation in the historical reference period, relative to the measurements that would have been obtained had the guidance of the methodology been followed.

- While the Santo Antonio hydroelectric dam is expected to develop near the project area, the reference region does not include a stratum where hydroelectric dam infrastructure was built in the past and where the impact on forest cover was similar to the one expected from the new or improved infrastructure in the project area. As described more fully in Section 3.2.3.1 of the validation report /68/, this deviation was a deviation to the criteria and procedures for measurement of area deforested in the baseline scenario. It is most likely that this led to conservative measurements of deforestation in the historical reference period, relative to the measurements that would have been obtained had the guidance of the methodology been followed.

- Only one forest class was included in the Land-Use/Land-Cover (LU/LC) classification system, although three forest strata were identified. The carbon stock values used to determine baseline emissions were weighted average values and were weighted by the area in each stratum. As described in Section 3.2.4.1 of the validation report /68/, this deviation a deviation to the criteria and procedures for measurement of area deforested in the baseline scenario. It was considered at validation to result in greatly simplified accounting of baseline and project GHG emissions while not compromising the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions.

- The distance maps used for predicting the location of unplanned deforestation, which are produced using the "empirical approach", are not categorized in a number of predefined distance classes but rather use continuous data. As described in Section 3.2.4.3 of the validation report /68/, this deviation was a deviation to the criteria and procedures for measurement of area deforested in the baseline scenario. The deviation results in increased accuracy of the prediction of deforestation because it avoids the degradation of accuracy that inevitably accompanies the dissolution of continuous data into categorical data.

- A "masking" approach was implemented to modify the risk map that was created following the guidance of Step 4.2.2 of the methodology /64/. As described in see Section 3.2.4.3 of the validation report /68/ this deviation was a deviation to the criteria and procedures for measurement of area deforested in the baseline scenario. For a variety of reasons, as set out in Section 3.2.4.3 of the validation report /68/, the deviation will result in increased accuracy of the measurement of baseline deforestation, and therefore increased accuracy in the quantification of GHG emission reductions.

- The areas of each post-deforestation class were not reported, as required by the Step 5 of the methodology /64/. Rather, a peer-reviewed publication was used to determine the "equilibrium proportion" of each post-deforestation land use, and a weighted carbon stock value (weighted by the "equilibrium proportion" was sourced from that publication. This deviation a deviation to the criteria and procedures for measurement of carbon stock changes in the baseline scenario. It was considered by the audit team to have no impact on the quantification of GHG emission reductions.

As described in the monitoring report for the second VCS monitoring period /73/, after the project validation, Jari group carried out additional assessments of impacts related to forestry operations. Consequently, several new impacts were identified that were not discussed prior to or during validation. These included forest inventory disturbances, timber dragging and transport and labor issues and others. The new monitoring techniques relating to impact mitigation were developed and was verified by the DOE DNV GL in the previous verification /69/.

In section 2.2.4 of the monitoring report, the project proponent describes that the reassessment of these impacts was undertaken as part of FSC-related demands and that additional monitoring techniques were implemented after each impact was individually assessed and the best action taken (minimize, mitigate, improve, monitor) was applied. As described in the previous VCS verification report /69/, "because re-assessment was required for FSC activities, and consequently notable negative impacts were identified, incorporating new mitigation techniques is not only justified, but responsible and forward-thinking. Mitigation techniques may encompass new monitoring components which trigger the need for a project description deviation. The project proponent's description of why impacts were re-assessed and mitigation steps revised justifies the changes and consequently, justifies the need for a project description deviation".

Also, in the previous VCS verification period, PP identified additional negative impacts relating to the Brazil Nut trees. As stated in the previous VCS verification report /69/, the management plan has been altered to incorporate these trees and activities such as tree identification, marking, mapping and community awareness outreach, which may qualify as additional monitoring components, have now been added post-hence to the project. It is mentioned in the monitoring report /73/ that the trees (such as copaiba and andiroba) have been identified as an important non-timber forest product and an important resource source for the local communities. The deviation is explained and justified in the monitoring report.

As this is the first CCB verification, there is no previously validated methodology deviations, project description deviations, and minor changes to the project description.

4.3.2 Risks to the Community and Biodiversity Benefits (G1.10)

The audit team verified the natural and human-induced risks to the expected project benefits identified by the project proponent. A widespread risk assessment to the climate aspect of the project is verified in section 4.4.3 of this report.

Section 2.2.6 of the MR is developed according to section G1.10 of the registered PD. The listed main risks and what will be done to mitigate are assessed as below:

Risk	Assessment od measure	VVB conclusion
Lack of interest from stakeholders, specially communities and government agencies to participate in the activities of the Project.	As verified during the remote audit, the project has been integrating some measures during its implementation and decision-making process concerning activities of communities interest, such as, workshops DOP /48/ and technical board meetings on REDD+ /19/ as a strategy to empower them and instigate a sense of belonging. During the implementation period it was also promoted the already existing reporting mechanisms among proponents and other stakeholders, such as Internal Ombudsman, Information Channels and Feedback and Grievance Procedure /15/ /21/.	VVB team concluded that mitigation measures provided by PP are appropriate to cover risk.
Difficulties commercializing the verified carbon credits.	As stated in the MR, Biofílica has a commercial sector responsible exclusive for the development of promotional materials of the	VVB team concluded that mitigation measures provided by PP are appropriate to cover risk.

	Project, attendance to national and international events related to REDD+ and carbon credits in order to promote the project, establish and amplify the networking of commercial contacts with possible interest in buying carbon credits. Biofílica is always searching for financing alternatives, such as donations and partnership for direct implementation of project activities (not necessarily liked with the sale of credits).	
New land invasions by squatters compromise through the infrastructure built for the sustainable forest management operation, causing new unplanned deforestation and competing with local communities for resources (land, hunting and non-timber forest products).	The SFM started just in 2018, so for the bigger forest monitoring period, this potential risk was not considered. As per interview with PP /97/-/104/, it was confirmed that the property surveillance and land security have been increased year by year due to the REDD+ resources in order to reduce and avoid invasion events and deforestation, and the SFM operator has been involved in these actions. In addition, it is valued a good relationship with communities that were in the area before the Project in a way that they are allies on the defense of the forest alerting the surveillance against the coming of outsiders.	VVB team concluded that mitigation measures provided by PP are appropriate to cover risk.
Reduced supply of natural resources (hunting and non-forest timber products) due to the SFM (logging) activities.	RINA verified that as a mitigation measure for the first risk there is the property surveillance program in place /25/, to avoid new invasions. In relation to the risk of tree species important to communities, in its management plan, Grupo Jari is committed to not explore any of the species of special interest to the communities and not to restrict	VVB team concluded that mitigation measures provided by PP are appropriate to cover risk.

	their access to these resources. The main *castanheiras* (brazil nut trees) accessed by the nearest community and directly impacted by the SFM operation in 2019 (Ramal do Retiro) were mapped /26/ /28/. In addition, meetings were held with the community /24/, and a community council was established to report on potential SFM impacts for the community /29/. The community received compensation in cases where the impact of SFM was identified /24/ and was able to enjoy some benefits provided by the operation, such as the reform of roads and bridges. SFM does not harvest *castanheiras* and during planning and forest inventory to support all annual operations (POAs - Annual Production Unit), a census is made prior to harvest, and all "trees of social interest" are mapped, especially castanheira, copaiba, and andiroba. Thus, they can plan the harvest without damaging these trees, and during the harvest, signs, and warnings are distributed at the site of the operation, and the surrounding communities are warned.	
Restriction on land use and land use conversion.	As per interview with PP and community /97/-/129/, VVB team verified that Fundação Jari staff has direct contact with the communities is constantly trained and oriented to clarify that the project cannot impose any land use and land use conservation restriction to them. Project's approach is to offer alternatives productions	VVB team concluded that mitigation measures provided by PP are appropriate to cover risk.

	technics, more productive and efficient, so little by little the communities won't need clear forest areas to grow crops any more. Along with alternative production technics (provided by TARE) /18/, the project also implements the Property use Plan Methodology, as a mediation approach to strategic think the property land use. With the Property use plan the producer will be encouraged to think on their "future use" of the land considering not just productive aspects but social and environmental function of the land. And even though the producer is free to do whatever he/she desires. The restrictions that exist are towards new invasions, as previously commented but even the land surveillance team doesn't open charges against families already established, being them engaged with the REDD+ project or not.	
Non-inclusion of vulnerable groups such as youth and women.	The technicians from Fundação Jari are constantly trained and oriented to not discriminate women and young people during the mobilizations for the project activities /13/ /16/. It must be noted that due to historical and cultural issues, in most cases men lead productivity issues of the family and the women take care of the issues linked to welfare. Since the project aims to bring both economic and welfare benefits, it is essential to involve women and young people in discussions. These groups have been represented in the	VVB team concluded that mitigation measures provided by PP are appropriate to cover risk.

	Technical Boards /19/, but the most representatives remain male. This is one of the actions that the project aims to strengthen in the coming years. An activity already initiated by the project on this theme is the promotion of the *Agulhas Versáteis* (Versatile Needles) initiative, with a female entrepreneurship bias.	
Risks connected to the management of the Socio-Environmental Fund of the Project.	During the consultations of the fund structuring /20/, the Technical Board was elected as the official space of consultations and accountability of the fund, specially regarding social activities. In this way the project proponents took some time to formalize the agreement related to the financial management of the REDD+ Project due to the complexity and importance of this instrument. However, during the project's implementation period, all guidelines related to transparency and stakeholder participation were implemented, including the presentation of the results and planning in the Technical Chamber. This Financial Management Agreement was formalized between the Proponents in 2020 and aims to guarantee the maintenance of the good financial management practices of the project throughout its duration.	VVB team concluded that mitigation measures provided by PP are appropriate to cover risk.
Regarding natural risks, as identified through the application of the AFLOU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v. 3.2", the Amazon Biome is a quite balanced	As verified during the remote audit, Grupo Jari has a plan of emergency response to forest fires since 2009 /52/. This plan is ready to be implemented	VVB team concluded that mitigation measures provided by PP are appropriate to cover risk.

ecosystem and in the Project Zone the main natural risk in related with forest fire.	in case of forest fire occurrence, caused by natural causes or human action (criminal fire, slash-and-burn practices, forest management operation, among others), and includes stationary and mobile surveillance, as well as prevention and fire control procedures. Additionally, another procedure called "Prevention and Controlling of Forest Fires" that aims to set prevention measures based on two mean strategies: Surveillance and Prevention Techniques. Through the monitoring of satellite images, annual bulletins are also prepared that report the occurrence of deforestation and fires in the project area. These bulletins are delivered to the security area of the Grupo Jari and to the Fundação Jari, which use this data to define actions implemented in the field, either with a view to punishing perpetrators and expelling invaders, as well as to establish dialogue and provide training for local communities that eventually are responsible for the fires.	

RINA is able to conclude that PP has identified the natural and human-induced risks to the expected project benefits and the actions taken to mitigate such risks are adequate.

4.3.3 Community and Biodiversity Benefit Permanence (G1.11)

The measures implemented to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime, as identified by the project proponent (as stated in section 2.2.7 of the MR /1/) is reasonable and ensures the continuity of the project beyond the project lifetime. The measures include improvement in patrimonial surveillance procedures, strengthening of the Fundação Jari, technical chamber of REDD+, technical assistance and rural extension service, workshops and training in agroforestry and farming techniques, family assessment and monitoring of socioeconomic development, nursery of native forest seedlings and planting in degraded areas and greater scientific knowledge on biodiversity and maintenance of high conservation value attributes.

The MR presents a clear description of the measures which are already implemented and the ones that are still in the implementation phase.

4.3.4 Stakeholder Access to Information (G3.1- G3.3)

The access of project documents to the stakeholder is described in section 2.3.1 to section 2.3.6 of the MR /1/. The PP has provided the information through writing (printed version of all project related document available at Fundação Jari office), virtual (all information available on Verra and Biofílica websites) and oral (through consultations and one to one meetings) /30/.

RINA verified that full project documentation has been made accessible to communities and other stakeholders. The MR summarizes how the informative meetings allow sharing project information with local communities and other stakeholder. The project information is prepared in Portuguese which is the relevant language for local stakeholders.

The project information including potential costs, risks and benefits to communities due to the project is well described.

Appropriate actions were taken to explain the verification process to communities and other stakeholders. PP has made public notice informing the remote audit of verification team in advance. The public notice was sent to Verra as well. Hence accepted by the verification team. This indicator is sufficiently addressed by the PP in the MR /1/.

4.3.5 Stakeholder Consultation (G3.4 – G3.5)

As per the MR /1/ and interview with the local people /97/ - /129/, it is confirmed that several local stakeholder meeting with the communities and relevant stakeholder were carried out during the monitoring period.

The verification team has also reviewed the adaptive management plan and its implementation where several actions were continued to include the communities and relevant stakeholder.

The monitoring report discusses the way stakeholders were involved in the project design initially. It also lists the ongoing meetings with different stakeholders. Meetings regarding design and implementation of benefit sharing arrangements are included. Community members are involved in land use planning and the monitoring methods and results were also discussed with them, which is being facilitated by the PP as a project activity.

During the remote audit Interviews with community members and their legitimate representatives and project team /97/ - /129/, indicate that the communities are still involved with the project implementation, including regarding the benefits they would like to see from the project. Requests from community members are being considered. Adequate levels of information are reaching stakeholders. Communication between the project and communities is on regular basis, strong and open, by all appearances. Stakeholders seem to be generally satisfied, with the project during this monitoring period.

This indicator is sufficiently addressed by the PP in the MR /1/. Hence accepted by the verification team.

4.3.6 Stakeholder Participation in Decision-making and Implementation (G3.6)

The step has been clearly explained in section 2.3.10 of the MR /1/. During the remote audit and the supporting documents assessed, it was found that the measures by the PP has enabled effective participation of all communities that want and need to be involved in project implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

4.3.7 Anti-discrimination (G3.7)

Grupo Jari has established company policies to prevent discrimination and outline a course of action, should it occur. The policy provides a clear statement on discrimination relating to gender, religion or sexual discrimination. The VVB checked the commitment of Group Jari with policy of human rights and social responsibility, in internal norms such as the Integrated policy of the management system /12/ and the Group Jari principles and general rules of conduct /13/.

The project has a policy of Conduct, and its guidelines expressed rejection to any act of discrimination type: racial, color, nationality, age, religious, sexual orientation, mental or physical disability, moral or sexual harassment. The scope of this policy involves all the staff of the project and is intended to guide and direct the attitude of all employees of the Group Jari relation to contact with internal, external and community audiences. The human rights policy of the PP Company has been reviewed and assessed by the VVB and guarantee that no type of discrimination is tolerated at any point of the project development.

This indicator is sufficiently addressed by the PP in the MR /1/.

During this monitoring period no incident related to this criterion was observed based on the interviews with the staff and community.

4.3.8 Stakeholder Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure (G3.8)

The VVB checked the procedures mentioned in section 2.3.12 of the MR /1/, Conflict Management Procedure /14/ and Procedures of Communication with Stakeholders /15/ and confirms that the description in the MR is correct /1/. During the remote audit, it also saw the “Speak with us” forms /74/ and boxes around Fundação Jari.

4.3.9 Worker Relations (G3.9 – G3.12)

By continuous interaction with the community the project ensures that all members of local communities have the same opportunity to attend capacity building workshops and participate in demonstrational activities, regardless of race, religion, sexual orientation, or gender. Based on the interview with the

management, it is understood that the employees are selected on the basis of their qualifications, skills and experience. The community members were provided with job opportunities without any discrimination of race, gender, sexual orientation, color, religion, age, ethnic origin, physical or mental disability or social class.

Equity of gender policy is practiced by the PP. During the remote audit, through interviews with project staff and villagers, the verification team has confirmed the same.

The details of all applicable laws were assessed and all these laws aim to achieve justice in the relations arising between employers and workers, under a spirit of economic coordination and social balance /75/ /76/. All hiring processes that occur inside the project are governed by the labor code, in addition to the internal quality system that has processes and procedures associated with the management of human resources. All workers employed have a contract, in which its duties, rights and laws that protect them are reported.

It is clear to the VVB team that the project is building local capacity through job skills training /16/ which is on-going and also conclude that the relationship between workers and the project upholds the intent and design presented in the validated project description.

Verification team checked all documents included in section 2.3.16 regarding to occupational safety assessment /12/ /16/ /33/-/41/ in order to confirm that all positions and situations that could provide some type of occupational hazard were profoundly avoided and mitigated.

4.3.10 Management Capacity (G4.2 – G4.3)

This has been explained in section 2.4.1 to section 2.4.5 of the MR /1/. The same has been checked and verified during the remote audit. In the opinion of VVB, the PP and its team has robust management team experience to ensure successful implementation and sustainability of the project.

The financial health of the implementing organization is adequate to support project implementation. The financial audits of the company /80/ /84/ since the project has started and confirms financial health of the PP. Documents supporting these investments can be produced to the project auditor for inspection /80/ /84/. The project partners are all well-funded, sufficiently capitalized organizations.

The VVB has checked and assessed the company policies /14/ /15/ /17/ and found that that its resources are allocated responsibly and free of corruption. Additionally, the project complies with all law and regulation of the host country including anti-corruption law /77/.

4.3.11 Commercially Sensitive Information (*Rules* 3.5.13 – 3.5.14)

Commercially sensitive information has been listed in the MR version 1.0 /1/ and provided to the VVB. During this verification report, RINA has reviewed the documents which can be classified as commercially sensitive information.

4.3.12 Rights Protection and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (G5.1-G5.5)

During the remote audit it was found that the:

- The project zone is represented by a private property. The land documents were provided by the PP for the same.
- The project does not invade any community property or government property.
- Project was not complicit of involuntary relocation of property rights holders, as well as activities important to the culture and livelihoods of communities living within the boundaries of the project area were respected and supported by the project.
- There are no illegal activities inside the Project Zone or in neighboring areas.
- In the project zone there are no ongoing or unresolved disputes or conflicts regarding rights to lands. All the activities produced by the project has produced only benefits to the stakeholders and no action can create any kind of dispute.

Hence concluded, that the project has protected the rights of indigenous peoples, communities and other stakeholders in accordance to the third edition of the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards and the validated project description.

4.3.13 Legal Status (G5.6)

Regarding to REDD+ activities, there are no applicable laws nationally regulating this subject. The MR listed all federal and state level regulations and laws. The monitoring report lists all the applicable national and local laws and regulations that are relevant to project activities, including labor laws. The same /78/ /79/ as been assessed by the VVB. It states the project is in compliance with these laws and regulations. The verification team finds that the project does not violate any local or national laws or regulations. Staff are aware of their rights and duties.

4.4 Climate

4.4.1 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

• Baseline Carbon Stock Change:

The formulae and values used for calculating total net carbon stock changes in the baseline scenario, for the project area (**Total net ΔCBSLPA**) and in the leakage belt area (**Total net ΔCBSLLK**), for the years 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018, were already validated /71//68/. Therefore, during the verification these values were crosschecked with the values in the registered PD /71/. The actual values verified are presented in section 4.4.2 of this report together with the ex-ante parameters used in the spreadsheet calculations of this monitoring period /2/ and reported in the MR version 1 of 23 August 2020 /1/, which were also verified against values in the PD /71/.

CAR10 was raised here to ask the PP to explain in the MR the formula used to calculate baseline changes in carbon stock in the Leakage Belt area. The PP inserted an explanation in the MR about the fact that

equation 10 of the VM0015 version 1.1 was used to calculate baseline net carbon stock change in the for both Project and Leakage Belt areas. Such a formula is as follows.

$$\Delta CBSLPA_t = \sum_{p=1}^{P}\left(\sum_{icl=1}^{Icl} ABSLPA_{icl,t} * \Delta Cp_{icl,t=t*} - \sum_{z=1}^{Z} ABSLPA_{z,t} * \Delta Cp_{z,t=t*} + \sum_{icl=1}^{Icl} ABSLPA_{icl,t-1} * \Delta Cp_{icl,t=t*+1} - \sum_{z=1}^{Z} ABSLPA_{z,t-1} * \Delta Cp_{z,t=t*+1} + \sum_{icl=1}^{Icl} ABSLPA_{icl,t-2} * \Delta Cp_{icl,t=t*+2} - \sum_{z=1}^{Z} ABSLPA_{z,t-2} * \Delta Cp_{z,t=t*+2} + \cdots + \sum_{icl=1}^{Icl} ABSLPA_{icl,t-19} * \Delta Cp_{icl,t=t*+19} - \sum_{z=1}^{Z} ABSLPA_{z,t-19} * \Delta Cp_{z,t=t*+19}\right)$$

Where:

$\Delta CBSLPA_t$: Total baseline carbon stock change within the project area at year *t* (tCO_2-e);

$ABSLPA_{icl,t}$: Area of initial forest class *icl* deforested at time *t* within the project area in the baseline case (ha);

$ABSLPA_{icl,t-1}$: Area of initial forest class *icl* deforested at time *t*-1 within the project area in the baseline case (ha);

$ABSLPA_{icl,t=t-19}$: Area of initial forest class *icl* deforested at time *t*-19 within the project area in the baseline case (ha);

$\Delta Cp_{icl,t=t*}$: Average carbon stock change factor for carbon pool pin the initial forest class *icl* applicable at time *t* (as per Table 20.a) (tCO_2-e.ha^{-1});

$\Delta Cp_{icl,t=t*+19}$: Average carbon stock change factor for carbon pool pin the initial forest class *icl* applicable at time t=t*+19 (20thyear after deforestation, (as per Table 20.a) (tCO_2-e.ha^{-1});

$ABSLPA_{z,t}$: Area of the zone *z* "deforested" at time *t* within the project area in the baseline case (ha);

$ABSLPA_{z,t-1}$: Area of the zone *z* "deforested" at time *t*-1 within the project area in the baseline case (ha);

$ABSLPA_{z,t-19}$: Area of the zone *z* "deforested" at time *t*-19 within the project area in the baseline case (ha);

$\Delta Cp_{z,t=t*}$: Average carbon stock change factor for carbon pool pin zone *z* applicable at time *t* = *t** (as per Table 20.b) (tCO_2-e.ha^{-1});

$\Delta Cp_{z,t=t+1}$: Average carbon stock change factor for carbon pool pin zone *z* applicable at time *t* = *t**+1 ((=2ndyear after deforestation, as per Table 20.b) (tCO_2-e.ha^{-1});

$\Delta Cp_{z,t=t*+19}$: Average carbon stock change factor for carbon pool pin zone *z* applicable at time *t* = *t**+19 ((=20thyear after deforestation, as per Table 20.b) (tCO_2-e.ha^{-1}).

• Project Emissions:

The calculation of the ex post net carbon stock change in the project area under the project scenario is as follows.

$\Delta CPSPAt = \Delta CUDdPAt + \Delta CPAdPAt - \Delta CPAiPAt$

Where,

$\Delta CPSPAt$ Sum ex post actual carbon stock changes in the project area at year t in tCO_2e

$\Delta CUDdPAt$ Total ex post actual carbon stock change due to unavoidable unplanned deforestation

at year t in the project area in tCO_2e

$\Delta CPAdPAt$ Total decrease in carbon stock due to all planned activities at year t in the project

Area in tCO_2e

$\Delta CPAiPAt$ Total increase in carbon stock due to all planned activities at year t in the project area in tCO_2e

As the Project foresees no planned activities that will result in increased carbon stocks the last part of the equation (- $\Delta CPAiPAt$) was 0. This is considered conservative by the applied methodology. So, the formula becomes:

$\Delta CPSPAt = \Delta CUDdPAt + \Delta CPAdPAt$

1) Unplanned:

a) The carbon stock decrease due to unplanned deforestation in the project area was calculated using the following equation:

$$\Delta\,\mathrm{CUDdPA}_t = \sum_{y=1}^{t}\left(\sum_{icl=1}^{icl} AUDPA_{icl,y} * \Delta Ctot_{icl,t-y} - \sum_{fcl=1}^{fcl} AUDPA_{fcl,y} * \Delta Ctot_{fcl,t-y}\right)$$

Where,

ΔCUDdPAt Total ex post actual carbon stock changes due to unavoidable unplanned deforestation in the project area at year t in tCO_2e

AUDPAicl, t Area of unplanned deforestation in forest class icl at year t in the project area in ha

Δctot icl, Ac Lost carbon stock in the initial forest class icl at the age of change Ac (number of years after the change of use and soil cover) in tCO_2;

AUDPAfcl, t Areas of post deforestation in the project area at time t in ha

Δctotfcl, Ac: Gained carbon stock in the post deforestation area at the age of change Ac (number of years after the change of use and soil cover) in tCO_2.

Both unplaned deforestation area (AUDPAicl,t) and the carbon stock lost in that area (*Ctot icl, Ac)* values and assessment are reported in section 4.4.2 below**.** The former in "*Parameters and Data Monitored*" and the latter in *"Parameters Available at Validation and Fixed Ex-ante"*. The area of unplanned deforestation (*AUDPAicl, t)* becomes the post deforestation area (*AUDPAfcl,t),* as soon as it is deforested. In the year subsequent to deforestation, this area is multiplied by the post deforestation carbon stock increase per year (to account for regeneration), which is calculated according to the applied methodology and the VCS Errata-and-Clarifications-VM0015-v1.1 using the Ctot*fcl*, Ac value reported below in section 4.4.2 in "*Parameters Available at Validation and Fixed Ex-ante*".

The calculation for the value of **ΔCUDdPAt** was verified in the ERs spreadsheets /2/ and the following values confirmed. Project Year t	$\Delta CUDdPA_t$ Annual (tCO_2e)
2014	54,448
2015	72,966
2016	19,931
2017	48,677
2018	35,116

Non-CO_2 emissions from forest fires are not accounted for as the PP justified in table 16 of the registered PD /71/, which shows the included and excluded sources of GHG within the boundary of the proposed Project activity, that this source of emissions were not considered significant. This information was already is in accordance with section 1.4 of the applied methodology VM0015. Any CO_2 emissions from burning would be captured by satellite images and accounted for as unplanned deforestation. Furthermore, the PP stated no catastrophic forest fires were observed in the PA.

2) Planned Activities:

a) Planned Deforestation:

The carbon stock decrease, and therefore emissions, due to planned deforestation in the project area were calculated using the following equation:

$\Delta CPDdPA\boldsymbol{t} = (APDPA\boldsymbol{icl},\boldsymbol{t} \times Ctot\boldsymbol{icl})$

Where,

***ΔCPD*d*PA*t** Total decrease in carbon stock due to planned deforestation at year t in the project area; tCO2e

APDPAicl,t Areas of planned deforestation in forest class icl at year t in the project area; ha

Ctoticl Average carbon stock of all accounted carbon pools of forest class icl at time t; tCO2e/ha

Both planned deforestation area **APDPAicl,t** and average carbon stock **Ctoticl** values and assessment are reported in section 4.4.2 below. The former in "*Parameters and Data Monitored*" and the latter in *"Parameters Available at Validation and Fixed Ex-ante"*.

For ***ΔCPDdPA*t** the following results were verified in the ERs spreadsheets /2/:

Project Year t	annual ΔCPDdPA$_t$ tCO_2e
2014	0
2015	0
2016	0
2017	0
2018	21,108
2019	0

b) Planned logging activities

CAR12 was raised to ask the PP about not estimating the total carbon stock decrease due to planned logging activities. PP pointed out that according to the validated PD-VCS (p. 51), the carbon pool harvested wood products was excluded because it demonstrated then that in the Baseline scenario long-lived wood products were lower than in the Project scenario. The VVB checked the registered PD /71/ and confirmed the information.

c) Planned degradation

Although an option given by the methodology as a Project Activity, charcoal production or firewood collection were not planned for the project activity as per section 3.2 of the PD /71/ and the MR informed there were no activities in the project area of fuel wood collection and charcoal production activities in the project area.

- Leakage

Leakage formula used was:

$$\Delta CBSLLK_t = \sum_{y=1}^{t}\left(\sum_{icl=1}^{icl} AUDLK_{icl,y} * \Delta Ctot_{icl,t-y} - \sum_{fcl=1}^{fcl} AUDLK_{fcl,y} * \Delta Ctot_{fcl,t-y}\right)$$

Where:

$\Delta CBSLLK_t$: Total carbon stock changes due to unavoidable unplanned deforestation in the area of the Leakage Belt in year *t*;

$AUDLK_{icl,y}$: Unplanned deforestation area in the initial forest class *icl* in year t in the area of the Leakage Belt in the Project scenario;

$\Delta Ctot_{icl,Ac}$: Loss in the carbon stock in the initial forest class *icl* at the age of change *Ac* (number of years after the change of LU/LC);

$AUDLK_{fcl,y}$: Post deforestation non-forest class area *fcl* in year *t* in the Leakage Belt after unplanned deforestation in the Project scenario;

$\Delta Ctot_{fcl,Ac}$: Gain in carbon stock in the final post deforestation non-forest class *fcl* at the age of change *Ac* (number of years after the change of LU/LC).

Activity data for the leakage belt area was determined using the same methods applied to determine unplanned deforestation mapping in the Project area. $Ctot_{icl,Ac}$ is also the same as in project area. The results for the above formula are pending CAR13. Even though verified deforested area in the leakage belt during the audit is slightly bigger then deforested area reported in the MR, it is still smaller then area projected in the baseline. Therefore, as $\Delta Ctot_{icl,Ac}$ is fixed, it is expected that the returned ex post net carbon stock change of the leakage belt area to be smaller than the estimated ex ante net carbon stock change of the leakage belt area /71/. This was actually confirmed with the closure of CAR13 (for details see Appendix 2). Therefore, no leakage emissions need to be considered in the calculations. This is in accordance with the applied methodology VCS VM0015 Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation version 1.1 of 03 December 2012.

- Summary of net GHG emission reductions or removals.

According to the applied methodology VM0015 version 1.1 and calculation spreadsheets /2/, the emission reductions are the baseline subtracting project emissions and leakage emissions. It is calculated as follows:

ΔREDDt = (ΔCBSLPAt – ΔCPSPAt) – (ΔCLKt + ELKt)

Where:

ΔREDDt Ex post estimated net anthropogenic greenhouse gas emission reduction attributable to the AUD project activity at year t; tCO2e

ΔCBSLPAt Sum of baseline carbon stock changes in the project area at year t; tCO2e

ΔCPSPAt Sum of ex post estimated actual carbon stock changes in the project area at year t; tCO2e

ΔCLKt Sum of ex post estimated leakage net carbon stock changes at year t; tCO2e

ELKt Sum of ex post estimated leakage emissions at year t; tCO2e

Regarding the number of Verified Carbon Units (VCUs) to be generated through the proposed **AUD** project activity per year were calculated as follows:

VCUt = ΔREDDt – VCBt

VCBt = (ΔCBSLPAt – ΔCPSPAt) x RFt

Where:

VCUt Number of Verified Carbon Units that can be traded at time t; tCO2e

Note: If **VCUt** < 0 no credits (VCUs) will be awarded to the proponents of the AUD project activity.

The values for each of the parameters in the formula used to calculate ΔREDDt are reported in section 4.4.2 below.

4.4.2 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

Below is a table with the values for the ex-ante total net carbon stock changes in the baseline scenario, for the project area **(Total Net ΔCBSLPA)** and in the leakage belt area **(Total Net ΔCBSLLK)**, for the years 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019, which, as mentioned in section 4.4.1, were already validated /68//71/. Therefore, during the verification, these values, as well as the ex-ante parameters used in the spreadsheet calculations of this monitoring period /2/ and reported in the MR v1 of 23 August 2020 /1/, were crosschecked against values in the registered PD /71/.

• Parameters Available at Validation and Fixed Ex-ante

Parameter (see PD for descriptions)	Source of data	Value reported in MR	Verified value	Assessment/Observation
Total Net ΔCBSLPA 2014 (tCO2)	PD v1.4 (as explained in section 4.4.1. of this report, these values were validated already and were	274,059	274,059	/1//3/
Total Net ΔCBSLPA 2015 (tCO2)		381,495	381,495	

Total Net ΔCBSLPA 2016 (tCO2)	calculated from estimated total areas of deforestation in the baseline and parameters fixed ex-ante in the registered PD).	336,148	336,148	
Total Net ΔCBSLPA 2017 (tCO2)		362,030	362,030	
Total Net ΔCBSLPA 2018 (tCO2)		358,795	358,795	
Total Net ΔCBSLPA 2019 (tCO2)		313,874	313,874	
Total Net ΔCBSLLK 2014 (tCO2)		426,968	426,968	
Total Net ΔCBSLLK 2015 (tCO2)		370,494	370,494	
Total Net ΔCBSLLK 2016 (tCO2)		344,804	344,804	
Total Net ΔCBSLLK 2017 (tCO2)		336,427	336,427	
Total Net ΔCBSLLK 2018 (tCO2)		351,710	351,710	
Total Net ΔCBSLLK 2019 (tCO2)		374,880	374,880	
Ctot, fcl	PD v1.4	566	566	/1//3/
CF	Nogueira et al. (2008)	0.485	0.485	
CO2 to 64arbono ratio	Scientific literature: 2006	44/12	44/12	

	IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Volume 4 AFOLU			

- Parameters and Data Monitored

Data/Parameter	**Deforestation in the project area / AUDPAicl,t** (as per monitoring plan of the PD v1.4 and section 4.2 of this report) / **ABSLPA$_{icl,t}$** (as per MR v5 monitoring plan)
Data Unit	Hectare (ha)
Description	Areas of forest cover converted into non-forest cover areas within the Project Area of the Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project at time t
Source of data	Vector data from PRODES, derived from Satellite Images
Value data for the monitoring period	

Project year$_t$	AUDPAicl,t reported in MR v1 and MRv5 (ha)	AUDPAicl,t verified during audit (ha)
2014	140	122
2015	71	163
2016	19	37
2017	103	103
2018	74	69
2019	80	80

Frequency of monitoring/recording	Annual
Monitoring equipment and its accuracy	Images of remote sensing of digital processing program, geographic information system.
QA/QC procedures to be applied	The PP used PRODES images of 30m to construct a confusion matrix to evaluate the accuracy of the PRODES classification. For each class of land use it used QGIS to generate a shape with random points. A total of 220 points were generated and the classification from PRODES was checked against 10m Sentinel images visually. The classification carried out with Sentinel was then passed on to ArcGis and with both classifications in the attribute tables they were then extracted to excel spreadsheet "ACCURACYASSESSM.xls" /4/ and the confusion matrix built and analysed. The accuracy calculated was of 83% so greater than the accuracy established at the PD which states it should come to a minimum accuracy of 80%. Nevertheless, the PD v1.4 states that "the assessment of the classifications will be carried out through data collection in the field using GPS navigation". CAR13 was closed as some visits are carried out in deforested areas to help Sentinel classification. Nevertheless FAR 4 was opened so that the PP includes areas which are not deforested in the classification checking process.
Purpose of Data	Calculation of project emissions
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked ?	Rina verified that vector data of deforested areas from satellite images in the state of Amapá for the year 2014 to 2018 can be downloaded from the website: http://terrabrasilis.dpi.inpe.br/downloads/ . Rina verified that the PP georeferenced satellite images to WGS84 and cut the images into PA with QGIS. The values were then extracted from the attribute tables of the shape files of the newly cut PA images to a spreadsheets and the areas of deforestation for each respective year calculated. The PP repeated the calculations from the extracted values of shapefiles to the "Verif_PRODES_PA_2018_AUDIT DAY" during site visit and the resulting values were as per the ones reported above.

Data/Parameter	Deforestation in the leakage belt AUDLKicl,t (as per monitoring plan of the PD v1.4) **ABSLLK$_{icl,t}$** (as per MP of MR)
Data Unit	Hectare (ha)
Description	Areas of forest cover converted into non-forest cover areas within the leakage belt of the Jari/Pará REDD+ Project
Source of data	Vector data from PRODES, derived from Satellite Images
Value data for the monitoring period	

Project year$_t$	AUDLKicl,t reported in MR v1 and MR v5 (ha)	AUDLKicl,t verified during audit (ha)
2014	111	117
2015	73	204
2016	34	33
2017	97	95
2018	87	87
2019	15	15

Frequency of monitoring/recording	Annual
Monitoring equipment and its accuracy	Images of remote sensing of digital processing program, geographic information system.
QA/QC procedures to be applied	The PP built used PRODES images of 30m and constructed a confusion matrix to evaluate the accuracy of the PRODES classification. For each class of land use it used QGIS to generate

	a shape with random points. A total of 220 points were generated and the classification from PRODES was checked against 10m Sentinel images visually. The classification carried out with Sentinel was then passed on to ArcGis and with both classifications in the attribute tables they were then extracted to excel spreadsheet "ACCURACYASSESSM.xls" /4/ and the confusion matrix built and analysed. The accuracy calculated was of 83% so greater than the accuracy established at the PD which states it should come to a minimum accuracy of 80%. Nevertheless, the PD v1.4 states that "the assessment of the classifications will be carried out through data collection in the field using GPS navigation". CAR13 was closed as some visits are carried out in deforested areas to help Sentinel classification. Nevertheless FAR 4 was opened so that the PP includes areas which are not deforested in the classification checking process.
Purpose of Data	Calculation of leakage emissions
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked ?	Rina verified that vector data of deforested areas from satellite images in the state of Amapá for the year 2014 to 2018 can be downloaded from the website: http://terrabrasilis.dpi.inpe.br/downloads/ . Rina verified that the PP georeferenced satellite images to WGS84 and cut the images into LK area with QGIS. The values were then extracted from the attribute tables of the shape files of the newly cut LK images to a spreadsheets and the areas of deforestation for each respective year calculated. The PP repeated the calculations from the extracted values of shapefiles to the "Verif_PRODES_LB_2018_AUDIT DAY" during site visit and the resulting values were as per the ones reported above.

Data/Parameter	Ctot
Data Unit	$tCO_2e.ha^{-1}$
Description	Average carbon stock per hectare in all carbon pools in the Forest class used at baseline scenario

Source of data	Calculated by allometric equations, expansion factors from scientific literature, and data measured in the field.
Value data for the monitoring period	566 $tCO_2e\ ha^{-1}$
Frequency of monitoring/recording	One year before harvest. At one, three and five-year intervals after the UPA harvesting.
Monitoring equipment and its accuracy	N/A
QA/QC procedures to be applied	See the document: - VCS-MR-jariamapa-2014-2019.xlxs /2/.
Purpose of Data	Calculation of project emissions and leakage.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked ?	RINA verified the documents listed below in order to confirm the estimated value applied. Estimativa do Estoque de Carbono Florestal para o Projeto Jari/Amapá. - PMFS – Amapá - Section 3.1 of the Project Description /71/; -Tabela_Estoque_TDR4_2013.xlsx

Data/Parameter	DBH
Data Unit	cm
Description	Diameter at Breast Height (130 cm) for each tree with DBH equal or higher than 15cm in each plot of the forest inventory.
Source of data	Calculated from the circumference at breast height measured in the field.
Value data for the monitoring period	See the document: - Inventário 100%_POA 01.xlsx /45/.
Frequency of monitoring/recording	One year before harvest. At one, three and five-year intervals after the UPA harvesting. As the harvest of UPA 01 has not yet been completed within the monitored period, only pre exploration data are presented.

Monitoring equipment and its accuracy	Calculated from the circumference at breast height data measured in the field. A team of 32 people was used, equipped with: knives, tape, pen, paper, clipboard, hammer, nails and aluminum plugs numbered, each tree measured was identified by popular name.
QA/QC procedures to be applied	The main target of the inventory were the forest species of recognized market acceptance such as Angelim, Maçaranduba, Cumaru, Jatobá, Sucupira, Cupiúba, but also all species with potential for commercialization in the region were inventoried, which had a diameter equal or superior to 40 cm. The circumference of the measuring point was collected (1.30m from the ground or above any irregularity), using a tape. The commercial height was estimated comparing it with 4 m logs.The trunk quality was defined by 1- Fully usable, 2-Partially usable and 3- Unusable. The spatial location was determined with the aid of orientation pickets, collecting the X and Y coordinates, noting the data in appropriate field spreadsheets. After identification and measurement, each tree was identified with a aluminum plug numbered, which was fixed with nail in a visible and easily accessible place at its base. See the document: - POA-Agregue versão 70inal_02.pdf /53/.
Purpose of Data	Estimation of loss and/or regeneration of forest individuals in management areas
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked ?	The verification team checked the inventory.

Data/Parameter	Planned deforestation to build Forest Management infrastructure ($APDPA_{icl,t}$)		
Data Unit	Hectare (ha)		
Description	Map of forest cover areas converted into non-forest areas due to the construction of forest management roads, trails and forest patios.		
Source of data			
Value data for the monitoring period		Project Year *t*	Areas of planned deforestation in the project area (ha)

	2014	0
	2015	0
	2016	0
	2017	0
	2018	37
	2019	0

Frequency of monitoring/recording	During the year of management of each UPA.
Monitoring equipment and its accuracy	Field card and geographic information system.
QA/QC procedures to be applied	Further information on QA/QC available in: • PMFS – Amapá; • PA-MFS – Trails planning; • PA-MFS – Clearing planning; • PA – Road Clearing and Maintenance Planning; • PA MFS – Monitoring of Road Openings.
Purpose of Data	Calculation of project emissions
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked ?	The audit team checked the new map with the areas of planned deforestation (roads plus patios) and coordinates sent by Agregue /85/ and compared it with the shapes with the calculated areas /86/. The audit team confirms that the planned deforested area in the shape files, which in turn is confirmed by the Agregue map coordinates, comes to 37ha. This value was updated in the Ers calculation spreadsheets v2 /2/.

Data/Parameter	$\Delta CabBSLLK_t$
Data Unit	tCO_2-e

Description	Total carbon stock changes in the leakage belt area
Source of data	Calculated
Value data for the monitoring period	No leakage was identified during the monitored period.
Frequency of monitoring/recording	Annually
Monitoring equipment and its accuracy	Images of remote sensing of digital processing program and calculation tables.
QA/QC procedures to be applied	Images with special resolution of 30 m or more were used in the mapping and the minimum mapping unit is 1 ha. Classifications were assessed through data collected in the field using GPS navigation. The minimum accuracy of use classification map and ground cover is 80%.
Purpose of Data	Leakage
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked ?	The verification team checked images of remote sensing.

Data/Parameter	Methane (CH4) and nitrous oxidate (N2O) emissions from livestock
Data Unit	tCO2-e /yr
Description	Emissions from grazing animals in leakage management areas at year t
Source of data	Reports from Fundação Jari and geographic information system
Value data for the monitoring period	The PP confirmed in the answer to CL5 that the Project did not stimulate, planned or implemented the introduction of grazing animals in the leakage management areas. For more details see appendix 2.

Frequency of monitoring/recording	Annually
Monitoring equipment and its accuracy	Field spreadsheets
QA/QC procedures to be applied	N/A
Purpose of Data	Project Emissions
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked ?	The PP confirmed in the answer to CL5 that the Project did not stimulate, planned or implemented the introduction of grazing animals in the leakage management areas. For more details see appendix 2.

- Monitoring Plan

The VVB verified the monitoring plan for climate impacts described in section 3.1.3.3 of the MR /1/. As reported in the MR, during the monitored period the project encompassed the monitoring of complementary REDD+ activities with the objective of avoiding unplanned deforestation through intensified enforcement activities (increase frequency and scope), monitoring of forest cover through satellite images, and social inclusion of communities in the Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project's area of influence. The proponents were responsible for managing the monitoring of REDD+ activities, which aim to avoid unplanned deforestation and quantify the emissions avoided by the project. This process was carried out by verifying the change of use of forest cover areas using satellite images available from the PRODES Project in the period from 2014 to 2019.

Additionally, since the PRODES data used to account for the project emissions did not cover the period from 16 October 2019 to 16 April 2020, coinciding with the CCB monitoring, an analysis of the monitored areas was performed with satellite imagery. The analysis was performed by evaluating the Sentinel-2 satellite image (04/21/2020), supported with images from the satellites LandSat-7 (05/08/2020), LandSat-8 (04/30/2020), and Sentinel-2 (05/01/2020) because of the high cloud cover in the region during the period.

The information provided has been reviewed by means of supporting evidences /96/. The VVB confirmed that no significant loss events occurred in the period and the emission estimate for the period, when compared to previous years, is within expectations. With this analysis it was possible to verify the maintenance of the net benefits on the climate maintained by the project in the period covered only by the CCB monitoring period. More details are provided in section 4.8 of this report.

4.4.3 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

A) Internal Risks =		0
Project Management Risk factor from the Non-Permanence Risk Report	Risk Rating given by PP	Assessment
a)	0	Not applicable as described in the PD /71/ the project involves the maintenance of carbon stocks already in the project area;
b)	2	Ongoing enforcement is required to protect more than 50% of stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued; Non-Permanence Risk Report /3/ updated to version 2.1 and now reflects that "Ongoing enforcement is required to protect more than 50% of stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued". For more detail see CAR14.
c)	0	The audit team confirms that met or spoke to most of the management team and that it includes individuals with significant experience in all skills necessary to successfully undertake all project activities. Description of team members' experience are in pages 5 to 8 of the Non-permanence risk report. The audit team would still add to the list a very important member of the team from Fundação Jarí: Arnaldo Santos, the agronomist who has been interviewed and visited communities with the audit team while in Pará site visit. From the site visit it was observed that this member of the team has thorough knowledge of the resources in the area, receives great respect from communities and showed great respect towards communities.
d)	0	The audit team confirms from the site visit that Grupo Jari maintains a physical presence in the project site and that the team members that do have to travel from other parts of Brazil do not take more than a day to get there.
e)	-2	Management team includes individuals with significant experience in AFOLU project design and implementation, and in carbon accounting, under

		approved GHG programs. Description of team members' experience already validated above.
f)	-2	More objective evidence was listed in risk report and provided to VVB. Issue closed in CAR14.
Total score for Project Management	-2	OK
Financial Viability Risk factor from the Non-Permanence Risk Report	Risk Rating given by PP	Assessment
a)	0	No objective evidence was presented as to the project cash flow being between 4 to 5 year from the current risk assessment. CAR14. The VVB checked the validated financial analysis "Modelo REDD JARI AMAPA_adicionalidade e risco_CCBS_20150720" presented by the PP and mentioned in the Validation Report, and confirms that the payback time was in 5 years. In the same spreadsheet was the information that 16% of the cash outflow before payback was assured. Issue closed for more details see Appendix 2.
b)		
c)		
d)		
e)	0	PP has not provided evidence of projects breakeven point neither that Project has secured less than 15% of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven.
f)	2	
g)	0	
h)	0	
i)	0	No mitigation reported so nothing to verify.
Total Score for Financial Viability	2	OK
Opportunity Cost Risk factor from the Non-Permanence Risk Report	Risk Rating given by PP	Assessment
a)	0	The PP chose option d) "… or where baseline activities are subsistence-driven, net positive community impacts are demonstrated". Furthermore it mentions section 2.4 of the registered PD as evidence
b)		
c)		

d) e) f)		of baseline activities being subsistence driven. The VVB confirms that section 2.4 of the registered PD /71/ states that the baseline scenario comprises land production by extrativists and subsistence farmers with lands up to 200ha. With regards to the assessment of social and economic impacts of the project on social and economic well being of the communities who derive livelihoods from the project area the PP states that this has been demonstrated in section 6 of the registered PD. While it is ok to demonstrate the baseline scenario from registered PD the VVB is of the opinion that the assessment of the social and economic impacts of the project on communities who derive livelihoods from the project area should be based on present conditions as per section 2.1.1 of the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool /6/. From audit interview the VVB was able to partially assess that but requires the PP to list in the Non-Permanence Risk Report and provide the VVB with further analysis and evidence of the social and economic impacts of the project on communities who derive livelihoods from the project area as required by the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool. CAR14. Issue closed. For more details see CAR14 appendix 2
g)	0	PP claims that all or most project proponents are for-profit organizations.
h) i)	0 -8	The PP stated that the entire project area is protected by the Brazilian Forest Code (Law nº 12.651 of 25/05/2012). Please provide evidence. CAR14 The VVB checked the shapes of the declared area of reserve, in the shapefile “RL.shp”. The size of the reserve area in this shape file is 230,637ha, which corresponds to the area shown in the receipt of rural registration (CAR receipt). The VVB also checked that the area of reserve involves the project area shown in the shape “area_projeto.shp”. Issue closed. For more details see CAR14 appendix 2.
Total Score for Opportunity Cost	-8	OK
Project Longevity Risk factor from the Non-Permanence Risk Report	Risk Rating given by PP	Assessment

a)	0	The PP stated that the entire project area is protected by the Brazilian Forest Code (Law nº 12.651 of 25/05/2012). Please provide evidence. CAR14 The VVB checked the shapes of the declared area of reserve, in the shapefile "RL.shp". The size of the reserve area in this shape file is 230,637ha, which corresponds to the area shown in the receipt of rural registration (CAR receipt). The VVB also checked that the area of reserve involves the project area shown in the shape "area_projeto.shp". Issue closed. For more details see CAR14 appendix 2.
b)	15	
Total Score for Project Longevity	0	OK
B) External Risks = 0		
Land Tenure and Resource Access/Impacts Risk factor from the Non-Permanence Risk Report	Risk Rating given by PP	Assessment
a)	0	According to the registered PD /71/ Jari Group is the rightful owner of the land guaranteed through Land Title Deeds. According to the PPs hey do not lease the land and they hold the rights to use of resources. There are no disputes over access and use rights in the Jari/Pará Project area as the Group formally recognises access and use rights to local extractive communities and itinerary farmers. Although there are not conflicts (as seen from interviews with communities during the audit) these recognised communities also have legal rights to use of resources so the score here should be corrected to 0 for a) and 2 for b). CAR14 the VVB checked and the Non-Permanence Risk Report v2.1 /3/ was corrected to 2. Issue closed. For more details see CAR14 appendix 2.
b)	2	
c)	0	The PP stated in its Non-Permanence Risk Report that "There no exist disputes over land tenure or ownership, as set out by the document Project Description Section 1 – 1.12." However, the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool /62/, section 2.1.1, requires present conditions to be assessed and therefore the VVB requests further evidence that there is no actual legal disputes over tenure and ownership

		in no more than 5% of the project area in order to verify a 0 score in this item. CAR14 The PP provided evidence of a consultation carried out in the State of Amapá Court website /92/ displaying 5 court cases. The PP provided details of such court cases /93/ and the VVB confirms that these were checked and that none of these were to do with with property disputes. CAR14 closed and accept score zero.
d)	0	During the audit the VVB interviewed the president, the secretary and the treasurer of the Padaria Association of Residents and Extractivist Producers of Padaria Community (AMPECP), a representative of the Sindicate of Rural Workers of Vitória do Jarí (STTR VJ) and many community representatives who informed that Jarí recognizes their tenure, access and right of use, and Jari and them have a very good coexistence specially since Fundação Jarí was created.
e)	0	Not applicable
f)	-2	The PP stated that the entire project area is protected by the Brazilian Forest Code (Law nº 12.651 of 25/05/2012). For more details see CAR14 appendix 2.
g)	0	ok
Total Score for Land Tenure and Resource Access/Impacts	0	OK
Community Engagement Risk factor from the Non-Permanence Risk Report	Risk Rating given by PP	Assessment
a)	0	100 percent of communities and nearly 100 percent of households living within the project area who are reliant on the project area were consulted.
b)	5	Less than 20 percent of households living within 20 km of the project boundary outside the project area, and who are reliant on the project area, have been consulted

c)	-5	OK
Community Engagement	0	OK
Political Risk Risk factor from the Non-Permanence Risk Report	Risk Rating given by PP	Assessment
a)	0	The VVB checked the calculations in the Governance Indicator_BR.xlsx and confirms the score of 0,15 is calculated correctly. Please provide exact link where data on spreadsheet The Worldwide Governance Indicators.xlsx were downloaded from as the link in the tool is not accessible anymore. CAR14. Exact link was provided. For details see CAR14 in annex 2.
b)	0	
c)	2	
d)	0	
e)	0	
f)	-2	The audit team can confirm that Brazil has an established DNA under the CDM and has at least one registered CDM A/R project as the auditor has worked in its validation (CDM project AES Tietê Afforestation /Reforestation Project in the State of São Paulo, Brazil).
Political Risk	0	OK
C) Natural Risks =		1
Natural Risk Risk factor from the Non-Permanence Risk Report	Risk Rating given by PP	Assessment
Natural Risk	1	It in the public domain that the risk of natural fires is low in the Amazon forest and as an experienced environmental scientist and ecologist the auditor confirms that pests outbreaks happen in environments that area normally unbalanced (usually by heavy anthropogenic activity) which the auditor confirms is not the case for the Project Area (previous visit to the project area was carried out before the year of Covid 19 when audit was carried out online). In the same

		way, extreme local weather and geological risks (like plate tectonic movement) or other natural risks are not characteristic of the region.

Risk Category		Rating
A)	Internal risk	0
B)	External risk	0
C)	Natural Risk	1
Overall risk rating (A + B + C)		10

4.4.4 Dissemination of Monitoring Plan and Results (CL4.2)

As described in section 4.3.4 of this report, the verification team confirmed that the Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project has implemented three methods of communication, aiming to guarantee access to documents and all other information of the project to the communities and other stakeholders through writing (printed version of all project related document available at Fundação Jari office), virtual (all information available on Verra and Biofílica websites) and oral (through consultations and one to one meetings) /30/.

Appropriate actions were taken to explain the verification process and disseminate the monitoring plan and results of monitoring undertaken to communities and other stakeholders. This indicator is sufficiently addressed by the PP in the MR /1/.

4.4.5 Optional Gold Level: Climate Change Adaptation Measures (GL1.3)

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

4.5 Community

4.5.1 Community Impacts (CM2.1)

Section CM 2.1 of the MR /1/ identifies the communities based on the impacts and overall the community benefits all levels is positive. Six communities (Ramal França da Rocha, Igarapé das pacas, Nova Conquista, Água Azul, Tira Couro and Ramal Fé em Deus) were identified as applicable for this monitoring period. The impacts, type of benefit/cost/risk and change in well-being were clearly described in this section of MR. All listed communities were benefited by the implementation of priority projects /7/, technical assistance and rural extension services provided by the Fundação Jari /18/, participation of the technical

chambers /11/ /19/, participation in training and workshops on agroextractivist techniques /11/ and reception of seedlings for restoration of degraded areas and production /22/. The priority projects were developed from the process of transferring production technology to the families of the rural producers participating, through the provision of technical assistance and rural extension (TERA) services.

RINA was able to confirm this information verifying the priority projects documents /7/ and interview with selected families from these communities (Tira Couro /110/ /116/ /117/ /118/ /119/ /120/, Nova Conquista /113/ /114/ /125/ /126/, Água Azul /115/ /127/ /128/ and Ramal França da Rocha /108/).

Although the community Ramal do Retiro did not participate directly in the project activities, the community was also included in the assessment of the impacts, since it was directly impacted by the forest management activities. Two leader members of the community Ramal do Retiro /111/ /112/ were interviewed by RINA verification team in order to understand the impacts caused by the forest management activities in the community and how Fundação Jari was supporting the affected families.

4.5.2 Negative Community Impact Mitigation (CM2.2)

Verification team verified the actions taken by PPs to mitigate any negative well-being impacts on the communities participating in the project.

The most significant negative impact identified was the time spent in the development of the priority projects.

As stated in the MR, the potential risks that could cause some kind of negative impact, such as the lack of interest of stakeholders in participating in the activities, the increase in population migration in the project area due to the improvements caused by the project, and the reduction in natural resources due to the increase in illegal activities on the property, were mitigated according to the following measures:

- The VVB checked the involvement of various stakeholders in decision-making processes was guaranteed and encouraged, mainly by participating in the Technical Chambers /11/ /19/, as well as in workshops /11/, courses, training /11/ and diagnostics conducted by the Fundação Jari. In addition, the communication channels were constantly monitored and enhanced. Although these actions were carried out, some producers, who initially engaged in the project, lost interest in participating in the activities. In spite of this, the families that left the scope of the project did not cause any changes in the planned activities, and were not harmed because of this, and at the same time that there were dropouts, new families joined to participate in the project;

- In order to mitigate the risks of property invasion and to ensure that illegal activities that threatened natural resources did not occur, the project supported and gave all necessary support to the surveillance team to carry out their field patrols by river and land routes acting to combat illegal activities. In addition, as expected, population movement due to project activities and their related impacts did not occur because only established and consolidated communities in the area were able to participate in project activities. RINA confirmed through document review /25/ and interview with a member from the patrolling team /122/.

Regarding to the high conservation value areas, RINA verified that the analysis was not completed during this monitoring period. It was verified by RINA that the team from Agregue held a workshop in April 2020 /29/ (after the end of this monitoring period) with Ramal do Retiro community to raise the main demands

and prepare an action plan that will be implemented in the operations during the management of the other Annual production Units of the property. Two risks that were related to forest management activities were identified: concern about restricted access to the areas and possible damage that could be caused to the Brazil nut areas. As confirmed by the verification team through document review /24/ and interview with community leaders of Ramal do Retiro community /111/ /112/, these risks occurred during the management of the Annual Production Unit 1 that was carried out in 2018. The main impacts caused by the forest management were obstruction of tracks and losses of individuals (Brazil nuts).

4.5.3 Net Positive Community Well-being (CM2.3)

As per MR, the following positive impacts were provided:

I. Producers trained in better production techniques;

II. Access to technical assistance and rural extension services directed to the reality of each community;

III. Creation of new spaces for participation generating opportunities for direct communication with other stakeholders;

IV. Access to workshops and training in agroforestry and agricultural techniques, giving access to diverse productive technologies;

V. Increase knowledge and skills in agroforestry systems, agricultural production and REDD+;

VI. Knowledge in fire control and fire management techniques;

VII. Analysis of soils, fertilizers, genetic material and other selected seeds.

RINA was able to verify the positive impacts for the families assisted by the project through document review /11/ /19/ and interview with some families of different communities (Tira Couro /110/ /116/ /117/ /118/ /119/ /120/, Nova Conquista /113/ /114/ /125/ /126/, Água Azul /115/ /127/ /128/ and Ramal França da Rocha /108/).

4.5.4 Protection of High Conservation Values (CM2.4)

During the monitoring period the analysis of high conservation value areas (HCVAs) was not completed. From the information included in the MR /1/ and interview with stakeholders /111/ /112/, it was verified the impacts on Brazil nut areas caused by forest management.

RINA verified the information through the inventory carried out in the Annual Production Unit 01 by Agregue /26/, the Agregue Sustainable Forest Management Plan /27/, the map with the nut areas identified in the Ramal do Retiro community /28/.

The verification team interviewed two community leaders from Ramal do Retiro /111/ /112/ in order to confirm the impacts.

The main impacts caused by the forest management were obstruction of tracks and losses of individuals (Brazil nuts).

As mentioned in the MR /1/, in order to remediate the situation, the team from Agregue held a workshop in April 2020 /29/ (after the end of this monitoring period) with Ramal do Retiro community to raise the main demands and prepared an action plan that will be implemented in the operations during the management of the other Annual production Units of the property.

4.5.5 Other Stakeholder Impacts (CM3.2-CM3.3)

As stated in the MR /1/, there are no negative impacts of the project activities identified on the well-being other stakeholders. However, during the monitoring period, it was identified impacts caused to the community Ramal do Retiro, located in the project zone, due to the forest management activities. As mentioned in the MR /1/, in January 2020 the community members of Ramal do Retiro met with the Agregue company, with the mediation of the Fundação Jari, and in this event all the damage caused was exposed to those responsible for forest management, especially in relation to the areas where Brazil nuts are collected. In this event, it was decided to elect a committee representing the interests of the community, which was responsible for conducting the dialogue with the company in subsequent meetings. The main product of this dialog was the elaboration of an action plan that will be implemented immediately, depending basically on the availability of raw material.

The verification team agrees that the MR /1/ contains the information necessary to meet the requirements of this indicator. During the monitoring period, any questions, complaints, dissatisfactions, disagreements and confrontations of opinions on land, environmental or social issues that might occur were reported by the communities through the “Contact Us” channel, or through the “Stakeholders’ Comments Form”, available at Fundação Jari offices and transported with the technicians during their field activities. The verification team checked the records /21/ and confirmed that there is no negative impact caused by the project activities and confirmed that the project promoted inclusion and well-being communities and other stakeholders.

The MR /1/ also describes in section 4.2.2 the positive impacts on other stakeholders. During the remote audit, the verification team confirmed the benefits listed such as the facilitation in the access to technical assistance and rural extension services directed to the reality of each community, supporting the realization of sustainable agro-extractive practices; the opportunity to access workshops and training in agroforestry and agricultural techniques, introducing various production technologies, and knowledge about techniques to control burning and fire management; part of the communities present in the project zone have fishing as an important source of subsistence consumption, an activity preserved due to the maintenance of the water quality of the rivers, with the reduction of soil erosion; the agro-extractive activities carried out by the communities in the project zone are their main source of income, and due to the maintenance of genetic variability of plant and animal species, important for species resilience to pests and diseases, as well as the maintenance of water body volume flows, that ensuring water for irrigation and agricultural production, and the conservation of forest cover that acts as a protective shield against winds and storms, so common in the region, these factors form a favorable environment to carry out these activities, besides the constant support from the technical assistance actions.

4.5.6 Community Monitoring Plan (CM4.1, CM4.2, GL2.2, GL2.3, GL2.5)

The VVB verified that the community impact monitoring has not been carried out in accordance with the project’s validated design as described in section 4.5.1 of this report.

The information provided in section 4.3.1 of the MR has been reviewed by means of supporting evidences and interviews with staff and community. The various well-being programs such as Technical Chambers, workshops at community level, family assessment, training have helped in overall capacity development of the community. VVB has assessed the monitoring plan and found that monitoring indicators listed in the Appendix of MR are confirmed as consistent with the net positive change which created by the project. The dates, frequency and sampling methods used are not in accordance with the validated project description for some indicators as described in section 3.3 of this report.

In line with the information provided in the MR, there are several measures related to the maintenance or enhancement of HCVs related to community well-being.

RINA checked the rural activity license /42/, the approval of the sustainable forest management plan /43/, evidence of training in forest management /44/ and registry of forest management activity /45/.

For more information refer to Appendix 3.

4.5.7 Community Monitoring Plan Dissemination (CM4.3)

The local communities and other stakeholder were informed about the public consultation period /30/, the verification remote audit and the availability of the MR and summary in the web page of CCB through communication notes. Communication notes were sent to relevant stakeholders, in order to inform about the public comments period for the MR. The verification team has reviewed the copies of those communication notes. This indicator is sufficiently addressed by the PP in the MR.

4.5.8 Optional Gold Level: Short-term and Long-term Community Benefits (GL2.2)

Not applicable.

4.5.9 Optional Gold Level: Smallholder/community member Risks (GL2.3)

Not applicable.

4.5.10 Optional Gold Level: Marginalized and/or Vulnerable Community Groups (GL2.4)

Not applicable.

4.5.11 Optional Gold Level: Net Impacts on Women (GL2.5)

Not applicable.

4.5.12 Optional Gold Level: Benefit Sharing Mechanisms (GL2.6)

Not applicable.

4.5.13 Optional Gold Level: Governance and Implementation Structures (GL2.8)

Not applicable.

4.5.14 Optional Gold Level: Smallholders/Community Members Capacity Development (GL2.9)

Not applicable.

4.6 Biodiversity

4.6.1 Biodiversity Changes (B2.1)

As per MR, there are two indicators:

1. Reduction of unavoidable unplanned deforestation;
2. Biodiversity conservation.

The MR summarises the information on the decrease in the deforested area observed during this monitoring period based on satellite images. Moreover, the monitoring of both flora and fauna is recorded by means of the Biodiversity Monitoring Report /31/ in the project area. As the implemented plan has achieved the objective of the net biodiversity impacts which are overall positive, RINA considered the information in the MR sufficient as the project used appropriate methodologies to estimate changes in biodiversity, including assessment of predicted and actual, positive and negative, direct and indirect impacts, resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario in the project zone and over the project lifetime.

4.6.2 Mitigation Actions (B2.3)

Measures planned to mitigate negative impacts on biodiversity and for maintenance or enhancement of the High Conservation Value attributes are described in the MR /1/ such as prevention of predatory hunting, vegetation and genetic diversity and buffer zone. The details of the mitigation actions were verified during the interviews. The verification team confirmed that the actions taken to mitigate the negative impacts are in accordance with the project's validated project description.

4.6.3 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts (B2.2)

The MR summarizes the information on the increase in the vegetation observed during this monitoring period based on PRODES/INPE maps as compared to the baseline. Further the monitoring of both flora and fauna is recorded by means of sightings in the project area /31/. As the implemented plan has achieved the objective of the net biodiversity impacts which are overall positive, the information in the MR is sufficient to meet the requirements of this section.

4.6.4 High Conservation Values Protected (B2.4)

The high conservation value area is not negatively affected by the project as described in section 5.1.4 of the MR. The information was checked through documents review /31/ and through interviews /97/ /99/ /100/ /101/ /102/ /121/ /123/ during the remote audit.

4.6.5 Invasive Species (B2.5)

The project proponent provides a thorough explanation of possible adverse effects of non-native species used by the project on the region's environment especially in terms of native species. Likewise, the project

proponent also includes a reasonable argument justifying their use of non-native species. The project proponent cites valid references to support their claims and provides copies of these references /87/ /88/ as additional documentation.

4.6.6 Impacts of Non-native Species (B2.6)

It was confirmed during the remote audit that Group Jari does use non-native species in its agroforestry programs. However, these species are non-invasive and were introduced into Brazil as agricultural species over 50 years ago. This was verified during on- site assessment and by checking the monitoring records /22/.

4.6.7 GMO Exclusion (B2.7)

Based on evidences provided by PP /51/, RINA verified that GMO was never used or proposed to be used in the monitoring period. This indicator is sufficiently addressed in the MR.

4.6.8 Inputs Justification (B2.8)

As stated in the registered PD and MR, there will be no use of chemical pesticides, and biological control agents. The main fertilizer used in the project is the organic compost. This information was verified through the priority project reports /7/ and soil analysis /48/.

4.6.9 Negative Offsite Biodiversity Impacts (B3.1) and Mitigation Actions (B3.2)

There are no negative impacts on biodiversity as the implemented monitoring plan has an overall positive effect even outside the project area. As stated in the MR /1/, the project area is surrounded by protected areas, so the main positive impacts on biodiversity are the maintenance of an ecological corridor for biodiversity and the functioning of the project area as a buffer zone from the risks and threats to the mosaic of protected areas in southern of Amapá. Thus, no potential negative off-site impacts are identified for this monitoring period.

As there are no negative impacts on biodiversity, no mitigation measure planned by the PP. This indicator is sufficiently addressed by the PP in the MR.

4.6.10 Net Offsite Biodiversity Benefits (B3.3)

There are no negative impacts on biodiversity as the implemented monitoring plan has an overall positive effect even outside the project area.

4.6.11 Biodiversity Monitoring Plan (B4.1, B4.2, GL3.4)

The VVB verified that the biodiversity monitoring plan has not been carried out in accordance with the project's validated design.

The information provided in section 5.3.1 of the MR has been reviewed by means of supporting evidences and interviews with staff and community. VVB has assessed the monitoring plan and found that monitoring indicators listed in the Appendix of MR are confirmed as consistent with the net positive change which

created by the project. The dates, frequency and sampling methods used are not in accordance with the validated project description for some indicators as described in section 3.3 of this report.

For more information refer to Appendix 4.

4.6.12 Biodiversity Monitoring Plan Dissemination (B4.3)

The local communities and other stakeholder were informed about the public consultation period /30/, the verification remote audit and the availability of the MR and summary in the web page of CCB through communication notes. Communication notes were sent to relevant stakeholders, in order to inform about the public comments period for the MR. The verification team has reviewed the copies of those communication notes /30/ were provided to the verification team. This indicator is sufficiently addressed by the PP in the MR.

4.6.13 Optional Gold Level: Trigger Species Population Trends (GL3.3)

RINA checked the evidences /24/ /26/ /31/ /45/ /46/ /55/ provided in order to confirm the actions taken by the project to maintain or enhance the population status of each trigger species in the project zone, and reduce threats to them. The MR is transparent on the changes in population status and/or threats during the monitoring period and since the start of the project.

4.6.14 Optional Gold Level: Effectiveness of Threat Reduction Actions (GL3.4)

The MR clearly described the actions taken by the project to maintain or enhance the population status of trigger species.

4.7 Additional Project Implementation Information

RINA verified the additional information included in section 6.1 of the MR /1/ about analysis of land use and land cover changes during the monitoring period.

As stated in the MR /1/, the analysis of changes in land use and land cover during the monitoring period was carried out for the PRODES data. Data were available in vector format (shapefile) and matrix (raster) with spatial resolution of 30 meters. According to the methodology of PRODES /95/, these images undergo a geometric correction with displacement error of less than 1 pixel (30 x 30 m). These images cover the reference period (2014 to 2019) and can be located through four Path/Row in the Landsat scene 226/60 e 226/61. The main activities carried out by the PRODES system to monitor the forest cover of the Brazilian Amazon is detailed in section 6.1 of the MR /1/.

4.8 Additional Project Impact Information

RINA verified the additional information included in section 7.1 of the MR /1/ about the preliminary assessment performed within the project area and leakage belt between during the monitoring period not covered by the VCS (16 October 2019 to 16 April 2020) in order to demonstrate the net positive climate impacts.

As stated in the MR /1/, the assessment was conducted via geoprocessing software using three information sources: shapefile data from the project area and leakage belt, 2019 PRODES shapefile data representing existing deforestation from 1988 to October 2019, and satellite imagens generated between April and May 2020.

Based on the PRODES classification (2019), it was possible to identify other deforestation areas in the region of the project area and the leakage belt through satellite images. As the month of April is characterized by rainfall phenomena in the region, clouds become a frequent element in satellite images at this time of year. Thus, to ensure the quality of deforestation detection and to increase the range of the areas analyzed, a main image from Sentinel-2 satellite (dated 21 April 2020) was used with the complementary support of imagens from the satellites1 LandSat-7 (08 May 2020), LandSat-8 (30 April 2020), and Sentinel-2 (01 May 2020). The analysis is detailed in section 7.1 of the MR /1/.

The VVB team was able to confirm that the preliminary estimate of the areas deforested through these procedures showed that there were no impacts during this period /96/. It is important to emphasize that this analysis is a preliminary survey of deforestation in the area, with the exclusive objective of demonstrating that no impacts occurred in the CCB period, which was not covered by the VCS (16 October 2019 to 16 April 2020), and that there clearly were no significant losses in the areas.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

RINA has performed the verification of the emission reductions that have been reported for the “Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project” (Project ID: 1115) for the period 15 February 2014 – 15 October 2019 (VCS) and 17 April 2016 – 16 April 2020 (CCB).

This verification was conducted by the accredited RINA in accordance with the VCS and CCB requirements, the applicable Methodology for Avoidance Unplanned Deforestation version 1.1, the monitoring plan from the VCS project description dated 12 April 2013, CCB project description dated 31 July 2015, and the non-permanence risk report dated 04 March 2021.

The project has been implemented in accordance with the validated project descriptions and the subsequently validated changes.

RINA verifies that the net GHG emission reductions and removals of the Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project for the monitoring period from 15 February 2014 – 15 October 2019 (VCS) are fairly stated in the monitoring report and can be approved as follows:

Monitoring period: 15 February 2014 – 15 October 2019

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

Year*	Baseline emissions (tCO_2e)	Project emissions (tCO_2e)	Leakage emissions (tCO_2e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO_2e)	Ex post buffer credits	Ex post VCUs tradable

Year 2014*	274,059	54,448	0	219,611	21,961	197,650
Year 2015*	381,495	72,966	0	308,529	30,853	277,676
Year 2016*	336,148	19,931	0	316,217	31,622	284,595
Year 2017*	362,030	48,677	0	313,353	31,335	282,018
Year 2018*	358,795	56,224	0	302,571	30,257	272,314
Year 2019**	313,874	40,110	0	273,764	27,376	246,388
Total	2,026,401	292,357	0	1,734,045	173,404	1,560,640

* The year started at February 15th and ended at February 14th.

** The year started at February 15th and ended at October 15th.

6 APPENDIX 1: ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations	Full texts
AFLOU	Agriculture Forestry and Other Land Use
APU	Annual Production Units
AUD	Avoided Unplanned Deforestation
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CCB	Climate, Community and Biodiversity
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER(s)	Certified Emission Reduction(s)
CL	Clarification Request
CR	Clarification Request
CO_2	Carbon dioxide
CO_2e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
DOP	Organizational Diagnosis Workshops
FAR	Forward Action Request
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
GHG(s)	Greenhouse gas(es)
LU/LC	Land-Use/Land-Cover
MR	Monitoring Report
PD	Project Description
PP(s)	Project Proponent(s)
REDD	Reducing Emissions Deforestation and Degradation
Ref.	Document Reference
RINA	RINA Services Spa
SS(s)	Sectoral Scope(s)
TA(s)	Technical Area(s)
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
VCU	Verified Carbon Unit
VER	Voluntary Emission Reductions
VVB	Validation and Validation Board
VVS	Validation and Validation Standard

7 APPENDIX 2: LIST OF FINDINGS

Table 1: FAR from validation or previous verification

Forward action requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
FAR 1 Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.3, G3.4, G5.2 Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3.3, G3.4 During the site visit, based on community household interviews and interviews with Other Stakeholders, questions were raised about the implementation status of the project. Using the communication plan and other resources, please consider maintaining and improving effective communication with Communities and Other Stakeholders.	We recognize that the Project demonstrated weaknesses and committed communication failures in this monitoring period. This is mainly due to the moment of uncertainty we went through in the years 2016 and 2017 where the Grupo Jari went through a serious financial crisis and the voluntary carbon market was also in a downtrend. However, as of 2018, we have already demonstrated concrete actions to adjust such flaws. Among these actions, we highlight the resumption of the Technical Chambers, the completion of the implementation of the priority projects, and in 2020 we had the broadest public consultation action ever made by the Grupo Jari in Amapá, with visits to all rural communities and dissemination on the local radio stations and newspapers (as shown in the Public Consult results report) (1). In addition, in 2020 we hired a communication agency (carbono.ag) that will work exclusively to improve the communication tools of the Fundação Jari (2) (3). Evidence files contemplated by FAR:	RINA verified that the communication channels were improved during the monitoring period. This FAR is closed.

	(1) Relatório de resultados da consulta pública 2020 F.J_final.pdf (2) Contrato - Carbono_Biofílica_FundacaoJari PR Digital_vf.pdf (3) Contrato - Carbono_Biofílica_FundacaoJari_Site Branding_vf.pdf	
FAR 2 Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G1.9 Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G1.9 Although the project proponent has defines an implementation schedule – indicating key dates and milestone in the project's development – it does not indicate all project activities. Specifically, the implementation schedule could include key dates and milestones related to the expansion of the non-FCS activities to communities within the project zone.	PP updated the schedule listing the key dates and milestones in the development and implementation of the Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project that were accomplished within its lifetime. The focus of this schedule was the non-FSC activities, as these were the actions carried out since the beginning of the project. One of the main milestones of this period, which serves the communities in the project area, was the hiring of the new Socioeconomic and Environmental Diagnostic to update the community characterization and registration, together with a reassessment of the social and environmental impacts on Jari Valley. The other items have been updated following the same pattern performed in previous verifications. All documents that served as	RINA verified that the implementation schedule was updated and all evidence were checked. This FAR is closed.

	reference in the table were delivered as evidence and are listed below. Evidence files contemplated by FAR: (1) Contrato-Biofilica-Orsa-Jari-2010.pdf (2) II-Workshop-Jari-Amapa-2012.pdf (3) VCS-PDD-Jari-Amapa-2013.pdf (4) SCS-Work-Order-2012.pdf (5) VCS-Validation-Report-2013.pdf (6) VCS-Verification-Report-2013.pdf (7) VCS-Verification-Report-2016.pdf (8) CCB-PDD-Jari-Amapa-2016.pdf (9) CCB-Validation-Report-2016.pdf (10) 3-Aditivo-Contrato-Biofilica-Jari-2018.pdf (11) comunicacao-aprovação-PMFS.pdf (12) AUTEX-POA01-AGREGUE.pdf (13) AUTEX-POA01-AGREGUE-renov.pdf (14) 01-shapefile-mapas-manejo.rar (15) 02-operacoes-manejo.rar	

	(16) Contrato-Prest-Servicos-Diciero-2019.pdf (17) jari-valley-redd-project-web-ENG-2020.pdf (18) relatorio-jari-amapa-vendas-2013-2019.pdf (19) 202011-Financeiro-REDDJariAmapa-Real+Projetado.xlsx	
FAR 3 Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section B1.1, B1.2, CM1.2 Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section B1.2, Section CM1.2 Please complete the HCV analyses for community and biodiversity.	The analysis of community HCV-5 was not completed during the monitored period. Even so, because of the forest management activities started in 2018, it was demanded the survey of the impact of the activities on Brazil nuts areas by Ramal do Retiro community, which had their areas directly affected. These data were made available in the evidence of CAR16 and indicated in section 4.1.4 of MR-v2. For biodiversity, the HCV-1 was analyzed in the biodiversity monitoring, done in 2019, the presence of endangered and endemic species of fauna and flora. Additionally, it was found that during the monitored period HCV-1 was not negatively affected, further details of this analysis were added to section 5.1.4 of MR-v2.	The FAR was not attended for the monitoring period. Refer to CAR 16, CAR 17. This FAR is closed.

FAR 4 Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G1.10, CM2 Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G1.10, CM2.1, CM2.2 Please assume the commitment of promoting workshops with each community to fully identify potential risks and negative impacts.	In 2020 we had the broadest public consultation action ever undertaken by Grupo Jari in Amapá, with visits to all rural communities (as shown in the Public Consult results report) (1). This was the first move to expand the scope of social action and stakeholder engagement across the project's zone of influence. One of the actions foreseen in the Project's Expansion Plan is the holding of Community Workshops with all the communities in the project zone. Expansion Plan for the REDD+ Project (2) proposed by the Jari Foundation for the coming years foresees the holding of workshops with all communities in Amapá. The financial evidence presented in the plan shows that the Project has available cash to start these activities from 2021. Evidence files contemplated by FAR: (1) Relatório de resultados da consulta pública 2020 F.J_final.pdf (2) plano-expansao-integrado-2021-2025.pdf	The FAR was not attended for the monitoring period. Refer to CAR 17, CAR 19 and CAR 22. This FAR is closed.
FAR 5 Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section B2.3 and Section B2.4	According to the PD-CCB, the activities and measures that would need to be taken to maintain the HCV-1 biodiversity would be the activities already proposed by the Project. Standing out for the maintenance of the landscape dynamics:	The FAR was not attended for the monitoring period. Refer to CAR 16, CAR 17.

Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section B2.3 Please include a complete discussion of measures needed and taken for maintenance or enhancement of High Conservation attributes for biodiversity upon the conclusion of the presence of HVC. Please completely assess the potential negative effects by the project on HVC. See CL16, CL17 and FAR 3.	• Sustainable forest management; • Monitoring deforestation; • Patrimonial Surveillance; • Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (TARE); • Identification of High Conservation Value Attributes; • Biodiversity Monitoring and Scientific Research (Biodiversity scope) As described in section 5.1.4 of MR-v2, although some deviations have occurred, none were considerable to prevent these areas from being protected. Thus, the actions performed during the monitored period were fundamental and sufficient so that the attribute was not affected. This finding is reinforced by the biodiversity study, where the presence of threatened and endemic species of fauna and flora was identified, and it was identified that the floristic composition, the structure and diversity indexes presented in the studied areas allow to classify them as areas of very high biological value, representative of the natural	

	(undisturbed) forests of the Amazonian dryland (Terra Firme, in Portuguese). Additionally, after verification of the project, an expansion plan (1) will be implemented to improve the activities developed in the territorial management of the property, which result in the conservation of the HCV, some points addressed in this plan are: • Satellite monitoring tool with daily frequency and high resolution; • Acquisition of equipment for the field team (e.g. Drones); • Intensification of rounds with more vehicles; • Biodiversity monitoring every 2 years with the next campaign in 2021; • Increasing the scope of social work with the inclusion of new communities; • Holding workshops with all communities in Amapá. Evidence files contemplated by FAR: (1) plano-expansao-integrado-2021-2025.pdf	

Table 2: CARs from this verification

Corrective action requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
CAR 1 The date format applied in the MR is not according to the CCB & VCS Monitoring Report Template. In addition, where a section is not applicable, same must be stated under the section (the section must not be deleted from the final document unless instructions specifically state so). Missing section 7 and appendices. In the first page, the template requires only the monitoring report title. It does not have to mention all this: “MONITORING REPORT OF GHG EMISSION REDUCTIONS FROM AVOIDING UNPLANNED DEFORESTATION FROM 2014 TO 2018”.	The date had been formatted in the automatic Word style, because of this a difference occurred, to correspond to the template of the report, was adjusted. The sections that had been excluded because they had no content were added to MR-v2. In the case of the appendices, those that had not been used were excluded as the report template says, *"Delete the instruction and heading if not used".* The title of the report was changed.	RINA verified the revised MR and confirmed that section 7 was included. However, the date format was not corrected in the whole document. Moreover, the monitoring report title is not correct. This CAR is open.
CAR 1 (cont.) RINA verified the revised MR and confirmed that section 7 was included. However, the date format was not corrected in the whole document. Moreover, the monitoring report title is not correct.	The date format was adjusted in whole document, and the title was adjusted in MR-v3.	RINA verified the revised MR and confirmed that the date format and the monitoring report title were corrected. This CAR is closed.

This CAR is open.		
CAR 2 Section 2.1.1 of the MR should not be more than one page. Also, it is not clear on how leakage and non-permanence risk factors are being monitored and managed. In addition, it is not clear if the project is fully implemented, what are the things that are pending and if there are any changes in the area proposed in ha. Furthermore, information on events that may impact the GHG emission reductions or removals and monitoring should be listed.	Section 2.1.1 has been revised to adjust the maximum size as set out by the template. The text was also revised to provide greater clarity regarding the actions to avoid leakage and reduce the risks of non-permanence. A disclaimer about project emissions was also included.	RINA verified the revised MR and confirmed that the information regarding on how leakage and non-permanence risk factors are being monitored and managed was included. However, it is not clear if the project is fully implemented, what are the things that are pending and if there are any changes in the area proposed in ha. Furthermore, information on events that may impact the GHG emission reductions or removals and monitoring should be listed. This CAR is open.
CAR 2 (cont.) RINA verified the revised MR and confirmed that the information regarding on how leakage and non-permanence risk factors are being monitored and managed was included. However, it is not clear if the project is fully implemented, what are the things that are pending and if there are any changes in the area proposed in ha.	The section 2.1.1. was revised again in order to adjust the items that had not yet been addressed or had not been fully clarified as required by the template.	RINA verified the revised MR and verified that it is clearly stated that the project is characterized by its continuous implementation. In addition, it is also mentioned the things that are pending and that there are no changes in the area proposed in ha. Furthermore, information on events that may impact the GHG emission reductions or removals and monitoring were listed. This CAR is closed.

Furthermore, information on events that may impact the GHG emission reductions or removals and monitoring should be listed. This CAR is open.		
CAR 3 PP is requested to demonstrate that the change in the project proponent and financial management mechanism does not impact the additionality of the project.	The changes were made aiming solely at improving management and governance procedures, and all investment lines and guidelines initially foreseen remain maintained. In other words, the changes made do not exempt or reduce the scope of additional socio-environmental actions and investments initially foreseen in the PD. To demonstrate that, the Financial Guidelines Term was shared with the VVB (1), a document that aims to establish the project's financial management and investment procedures. In addition, it was demonstrated that the project made additional investments (evidence of the activity "Structuring the Socioenvironmental Fund REDD+ Jari") in this monitoring period in line with the investments provided for in the validation. As such investments would not have been made if there were no resources generated by the sale of VCUs and the perspective of generating new resources in the coming years.	RINA verified the revised MR and evidences provided by PP and confirmed that the change in the project proponent and financial management mechanism does not impact the additionality of the project. This CAR is closed.

	Some evidence was presented that shows that the final approved version of the financial management mechanism does not differ from the version initially designed regarding the planned investments (2) (3). Changes were made to improve the instrument, in addition to reflecting the change in proponents and new assignments of Fundação Jari. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) 001-Termo de Diretrizes Financeiras-REDDJARI.pdf (2) ESBOÇO - Fundo REDD+ Jari.pdf (3) Convenio_Conta_REDD+.doc	
CAR 4 The deviation should be clearly described in the MR and all changes in the monitoring plan regarding monitoring frequency and lack of monitoring information for community should be informed. Refer to CAR 16 to CAR 30.	With the elaboration of CAR16 to CAR30 responses, the deviations were reassessed. All frequencies were adjusted in the table of indicators attached to MR-v2, according to what was established in the PD-CCB. The indicators that were not completed due to lack of information were described individually in item 2.2.4 of MR-v2, as well as explained in the responses of the respective CARs and below:	RINA verified that the following information was not included in the project description deviation: Activity “Monitoring of Deforestation” was not included in the deviation. Only 11 families were considered in the indicator “Area deforested per family attended”. These communities were monitored just once in the role monitoring period.

	- Property Surveillance: the indicator "Number of complaints/demands regarding the surveillance action" was not collected because there was no registered procedure to stimulate the collection of this data. The collection procedure has been updated and made available to VVB, including that complaints, denunciations and demands must be registered and forwarded to the Infrastructure Management, preserving the confidentiality of the source. - Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (TARE): due to the high amount of information from this activity, the proponents performed the data control in the annual frequency for the indicators: "Number of families attended", "Number of communities engaged", "Frequency of visits" and "Gender and age of the producers attended", being different from what had been established in the PD-CCB, which was every 6 months. In any case, the accounting of the information in a different frequency than that established did not generate problems in verifying the results of the activities. The indicators "Familiar Income" and "Final market achieved" were not considered because the main source of this information is the Family Assessment, which during the monitored period was not carried out. As	Indicator "Number of fire control and prevention workshops implemented per communities engaged" for the activity "Property Surveillance" was not included in the deviation. The project only monitored one community in 2018 and 2019. Activity "Technical Board Meetings" was not included in the deviation. The monitoring of all indicators was not done every 6 months. Indicator "Gender and age of farmers attended" for the activity "Workshops and trainings in agro-extractive techniques". The age of farmers was not monitored. This CAR is open.

	explained above, this activity was directly impacted by the delay in the effective implementation of the Priority Projects due to budget problems and the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020. The indicator "Time invested by the communities' members" was also not considered, as no proper way of recording this data to be accounted for was found. Although the Fundação Jari prepared a new field sheet in 2020 that presents the time data, the filling out of this information was not effective. For the next verification, the proponents committed themselves to improving this methodology. - Development of Property Use Plans: the indicator "Time invested by the communities' members" was not considered, as an adequate way of recording this data to be accounted for was not found either. For the next verification, the proponents committed themselves to improving this methodology. - Family Assessment: the indicator "Time invested by the communities' members" was not considered, as an adequate way of recording this data to be accounted for was not found either. For the next verification, the proponents committed themselves to improving this methodology.	

	- Biodiversity Monitoring and Scientific Research: none of the indicators of this activity were collected, they are qualitative analyses, covering the communities' perception of the availability of natural resources and the importance of the forest, and during the monitoring of the biodiversity carried out in the monitored period this scope was not registered, as well as in any activity carried out with the communities. For the next verification, the proponents committed themselves to improve the methodology of collection and storage of this information, mainly joining the survey conducted for the Family Assessment.	
CAR 4 (cont.) RINA verified that the following information was not included in the project description deviation: Activity "Monitoring of Deforestation" was not included in the deviation. Only 11 families were considered in the indicator "Area deforested per family attended". These communities were monitored just once in the role monitoring period. Indicator "Number of fire control and prevention workshops implemented per communities engaged" for the activity	Regarding activity "Monitoring of Deforestation", 33 families were monitored, as can be seen in evidence attributes table – provided in shapefile format (1) – present in CAR18, and spreadsheet prepared from this attributes table (2). These 33 families were able to be monitored because they adhered to the Property Use Plan, consequently, their properties were delimited through the microzoning process. Only 10 families, of the 33 analyzed, had deforestation detected by PRODES within their properties, which is why only 10 families were considered in the indicator "Area deforested per family	RINA verified that the revised MR clearly described all changes in the monitoring plan regarding monitoring frequency and lack of monitoring information for community in the project description deviation section. This CAR is closed.

"Property Surveillance" was not included in the deviation. The project only monitored one community in 2018 and 2019. Activity "Technical Board Meetings" was not included in the deviation. The monitoring of all indicators was not done every 6 months. Indicator "Gender and age of farmers attended" for the activity "Workshops and trainings in agro-extractive techniques". The age of farmers was not monitored. This CAR is open.	attended". More information is found at CAR18. Deviations were reassessed and PP included in the project description deviation – section 2.2.4 of MR-v3 – the following information: -Monitoring of Deforestation: indicator "Area deforested per family attended" was only monitored once, as it depended on the completion of microzoning process. As described in section 4.3.1. of the MR-v3, this process was divided in two moments during the monitored period. The first was in 2014 with some community members, where the memorials describing their properties were prepared. The second, covered a larger number of community members, and focused on those involved in priority projects in their most robust phase in 2018. As microzoning was completed in 2018, it was only from this year that it was possible to monitor these communities involved in priority projects. - Property Surveillance: indicator "Number of fire control and prevention workshops implemented per communities engaged" was collected just in 2018 and 2019, reaching just one community, because there was a greater focus of these actions in Pará due to required certifications by FSC and Serflor. In addition, other actions of the project were prioritized. However, PP registered in MR-v2 its	

	commitment to increase its reach with other engaged communities until the next verification. In addition, it was possible to identify that there was a positive impact because other communities present in the project area participated in fire control and prevention workshops. Considering 2020, due to the pandemic situation, it was necessary to adapt the communication with communities to ensure health and safety of all. Thus, information's on fire control and prevention were carried out through the distribution of posters and by radios. -Technical Board Meetings: indicators, except for "Public Policies communities are accessing" that should be monitored every 2 years, were not included every 6 months with data, as the technical board meetings were not carried out as planned in the PD. However, for the semesters in which activities took place, there were results for community members as can be analyzed by available evidence. Furthermore, deviation of indicators "Number of institutions invited" and "Number of communities invited", are described in CAR20. -Workshops and trainings in agro-extractive techniques: regarding indicator "Gender and age of farmers attended", information about age of farmers was not considered, as an	

	adequate way of recording this data to be accounted for was not found either. For the next verification, the proponents committed themselves to improving this methodology. In addition to the adjusted points, the following information was included in the project description deviation – section 2.2.4 of MR-v3: -Community Level Workshops (Participatory Organizational Workshops, Community Development Plans and Risks and Impacts Assessment): the indicators “Number of demands identified per community” and “Number of demands addressed per community” for 2014 were not collected, because the activity held this year - called "Meeting of the 50" - was a special technical board between the proponents and the producers that had as its objective the presentation and discussion about the "Plan of the Use of Property" methodology. Thus, the activity allowed the communication and openness for discussion about the project's progress among the stakeholders, not necessarily focusing only on raising or addressing demands by community members. -Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (TARE): deviation of indicator "Percentage of families with access to loans” is described in CAR21.	

	Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) delimitacao_comunidades_engajadas.rar (2)tabela-atributos-familias-comunidades.xlsx	
CAR 5 PP is requested to demonstrate that the addition does not impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions. It is always better to put the information in the tabular format. As per the PD, current MP, justification on change with reference/evidences, and impact on the quantification of GHG emission reductions.	CAR15 clarifies that PP reevaluated the communities engaged to the project based on evidences, and decided to consider Arapiranga community as part of Tira Couro, so it was not considered inclusion of a new community. However, during the monitoring period, two new members of the communities Nova Conquista and Tira Couro (1) joined the project. To analyze whether the entry of these new communities members did or not impact the reduction of GHG emissions, it was conducted a survey of area deforested per family attended by the project (CAR18) and it was calculated the statistical significance of these areas. As a result of this analysis, two important points stand out: 1º the two community members who joined the project had no open areas during the monitored period; 2º the deforestation significance by others community members did not reach the 5%	RINA verified that the inclusion of new families in the project does not impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions. In addition, the registered PD expected the inclusion of new families to be attended by the project. This CAR is closed.

	significance required by VM0015 regarding to reduced emissions to be considered. Thus, PP considers that the entry of new families to participate in the project has not impacted the reduction of emissions. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) LinhaTempo_ProjetosPrioritarios.xls (2) signif-emissoes-desmat-comunitario.xlsx	
CAR 6 The changes in the biodiversity monitoring should be considered as a project description deviation. The deviation should be clearly described in the MR and all changes in the monitoring plan regarding monitoring frequency and lack of monitoring information should be informed. Refer to CAR 35 to CAR 40.	Activity: Biodiversity Monitoring and Scientific Research There are three main fronts associated with the monitoring of biodiversity: i) fauna monitoring, in which data are obtained by field expeditions; ii) monitoring of flora through data obtained from the inventory of permanent plots of sustainable forest management areas (based, in this case, on the Post-exploratory Report); iii) the non-realization of the "Validation workshops/knowledge return events". Fauna monitoring: As stated in the PD (Section B4. Biodiversity Impacts Monitoring - p.194, as well as briefly	Information regarding the changes in the biodiversity monitoring was not included in the revised MR as a project deviation. This CAR is open.

	in Section B2.3. Mitigation of Negative Impacts - p.187), the indicators for monitoring fauna biodiversity and scientific research were constructed considering the existing partnership between the Grupo Jari and the Universities of Lancaster and Lavras. The proposal was that the studies that universities carried out for at least 10 years in the areas of sustainable forest management in Pará would be expanded to the areas of sustainable forest management (Project Area) in Amapá. Thus, the frequency of the indicators was established using the methodologies recommended by the Universities. With the end of this partnership in 2012, however, it was not possible to comply with this biannual monitoring. With the end of the partnership and the economic crisis that the Grupo Jari faced, it was not possible to hire an outsourced company to monitor fauna biodiversity before 2019. In this period, as previously explained, activities aimed at communities were prioritized. As for activities associated with biodiversity, priority was given to actions to curb deforestation, aiming not to impact the biodiversity of the Project Area due to the loss of forest cover and fragmentation of habitats. The positive results of containing	

	deforestation in this monitoring period, associated with the excellent results found by the company Ambiens (contracted for the monitoring of biodiversity), validate the efforts made during this period of financial instability and readjustment of the project's priorities. Therefore, it was not possible to comply with the frequency of fauna monitoring and the indicators associated with this monitoring, including those related to production and scientific dissemination. There is a clear need to rethink the frequency of these indicators in the revalidation of the PD, considering the costs and other difficulties associated with such frequent monitoring of biodiversity. Flora monitoring: The monitoring of flora is based on the Post-exploratory Report of the Permanent Plots of sustainable forest management. Thus, the indicator is linked to the occurrence of sustainable forest management operations in the Project Area. Unlike planned (and already explained in Sections 2.2.4 of MR-v2), forest management operations only started in 2018 and have not yet been completed. Thus, there is still no explored Post-Exploratory Report for UPA01	

	and, consequently, the response of the indicators. Therefore, there was no monitoring of these indicators (“Diversity of plant community in Permanent Plots”, “Richness of the plant community in Permanent Plots” and “Presence of endangered species in the Project Area”) using the data from the Post-Exploratory Report in this period of monitoring. It is noted, however, that analysis of pre-exploratory data (using the census carried out on the permanent plots of UPA01 in operation) was carried out by Ambiens (1) and can serve as a basis for comparison with the data to be generated in the PP forest census to be carried out at the end of the exploration of UPA01. As forest management activities are subject to change, it is understood that the frequency of this indicator should also be rethought for the revalidation of the PD, making it clear that monitoring (and frequency) is dependent on the execution of forest management and that changes may occur. Finally, the REDD + Project Expansion Plan (2) proposed by Fundação Jari for the coming years foresees the carrying out of biodiversity monitoring every two years, that is, the next	

	campaign will be carried out in 2021 and another one in 2023. The financial evidence presented in the plan shows that the Project has cash available to implement the new monitoring campaign as early as 2021. Validation workshops/knowledge return events: In addition to the points explained above, the "Validation Workshops/knowledge return events" were not held during the monitored period (after the monitoring conducted by Ambiens) because of the Covid-19 pandemic. The data analysis and delivery of the monitoring report by Ambiens was finalized in March 2020, a period in which the Covid-19 pandemic was already occurring in Brazil. For stakeholder protection measures, it was decided to postpone the presentation workshops and resume only with the end of the pandemic. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) Relatório Monitoramento da Biodiversidade ProjetoREDDJariAmapa rev 4.pdf (2) plano-expansao-integrado-2021-2025.pdf	

CAR 6 (cont.) Information regarding the changes in the biodiversity monitoring was not included in the revised MR as project deviation. This CAR is open.	The deviations were placed incorrectly in Section "2.2.3. Minor Changes to Project Description" in MR-v2. It was adjusted and in the new version (MR-v3) these deviations related to biodiversity monitoring are in section "2.2.4. Project Description Deviations".	Information regarding the changes in the biodiversity monitoring was correctly included in the revised MR as project deviation. This CAR is closed.
CAR 7 As per MR template, PP is requested to insert in section 1.1 the brief summaries of two to five benefits of the project not captured by the standardized benefit metrics in section 1.2. Regarding to the community project benefits, it is noticed that the numbers in the achievements during the project lifetime are the same as during the monitoring period. There is a lack of justification on how the numbers could be the same. PP is requested to provide evidences for all information included in table 2 of section 1.2.	The values of the communities and families affected were changed in section 1.1, so that in "Achievements during the Project Lifetime" all the families who were involved in the project activities at some point in its duration were considered, even though some gave up participating, the values were considered because they participated in activities encouraged by the project. For "Achievements during the Monitoring Period" only the families and communities that remained until the end of the monitored period were considered, participating in all the activities and actions applied by the project. To better clarify the dynamics of community participation during the project's life cycle, evidence (1) was made available. For the value of TARE (2), the assistance actions carried out in the communities of the Project Zone were considered for "Achievements during the Project Lifetime", and for "Achievements during the Monitoring	RINA verified the revised MR and confirmed that section 1.1 was correctly updated. This CAR is closed.

	Period", the assistance actions carried out only in the communities engaged in the project were considered, more details of these actions are described in CAR 21. All the values indicated in Table 2, section 1.2, are referenced with their respective MR-v2 sections and items. Thus, respecting what the template requires, PP preferred to keep the information as it is presented and highlighted in MR-v2 the values placed in the table, creating a connection between the information within the document. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) LinhaTempo_ProjetosPrioritarios.xls (2) LinhaTempo_ATER.xlsx	
CAR 8 PP is requested to make note of where the dates listed in section 2.2.1 of the MR have changed since the last validation or verification. As per Monitoring Report Template, PP is requested to describe and report on any project description deviations applied in previous monitoring reports in section 2.2.4 of	The schedule indicated in section 2.2.1 has been updated according to the information presented in the latest verifications, leaving non-FSC activities more detailed, and indicating all milestones that occurred for the project during its lifetime, as requested by FAR 2. Documents have been referenced where it is possible to verify the dates of activities performed, and sections of MR-v2 where all actions related to the milestones and key dates of the project are found.	RINA verified the revised MR and evidences provided by PP and confirmed that the changes since the last validation or verification have been listed in section 2.2.1. In addition, the project description deviations applied in previous monitoring reports were described in section 2.2.4 of the revised MR. This CAR is closed.

the MR. This indicator is not sufficient addressed by PP in the MR.	The first verification report, for the year 2011, did not have any kind of project description deviations, so nothing was added to this MR. In the 2012 - 2013 monitoring report a deviation was presented, this was added to section 2.2.4 of the MR-v2.	
CAR 9 MR is not transparent on the grievances received during the current monitoring period and how the same was addressed.	The item 2.3.1 MR-v2 Grievances was updated with the inclusion of more information on the Communication with Stakeholders process and registration of demands and complaints.	RINA verified the revised MR and evidences provided by PP and confirmed that information regarding the grievances received during the current monitoring period and how the same was addressed is clearly describer. This CAR is closed.
	Climate	
CAR 10 The formula for the calculation of net carbon stock change in baseline for the LB area is not presented in MR v1 of 23/08/2020 section 3.2.1. Furthermore, the formula for the calculation of baseline carbon stock change for the PA area doesn't seem correct in the light of the information available in registered PD.	In MR-v1 of 08/23/2020, section 3.2.1 is written "For the calculation of the baseline changes in carbon stock in the **Project Area (Table 14) and Leakage Belt (Table 15)** for year t was used Method 1 of VM0015 version 1.1, according to **Equation 10 (page 72 of this VM0015**) presented below:", thus, it is understood that the formula presented in MR-v1 was also used to calculate the variation of the net carbon stock in the baseline for the leakage belt. Reinforcing this, the note of VM0015 (p. 73) says "Equation 10 should also be applied to the leakage belt area and, optionally, to the reference region. Calculations must be made at least for the	Ok formulae not added to MR v2 to show different parameter name but reiterated that the formula used for PA is also used for LK area. This CAR10 is closed.

	fixed baseline period and, optionally, for the entire project crediting period". Anyway, MR-v2 has been adjusting making the use of the equation clearer for both areas. In PD-VCS (p. 111) it has been written "The Method 1 (activity data are available for classes) was used to calculation the total baseline carbon stock change in the project area (Tables 41) and in the leakage belt (Table 46) at year t **following the equation 10 in page 72 of VM0015 version 1.1"**, and in the PD-CCB there is no detailed description of the calculations. Therefore, the formula used in MR is the same used in the validated PD-VCS.	
CAR11 The PP sent Rina a map from Agregue (the company responsible for the SFM), in a pdf format, with the main and secondary roads (informed by Agregue were the roads executed in UPA 1 of the SFM), as evidence of the area of planned deforestation. These maps informed the area of these roads to be 23,5ha but they had no coordinates. Agregue's documentation also informed that the executed patios were 4,75ha. The PP also provided a shape file with the calculated area in what seems to be the map presented by Agregue (it was not possible to	During the reevaluation and adjustment of the emissions calculations, PP received from the company Agregue more updated data from roads and patios. The data initially presented in MR-v1 were based mainly on the exploration planning information, which as mentioned, coincided with the data in POA-01. However, the new data presented were updated according to the survey after the activities of opening roads and patios were carried out, according to the justification sent by Agregue (1). Since the post-exploration report was not finalized during the monitored period, this	The audit team checked the new map with the areas of planned deforestation (roads plus patios) and coordinates sent by Agregue /80/ and compared it with the shapes with the calculated areas /81/. The audit team confirms that the planned deforested area in the shape files, which in turn is confirmed by the Agregue map coordinates, comes to 37ha. This value was updated in the ERs calculation spreadsheets v2 /2/. This CAR11 is closed.

tell exactly as the maps sent by Agregue had no coordinates). Nevertheless, it is possible to see from the attribute table from the shape file sent that the area of the roads correspond to Agregues map and that these were calculated from GPS and “office” data. The PP also provided the PoA as evidence of the area of planned deforestation. However, the document has information about primary and secondary planned roads in Km. The description of the parameter, of the measurement methods and monitoring equipment in the MP of the MR are not the same as in the MP of the registered VCS PD. MP of the MR must always be consistent with MP of the registered PD. Furthermore, the PP must send more complete, consistent and quality third party evidence to demonstrate are of planned deforestation which is compatible with what the MP of the registered PD asks for.	information was only presented in shapefile format (2) and map with location coordinates (3). The road data are presented in hectares, as requested by the indicator of the PD "Planned deforestation to build the Forest Management infrastructure", which was also updated to be consistent with the MP of the PD-VCS, together with the methodology applied during the monitored period. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) justificativa-divergencias-planejamento-agregue.pdf (2) 01-shapefile-estradas-patios.rar (3) mapa-POA01-microzoneamento.pdf	
CAR12 The PP has not estimated total carbon stock decrease due to planned logging activities. During the audit the PP has not presented a justification for not doing so even though in page 117 of the PD it stated it would monitor	The PD-VCS (p. 114) says: “As observed by Holmes et al. (2002) less than 10% of skidding trails from reduced impact forest management systems as the FSC-certified forest management caused soil degradation and consequently clearings in the forest canopy.”, as explained during the audit week, the	The PP is requested to explain, in more detail, how they come to the conclusion that the name of the companies and the CNPJ of such companies are evidence that the wood logged can be considered long-lived as per page 85 of the methodology. They are also requested to explain in more detail how and which of the

Forest Management Activities and that table 25b would be filled if reduction in carbon stocks due to logging were observed. Furthermore, in the MR section 3.2.2.2 it states the following "there were no emissions associated to planned logging activities were developed in Project Area from 2014 to 2018. As outlined in the most up-to-date Forest Management Plan 2018, logging was mainly directed to obtain long-lived wood products and based on the fact that VM0015 considers conservative to disregards these products from the calculations, all logging activities were excluded. Please provide evidence of monitoring or evidence of the justification given in MR that harvested wood is long lived. Also, the monitoring plan states that DBH would be monitored one year before harvest and in intervals of one, three and five years after UPA harvest. It is not clear if this is related to the monitoring of carbon being removed and to the regeneration however it is a parameter required in the MP of the registered PD which is not in the MR. Section 3.1.3.3 b) of the MR also mentions the monitoring of ΔCPLdPAt which is the Total decrease in carbon stock due to planned	carbon stock due to planned harvesting activities was not accounted for because, even though the forest management activities carried out during the monitored period were not certified by the FSC, as was planned in the PD, all logging activities followed rules and laws that establish that the activities are carried out with the least possible impact on the forest within a 30-year cycle for each harvested area (1). This means that the second cycle of exploration of an Annual Production Unit (UPA) will occur only after 30 years, being a considerable time for the forest to obtain sustainable growth and reestablish the small portion of carbon that was lost in the exploratory activities. Also in accordance with the PD (p.117) "<u>If it is observed</u> a reduction in the carbon stock due to timber removal, Table 25b of the methodology will be filled ex post", the section "3.2.2.2. Emissions due to planned logging activities" of MR-v2 presents the value equal to zero during the year that the management occurred in the area (2018) for the indicator $\Delta CPLdPA_t$. During the monitoring period the exploratory activities of management were not closed, consequently, the information post exploratory was not finalized, even so, to evidence these actions the PP provides the evidence (1) (2) (3) (4) (5), proving the	invoices can be used as evidence that the wood was extracted in 2018 from UPA-01. Only then the audit team will be able to come to a conclusion on whether or not the wood extracted from UPA-01 can be ignored in the calculations of emission reductions. This CAR is open.

<table>
<tr>
<td>timber cutting activities in year t in the Project area.</td>
<td>premise considered with the endorsement of environmental agencies.

Agregue, the company responsible for forest management, does not process the wood extracted from the forest. However, during 2019 and 2020 it made sales of some logs extracted. To prove the destination of the wood sold, PP made a brief survey of buyers, based on the evidence (6) and (7), and which is presented in the table below. All buyers have as activity "raw wood sawmills" - information that can be proved by consulting the CNPJ available via web. With these data, and the information in the 2018 PMFS, PP can prove that all wood extracted from the forest has the purpose of obtaining long-lived wood products.

<table>
<tr><th>Razão Social</th><th>CNPJ/CPF</th></tr>
<tr><td>WERSAN - IND. COM. E EXPORT. DE MADEIRAS LTDA</td><td>07.640.567/0001-71</td></tr>
<tr><td>MADENAVE MADEIRAS NAVEGANTES LTDA</td><td>04.520.833/0001-34</td></tr>
<tr><td>PROMAP PRODUTOS DE MADEIRAS DO PARA LTDA</td><td>83.383.133/0001-11</td></tr>
<tr><td>LAVOURA e FRISSO LTDA</td><td>83.734.376/0001-57</td></tr>
<tr><td>S S P D DINIZ - ME (Diniz Industria e Comercio de Madeiras LTDA)</td><td>09.381.862/0001-86</td></tr>
<tr><td>RIO BONITO INDUSTRIA E COMERCIO DE MADEIRAS EIRELI</td><td>34.057.313/0001-06</td></tr>
<tr><td>GOLF INDUSTRIA, COMERCIO E EXPORTACAO DE MADEIRAS LTD</td><td>09.263.182/0001-68</td></tr>
<tr><td>MADRIL - IND. E COM. DE MADEIRAS - EIRELI</td><td>18.091.234/0001-57</td></tr>
</table>

The DBH parameter is related to the monitoring of the regeneration of the plots where management occurred, evaluating possible losses and/or inclusion of new individuals in the area. As mentioned above, management activities have not yet been finalized until the end of the monitoring period,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

	because of this, data from the post-exploration inventory are not yet available. Anyway, the parameter was added to MR-v2, referring to the 100% inventory made at UPA01 (8) before the start of harvesting.	
CAR 12 (cont.) The PP is requested to explain, in more detail, how they come to the conclusion that the name of the companies and the CNPJ of such companies are evidence that the wood logged can be considered long-lived as per page 85 of the methodology. They are also requested to explain in more detail how and which of the invoices can be used as evidence that the wood was extracted in 2018 from UPA-01. Only then the audit team will be able to come to a conclusion on whether or not the wood extracted from UPA-01 can be ignored in the calculations of emission reductions. This CAR is open.	With the CNPJ and company names on the internet it is possible to get to the CNAE (National Classification of Economic Activities), which is the national standardization instrument for the economic activity codes and the framework criteria used by the various tax administration bodies in Brazil. All the companies listed have the main CNAE "16.10-2-03 – Sawmills with sawing of wood rough (*Serrarias com desdobramento de madeira em bruto* in Portuguese)". The CNAE and the main source of the searches carried out were added to the table previously presented, showing the main activity performed by the buyers of the timber harvested by Agregue (9).	PP pointed out that according to the validated PD-VCS (p. 51), the carbon pool harvested wood products was excluded because it demonstrated then that in the Baseline scenario long-lived wood products were lower than in the Project scenario. This CAR 12 is closed.

Corporate Name	CNPJ	National Classification of Economic Activities (CNAE)	Source
WERSAN - IND. COM. E EXPORTAÇÃO DE MADEIRAS LTDA.	07.640.567/0001-71	16.10-2-03 - Sawmills with sawing of wood rough (*Serrarias com desdobramento de madeira em*	http://cnpj.info/Wersan-Ind-com-e-Export-de-Madeiras-Wersan-Madeiras
MADENAVE MADEIRAS NAVEGANTES LTDA	04.520.833/0001-34	16.10-2-03 - Sawmills with sawing of wood rough (*Serrarias com desdobramento de madeira em*	http://cnpj.info/Madenave-Madeiras-Navegantes-Ltda
PROMAP PRODUTOS DE MADEIRAS DO PARA LTDA.	83.383.133/0001-11	16.10-2-03 - Sawmills with sawing of wood rough (*Serrarias com desdobramento de madeira em*	http://cnpj.info/Promap-Produtos-de-Madeiras-do-Para-Promap-Madeiras
LAVOURA & FRISSO LTDA	83.734.376/0001-57	16.10-2-03 - Sawmills with sawing of wood rough (*Serrarias com desdobramento de madeira em*	http://cnpj.info/Lavoura-Frisso-Madeireira-Frisso
DINIZ INDUSTRIA E COMERCIO DE MADEIRAS LTDA	09.381.862/0001-86	16.10-2-03 - Sawmills with sawing of wood rough (*Serrarias com desdobramento de madeira em*	http://cnpj.info/Diniz-Industria-e-Comercio-de-Madeiras-Serraria-Barn
RIO BONITO INDUSTRIA E COMÉRCIO DE MADEIRAS EIRELI	34.057.313/0001-06	16.10-2-03 - Sawmills with sawing of wood rough (*Serrarias com desdobramento de madeira em*	http://cnpj.info/Rio-Bonito-Industria-e-Comercio-de-Madeiras-Rio-Bonito-Madeiras
GOLF IND. COM. E EXPORT. DE MADEIRAS LTDA. - EPP	09.263.182/0001-68	16.10-2-03 - Sawmills with sawing of wood rough (*Serrarias com desdobramento de madeira em*	http://cnpj.info/Golf-Industria-Comercio-e-Exportacao-de-Madeiras-Golf-Florestal
MADRIL - INDÚSTRIA E COMÉRCIO DE MADEIRAS EIRELI - EPP	18.091.234/0001-57	16.10-2-03 - Sawmills with sawing of wood rough (*Serrarias com desdobramento de madeira em*	http://cnpj.info/Madril-Ind-e-com-de-Madeiras-Madril-Madeiras

With this, it is possible to interpret that a sawmill that produces products in a rawer state, such as those intended for civil construction, like struts, columns, and joists, to products with a higher level of processing, like floors, decks, and lining, can have its products considered as long-lived wood products, since in both applications the wood has a long time of use, and will remain in this state for a long time.

The origin and year of harvest of this wood from UPA01: from the moment that the log is removed from the forest and transported to the harvest yard it becomes susceptible to degradation, whether physical or, especially in an Amazonian environment, biological, which directly affects the quality of the wood when processed. Therefore, there is a logic in selling this product. As it is an extremely costly activity, for the forest management to lose

	materials because of these problems becomes a loss. In this way, it is in the company's interest to first sell the wood already in the harvest yard (the oldest) until the stocks finish and are complemented with logs collected in following years. Since it is not possible to track logs with the previously available documents (6) (7), a comparison of volumes between marketed and harvested species (between 2018 and 2020) was performed (10). Of the 10 species marketed, only 3 had a volume sold greater than what was harvested in 2018, demonstrating that a portion of what was marketed was harvested in other years, 2019 primarily. For the Jatobá species, this is clear, since in 2020 the species was not harvested. For the other 7, all the volumes sold were below those extracted in 2018, it being understood that the wood sold was for the first year of harvest. To clarify this, Agregue, responsible for management, prepared an official justification where it explains how this procedure occurs (11). Finally, based on what was presented, and considering that, regardless of the harvest year, the only destination of the wood extracted by management is for sawmills, to produce long-lived products, and taking into consideration what is recommended by the	

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>methodology, PP decided to conservatively ignore the stocks of long-lived wood products.

Additionally, according to the validated PD-VCS (p. 51), the carbon pool harvested wood to long-lived products was excluded because in the baseline scenario it was lower than in the Project scenario.

Evidence files contemplated by CAR:
(9) cnpj-serrarias.xlsx
(10) corte-geral-poa01.xlsx

(11) Carta agregue processo venda toras.pdf</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>CAR 13

Below are the reported values of unplanned deforestation in PA and LK area against verified values during the audit. Please correct calculations to use the most conservative of the values.

<table><tr><th>Project year$_t$</th><th>AUDPAicl,t reported in MR v1

(ha)</th><th>AUDPAicl,t verified during audit

(ha)</th></tr><tr><td>2014</td><td>140</td><td>122</td></tr></table></td><td>The calculations were corrected, considering more conservative values (only PRODES-2018 data), this change can be verified in the evidence (1). The data extracted from the PRODES-2018 project were also made available in spreadsheet and shapefile formats (2) and (3).

In addition, PP realized that an error occurred at the time of registering the monitored period for VCS within MR-v1, which was indicated as "February 14, 2014 to February 13, 2018", this information was adjusted to "February 14, 2014 to February 13, 2019" in MR-v2.

Considering QA/QC procedures, a detailed explanation was elaborated in Section 6.1 of MR explaining how this evaluation was done,</td><td>The audit team checked the ERs calculations spreadsheet v2 /2/ and the MR v2 /1/ and confirms the values for AUDPA*icl*, t and AUDLK*icl*, t have been corrected to reflect downloaded values of 2018 Prodes images during the audit.

With regards to QA/QC procedures the PP is requested to provide the records of in the field classification confirmation which uses GPS navigation. If the documents in the file 03-verificacao-acuracia.rar already have these records, PP is requested to explain and refer to exact documents show that classification data was checked in the field.

This CAR is open.</td></tr>
</table>

2015	71	163
2016	19	37
2017	103	103
2018	74	70

Also QA/QC procedures of the monitoring plan for both of these parameters in PD v1.4 states that "the assessment of the classifications will be carried out through data collection in the field using GPS navigation" however, during site visit it was seen that data classification was assessed using sentinel images.

Furthermore, the names of the parameters in the MR are not consistent with MP of the registered PD.

using together the methodology applied for the accuracy evaluation, with Sentinel-2 data and data collected in field using GPS navigation, which is performed by the surveillance team. This information was also mentioned in MR's MP and presented in the evidence (4).

The change of the parameter's names in MR-v1 was made to be compatible with the methodology. However, respecting what was initially established in the PD, the names were adjusted.

Evidence files contemplated by CAR:

(1) VCS-MR-jariamapa- 2014-2018-v2.xlsx

(2) 01-planilhas.rar

(3) 02-shapefile.rar

(4) 03-verificacao-acuracia.rar

CAR 13 (cont.)

The audit team checked the ERs calculations spreadsheet v2 /2/ and the MR v2 /1/ and confirms the values for AUDPA*icl*, t and AUDLK*icl*, t have been corrected to reflect

Regarding QA/QC procedures, PP provided new evidences (5) (6) to confirm that there is a field conference on the data gathered by the PRODES project, which are forwarded through annual monitoring 0bulletins prepared by Biofílica.

Ok the VVB checked the evidence sent and confirms fields visits are carried out to check areas classified as deforested areas by PRODES (30m resolution images), which helps the classification carried out with Sentinel (10m resolution images). The VVB will close this CAR but open a FAR for a

downloaded values of 2018 Prodes images during the audit. With regards to QA/QC procedures the PP is requested to provide the records of in the field classification confirmation which uses GPS navigation. If the documents in the file 03-verificacao-acuracia.rar already have these records, PP is requested to explain and refer to exact documents show that classification data was checked in the field. CAR13 is still opened.	Based on the deforestation coordinates of the bulletins, the security team is directed to the exact location for checking areas classified as deforested by PRODES. To help the field actions, maps are produced with the deforestation coordinates, as can be seen in the evidence (4), mentioned above, inside of the folder “05-mapas-monitoramento-campo”. As detailed in Section 6.1 of MR-v3, when the deforested areas were identified in field, the security team collects information relevant to the problems such as description of the deforested area, name of the person possibly involved and photos (5) (6). This information is then forwarded to the Infrastructure Manager who evaluate the fact. The 2014, 2015/2016, and 2017 Biofílica monitoring bulletins were produced respectively in January 2016, May 2018 and June 2018. However, field conference was carried out in May 2018 for 2014 and 2015/2016, and in August 2018 for the 2017 bulletin. Delay cause was mainly because of the crisis that occurred in Grupo Jari in 2016, affecting actions promoted by patrimonial vigilance team. So, in 2016 and 2017 there was a decrease in project's actions, consequently causing a delay in the field conference. The 2018 Biofílica monitoring bulletin was produced in September 2019,	improvement of the QA/QC so that the PP will include in the field verification a sample of other classes too, to be checked on the field together with deforested areas since what the PD states is that “the assessment of the classifications will be carried out through data collection in the field using GPS navigation”. This CAR13 is closed.

	because of the publication interval of the PRODES data, already explained to the VVB, and field conference happened in February 2020. The field checking was not carried out right when Biofílica monitoring reports are delivered, because intense periods of rainfall impaired and postponed it. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (5) boletim-checagem-pontos-biofílica.rar (6) fotos-checagem-campo.rar	
CAR14 With regards to non-permanence risk analysis: Internal Risks: Project Management: **b)** Ongoing enforcement is required to protect more than 50% of stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued; **f)** Mitigation: Adaptive management plan in place 1. Encroachment by outside actors and communities within project area (High):	The JariAP-VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v4.0 has been updated to adjust all the recommendations made by the VVB and to insert further explanations about each item raised. Other necessary evidence was attached to the report and follow listed below. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) JariAP-VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v4.0_v2.0.docx (2) JariAP-VCS-Risk-Report-Calculation-Tool-v4.0_v2.0.xls	Internal Risks: Project Management: b) Non-Permanence Risk Report /3/ updated to version 2 and now reflect that “Ongoing enforcement is required to protect more than 50% of stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued”. Item closed; f) Mitigation: Adaptive management plan in place 1. Encroachment by outside actors and communities within project area (High):

Please list in the risk report and provide to the VVB more objective evidence of adaptive management plan in place to reduce encroachment by outside actors and communities within project area as the PD cannot be considered to reflect present conditions as requested in the AFOLU non permanence risk tool. Financial Viability: **a) to d)** No objective evidence was presented as to the project cash flow being between 4 to 5 year from the current risk assessment to support score 1; **e) to h)** PP has not provided evidence of projects breakeven point from the current risk assessment neither that Project has secured less than 15% of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven; **Opportunity Cost:** **a) to f)** The PP chose option d) "… or where baseline activities are subsistence-driven, net positive community impacts are demonstrated". Furthermore it mentions section 2.4 of the registered PD as evidence of baseline activities being subsistence driven. The VVB confirms that section 2.4 of the registered PD /1/ states that the baseline	(3) 202011-Financeiro-REDDJariAmapa-Real+Projetado.xls (4) Modelo REDD JARI AMAPA_adicionalidade e risco_CCBS_20150720.xls (5) Esclarecimentos CAR Jari II.rar (6) Disputes over land tenure or ownership.rar	- Interaction with communities in order to contribute to social and economic development, and reduce the pressure on natural resources and forest cover: please indicate in the Non permanence risk report exactly what in section "4.3 Community Impact Monitoring" of the document "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project Monitoring Report" is being used to evidence that an adaptive management plan is being introduced in the following items: (i) Social Management: strengthening of social inclusion initiatives and social-based organizations; (ii) Business management: development of work opportunities and income to communities; and (iii) Environmental Management: mobilization of communities and communities representatives for environmental education and forest conservation - Implementation of a Monitoring Plan, as set out by the document "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project Monitoring Report v2.0 Of GHG Emission Reductions From Avoiding Unplanned Deforestation From 2014 To 2018 Section 4.3. Community Impact Monitoring": Ok will wait till all findings regarding the Montiring Plan of the MR are resolved.

scenario comprises land production by extractives and subsistence farmers with lands up to 200ha. With regards to the assessment of social and economic impacts of the project on social and economic wellbeing of the communities who derive livelihoods from the project area the PP states that this has been demonstrated in section 6 of the registered PD. While it is ok to demonstrate the baseline scenario from registered PD the VVB is of the opinion that the assessment of the social and economic impacts of the project on communities who derive livelihoods from the project area should be based on present conditions as per section 2.1.1 of the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool /6/. From audit interview the VVB was able to partially assess that but requires the PP to list in the Non-Permanence Risk Report and provide the VVB with further analysis and evidence of the social and economic impacts of the project on communities who derive livelihoods from the project area, as required by the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool. **h) e i)** The PP stated that the entire project area is protected by the Brazilian Forest Code (Law nº 12.651 of 25/05/2012). Please provide evidence. **External Risks:**		- Creation of a regular stakeholders meeting, the Technical Chamber, were stakeholders (communities, government, private sector and NGOs) can discuss projects activities and proposals.: Please provide evidence with the answers to this CAR explaining exactly which ones are demonstrating regular stakeholders meetings. As per email sent with the findings, the responses should be included in this form providing, whenever necessary, its respective support (evidence/s) documentation, linking them to the issues/findings (matching / cross-reference to CARs and/or CLs numbers). 2. Lack of qualified human capital to continue managing the project over time (Medium) - Establishment of training and qualification activities over the project lifetime: Please provide the evidence “Sistemática de Treinamento e Desenvolvimento” with the answer to this CAR (citing the name of the file in the answer to the CAR) and also any training records of training carried out which does not seem to have been sent. - Maintenance of continuous interaction with teaching, research and training institutions, such as Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa

Land Tenure and Resource Access/Impacts: **a) and b)** According to the registered PD /1/ Jari Group is the rightful owner of the land guaranteed through Land Title Deeds and therefore hold the right for resources. According to the PPs they do not lease the land. There are no disputes over access and use rights in the Jari/Pará Project area as the Group formally 130ecognized access and use rights to local extractive communities and itinerary farmers. Although there are no conflicts (as evidenced from interviews with communities during the audit) these 130ecognized communities also have legal rights to use of resources so the score here should be corrected to 2; **c)** The PP stated in its Non-Permanence Risk Report that "There no exist disputes over land tenure or ownership, as set out by the document Project Description Section 1 – 1.12." However, the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool /6/, section 2.1.1, requires present conditions to be assessed and therefore the VVB requests further evidence that there is no actual legal disputes over tenure and ownership in no more than 5% of the project area in order to verify a 0 score in this item;		Agropecuária - EMBRAPA/AP (Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation) and Instituto de Extensão, Assistência e Desenvolvimento Rural do Amapá (RURAP) – Vitória do Jari & Laranjal do Jari: Please provide evidence. 3. Delay in approving or no approval of plans needed to operate forest management (Multiple Use Forest Management) (Low) - Institutional articulation with competent governmental bodies (Governo do Estado do Amapá, Secretaria do Meio Ambiente – SEMA, Instituto do Meio Ambiente e de Ordenamento Territorial do Estado do Amapá – IMAP, Instituto Estadual de Florestas - IEF): Please provide evidence with the answer to this CAR - Ongoing monitoring of approval processes by qualified team (lawyers, professionals with significant experience in forest management and licensing processes): Please provide evidence with the answer to this CAR - Implementation of forest management operation following all procedures established by Jari Celulose in order to guarantee

Political risk: Please provide exact link where data on spreadsheet The Worldwide Governance Indicators.xlsx were downloaded from as the link in the tool is not accessible anymore.		technical quality of the operation, which includes forest operations, workforce management, social impact mitigation, and environmental monitoring (see procedures in the document Monitoring Report v2.0): Please state exactly where in the MR such procedures are found and provide any evidence needed with the answer to this CAR. Financial Viability: **a) to d)** The answer is not clear first the PP states that according to the validated financial analysis, breakeven point has been reached in 2016 and then it states that the breakeven point will be in 2021. The revalidation of the financial analysis is not a requirement of the verification so please correct the year to reflect the one in the validated financial analysis and provide the exact sheet and cell where the VVB can find the year of the breakeven point. **e) to h)** please see above answer. The VVB is not obliged to validate a whole new cashflow. Please just provide evidence that the stated % of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reached breakeven was secured.**Opportunity Cost:**

		a) to f) With regards to the assessment of social and economic impacts of the project on social and economic well being of the communities who derive livelihoods from the project area the PP states that this has been demonstrated in Monitoring Report v2.0 Section 4 – 4.1.1. such as by the results of the priority projects for the initially involved families, technical assistance (TARE), and training offered by the Project to the communities. The verification of these were axtensively discussed in section 4.5.1 of this report. Issue closed. **h) e i)** Please explain how can be evidenced that the maps presented in files “CAR_JARI II 2015” and “Car Jari II 2018 AP”, are the ones in the CAR of the property. **External Risks:** **Land Tenure and Resource Access/Impacts:** **a) and b)** if as per the PPs statement in the Non-Permanence Risk Report v2 /3/ the “Grupo Jari recognizes the right to resources access, such as Brazil nut, held by the local extractive communities” the score should be corrected to 2;

		c) With regards to the statement in the Non-Permanence Risk Report v2 /3/ "There no exist disputes over land tenure or ownership" the document "CAR14-Esclarecimento-ReservaLegal-ProjetoREDD+" in the file "(5) Esclarecimentos CAR Jari II.rar" sent with the answers to CAR14, is evidence that there is some kind of dispute over part of the land in the PA. Please provide evidence from district court that no disputes are being held. If no presential or email evidence can be obtained, as mentioned in the document "Esclarecimentos-Disputas", provide evidence from the web or equivalent. Normally it is possible to access information of legal proceedings in progress of a particular court from the web.**Political risk:** Please write in the Non-Permanence Risk Report the exact link where the spreadsheet The Worldwide Governance Indicators.xlsx was downloaded from. This CAR is open.
CAR 14 (cont.) Internal Risks: Project Management:	Internal Risks – Project Management: f) 1. Encroachment by outside actors and communities within project area (High): The item was reviewed as per VVB questionings.	Internal Risks: Project Management:

b) Non-Permanence Risk Report /3/ updated to version 2 and now reflect that “Ongoing enforcement is required to protect more than 50% of stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued”. Item closed; f) Mitigation: Adaptive management plan in place 1. Encroachment by outside actors and communities within project area (High): - Interaction with communities in order to contribute to social and economic development, and reduce the pressure on natural resources and forest cover: please indicate in the Non permanence risk report exactly what in section “4.3 Community Impact Monitoring” of the document “Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project Monitoring Report” is being used to evidence that an adaptive management plan is being introduced in the following items: (i) Social Management: strengthening of social inclusion initiatives and social-based organizations; (ii) Business management: development of work opportunities and income to communities; and (iii) Environmental Management: mobilization of communities and communities	All sections of MR-v3, other than those contemplated in 4.3, which refer to the points indicated in "Interaction with communities in order to contribute to social and economic development and reduce the pressure on natural resources and forest cover" have been indicated, making it clearer that an adaptive management plan is being introduced. The evidence contemplated in the CAR20, demonstrates the effectiveness of the creation of regular stakeholder meetings, established through the Technical Chambers. 2. Lack of qualified human capital to continue managing the project over time (Medium): The procedure *“Sistemática de Treinamento e Desenvolvimento”* was mede available for the VVB (7). In addition, during this monitoring period, a series of training and qualifications were offered to the technical team of Fundação Jari. The evidences are presented in the documents inside of folder "01-training-qualification" (8). The evidence of maintenance of continuous interaction with teaching, research and training institutions, such as EMBRAPA/AP and RURAP were provided (9). 3. Delay in approving or no approval of plans needed to operate forest management (Multiple Use Forest Management) (Low): The PP understands that item 3 of the adaptive	f) Mitigation: Adaptive management plan in place - Interaction with communities in order to contribute to social and economic development, and reduce the pressure on natural resources and forest cover: (i) Social Management: strengthening of social inclusion initiatives and social-based organizations; (ii) Business management: development of work opportunities and income to communities; and (iii) Environmental Management: mobilization of communities and communities representatives for environmental education and forest conservation. The VVB agrees that the Technical Chambers, Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (TARE) being carried out as concluded in CAR 20 of this report is evidence that an adaptive management plan is in place for this item. **Issue closed**. - Implementation of a Monitoring Plan, as set out by the document “Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project Monitoring Report v2.0 Of GHG Emission Reductions From Avoiding Unplanned Deforestation From 2014 To 2018 Section 4.3. Community Impact Monitoring”:

representatives for environmental education and forest conservation - Implementation of a Monitoring Plan, as set out by the document "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project Monitoring Report v2.0 Of GHG Emission Reductions From Avoiding Unplanned Deforestation From 2014 To 2018 Section 4.3. Community Impact Monitoring": Ok will wait till all findings regarding the Montiring Plan of the MR are resolved. - Creation of a regular stakeholders meeting, the Technical Chamber, were stakeholders (communities, government, private sector and NGOs) can discuss projects activities and proposals.: Please provide evidence with the answers to this CAR explaining exactly which ones are demonstrating regular stakeholders meetings. As per email sent with the findings, the responses should be included in this form providing, whenever necessary, its respective support (evidence/s) documentation, linking them to the issues/findings (matching / cross-reference to CARs and/or CLs numbers). 2. Lack of qualified human capital to continue managing the project over time (Medium)	management plan was not carried out as planned, because as described in item 2.2.4 of the MR, forest management did not occur within the monitored period as planned in the PD due to financial difficulties of the Grupo Jari. The start of forest management activities in Amapá only occurred in 2018, when the Grupo Jari decided to outsource the operation to a company with greater expertise in the activity (Agregue), acting in compliance with laws, standards, and the certification guidelines. In addition, the approved forest management plan was built based on the procedures established by the Grupo Jari. Thus, the item "Institutional articulation with competent governmental bodies" can be proven through the documentation prepared by Agregue and IMAP. Explaining the chronology of the documentation: Firstly, Agregue requested an APAT (Authorization prior to the technical analysis of a sustainable forest management plan) from IMAP (10) to analyze the legal viability of the forest management practice, based on the documentation presented and the existence of forest cover through satellite images. After the APAT was carried out and approved, Agregue sent all the documents referring to the forest management plan and the annual operational plan (POA) to IMAP (11) for subsequent approval. And then the forest management	Confirmed that all findings regarding the Montiring Plan of the MR were resolved. **Issue is closed.** - Creation of a regular stakeholders meeting, the Technical Chamber, were stakeholders (communities, government, private sector and NGOs) can discuss projects activities and proposals.: Ok evidence of regular stakeholder meetings implementation and monitoring were analysed in CAR20 and it was considered appropriate. **Issue closed.** 2. Lack of qualified human capital to continue managing the project over time (Medium) - Establishment of training and qualification activities over the project lifetime: The "Sistemática de Treinamento e Desenvolvimento" was provided with the answer to this CAR and also the training records of training carried out during the monitoring period for FSC SLIMF, GPS use, Capacitation and moderation of participatory tools amongst others carried out with Fundação Jari staff. **Issue closed** - Maintenance of continuous interaction with teaching, research and training institutions, such as Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária - EMBRAPA/AP (Brazilian

- Establishment of training and qualification activities over the project lifetime: Please provide the evidence "Sistemática de Treinamento e Desenvolvimento" with the answer to this CAR (citing the name of the file in the answer to the CAR) and also any training records of training carried out which does not seem to have been sent. - Maintenance of continuous interaction with teaching, research and training institutions, such as Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária - EMBRAPA/AP (Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation) and Instituto de Extensão, Assistência e Desenvolvimento Rural do Amapá (RURAP) – Vitória do Jari & Laranjal do Jari: Please provide evidence. 3. Delay in approving or no approval of plans needed to operate forest management (Multiple Use Forest Management) (Low) - Institutional articulation with competent governmental bodies (Governo do Estado do Amapá, Secretaria do Meio Ambiente – SEMA, Instituto do Meio Ambiente e de Ordenamento Territorial do Estado do Amapá – IMAP, Instituto Estadual de Florestas - IEF):	plan was approved, recognized by IMAP and informed to Agregue (12). Then, the first authorization for logging (AUTEX) was issued and signed by IMAP showing its recognition (13). After this, as the forestry operation extended beyond the term of the first AUTEX issued (13), so Agregue made a renewal request, which was approved (14), however, as the signed document was not received, Agregue contacted SEMA - AP to request a document proving that the AUTEX had already been renewed (15). All this process demonstrates how effective the communication between institutions has been. The item "Ongoing monitoring of approval processes by qualified team" was revised, directing the profiles of those responsible for forest management. The responsible people appointed were professional of Agregue: 1. Rafael Endler, engineer that is responsible of the Agregue in the state of Amapá and who communicates directly with the environmental agencies, as can be seen by evidence (10) (11) (15); and 2. Madson dos Santos, forest engineer responsible for the forest management plan in the state of Amapá, who was in direct contact with VVB during the audit. The procedures followed by sustainable forest management established by Jari Celulose	Agricultural Research Corporation) and Instituto de Extensão, Assistência e Desenvolvimento Rural do Amapá (RURAP) – Vitória do Jari & Laranjal do Jari: A series of certificates of courses run by EMBRAPA and Fundação Jarí were provided and a agreement of cooperation between Fundação Jarí and RURAP amongst other documents, as evidence of the continuous intereaction with teaching and research training institutions. **Issue closed.** 3. Delay in approving or no approval of plans needed to operate forest management (Multiple Use Forest Management) (Low) - Institutional articulation with competent governmental bodies (Governo do Estado do Amapá, Secretaria do Meio Ambiente – SEMA, Instituto do Meio Ambiente e de Ordenamento Territorial do Estado do Amapá – IMAP, Instituto Estadual de Florestas - IEF): Evidence provided. **Issue closed.** - Ongoing monitoring of approval processes by qualified team: VVB confirms that the team has been changed in the Risk Assessment Report to professionals with significant experience in forest management and licensing processes.

Please provide evidence with the answer to this CAR - Ongoing monitoring of approval processes by qualified team (lawyers, professionals with significant experience in forest management and licensing processes): Please provide evidence with the answer to this CAR - Implementation of forest management operation following all procedures established by Jari Celulose in order to guarantee technical quality of the operation, which includes forest operations, workforce management, social impact mitigation, and environmental monitoring (see procedures in the document Monitoring Report v2.0): Please state exactly where in the MR such procedures are found and provide any evidence needed with the answer to this CAR. Financial Viability: **a) to d)** The answer is not clear first the PP states that according to the validated financial analysis, breakeven point has been reached in 2016 and then it states that the breakeven point will be in 2021. The revalidation of the financial analysis is not a requirement of the	(Grupo Jari) are mentioned in section 2.4.6 - Commercially Sensitive Information and were made available on the first link of the shared drive, under the path "Auditoria Jari Amapá > Procedimentos > Manejo", but again, have been made available to the VVB as evidence (16) confidentially. Independent of the delays that occurred to carry out the part of the adaptive management plan that refers to the approval of the forest management, this point is considered low risk, and did not cause damage to the progress of the project. In addition, the PP carried out the measures defined as high and medium risk in full, as presented above, understanding that, given the priorities, in the main the measures of the adaptive management plan were implemented aiming to mitigate the internal risks of the project. Financial Viability: The item “Financial Viability (a to d)” was reviewed as per VVB comments. The exact sheet and cell where the VVB can find the year of the breakeven point is (17), cell C41. In fact, the breakeven point is called "Payback" in the sheet, however, in this analysis, the information has the same meaning. The Validation Report, p. 9 – ref. 65 (18), states that the reference is the same. The validated financial model (17), cell E51 states that the project has secured more than	The audit team also confirms the interviews with Agregue staff /128/. **Issue closed.** - Implementation of forest management operation following all procedures established by Jari Celulose in order to guarantee technical quality of the operation, which includes forest operations, workforce management, social impact mitigation, and environmental monitoring (see procedures in the document Monitoring Report v2.0): VVB confirms procedures are stated in section 2.4.3 of the MR and provided with the answer to this CAR. **Issue closed.** Financial Viability: a) to d) The VVB checked the validated financial analysis “Modelo REDD JARI AMAPA_adicionalidade e risco_CCBS_20150720” presented by the PP and mentioned in the Validation Report, and confirms that the payback time was in 5 years. In the same spreadsheet was the information that 16% of the cash outflow before payback was assured. **Issue closed.** h) e i) The VVB checked the shapes of the declared area of reserve, in the shapefile “RL.shp”. The size of the reserve area in this shape file is 230,637ha, which corresponds to the area shown in the receipt of rural

verification so please correct the year to reflect the one in the validated financial analysis and provide the exact sheet and cell where the VVB can find the year of the breakeven point. **e) to h)** please see above answer. The VVB is not obliged to validate a whole new cashflow. Please just provide evidence that the stated % of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reached breakeven was secured.**Opportunity Cost:** **a) to f)** With regards to the assessment of social and economic impacts of the project on social and economic well being of the communities who derive livelihoods from the project area the PP states that this has been demonstrated in Monitoring Report v2.0 Section 4 – 4.1.1. such as by the results of the priority projects for the initially involved families, technical assistance (TARE), and training offered by the Project to the communities. The verification of these were axtensively discussed in section 4.5.1 of this report. Issue closed. **h) e i)** Please explain how can be evidenced that the maps presented in files “CAR_JARI II 2015” and “Car Jari II 2018 AP”, are the ones in the CAR of the property.	15% of funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven. The answer in the risk report was change from de item e to f (19) (20). Opportunity Cost: To prove that the boundaries presented in the maps "CAR_JARI II 2015" and "Car Jari II 2018 AP" are the same as in the CAR of the property, PP made available the shapefiles of the respective CARs (2015 (21) and 2018(22)), with all the layers cited in the maps, the shapefile of the project area (23), and the property (24). With these data, the VVB can verify through georeferencing software the location of the areas presented and prove the overlap. In addition, PP also made the CAR documents available. Following the logic of what was presented in the clarification prepared by Group Jari (25), the property has a CAR generated in 2015 (26), which gave rise to the shapefile presented above (21) (27), to continue the process and grant an operating license for forest management, the correction of the CAR was requested in 2018, this correction process can be verified in the document "Statement of the Status of Information Declared in the CAR" (28), where the last rectification of the environmental declaration was highlighted in yellow, and which originated the 2018 shapefile (22) (29), also presented above. In addition to the	registration (CAR receipt). The VVB also checked that the area of reserve involves the project area shown in the shape “area_projeto.shp”. **Issue closed.** External Risks: Land Tenure and Resource Access/Impacts: **a) and b)** the VVB checked and the Non-Permanence Risk Report v2.1 /3/ was corrected to 2. **Issue closed.** **c)** The PP provided evidence of a consultation carried out in the State of Amapá Court website /92/ displaying 5 court cases. The PP provided details of such court cases /93/ and the VVB confirms that these were checked and that none of these were to do with property disputes. **Issued closed** and accept score. Political risk: The PP wrote in the answer to this CAR the exact link where the spreadsheet The Worldwide Governance Indicators.xlsx was downloaded from. **Issue closed.** This CAR is closed.

External Risks: **Land Tenure and Resource Access/Impacts:** **a) and b)** if as per the PPs statement in the Non-Permanence Risk Report v2 /3/ the "Grupo Jari recognizes the right to resources access, such as Brazil nut, held by the local extractive communities" the score should be corrected to 2; **c)** With regards to the statement in the Non-Permanence Risk Report v2 /3/ "There no exist disputes over land tenure or ownership" the document "CAR14-Esclarecimento-ReservaLegal-ProjetoREDD+" in the file "(5) Esclarecimentos CAR Jari II.rar" sent with the answers to CAR14, is evidence that there is some kind of dispute over part of the land in the PA. Please provide evidence from district court that no disputes are being held. If no presential or email evidence can be obtained, as mentioned in the document "Esclarecimentos-Disputas", provide evidence from the web or equivalent. Normally it is possible to access information of legal proceedings in progress of a particular court from the web.**Political risk:**	statement, the comparison of information can be made by the "mirror of the registrations" (30), where the information in the respective years is described for the same CAR identification. Another option is to query the information, with the CAR registration highlighted yellow in documents (26) and (28). The VVB can access the Sicar platform and consult the status of the property. Accessing: https://www.car.gov.br/#/consultar, enter the CAR registration and click on "Consulta", all public information available on the property's CAR can be accessed. External Risks – Land Tenure and Resource Access/Impacts: The score was corrected to 2 in the Non-Permanence Risk Report (19) and the Risk Report Calculation Tool (20). c) According to what was surveyed with the legal department of Grupo Jari, a conclusive evidence to prove that there are no land conflicts/disputes over the property would be the presentation of a civil distribution certificate from the Laranjal do Jari District Forum. However, a note of clarification was prepared by the Grupo Jari (31), explaining that due to the exponential increase of COVID-19 contagion cases in Amapá state, the State Court of Justice, as a preventive measure, suspended in-person access in all	

Please write in the Non-Permanence Risk Report the exact link where the spreadsheet The Worldwide Governance Indicators.xlsx was downloaded from. This CAR is open.	regional forums. This process had already been presented in evidence (6), in the document "TJAP.pdf", documents (32) (33) (34) demonstrate the perpetuation of this action until the time of submission of the documentation to the VVB, directly damaging the request and obtaining of a certificate. The presentation of this note to the VVB has been added to MR-v3 as a Commercially Sensitive Information (section 2.4.6). To get around this situation, the request for the certificate was made via e-mail (35), but until the deadline for delivery of the documents to the VVB there was no answer either, mainly because, since the servers are teleworking, this type of request is not included in the priority processes. A short description of this problem has been added to section 2.5.5 of MR-v3. Despite the delays by government agencies, another way found to prove the non-existence of these conflicts was the fact that the environmental agencies have been issuing environmental licenses and forest exploitation authorization to the Grupo Jari over all these years, such forest management licenses for the project area (36). According to Decree No. 3,325/2013, which regulates the exploitation of native forests in the State of Amapá, for the approval of the forest management plan the competent body will analyze the documentation submitted by those	

	responsible and will allow the start of activities that is demonstrated, among other information, the proof of regularity of the title of the property. Thus, the PP understands that since the environmental licenses and authorizations for forest management were only issued after demonstration of the property's regularity, consequently, the absence of any type of land conflict/disagreement over the land can be considered. Additionally, the PP makes available to the VVB for later consultation the list of all the lawsuits filed against Jari Celulose (owner of the area) according to the Amapá State Court of Justice (37), so, the VVB can check that any of these lawsuits are related to land conflicts. Political risk: KAUFMANN, D.; KRAAY, A., The Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI). Available on: http://www.govindicators.org Access in: April 13, 2020. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: Internal Risks: (7) SIG-PI Sistemática de Treinamento e Desenvolvimento.pdf (8) 01-training-qualification.rar	

	(9) 02-interactions-research-institutions.rar (10) protocolo Apat.pdf (11) protocolo PMFS POA 01.pdf (12) comunicacao-aprovação-PMFS.pdf (13) AUTEX-POA01-AGREGUE.pdf (14) AUTEX-POA01-AGREGUE-renov.pdf (15) Requeirmento de Comprovação de Autex Renovada sem Ass.pd (16) 05-grupo-jari-procedures.zip Financial Viability: (17) Modelo REDD JARI AMAPA_adicionalidade e risco_CCBS_20150720.xlsx (18) CCB Validation Report_ Biofilica_DNV_v2.0.pdf (19) JariAP-VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v4.0_v2.1 (20) JariAP-VCS-Risk-Report-Calculation-Tool-v4.0_v2.1	

	Opportunity Cost: (21) CAR-gleba-jari-II-2015.rar (22) CAR-gleba-jari-II-2018.rar (23) shp-project-area.rar (24) shp-prop-gleba-jari-II (25) CAR14-Esclarecimento-ReservaLegal-ProjetoREDD+.pdf (26) AP-1600279-B0490448E3CF418A961FB92E3B740A4F.pdf (27) CAR_JARI II 2015.pdf (28) demonstrativo-infos-car-2018.pdf (29) Car Jari II 2018 AP.pdf (30) Espelho CAP AP Cadastros 2015 e 2018.png External Risks: (31) Esclarecimentos-Disputas-GrupoJari.pdf	

	(32) TJAP prorroga suspensão do atendimento presencial.pdf (33) Prevenção à Covid-19_ TJAP prorroga suspensão do atendimento presencial.pdf (34) Justiça do Amapá prorroga medidas de contenção à COVID-19.pdf (35) E-mail para o Fórum_CERTIDÃO DO DISTRIBUIDOR CÍVEL (Ações de Natureza Possessória).pdf (36) environmental-licenses.rar (37) Pesquisa TJAP por nome Jari.pdf	
	Community	
CAR 15 As verified during the remote audit, the documents presented by PP do not provide separated information for Arapiranga and Tira Couro communities. Information for Tira Couro community was provided with Ramal França Rocha community. PP is requested to provide the information separated for each community included in the monitoring report.	Based on evidence review about engaged communities, in the specific case of the Arapiranga community, PP decided to consider the datas from this community as belonging to Tira Couro, the MR-v2 was updated based on this consideration, as well as presented evidences (1) (2) (3) (4) (5). Furthermore, all evidence related to communities were reviewed, so that the information corresponded correctly to the respective ones. All updated information is in CAR16 to CAR30, and in section 2.2.3 of MR-v2.	RINA verified that all information was revised and separated for each community except for Arapiranga that is part of Tira Couro community. This CAR is closed.

	Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) comunidades-total.shp (2) comunidades-engajadas.shp (3) comunidades-desistentes.shp (4) map-communities-location-v2.pdf (5) LinhaTempo_ProjetosPrioritarios.xls	
CAR 16 The indicators “Number of Brazil Nut trees identified by the pre-harvesting inventory”, “Number of Brazil Nut trees damage by the SFM”, “Number of complaint regarding damage to Brazil Nut tree or to restriction of access” and “Analysis of communities’ perception regarding resources availability, focus on the Brazil Nut” are not included in the monitoring report. Thus, it was not possible to verify that no high conservation values have been negatively affected by the project.	The indicators “Number of Brazil Nut trees identified by the pre-harvesting inventory”, “Number of Brazil Nut trees damage by the SFM”, “Number of complaint regarding damage to Brazil Nut tree or to restriction of access” and “Analysis of communities’ perception regarding resources availability, focus on the Brazil Nut” were included in the indicators table attached to MR-v2 and PM was updated. PP has provided new evidence to assist in the analysis of the impact degree occurred in potential areas of high conservation value (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7). Evidence files contemplated by CAR:	RINA verified that the indicators were included in the revised MR and the values monitored are according to the evidences provided. This CAR is closed.

	(1) PMFS AGREGUE avaliação de danos castanaheiras.xlsx (2) AGREGUE MF - INVENTÁRIO FLORESTAL CASTANHEIRAS.xlsx (3) 01-mapa-castanhais-retiro.rar (4) 02-fichas-mapeamento-retiro.rar (5) 03-comunicacao-conselho-retiro.rar (6) 04-plano-acao-compensacao-retiro.rar (7) 05-shapefile.rar	
CAR 17 Regarding the activity “Sustainable Forest Management”, the following issues were identified: The frequency of monitoring for all indicators included under this activity is not as per registered PD. The type of measurement/unit for the indicator “Extension of roads opened” is not according to the registered PD. The evidence provided for the indicator “Number of communities affected by the SFM” should be revised in order to include the	The frequency of monitoring for all indicators were adjusted to comply with the PD-VCS. To the years that activities were not developed, the indicator was zeroed. According to evidences (1) (2) (3), the information of the indicator "Extension of roads opened" was updated in the indicators table attached to MR-v2 based on what was defined in the PC-VCS. Evidence of the indicator "Number of communities affected by the SFM" were reviewed by Agregue and a new table (4) were prepared, containing the information from Amapá and indicating the years that	RINA verified the following: The frequency of monitoring for all indicators included under this activity is as per registered PD. The type of measurement/unit for the indicator “Extension of roads opened” is according to the registered PD. RINA verified the shapefile and confirmed the information included for this indicator. However, PP is requested to clarify when the roads were opened. The evidence provided for the indicator “Number of communities affected by the SFM” was correctly revised.

evidence RELAÇÃO COLABORADORES MANEJO AGREGUE 2019-2020.XLSX. Furthermore, information regarding Pará state should be removed from the evidence and information regarding the period that subcontractor employees should be provided. Indicator “Number of workshops regarding SFM activities implemented prior to the operation”: The presence list for the workshop done on 28 November 2014 should be provided. Indicator “Number of complains and demands regarding the SFM activities”: PP is requested to clarify the events chronology and provide evidences. PP is requested to provide the rural activity license and the approval of the sustainable forest management plan. Evidence of training in forest management and registry of forest management activity should be provided.	community members were hired. Strengthening the information contained in the table, another evidence (5) demonstrates the training actions carried out by Agregue. The indicator "Number of workshops regarding SFM activities implemented prior to the operation" was revised, and no attendance list was found for the meeting held on 28/11/2014, there are only written report of the community members in sheets and photos of the event. For other workshops, presence lists were provided (6) (7) (8). For the indicator "Number of complains and demands regarding the SFM activities" information was collected since 2014, through workshops that focused on communities belonging to Cajari River region, with the objective to establish a dialogue and to raise the main demands (7), going through the direct relationship with the municipality (9) and ending with the demands raised by the Ramal do Retiro community council which was directly impacted by the management activities (10) (11) (12) (13) (14). The concession documentation for the management of the area (15), approval of the sustainable forest management plan (16), evidence of training (4) and records of forest management activities (17) were provided.	Indicator “Number of workshops regarding SFM activities implemented prior to the operation”: The presence list for the workshop done on 28 November 2014 was not provided. The evidence provided is not sufficient to demonstrate the indicator. Indicator “Number of complains and demands regarding the SFM activities”: PP is requested to demonstrate that evidence (9) is a demand related to the project activity. How to demonstrate that the demands and complains included in the minute of the meeting held on 28 November 2014 are related to the project area. The evidence for the rural activity license and the approval of the sustainable forest management plan was provided. Evidence of training in forest management and registry of forest management activity was provided. This CAR is open.

	Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) 01-shapefile-estradas.rar (2) mapa-POA01-microzoneamento.pdf (3) autorizacao-ambiental-207-2018.pdf (4) AGREGUE MF - COLABORADORES POA 01 SAFRA 2020.2.xlsx (5) 02-treinamentos.rar (6) Relatorio de Visita as Comunidades_Cajari 10072014.pdf (7) Relatorio de Visita as Comunidades_Cajari2 28112014.pdf (8) Relatorio de Palestra IFAP_2018.pdf (9) Relatório Entrega de madeiras em toras_AGREGUE_COOPMOVEIS_PREFEITURA LARANJAL DO JARI.pdf (10) Fwd Reunião no Ramal do Retiro.msg (11) ConselhoRetiro_ATA01.pdf (12) ConselhoRetiro_ATA02.pdf	

	(13) RELATÓRIO DE REGISTRO DE DEMANDAS DE PARTES INTERESSADAS 24.06.20.pdf (14) Plano de Ação.pdf (15) Jari_Agregue-Contrato de Arrendamento Rural.pdf (16) comunicacao-aprovação-PMFS.pdf (17) 03-operacoes-manejo.rar	
CAR 17 (cont.) RINA verified the following: The frequency of monitoring for all indicators included under this activity is as per registered PD. The type of measurement/unit for the indicator “Extension of roads opened” is according to the registered PD. RINA verified the shapefile and confirmed the information included for this indicator. However, PP is requested to clarify when the roads were opened. The evidence provided for the indicator “Number of communities affected by the SFM” was correctly revised.	It is not possible to bring an exact date of when roads were opened because Agregue, responsible for forest management, does not record the opening date of roads. Considering processes, first field survey is made with GPS from where the roads will be allocated, and then this information is forwarded to the geoprocessing team of the Grupo Jari, responsible for preparing the maps that will assist in process of opening the infrastructures with machinery. None of the data collected in the field for the monitored period (shapefiles or maps) have dates, so to have an idea of the period that the activity occurred the Annual Operational Plan (POA) approved in 2018 (18), and the environmental authorization document for opening roads signed by the state agency IMAP in 2018 (3) were used. As both are	RINA verified the following: The frequency of monitoring for all indicators included under this activity is as per registered PD. The type of measurement/unit for the indicator “Extension of roads opened” is according to the registered PD. RINA verified the shapefile and confirmed the information included for this indicator. RINA accepted the explanation provide by PP in order to clarify when the roads were opened. The evidence provided for the indicator “Number of communities affected by the SFM” was correctly revised.

Indicator "Number of workshops regarding SFM activities implemented prior to the operation": The presence list for the workshop done on 28 November 2014 was not provided. The evidence provided is not sufficient to demonstrate the indicator. Indicator "Number of complains and demands regarding the SFM activities": PP is requested to demonstrate that evidence (9) is a demand related to the project activity. How to demonstrate that the demands and complains included in the minute of the meeting held on 28 November 2014 are related to the project area. The evidence for the rural activity license and the approval of the sustainable forest management plan was provided. Evidence of training in forest management and registry of forest management activity was provided. This CAR is open.	dated in the same year, the year 2018 was adopted conservatively as the opening of roads, as these official documents are the main source of possible dates that this activity occurred. The PP considered the workshop held on 28 November 2014 due to the completed questionnaires - pages 3 to 6 of the evidence (7) - by community members. The purpose of the workshop was to disseminate and inform SFM activities to community members and to encourage their communication with the company. As an initiative to stimulate communication, the event presented the forms of the "Fale Conosco" tool so that community members could register their demands during the event. The completed questionnaires by the participants were subsequently sent to the institutional relations sector for registration, analysis, and treatment. Thus, PP understands that the completed forms can prove the participation of the community members present in the activity. In section 2.3.3 of MR-v3, there is a contextualization of the workshop done as informational meeting with stakeholders. Regarding Indicator "Number of complains and demands regarding the SFM activities", PP provided a new evidence (19) to demonstrate that evidence (9) is a demand related to the project activity. The evidence (9)	Indicator "Number of workshops regarding SFM activities implemented prior to the operation": The evidence provided is sufficient to demonstrate the indicator. Indicator "Number of complains and demands regarding the SFM activities": PP demonstrated that evidence (9) is a demand related to the project activity. PP clearly demonstrated that the demands and complains included in the minute of the meeting held on 28 November 2014 are related to the project area. The evidence for the rural activity license and the approval of the sustainable forest management plan was provided. Evidence of training in forest management and registry of forest management activity was provided. This CAR is closed.

	is related to the partnership between Agregue and municipality of Laranjal do Jari (19) for provision of wood logs, derived from SFM activities, to be benefited and used for construction and restoration of walkways, bridges, bus stops among other constructions that benefit communities. Thus, the demand is related to the project activity since it positively impacts the community from municipality of Laranjal do Jari and works on one of the concerns raised by the community as recorded in section 2.3.3 of MR-v3. This partnership was also described in section 4.2.2. Demands and complaints highlighted in the minute of the meeting held on 28 November 2014 (7) are related to SFM activities, as they respond to the indicator "Number of complains and demands regarding the SFM activities". Forest management activities are carried out within the project area as stated in section G1.8 of PD - discussed in the text and visualized in figure 10 - and section 2.3.3 of MR-v3. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (3) autorizacao-ambiental-207-2018.pdf (18) POA-AGREGUE-FINAL	

	(19) termo-concessao-uso-bem-publico-07-2019	
CAR 18 Regarding the activity "Monitoring of Deforestation", the following issues were identified: The frequency of monitoring for all indicators included under this activity is not as per registered PD. The evidence provided (Microzoneamento_REDD 2019_Final.xls) does not allow to monitor the efficacy of the project activity on reducing the need of opening new forest areas. Provide third party evidence of areas deforested per engaged community and area deforested per family attended. Indicator "Number of occurrences forwarded to environmental agencies": The verification team was not able to verify this indicator through the evidence provided. Moreover, information for 2019 and 2020 should be provided.	The frequency of monitoring for all indicators were adjusted in the MR-v2 to comply the registered PD. Regarding the indicator "Area deforested per engaged community", the PP updated the numbers through monitoring period, and provided new evidence (shapefiles in SIRGAS 2000 UTM 22S and excel spreadsheets) (1). Values were collected through a combined analysis using shapefile datas of communities' location (2), which was produced as a result of microzoning in 2018, and deforestation of PRODES-2019 (3). The analysis was supported by field knowledge of Fundação Jari, which has a strong presence in the area and has a deep knowledge of the communities' dynamics. In order to select which deforestation polygons would be accounted for as responsibility of engaged communities, the existence of other communities in project zone was considered through a shapefile data (4), which presents the entries of the communities' properties through roads and also communities' location. This data was produced during the 2020 public consultation, using the coordinates recorded in photographs taken of the	RINA verified the following: The frequency of monitoring for all indicators included under this activity is as per registered PD. The evidences provided to monitor the efficacy of the project activity on reducing the need of opening new forest areas were checked. • delimitacao_comunidades_engajadas.zip: The shapefiles have the areas of the communities listed in the spreadsheet "Annex_JariAmapaMR_CCBv3.0-VCSv3.4_ENG2.0"; • deforestation_comunidades.zip: Shapefiles with some areas of deforestation close to the areas of the communities. However, the method used to assign each of the deforested areas to communities was not clear. Thus, PP is requested to explain and demonstrate the method applied. Regarding to the area deforested per family attended, PP is requested to clearly explain the method used to identify each property.

	community members by Fundação Jari. If there are any doubts about the information, the technician in charge Luiz Figueiredo can clarify any point that arises. Considering the indicator "Area deforested per family attended", PP updated the numbers through monitoring period, and provided new evidence (shapefiles in SIRGAS 2000 UTM 22S and excel spreadsheets) (5). Numbers were extracted through intersection of deforestation from PRODES-2019 (3) and properties of the families attended (2). The latter was produced during microzoning in 2018. Both indicator “Area deforested per engaged community” and "Area deforested per family attended" do not present values for 2020, as deforestation data from PRODES for 2020 is expected to be available in 2021. Regarding the indicator “Number of occurrences forwarded to environmental agencies”, PP updated the numbers through monitoring period, and provided new evidences (6) - police reports and others official documents with registered occurrences. Considering 2016 and 2020, there was no occurrences forwarded to environmental agencies, explaining the cause of the zero's numbers for these years.	In addition, PP is requested to clarify the following: • Why the total amount of areas deforested per communities + families in 2019/2020 is less than the areas deforested in the project area and leakage belt in 2018. • Why some areas deforested very close to the communities were not considered. Indicator “Number of occurrences forwarded to environmental agencies”: The number mentioned for the year 2017 is not according to the evidences provided. This CAR is open.

	Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) desmatamento_comunidades.zip (2) delimitacao_comunidades_engajadas.zip (3) http://www.dpi.inpe.br/prodesdigital/dadosn/mosaicos/2019/ (4) entradas_ramais_e_comunidades.shp (5) desmatamento_agricultores.zip (6) ocorrencias_denuncias_ambientais.zip	
CAR 18 (cont.) RINA verified the following: The frequency of monitoring for all indicators included under this activity is as per registered PD. The evidences provided to monitor the efficacy of the project activity on reducing the need of opening new forest areas were checked. • delimitacao_comunidades_engajadas.zip: The shapefiles have the areas of the	The method used to assign each of the deforested areas to communities – described in section 4.3.1. of the MR-v3 – was done considering an analysis with deforestation data from PRODES-2019, location of communities and their entrances through roads. For analysis, it is essential the field knowledge of Fundação Jari, which has a strong presence in the area and has a deep knowledge of the communities' dynamics. PP provided evidence (7) explaining some specific cases of deforestation for the audit team to know about. The evidence explains	PP clearly explained the method used to assign each of the deforested areas to communities. Regarding to the area deforested per family attended, PP clearly explained the method used to identify each property. In addition, PP clarified the following: • Why the total amount of areas deforested per communities + families in 2019/2020 is less than the areas deforested in the project area and leakage belt in 2018.

communities listed in the spreadsheet "Annex_JariAmapaMR_CCBv3.0-VCSv3.4_ENG2.0"; • deforestation_comunidades.zip: Shapefiles with some areas of deforestation close to the areas of the communities. However, the method used to assign each of the deforested areas to communities was not clear. Thus, PP is requested to explain and demonstrate the method applied. Regarding to the area deforested per family attended, PP is requested to clearly explain the method used to identify each property. In addition, PP is requested to clarify the following: • Why the total amount of areas deforested per communities + families in 2019/2020 is less than the areas deforested in the project area and leakage belt in 2018. • Why some areas deforested very close to the communities were not considered. Indicator "Number of occurrences forwarded to environmental agencies": The number mentioned for the year 2017 is not according to the evidences provided. This CAR is open.	why some areas deforested very close to the communities were not considered. Regarding to the area deforested per family attended, the method used to identify each property consists of the microzoning process – described "Development of the Plan for Use of Properties" in section 4.3.1. of the MR-v3. Microzoning of the family unit was the georeferenced demarcation of the entire property area, carried out by the technicians of Fundação Jari, identifying productive areas, recoverable areas, watercourses and rivers, conservation areas, different uses of the property, delimiting borders and collecting soil samples for analysis. The microzoning was divided in two moments during the monitored period. The first was in 2014 with some community members, where the memorials describing their properties were prepared. The second, covered a larger number of community members, and focused on those involved in priority projects in their most robust phase in 2018. The main objective is to monitor the properties to verify that the REDD project investment is being applied correctly. Thus, microzoning allows a comparison between what is observed before and after the implementation of priority projects. Another point that PP clarifies is that deforestation that occurred within project area	• Why some areas deforested very close to the communities were not considered. Indicator "Number of occurrences forwarded to environmental agencies": The number mentioned for the year 2017 was revised and is according to the evidences provided. This CAR is closed.

	and leakage belt occurred in other regions besides the areas of communities and families, that is why the values referring to the areas of communities and families were lower than those in project area and leakage belt. The indicator "Number of occurrences forwarded to environmental agencies" for the year 2017 was revised and adjusted. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (7) explicacao-dados-desmatamento.pdf	
CAR 19 Regarding the activity "Property Surveillance", the following issues were identified: The frequency of monitoring for the indicator "Number of fire control and prevention workshops implemented per communities engaged" is not as per registered PD. Further clarification should be provided in order to explain why the workshops were done only in two of the seven communities engaged in the project activity. Indicator "Number of complaints/demands regarding the surveillance action": The evidence provided does not inform the number of demands. Information for 2019 and	The frequency of monitoring for the indicator "Number of fire control and prevention workshops implemented per communities engaged" were adjusted in the MR-v2 to comply the registered PD. In addition, PP reevaluated the evidences (presence lists of the occurred activities) (1) (2) and updated the numbers through monitoring period. The project was not able to reach other engaged communities and neither to maintain the frequency established in PD because there was a greater focus of these actions in Pará due to required certifications by FSC and Serflor. In addition, other actions of the project were prioritized. However, PP registered in MR-v2 its commitment to increase its reach with other engaged communities until the next	RINA verified the following: Indicator "Number of fire control and prevention workshops implemented per communities engaged": frequency of monitoring is as per registered PD. A clarification was provided in order to explain why the workshops were done only in Nova Conquista. Indicator "Number of complaints/demands regarding the surveillance action": Not monitored during the verification period. This lack of monitoring was included in the project description deviation section. This CAR is closed.

2020 was not provided. In addition, based on the document provided, PP is requested to explain the absence of surveillance action in the second semester of the years 2015 and 2016.	verification. In addition, it was possible to identify that there was a positive impact because other communities present in the project area participated in fire control and prevention workshops. Considering 2020, due to the pandemic situation, it was necessary to adapt the communication with communities to ensure health and safety of all. Thus, information's on fire control and prevention were carried out through the distribution of posters (3) and by radios (4) (5). Regarding the indicator "Number of complaints/demands regarding the surveillance action", it was not possible to collect the values because there was no registered procedure to stimulate the collection of these data. PP updated the procedure to gather these data to the next verification. The document (6) is available for verification of the procedure update. It was included that complaints, denunciations and demands should be registered and forwarded to the Infrastructure Management, preserving the confidentiality of the source. Also, it was available the e-mail (7) from Property Surveillance manager requesting to update the new procedure in the system. Regarding the lack of surveillance in the second half of 2015 and 2016, it was due to	

	Jari Celulose's economic crisis in this period, causing the reduce the number of operations. In addition, for internal management reasons, the team was shifted to make the surveillance at the factory in this period, causing a reduction of surveillance in Amapá. There was no significant reduction in expenses in this period as the structure was maintained, with only a reduction in patrol operations. An analysis was performed of specific cost centers (8) that point to a reduction in Fuel and Accommodation, expenses directly related to the surveillance operation. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) palestras_incendio_florestal_2018_09_19.pdf (2) palestras_incendio_florestal_2019.pdf (3) cartaz_incendios_florestais.pdf (4) AUD-20201001-WA0127_1.mp3 (5) AUD-20201001-WA0127_2.mp3 (6) fiscalizacao_area_fundiaria.doc	

	(7) enc_revisao_procedimento_fiscalização_area_fundiaria.msg (8) CAR19-Analise CC Patrulhamento.xls	
CAR 20 Regarding the activity “Technical Board Meetings”, the following issues were identified: Information regarding the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020, should be provided. The indicators “Number of institutions invited”, “Number of communities invited”, “Percentage of youth participating”, “Time invested by the communities’ members” and “Public Policies communities are accessing” were not considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. Information regarding the indicators “Number of Institutions that attended”, “Number of communities that attended”, “Number of representants per communities”, “Percentage of women participating” and “Number of issues addressed” should be revised. Information provided in the monitoring report is not according to evidences provided. The	All indicators of the activity “Technical Board Meetings” have been reviewed. Information on the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020 was included, and in years when the activity did not take place, the parameters were reset to zero. All the presence lists, minutes and mobilization reports were made available (1) (2) (3) (4) (5). The indicators “Number of institutions invited”, “Number of communities invited”, “Percentage of youth participating”, “Time invested by the communities’ members” and “Public Policies communities are accessing” were added in the updated spreadsheet. The indicator "Public Policies communities are accessing" has the frequency to be monitored every 2 years, because of this, the data were collected adding the information of each period, for example, for the year 2016 were added information from 2015 and 2016. And the data of the indicators “Number of Institutions that attended”, “Number of	RINA verified the following: Information regarding the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020, was provided. The indicators “Number of institutions invited”, “Number of communities invited”, “Percentage of youth participating”, “Time invested by the communities’ members” and “Public Policies communities are accessing” were considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. However, no evidence was provided for the “Percentage of youth participating”. Information regarding the indicator “Number of Institutions that attended” was correctly revised and evidences were provided. “Number of issues addressed”: Missing evidence. “Number of institutions invited”: Missing evidence for 2014, 2015, 2018. “Number of communities invited”: Missing evidence for 2015, 2018, 2019.

presence list of all Technical Board Meetings should be provided.	communities that attended", "Number of representants per communities", "Percentage of women participating" and "Number of issues addressed" have been reviewed. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) 2014-dados-cts.rar (2) 2015-dados-cts.rar (3) 2018-dados-cts.rar (4) 2019-dados-cts.rar (5) OrganizacaoDadosCTs.xlsx	"Number of communities that attended": 2nd semester 2014: Number of communities that attended is not correct. 2019: Number of communities that attended is not correct. "Number of representants per communities": 1st semester 2014: Igarapé das Pacas: number of men is not correct. 2018: Tira Couro: The number of men and women is not correct. França Rocha: The number of men is not correct. Água Azul: The number of women is not correct. 2019: Tira Couro: The number of men and women is not correct. "Percentage of women participating": 2019: The number of representants (institutions) is not correct. This CAR is open.
CAR 20 (cont.) RINA verified the following:	The Fundação Jari, which worked directly with the community members participating in the project, surveyed just the main personal data of the 33 community members who prepared the priority projects (6), and consequently took	RINA verified the following: Information regarding the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020, was provided.

Information regarding the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020, was provided. The indicators “Number of institutions invited”, “Number of communities invited”, “Percentage of youth participating”, “Time invested by the communities’ members” and “Public Policies communities are accessing” were considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. However, no evidence was provided for the “Percentage of youth participating”. Information regarding the indicator “Number of Institutions that attended” was correctly revised and evidences were provided. “Number of issues addressed”: Missing evidence. “Number of institutions invited”: Missing evidence for 2014, 2015, 2018. “Number of communities invited”: Missing evidence for 2015, 2018, 2019. “Number of communities that attended”: 2nd semester 2014: Number of communities that attended is not correct. 2019: Number of communities that attended is not correct.	part in the technical chambers. In this survey the age of the participants was pointed out, and only 1 community member was found to fit the "young" profile during the monitored period. Thus, to arrive at the "Percentage of youth participating" indicator, the data from the presence lists of the technical chambers (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) were crossed with the document that indicates the age of the participants (6). When the only community member considered "young" participated in the TCs, the value 1 was divided by the total number of participants (summing communities and institutions), thus arriving at the percentage presented. When the community member identified did not participate in the TC the value was left as zero. The evidence cited above used to arrive at these values was indicated in the table of monitored indicators provided to the VVB. The evidence for the indicator "Number of issues addressed" has been provided (12) (13) (14) (15) (16). Previously, for the indicator "Number of institutions invited", the evidence considered was based on the minutes and attendance lists, but the PP realized that this data refers to who in fact participated, responding only to the indicator "Number of Institutions that attended", so the values were adjusted for all	The indicators “Number of institutions invited”, “Number of communities invited”, “Percentage of youth participating”, “Time invested by the communities’ members” and “Public Policies communities are accessing” were considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. Evidence was provided for the “Percentage of youth participating”. Information regarding the indicator “Number of Institutions that attended” was correctly revised and evidences were provided. “Number of issues addressed”: evidence was provided. “Number of institutions invited”: evidences were provided. “Number of communities invited”: evidences were provided. “Number of communities that attended”: 2nd semester 2014: Number of communities that attended is correct. 2019: Number of communities that attended is correct. “Number of representants per communities”:

“Number of representants per communities”: 1st semester 2014: Igarapé das Pacas: number of men is not correct. 2018: Tira Couro: The number of men and women is not correct. França Rocha: The number of men is not correct. Água Azul: The number of women is not correct. 2019: Tira Couro: The number of men and women is not correct. “Percentage of women participating”: 2019: The number of representants (institutions) is not correct. This CAR is open.	years. Thus, the indicator “Number of institutions invited” was not recorded for the years 2014 and 2015, because in the beginning of the monitored period these actions were carried out in a more “informal” way, not being made an official record of the institutions contacted to participate in the technical chambers. However, it is possible to know that the institutions were invited, since, when analyzing the indicator "Number of Institutions that attended" there are numbers for all the years monitored. Even so, as the contact/invitation was not registered, there was no evidence, so these indicators were reset to zero for the respective years and this point was added as a deviation in section 2.2.4. For 2018 the values were updated, and evidence provided (15). In the same way, for the indicator "Number of communities invited", in 2015 and 2019 this process was also carried out informally. The communities were contacted directly by technicians of the Fundação Jari through visits, which were not recorded for these two years. However, it is also possible to know that these invitations were made when checking the indicator "Number of communities that attended", which shows the participation of community members in the technical chambers in both years. Therefore, it was not possible to find evidence of these actions and,	1st semester 2014: Igarapé das Pacas: number of men is correct. 2018: Tira Couro: The number of men and women is correct. França Rocha: The number of men is correct. Água Azul: The number of women is correct. 2019: Tira Couro: The number of men and women is correct. “Percentage of women participating”: 2019: The number of representants (institutions) is correct. This CAR is closed.

	consequently, for these years the values were reset to zero, this point was added as a deviation in section 2.2.4 too. For 2018 the values were updated, and evidence provided (17). The indicator "Number of communities that attended" was adjusted. For the 2nd Semester of 2014, 6 communities were considered, the presence list (8) points out: 1. Igarapé das Pacas (orange), 2. Água Azul (purple), 3. Nova Conquista (green), 4. Sombra da Mata (yellow), 5. Fé em Deus (dark purple and annotation) and 6. França Rocha (red). For 2019, 6 communities were considered, the attendance list (6) points out: 1. Igarapé das Pacas (orange), 2. Água Azul (blue), 3. Nova Conquista (dark purple), 4. França Rocha (pink), 5. Tira Couro (light pink) - community members signed as "Boa Esperança", but appear in all project records as Tira Couro, including in the information on priority projects -, 6. Fé em Deus (green). Previously, the indicator "Number of representatives per communities" showed the sum of men and women for each community. Now, for better analysis, the number of men and women participants have been revised and presented separately, and evidence has been added individually for each event with	

	color identification for the respective communities indicated (7) (8) (9) (10) (11). The indicator "Percentage of women participating" has been adjusted and the references indicated year by year (7) (12) (8) (13) (9) (14) (10) (11). Other evidence, previously presented, was updated and served to modify the information in the indicators table, the new versions were also made available to the VVB (18) (19) (20) (21) (22) (23). Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (6) relacao-produtores-pps.pdf (7) ListaFrequenciaCT_13032014-v2.pdf (8) ListaFrequenciaCT_20082014-v2.pdf (9) ListaFrequenciaCT_25082015-v2.pdf (10) ListaFrequenciaCT_09082018-v2.pdf (11) ListaFrequenciaCT_24072019-v2.pdf (12) AtaCTREDD_13032014-v2.pdf (13) AtaCTREDD_20082014-v2.pdf	

	(14) AtaCTREDD_25082015-v2.pdf (15) MobilizacaoCT_09082018-v2-pt1.pdf (16) AtaCTREDD_24072019-v2.pdf (17) MobilizacaoCT_09082018-v2-pt2.pdf (18) OrganizacaoDadosCTs-v2.xlsx (19) MobilizacaoCT_13032014-v2.pdf (20) PPTCTREDD_13032014-v2.pdf (21) MobilizacaoCT_20082014-v2.pdf (22) MobilizacaoCT_24072019-v2.pdf (23) PPTCTREDD_24072019-v2.pdf	
CAR 21 Regarding the activity “Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (TARE)”, the following issues were identified: The indicators “Amount of cassava produced”, “Percentage of families with access to loans”, “Familiar income”, “Final market achieved” and “Time invested by the communities’ members” were not considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD.	The indicators "Amount of cassava produced" and "Percentage of families with access to loans" were added to the spreadsheet of monitored results. The evidence used to gather this information was made available (1) (2) (6) (7) (8) (9). The indicators "Familiar income" and "Final market achieved" were still not considered because the main source of this information is family assessment, which during the monitored period was not carried out, as explained in CAR25 and in section 2.2.4 of	RINA verified the following: The indicators “Amount of cassava produced” and “Percentage of families with access to loans”, were included in the monitoring plan. However, the numbers for the indicator “Percentage of families with access to loans” are not according to the evidences provided. The indicators “Familiar income”, “Final market achieved” and “Time invested by the communities’ members” were not monitored during the verification period and as a

The frequency of monitoring for all indicators included under this activity is not as per registered PD. Information regarding the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020, should be provided. Information regarding the indicator “Number of families attended” is not correct. Information regarding the indicator “Number of communities engaged” should be provided for each community and not for the municipalities. Indicator “Frequency of visits”: The type of measurement/unit should be number per month. Thus, the information per month should be provided for each semester. Additionally, information for 2016 and 2020 should be provided. Indicator “Percentage of producers using the forest to grow crops”: Information regarding the period should be included. Indicator “Diversity of products produced”: The value mentioned in the monitoring report is not according to the evidence provided. In addition, information regarding the period should be included.	MR-v2, this activity was directly impacted by the delay in the effective implementation of the Priority Projects, due to budget problems, and by the corona virus pandemic in 2020. The indicator "Time invested by the communities' members" was also still not considered, as no adequate way of recording this data to be accounted for was found. Although the Fundação Jari prepared a new field sheet in 2020 that presents the time data, the filling out of this information is not taking place effectively. Therefore, it was decided to consider the lack of this data as a project description deviation, described in section 2.2.4 of MR-v2. For the indicators "Number of families attended", "Number of communities engaged", "Frequency of visits" and "Gender and age of the producers attended", the information was re-evaluated based on the survey of actions prepared by the Fundação Jari (1). As the quantity of numbers surveyed is very high, in order to verify the data indicated in the spreadsheet prepared by the VBB, the PP made available sheets of three producers attended throughout the monitored period (3) (4) (5), each action indicated in the field sheets was considered as an advisory service (“Assessoramentos” in Portuguese). Due to the high number of data, the Fundação	consequence were not considered in the monitoring report. This lack of monitoring was included in the project description deviation section. The frequency of monitoring for the indicators included under this activity is as per registered PD, except for the indicators "Number of families attended", "Number of communities engaged", "Frequency of visits", “Percentage of families with access to loans” and "Gender and age of the producers attended". RINA verified that the documents (3) (4) (5) provided for each producer attended have the date. Thus, PP is requested to clarify why it is not possible to separate the information according to the monitoring frequency mentioned in the registered PD (every 6 months). Information regarding to the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020 was provided. Information regarding to the indicator “Number of families attended” was corrected. Information regarding to the indicator “Number of communities engaged” was provided for each community. Indicator “Frequency of visits”: The type of measurement/unit should be number per month. The information per month was not

Indicator “Gender and age of the producers attended”: Information regarding the age of the producers attended was not provided. Moreover, information for 2016 and 2020 should be provided.	Jari only controls this data on an annual frequency, different from what was established in the PD. Thus, the presentation of data followed the annual pattern and the change in monitoring frequency for these indicators was explained in section 2.2.4 of MR-v2. The indicators "Percentage of producers using the forest to grow crops" and "Diversity of products produced" were revised and updated in the spreadsheet according to the frequency established in the PD. The survey of this information (6) was based on data compiled by the Fundação Jari based on data from the Diagnostic conducted in 2014 (DOP) (7), data from the Family Agriculture Food Acquisition Program (FAFAP, PAA in Portuguese) for 2016 and 2018 (8), and data from the questionnaire conducted in the field in 2020 for the acquisition of the Declaration of Aptitude to Pronaf (DAP) (9). The data referring to FAFAP were counted only from Laranjal do Jari, as the information from Vitória do Jari is presented by entities. That is, the producers made their deliveries through institutions and the information was not accounted individually. Evidence files contemplated by CAR:	provided for each semester. Information for 2016 and 2020 were included. Indicator “Gender and age of the producers attended”: PP is requested to clarify which evidence was used to confirm Information regarding the age of the producers attended. Information regarding the indicators “Percentage of producers using the forest to grow crops”, “Amount of cassava produced” and “Diversity of products produced” is according to the evidences provided. This CAR is open.

	(1) LinhaTempo_ATER.xlsx (2) relatorio-credito-rural.pdf (3) fichas-natalina-pereira-sousa.pdf (4) fichas-nilson-pedreiro-torriel.pdf (5) fichas-osvaldo-pinto-silva.pdf (6) indicador-diversidade-produtos.xlsx (7) 2014-diagnostico.rar (8) 2016-2018-PAA.rar (9) 2020-questionario-dap.rar	
CAR 21 (cont.) RINA verified the following: The indicators “Amount of cassava produced” and “Percentage of families with access to loans”, were included in the monitoring plan. However, the numbers for the indicator “Percentage of families with access to loans” are not according to the evidences provided. The indicators “Familiar income”, “Final market achieved” and “Time invested by the communities’ members” were not monitored	The frequency of the indicator "Percentage of families with access to loans" was defined in the PD-CCB that would be done every 2 years, being represented by the percentage of families that had access to loans, within those attended by ATER. In 2014, no actions were taken on this topic, because the project was focused mainly on choosing and starting the development of activities with community members, while 2016 was the year that the Grupo Jari went through a crisis that affected all sectors of the company, so between 2014 and 2016 this activity was not carried out, being started only in 2017, as shown in the	RINA verified the following: The indicators “Amount of cassava produced” and “Percentage of families with access to loans”, were included in the monitoring plan. The numbers for the indicator “Percentage of families with access to loans” are according to the evidences provided. The indicators “Familiar income”, “Final market achieved” and “Time invested by the communities’ members” were not monitored during the verification period and as a consequence were not considered in the

during the verification period and as a consequence were not considered in the monitoring report. This lack of monitoring was included in the project description deviation section. The frequency of monitoring for the indicators included under this activity is as per registered PD, except for the indicators "Number of families attended", "Number of communities engaged", "Frequency of visits", “Percentage of families with access to loans” and "Gender and age of the producers attended". RINA verified that the documents (3) (4) (5) provided for each producer attended have the date. Thus, PP is requested to clarify why it is not possible to separate the information according to the monitoring frequency mentioned in the registered PD (every 6 months). Information regarding the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020 was provided. Information regarding the indicator “Number of families attended” was corrected. Information regarding the indicator “Number of communities engaged” was provided for each community. Indicator “Frequency of visits”: The type of measurement/unit should be number per month. The information per month was not	Rural Credit report (10). Between 2019 and 2020, the focus was on monitoring the 2017 and 2018 beneficiaries, verifying the effectiveness of the investments made. In addition, this activity was also impacted by the delay in the effective implementation of the Priority Projects, due to budgetary problems, and by the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020, thus having no new community members with access to credit in these years. Therefore, for 2014, 2016 and 2020 the values of families that had access to loans were zero, and the justification for the non-occurrence of the activity in these years was added as a deviation in section 2.2.4. For 2018, considering the information highlighted in the Rural Credit report (10), the number of community members benefited in 2017 was summed with the number of community members benefited in 2018 - the names and dates are highlighted in the report in yellow and purple, respectively. The only exception in the report was the community member Idellandia Ferreira de Araújo, who did not present her signature on the loan agreement presented, but presented the "DAP" (Declaration of Aptitude to the National Program for Strengthening Family Agriculture), an essential document for the family farmer to have access to public policies to encourage production and income	monitoring report. This lack of monitoring was included in the project description deviation section. The frequency of monitoring for the indicators included under this activity is as per registered PD, except for the indicators "Number of families attended", "Number of communities engaged", "Frequency of visits" and "Gender and age of the producers attended". RINA accepted the explanation provided by PP and understand that it is not possible to separate the information according to the monitoring frequency mentioned in the registered PD (every 6 months). Information regarding the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020 was provided. Information regarding the indicator “Number of families attended” was corrected. Information regarding the indicator “Number of communities engaged” was provided for each community. Indicator “Frequency of visits”: The type of measurement/unit should be number per month. PP explained that it was not possible to provide the information per month for each semester. Information for 2016 and 2020 were included.

provided for each semester. Information for 2016 and 2020 were included. Indicator “Gender and age of the producers attended”: PP is requested to clarify which evidence was used to confirm Information regarding the age of the producers attended. Information regarding the indicators “Percentage of producers using the forest to grow crops”, “Amount of cassava produced” and “Diversity of products produced” is according to the evidences provided. This CAR is open.	generation, and to access a line of credit it is essential to present the DAP, because it contains information that will give legal security for financing transactions. Thus, his DAP was considered evidence of receipt of the loan. Finally, between 2017 and 2018, 46 community members had access to credit, which represented 9.83% of the 468 farmers served by TARE actions in these two years (10) ((11) - worksheet "Rural Credit"). For the indicators "Number of families attended", "Number of communities engaged", "Frequency of visits" and "Gender and age of the producers attended", the PP understands that it failed in the procedures of management, collection and writing of the monitoring forms that would serve as evidence, which directly influenced the presentation of results in the frequency required by the PD-CCB. The information presented in the TARE monitoring table (11) was collected with the Fundação Jari, based on several documents that referred to actions that fit "TARE", however, much of this information was not complete in the forms and records, and relied, mainly, on the field knowledge of the Fundação's team to collect this information and identify actors and the years in which they were carried out. For this reason, the data were presented only annually. The presentation of "example	Indicator “Gender and age of the producers attended”: PP clarified which evidence was used to confirm Information regarding the age of the producers attended. Information regarding the indicators “Percentage of producers using the forest to grow crops”, “Amount of cassava produced” and “Diversity of products produced” is according to the evidences provided. This CAR is closed.

	sheets" was to illustrate how this monitoring would be carried out, but unfortunately not all documents on file have complete information. Given this, the PP understands the need to revise the field sheets to make them clearer for the technicians to fill out, answering all the points raised in the PD as essential to monitor the activities, and commits to make this update and monitoring effective in the next verifications, covering all the flaws of the current verification, including the point addressed in the FAR03 of this verification. This point was also adjusted in section 2.2.4. In the same way as was pointed out in CAR20's response, the age of the community members in the indicator "Gender and age of the producers attended" was pointed out in the survey of the main personal data of the 33 community members who prepared the priority projects (12). In this survey the age of the participants was indicated and, in this analysis, only 1 community member was found to fit the profile of "young" during the monitored period. Thus, to arrive at the indicator, the data from the TARE table (11) was crossed with the document that indicates the age of the participants (12). When the only community member considered "young" participated in the activities, the number 1 (corresponding to the participation in TARE actions) was divided by the total number of	

	community members served in each year, thus obtaining the percentage presented. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (10) relatorio-credito-rural-v2.pdf (11) LinhaTempo_ATER-v2.xlsx (12) relacao-produtores-pps.pdf	
CAR 22 Regarding the activity "Workshops and trainings in agro-extractive techniques", the following issues were identified: Information regarding the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020, should be provided. The values mentioned in the monitoring report for all indicators are not according to the evidences provided. Furthermore, the presence list should be provided for all workshops and trainings. Missing information for some periods. Indicator "Gender and age of farmers attended": The title of the indicator in the monitoring report is not as per registered PD.	Regarding the activity "Workshops and trainings in agro-extractive techniques", PP reevaluated the indicators and updated the numbers through monitoring period. New evidences (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) were provided as presence lists for all workshops/trainings and other reports in which these activities had been recorded along with the presence lists. All evidences were highlighted to indicate what was considered for indicators. It was analyzed the communities that belonged to the state of Amapá, the number of participants in each training, the gender of participants, the time and theme of each training. Due to the crisis that occurred in Grupo Jari in 2016, actions promoted by Fundação Jari were affected. Thus, 2016 was a year in which	RINA verified the following: Information regarding the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020, was provided. The values mentioned in the monitoring report for all indicators are according to the evidences provided. Indicator "Gender and age of farmers attended": The title of the indicator in the monitoring report is as per registered PD. Information regarding age of farmers attended was not included. This lack of monitoring was included in the project description deviation section. This CAR is closed.

Information regarding age of farmers attended should be included.	there was a decrease in the project's actions, so it was not possible to develop trainings in agro-extractive techniques. Likewise, the activities could not be developed in 2020 due to the pandemic. In order to ensure the health and safety of the communities, face-to-face actions such as trainings had to be temporarily paused. PP formalizes in MR-v2 that when situation get backs normal, the activities will resume. Thus, the indicators are zeroed for these two years. The title of the indicator "Gender and age of the producers attended" were adjusted in MR-v2 to attend the pattern of PD. The age of the producers who participated in trainings was not an information raised during these activities. Therefore, the indicator cannot be answered. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) cursos_2014_1o_sem.pdf (2) cursos_2014_2o_sem_palestra_credito_rural.pdf (3) relatorio_agente_agroextrativista_2014.pdf (p. 22 - 24, 36 -43)	

	(4) relatorio_iv_trimestre_redd_2015.pdf (p. 50 - 54) (5) cursos_2017_1o_sem.pdf (6) cursos_2017_2o_sem.pdf (7) relatorio_biofilica_2017.pdf (p. 29 - 33, 35 - 36) (8) evidencia_relatorio_biofilica_2017_apicultura.pdf (9) cursos_2018_1o_sem.pdf (10) cursos_2018_2o_sem.pdf (11) cursos_2019_1o_sem_curso_defensivo_agricola.pdf	
CAR 23 Regarding the activity “Development of Property Use Plans”, the following issues were identified: The indicator “Time invested by communities’ members” is not considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD.	The indicator "Time invested by communities' members" was still not considered, as no adequate way of recording this data to be accounted for was found, as already explained in CAR21. The "Number of property use plans completely realized" indicator was revised and the frequency of realization followed according to the years that had as results the reports of the	RINA verified the following: Indicator “Number of property use plans completely realized”: The value mentioned in the monitoring report for 1st semester 2016 is not according to the evidence provided. Indicator “Number of soil analysis”: The value mentioned in the monitoring report for 2nd semester 2015 is not according to the evidence provided.

Indicator “Number of property use plans completely realized”: The value mentioned in the monitoring report is not according to the evidence provided. In addition, the monitoring frequency is not as per registered PD. Indicator “Number of soil analysis”: Clarification should be provided regarding the source of information included at Jari’s report and provide the evidence. Moreover, information for 2016 to 2020 should be included in the MR. Indicator “Number of “future maps” designed”: The value mentioned in the monitoring report is not according to the evidence provided. PP should provide evidence of the maps. Indicator “Number of property micro-zoning realized”: The value mentioned for the year 2014 in the monitoring report is not according to the evidence provided. PP is requested to provide evidence of the activities register. Indicators “Number of finalized property use of plans discussed with farmers”, “Diversity of products in the future maps” and “Number of “future maps” implemented”: The values mentioned in the monitoring report are not according to the evidences provided. In addition, the monitoring frequency is not as per registered PD.	projects elaborated with the communities, 2016 (1) and 2020 (2), in the other years the indicator was zero. The "Number of soil analysis" indicator was revised according to data sent by the Group Jari's Product Research and Development Management, with the signature of the technician in charge. (3) (4) (5) The analyses were carried out in 2014, 2015 and 2018, for the other years the indicator was zero. The indicators "Number of "future maps" designed" and "Diversity of products in the future maps" were revised with the photos of the maps made by the community members in 2014 (6) (7) (8). This activity was only carried out in the first year of the monitored period, as it was the initial part of the development of the plans for the use of the properties, so in the other years monitored the values were zero. The "Number of property micro-zoning realized" indicator was revised based on the first micro-zoning carried out by the technicians of the Fundação Jari who generated descriptive memorials of some community properties (9) and on the service sheets prepared by the technicians of the Fundação Jari during this activity in 2018 (10). The indicator "Number of finalized property use of plans discussed with farmers" has been	Indicator “Number of property micro-zoning realized”: The value mentioned for the year 2018 in the monitoring report is not according to the evidence provided. Indicator “Number of finalized property use of plans discussed with farmers”: The value mentioned for the year 2020 in the monitoring report is not according to the evidence provided. Indicator “Number of “future maps” implemented”: The values mentioned in the monitoring report are not according to the evidences provided. This CAR is open.

	revised based on the declarations of commitment to the REDD+ Project signed by community members (11). The same occurred for the indicator "Number of "future maps" implemented", the revision of this item was made based on Payment Receipts, transfer receipts and material delivery receipts (12). Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) PPRevisados-2016.rar (2) Relatorios-Jan-2020.rar (3) arquivo-analisesolo-2014.pdf (4) arquivo-analisesolo-2015.pdf (5) arquivo-analisesolo-2018.pdf (6) 01-sem-2014-mapasfuturo.pdf (7) 02-sem-2014-mapasfuturo.pdf (8) monit-mapa-futuro.xls (9) memorial-descritivo-2014.rar (10) Microzoneamento_AtendFichas.pdf (11) DeclaracaoCompromisso_PP.pdf	

	(12) ReciboQuitacao_PP.pdf	
CAR 23 (cont.) RINA verified the following: Indicator "Number of property use plans completely realized": The value mentioned in the monitoring report for 1st semester 2016 is not according to the evidence provided. Indicator "Number of soil analysis": The value mentioned in the monitoring report for 2nd semester 2015 is not according to the evidence provided. Indicator "Number of property micro-zoning realized": The value mentioned for the year 2018 in the monitoring report is not according to the evidence provided. Indicator "Number of finalized property use of plans discussed with farmers": The value mentioned for the year 2020 in the monitoring report is not according to the evidence provided. Indicator "Number of "future maps" implemented": The values mentioned in the monitoring report are not according to the evidences provided.	The indicator "Number of property use plans completely realized" for 1st semester 2016 was revised and adjusted. The indicator "Number of soil analysis" for 2nd semester 2015 was revised and adjusted. The indicator "Number of property micro-zoning realized" for the year 2018 was revised and adjusted. Regarding the indicator "Number of finalized property use of plans discussed with farmers", PP provided new evidence (14) (16) so that indicator number could be proven. Evidence (11) proves 29 finalized property use of plans discussed with farmers through declarations of commitment to the REDD+ Project signed by community members. Only 4 community members did not sign when the technicians from Fundação Jari went to the communities to collect signatures: Joaquim Augusto da Silva who was traveling, Maria Creuza Dias da Silva who had passed away, José Claudio Reis who refused to sign the document and Marcos Antonio Ferreira de Sousa who decided to sell the land. As evidence of the indicator for these four community members, PP provided reports of the projects elaborated with the communities since the evidence	RINA verified the following: Indicator "Number of property use plans completely realized": The value mentioned in the monitoring report for 1st semester 2016 was revised and is according to the evidence provided. Indicator "Number of soil analysis": The value mentioned in the monitoring report for 2nd semester 2015 was revised and is according to the evidence provided. Indicator "Number of property micro-zoning realized": The value mentioned for the year 2018 in the monitoring report was revised and is according to the evidence provided. Indicator "Number of finalized property use of plans discussed with farmers": The value mentioned for the year 2020 in the monitoring report is according to the evidences provided. Indicator "Number of "future maps" implemented": The values mentioned in the monitoring report are according to the evidences provided. This CAR is closed.

This CAR is open.	shows property use plans completely realized. PP considered the reports as evidence because a plan can only be considered fully implemented and carried out if it was previously structured and finalized. PP also provided as evidence the participation (14) of three community members in the technical board that took place on August 9, 2018. The technical board (16) aimed to provide guidance on how to invest resources from the REDD + Jari Amapá project. During the event, a “carbon credit note” was delivered to each producer attesting that they received the aid amount for financing the priority project, thus showing that previously the projects were discussed with the partners and completed. Regarding indicator “Number of “future maps” implemented”, PP adjusted the previously submitted evidence and provided others so that indicator number for the year 2018 could be proved. Evidence (13) brings the payment receipts to prove 31 “future maps” that have been implemented. It was not possible to bring receipts from the community members Joaquim Augusto da Silva and Maria Creuza Dias da Silva, because when the technicians from Fundação Jari went to the communities to collect signatures, Joaquim Augusto da Silva was not present because he was traveling, and Maria Creuza Dias da Silva had passed away. Thus, PP provided as evidence	

	the participation (14) (15) of these two community members in the technical board that occurred on August 9, 2018 (16). During the event, a “carbon credit note” was given to each producer attesting that they received the aid amount to finance the priority project, so the technical board is in line with the evidence (13) while certifying the implementation of “future maps”. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (13) recibo-quitacao_PP_organized.pdf (14) lista-presenca-CT-09082018.pdf (15) cedula-carbono-joaquim-silva.jpg (16) relatorio-3-tri-2018.pdf (p.32-35)	
CAR 24 Regarding the activity “Community Level Workshops (Participatory Organizational Workshops, Community Development Plans and Risks and Impacts Assessment”, the following issues were identified: The indicator “Time invested by communities’ members” is not considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD.	The evidence was reviewed and community/family level workshops for the years 2014, 2016, 2018 and 2020 were included. The indicators were filled in according to the determination of the PD, however, in some specific situations it was not possible to present the data due to proponents' error when registering the activity. Comments were left in the activity table for each activity and indicator.	RINA verified the following: Indicators “Number of demands identified per community” and “Number of demands addressed per community”: The number for the year 2020 is not correct. Indicator “Stakeholders involved on addressing each demand”: PP is requested to explain the value mentioned for the year 2014 since there is no demand for this year. In addition, PP is requested to clarify why the

The frequency of monitoring should be revised for all indicators. Information regarding the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020, should be provided.	Evidence files contemplated by CAR: 2014.rar: (1)AtaCTREDD_13032014.pdf; (2)ListaFrequenciaCT_13032014.pdf; (3)PPTCTREDD_13032014.pdf 2016.rar: (4)maio_2016_relatorio_diagnostico_familiar_participativo.pdf; (5)out_2016_relatorio_assistencia_tecnica_social_as_familias_remanejadas_pela_UHE.pdf; (6)listas_atividades_para_demandas_atendidas.rar; 2018-19.rar: (7)ATA_ASPRUENC_04.052018_marc.pdf; (8)ATA_ASPRUENC_28.06.2019.pdf; (9)20201019_163312.jpg;	value for the year 2019 is not applicable if there is a demand for this year. The indicator “Time invested by communities’ members” is correctly considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. This CAR is open.

	2020.rar: (10)Carliane Pereira de Oliveira.rar; (11) Ismael Cavalho Freire.rar	
CAR 24 (cont.) RINA verified the following: Indicators “Number of demands identified per community” and “Number of demands addressed per community”: The number for the year 2020 is not correct. Indicator “Stakeholders involved on addressing each demand”: PP is requested to explain the value mentioned for the year 2014 since there is no demand for this year. In addition, PP is requested to clarify why the value for the year 2019 is not applicable if there is a demand for this year. The indicator “Time invested by communities’ members” is correctly considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. This CAR is open.	Considering the indicators “Number of demands identified per community” and “Number of demands addressed per community”, the value of 2020 was composed by a demand from Carliane P de Oliveira, referring to the creation of an aviary, and two demands from Ismael C Freire, regarding the implantation of areas for cultivation and management of açaí and the implantation of a pisciculture. PP considered two demands for Ismael C Freire due to the different scope of activities. The final products, the investments and the execution processes of açaizal and fish farming are different as can be seen in evidence (11). The indicators “Stakeholders involved on addressing each demand” was adjusted for 2014 and no activities were considered for this year as no proper way of recording indicators data to be accounted for was found.	RINA verified the following: Indicators “Number of demands identified per community” and “Number of demands addressed per community”: The number for the year 2020 is correct as per evidence provided. Indicator “Stakeholders involved on addressing each demand”: The numbers were correctly revised. As per evidences provided. The indicator “Time invested by communities’ members” is correctly considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. This CAR is closed.

	Considering the years 2017 and 2019, PP updated the indicators for the activity "Community Level Workshops (Participatory Organizational Workshops, Community Development Plans and Risks and Impacts Assessment)". The demands addressed in 2017 and 2019 are related to demands identified in 2015 regarding the improvement in energy supply, as can be seen in evidence (13). In 2017, electrical wiring was donated to Nova Conquista community (12) reaching at least 59 families (9), and in 2019, as a continuity of the demand addressed, transformers were donated to the same community (8). Section 4.3.1 of MR-v3 was updated considering rectifications. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: 2017-2019.rar: (8) ATA_ASPRUENC_28.06.2019.pdf; (9) 20201019_163312.jpg; (12) Doação Luz - Nova Conquista.pdf;	

	2015.rar: (13) follow-up-2015.xls	
CAR 25 Regarding the activity “Family Assessment”, the following issues were identified: The indicators “Frequency” and “Time invested by the communities’ members” are not considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. Information should be presented for each 2 years. Indicator “Number of families interviewed”: Evidence should be provided. Information for the community Arapiranga was not considered in the indicator “Number of communities contemplated”.	The indicator "Time invested by communities' members" was still not considered, as no adequate way of recording this data to be accounted for was found, as already explained in CAR21 an CAR23. A justification was developed related to the failure to carry out the "Family Assessment" activity at the frequency provided for in the PD. The justification, as well as other evidence, is available for the assessment of VVB and listed below. In addition, a PD deviation note was also written in section 2.2.4 of the Monitoring Report. As already mentioned in CAR05, and clarified in CAR15, the PP reevaluated the communities engaged to the project based on evidences, and decided to consider Arapiranga community as part of Tira Couro, so it was not considered inclusion of a new community. Evidence files contemplated by CAR:	RINA verified the following: The indicators “Frequency” and “Time invested by the communities’ members” were included in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. However, “Time invested by the communities’ members” was not monitored during the verification period. In addition, information is not presented for each 2 years. This lack of monitoring was included in the project description deviation section. Indicator “Number of families interviewed”: According to the evidences provided there are 38 forms dated 2014. There are some forms without date. PP is requested to clarify the number adopted. Indicator “Number of communities contemplated”: As per evidences provided, the number of communities is 7. Rabo de Couro community (Example: Carliane Pereira Oliveira sometimes the documents mention Arapiranga and in some documents Rabo de Couro) should be considered as Tira Couro. This CAR is open.

	(1) CAR 25-JustificativaFJ-AvaliacaoFamiliar.pdf (2) Questionario do Produtores do Redd.rar (3) Questionário REDDAmapa_2020.V4-vf.pdf (4) TABULAÇÃO REDD 2014.xls (5) Depoimentos-REDD-20201015T151825Z-001.rar (6) Depoimentos-REDD-20201015T151825Z-002.rar (7) plano-expansao-integrado-2021-2025.pdf	
CAR 25 (cont.) RINA verified the following: The indicators “Frequency” and “Time invested by the communities’ members” were included in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. However, “Time invested by the communities’ members” was not monitored during the verification period. In addition, information is not presented for each 2 years. This lack of monitoring was included in the project description deviation section.	Indicators “Number of families interviewed” and “Number of communities contemplated” were corrected. As pointed out in the file (8), the Family Diagnosis, or Family Assessment, was carried out by applying a questionnaire to rural producers interested in participating in the REDD+ Project (since they were residents of the communities selected for the first phase of the Project). The first questionnaire (Model 1) was applied in 2013. This was modified and gave rise to	RINA verified the following: The indicators “Frequency” and “Time invested by the communities’ members” were included in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. However, “Time invested by the communities’ members” was not monitored during the verification period. In addition, information is not presented for each 2 years. This lack of monitoring was included in the project description deviation section.

Indicator "Number of families interviewed": According to the evidences provided there are 38 forms dated 2014. There are some forms without date. PP is requested to clarify the number adopted. Indicator "Number of communities contemplated": As per evidences provided, the number of communities is 7. Rabo de Couro community (Example: Carliane Pereira Oliveira sometimes the documents mention Arapiranga and in some documents Rabo de Couro) should be considered as Tira Couro. This CAR is open.	a new questionnaire (Model 2), which was applied in 2014. Part of the producers who had already answered the questionnaire in 2013 replied again in 2014. Thus, even though some forms do not have information on the date on which the interviews were conducted, the year is known by the questionnaire model. In this sense, all the forms with the 2014 model of the questionnaire were considered as applied in 2014. All individual questionnaires applied in 2014 have been reorganized and are available in file (9). In addition to these 2014 forms, model 1 of the questionnaire, applied in 2013, can be verified by the documents (10) and (11). Evidence files: (8) justificativa-datas-questionario-Projeto-REDD.pdf; (9) fichas-questionario-produtores.rar; (10) questionario-modelo1-2013"; (11) questionario-modelo1-2013-JoseBeneditoDiasLobato.	Indicator "Number of families interviewed": PP clarified the number adopted. The evidences were checked. Indicator "Number of communities contemplated": As per evidences provided, the number of communities is 7. Rabo de Couro community (Example: Carliane Pereira Oliveira sometimes the documents mention Arapiranga and in some documents Rabo de Couro) was considered as Tira Couro. This CAR is closed.
CAR 26	All changes and corrections to the activity table requested by the VVB were carried out. Additional evidence supporting the	RINA verified the following:

Regarding the activity "Structuring of the socio-environmental Fund REDD+ Jari", the following issues were identified: The description of the activity and the description of the indictor "Number of meetings carried out between the executive committee" should be the same of the registered PD. The frequency of monitoring should be revised for all indicators. Indicator "Resources invested on each strategic line (climate, community, biodiversity and management)": • Climate: Information in the spreadsheet regarding cobertura vegetal monitoring should be revised. • Community: Explain the costs for the year 2016 since according to PP the project stopped this year. • Management: The value provided is not according to the evidence. Indicator "Number of meetings carried out between the executive committee": The information provided is not according to the monitoring period. Missing evidence.	information presented is available for assessment of the VVB and listed in the activities table. Regarding the 2016 expenses, as informed to the VVB, the activities of the REDD+ Project were suspended this year, within the scope of the execution of the Priority Projects, as well as the collective actions of ATER in the communities engaged in the Project. During this period, Biofílica made direct investments in the Fundação Jari called "Convênio REDD+", however, this financing was temporarily halted due to the economic and institutional crisis that the Grupo Jari was going through. This agreement added up to R$100,000.00 per year and aimed to support the payment of two agricultural technicians and field logistics. The absence of this financial contribution from Biofílica, coupled with the worsening of Jari Celulose's financial crisis led to the inevitable suspension of the Priority Projects' field activities. However, the workforce was maintained, given that, due to the lack of liquidity on the part of its main financier (Jari Celulose), it was not even possible to promote the dismissal of these employees due to the resulting high severance costs.	The description of the activity and the description of the indictor "Number of meetings carried out between the executive committee" are the same of the registered PD. The frequency of monitoring was revised for all indicators. Indicator "Resources invested on each strategic line (climate, community, biodiversity and management)": • Climate: Information in the spreadsheet regarding cobertura vegetal monitoring was revised. • Community: An explain the costs for the year 2016 was provided and is considered ok. • Management: The value provided is according to the evidence. Indicator "Number of meetings carried out between the executive committee": The information provided is according to the monitoring period and evidence was provided. Indicators "Number of consultation made through Technical Board" and "Number of communities represented in the technical

Indicators “Number of consultation made through Technical Board” and “Number of communities represented in the technical board consulted about the investments to be done/done”: Evidence should be provided.	In this context, the Fundação Jari opted for the maintenance of technicians in the REDD+ cost center, however, with its activities allocated to assist other communities nearby. It is possible to observe in the detailed Financial Report of expenses of 2016 (4) that the expenses registered in the REDD+ cost center remained, which, more than 85% refer to the costs with salaries, charges, and benefits of the 2 employees. Even though the Fundação Jari did not conduct Priority Projects at that time, it continued to act in activities aimed at assisting rural communities, thus not constituting a deviation in the purpose of the resource allocated at the REDD+ cost center. Currently, thanks to the good performance of REDD+ Projects in the voluntary market, direct contributions of resources by Biofílica are no longer needed and the Fundação Jari has been 100% financed by the resources of the REDD+ Project. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) Investimentos em Biodiversidade.rar	board consulted about the investments to be done/done”: evidence was provided. This CAR is closed.

	(2) Investimentos em Clima.rar (3) Investimentos em Comunidade.rar (4) Investimentos em Gestao.rar (5) Reuniao_CT_25082015.rar (6) ReuniaoCT_09082018.rar (7) Reunioes Comite Executivo.rar (8) follow_up_demandas.zip (9) 202011-Financeiro-REDDJariAmapa-Real+Projetado.xls (10) Relatorios-Financeiros-FundacaoJari-2016.xls	
CAR 27 Regarding the activity “Improvement of communication channels”, the following issues were identified: Information for the years 2014 and 2020 should be included in the monitoring report.	Regarding the activity “Improvement of communication channels”, PP included the values for the years 2014 and 2020, and provided the respective evidences in excel spreadsheets (1). For the indicator "Number of registered complaints or demands", the complains or demands forwarded to quality sector, present in the column "Description of the Subject", were counted. It is important to highlight that	RINA verified the following: Information for the years 2014 and 2020 was included in the monitoring report. Indicators “Number of addressed complains or demands”: The information for the year 2016 was corrected and is according to the evidence provided. This CAR is closed.

Indicators “Number of addressed complains or demands”: The information for the year 2016 is not according to the evidence provided. Evidence of the information received should be provided.	for the cases where subject description was empty, the accounting was not considerated. For indicator "Number of addressed complains or demands" the complaints or demands that had been completed were counted for the "Status" field of the "Response" or "Submission". Regarding the value of 2016, PP adjusted the inconsistency that had occurred because it was considered a not concluded demand. The information for the year 2016 to the indicator “Number of addressed complains or demands” were adjusted according to the evidence provided. Considering the validity of the tables, a new evidence was provided (2). It is an e-mail proving that the quality team sent informations to Fundação Jari regarding the complaints and demands. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) follow_up_demandas.zip (2) fwd_follow_up_DPI.msg	
CAR 28 The activity “Biodiversity Monitoring and Scientific Research” was not included in the	A topic about deviations and justifications related to the activity “Biodiversity Monitoring and Scientific Research” was added in	RINA verified that the lack of monitoring for this indicator was included in the project description deviation section.

monitoring report according to the registered PD.	Section 2.2.4 (Project Description Deviations), as well as in this document in CAR4.	This CAR is closed.
CAR 29 Regarding the activity "Seedling Nursery", the following issues were identified: The indicator "Number of seedling distributed per family attended" is not considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. Information regarding the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020, should be provided. Indicator "Number of total species produced": Only information regarding native trees species should be included. The values in the MR are not according to the evidence provided. Indicator "Number of different species produced": The value in the MR is not according to the evidence provided. Indicator "Number of seedlings distributed to the engaged communities": It is not clear how the seedlings of Jari's Group are distributed.	The indicator "Number of seedlings distributed per family attended" was included. All indicators were corrected, considering the period from 2014 to 2020. All indicators were corrected, considering only seedlings of native tree species. The indicators values can be verified in the indicator spreadsheet that was delivered as an annex to MR-v2. The text on seedling production (Section 4.3.1) was modified in the MR-v2. In addition to the evidence presented (1), a "complementary guide" was written (in Portuguese) to understand the use of these evidence to answer the indicators (2). Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) Viveiro de Mudas.rar; (2) Guia_indicadores.pdf. (3) LinhaTempo_ATER.xlsx	RINA verified the following: The indicator "Number of seedling distributed per family attended" was included in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. Information regarding the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020, was provided. Indicator "Number of total species produced": Only information regarding native trees species was included. The values in the MR were revised and are according to the evidence provided. Indicator "Number of different species produced": The value in the MR is according to the evidence provided. Indicator "Number of seedlings distributed to the engaged communities": The values applied are as per evidence provided. This CAR is closed.

	(4) LinhaTempo_ProjetosPrioritarios.xls	
CAR 30 Regarding the activity “Xylotheque (Wood Collection)”, the following issues were identified: Indicator “Number of families attended that have been there”: PP should provide information for the years 2014 and 2020.	The indicator "Number of families attended that have been there" was raised through analysis of the visitors' registration book of the Xylotheque (1) considering the monitoring period - 2014 to 2020. In this book, visitors can leave a record of their visit by filling in informations as their name, date when they visited and where they came from. For analysis of which families that are involved in the project and attended the Xylotheque, it was necessary to compile names of the producers who participated in the family diagnosis and their family members in excel spreadsheets (2). The list of the producers' names and their relatives was taken from each questionnaire completed in the family diagnosis (3). It was possible to identify that there was no visitation by producers and their relatives, because considering the names raised, none were present in the Xylotheque presence books. Thus, for the entire period monitored, the indicator values are zeroed. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) livro_xiloteca.zip	RINA verified the evidences provided and confirmed that no families attended have been there. This CAR is closed.

	(2) relacao_produtores_dignostico.xlsx (3) diagnostico_familiar.zip	
	Biodiversity	
CAR 31 The row monitored change should provide specific numbers with respect to the corresponding monitoring period. Though for “Reducing deforestation and forest degradation” provide 3, 696 ha, the monitoring period is not correct. The same is not transparent in Habitat Conservation/Biodiversity Conservation. PP should provide specific number on the flora and fauna.	Item 5.1.1 has been revised. The change in biodiversity "Reducing deforestation and forest degradation" was renamed "Reduction of unavoidable unplanned deforestation", making it clearer that the assessment was made based on the unplanned unavoidable deforestation data collected with PRODES, and that was used in the avoided emissions calculations. In addition, the description of the items "Monitored Change" and "Justification of Change" were changed, providing the specific numbers raised during the monitored period and the methods applied for the occurrence of the change. The change "Habitat Conservation/Biodiversity Conservation" was also renamed to "Biodiversity Conservation", focusing on the data collected by the biodiversity monitoring conducted during the period monitored. The items "Monitored Change" and "Justification of Change" were also changed, providing the specific numbers raised during the monitored period for fauna	Regarding to the "Reduction of unavoidable unplanned deforestation", refers to CAR 13. For "Biodiversity Conservation", the specific numbers on flora and fauna were provided and the information was checked by the verification team. The revised information was accepted. This CAR is open.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>and flora and the methods applied for the occurrence of the change.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR 31 (cont.)

Regarding to the "Reduction of unavoidable unplanned deforestation", refers to CAR 13.

For "Biodiversity Conservation", the specific numbers on flora and fauna were provided and the information was checked by the verification team. The revised information was accepted.

This CAR is open.</td>
<td>Regarding "Reduction of unavoidable unplanned deforestation", PP updated the row monitored change – section 5.1.1. in MR-v3 – to specific numbers corresponding monitoring period:
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Ex ante deforested area in PAha)</td><td>Ex post deforested area in PA (ha)</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>608</td><td>122</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>847</td><td>163</td></tr>
<tr><td>2016</td><td>724</td><td>37</td></tr>
<tr><td>2017</td><td>770</td><td>103</td></tr>
<tr><td>2018</td><td>747</td><td>69</td></tr>
</table>
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Ex ante deforested area in LK (ha)</td><td>Ex post deforested area in LK (ha)</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>946</td><td>117</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>795</td><td>204</td></tr>
<tr><td>2016</td><td>719</td><td>33</td></tr>
<tr><td>2017</td><td>685</td><td>95</td></tr>
<tr><td>2018</td><td>707</td><td>87</td></tr>
</table>
As can be seen, the values found in the monitored period were below those predicted in the baseline, thus showing the project's effectiveness.</td>
<td>Based on the assessment of CAR 13, the verification team confirmed that information provided for "Reduction of unavoidable unplanned deforestation" is correct. This CAR is closed. However, FAR 4 was opened in order to improve the Q/QC.

Refer to FAR 4.</td>
</tr>
</table>

	The description of how the values were calculated can be found in CAR13.	
CAR 32 It is not transparent in the MR if the mitigation actions taken are appropriate and in accordance with the project's validated project description. In addition, evidences should be provided in order to ensure that the mitigation actions are in place.	As stated in both the PD and the MR, the greatest potential impacts on biodiversity that need to be addressed are associated with sustainable forest management activities. The approved Sustainable Forest Management Plan (PMFS) (1) was used to build the section in the PD and support the section in the MR-v1, assuming that the PMFS has been fulfilled. For version 2 of the MR, the use of the approved POA (UPA01) (2) was also included, which includes pre-exploratory activities already carried out and other activities associated with management operations, including post-exploratory ones. As this is a reduced impact forest management, all operations are planned and carried out in a way that has the least possible impact on the forest. In addition, some other documents reaffirm about some mitigating actions, such as: I) the microzoning map carried out (3); ii) the planning of roads and yards, which underwent changes precisely to fulfill the main role of reducing impacts on the forest (4), iii) training of workers on sustainable forest management and other related issues, such as Safety and Health at Work, regulatory standards,	The verification team checked the revised MR and confirmed that the mitigation actions taken are appropriate and in accordance with the project's validated project description. The evidences provided were checked and found satisfactory. This CAR is closed.

	environmental risks, chain of custody, among others (5); and iv) the map (6) and spreadsheet (7) containing the Brazil nut trees and individuals from 13 other species that were mapped and not harvested. It is also assumed that the renewal of AUTEX by SEMA ((8) and (9)) is a form of legal guarantee that what was proposed in PMFS and POA has been fulfilled. Some changes were made in MR-v2 (Section 5.1.2), such as the introduction of the text connecting the PD to the MR, and the citation of the POA as evidence, as well as the inclusion of the microzoning activity and the replanning of activities. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) PMFS-AGREGUE-FINAL.pdf (2) POA-AGREGUE-FINAL.pdf - p.13-26 (3) mapa-POA01-microzoneamento.pdf (4) justificativa-divergencias-planejamento-agregue.pdf (5) 01-treinamentos.rar	

	(6) POA 1 Arvores Castanheiras e Canceladas.pdf (7) Dados Cancelamentos Corte POA 01 Agregue.xlsx (8) AUTEX-POA01-AGREGUE-renov.pdf (9) Requeirmento de Comprovação de Autex Renovada sem Ass.pdf	
CAR 33 PP is requested to demonstrate that GMO was never used or proposed to be used in the monitoring period.	The Fundação Jari, in its role of rural technical assistance in the region, does not recommend or encourage the use of genetically modified species. During this monitoring period, only pure species were distributed or, in the case of species developed by Embrapa, genetically improved (not modified): Banana BRS Conquista, Banana Pacová (Terra Maranhão), Banana Pacovan Ken, Banana Anã Prata, Cupuaçu BRS Carimbó and Açaí BRS Pará. The technical communications published by Embrapa (1) show that these species are not considered GMOs, but improved species. There has not been published a technical communiqué of "cultivar" Pacová (Terra Maranhão), but Embrapa researcher Walter Paixão forwarded (2) a news article about this	RINA verified that additional information included in the revised MR and the evidences provided and concluded that GMO was never used or proposed to be used in the monitoring period. This CAR is closed.

	cultivar (3), as well as on the National Cultivar Registry website (4) of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply (Ministério de Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento - MAPA, in Portuguese) it is also possible to check on the registered cultivars and verify that these varieties have not been genetically modified. In addition to the fact that seedlings or seeds of genetically modified species (both forest and agricultural) were not distributed during this monitoring period (April 2014 to April 2020), it is also not part of the Project's scope to stimulate, produce or donate seedlings and/or GMO seeds in the other future years of the Project. If used, this will be reported in the corresponding MR, as well as evidence to prove this use will be provided. These additional information were included in MR-v2 (Section 5.1.7). An official note written by Fundação Jari was also added as evidence (5). Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) Comunicados_tecnicos – Embrapa.rar (2) Walter Paixao – email.pdf	

	(3) Pacova (Terra Maranhao) - Noticia.pdf or https://nordesterural.com.br/voce-sabe-o-que-e-platano-no-brasil-ja-existem-duas-variedades-registradas-oficialmente/ (4) http://sistemas.agricultura.gov.br/snpc/cultivarweb/cultivares_registradas.php (5) Cultivo e o manejo de organismos geneticamente modificados (OGM).pdf	
CAR 34 PP is requested to discuss the project activities, which can help offsite biodiversity.	Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 of MR-v2 have been modified to clarify what was done during the monitored period to help the conservation of the biodiversity present in the Project Zone.	RINA verified that section 5.2.2 was not revised. This CAR is open.
CAR 34 (cont.) RINA verified that section 5.2.2 was not revised. This CAR is open.	In version 2.0 of the MR the PP made a mistake and forgot to add the edited sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2. Correcting this, the sections were added MR-v3 with the appropriate points adjusted, clarifying how the activities carried out during the monitored period did not impact negatively on offsite biodiversity, and no mitigation actions were required. Only offsite biodiversity benefits were scored.	RINA verified that section 5.2.2 was correctly revised. This CAR is closed.
CAR 35	The deviation in the frequency of monitoring the activity “Biodiversity Monitoring and Scientific Research” was detailed in Section	RINA verified the following:

Regarding the activity "Biodiversity Monitoring and Scientific Research", the following issues were identified: The frequency of monitoring should be revised for all indicators. As per registered PD, the monitoring frequency is biannual. The indicators "Number of studies and research projects developed" and "Number of scientific papers" are not included in the MR according to the registered PD. Indicator "No. of monitored species at each monitoring event": PP is requested to clarify why the 33 species of mammals listed in the evidence provided were not considered. Indicator "Diversity of the monitored fauna taxon at each monitoring event": Information regarding value monitored should be revised. A value should be provided and not the figure refence. In addition, the value for mammals should also be considered in this indicator. Indicators "Diversity of plant community in Permanent Plots" and "Richness of the plant community in Permanent Plots": PP is requested to clarify the representative of the information mentioned since the study considered a pre-exploratory inventory. As per	2.24 - Project Description Deviations of the MR-v2. The indicators and corresponding values for "Number of studies and research projects developed" (1) and "Number of scientific papers" (2) were included in the annex of MR-v2 and evidence were provided. Indicator "No. of monitored species at each monitoring event": the number of mammal species was corrected to 33 in the annex of MR-v2. In the previous version of the monitoring report, only species found in the field were considered, not those from interviews with the population. In this new version, the species identified by the population were included. Values for the indicator "Diversity of the monitored fauna taxon at each monitoring event" were provided in the annex of MR-v2, both for mammal as avifauna. Indicators "Diversity of plant community in Permanent Plots" and "Richness of the plant community in Permanent Plots": an explanation was written in Section 2.2.4 - Project Description Deviations of the MR-v2. The values obtained from pre-exploratory inventory data was used in the first version of MR, but in the annex of MR-v2, no values were included, since the PD states that the	The frequency of monitoring for all indicators is biannual as per registered PD. However, the biodiversity indicator monitoring was only done for the year 2019. The difference in the monitoring frequency was not discussed in the project description deviation section. The indicators "Number of studies and research projects developed" and "Number of scientific papers" were included in the MR according to the registered PD. However, PP is requested to demonstrate that the studies, research projects and scientific articles provided are related to the biodiversity conservation focal issue, allowing the proponents to monitor the efficacy of project's activies on maintaining regional biodiversity, and to environmental education focal issue, allowing society to build awareness about Jari Valley's biodiversity importance and relevance. Indicator "No. of monitored species at each monitoring event": The value for species of mammals and avifauna was corrected according to the evidence. Indicator "Diversity of the monitored fauna taxon at each monitoring event": Information correctly revised.

registered PD, a post exploratory report should be used to monitor these indicators. Indicators “Presence of endangered species in the Project Area” and “Status of species of relevance on IUCN’s red list of endangered species”: The name of the species included for Avifauna is not correct as per evidence provided. Indicators “Number of institutions engaged”, “Amount invested in research” and “Validation workshops/knowledge return events”: The Project Financial Reports used as evidence should be provided.	source of the data should be the Post-Exploration Report. The name of avifauna species was corrected in the indicators “Presence of endangered species in the Project Area” and “Status of species of relevance on IUCN’s red list of endangered species” in the annex of MR-v2. The indicators “Number of institutions engaged” and “Amount invested in research” were revised and corrected, as well as the corresponding evidence (3 and 4). The indicator "Validation workshops/knowledge return events" was not filled in because the activity was not performed during the monitored period. The CAR06 and section 2.2.3 of MR-v2 provide the reasons for this. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) Projetos de Pesquisa.rar (2) Artigos cientificos.rar (3) Contrato Ambiens.rar (4) Parceria Embrapa e FJ.rar	Indicators “Diversity of plant community in Permanent Plots” and “Richness of the plant community in Permanent Plots”: Information was wrongly included in the column “Value monitored”. The value should be zero and the information included in a comment. Indicators “Presence of endangered species in the Project Area” and “Status of species of relevance on IUCN’s red list of endangered species”: The name of the specie was correct to *Crax alector* as per evidence provided. Indicators “Number of institutions engaged” and “Amount invested in research”: Updated as per evidences provided. Indicator “Validation workshops/knowledge return events”: This indicator was not monitored during the verification period. The lack of monitoring information was not described in project description deviation section. This CAR is open.

CAR 35 (cont.) RINA verified the following: The frequency of monitoring for all indicators is biannual as per registered PD. However, the biodiversity indicator monitoring was only done for the year 2019. The difference in the monitoring frequency was not discussed in the project description deviation section. The indicators “Number of studies and research projects developed” and “Number of scientific papers” were included in the MR according to the registered PD. However, PP is requested to demonstrate that the studies, research projects and scientific articles provided are related to the biodiversity conservation focal issue, allowing the proponents to monitor the efficacy of project’s activities on maintaining regional biodiversity, and to environmental education focal issue, allowing society to build awareness about Jari Valley’s biodiversity importance and relevance. Indicator “No. of monitored species at each monitoring event”: The value for species of mammals and avifauna was corrected according to the evidence.	The deviations were placed incorrectly in Section 2.2.3. Minor Changes to Project Description" in MR-v2. It was adjusted and in the new version (MR-v3) these deviations related to biodiversity monitoring are in section "2.2.4. Project Description Deviations". In this deviation section, the difference in the monitoring frequency was discussed in the first paragraph of the item “Fauna monitoring”. The deviation on “Validation workshops/ knowledge return events” is also described in section 2.2.4. Project Description Deviations. The values for “Diversity of plant community in Permanent Plots” and “Richness of the plant community in Permanent Plots” was corrected and an explanation was written in Section 5.3.1 (item “b. Flora”). All the research (1) and publications (2) presented were developed within the forest area of Grupo Jari in Amapá and are focused both on diversity indicators (dung beetle) as on forest dynamics and resilience after forest harvest (forest management at different harvest intensities), sustainable use of forest resources and quality standards	RINA verified the following: The frequency of monitoring for all indicators is biannual as per registered PD. However, the biodiversity indicator monitoring was only done for the year 2019. The difference in the monitoring frequency was discussed in the project description deviation section. The indicators “Number of studies and research projects developed” and “Number of scientific papers” were included in the MR according to the registered PD. PP demonstrated that the studies, research projects and scientific articles provided are related to the biodiversity conservation focal issue, allowing the proponents to monitor the efficacy of project’s activities on maintaining regional biodiversity, and to environmental education focal issue, allowing society to build awareness about Jari Valley’s biodiversity importance and relevance. Indicator “No. of monitored species at each monitoring event”: The value for species of mammals and avifauna was corrected according to the evidence. Indicator “Diversity of the monitored fauna taxon at each monitoring event”: Information correctly revised.

Indicator “Diversity of the monitored fauna taxon at each monitoring event”: Information correctly revised. Indicators “Diversity of plant community in Permanent Plots” and “Richness of the plant community in Permanent Plots”: Information was wrongly included in the column “Value monitored”. The value should be zero and the information included in a comment. Indicators “Presence of endangered species in the Project Area” and “Status of species of relevance on IUCN’s red list of endangered species”: The name of the specie was correct to *Crax alector* as per evidence provided. Indicators “Number of institutions engaged” and “Amount invested in research”: Updated as per evidences provided. Indicator “Validation workshops/knowledge return events”: This indicator was not monitored during the verification period. The lack of monitoring information was not described in project description deviation section. This CAR is open.	existing on the market for Brazil nut tree. A brief description of each study is presented in the document (5). It is important to point out that the Project's proponents support the development of scientific research in the area (with the ideal of the area functioning as an “open-air laboratory”), with autonomy being given to researchers, who develop research regardless of whether the content to be researched is directly related to an indicator or parameter of the Project. It is understood that any research developed in the area will somehow generate knowledge and support the conservation and socioeconomic development actions of Fundação Jari, ATER and even Grupo Jari. As explained in Section 2.2.4 of deviations, the financial crisis experienced in the first years of the Project made it impossible for some activities to be developed, especially those related to biodiversity. The idea is that in the coming years (with the continuity of the process that has been built with more force since 2019, when it was possible to carry out the monitoring of biodiversity), the workshop events become spaces and moments of return, not only of the results found in the monitoring carried out directly by the Project, but also from the	Indicators “Diversity of plant community in Permanent Plots” and “Richness of the plant community in Permanent Plots”: The information was correctly revised. Indicators “Presence of endangered species in the Project Area” and “Status of species of relevance on IUCN’s red list of endangered species”: The name of the specie was correct to *Crax alector* as per evidence provided. Indicators “Number of institutions engaged” and “Amount invested in research”: Updated as per evidences provided. Indicator “Validation workshops/knowledge return events”: This indicator was not monitored during the verification period. The lack of monitoring information was described in project description deviation section. This CAR is closed.

	results found in other scientific studies. Not all studies will necessarily be the theme of the workshops, and it is up to the proponents (mainly the Fundação Jari) to select those that are relevant and applicable to the context of the communities and the activities they develop. Evidence files: (5) pesquisas-e-publicacoes.pdf	
CAR 36 Regarding the activity "Seedling Nursery", the following issues were identified: The indicator "Number of seedling distributed per family attended" is not considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. Information regarding the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020, should be provided. Indicator "Number of seedlings": Only information regarding native trees species should be included. The values in the MR are not according to the evidence provided. Indicator "Number of species produced": The value in the MR is not according to the evidence provided.	The indicator "Number of seedlings distributed per family attended" was included. All indicators were corrected, considering the period from 2014 to 2020. All indicators were corrected, considering only seedlings of native tree species. All indicators were reviewed and corrected, based on the evidence available for the production and/or distribution of seedlings (1). The indicators values can be verified in the indicator spreadsheet that was delivered as an annex to MR-v2. The text on seedling production (Section 5.3.1.c) was modified in the MR-v2.	RINA verified the following: The indicator "Number of seedling distributed per family attended" was considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD. Information regarding the monitoring period, 2014 to 2020 was provided. Indicator "Number of seedlings": Only information regarding native trees species was included. The values in the MR were revised and are according to the evidence provided. Indicator "Number of species produced": The value in the MR is according to the evidence provided.

Indicator “Number of seedlings distributed to communities in the Project Zone”: The value in the MR is not according to the evidence provided. It is not clear how the mudas of Jari Group are distributed. Indicator “Number of seedlings distributed to communities engaged by the Project”: It is not clear how the mudas of Jari Group are distributed. Indicators “Number of seedlings used for restoration of degraded lands” and “Number of seedling used for productive ends”: The values in the MR are not according to the evidence provided. It is not clear how the mudas of Jari Group are distributed.	In addition to the evidences presented (1), a “complementary guide” was written (in Portuguese) to understand the use of these evidences to answer the indicators (2), including an explanation of the methodology used to consider the species used to restore degraded areas and those used for productive purposes. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) Viveiro de Mudas.rar (2) Guia_indicadores.pdf (3) LinhaTempo_ATER.xlsx (4) LinhaTempo_ProjetosPrioritarios.xls	Indicator “Number of seedlings distributed to communities in the Project Zone”: The value in the MR is according to the evidence provided. Indicator “Number of seedlings distributed to communities engaged by the Project”: Information was correctly revised in the MR. Indicators “Number of seedlings used for restoration of degraded lands” and “Number of seedling used for productive ends”: The values in the MR are according to the evidence provided. This CAR is closed.
CAR 37 Regarding the activity “Xylotheque (Wood Collection)”, the following issues were identified: The indicator “Number of visits with educational ends” is not considered in the monitoring plan as per registered PD.	The indicator “Number of visits with educational ends” was included. All indicators were presented annually and considered the period from 2014 to 2020, as established in the PD. The evidence was reviewed and made available to VVB (1), (2), (3), (4) and (5).	RINA verified that the activity “Xylotheque (Wood Collection)” was correctly monitored. The values for all indicator were revised according to the evidences provided. This CAR is closed.

Indicators "Number of Wood samples", "Number of botanical samples" and "Number of botanical samples": The values in the MR should be annually and not accumulated values. Indicator "Number of general visits": PP should provide information for the years 2014 and 2020.	The indicators values can be verified in the indicator spreadsheet that was delivered as an annex to MR-v2. The text on xylotheque (Section 5.3.1.d) was modified in the MR-v2. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) Visitas_Xiloteca 2014_2020 – email.pdf. (2) Visitas_Xiloteca 2014_2020.xlsx (3) Livro Visitas.rar (4) Dados Acervo Florestal Jari – email.pdf (5) Dados Acervo Florestal Jari – Auditoria REDD.xlsx	
CAR 38 PP is requested to provide evidence in order to confirm the actions taken by the project to maintain or enhance the population status of each trigger species in the project zone, and reduce threats to them. In addition, the value for the absolute density of the specie *Vouacapoua americana* is not according to the evidence provided. The MR	Brazil Nut tree and Acapú: Both Brazil Nut Tree (Bertholletia excelsa) and Acapú (Vouacapoua americana) were not exploited in this cycle of forest management that occurred at UPA01. None of the species had a volume to be explored in the POA (1) approved by SEMA, thus, there is no permission to cut these species. In other words, there is a legal guarantee of non-exploitation of both species. The species are	RINA checked the evidences provided in order to confirm the actions taken by the project to maintain or enhance the population status of each trigger species in the project zone, and reduce threats to them and found that information included in the revised MR is correct. The value for the absolute density of the specie *Vouacapoua americana* was revised and is according to the evidence provided.

is not transparent on the changes in population status and/or threats during the monitoring period and since the start of the project.	also not included in the spreadsheets regarding skidding, cutting, tracing and transportation, as well as not included in the invoices for the sale of log wood (2) and (3). It is also important to note that Brazil Nut Tree is protected by law, and its cutting is prohibited ((4) – Art.29 of Decree nº 5.975 of November 2006: "Chestnut trees (Bertholetia excelsa) and rubber trees (Hevea spp) in natural, primitive or regenerated forests cannot be exploited for timber purposes"). In addition to the species not being explored, mitigation actions carried out before and during management operations ((5), (6) and (7)) positively influenced the maintenance of the populations of these species in the Project Area during this monitoring period, as well as other activities of the Project that resulted in the containment of deforestation and forest maintenance. More details on species and activities developed for conservation have been added to MR-v2. Lastly, the value for absolute density of the specie Vouacapoua americana was corrected in the MR-v2. Jandaia amarela: It was written in the first version of the MR that the species had not	The MR is now transparent on the changes in population status and/or threats during the monitoring period and since the start of the project. This CAR is closed.

	been found in the biodiversity monitoring campaign carried out in 2019 by Ambiens. However, according to the Ambiens ornithologist (8), the species initially found in the Project Area and classified as Aratinga solstitialis, underwent a reclassification in 2015 (9), changing its name to Arantinga 207udança207, with the common name "Cacaué". Thus, differently from the first version of the MR, the species placed as a trigger was found by the Ambiens team both in the area of primary forest and in the areas of forest management and eucalyptus silviculture. Additionally, the report (10) shows that the species is one of the 22 species of birds found that are exclusive (endemic) to the Guiana Shield, has a medium sensitivity to environmental changes and has forest areas as its preferred habitat. As pointed out in the first version of the MR and maintained in the MR-v2, "the existence of primary forests associated with forest management areas has proved to be an excellent arrangement for maintaining fauna biodiversity, especially for species that are not tolerant of human presence or forest disturbance. Likewise, the similarities found between native and managed forests indicate that the management protocols have been	

	efficient and fulfill the main role of contributing to the sustainable development of the region and preserving local biodiversity”. It is understood, therefore, that as well as placed for the other two trigger species above (Brazil Nut tree and Acapú), all Project activities, which result in a common goal of reducing deforestation, forest conservation and socioeconomic development (mainly through reduced impact forest management and rural technical assistance actions developed with communities in the region) have been efficient in maintaining populations of trigger species. Obs: It is important to note, however, that, unlike Aratinga solstitialis (exclusive to Roraima, after reclassification), Aratinga 208udança208 does not appear as “endangered” on the IUCN Red List. Knowing this reclassification and conservation status of the species that occurs in the Project Area, it is likely that for the revalidation of the project, the permanence of the species in this category of trigger species will be evaluated. Evidence files contemplated by CAR: (1) POA-AGREGUE-FINAL.pdf – p.29	

	(2) Planilhas-operacoes.rar (3) venda-prodmadeira.rar (4) Decreto nº 5975-2006.pdf (5) Bertholletia excelsa.rar (6) Dados Cancelamentos Corte POA 01 Agregue.xlsx (7) POA-AGREGUE-FINAL.pdf – p.13-26 (8) Email_Especie-gatilho_Aratinga-solstitialis_mudanca de nome.pdf (9) PIACENTINI et al, 2015 – Rev.Bras.Ornit.pdf (10) Relatório Monitoramento da Biodiversidade ProjetoREDDJariAmapa ver 4.pdf – p.108,109,120 and 122.	
CAR 39 PP is requested to provide information and evidence in order to confirm the actions taken by the project to maintain or enhance the population status of trigger species.	The information for this CAR has already been answered in CAR38 above, as well as in Section 5.4.1 of MR-v2.	The information and evidences provided in CAR 38 were checked and found ok. This CAR is closed.
CAR 40	To correspond to what the MR template asks for, the information provided has been modified.	Refers to CAR 13.

As per the MR format, the section shall document any additional information that explains how the project has been implemented in accordance with the validated project description for all indicators that require implementation of an activity or process. Criteria and indicators shall be referenced for each statement made in this section.	PP understood that the data of the accumulated areas credited within the project area did not relate to what the requested item "any additional information that explains how the project was implemented". Therefore, what is now included in this section is a detailed explanation of the analysis of changes in land use and land cover during the monitoring period, cited in CAR 13.	
CAR 40 (cont.) Refers to CAR 13.	PP updated the section 6.1 of the MR-v3 to document any additional information that explains how the project has been implemented in accordance with the validated project description for all indicators that require implementation of an activity or process. So, the field conference process was described in section 6.1 of the MR-v3 in accordance with the information presented in CAR13.	Information included in section 6.1 of the MR was verified against the evidences provided (refers to CAR13). RINA confirmed that the information is correct. This CAR is closed.

Table 3: CLs from this verification

Clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
CL 1 PP is requested to clarify if the FSC certification will be obtained as described in	Some evidence has been made available to the VVB that demonstrates that Agregue carries out timber forest management in accordance with certification standards.	RINA verified that the deviation related to FSC certification does not impact the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the

the CCB PD. Moreover, PP is requested to demonstrate that this deviation did not impacts the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline/without-project scenario.	Agregue already has the FSC certification label for other areas of its operation, which demonstrates that the company operates in line with such operational guidelines (1). The intention is to certify Jari's operation in the coming years, the same as the company's operations in other locations. About additionality, as described by the analysis of alternative land use scenarios in the PD, obtaining FSC-certification is not an additional action to contain deforestation in the project scenario. The project scenario describes a series of additional socio-environmental actions that were carried out during this monitoring period. The realization of timber forest management in the area has the function of improving the management and governance of the territory, regardless of the application of certifications. Despite this, the evidence presented shows that Agregue acts in line with the certification guidelines and therefore the PP understands that it does not constitute a deviation or non-appropriateness in relation to the with-project scenario. About the methodology, the PP also checked that this change in relation to the PD doesn't have any relation with its applicability conditions. Evidence file contemplated by CL: (1) CertificacaoAgregue.rar	appropriateness of the baseline/without-project scenario. This CL is closed.

CL 2 It was verified that there are some measures which are already implemented and some still in the implementation phase. However, it is not clear if the listed measures in section 2.2.7 of the MR are initiated since the last validation. PP is requested to provide evidences to cross check the same.	Section 2.2.7 has been adjusted, making clear which measures have already been implemented by the project since the validation, linking the sections referring to the points indicated, and which are those planned to be carried out in the future, based mainly on the expansion plan elaborated which was referred to in FAR 4 and FAR 5.	FAR 4 from validation refers to section G1.10 of the registered PD or 2.2.6 of the MR. Here RINA refers to section 2.2.7 of the MR which corresponds to section G1.11 of the PD. FAR 5 from validation refers to biodiversity impacts. This CL is open.
CL 2 (cont.) FAR 4 from validation refers to section G1.10 of the registered PD or 2.2.6 of the MR. Here RINA refers to section 2.2.7 of the MR which corresponds to section G1.11 of the PD. FAR 5 from validation refers to biodiversity impacts. This CL is open.	The PP understands that the points addressed by FAR04 and FAR 05 do not refer to section 2.2.7, as pointed out. The relationship made between the FARs and section 2.2.7 is the fact that they both cite the Project Expansion Plan and bring important information for future actions that will be implemented focusing on maintaining and enhancing climate, community, and biodiversity benefits beyond the duration of the project. PP referred to the following mechanisms pointed out in section 2.2.7: - For the "Strengthening of the Fundação Jari", the actions described in item 2.2.7, refer to the consolidation and enhancement of the activities already carried out by the Fundação in the Project Zone, which are presented in the Expansion Plan, which was also addressed in FAR04 by the statement “One of the actions	RINA verified that section 2.2.7 was correctly revised and the measures which are already implemented and the ones that are in the implementation phase are identified. This CL is closed.

	foreseen in the Project's Expansion Plan is the holding of Community Workshops with all the communities in the project zone. Expansion Plan for the REDD+ Project proposed by the Fundação Jari for the coming years foresees the holding of workshops with all communities in Amapá." - For the "Greater scientific knowledge on Biodiversity and Maintenance of High Conservation Value Attributes" and "Improvement in patrimonial surveillance procedures", in FAR05 was presented the points: "Satellite monitoring tool with daily frequency and high resolution; Acquisition of equipment for the field team (e.g. Drones); Intensification of rounds with more vehicles; Biodiversity monitoring every 2 years with the next campaign in 2021", that are addressed in the Expansion Plan to improve land management activities on the property, resulting in HCV conservation, which were also mentioned in 2.2.7. In any case, as it was requested to make it clear whether the measures listed in MR-v3 section 2.2.7 are initiated since the last validation, PP edited the section making this timeline clear, and below referenced the CARs that have the requested **evidence of the actions already implemented**: CAR20: Technical Chamber of REDD+; CAR25:	

	Family Assessment and monitoring of the socioeconomic development; CAR21: Technical Assistance and Rural Extension Service (TARE); CAR22: Workshops and trainings in agroforestry and farming techniques; CAR29 e 36: Nursery of native forest seedlings and planting in degraded areas; CAR35: Greater scientific knowledge on Biodiversity and Maintenance of High Conservation Value Attributes; CAR17: Forest Management.	
CL 3 PP is requested to provide evidences of the professional qualification of young people, women and vulnerable people. PP is requested to clarify the inconsistent information regarding to employment. In section 2.3.14, it is stated that the project creates employment opportunities however, it is mentioned as not applicable in section 1.2 of the MR.	Section 2.3.14. Community Employment Opportunities presents the hiring procedures determined by Grupo Jari, in addition to alternatives for employment directly or indirectly provided by the REDD+ Project for the local community. Such employment creation alternatives do not determine that vacancies will necessarily be for full or partial dedication to the REDD+ Project. Section 1.2 was revised to correct the inconsistency identified by the VVB. All employees of Fundação Jari e Biofílica who are directly dedicated to the Project during this period were counted (1) (2). Evidence file contemplated by CL: (1) Analise-empregos-REDD-Jari.xls (2) FichaRegistro-Biofilica.rar	No evidence was provided of the professional qualification of young people, women and vulnerable people. This CL is open.

CL 3 (cont.) No evidence was provided of the professional qualification of young people, women and vulnerable people. This CL is open.	Evidence was collected to demonstrate qualification and advisory actions for young people, women and vulnerable people as described in section 2.3.13 of the Monitoring Report. As described in this section, the main programs and projects designed for this audience are the Geração Aprendiz project, which has the support of Senai, the Magia de Tupã project and the cooperative Agulhas Versáteis. The evidence presented is frequency lists, advising sheets, course plans, meeting minutes and newspaper articles (3). In addition, during this monitoring period, a series of training and qualifications were offered to the technical team of Fundação Jari. These trainings involved technical courses on various topics, from agroecological and agroextractive techniques to social media management. All the evidences related to these trainings are available in CAR14. Evidence file contemplated by CL: (3) professional-qualification.rar	Evidences were provided of the professional qualification of young people, women and vulnerable people. This CL is closed.
CL 4 PP is requested to provide the annual financial auditing reports for Biofílica and Fundação Jari. Only the audit report for 2018 was available.	The 2014 to 2019 financial reports from Fundação Jari e Biofílica are available for VVB. All are duly audited except for the 2019 report from Fundação Jari, which was only approved at a meeting of the board of trustees.	RINA verified the annual financial auditing reports for both companies. This CL is closed.

	Evidence file contemplated by CL: (1)DFs-Biofilica.rar. (2)Dfs-Fundacao Jari.rar	
CL5 The MP of the MR states that ΔCabBSLLKt emissions are 0 in all years of project activity. It also states that the Methane (CH4) and nitrous oxidate (N2O) from livestock is not applicable. According to page 142 of the registered PD "Monitoring of decrease in carbon stocks and/or increase in GHG emissions associated with leakage prevention measures if the project proponents implement activities such as tree planting, agricultural intensification, fertilization, fodder production and/or other measures to enhance cropland and grazing land areas. If these activities cause reductions in carbon stocks and/or increase in GHG emissions in leakage management areas, such carbon stock changes and/or GHG emissions will be estimated by Fundação Jari and Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais technical staff. Please clarify if from 2014 to 2018 no such measures were introduced by the Project	It was stated in the VCS-PD (pages 120 and 121) that besides "activities of agricultural or grazing management improvement, or fodder production or any other activities that reduce carbon stocks and increase GHG emission in comparison with baseline scenario are not expected", sustainable agriculture techniques and non-wood products collection would be promoted. It was also stated that activities that could promote a significant increase in CH4 and N20 emissions by intensifying livestock farming would not be implemented. If such activities were implemented, changes in the carbon stock would be monitored (and if significant, they would be accounted for). During this monitoring period, Fundação Jari and partners engaged in the technical assistance service in the communities of the region promoted the strengthening of productive chains with a sustainable and community base. Proponents did not encourage the intensification of agriculture or livestock, but rather productive and sustainable arrangements, considering the activity already developed in the assisted	ΔCabBSLLKt reported correctly. Ok With regards to methane (CH4) and nitrous oxidate (N2O) emissions from livestock, according to registered PD page 135, these are related to grazing animals in leakage management areas and the methods described in appendix 4 of the VM0015 will be used to estimate emissions from enteric fermentation (CH4) and manure management (CH4 and N2O – see eq. 18 of the meth) . So these should have been monitored if introduced in leakage management areas. Please provide information and evidence if any of the communities in the leakage management areas have had grazing activities in the leakage management area. If so provide information on the monitored parameters. This CL is open.

Activity and this is why the results of emissions are 0 or whether this has not been monitored. If no measures were taken explain why frequency of monitoring and monitoring equipment in MR is different from registered PD. Methane (CH4) and nitrous oxidate (N2O) emissions from Livestock the PP wrote in the MP of the MR not applicable. Please explain.	property (as well as other suggestions for more sustainable productive arrangements that have an already established consumer market). It is also important to emphasize that the activities developed with local producers, being guided by sustainable arrangements, are part of the actions planned to contain the common practice scenario. As stated in the CCB-PD (page 68), in the common practice scenario, in addition to not mitigating climate change, the “slash and burn” cycle, the basis of itinerant agriculture, continues to reproduce. The small family producer without access to public policies and programs that encourage improvements in agroextractive practices and good living conditions, eventually decides to abandon the already deforested land in search of opening up new areas. In this context, indicators of socioeconomic development are kept low, as well as the continuous cycle of forest degradation and deforestation that lead to the loss of biodiversity. In other words, the actions stimulated and developed by the Project are below the emission level of common practice activities (both CO2 and non-CO2 gases) and avoided the reduction of the carbon stock and the increase of GHG emissions.	

	Also in this sense, it is concluded that, as activities were not stimulated or implemented to enhance cropland and grazing land areas, the monitoring of methane (CH4) and nitrous oxide (N2O), was not applicable. Note: for priority projects, even the recommended fertilization did not contain nitrogen in the formulation (NPK: 00-30-10). This nutrient being supplied through the organic compound (1). Evidence file contemplated by CL: (1) Relatorios-Jan-2020.rar	
CL 5 (cont.) ΔCabBSLLKt reported correctly. Ok With regards to methane (CH4) and nitrous oxidate (N2O) emissions from livestock, according to registered PD page 135, these are related to grazing animals in leakage management areas and the methods described in appendix 4 of the VM0015 will be used to estimate emissions from enteric fermentation (CH4) and manure management (CH4 and N2O – see eq. 18 of the meth) . So	As pointed out in the previous answer, monitoring of CH_4 and N_2O emissions in leakage management areas should be carried out when livestock activities are intensified by the Project. <u>Thus, as the Project did not stimulate, planned or implemented such activities, the monitoring of these emissions was not performed</u>. In this same context, the monitoring of livestock activities in the communities was not carried out (including, it is important to point out that this specific analysis to the communities about livestock carried out in the LMA is not within the PD' scope).	The PP confirmed in the answer to this CL that the Project did not stimulate, planned or implemented the introduction of grazing animals in the leakage management areas. CL5 is closed.

these should have been monitored if introduced in leakage management areas. Please provide information and evidence if any of the communities in the leakage management areas have had grazing activities in the leakage management area. If so provide information on the monitored parameters. This CL is open.	Obs.1: more details have already been presented in the previous answer. Obs.2: Document (2) presents an overview (prepared by Fundação Jari) on livestock activity. Obs.3: The Section 3.1.3.3 (item 2 – Monitoring of Leakage) was revised and some topics were added, in order to bring the section closer to what was written in the PD. Evidence file contemplated by CL: (2) Carta-pecuaria.pdf	
CL 6 As mentioned in the MR, in order to remediate the situation, the team from Agregue held a workshop in April 2020 (after the end of this monitoring period) with Ramal do Retiro community to raise the main demands and prepare an action plan that will be implemented in the operations during the management of the other Annual production Units of the property. Considering that, PP is requested to clarify chronology of the facts, since an action plan dated July 2019 was provided during the remote audit.	The conversation between the parties began on January 4, 2020, in a meeting between the company Agregue and the communities of the Ramal do Retiro, with the mediation of the Fundação Jari. At this meeting, all the damage caused was exposed to those responsible for forest management, especially with regard to the Brazil nut collection areas. The result of this meeting was the election of a committee representing the interests of the community, which was responsible for conducting the dialogue with the company in subsequent meetings. The second meeting with the community, the first of the elected committee, took place on April 30, 2020. In this meeting the main demands pointed out were:	RINA verified all evidences provided. It is now clear the chronology of the facts. This CL is closed.

PP is requested to clarify the actions included in the plan since during the interviews it was said that the actions were not previously discussed with the community.	- Obstruction of tracks, which are used for the traffic flow of vehicles used for the collection of Brazil nuts and the need to recover old tracks, already existing before forestry operations; - Execution of the activities in areas that have Brazil nut trees for community use, causing losses of individuals (Brazil nuts); - Complaint for more employment opportunities provided by the company to community residents. Based on these demands, initially Agregue proposed the following actions to remedy the damage immediately: provide machinery for cleaning the tracks mentioned in the complaints, evaluate the forest impacts in the areas affected by the operation and prepare an action plan for the treatment of other demands. The evaluation of the forest impacts on the affected areas was carried out by the Agregue team with the support of technicians from the Fundação Jari. A survey was carried out in the Brazil nut areas, surveying the damage that occurred and mapping the areas.	

	The next step was the elaboration of the Action Plan, which followed the following points: - Clearing of roads that are used for the flow of vehicles for the collection of Brazil nuts; - Promote guidelines for those responsible for the execution of forestry operations in areas with Brazil nut trees for community use, programming the monitoring of the activities carried out; - Prepare a proposal that contains compensation actions, related to the damages to the Brazil nut areas, to be carried out after the due acceptance of the parties; - Identify ways to generate more employment opportunities that serve the community residents; - Promote the recovery of old roads, existing before forest operations; - To produce documents proving that all demands have been met; - Install solar panel kits for the affected families.	

	By the end of the monitoring period, the plan had not yet been discussed with the community members. This occurred at a second committee meeting with Agregue on July 22, 2020, where proposals were presented to the community members to add their counterpoints. The main points raised at this meeting were the need to open tracks to access the Brazil nut groves and the construction of some bridges, in a joint planning with the community members, and the survey of the families who live and work at the Ramal do Retiro to be attended by technical assistance through the Fundação Jari and the project. Evidence file contemplated by CL: (1) ConselhoRetiro_ATA01.pdf (2) ConselhoRetiro_ATA02.pdf (3) ConselhoRetiro_ATA03.pdf (4) Fwd Reunião no Ramal do Retiro.msg (5) RELATÓRIO DE REGISTRO DE DEMANDAS DE PARTES INTERESSADAS 24.06.20.pdf	

CL 7 During interview with some communities that are not part of the project, it was verified that the region of Padaria, Santo Antônio da Cachoeira, São José da Cachoeira were affected by the sustainable forest management. However, as these communities are not inside the project zone only Ramal do Retiro was considered as an impacted community. PP is requested to provide information of all communities inside the sustainable forest management area.	The company Agregue elaborated a justification (1) to clarify that the communities mentioned were not assisted in the compensation actions because of their location far from the areas where the management activities take place (2). In this justification it was also established that in the exploration of the next UPAs, a prior consultation with the other communities will be carried out to resolve their possible questions. As a complement to this, in response to a question from the leadership of RESEX Cajari. about the realization of sustainable alternatives for the wood and furniture sector in the region of the Jari Valley by the Fundação Jari, a letter was prepared describing the main initiatives carried out by the Fundação in partnership with Agregue for this topic (3), including actions to donate wood and equipment to the municipality of Laranjal do Jari for improvements to the population (4). In this way, PP understands that, although these communities have not been contemplated as directly impacted by the management actions, the project stimulates other actions that generate benefits to the region. Evidence files contemplated by CL:	RINA considered the information provided sufficient. It was clarified that these communities were not directly affected by the sustainable forest management. This CL is closed.

	(1) AGREGUE-Justificativa-nao-envolv-comunid.pdf (2) comunidades-POA1-PMFS.pdf (3) oficio-resex-cajari.pdf (4) TERMO DE CONCESSÃO DE USO DE BEM PÚBLICO.pdf	
CL 8 During the interviews, it was checked that some families have fish-farming (tilapia). PP is requested to clarify why the production of tilapia is not considered in the MR as an invasive species.	The Fundação Jari does not encourage the cultivation of tilapia, but the cultivation and management of region fish species and which have greater consumption demand and greater added value, such as Tambaqui, Jutuarana and Matrixã. It is also the recommendation of the Fundação Jari that in the case of tilapia cultivation, it should be carried out in a hollowed-tank (tanque-escavado in portuguese) and the handling should follow the technical recommendations. In order to prevent the fry (young fish) from escaping, the tanks must be opened in places on dry land and away from rivers, lakes and streams (1). Of the Priority Projects Reports (2), 7 involve the production and management of fish, but none of them include tilapia as a species to be used (3). In this case, the 7 producers chose tambaqui (*Colossoma macropomum*). It is noted that of the three producers in the region who sold tilapia in 2020 (4), only	During the interviews it was verified that a different producer from Natalina Pereira Sousa has fish-farming (tilapia). Thus, a FAR was opened in order to monitor the production of tilapia by the producers during the next monitoring period. Refers to FAR 2.

	Natalina Pereira Sousa is directly assisted by the Project, but her Priority Project, involves the cultivation of greenery, not the tilapia (5). Thus, as tilapia is neither a recommended or cultivated species with the producers of Priority Projects (and even in the region), the species was not included in the MR as an invasive species. Evidence files contemplated by CL: (1) Parecer FJ –tilapia.pdf (2) Relatorios-Jan-2020.rar (3) Piscicultura.rar (4) indicador-diversidade-produtos.xlsx (5) NATALINAPEREIRASOUSA.pdf (in "Relatorios-Jan-2020.rar")	
CL 9 PP is requested to clarify how the use of chemical fertilizers were defined as minimally.	The chemical fertilizers that PP considers as used by the project are those applied in the areas of community members who developed priority projects. The priority projects had the collection and analysis of soil (1) (2) (3) carried out to base the recommendation of the fertilizers that should be used for each type of productive system implemented on the properties. The indication of these fertilizers is presented in the project reports (4). The recommended fertilization did not contain nitrogen in the formulation (NPK: 00-30-10), being this	RINA verified the analysis of soil and the reports provided. It is stated in the revised MR and in PP response that he recommended fertilization did not contain nitrogen in the formulation (NPK: 00-30-10), being this nutrient supplied through the organic compost. However, RINA observed in the reports item rural property data information of chemical fertilizer that contain nitrogen (NKP). PP is requested to explain. This CL is open.

	nutrient supplied through the organic compost. Thus, PP understands that the minimum use cited represents the application of fertilizers by community members within what was recommended, based on the analyses performed. Item 5.1.8 of MR-v2 has been changed to make this explanation clear. Evidence files contemplated by CL: (1) arquivo-analisesolo-2014.pdf (2) arquivo-analisesolo-2015.pdf (3) arquivo-analisesolo-2018.pdf (4) Relatorios-Jan-2020.rar	
CL 9 (cont.) RINA verified the analysis of soil and the reports provided. It is stated in the revised MR and in PP response that he recommended fertilization did not contain nitrogen in the formulation (NPK: 00-30-10), being this nutrient supplied through the organic compost. However, RINA observed in the reports item rural property data information of chemical fertilizer that contain nitrogen (NKP). PP is requested to explain. This CL is open.	The recommended fertilization was verified in each of the reports of the priority projects (4). In all NPK recommendations, the recommended formula was 00-30-10. In other words, in the fertilizer formulation there is 0% nitrogen, 30% phosphorus and 10% potassium. In the link (5) it is possible to better understand the formulation of fertilizers. Thus, it is concluded that the use of nitrogen from chemical sources in priority projects was not recommended by Fundação Jari (and the Project). Evidence files contemplated by CL:	RINA verified again the priority projects and confirmed that the value for nitrogen is zero. This CL is closed.

	(5) https://www.agencia.cnptia.embrapa.br/gestor/pimenta/arvore/CONT000gn08zc7m02wx5ok0liq1mqw825isw.html	

Table 4: FARs from this verification

Forward action requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
FAR 1 Fire control report should be provided to Fundação Jari in order to schedule workshops with the communities involved.	The Fundação Jari already receives forest fire control reports, it was included some evidences aiming to demonstrate that (3), (4), (5). Regardless that, an update was made to the procedure (1) to ensure that this internal communication process is carried out from now on (2). Evidence files contemplated by FAR: (1) PA – Plano de Atendimento à Incêndios Florestais ver. 0.008 ok ecm_adendoREDD.doc (2) Re Ação de Correção Futura Combate à Incêndios Florestais.msg (3) Fwd PPACIF- Relatórios finais.msg (4) Fwd Relatório de incêndio Fomento.msg (5) Fwd Relatório de Incêndios.msg	To be checked during next verifications.

FAR 2 During the interviews it was verified that a different producer from Natalina Pereira Sousa has fish-farming (tilapia). Thus, PP is requested to monitor the production of tilapia by the producers during the next monitoring period.	As pointed out in the previous answer from CL8, the cultivation of tilapia is not recommended and encouraged by the Project (but the producer has the right to cultivate on his property). In any case, the PP is committed to formulating strategies to monitor the cultivation of the species in the next years of the Project.	To be checked during next verifications.
FAR 3 Regarding to the monitoring plan, for the next verification period the monitoring frequency and monitoring information for community and biodiversity should be according to the registered PD.	The failures associated with non-compliance with the established frequencies were reported in the deviations section of MR-v3 (as well as in the specific responses in this table) and the proponents are aware of the need to monitor information regarding the community and biodiversity in accordance with the established in the PD. Thus, for the next verifications, this point will be adjusted.	To be checked during next verifications.
FAR 4 The VVB checked the evidence sent by PP which confirms field visits are carried out to check areas classified as “deforested areas” by PRODES (30m resolution images), which helps the classification carried out with Sentinel (10m resolution images). An improvement of the QA/QC should be done to		

include in the field verifications a sample of other land use classes too, to be checked on the field together with deforested areas, in order to better follow what the PD states “the assessment of the classifications will be carried out through data collection in the field using GPS navigation”.		

8 APPENDIX 3: MONITORING PLAN - COMMUNITY

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Sustainable Forest Management, FSC-certified	Number of communities affected by the SFM	Annual	From 2014 to 2017 no value was monitored. For 2018 to 2020 the value monitored was 1 for each year.	RINA verified the evidences /24/ /44/ provided and confirmed that the indicator was correctly monitored. Since the SFM stated only in 2018, there are no information for the previous years.
	Number of workshops regarding SFM activities implemented prior to the operation		For 2014 and 2018 the value monitored was 2 and 1, respectively. From 2015 to 2017, 2019 and 2020 no value was monitored.	The verification team checked the evidences of the workshop and the attendance list of the meetings /24/.
	Number and location of trees important to the communities mapped		From 2014 to 2017 and 2019 no value was monitored. For 2018, the total number of Brazil nuts tree counted in the POA01 census was 8,394. For 2020, the number of trees located in the Brazil nuts groves identified was 4,807.	RINA verified the shape files and maps /46/ provided by PP and confirmed that the monitored information is correct.
	Number of complains and demands regarding the SFM activities		The value monitored for 2014 and 2019 was 22 and 1, respectively. From 2015 to 2018 no value was monitored. For 2020, a total of 16 complains and demands were identified: 04/01 – 4; 30/04 – 5 and Action Plan - 7.	For 2014, RINA verified the evidences of the workshop and confirmed the number of complains and demands /24/. For 2019, the documents “Relatório Entrega de madeiras em toras_AGREGUE_COOPMOVEIS_PREFEITURA LARANJAL DO JARI.pdf” and “termo-concessao-uso-bem-publico-07-2019.pdf” /24/ were checked to confirm the information provided. For 2020, the evidences /24/ /29/ provided were verified and the number of complains and demands were confirmed.
	Extension of roads opened		From 2014 to 2017, 2019 and 2020 no value was monitored. For 2018, the total extension of roads opened was 62.68 Km (main: 19.74 and secondary: 42.94).	The shapefiles, mapa-POA01-microzoneamento.pdf, autorizacao-ambiental-207-2018.pdf and POA-AGREGUE-FINAL.pdf /46/ were checked and the extension of roads opened was confirmed.

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Monitoring of Deforestation	Area deforested per engaged community	Annual	França da Rocha: no value was monitored for 2020. 2014: 9.26; 2015: 8.27; 2016: 0; 2017: 0; 2018: 15.89; 2019: 18.17.	RINA verified the shapefiles /9/ and confirmed the areas deforested per engaged community.
			Fé em Deus: no value was monitored for 2020. 2014: 33.84; 2015: 70.74; 2016: 0; 2017: 61.33; 2018: 0; 2019: 0.	
			Tira Couro: no value was monitored for 2020. 2014: 135.46; 2015: 21.28; 2016: 7.78; 2017: 33.51; 2018: 64.84; 2019: 29.20.	
			Água Azul: no value was monitored for 2020. 2014: 0; 2015: 0; 2016: 6.69; 2017: 27.85; 2018: 34.09; 2019: 0.	
			Igarapé das Pacas: 2014: 24.05; 2015: 0; 2016: 6.48; 2017: 23.72; 2018: 6.91; 2019: 39.34. For 2020: no value was monitored.	
			Nova Conquista: 2014: 10.06; 2015: 0; 2016: 6.66; 2017: 0; 2018: 0; 2019: 0. For 2020: no value was monitored.	
	Area deforested per family attended		Francisco dos Santos Cardoso: From 2014 to 2016, 2018 and 2019 the value is 0. For 2017: 0.1 For 2020: no value was monitored.	RINA verified the shapefiles for the community engaged and the family attended /9/ and confirmed the areas deforested.
			Humberto Pereira de Oliveira: For 2014: 5.32; 2018: 6.88. From 2015 to 2017 and 2019 the value is 0. For 2020: no value was monitored.	
			Joaquim Augusto da Silva: From 2014 to 2016, 2018 and 2019 the value monitored is 0. For 2017: 0.10. For 2020: no value was monitored.	

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
			Joaquim da Conceição dos Santos: For 2014, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019 the value is 0. For 2015: 0.09. For 2020: no value was monitored.	
			Marco Antônio Ferreira de Sousa: For 2014, 2015, 2017, 2018, 2019 the value is 0. For 2016: 0.92. For 2020: no value was monitored.	
			Marli dos Santos Barbosa: From 2014 to 2016, 2018, 2019 the value is 0. For 2017: 2.42. For 2020: no value was monitored.	
			Nilson Pedreiro Torriel: From 2014 to 2017, 2019 the value is 0. For 2018: 2.56. For 2020: no value was monitored.	
			Osvaldo Pinto da Silva: From 2014 to 2016, 2018, 2019 the value is 0. For 2017: 2.61. For 2020: no value was monitored.	
			Raquel dos Santos Araújo: For 2014, 2015, 2017, 2018, 2019 the value is 0. For 2016: 7.78. For 2020: no value was monitored.	
			Walcir Cavalcante Santana: For 2014, 2016, 2018, 2019 the value is 0. For 2015: 2.06; 2017: 7.11. For 2020: no value was monitored.	
	Number of occurrences forwarded to environmental agencies		2014: 3; 2015: 1; 2016: 0; 2017: 5; 2018: 1; 2019: 22; 2020: 0.	RINA verified the police reports and other official documents /9/ with registered occurrences and confirmed that there are no occurrences for the years 2016 and 2020.

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Property Surveillance	Number of complaints/demands regarding the surveillance action	Annual	No value was monitored for the entire monitoring period.	This indicator was not monitored during the entire verification period.
	Number of fire control and prevention workshops implemented per communities engaged		Nova Conquista: From 2014 to 2017, 2020 the value is 0. For 2018: 1; 2019: 2.	The workshop was only done for the community Nova Conquista and the number of workshops implemented was verified through the evidences provided /25/.

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Technical Board Meetings	Number of meetings per year	Every 6 months	1ºsem 2014: 1; 2ºsem 2014: 1; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 1. For 2016, 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 1; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 1; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	The evidences /19/ were checked in order to confirm the number of all indicators.
	Number of institutions invited		From 2014 to 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 5; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 28; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
	Number of Institutions that attended		1ºsem 2014: 3; 2ºsem 2014: 7; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 4. For 2016, 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 10; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 10; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
	Number of communities invited		1ºsem 2014: 7; 2ºsem 2014: 4. From 2015 to 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 6; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 0; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
	Number of communities that attended		1ºsem 2014: 7; 2ºsem 2014: 6; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 4. For 2016, 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 7; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 6; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
	Number of represents per communities		Tira Couro: 1ºsem 2014: 5; 2ºsem 2014: 0. From 2015 to 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 4; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 2; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
			Sombra da Mata: 1ºsem 2014: 1; 2ºsem 2014: 1. For 2015 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			Ramal do Valdomiro: From 2014 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			França Rocha: 1ºsem 2014: 4; 2ºsem 2014: 1; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 2. For 2016, 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 1; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 2; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
			Ramal Fé em Deus: 1ºsem 2014: 3; 2ºsem 2014: 4. From 2015 to 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 6; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 3; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
			Nova Conquista: 1ºsem 2014: 6; 2ºsem 2014: 5; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 3. For 2016, 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 12; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 4; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
			Igarapé das Pacas: 1ºsem 2014: 11; 2ºsem 2014: 4; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 2.	

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
			For 2016, 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 8; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 2; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
			Água Azul: 1ºsem 2014: 4; 2ºsem 2014: 4; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 3. For 2016, 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 8; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 1; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
	Percentage of women participating		1ºsem 2014: 33%; 2ºsem 2014: 36%; 1ºsem 2015: 0%; 2ºsem 2015: 31%; 1ºsem 2016: 0%; 2ºsem 2016: 0%; 1ºsem 2017: 0%; 2ºsem 2017: 0%; 1ºsem 2018: 0%; 2ºsem 2018: 32%; 1ºsem 2019: 0%; 2ºsem 2019: 19%; 1ºsem 2020: 0%.	
	Percentage of youth participating		1ºsem 2014: 3%; 2ºsem 2014: 0%. From 2015 to 2018: 0% for both semesters. 1ºsem 2019: 0%; 2ºsem 2019: 4%; 1ºsem 2020: 0%.	
	Number of issues addressed		1ºsem 2014: 5; 2ºsem 2014: 4; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 5. For 2016, 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 1; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 4; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
	Time invested by the communities' members		1ºsem 2014: 8; 2ºsem 2014: 5; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 4. For 2016, 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 4; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 6; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
	Public Policies communities are accessing	Every 2 years	2014: 4; 2016: 1; 2018: 0; 2020: 1.	

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (TARE)	Number of families attended	Every 6 months	2014: 74; 2015: 75; 2016: 8; 2017: 366; 2018: 102; 2019: 67; 2020: 1067.	The documents with the activity register of each producer and the spreadsheet LinhaTempo_ATER.xlsx /18/ were verified and the values monitored were confirmed.
	Number of communities engaged		2014: 8; 2015: 7; 2016: 3; 2017: 4; 2018: 6; 2019: 6; 2020: 6.	
	Frequency of visits		2014: 420; 2015: 166; 2016: 15; 2017: 705; 2018: 183; 2019: 168; 2020: 3197.	
	Percentage of producers using the forest to grow crops	Every 2 years	2014: Brazil Nut - 16%; Açai - 10%; Cupuaçu - 4% 2016: Brazil Nut - 59%; Cupuaçu - 20%; Pupunha - 20% 2018: Brazil Nut - 62%; Cupuaçu - 9%; Pupunha - 45% 2020: Brazil Nut - 29%; Açai - 51%; Cupuaçu - 25%; Pupunha - 26%; Biribá - 3%; Camu Camu - 6%; Urucum - 3%.	The diagnose report for each producer and the spreadsheet Indicador-diversidade-produtos.xlsx /18/ were verified in order to confirm the values monitored.
	Amount of cassava produced		2014: 9.2 (Cassava root); 2016: 10.5012 (Cassava root); 2018: 6.7 (Cassava root); 2020: 28.46 (Cassava).	
	Diversity of products produced		2014: 24; 2016: 28; 2018: 33; 2020: 51.	
	Percentage of families with access to loans		2014: 0%; 2016: 0%; 2018: 10%; 2020: 0%.	The documents LinhaTempo_ATER.xlsx and relatorio-credito-rural.pdf were checked and the percentage of families with access to loans was confirmed /18/.
	Familiar Income		No value was monitored for the entire period.	
	Gender and age of the producers attended	Every 6 months	Youth: 2014: 1%; 2015: 1%; 2016: 0%; 2017: 0%; 2018: 1%; 2019: 1%; 2020: 0%. Women: 2014: 30%; 2015: 28%; 2016: 0%; 2017: 32%; 2018: 33%; 2019: 33%; 2020: 42%.	The documents with the activity register of each producer and the spreadsheet LinhaTempo_ATER.xlsx /18/ were verified and the values monitored were confirmed.
	Final market achieved	Every 2 years	No value was monitored for the entire period.	
	Time invested by the communities' members	Every 6 months	No value was monitored for the entire period.	

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Workshops and training in agro-extractive techniques	Number of total trainings	Every 6 months	1ºsem 2014: 3; 2ºsem 2014: 5; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 4; 1ºsem 2016: 0; 2ºsem 2016: 0; 1ºsem 2017: 2; 2ºsem 2017: 7; 1ºsem 2018: 2; 2ºsem 2018: 6; 1ºsem 2019: 1; 2ºsem 2019: 0; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	All documents listed in /47/ were verified and the values monitored were confirmed.
	Number of trainings per community		Água Azul: 1ºsem 2014: 3; 2ºsem 2014: 1. For 2015, 2016: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2017: 1; 2ºsem 2017: 0; 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 1; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 0; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
			Água Branca: For 2014: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 2. From 2016 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			Aruru: From 2014 to 2016: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2017: 1; 2ºsem 2017: 0. From 2018 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			Aterro do Muriacá: From 2014 to 2016: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2017: 0; 2ºsem 2017: 1. From 2018 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			Cachoeira do Santo Antônio: 1ºsem 2014: 0; 2ºsem 2014: 5; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 4. From 2016 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			Fé em Deus: 1ºsem 2014: 3; 2ºsem 2014: 4; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 2. For 2016, 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 1; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 0; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
			França Rocha: 1ºsem 2014: 3; 2ºsem 2014: 3. From 2015 to 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 2; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 0; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
			Igarapé das Pacas: 1ºsem 2014: 3; 2ºsem 2014: 3. From 2015 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			Iratapuru: 1ºsem 2014: 0; 2ºsem 2014: 1. From 2015 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			Marapi: From 2014 to 2016: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2017: 1; 2ºsem 2017: 0. From 2018 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			Martins: From 2014 to 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 2. From 2019 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			Nazaré Mineiro: From 2014 to 2018: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2019: 1; 2ºsem 2019: 0; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
			Nova Arumanduba: 1ºsem 2014: 0; 2ºsem 2014: 1. From 2015 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			Nova Conquista: 1ºsem 2014: 3; 2ºsem 2014: 1. From 2015 to 2016: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2017: 1; 2ºsem 2017: 6; 1ºsem 2018: 2; 2ºsem 2018: 1. From 2019 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
			Padaria: 1ºsem 2014: 0; 2ºsem 2014: 5. From 2015 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			Ramal Maicá: From 2014 to 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 1. From 2019 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			Ramal Maranhense: From 2014 to 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 1. From 2019 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			São José: 1ºsem 2014: 0; 2ºsem 2014: 1. From 2015 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			Sombra da Mata: 1ºsem 2014: 2; 2ºsem 2014: 0. From 2015 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
			Tira Couro: 1ºsem 2014: 2; 2ºsem 2014: 4. From 2015 to 2017: 0 for both semesters. 1ºsem 2018: 0; 2ºsem 2018: 2. From 2019 to 2020: 0 for both semesters.	
	Number of farmers attended		1ºsem 2014: 272; 2ºsem 2014: 91; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 25; 1ºsem 2016: 0; 2ºsem 2016: 0; 1ºsem 2017: 34; 2ºsem 2017: 59; 1ºsem 2018: 64; 2ºsem 2018: 88; 1ºsem 2019: 11; 2ºsem 2019: 0; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
	Gender and age of farmers attended		Women: 1ºsem 2014: 27%; 2ºsem 2014: 46%; 1ºsem 2015: 0%; 2ºsem 2015: 44%; 1ºsem 2016: 0%; 2ºsem 2016: 0%; 1ºsem 2017: 35%; 2ºsem 2017: 39%; 1ºsem 2018: 36%; 2ºsem 2018: 43%; 1ºsem 2019: 9%; 2ºsem 2019: 0%; 1ºsem 2020: 0%. Men: 1ºsem 2014: 73%; 2ºsem 2014: 54%; 1ºsem 2015: 0%; 2ºsem 2015: 56%; 1ºsem 2016: 0%; 2ºsem 2016: 0%; 1ºsem 2017: 65%; 2ºsem 2017: 61%; 1ºsem 2018: 64%; 2ºsem 2018: 57%; 1ºsem 2019: 91%; 2ºsem 2019: 0%; 1ºsem 2020: 0%. No information for age was provided.	
	Variety of topics covered		1ºsem 2014: 3; 2ºsem 2014: 4; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 1; 1ºsem 2016: 0; 2ºsem 2016: 0; 1ºsem 2017: 2; 2ºsem 2017: 3; 1ºsem 2018: 2; 2ºsem 2018: 4; 1ºsem 2019: 1; 2ºsem 2019: 0; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	
	Time invested by the communities' members		1ºsem 2014: 12; 2ºsem 2014: 33.5; 1ºsem 2015: 0; 2ºsem 2015: 0; 1ºsem 2016: 0; 2ºsem 2016: 0; 1ºsem 2017: 5.5; 2ºsem 2017: 40; 1ºsem 2018: 4; 2ºsem 2018: 26; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 2ºsem 2019: 0; 1ºsem 2020: 0.	

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Development of Property Use Plans	Number of property use plans completely realized	Every 6 months	From 2014 to 2015, 2ºsem 2016 and from 2017 to 2019 no value was monitored. 1ºsem 2016: 36; 1ºsem 2020: 33.	The verification team revised the priority projects reports /7/ and reports for each producer /48/ and confirmed the information for the number of property use plans completely realized.
	Number of "future maps" designed		1ºsem 2014: 35; 2ºsem 2014: 12. From 2015 to 2020 no value was monitored.	The future maps were checked by the verification team /48/.
	Number of soil analysis performed		For 1ºsem 2014, 1ºsem 2015, from 2016 to 1ºsem 2018 and from 2019 to 2020 no value was monitored. 2ºsem 2014: 11; 2ºsem 2015: 36; 2ºsem 2018: 24.	The documents with the results of the soil analysis were checked /48/.
	Number of property micro-zoning realized		For 1ºsem 2014, from 2015 to 1ºsem 2018 and from 2019 to 2020 no value was monitored. 2ºsem 2014: 6; 2ºsem 2018: 35.	The micro-zoning of each property was verified by the verification team /48/.
	Number of finalized property use plans discussed with farmers		From 2014 to 2019 no value was monitored. 1ºsem 2020: 33.	The declarations were verified by RINA /48/.
	Diversity of products in the future maps		1ºsem 2014: 109; 2ºsem 2014: 55. From 2015 to 2020 no value was monitored.	The diversity of products was checked by the verification team in the future maps /48/.
	Number of "future maps" implemented		From 2014 to 2019 no value was monitored. 1ºsem 2020: 33.	The receipt was check in order to confirm the implemented maps /10/.
	Time invested by the communities' members		No value was monitored for the entire period.	This indicator was not monitored during the entire verification period.

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Community Level Workshops (Participatory Organizational Workshops, Community Development Plans and Risks and Impacts Assessment)	Number of demands identified per community	Every 6 months	1ºsem 2015: 1; 1ºsem 2016: 53 (Padaria -15, São José -9, Santo Antônio da Cachoeira -13, Iratapuru -16); 1ºsem 2018: 1; 1ºsem 2020: 3. For 1ºsem 2014, 2ºsem 2014, 2ºsem 2015, from 2ºsem 2016 to 2017, 2ºsem 2018, 2019 no value was monitored.	The minutes of the meeting, presentation and attendance list were verified for the year 2014 /19/. For 2015, the follow-up was checked /21/ and RINA confirmed that the values included are correct. For 2016, 2018, 2019 and 2020 the evidences /54/ were verified and the values monitored were confirmed.
	Number of demands addressed per community		1ºsem 2014: 0; 1ºsem 2016: 7 (Padaria -2, São José -1, Santo Antônio da Cachoeira -1, Iratapuru -3); 1ºsem 2018: 1; 1ºsem 2019: 1; 1ºsem 2020: 3. For 2ºsem 2014, from 1ºsem 2015 to 2017, 2ºsem 2018 and 2ºsem 2019 no value was monitored.	
	Stakeholders involved on addressing each demand		1ºsem 2014: 37; 1ºsem 2016: 103; 1ºsem 2018: 18; 1ºsem 2019: 1; 1ºsem 2020: 6. For 2ºsem 2014, from 1ºsem 2015 to 2017, 2ºsem 2018 and 2ºsem 2019 no value was monitored.	
	Time invested by the communities' members		1ºsem 2014: 10; 1ºsem 2016: 6 for each community; 1ºsem 2018: 0; 1ºsem 2019: 0; 1ºsem 2020: 0. For 2ºsem 2014, from 1ºsem 2015 to 2017, 2ºsem 2018 and 2ºsem 2019 no value was monitored.	
Family Assessment	Number of families interviewed	Every 2 years	2014: 45. No value was monitored for 2016, 2018 and 2020.	The evidences /49/ were checked and the values monitored were confirmed.
	Number of communities contemplated		2014: 7. No value was monitored for 2016, 2018 and 2020.	
	Frequency		2014: 1. No value was monitored for 2016, 2018 and 2020.	
	Time invested by the communities' members		No value was monitored for the entire period.	

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Structuring of the socio-environmental Fund REDD+ Jari	Resources invested on each strategic line (climate, community, biodiversity and management)	Annual	Climate: 2014: R$ 67,708; 2015: R$ 62,315; 2016: R$ 59,373; 2017: R$ 72,672; 2018: R$ 62,113; 2019: R$ 41,051; 2020: R$ 69,617.79. Community: 2014: R$ 635,664; 2015: R$ 644,819; 2016: R$ 580,587; 2017: R$ 619,335; 2018: R$ 631,659; 2019: R$ 494,846; 2020: R$ 268,349. Biodiversity: From 2014 to 2018 no value was monitored. 2019: R$ 12,551; 2020: R$ 86,651. Management: 2014: R$ 100,511; 2015: R$ 155,467; 2016: R$ 83,539; 2017: R$ 89,086; 2018: R$ 187,262; 2019: R$ 209,745. 2020:no value was monitored.	The evidences related to climate, community, biodiversity and management /20/ were verified and the values monitored are correct.
	Number of meetings carried out between the executive committee		2014: 1; 2019: 1. From 2015 to 2018 and 2020 no value was monitored.	The evidence of the meetings /20/ were checked and the values monitored are correct.
	Number of consultation made through Technical Board		2015: 1; 2018: 1. For 2014, 2016, 2017, 2019, 2020 no value was monitored.	The minutes of meeting of 2015 and the presentation for 2018 /19/ were verified.
	Number of communities represented in the technical board consulted about the investments to be done/done		2015: 4; 2018: 6. For 2014, 2016, 2017, 2019, 2020 no value was monitored.	The attendance lists /19/ (ListaFrequenciaCT_25082015.pdf and ListaFrequenciaCT_09082018.pdf) were verified.
	Number of complains regarding the investments made		2015: 2. For 2014 and from 2016 to 2020 no value was monitored.	The documents of follow-up /21/ were verified and the number of complains was confirmed.

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Improvement of communication channels	Number of registered complaints or demands	Annual	2014: 13; 2015: 27; 2016: 38; 2017: 72; 2018: 143; 2019: 169; 2020: 60.	RINA verified the evidences /21/ and checked that the register of the complains or demands and how were addressed are correct.
	Number of addressed complaints or demands		2014: 8; 2015: 27; 2016: 35; 2017: 71; 2018: 141; 2019: 169; 2020: 59.	
Biodiversity Monitoring and Scientific Research	Analysis of communities perception regarding availability of natural resources	Every 2 years	No value was monitored for the entire period.	This indicator was not monitored during the entire verification period.
	Analysis of communities perception regarding the forest importance		No value was monitored for the entire period.	This indicator was not monitored during the entire verification period.

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Identified High Conservation Value	Number of communities engaged that manage Brazil Nut	Annually, once the HCV attribute is validated and the SFM Plan is approved.	2014: 1; 2016: 1; 2018: 1; 2020: 3. For 2015, 2017, 2019 no value was monitored.	A spreadsheet with information about diversity of products and the diagnose report for each producer /18/ were verified.
	Number of families attended that manage Brazil Nut		2014: 8; 2016: 1; 2018: 1; 2020: 5. For 2015, 2017, 2019 no value was monitored.	
	Number of communities affected by the SFM that manage Brazil Nut		2020: 1. From 2014 to 2019 no value was monitored.	The minutes of the workshops /29/ was verified.
	Number of workshops carried with communities affected by the SFM previously to the operation		2014: 2. From 2015 to 2020 no value was monitored.	The reports of the visits to the communities /24/ were verified.
	Number of Brazil Nut trees identified by the pre-harvesting inventory		2020: 8,394. From 2014 to 2019 no value was monitored.	The information was verified against shapefiles /46/ and the inventory done by Agregue /26/.
	Number of Brazil Nut tree damage by the SFM		From 2014 to 2019 no value was monitored. 2020: Irreversible damage: 28; less than 50% damage: 85; damage in more than 50%: 24; trunk damage: 14; canopy damage: 26; access damage: 223.	The damage by the SFM was cross checked against the spreadsheet provided by Agregue with information about evaluation of damages /24/.
	Number of complaint regarding damage to Brazil Nut tree or to restriction of access		From 2014 to 2019 no value was monitored. 2020: 2. 1-Partial or total loss of productivity of Brazil nut trees in the collection area, due to the fall of managed trees near the bases of the Brazil nut trees, causing obstruction of access to trees due to the high volume of branches of managed trees, making it impossible/difficult to collect fruits/ nuts; 2- access roads to the Brazil nut groves in bad conditions, due to the traffic of large machinery.	The minutes of the workshops /29/ was verified.
	Analysis of communities' perception regarding resources availability, focus on the Brazil Nut		From 2014 to 2019 no value was monitored. 2020: 1- "O Sr. Rosinaldo iniciou a conversa abordando que os danos provocados pela extração florestal (PMFS – AP), tais como árvores mortas, copas parcialmente quebradas e copas	The minutes of the workshops /29/ was verified.

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
			das árvores abatidas que entulham as bases das castanheiras dificultando a coleta dos ouriços/ castanhas, reduzindo drasticamente a produção, o Sr. Rosinaldo segue citando que nas áreas com clareiras abertas devido o abate das árvores, já estão sendo infestadas de tiririca e outras ervas invasoras formando uma juguira (capoeira), que dificultarão o acesso dos extrativistas." 2- "O Sr. Izanor comenta que em sua área a extração foi muito forte, danificando muitas castanheiras deixando grande parte delas entupidas de galhos, trazendo uma perca de metade da produção. O Sr. Izanor comenta que antes das atividades do PMFS, ele já tinha o ramal da grota Rica e outros ramais que dava acesso aos castanhais; os ramais da empresa são bons, infelizmente a produção do ano passado e deste ano foram afetadas, prejudicando sua renda." 3- "O Sr. Ozeias comenta que foi bem atendido por ramais em sua área, porem observa que os danos aos castanhais tarar reflexo por 4 há 5 anos."	

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Seedling Nursery	Number of total seedling produced	Annual	2014: 7,024; 2015: 12,803; 2016: 49,569; 2017: 28,904; 2018: 50,771; 2019: 43,725; 2020: 4,982.	The number of total seedling produced and of different species produced was verified against the spreasheet Producao_e_distribuicao_de_mudas - compilado.xlsx /22/.
	Number of different species produced		2014: 12; 2015: 2; 2016: 31; 2017: 23; 2018: 26; 2019: 24; 2020: 17.	
	Number of seedling distributed to the engaged communities		2014: 3,840; 2015: 11,753; 2016: 865; 2017: 835; 2018: 5,993; 2019: 0; 2020: 0.	The number of seedling distributed to the engaged communities was verified against the spreasheets Producao_e_distribuicao_de_mudas - compilado.xlsx /22/ and LinhaTempo_ATER.xlsx /18/.
	Number of seedling distributed per family attended		2014: 1,400; 2015: 11,553; 2016: 0; 2017: 0; 2018: 387; 2019: 0; 2020: 0.	The number of seedling distributed per families attended was verified against the spreasheets Producao_e_distribuicao_de_mudas - compilado.xlsx /22/, LinhaTempo_ATER.xlsx /18/ and LinhaTempo_ProjetosPrioritarios.xls /7/.
Xylotheque (Wood Collection)	Number of families attended that have been there	Annual	From 2014 to 2020 the value monitored is 0.	The evidences /23/ were verified however, there is no family attended that have been there.

9 APPENDIX 4: MONITORING PLAN - BIODIVERSITY

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Biodiversity Monitoring and Scientific Research	Number of expeditions for the sampling at each monitoring event	Biannual	During the entire monitoring period, the indicator was only monitored in 2019: 1.	RINA verified the biodiversity monitoring report /31/ and confirmed all information included for these indicators.
	Intensity of expeditions for the sampling at each monitoring event		During the entire monitoring period, the indicator was only monitored in 2019: 13.	
	No. of monitored taxa at each monitoring event		During the entire monitoring period, the indicator was only monitored in 2019: 2 (Avifauna and mammals).	
	No. of monitored species at each monitoring event		During the entire monitoring period, the indicator was only monitored in 2019: 230 (Avifauna: 197; Mammals: 33).	
	Diversity of the monitored fauna taxon at each monitoring event		During the entire monitoring period, the indicator was only monitored in 2019: Beta Diversity for Avifauna - Eucaliptus plantation: 0.65; Managed native forests: 0.55; Primary forest: 0.64; Beta Diversity for Mammals - Eucaliptus plantation: 0.71; Managed native forests: 0.43; Primary forest: 0.47.	
	Richness of the monitored fauna taxon at each monitoring event		During the entire monitoring period, the indicator was only monitored in 2019: Avifauna - Eucaliptus plantation: 76 species; Managed native forests: 140 species; Primary forests: 134 species; Mammals - Eucaliptus plantation: 10 species; Managed native forests: 10 species; Primary forests: 15 species.	
	Diversity of plant community in Permanent Plots		During the entire monitoring period, the indicator was only monitored in 2019: 0.	
	Richness of the plant community in Permanent Plots		During the entire monitoring period, the indicator was only monitored in 2019: 0.	
	Presence of endangered species in the Project Area		During the entire monitoring period, the indicator was only monitored in 2019: 8. Avifauna: *Crax alector*; *Ramphastos tucanus*; *Ramphastos vitellinus*; *Patagioenas subvinacea.* Mammals: *Panthera once*; *Priodontes maximus*; *Ateles paniscus*; *Mazama americana*.	

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
	Status of species of relevance on IUCN's red list of endangered species		During the entire monitoring period, the indicator was only monitored in 2019: Avifauna: *Crax alector* (VU); *Patagioenas subvinacea* (VU); *Ramphastos tucanus* (VU); *Ramphastos vitellinus* (VU). Mammals: *Panthera once* (NT); *Priodontes maximus* (VU); *Ateles paniscus* (VU); *Mazama americana* (DD).	
	Number of studies and research projects developed		For 2014, 2019 and 2020 the value is 0. For 2016: 3; 2018: 1.	The thesis /89/ were verified and the number of studies and research are correct.
	Number of scientific papers		For 2014, 2018 and 2020 the value is 0. For 2015: 1; 2016: 1; 2019: 1.	The articles /90//91//92/ were checked and the values monitored are correct.
	Number of institutions engaged		For 2014, 2016, 2018 and 2020 the value is 0. For 2019: 2 (Ambiens and Embrapa).	The information monitored is according to the evidence /50/ provided.
	Amount invested in research		From 2014 to 2018 no value was monitored. For 2019: R$ 12,551; 2020: R$ 86,651.	RINA verified that the values included for the years 2019 and 2020 are correct as per evidences /20/ /50/.
	Validation workshops/knowledge return events		No value was monitored for the entire period.	This indicator was not monitored.

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Seedling Nursery	Number of seedlings	Annual	2014: 7,024; 2015: 12,803; 2016: 49,569; 2017: 28,904; 2018: 50,771; 2019: 43,725; 2020: 4,982	Only information regarding native trees species was included. The values in the MR were checked against the evidence /22/ provided.
	Number of species produced		2014: 12; 2015: 2; 2016: 31; 2017: 23; 2018: 26; 2019: 24; 2020: 17	
	Number of seedlings distributed to communities in the Project Zone		2014: 3,840; 2015: 12,803; 2016: 865; 2017: 1,495; 2018: 8,266; 2019: 0; 2020: 0	The numbers were verified against the spreasheets Producao_e_distribuicao_de_mudas - compilado.xlsx /22/ and LinhaTempo_ATER.xlsx /18/.
	Number of seedling distributed to communities engaged by the Project		2014: 3,840; 2015: 11,753; 2016: 865; 2017: 835; 2018: 5,993; 2019: 0; 2020: 0	The numbers were verified against the spreasheets Producao_e_distribuicao_de_mudas - compilado.xlsx /22/ and LinhaTempo_ATER.xlsx /18/.
	Number of seedling distributed to families engaged		2014: 1,400; 2015: 11,553; 2016: 0; 2017: 0; 2018: 387; 2019: 0; 2020: 0.	The values were verified against the spreasheets Producao_e_distribuicao_de_mudas - compilado.xlsx /22/, LinhaTempo_ATER.xlsx /18/ and LinhaTempo_ProjetosPrioritarios.xls /7/.
	Number of seedlings used for restoration of degraded lands		2014: 0; 2015: 0; 2016: 155; 2017: 0; 2018: 0; 2019: 0; 2020: 0.	These indicators were confirmed by the verification of the spreasheet Producao_e_distribuicao_de_mudas - compilado.xlsx /22/.
	Number of seedling used for productive ends		2014: 6,474; 2015: 12,803; 2016: 38,410; 2017: 26,245; 2018: 47,881; 2019: 42,425; 2020: 4,757.	

Activities	Indicator	Frequency of Monitoring	Value monitored	Assessment/Observation
Xylotheque (Wood Collection)	Number of Wood samples	Annual	2014: 1,050; 2015: 1,050; 2016: 1,050; 2017: 1,050; 2018: 1,050; 2019: 1,050; 2020: 1,050.	The number of wood samples, botanical samples and insects samples for each year was confirmed by the verification team through the documents Dados Acervo Florestal Jari – email.pdf and Dados Acervo Florestal Jari - Auditoria REDD.xlsx /23/.
	Number of botanical samples		2014: 4,921; 2015: 4,921; 2016: 4,921; 2017: 4,921; 2018: 4,921; 2019: 4,921; 2020: 4,780.	
	Number of insects samples		2014: 2,322; 2015: 2,322; 2016: 2,322; 2017: 2,322; 2018: 3,000; 2019: 3,000; 2020: 2,786.	
	Number of general visits		2014: 114; 2015: 80; 2016: 96; 2017: 88; 2018: 235; 2019: 85; 2020: 18.	The evidences /23/ were verified and the number of general visits and visits with educational ends are correct.
	Number of visits with educational ends		2014: 0; 2015: 136; 2016: 48; 2017: 109; 2018: 28; 2019:75; 2020: 0.	

RINA SERVICES
classification, certification, inspection & testing

CERTIFICATO DI QUALIFICA PER GLI SCHEMI VOLONTARI*
QUALIFICATION CERTIFICATE FOR VOLUNTARY SCHEMES*

Si attesta che il sig./sig.ra:
We declare that Mr/Mrs/Ms: **Geisa Maria Principe Branco Saettoni**

è qualificato come:
is qualified as: **TEC, VAL, VER, TL, ITRP**

per le seguenti aree tecniche:
for the following technical areas:

AREE TECNICHE *TECHNICAL AREAS*	DESCRIZIONE DELL'AREA TECNICA *TECHNICAL AREA DESCRIPTION*	SCOPO SETTORIALE *SECTORAL SCOPE*
1.1	Thermal energy generation	1
1.2	Renewables	1
13.1	Solid waste and wastewater	13

REVISIONE *REVISION*	DATA *DATE*	MOTIVAZIONI PER LA REVISIONE *REASON FOR THE REVISION*
0	19/07/2016	First issue with new template (this certificate is linked to CDM qualification)

Responsabile di schema
Scheme Leader
Rita Valoroso

*SCHEMI VOLONTARI/ VOLUNTARY SCHEMES: ACR American Carbon Registry, CCB The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance, GS Gold Standard, JI Joint Implementation, SCS Social Carbon Standard, VCS Verified Carbon Standard.

TEC: Technical expert; VAL: Validator; VER: Verifier; TL: Team leader; FIN EXP: Financial Expert; ITRP: Independent technical reviewer

RINA Services S.p.A. è accreditato/riconosciuto da
RINA Services S.p.A. Is accredited /recognized by

UNFCCC	quale Entità Operativa Designata (DOE), per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti CDM *as Designated Operational Entity (DOE), to carry out Validation and Verification of CDM Projects*
VCSA	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti VCS *to carry out Validation and Verification of VCS Projects*
GS Foundation	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti GS *to carry out Validation and Verification of GS Projects*
Ecologica Institute	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di rapporti SCS *to carry out Validation and Verification of SCS Reports*
American Carbon Registry ACR	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti ACR *to carry out Validation and Verification of ACR projects*
The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance CCB	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti co-benefit CCB *to carry out Validation and Verification of co-benefit CCB projects*

GHG_QUAL_CERT_EN_07_16 Voluntary(Certificate) Page 1 of 1

CERTIFICATO DI QUALIFICA
QUALIFICATION CERTIFICATE

Si attesta che il sig./sig.ra: **Andrea LEIROZ**
We declare that Mr/Mrs/Ms:

è qualificato come[1]: **TEC, VAL, VER, TEC**
is qualified as:

per le seguenti aree tecniche:
for the following technical areas:

AREE TECNICHE TECHNICAL AREAS	DESCRIZIONE DELL'AREA TECNICA *TECHNICAL AREA DESCRIPTION*	SCOPO SETTORIALE *SECTORAL SCOPE*
1.1	Thermal Energy Generation	1
1.2	Renewables	1
5.1	Chemical industry	5
13.1	Solid waste and wastewater	13
13.2	Manure	13

in accordo alle istruzioni dell'unità Sostenibilità & Cambiamenti Climatici.
in accordance with the instructions of the Sustainability & Climate Change Unit.

REVISIONE *REVISION*	DATA *DATE*	MOTIVAZIONI PER LA REVISIONE *REASON FOR THE REVISION*
0	17/09/2019	First issue with new template (this certificate is linked to CDM qualification)

Il Resp. CCPLS
Head of CCPLS
Laura SEVERINO

[1] Legend:

VAL:	Validator	CDM: Clean Development Mechanism
VER:	Verifier	VCS : Verified Carbon Standard:
TEC:	Technical Expert	GS4GG: Gold Standard For Global Goals
TL:	Team Leader	SCS: SocialCarbon Standard
FIN-EXP:	Financial Expert	JI: Joint Implementation
DET:	Determiner	

RINA Services S.p.A. è accreditato da UNFCCC, quale Entità Operativa Designata (DOE), per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti CDM, da VCSA per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti VCS, da GS Foundation, per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti GS, da Ecologica Institute per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di rapporti SCS

RINA Services S.p.A. is accredited by the UNFCCC, as Designated Operational Entity (DOE), to carry out Validation and Verification of CDM Projects, by the VCSA, to carry out Validation and Verification of VCS Projects, by the GS Foundation, to carry out Validation and Verification of GS4GG Projects and by the Ecologica Institute, to carry out Validation and Verification of SCS Reports

GHG_QUAL_CERT_EN(07-2018) Page 1 of 1

RINA SERVICES
classification, certification, inspection & testing

CERTIFICATO DI QUALIFICA PER GLI SCHEMI VOLONTARI*
QUALIFICATION CERTIFICATE FOR VOLUNTARY SCHEMES*

Si attesta che il sig./sig.ra: **Talita Carvalho Beck**
We declare that Mr/Mrs/Ms:

è qualificato come: **TEC, VAL, VER, TL**
is qualified as: **LOCAL EXPERT**

per le seguenti aree tecniche:
for the following technical areas:

AREE TECNICHE *TECHNICAL AREAS*	DESCRIZIONE DELL'AREA TECNICA *TECHNICAL AREA DESCRIPTION*	SCOPO SETTORIALE *SECTORAL SCOPE*
1.1	Thermal energy generation	1
1.2	Renewables	1
13.1	Solid waste and wastewater	13
14.1	Forestry	14

REVISIONE *REVISION*	DATA *DATE*	MOTIVAZIONI PER LA REVISIONE *REASON FOR THE REVISION*
0	19/07/2016	First issue with new template (this certificate is linked to CDM qualification)
1	14/06/2017	Update qualification in TA 14.1 and Local expert

Responsabile di schema
Scheme Leader
Laura Severino

*SCHEMI VOLONTARI/ VOLUNTARY SCHEMES: ACR American Carbon Registry, CCB The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance, GS Gold Standard, JI Joint Implementation, SCS Social Carbon Standard, VCS Verified Carbon Standard.

TEC: Technical expert; VAL: Validator; VER: Verifier; TL: Team leader; FIN EXP: Financial Expert; ITRP: Independent technical reviewer

RINA Services S.p.A. è accreditato/riconosciuto da
RINA Services S.p.A. is accredited /recognized by

UNFCCC	quale Entità Operativa Designata (DOE), per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti CDM *as Designated Operational Entity (DOE), to carry out Validation and Verification of CDM Projects*
VCSA	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti VCS *to carry out Validation and Verification of VCS Projects*
GS Foundation	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti GS *to carry out Validation and Verification of GS Projects*
Ecologica Institute	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di rapporti SCS *to carry out Validation and Verification of SCS Reports*
American Carbon Registry ACR	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti ACR *to carry out Validation and Verification of ACR projects*
The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance CCB	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti co-benefit CCB *to carry out Validation and Verification of co-benefit CCB projects*

GHG_QUAL_CERT_EN_07_16 Voluntary(Certificate) Page 1 of 1

RINA SERVICES
classification, certification, inspection & testing

CERTIFICATO DI QUALIFICA PER GLI SCHEMI VOLONTARI*
QUALIFICATION CERTIFICATE FOR VOLUNTARY SCHEMES*

Si attesta che il sig./sig.ra:
We declare that Mr/Mrs/Ms: **Thais De Lima Carvalho**

è qualificato come:
is qualified as: **TEC, VAL, VER, TL, ITRP**

per le seguenti aree tecniche:
for the following technical areas:

AREE TECNICHE *TECHNICAL AREAS*	DESCRIZIONE DELL'AREA TECNICA *TECHNICAL AREA DESCRIPTION*	SCOPO SETTORIALE *SECTORAL SCOPE*
1.1	Thermal energy generation	1
1.2	Renewables	1
2.1	Electricity distribution	2
13.1	Solid waste and wastewater	13

REVISIONE *REVISION*	DATA *DATE*	MOTIVAZIONI PER LA REVISIONE *REASON FOR THE REVISION*
0	19/07/2016	First issue with new template (this certificate is linked to CDM qualification)

Responsabile di schema
Scheme Leader
Rita Valoroso

*SCHEMI VOLONTARI/ VOLUNTARY SCHEMES: ACR American Carbon Registry, CCB The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance, GS Gold Standard, JI Joint Implementation, SCS Social Carbon Standard, VCS Verified Carbon Standard.

TEC: Technical expert; VAL: Validator; VER: Verifier; TL: Team leader; FIN EXP: Financial Expert; ITRP: Independent technical reviewer

RINA Services S.p.A. è accreditato/riconosciuto da
RINA Services S.p.A. /is accredited /recognized by

UNFCCC	quale Entità Operativa Designata (DOE), per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti CDM *as Designated Operational Entity (DOE), to carry out Validation and Verification of CDM Projects*
VCSA	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti VCS *to carry out Validation and Verification of VCS Projects*
GS Foundation	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti GS *to carry out Validation and Verification of GS Projects*
Ecologica Institute	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di rapporti SCS *to carry out Validation and Verification of SCS Reports*
American Carbon Registry ACR	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti ACR *to carry out Validation and Verification of ACR projects*
The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance CCB	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti co-benefit CCB *to carry out Validation and Verification of co-benefit CCB projects*

GHG_QUAL_CERT_EN_07_16 Voluntary(Certificate) Page 1 of 1

CERTIFICATO DI QUALIFICA PER GLI SCHEMI VOLONTARI*
QUALIFICATION CERTIFICATE FOR VOLUNTARY SCHEMES*

Si attesta che il sig./sig.ra: / *We declare that Mr/Mrs/Ms:* **Vinay SINGH**

è qualificato come: / *is qualified as:* **TEC, VAL, VER**

per le seguenti aree tecniche: / *for the following technical areas:* 1.2, 14.1

AREE TECNICHE *TECHNICAL AREAS*	DESCRIZIONE DELL'AREA TECNICA *TECHNICAL AREA DESCRIPTION*	SCOPO SETTORIALE *SECTORAL SCOPE*
1.2	Renewables	1
14.1	Forestry	14

REVISIONE *REVISION*	DATA *DATE*	MOTIVAZIONI PER LA REVISIONE *REASON FOR THE REVISION*
0	09/09/2020	First issue

Il Resp. CEINS
Head of CEINS

*SCHEMI VOLONTARI/ VOLUNTARY SCHEMES: ACR American Carbon Registry, CCB The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance, GS Gold Standard, JI Joint Implementation, SCS Social Carbon Standard, VCS Verified Carbon Standard.

TEC: Technical expert; VAL: Validator; VER: Verifier; TL: Team leader; FIN EXP: Financial Expert; ITRP: Indipendent technical reviewer

RINA Services S.p.A. è accreditato/riconosciuto da
RINA Services S.p.A. is accredited /recognized by

UNFCCC	quale Entità Operativa Designata (DOE), per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti CDM *as Designated Operational Entity (DOE), to carry out Validation and Verification of CDM Projects*
VCSA	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti VCS *to carry out Validation and Verification of VCS Projects*
GS Foundation	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti GS *to carry out Validation and Verification of GS Projects*
Ecologica Institute	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di rapporti SCS *to carry out Validation and Verification of SCS Reports*
American Carbon Registry ACR	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti ACR *to carry out Validation and Verification of ACR projects*
The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance CCB	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti co-benefit CCB *to carry out Validation and Verification of co-benefit CCB projects*

GHG_QUAL_CERT_EN_07_16 Voluntary(Certificate) Page 1 of 1