



LOWER ZAMBEZI REDD+ PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT



Document Prepared By AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U.

www.aenor.com

Project Title	THE LOWER ZAMBEZI REDD+ PROJECT
Version	1.4
Report ID	LZRP_MR9_VerificationReport_2022_1.4

Report Title	Lower Zambezi REDD+ Project Verification Report
Client	BioCarbon Partners
Pages	62
Date of Issue	16/06/2022

Prepared By	AENOR INTERNACIONAL SAU
Contact	Génova, 6. 28004 Madrid – Spain Telephone +34 914326000 jfuentes@aenor.com , jcgomez@aenor.com www.aenor.com
Approved By	Jose Luis Fuentes
Work Carried Out By	Lead auditor: Juan Carlos Gómez Lead auditor in trainee: Javier Cócera Technical reviewer: Elena Llorente

Summary:

AENOR has carried out the verification of the Lower Zambezi REDD+ Project. The project is a reducing emission from deforestation and degradation (REDD+) project on 40,126 ha of privately-owned land in Rufunsa District, Zambia. The Project Area is known as 'Rufunsa Conservancy' and is owned by a Zambian company named Sable Transport Limited. The Conservancy is one of the last intact areas of forest within Lusaka Province (named after the nearby capital city), and provides a 60-kilometer buffer to Lower Zambezi National Park (NP), a strategic protected area in Zambia in a globally significant trans-frontier conservation area.

The core project climate activities undertaken include forest carbon inventorying, modeling cumulative deforestation patterns, and soil carbon assessments. Core community project activities include up to eighteen different types of community-based deforestation mitigation initiatives designed to create sustainable, scalable alternatives to deforestation, and strategic, meaningful incentives that comprise part of pay for performance programs that support forest conservation. Core biodiversity project activities include forest conservation systems, biodiversity monitoring and management, and fire management. Project area boundaries were marked at project start date and since then, aerial and/or ground patrols are conducted weekly to monitor compliance. Every monitoring period, 20 % of accounting and proxy area biomass plots and 100 % of leakage area monitoring plots are inventoried. Remote sensing is used to monitor disturbance and fires while wildlife and other biodiversity indicators are monitored in bi-annual fixed transects surveys as well as random ground patrols.

The project start, and implementation date is 1 October 2009 and will be operational until 1 October 2039. The estimated emissions reduction for the 30-year project span is 5,673,505 tCO₂e at an average of 189,117 tCO₂e/yr. The emissions reduction for the current monitoring period (January 1st, 2021, to December 31st, 2021) is 221,813 tCO₂e.

During the verification 4 CLs and 7 CARs were raised. All these issues were appropriately closed by means of corrections, more clear explanations, and additional supporting documents.

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Objective	4
1.2	Scope and Criteria	4
1.3	Level of Assurance.....	5
1.4	Summary Description of the Project	5
2	Verification Process	6
2.1	Method and Criteria.....	6
2.2	Document Review	8
2.3	Interviews	9
2.4	Site Inspections.....	9
2.5	Resolution of Findings	13
2.5.1	Forward Action Requests	13
2.6	Eligibility for Validation Activities	13
3	Validation Findings	13
3.1	Participation under Other GHG Programs	13
3.2	Methodology Deviations.....	13
3.3	Project Description Deviations.....	14
3.4	Grouped Project	14
4	Verification Findings	15
4.1	Project Implementation Status	15
4.2	Safeguards	17
4.2.1	No Net Harm	17
4.2.2	Local Stakeholder Consultation	17
4.3	AFOLU-Specific Safeguards	19
4.4	Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations	20
4.5	Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals	33
4.6	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis.....	34
5	Verification conclusion	40
	APPENDIX I: LIST OF EVIDENCE PROVIDED	41
	APPENDIX II: FINDINGS	46

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The objective of the verification audit was to conduct an independent assessment of the project to determine:

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

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of the verification audit was to verify the emissions reductions and/or removals of the project The Lower Zambezi REDD+, against the VCS Standard, the identified methodology and the validated PD throughout the monitoring period from 1st of January 2021 to 31st of December 2021.

The scope was defined as follows:

- The project area
- The eligibility, baseline scenario and additionality
- The physical infrastructure of the project
- The GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs that are applicable to the project according to the used methodology and the validated PD
- The types of GHGs that are applicable to the project according to the used methodology and the validated PD.
- The project monitoring period.
- The GHG emission reductions/removals assertions and claims.
- The local stakeholder consultation processes.
- The AFOLU safeguards.

This audit included a verification of the project's calculated reductions and/or removals /8/ and the Non-permanence Risk Assessment Report /31-35/ with the Verified Carbon Standard requirements and any additional requirements of VCS AFOLU projects. In addition, the audit assessed the project with respect to the validated baseline scenarios and the eligibility criteria presented in the PD.

In accordance with Section 4.1.8 of the VCS Standard v4.2, the criterion for validation and verification was the VCS Version 4, including the following documents:

- VCS Standard v4.2
- VCS Program Guide v4.1
- VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v 4.0

Unless otherwise indicated, the assessment was performed against the most recent version of the relevant VCS guidance document.

1.3 Level of Assurance

The assessment was conducted to provide a reasonable level of assurance of conformance against the defined audit criteria and materiality thresholds within the audit scope. Based on the audit findings, a positive evaluation statement reasonably assures that the project GHG assertions are materially correct and is a fair representation of the GHG data and information.

All the versions of the verification report were subjected to an independent internal technical review before being submitted to the client to confirm that all verification activities had been completed according to the pertinent AENOR instructions required. The technical review was performed by technical reviewer(s) qualified in accordance with AENOR's qualification scheme for VCS validation and verification.

Name	Role in the team
Juan Carlos Gómez	Lead Auditor
Javier Cócera	Lead Auditor under supervision
Elena Llorente	Technical reviewer

The threshold for materiality with respect to the aggregate of errors, omissions, and misrepresentations relative to the total reported GHG emission reductions/removals was five percent (5%), as established for projects by the VCS Standard.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The Lower Zambezi REDD+ Project is an emissions reduction project from deforestation and degradation (REDD+) project on 40,126 ha of privately-owned land in Rufunsa District, Zambia. The Project Area is known as 'Rufunsa Conservancy' and is owned by a Zambian company named Sable Transport Limited.

The Conservancy is one of the last intact areas of forest within Lusaka Province (named after the nearby capital city) and provides a 60-kilometer buffer to Lower Zambezi National Park (NP), a strategic protected area in Zambia in a globally significant trans-frontier conservation area. Lower Zambezi NP is adjacent to Mana Pools National Park in Zimbabwe which is a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) designated World Heritage Site. The population of the Project Zone as of the 2012 baseline evaluation was approximately 8,933 people living in 28 villages spread within 4 community zones.

The Project Proponent is BioCarbon Partners, which is responsible for certifying the Project and for early-stage Project finance.

The core project climate activities undertaken include forest carbon inventorying, modelling cumulative deforestation patterns, and soil carbon assessments. Core community project activities include up to eighteen different types of community-based deforestation mitigation initiatives designed to create sustainable, scalable alternatives to deforestation, and strategic, meaningful incentives that comprise part of pay for performance programs that support forest conservation. Core biodiversity project activities include forest conservation systems, biodiversity monitoring and management, and fire management. Project area boundaries were marked at project start date and since then, aerial and/or ground patrols are conducted weekly to monitor compliance. Every monitoring period, 20 % of accounting and proxy area biomass plots and 100 % of leakage area monitoring plots are inventoried. Remote sensing is used to monitor disturbance and fires while wildlife and other biodiversity indicators are monitored in bi-annual fixed transects surveys as well as random ground patrols.

The project start and implementation date is 1 October 2009 /75//91/ and will be operational until 1 October 2039. The estimated emissions reduction for the 30-year project span is 5,673,505 tCO₂e at an average of 189,117 tCO₂e/yr. The emissions reduction for the current monitoring period (January 1st, 2021 to Dec. 31st, 2021) is 221,813 tCO₂e /8/.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Method and Criteria

The verification was performed through a combination of document review and interviews with relevant personnel, as discussed in Sections 2.2 through 2.4 of this report. At all times, the project was assessed for conformance to the criteria described in Section 1.2 of this report. As discussed in Section 2.5, findings were issued to ensure that the project was in full conformance to all requirements.

A project specific Verification and Sampling Plan was developed to guide the verification auditing process to ensure efficiency and effectiveness. The purpose of the Verification and Sampling Plan was to present a risk assessment for determining the nature and extent of verification procedures necessary to ensure the risk of auditing error was reduced to a reasonable level. The Verification & Sampling Plan methodology was derived from all items in our verification process stated above. Specifically, the sampling plan utilized the VCS guidance documents, ISO 14064-3 and the Standard for Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities Version 03.0. Random samplings were carried out considering a confidence interval of 95% and error of 10%. Any modifications applied to the Verification and Sampling plan were made based upon the conditions observed for monitoring in order to detect the processes with highest risk of material discrepancy.

The verification activities in which risks were assessed were the evaluations of the monitoring system (data flow, data control procedures, etc.) but mainly the quality of raw data as well as sources and the calculation spreadsheets. AENOR reproduced and verified 100% of spreadsheets /5-23/ for the monitoring period from January 1st, 2021, to December 31st, 2021 for the project area. The project boundary and the project area for the monitoring period were 100% checked using the GIS database /36-54/.

The carbon stock changes, and the land used classes in the project area were also 100% verified /8/ and crosschecked with validated values in the PD.

AENOR carried out a deep and meticulous review of the spreadsheets /5-23/ to verify the correct application of the methodology (formulae, equations.) and checked that data required for calculating the GHG removals were appropriately provided. Based on the assessment carried out, AENOR confirms with a reasonable level of assurance that the claimed emission reductions and removals are free from material errors, omissions, or misstatements.

AENOR confirms that sufficient evidence was presented for the reported net anthropogenic GHG emission reductions and removals and that there is a clear audit trail that contains the evidence and records that validate the stated figure in this verification report since:

- Sufficient evidence available: The project participant has provided the 100% of data used in the calculations to achieve the final amount of GHG emission reductions and removals reported.
- Nature of evidence: The raw data were collected from reliable sources. They are detailed in the project documents and have been provided to the verification team and were checked during the interviews.
- Cross-checked evidence: AENOR cross-checked the collected information through interviews with stakeholders and reproducing calculations.

Hence, AENOR confirms that the stated figures in the monitoring report are correct and confirms that is able to certify the ex-post net anthropogenic GHG reductions and removals based on verifiable and reliable evidence.

2.2 Document Review

A detailed review of all project documentation was conducted to ensure consistency with, and identify any deviation from VCS program requirements, the methodology (VM0009 – Methodology for Avoided Ecosystem Conversion, v3.0), and the validated PD. Initial review focused on the MR and included an examination of the project details, implementation status and internal reports, data and parameters, and quantification of GHG emission reductions and removals. Documents reviewed included data from monitoring, management plans, maps and satellite images, /2/, monitoring and grievance SOPs, carbon calculation spreadsheets /8/, and responses to Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and Clarifications (CLs) (Appendix 2).

The verification included a review of the validated PD and the MR, relative to the field conditions, and interviews with project management staff and stakeholders. Modifications to the Verification and Sampling plan were made based upon the conditions observed for monitoring in order to detect the processes with highest risk of material discrepancy.

The VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v 4.0 was used by the Project Proponent (PP) to assess overall project risk. AENOR reviewed the Non-Permanence Risk Report /33/ provided with the verification support documentation and confirmed that the project adheres to the requirements set out in the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool. Each risk factor was thoroughly assessed for conformance. The final score was calculated to be 10%.

For a listing of all documents received from the client and assessed for this verification, see Appendix 1. Numerical references to evidence are provided throughout this report, following the numeration provided in Appendix 1.

2.3 Interviews

Interviews were performed as part of the verification process in order to confirm and verify the information provided in the documents. AENOR's verification team gather the testimonies and opinion of people with different roles and relation with the project. This included interviews with project management and in-country staff in relation to project activities implementation and project monitoring. Local community members were interviewed in relation to participation in the project, support received, project implementation status, consultation processes, and project benefits expected and achieved.

Due to COVID-19 health restrictions, all interviews were carried out through a combination of live videoconferences and video recordings of questionnaire answering. The interviews took place on 02/02/2022.

The AENOR verification team conducted interviews (remotely) to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. The list of the interviewed people is below detailed.

Stakeholder group	Name/role	Topic	Date/verification mean
Beneficiary	Simuyala Goliat	Conservation Farming Training	02/02/2022
Beneficiary	Mutondo Sainet	Honey Production	02/02/2022
Beneficiary	Royce Sakala	Crop Diversification Training	02/02/2022
Beneficiary	Mukonka Abson	Distribution of farmer Inputs	02/02/2022
Beneficiary	Chola Henry	School Support/Completion of the class room block	02/02/2022
Beneficiary	Paulina Chibalamuna	Completion of the Poultry	02/02/2022
Beneficiary	Nakasamu Nchimunya	Forestry Department Support	02/02/2022

2.4 Site Inspections

Due to COVID-19 and its mobility restrictions, AENOR as VVB proposed to carry out a remote audit that ensured the achievement of the assurance level required by the VCS program, i.e: a reasonable level.

The remote audit was based on the following auditing techniques:

- Document review and cross checks between the information provided in the in the MR, the PD and supporting information and evidence provided by the PP's emissions calculations, GIS database, and supporting information and evidence provided.
- Review, based on the selected methodologies, tools and the other applied methodological regulatory documents, of the appropriateness of formulae and accuracy of calculations.
- Telephone, teleconference and/or e-mail interviews for the implementation of project activities and the elaboration of project's documents.
- Cross checks between information provided by interviewees to ensure that not relevant information has been omitted.
- The remote audit procedure was agreed with the PP based on available means and safety procedures. Key stakeholders were interviewed as described below.

The dates when the remote work was carried on were between the first and the second week of February of 2022.

For the verification of project activities and monitoring, the following means were used:

Activity	Verification Means	Stakeholders' testimonies
Biomass sampling	Video/photo testimonies	Elvin Muchimba Lawrence Musone Laison Chiyakamba Besa Kalinda Edward Shasha
Poultry house construction	Written/video/photo testimonies	Pauline Chibalamuna
Crop diversification	Video/photo testimonies	Violet Daka
input distribution	Video testimony	Memory Kalaingele
Borehole construction	Written/video/photo testimonies	Edson Phiri Faidess Zumbuni Nelly Kawanga Eliza Tembo
Education improvement	Written/video/photo testimonies	Chola Henry

Activity	Verification Means	Stakeholders' testimonies
Forestry department support	Written/video/photo testimonies	Simon Bwewepe Kelly Muhan
Sustainable echo charcoal production	Photo testimony	David Chamunda Cornwall Machila Trust Munsajne Stephene Kafwanda Patrick Mutyiolambi Christine Miti
Sustainable honey production	Written/video/photo testimonies	Sainet Mutondo Trisa Makala
Farmers 'training	Photo testimonies	Hakaloba Ford Zulu Steven Ghanskuka Samd Memory Kaliyangi Simuyala Goliat Oliver Milardi Davidson Nuovo Philimon Chiluapela Naomi Nsambilo Obrien Mwalishinka Sunday Mbuenga Andrew Chisoko Mudenda Tiason Felix Simmueni Maureen Chipungo Royce Sathala

Activity	Verification Means	Stakeholders' testimonies
		Cosmos Chikomba Kaonga Presca Juelitta Masuko Justine Mukanga Wiliam B. Muekinchi Evans Chatembwa Mvhav Khasamunu Mukonka Abson Xameyo Vincent Eunice Mweembre Enny Simufwi Lister Choronja Benard Muansa

2.5 Resolution of Findings

All documentation provided by the PP was assessed against the applicable version of the relevant VCS guidance document. Several clarification requests (CL) and corrective action requests (CAR) were raised and submitted to the PP, which addressed them either by providing to the audit team the requested information or by making the appropriate corrections. Updated versions of the documentation were submitted by the PP and the audit team reassessed them against the guidance documentation. This process was repeated iteratively until all CLs and CARs were fully closed. Specifically, 4 CLs and 7 CARs were raised.

All findings issued by the AENOR audit team during the verification process have been closed. In accordance with Section 4.1.13 of the VCS Standard, all findings issued during the verification process and the inputs for their closure are described in Appendix 2 of this report.

There was no outstanding forward action request (FAR) from the previous verification

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

During the current verification, no FAR has been raised.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

AENOR holds accreditation for validation and verification for the relevant sectorial scope 14 under which this project activity is classified.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

The project has not been registered, and is not seeking registration, under any other GHG programs. The project has already been validated and registered under the VCS Program.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

The following methodology deviations were applied to the project from previous monitoring periods:

- As in M8, there was a minor deviation of the visual approach for leakage monitoring. Instead of Forest Inventory Team members estimating degradation, they were required to geo-reference every felled tree in the permanent plots and the total number of felled trees were compared against the average density of trees/ha in the project accounting area, again avoiding biased estimations/erroneous counting of trees in 1 ha plots. This value was then placed in a degradation category as per VM0009. This approach removed all potential bias and greatly improves the robustness and repeatability of degradation monitoring. This deviation does not affect the conservativeness of any emissions reductions as it is in fact an improvement of the prescribed procedure and removes observer bias that could result in degradation in the leakage area being underestimated.
- There was also a minor variation with regards to the monitoring of disturbances. VM0009 requires that disturbances in the project area must be monitored in plots. The very low density of disturbances experienced in the LZRP are not captured by plots. Therefore, when disturbances are detected by other means, their size is directly measured using ground surveys.
- The project uses two different allometric equations to estimate above-ground biomass. One was tested on trees up to 55 cm DBH. It is used to estimate the biomass of trees up to 63 cm DBH, with the biomass of trees between 55 cm and 63 cm DBH assumed to be equal to a 55 cm DBH tree. Then, a second equation is used to estimate the biomass of trees between 63 cm DBH and 110 cm DBH with trees with a greater than 110 cm DBH assumed to have biomass equal to a 110 cm DBH tree. This deviation only relates to how biomass is measured for monitoring purposes and doesn't affect any other part of the methodology. It results in a more conservative estimate of biomass and emissions savings. Therefore, it meets the criteria for an acceptable methodological deviation.

AENOR verified that these methodology deviations were validated in previous verification events by checking the validated PD, validation report and all previously issued MRs and verification reports, published in Verra's Registry .

There are not new methodology deviations applied in this monitoring period.

3.3 Project Description Deviations

There are not project description deviations during this Monitoring Period.

3.4 Grouped Project

This is not a grouped project

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

During this verification process, AENOR has not detected project changes in regards of the project title, its purposes, and objectives. The MR provides in its Section 3.1 a detailed description of the activities implemented by the project since its start.

The LZRP has developed a wide range of deforestation mitigation and benefit sharing activities with local stakeholders. These activities fit broadly into three different categories namely a) Community Sensitization, Education and Consultation, b) Community-Based Deforestation Mitigation Projects, and c) Protection, Enforcement and Monitoring.

Through the review of project planification and management documents /2/ and interviews with key staff and project stakeholders, the auditor's team ratified the main objectives of the project activity and checked the actual implementation of the project activities.

After the review of the MR, spreadsheet calculations /8/ and the other document to support calculations such as GIS information /36-54/, and others /115-126/, AENOR deems that project status is in compliance with applicable methodologies and implementation is in support of the VCS principles of Conservativeness and Accuracy.

Related to the compliance with the Monitoring Plan, section 4.3 of the MR provides information about the monitoring plan and actions carried out for the current monitoring period. AENOR checked the monitoring plan contained in the validated PD and compared it with the MR to verify whether there was any difference that would cause an increase in estimates of the GHG emission reductions or removals in the current monitoring period. AENOR has confirmed that there are no material discrepancies between the actual monitoring system and the monitoring plan set out in the PD and the applied methodologies. Also, the PP effectively monitors the required parameters to determine the project's removals by sinks and emissions by sources as required by the monitoring plan and the applicable methodologies

The parameters reported, including source, frequency and review criteria as indicated in the monitoring plan were verified to be correct and in line with the monitoring plan of the validated PD.

Regarding leakage emission, they account zero, and there are that no significant deforestation has taken place in the leakage area, only minor degradation. In this regard, AENOR has checked evidence provided /28-29//8//45/ which confirms the information included in the MR.

All the activities performed by the PP and described in section 3.1 of the MR impacted positively on the reduction and removal of GHG emissions. All the activities have some type of indirect effect on the population that will help to achieve the objective of GHG emission reduction/removal.

Specifically, the social services activities, such as the school, the borehole and the clinic activities intend to improve the quality of the people who live within the project zone, and to ensure that the new generations have better services. During 2021, 8 teachers supported the education and 1x2 classroom was built in Chilimba. These improvements in education will increase the knowledge of students about nature and the benefits of protecting biodiversity among others.

AENOR assessed these activities through review of the evidence provided by the PP /55/ /62/ /63/, as well as the interviews to different stakeholders. The construction of borehole will improve the access to water and will reduce the displacements of local communities to look for water as well as the usage of water for other activities. AENOR has assessed all the evidence provided for the borehole construction /119/.

The sustainable eco-charcoal production is another activity implemented by the PP to promote GHG reduction and removal. The project is designed to replace unsustainable harvesting practices with sustainable practices that allow for the regeneration of forests, promote community-based forest protection, and improve rural producer livelihoods through the development of a commercially viable sustainably harvested charcoal product. In accordance with this activity, new viability assessments were conducted as well as the number of active *charprenuers* has grown. The increase of the eco-charcoal production will help to reduce the GHG emissions of the project zone. AENOR has assessed through wide evidence provided by the PP /123/ as well as through direct questions on the interviews.

The boundary demarcation is done annually to prevent illegal activities within the limits of the project. Through this activity, local communities are aware of the limits of the project area. AENOR has asked to the interviewees about the boundary's demarcation as well as their knowledge of the limits and confirms that all of them were aware of the activity and the current demarcation.

There is no evidence of double counting or that the project has participated nor been rejected under any other GHG programs. GHG emission reductions and removals generated by the project are not included in an emission trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading. The project has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit.

Regarding the sustainable development, LZRP contributes to 16 of the 17 sustainable development goals. AENOR interviewed different stakeholders and verified the claimed contributions of the project /55-71/.

The audit team reviewed the monitoring plan, its implementation, and its suitability. AENOR has carried out a series of reviews of material provided as evidence to demonstrate the implementation of the plan, as well as through interviews carried out with the different stakeholders. This information can be found in section 2.3 and 2.4 of the Verification Report.

Regarding the adequacy of implementation of the plan, all carbon calculations /5-11/, geodatabase /36-54/, risk analysis /32/, monitoring report /1/ and its comparison with the previous verification period and the DDA have been reviewed.

The analysis carried out by AENOR reproduced all the calculations and parameters reported in both the Excel document and the monitoring report.

The monitoring review process for The Lower Zambezi REDD+ Project covered the months between December 2021 and April 2022. After a complete review of the different documents provided (see Appendix 1) and the information gathered through the remote audit process, AENOR is able to confirm that the project implementation is in accordance with the validated PD. There are not material discrepancies between project implementation and the project description different from those reported and validated as PD deviations.

There are no new methodology deviations for this monitoring period. The 3 methodology deviations listed in section 3.2 of this report were validated during previous monitoring periods and are all the methodology deviations applied to the project in the current monitoring period.

4.2 Safeguards

4.2.1 No Net Harm

The project has been Gold Level Validated for positive community impacts under the CCB Standard. The project was also successfully verified against the CCB standard at the Gold Level in 2018 for the period from 2013-2017.

During the audit process, AENOR verified that the Project has a net positive impact from both the environmental and social side. With the latter and according to the Gold Level validation, AENOR deems that the PP has taken successfully reasonable steps to mitigate potential negative impacts.

A detailed description of stakeholder consultations for each farm have been provided to AENOR including pictures of the events, the list of attended people, the brochure disseminated to communities and report of the event with comments from communities.

No negative impacts have been found according to the project implementation.

AENOR verified records of jobs generated and the contracts with local people. In addition, other benefits are reported such training, safety measures, etc.

The project generates net positive impacts on the social and economic well-being of the local communities who derive livelihoods from the project area.

4.2.2 Local Stakeholder Consultation

BCP's Community Engagement Strategy is a comprehensive set of policies and procedures that have been designed to ensure that BCP's REDD+ projects bring maximum positive impacts to local community stakeholder livelihoods and meaningfully reduce deforestation.

There are five main components in BCP's Community Engagement Strategy:

- Community Stakeholder Identification, Mapping and Census Process

- Community Sensitization and Consultation
- Community Projects: Design and Implementation Processes
- Documenting Compliance with International Standards, such as FPIC
- On-going Social Monitoring Program

BCP has thus far consulted over 86% of community stakeholders and benefited from a more than 75 % project success rating among stakeholders surveyed at community meetings. All stakeholder communication is documented, and minutes of meetings stored. All projects are either proposed directly by the local community or in partnership with BCP and then tailor-made according to local needs.

The community engagement team lives within the local community and interacts formally and informally with community members on a daily basis and the Zambian laws and regulations covering workers' rights have not changed since the last monitoring period (M8).

Local stakeholders have been made fully aware (via the sensitization meetings referred to above) of the requirements for an auditing team to verify the findings of the annual monitoring report, as is standard procedure, and what this auditing process will entail. This communication is part and parcel of the REDD+ project information dissemination which occurs since the start of community engagement and continues to be communicated during refresher information sharing meetings.

In the current verification the project conducted over 70 community meetings where project Implementation and project benefits (e.g. borehole drilling, distribution of beehives and construction of the poultry house) were discussed with local stakeholders. These meetings enable communities/local stakeholder to be informed of project benefits over this monitoring period. There have been no relevant changes to the risks and costs to the communities associated with the project implementation in this monitoring period to communicate

In the MR, Table 1 (List of consent and consultation meetings held with local stakeholders for LZRP in 2021) summarizes all stakeholders' communications held during the current monitoring period. Main informative targets exposed in the table were verified during the remote audit process, through online interviews with key community representatives.

There haven't been any issues in relation to property and land use rights of local stakeholders being negatively impacted. However, during the current monitoring period (M9), Namanongo Zone raised a grievance to BCP in relation to project area boundaries not being clear to them following the erection of community project signposts in the villages. Some villages claimed that they were not fully informed about the construction of the sign posts and considered the actions as extension of project area boundaries. This grievance was raised in a meeting facilitated by BCP's Bunda Bunda Chiefdom Lead and proceedings related to the issue recorded in meeting minutes and subsequently tracked in the project grievance trackers until closure. A follow up grievance resolution meeting was conducted where the community members demanded to have an audience with the landowner, Sable Transport and further instructed BCP not to conduct any project related activities in the Zone until the issue was resolved and closed.

The community selected one of the head women to represent them and to meet with the landowner to get clarity on the boundary status and was told that there was no extension whatsoever and that the previously painted boundary remained the same. After the meeting with the landowner, the emissary reported back in a follow up community meeting with headmen, community members and BCP.

Through reviewed documentation /55-71/ and consultation to community members during the interviews, AENOR considers that community members demonstrated awareness and consent of the project activities and verified that inputs from communities are considered when those activities are implemented. AENOR verified during the online interviews that BCP has continuous communication with the whole stakeholders' group and their inputs are taken into consideration. The stakeholders interviewed were aware of the current status of the project implementation, were informed of the audit process (remote) and the grievances occurred, project activities, next steps, etc.

4.3 AFOLU-Specific Safeguards

BCP works closely with local representatives and traditional community leaders to identify local causes and drivers of deforestation, and to design projects that are anticipated to address them meaningfully and sustainably. To mitigate risks to local stakeholders due to project implementation, alternative livelihood projects i.e., honey and eco-charcoal production, conservation farming interventions, training of lead farmers, education support, and fire management training were implemented.

There haven't been any issues in relation to property and land use rights of local stakeholders being negatively impacted. BCP has a well-established and publicly known grievance mechanism that has been designed to address and resolve any problems. The grievance mechanism is clearly outlined and discussed in community sensitization meetings and contact information for BCP representatives is included in all public communications.

The project has been Gold Level Validated for positive community impacts under the CCB Standard. The project was also successfully verified against the CCB standard at the Gold Level in 2018 for the period from 2013-2017.

During the remote audit process, AENOR interviewed local community stakeholders and verified that the Project has a net positive impact from both the environmental and social side. With the latter and according to the Gold Level validation, AENOR deems that the PP has taken successfully reasonable steps to mitigate potential negative impacts.

4.4 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

The verification team performed an intensive review of all input data, parameters, formulas, calculations, conversions, statistics and resulting uncertainties and output data to ensure consistency with the VCS documentation, methodologies and associated tools, and the PD. Further, the verification team reproduced calculations for selected samples to ensure accuracy of the results. Conversion factors, formulas, and calculations were provided by PP in spreadsheet format to ensure all formulas were accessible for review /8/. The verification team recalculated subsets of the analysis to confirm correctness. PP also provided a step-by-step overview of select calculations to ensure the verification team understood the approach and could confirm its consistency with the methodologies and PD. Where applicable, references for analysis methods or default values were checked against relevant scientific literature for best practice.

Procedures for quantifying emission reductions and removals were conducted in accordance with the VM0009 v.3.0 June 2014: Methodology for Avoided Ecosystem Conversion for Sectorial Scope 14 methodology and its related tools.

Baseline Emissions

Section 5.1 of the MR and the calculation spreadsheet submitted to AENOR provide information related to the baseline emissions calculations.

Baseline emissions ($E_{(BA)}^{[m]}$) for the current monitoring period (01-January-2021 to 31-December-2021) were calculated using Equation F.15. from VM0009 v3.0

$$E_{BA}^{[m]} = E_B^{[m]} - E_B^{[m-1]} \quad [F.15]$$

Cumulative baseline emissions were calculated using a logistic deforestation model, based upon a point interpretation of forest state in the reference area applying equation F.16 from VM0009, v3.0

$$E_B^{[m]} = E_{BBM}^{[m]} + E_{BSOC}^{[m]} - C_{BSOC}^{[m]} - C_{BBGB}^{[m]} - C_{BDW}^{[m]} - C_{BWP}^{[m]} \quad [F.16]$$

Baseline emissions from biomass for the current monitoring period are based on the average per hectare carbon stocks in selected carbon pools from AGOT, BGOT given by equation F.17 for the accounting area and F.18 for the proxy area.

$$C_{PBM}^{[m]} = \sum_{b \in B} C_{Pb}^{[m]} \quad [F.17]$$

$$c_{B\ BM}^{[m]} = \sum_{b \in B} c_{B\ b}^{[m]} \quad [F.18]$$

Cumulative baseline emissions were calculated using a logistic biomass emission model (BEM), validated in the PD, based upon a point interpretation of forest state in the reference area applying equation F.24.

$$\begin{aligned} E_{B\ BM}^{[m]} &= BEM_{SP}(c_{P\ 1\ BM}^{[m=0]}, c_{B\ BM}^{[m]}, t^{[m]}, x^{[m]}) = BEM_{U2,3/P1}(c_{P\ 1\ BM}^{[m=0]}, c_{B\ BM}^{[m]}, t^{[m]}, x^{[m]}) \quad [F.24] \\ \text{when } E_{B\ BM}^{[m]} &\geq A_{P\ 1}^{[m=0]}(c_{P\ 1\ BM}^{[m=0]} - c_{B\ BM}^{[m]}) \\ \text{then } E_{B\ BM}^{[m]} &= BEM_{U2,3}(wc_{P\ 1,2\ BM}^{[m=0]}, c_{B\ BM}^{[m]}, t^{[m]}, x^{[m]}) \\ \text{when } E_{B\ BM}^{[m]} &\geq A_{P\ 1}^{[m=0]}c_{P\ 1\ BM}^{[m=0]} + A_{P\ 2}^{[m=0]}c_{P\ 2\ BM}^{[m=0]} - c_{B\ BM}^{[m]}(A_{P\ 1}^{[m=0]} + A_{P\ 2}^{[m=0]}) \\ \text{then } E_{B\ BM}^{[m]} &= BEM_{U2,3/P1}(wc_{P\ 1,2,3\ BM}^{[m=0]}, c_{B\ BM}^{[m]}, t^{[m]}, x^{[m]}) \\ &\dots \\ E_{B\ BM}^{[m]} &= A_{P\ 1}^{[m=0]}c_{P\ 1\ BM}^{[m=0]} + A_{P\ 2}^{[m=0]}wc_{P\ 1,2\ BM}^{[m=0]} + \dots + A_{P\ n}^{[m=0]}wc_{P\ i,n\ BM}^{[m=0]} \\ &\quad - c_{B\ BM}^{[m]}(A_{P\ 1}^{[m=0]} + A_{P\ 2}^{[m=0]} + \dots + A_{P\ n}^{[m=0]}) \end{aligned}$$

Cumulative baseline emission from SOC were estimated using a soil emission model (SEM), applying equation F.29.

$$\begin{aligned} E_{B\ SOC}^{[m]} &= SEM_{SP}(c_{P\ 1\ SOC}^{[m=0]}, c_{B\ SOC}^{[m]}, t^{[m]}, x^{[m]}) = SEM_{U2,3/P1}(c_{P\ 1\ SOC}^{[m=0]}, c_{B\ SOC}^{[m]}, t^{[m]}, x^{[m]}) \quad [F.29] \\ \text{when } E_{B\ SOC}^{[m]} &\geq A_{P\ 1}^{[m=0]}(c_{P\ 1\ SOC}^{[m=0]} - c_{B\ SOC}^{[m]}) \\ \text{then } E_{B\ SOC}^{[m]} &= SEM_{U2,3/P1}(wc_{P\ 1,2\ SOC}^{[m=0]}, c_{B\ SOC}^{[m]}, t^{[m]}, x^{[m]}) \\ \text{when } E_{B\ SOC}^{[m]} &\geq A_{P\ 1}^{[m=0]}c_{P\ 1\ SOC}^{[m=0]} + A_{P\ 2}^{[m=0]}c_{P\ 2\ SOC}^{[m=0]} - c_{B\ SOC}^{[m]}(A_{P\ 1}^{[m=0]} + A_{P\ 2}^{[m=0]}) \\ \text{then } E_{B\ SOC}^{[m]} &= SEM_{U2,3/P1}(wc_{P\ 1,2,3\ SOC}^{[m=0]}, c_{B\ SOC}^{[m]}, t^{[m]}, x^{[m]}) \\ &\dots \\ E_{B\ SOC}^{[m]} &= A_{P\ 1}^{[m=0]}c_{P\ 1\ SOC}^{[m=0]} + A_{P\ 2}^{[m=0]}wc_{P\ 1,2\ SOC}^{[m=0]} + \dots + A_{P\ n}^{[m=0]}wc_{P\ i,n\ SOC}^{[m=0]} \\ &\quad - c_{B\ SOC}^{[m]}(A_{P\ 1}^{[m=0]} + A_{P\ 2}^{[m=0]} + \dots + A_{P\ n}^{[m=0]}) \end{aligned}$$

Cumulative carbon not decayed in SOC used a decay emission model (DEMSOC) as per equation F.33

$$c_{B\ SOC}^{[m]} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} DEM_{SOC}(E_{B\ \Delta\ SOC}^{[i]}, t^{[m]}, t^{[i-1]}) \quad [F.33]$$

Carbon not decayed in below-ground biomass used a decay emission model (BEM), as per F.32 of VM0009 v3.0.

$$C_{B\ BGB}^{[m]} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} DEM_{DW,BGB}(E_{B\ \Delta\ BGB}^{[i]}, t, t^{[m]}, t^{[i-1]}) \quad [F.32]$$

Both cumulative baseline emissions from below-ground biomass at the end of the previous [m-1] and current monitoring period [m] were calculated according to equation F.30.

$$E_{B\ BGB}^{[m]} = \frac{r_{RS} E_{B\ BM}^{[m]}}{1 + r_{RS}} \quad [F.30]$$

The following table summarizes the calculated values of the baseline parameters:

Parameter	Equation used (VM0009 v3.0)	Value (tCO ₂ e)
$E_{(B\Delta)}^{[m]}$ Baseline emissions for the current monitoring period	F.15	221,813
$E_{(B\Delta)}^{[m-1]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions from previous monitoring period	F.16	1,531,420
$E_{B\ BM}^{[m]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions from biomass at the end of the current monitoring period	F.24	1,718,495
$E_{B\ SOC}^{[m]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions from SOC at the end of the current monitoring period	F.29	621,481
$C_{B\ SOC}^{[m]}$ Carbon not decayed SOC at the end of the current monitoring period	F.33	-386,973
$C_{B\ BGB}^{[m]}$ Carbon not decayed in BGB at the end of the current monitoring period	F.32	10
$E_{B\ BGB}^{[m]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions from below-ground biomass at the end of the current monitoring period	F.30	602,587
$E_{B\ BGB}^{[m-1]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions from below-ground biomass at the end of the previous monitoring period	F.30	536,985

AENOR has checked the calculations provided and confirmed that this amount of baseline emissions is in conformance and have followed the methodology in the new version of the PD.

Project emissions

The MR stated that there were no project emissions in the current monitoring period. It was justified by the remote sensing and GIS analysis in the MR.

The assessment of project emissions has been done with the fully review of spreadsheets calculations /5/ /7/ /9-10/ and the proper comparison with the methodology. Furthermore, GIS material /36-54/ has been checked to be contrasted with the boundaries of the project and the spreadsheet calculation.

The calculations have been reproduced according to the methodology used, and the verification team obtained the same results. Thus, AENOR considers that the calculations were done correctly by the PP.

AENOR has checked the assumptions provided and confirmed that this amount of project emissions is in conformance and have followed the methodology in the validated Project Description.

Leakage

As reported in Section 5.3 of the MR, leakage emission for the current period ($E_{L\Delta}^{[m]}$) was calculated using equations F.44 and F.45 of VM0009.

$$E_{L\Delta}^{[m]} = E_L^{[m]} - E_L^{[m-1]} \quad [F.44]$$

$$E_L^{[m]} = E_{LASF}^{[m]} + E_{LASG}^{[m]} + E_{LME}^{[m]} \quad [F.45]$$

Activity-shifting leakage in forested area is calculated through the validated leakage emissions model (LEM) validated in the PD, as per equation F.46. Market leakage is not accounted by the project.

$$E_{LASF}^{[m]} = LEM(c_P^{[m]}, c_B^{[m]}, p_{LDEG}^{[m]}, t^{[m]}, x^{[m]}) \quad [F.46]$$

The portion of leakage due to degradation in forest at the end of the current monitoring period was calculated as per equation B.9

$$z = \frac{1}{\sum_{k \in S} A_k} \sum_{k \in S} \frac{A_k}{n_k} \sum_{j \in P_k} y_{j,k} \quad [B.9]$$

The following table summarizes the calculated values of the leakage parameters:

Parameter	Equation used (VM0009 v3.0)	Value
$E_{L\Delta}^{[m]}$ Emissions from leakage for the current monitoring period.	F.44	0
$E_{LASF}^{[m]}$ Cumulative emissions from activity-shifting leakage in forested areas at the end of the current monitoring period	F.46	0
$E_{LASF}^{[m-1]}$ Cumulative emissions from activity-shifting leakage in forested areas at the end of the previous monitoring period	F.46	0

Parameter	Equation used (VM0009 v3.0)	Value
$P_{L\ DEG}^{[m=0]}$ Portion of leakage due to degradation prior to first verification event	B.9	0.087

The assessment of the leakage has been done with the full review of spreadsheets calculations /5/ /7/ /9-10/. Complementary, GIS material /36-54/ has been checked to be contrasted with the boundaries of the project and the spreadsheet calculation.

The calculations have been reproduced according to the methodology used, and the verification team obtained the same results. Thus, AENOR considers that the leakage calculations were done correctly by the PP.

AENOR has checked the calculations provided and confirmed that this amount of leakage emissions is in conformance and have followed the methodology in the validated PD.

Net GHG Emissions Reductions and Removals

As indicated in Section 5.4 of the MR, net GHG emission reductions were calculated using equation F.53 of VM0009 v3.0.

$$E_{\Delta GER}^{[m]} = E_{B\Delta}^{[m]} - E_{P\Delta}^{[m]} - E_{L\Delta}^{[m]} - E_U^{[m]} \quad [F.53]$$

The confidence deduction based on uncertainty in emissions models, carbon stock estimates in the project accounting area and carbon stock estimates in the proxy area ($E_U^{[m]}$) was calculated per equation F.57.

$$1. \quad E_U^{[m]} = E_{B\Delta}^{[m]} \left[\frac{1.64}{E_{B\Delta}^{[m]} + A_{PAA}C_P^{[m]} + A_{PX}C_B^{[m]}} \sqrt{(U_{EM}^{[m]})^2 + (U_P^{[m]})^2 + (U_B^{[m]})^2} - 0.15 \right] \quad [F.57]$$

The following table summarizes the uncertainty parameters calculated:

Parameter	Equation used (VM0009 v3.0)	Value (tCO ₂ e)
$E_U^{[m]}$ Confidence deduction based on uncertainty in emissions models, carbon stock estimates in the project accounting area and carbon stock estimates	F.57	0
$U_{EM}^{[m]}$ Total uncertainty in Baseline Emissions Models	F.14	5,542
$U_P^{[m]}$ Total uncertainty in project accounting area carbon stock estimate	B.10	877,833

Parameter	Equation used (VM0009 v3.0)	Value (tCO ₂ e)
$U_B^{[m]}$ Total uncertainty in proxy area carbon stock estimate	B.10	60,520

VCUs were estimated using equation F.55, in which emissions allocated to the buffer account are calculated using a non-permanence risk rating of 10% (see Section 4.6 of this report).

$$E_{\Delta NER}^{[m]} = E_{\Delta GER}^{[m]} - E_{BA}^{[m]} \quad [F.55]$$

The following table summarized the GHG emissions of the project calculated for the current monitoring period.

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Buffer pool allocation	VCUs eligible for issuance
2021	221,813	0	0	221,813	-22,181	199,631

The net anthropogenic GHG reductions due to the project activity for the monitoring period (01-January-2021 to 31-December-2021) were 221,813 tCO₂e. The total number of buffer credits that need to be deposited into the AFOLU pooled buffer account are 22,181 and the VCUs eligible for issuance are 199,631VCUs.

AENOR reproduced the calculations to achieve the same results and deems they are depicted clearly and correctly in the provided sheets. AENOR verification team was able to trace calculations directly from the data sources of inventory's field measurements. Formulae used are in compliance with MR, validated PD and methodology, like the default values used to determine the parameters, are appropriate. Thus, the net amount of VCUs to be issued is accurate and realistic.

AENOR verified for the parameters available at validation, the values reported or the references to the documents where they are used or explained by reviewing, reproducing, and crosschecking the evidence provided by the PP. AENOR checked the values of these parameters to be appropriate and correctly used in equations.

Regarding the accuracy of spreadsheet /8/, formulae, conversions and aggregations and consistent use of data and parameters, the PP elaborated a complete procedure to assure the accuracy and appropriateness of data. During the verification process, AENOR not only verified the spreadsheet calculation, data and parameters but also the AENOR team could verify that the PP conducted a rigorous QC/QA procedure of its field measurements and an assessment of uncertainty. Thus, AENOR deems the PP performed good practices in this assessment and concludes that GHG reductions were quantified correctly in accordance with the project description and applied methodology.

AENOR verified the consistency and accuracy of each parameter detailed in it Section 4 of the MR by crosschecking the information in the MR with the information in PD as well as checking values and reproducing the calculations in the spreadsheet calculation package and did not find inconsistencies. Therefore, AENOR deems that values reported for the parameters are accurate and consistent.

The following tables summarize the data and parameters used by the PP to calculate the GHG emission reductions, their verified values and the assessment procedures implemented by AENOR and their results .

Data/Parameter available at validation	Value	Assessment procedure and result
α Combined effects of β and θ at the start of the historic reference period	1,484	Value is consistent with validated PD. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
β Effect of time on the cumulative proportion of conversion over time	0.000371	Value is consistent with validated PD. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
γ Time shift from beginning of historic reference period to project start date	10, 957	Value is consistent with validated PD. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
λ_{soc} Exponential soil carbon decay parameter	0.2	Conservative default based on IPCC value. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
$\hat{\sigma}_{EM}$ Estimated standard deviation of the state observations used to fit the logistic function	0.4978	Value is consistent with validated PD. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
$\mathcal{B}$ The set of all selected carbon pools in biomass.	2	Value is consistent with validated PD. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
$\mathcal{C}$ The set of all selected carbon pools	3	The project accounts for AGOT, BGOT and SOC. All other pools are optional, were found to be insignificant and have been conservatively excluded. Value is consistent with validated PD.
$\mathcal{J}$ The set of all observations of conversion	28,582	VM0009, v3.0 section 6.6 onwards. The number of observations of forest state in the reference area were originally quantified as 3120 but some points were removed due to complications with forest state interpretation or non-forest at start

Data/Parameter available at validation	Value	Assessment procedure and result
		of historic reference period. Value is consistent with validated PD.
M The set of all monitoring periods	27	There will be 27 monitoring events over the project crediting period of 30 years.
A_{PAA} Area of project accounting area	33,338	Value is consistent with validated PD, previous MR, and GIS data. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
A_{PX} Area of proxy area	42,794	Value is consistent with validated PD, previous MR, and GIS data. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
A_{AS} Area of activity-shifting leakage area	27,805	Value is consistent with validated PD, previous MR, and GIS data. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
n_d Number of spatial points in the reference area	2,582	Value is consistent with new version of the PD, previous MR, and GIS data. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
o_i Binary. State observation for the sample point in the reference area	0 or 1	Data collected as per the methodology. Value is consistent with validated PD.
P_{LME} Portion of leakage related to market	0	Value is consistent with validated PD.
q Lag between start of degradation and conversion	620	Value is consistent with validated PD. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
r_{RS} Expansion factor for above-ground biomass to below-ground biomass (root/shoot ratio)	0.54	Value is consistent with validated PD and original source (Chidumayo, E. N. 2013). Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
r_U Onset proportion of conversion immediately adjacent to project area	0.126	Value is consistent with validated PD. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
t Time since project start date	4,475	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.

Data/Parameter available at validation	Value	Assessment procedure and result
t_i The point in time of the observation made at point	1-12,698	Value is consistent with validated PD. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
t_{PL} Length of project crediting period	10,957	Value is consistent with validated PD. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
w_i Weight applied to the i th sample point in the reference area	0.000034965	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Values correctly estimated.

Data/Parameter monitored	Value	Assessment procedure and result
$A_{P1}^{[m=0]}$ Area of project accounting area stratum 1 prior to first verification event	27,322	Value is consistent with validated PD and GIS data. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
$A_{P2}^{[m=0]}$ Area of project accounting area stratum 2 prior to first verification event	6.016	Value is consistent with validated PD and GIS data. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
$c_B^{[m]}$ Baseline carbon stocks at the end of the current monitoring period	9,7	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$c_{B\ BGB}^{[m]}$ Carbon not decayed in BGB at the end of the current monitoring period	- 10	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$c_{B\ SOC}^{[m]}$ Carbon not decayed in SOC at the end of the current monitoring period	-386,973	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$c_{B\ b}^{[m]}$ Baseline scenario average carbon stock in selected carbon pools	9,7	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$c_{B\ BM}^{[m]}$	9,7	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.

Data/Parameter monitored	Value	Assessment procedure and result
Baseline carbon stocks in biomass at the end of the current monitoring period		
$c_{B\ SOC}^{[m]}$ Baseline soil carbon stocks at the end of the current monitoring period	131,7	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$c_P^{[m]}$ Project carbon stocks at the end of the current monitoring period	179.5 Dense Tree Stratum, 168.4 Light Tree Stratum	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Values correctly estimated.
$c_P^{[m-1]}$ Project carbon stocks at the beginning of the current monitoring period	179.5 Dense Tree Stratum, 168.4 Light Tree Stratum	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Values correctly estimated.
$c_P^{[m=0]}$ Project carbon stocks prior to first verification event	233.8 Dense Tree Stratum, 225.0 Light Tree Stratum	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$c_{P\ 1\ BM}^{[m=0]}$ Project carbon stocks in stratum 1 prior to first verification event	225	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$c_{P\ 2\ BM}^{[m=0]}$ Project carbon stocks in stratum 2 prior to first verification event	233,8	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$c_{P\ BM}^{[m=0]}$ Project carbon stocks in biomass prior to first verification event	7,554,258	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$c_{P\ b}^{[m]}$ Average carbon in biomass in the project accounting area	168.4 in Stratum 1 and 170.4 in Stratum 2	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$c_{P\ SOC}^{[m=0]}$ Project soil carbon stocks prior to first verification event	192.6	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{\Delta GER}^{[m]}$ GERs for the current monitoring period	221,813	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.

Data/Parameter monitored	Value	Assessment procedure and result
$E_{\Delta GER}^{[i]}$ GERs for monitoring period i	1,953,003	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{\Delta NER}^{[i]}$ NERs for monitoring period i	1,714,662	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_B^{[m]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions at the end of the current monitoring period	1,934,812	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_B^{[m-1]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions at the beginning of the current monitoring period	1,731,190	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{B \Delta}^{[m]}$ Change in baseline emissions	221,813	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{B \Delta BGB}^{[i]}$ Change in baseline emissions from below-ground biomass during monitoring period i	1,610,191	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{B \Delta SOC}^{[m]}$ Baseline change in emissions from soil carbon	71,488	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{B \Delta SOC}^{[i]}$ Baseline emissions from soil carbon in monitoring period i	1,730,828	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{B BGB}^{[m]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions from below-ground biomass at the end of the current monitoring period	602,587	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{B BGB}^{[m-1]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions from below-ground biomass at the beginning of the current monitoring period	536,985	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{B BM}^{[m]}$	1,718,495	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.

Data/Parameter monitored	Value	Assessment procedure and result
Cumulative baseline emissions from biomass at the end of the current monitoring period		
$E_{B SOC}^{[m]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions from soil carbon at the end of the current monitoring period	621,481	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{B SOC}^{[m-1]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions from soil carbon at the beginning of the current monitoring period	549,993	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{BA}^{[m]}$ Cumulative emissions allocated to the buffer account at the end of the current monitoring period	-220,146	Consistent with Non-permanence risk report. Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_L^{[m]}$ Cumulative emissions from leakage at the end of the current monitoring period	0	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_L^{[m-1]}$ Cumulative emissions from leakage at the beginning of the current monitoring period	0	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{L \Delta}^{[m]}$ Change in emissions due to leakage	0	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{L ASF}^{[m]}$ Cumulative emissions from activity-shifting leakage in forested strata at the end of the current monitoring period	0	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{P \Delta}^{[m]}$ Change in project emissions	0	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$E_{P \Delta BRN}^{[m]}$ Cumulative project emissions due to burning at the end of the current monitoring period	0	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.

Data/Parameter monitored	Value	Assessment procedure and result
$E_u^{[m]}$ Cumulative confidence deduction at the end of the current monitoring period	0	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$P_{L\ DEG}^{[m]}$ Portion of leakage due to degradation at the end of the current monitoring period	0.073	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$P_{L\ DEG}^{[m=0]}$ Portion of leakage due to degradation prior to first verification event	0.087	Consistent with previous MR. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
$t^{[i-1]}$ time from the project start date to beginning of monitoring period i	0	Consistent with previous MR. Correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets /5-10/.
$t^{[m]}$ Time from project start date to end of current monitoring period	4,475	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$t^{[m-1]}$ Time from project start date to beginning of current monitoring period	4,110	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$U_B^{[m]}$ Total uncertainty in proxy area carbon stock estimate	60,520	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$U_{EM}^{[M]}$ Total uncertainty in Baseline Emissions Models	5,542	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.
$U_P^{[m]}$ Total uncertainty in proxy area carbon stock estimate	877,833	Calculation reproduced /5-10/. Value correctly estimated.

AENOR, through the fully assessment of the calculations and the parameters, as well as the comparison with the methodology and the previous MR, considers that the parameters has been stablished correctly and they are appropriate.

AENOR deems the parameters monitored and available at validation are correct, reliable, and consistent. Information in the monitoring report is in compliance with the PD, the calculations provided and the applicable methodology. Then, the results showed in the monitoring report are reliable, consistent, and accurate.

4.5 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

The data and parameters used to determine GHG emission reductions and removals are listed in Section 4 of the MR.

During AENOR's verification, the evidence provided by the PP was enough in both quantity and quality to support the determination of GHG emission removals reported by the project.

Quality assurance and control is an essential part of company procedures in order to assure the accuracy of inventory data, modeling results, and carbon accounting. Quality assurance procedures are done in order to minimize and correct any potential data transcription, calculation, or formatting errors that may result in inaccurate carbon accounting results.

The majority of field data is collected using digital tools and directly loaded to the database or saved on GDrive where it is checked and then transferred to the database. All data submitted to the central database is subjected to quality control by appropriate staff. The PP has developed SOP and Field manuals which /16//25/ covers all aspects related to carbon inventory. Spot checks and internal audits are conducted to make sure all data collection is carried out following the standards.

In accordance with VCS, the PP is committed to storing all project data in a secure and retrievable manner for at least two years after the end of the project crediting period. In order to facilitate project management and long-term accounting, all primary data outputs supporting annual verification including the spatial database is stored and maintained.

Roles and responsibilities are clearly identified in the MR. QA/QC procedures were developed by the PP for maintaining consistency and quality of field inventories over time. Interviews with the PP and inspection of data and results demonstrated that the PP possess all the competencies required for reporting of GHG emissions removals in an accurate way.

Data presented to the audit team were clear and coherent and processing steps could be traced to the corresponding sections of the methodology and monitoring plan with transparency.

Above procedures to ensure this are described in Section 4.3 of the MR, in terms of general QA/QC of the monitoring plan and specific QA/QC procedures applied to data and parameters monitored.

AENOR deems that the PP performed good practices in this assessment and concludes that GHG reductions were quantified correctly in accordance with the PD and applied methodology, and that the that evidence is sufficient in quantity and appropriate in quality to determine the GHG reductions of the project.

4.6 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

PP has elaborated a VCS Non permanence Risk Report (NPRR) for the verification process according to the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v4.0. As required by the VCS Program, the non-permanence risk rating is reassessed for each verification event.

Below, it is explained the assessment and the issues raised on regard the non-permanence risk rating determined by the PP in the NPRR.

Risk Factor	Risk rating	Assessment	CARs/CLs
INTERNAL RISK (PM+FV+OC+PL) = 9			
Project Management	-4	a)-d) N/A e) Management team includes individuals with significant experience in AFOLU project design and implementation, carbon accounting and reporting under the VCS Program or other approved GHG programs. Risk rating = -2 is justified f) Adaptive management plan in place risk rating = -2 is justified For the experience assessment, BCP has provided on the NPRR document a full description of the roles and responsibilities of the people who make up its team and the location of their offices. For the analysis of the adaptatie management plan, BCP has provided the document Rufunsa Conservancy Management Plan and it has been assesed by AENOR. And considers that the risk calculation has been done correctly.	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested.
Financial Viability	0	a)-g) N/A h) Project cash flow breakeven point is between 7 and up to less than 10 years from the current risk assessment. Project has secured 80% or more of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven. Risk rating = 0 is justified i) Project has available as callable financial resources at least 50% of total cash out before project reaches breakeven Risk rating = -2 is justified	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested.

		For the breakeven point, AENOR has assessed the document <i>Financial Viability Breakeven Analysis</i> as well as the description provided by BCP within the NPRR analysis. And considers that the risk calculation has been done correctly.	
Opportunity Cost	-2	a)-c) N/A d) Baseline activities are subsistence-driven, net positive community impacts are demonstrated risk rating = 0 is justified e)-g) N/A h) Project is protected by legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period risk rating = -2 is justified i) N/A AENOR has assessed deeply the description provided by BCP within the NPRR in the section opportunity cost and considers that the information provided is correct and truthful. Complementary AENOR asked about community impacts during the interviews and reviewed the certify that BCP obtained under CCBA standard. And considers that the risk calculation has been done correctly.	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested.
Project Longevity	15	a)N/A b) The project has a legal agreement to continue the management practice risk rating = 15 is justified AENOR has assessed the document “ Carbon Rights Covenant between BioCarbon Partners and Land Owner” and also asked to different stakeholders about the likelihood of any risks committed the duration of the project. And considers that the risk calculation has been done correctly.	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested.
EXTERNAL RISK (LT+CE+PC) = 0			
Land Tenure and Resource Access/ Impacts	0	a) N/A b)ownership and resource access are held by different entities risk rating = 2 is justified	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested

		c)-e) N/A f) The Rufunsa Conservancy has a free and clear title deed. Project boundaries were demarcated with full consultation with local leaders. Risk rating = -2 is justified g) N/A For the assessment of the ownership, AENOR review the Carbon Rights Covenant between BioCarbon Partners and Land Owner and checked the limits of the project through GIS and the evidence provided. The deep description of the risk analysis within the NPRR is another way to assess this risk. And considers that the risk calculation has been done correctly.	
Community engagement	-5	a)-b) N/A c) Project is seen by the local stakeholders as a generator of positive impacts on the environmental/social/económico aspects of the communities involved in the project. Risk rating = -5 is justified BCP has performed several surveys to the stakeholders to know their opinion about the project. AENOR has assessed the surveys provided as well as the fully description of the risk analysis within the NPRR document. And considers that the risk calculation has been done correctly.	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested
Political Risk	2	a)-b) N/A c) Governance Score: -0.42 Country implementing REDD+ Readiness or other activities, UN REDD Country. The project benefits from solid government support and interest for learning reasons Risk rating = 4 is justified d)-e) N/A f) Country is implementing REDD+ Readiness or other activities, UN REDD Country risk rating = -2 is justified AENOR has assessed the statement that BCP refers in its document and also has reviewed and reproduced the calculation of the governance indicator, obtained from The World Bank Institute Worldwide Governance Indicators. AENOR considers	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested

		that the value obtained is correct according to the sources. And considers that the risk calculation has been done correctly.	
NATURAL (F+Pd+W+G+ON) = 0,25			
Fire	LS*M=0,25	Fire is a natural and anthropogenic phenomenon in all the higher rainfall african savannahs. Project fire risk significance was found insignificant (less than 5% loss of carbon stocks) or transient (full recovery of lost carbon stock within a 10-year period). Likelihood of an event like this occurring is of a fire every 10 to 25 years. Score(LS)= 1 Despite of the fire regime where Rufunsa Conservancy is located, the project area have not recorded within its bouderies, since 1984. Besides in order to mitigate fire risks, BCP have impemented a fire management system in partnership with surrounding communities. AENOR has reviewed the description of the fire risk within the NPRR. The verification team has checked the evidence provided by BCP such as: Trollope, W.S.W., 1993. Fire regime of the Kruger National Park for the period 1980 – 1992. Koedoe, 36, 2: 45-52; Bond, W. J. and S. Archibald. 2003. Confronting complexity: fire policy choices in South African savannah parks. International Journal of Wildland Fire 12:381-389.; Archibald, S., D. P. Roy, B. W. Van Wilgen, and R. J. Scholes. 2009. What limits fire? An examination of drivers of burnt area in Southern Africa. Global Change Biology 15:613-630.; Higgins, S. I., W. J. Bond, E. C. February, A. Bronn, D. I. W. Euston-Brown, B. Enslin, N. Govender, L. Rademan, S. O'Regan, A. L. F. Potgieter, S. Scheiter, R. Sowry, L. Trollope, and W. S. W. Trollope. 2007. Effects of four decades of fire manipulation on woody vegetation structure in savannah. Ecology 88:1119-1125.;	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested

		Trapnell, C. G. 1959. Ecological Results of Woodland and Burning Experiments in Northern Rhodesia. Journal of Ecology 47(1): 129-168. Mapaure, I. 2013a. Short-term responses of shrub layer communities to dry season fires and tree thinning in semi-arid miombo woodlands of north-western Zimbabwe. Afr. J. Plant Sci. 7(9): 414-425 Also AENOR has asked to different stakeholders about the fire risks and if it could difficult the project implementation. And considers that the risk calculation has been done correctly.	
Pest ad Disease Outbreaks	LS*M=0	There were no records of disease or pest outbreaks causing any significant impacts to carbon stocks in Miombo woodlands found. AENOR has asked to different stakeholders about their knowledge of pest and disease, and nobody were aware of any episode of pest and disease in the past. And considers that the risk calculation has been done correctly.	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested.
Extreme Weather	LS*M=0	Significant impact extreme weather phenomenon are rarely likely to occur in Zambia. Nevertheless droughts, as extreme weather event, may be considered. Despite this, there were no records found on droughts causing significant impacts to carbon stocks in Miombo woodlands. AENOR has asked to different stakeholders about their knowledge of extreme weather, and nobody were aware of any episode of extreme weather in the past. And considers that the risk calculation has been done correctly.	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested.
Geological Risk	LS*M=0	Zambia is geologically stable and the risk of geological events with significant impact on carbon stocks occurring is improbable. AENOR has asked to different stakeholders about their knowledge of possible geological risks, and nobody were aware of any geological disturbance within the project area. And considers that the risk calculation has been done correctly.	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested.

Other natural risk. Elephant populations	LS*M=0	The density of elephants in the project area is not enough for the animals to convert. In case number of elephants increases, a plan to manage the population through rotational grazing systems will be implemented AENOR review the bibliography provided by BCP such as: Guldemond, R. and R. Van Aarde 2008. A Meta-Analysis of the Impact of African Elephants on Savanna Vegetation. The Journal of Wildlife Management 72(4): 892-899. Mapaure, I. 2013b. A preliminary simulation model of individual and synergistic impacts of elephants and fire on the structure of semi-arid miombo woodlands in northwestern Zimbabwe. Journal of Environmental Microbiology 1(1): 76-93. And considers that the risk calculation has been done correctly.	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested.
OVERALL RISK RATING (9+0+0.25) = 9.25 . Then, a minimum risk of 10% is considered			

AENOR has checked that information provided in the NPRR for the monitoring period is consistent with supporting documents provided. The assumptions and justifications provided to determine the risk rating of each risk factor are elaborated and they are based on provided documents using conservative assessments. AENOR deems that information provided is reliable and appropriate from reliable sources, thus, the overall risk rating is credible and realistic. Thus, the overall risk rating of 10% is credible and realistic.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

AENOR has verified that The Lower Zambezi REDD+ Project is in compliance with the Verified Carbon Standard version 4.2 without qualifications or limitations. The project has been implemented in accordance with the validated Project Description and its validated deviations. The project complies with the validation and verification criteria for projects set out in VCS Version 4, without any qualification or limitation.

AENOR is able to issue a positive verification opinion for the 221,813 tCO₂e of verified net GHG emissions reductions and removals, as reported in the Monitoring Report version 1.4 dated on 07/04/2022.

The verification assessment covered the monitoring period from 01/01/2021 to 31/12/2021 and verified that calculated emission reductions and/or removals were achieved during the monitoring period with a reasonable level of assurance. The overall non-permanence risk rating was 10%. The net change in carbon stocks has been estimated in 221,813 tCO₂e. Therefore, the total number of credits to be deposited in the buffer account is 22,181 and the total VCUs eligible for issuance are 199,631 VCU.

Verification period: 01/01/2021 to 31/12/2021.

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

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Buffer pool allocation	VCUs eligible for issuance
2021	221,813	0	0	221,813	22,181	199,631
Total	221,813	0	0	221,813	22,181	199,631

Net change in carbon stocks: 221,813 t CO₂e.

Overall non-permanence risk rating: 10%

VCUs buffer to be deposited: 22,181

Total VCU to be issued: 199,631 VCU.


 Juan Carlos Gómez
 Lead Auditor
 16/06/2022

APPENDIX I: LIST OF EVIDENCE PROVIDED

N°	Name
Project documentation	
1	20220407_LZRP_MR9_v1.4V4
Management Plan	
2	20170505_LZRP_EnvironManPlan_Final_signed.pdf
Community engagement	
3	Meeting summary reports (72 files)
4	2021_Chinyunyu_Engagement Tracker_Bk.xlsx
Carbon inventory and NERs Calculation	
5	20201120_MRV_LZRP_M4-M8_5years_update_ForestInv.xlsx"
6	20201125_Master_carbon_stocks_calculations.xlsx"
7	20201125_Master_carbon_stocks_calculations_v2.xlsx"
8	20210827_LZRPLeakageV2_Leakage_M9.xlsx"
9	20211020_LZRP_ER_Calc_M9_v2.xlsm"
10	BCP_LZRP_CarbonData_MonitoringPeriod1_27Nov_2013_Resp1.xlsx"
11	Chidumayo_2013_allometry_paper.pdf"
12	Chidumayo_Estimating AG and BG biomass after clearing miombo_EnviroLet_2013.pdf"
13	Mugasha_Miombo_Allometry.pdf"
14	20200219_LZRP_CDM_image_interpretation.xlsx"
15	Baseline_reevaluation_alpha_and_beta_updates.docx"
16	Baseline_reevaluation_CDM_Point_Interpretation_SOP.docx"
17	LCFP_Annex_cdm_v2.0.R"
18	logistic model summary_after_recode.txt"
19	LZRP_2020_R-Model_Input_CDM_Points.csv"
20	Phased_logistic.curve_after_recode.png"
21	proportion.deforestation_after_recode.txt"
22	20211020_LZRP_ER_Calc_M9.xlsm"
23	20200219_LZRP_CDM_image_interpretation.xlsx"

N°	Name
Biomass protocol	
24	20201125_Master_carbon_stocks_calculations_v2.xlsx"
25	BCP_Biomass_Sampling_SOP_June_2019_V3.pdf"
26	BCP_Biomass_SpotError_Protocol_Jan_2014.pdf"
27	LZRP_biomass_plots.shp"
Leakage protocol	
28	LZRP_Annex_M_BCP_Biomass_Sampling_LeakageMon_8June_2013.pdf"
29	LZRP_Annex_M_BCP_Biomass_Sampling_LeakageMon_8June_Addendum2013.pdf"
Non Permanence Risk Report	
31	20211510_LZRP_Non_Perm_MR9_AT.xls"
32	20220407_LZRP_VCS Non-Permanence Risk_MR9_v1.2.docx"
33	20212911_LZRP_VCS Non-Permanence Risk_MR9_AT.docx"
34	wgidataset.xlsx"
35	Zambia_World_Bank_Governance_Score_2020.xlsx"
Spatial Data	
36	LZRP_VCS_EcoCharcoal_Sites_2015.shp"
37	LZRP_VCS_Encroachment_Area.shp"
38	LZRP_VCS_Encroachment_Clearings_2015.shp"
39	LZRP_VCS_Forest_Non-Forest_1989.shp"
40	LZRP_VCS_Forest_Non-Forest_2009.shp"
41	LZRP_VCS_Land_Cover.shp"
42	LZRP_VCS_Landsat_Burned_Area_2015.shp"
43	LZRP_VCS_Landsat_Cloud_Cover_2015.shp"
44	LZRP_VCS_Leakage_Area.shp"
45	LZRP_VCS_Leakage_Monitoring_Tracks_2015.shp"
46	LZRP_VCS_MODIS_Burned_Area_2014.shp"
47	LZRP_VCS_Monitoring_Plots.shp"
48	LZRP_VCS_Proxy_Area.shp"
49	LZRP_VCS_Reference_Area.shp"

N°	Name
50	LZRP_VCS_Rivers.shp"
51	LZRP_VCS_Threatened_Perimeter.shp"
52	LZRP_VCS_Villages.shp"
53	VCS_LZRP_Project_Area.kml"
54	LZRP_Annex_T-Raster"
Implementation status	
55	Chilimba school testimony.pdf"
56	breeding_hub4.jpg"
57	breeding_hub3.jpg"
58	breeding_hub2.jpg"
59	breeding_hub1.jpg"
60	Ndubulula improved village chicken project.mp4"
61	Mweshangombe horticulture project\Mweshangombe_horticulture.mp4"
62	Chilimba_classroom_block.mp4"
63	20201203_Teacher policy_Mweshang_ombe and Chilimba_BC.pdf"
64	CommunityImprovedVillageChickenProjectConstruction2.jpg"
65	CommunityImprovedVillageChickenProjectConstruction1.JPG"
66	CASH DIVIDEND PILOT PROJECT- PRE-IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY REPORT-July 2020_V3_20201125.pdf"
67	Sandwe lead farmers bicycles hand over.jpeg"
68	Community improved village chicken Project guide..pdf"
69	BCP CDP PILOT IMPLEMENTATION MANUAL 4.pdf"
70	Pilot Cash dividend project consultant-SOW.pdf"
71	20200404_Mills Foundation cash dividend proposal.pdf"
Project support documents	
72	Authorization Letter_Chief Mpanshya_REDD feasibility__20120215.pdf"
73	Chief Bunda Bunda Letter Feasibility.jpg"
74	Chiefs_REDD_Permission.pdf"
75	Chongwe District Letter.pdf"

N°	Name
76	FD Letter.pdf"
77	Greenchoice_purchase agreement_Letter.pdf"
78	LZRP_Annex_E-Camp Zambia Lol.jpg"
79	LZRP_Annex_E-CFU Lol.pdf"
80	LZRP_Annex_E-DC_Rufunsa_Support Letter.PDF"
81	LZRP_Annex_E-FINAL_Lol_Comaco_BCP_2013.04.09.pdf"
82	LZRP_Annex_E-Rift Valley Lol.pdf"
83	LZRP_Annex_E-SunneyMoney Letter of Intent.pdf"
84	Partnership Letter- Chief Bunda Bunda-09102012.pdf"
85	Provincial_forestry department letter.pdf"
86	ZDA Investment Certificate.pdf"
87	ZDA_Investment Certificate Letter.pdf"
Title deed	
88	LZRP_Annex_A-CRC_Addendum.PDF"
89	LZRP_Annex_A-Preliminary Registration.pdf"
90	LZRP_Annex_A-Rufunsa_CERTIFICATE OF TITLE.pdf"
91	Preliminary Registration.pdf"
Socio economic surveys	
113	IM_P005_MINT_Social Monitoring Survey Report.pdf"
114	LZRP_Annex_G-BASELINE REPORT_FINAL_2use.pdf"
Audit evidence request	
115	Biomass_Plot_Run210_Sampling_Video_Pictures (14 files)
116	Community Improved Village Chicken Project (5 files)
117	Crop Diversification (5 files)
118	Distribution of inputs for farmer field school demonstration (1 file)
119	Drilling of 8 boreholes (15 files)
120	Education sector support (6 files)
121	Monitoring activities (1 file)
122	Support to FD (4 files)

N°	Name
123	Sustainable Eco-Charcoal Production (16 files)
124	Sustainable honey production (175 files)
125	Training of Lead farmers in conservation farming (4 files)
126	SMART_LZRP Jan_Dec Report .pdf"
New entities	
127	New Entities Involved in the LZRP Project during year 2021.docx"

APPENDIX II: FINDINGS

Corrective Action Request (CARs)

CAR ID:	01	Date: 01/02/2022
Description of CAR		
According to the new updates from VERRA (20 January 2022), the template of the Monitoring Report should be updated to the <u>version 4.1</u>		
Country participant response		Date: 01/03/2022
<i>We have moved the MR to the new template version 4.1. See the updated Monitoring Report</i>		
Documentation provided by the Country Participant		
LZRP_MR9_v1.3		
VVB Assessment		Date: 10/03/2022
The version of the MR has been updated. Therefore, CAR 01 is closed.		

CAR ID:	02	Date: 01/03/2022
Description of CAR		
In section 1.1 it is stated that the current monitoring period is from 01/01/2020 to 31/12/2020. However, these dates are not correct.		
Country participant response		Date: 01/03/2022
<i>We have amended the dates of the monitoring period in section 1.1 to represent the actual M9 dates . See section 1.1 of the updated MR version 4.1</i>		
Documentation provided by the Country Participant		
LZRP_MR9_v1.3		
VVB Assessment		Date: 10/03/2022

The dates have been updated.

CAR 02 is closed

CAR ID:	03	Date: 01/02/2022
Description of CAR		
According to the template, in section 2.2: "For AFOLU projects, demonstrate how the project has communicated the following: 1. The results of project implementation 2. Risks, costs, and benefits the projects brings to local stakeholders		
Country participant response		Date: 01/03/2022
<i>Most of these communications are done through community meetings. Please find all meeting details in the LZRP engagement Tracker that has all the meeting details that took place in 2021 with Gdrive Links to the Meeting Minutes. The tracker is in the LZRP_M9_Appendix3_ComEng folder</i>		
Documentation provided by the Country Participant		
2021_Chinyunyu_Engagement Tracker_Bk		
VVB Assessment		Date: 10/03/2022
The evidence provided is deemed corrected. However, the results of project implementation and the risks, costs and benefits are not explained within the requested section.		
Country participant response	Date: 17/03/2022	
We have added the following text to section 2.2 of the updated MR9: <i>In 2021(M9), the project conducted over 70 community meetings where project Implementation and project benefits (e.g. borehole drilling, distribution of beehives and construction of the poultry house) were discussed with local stakeholders. These meetings enable communities/local stakeholders to be informed of project benefits over this monitoring period. There have been no relevant changes to the risks and costs to the communities associated with the project implementation in this monitoring period to communicate. See table 1 below for details of these community meetings and the community engagement tracker in Appendix B that has Gdrive links to the meeting minutes.</i> We note that in the template it is required to communicate only relevant changes in the benefits, risks and costs associated with the project to the local stakeholders.		
VVB Assessment	Date: 24/03/2022	

The section has been updated and deemed correct.

Therefore CAR 03 is closed

CAR ID:	04	Date: 01/02/2022
Description of CAR		
The following errors have been found within section 4.1 “Data and parameters available at validation” 1. Area of proxy area is reported as 42.794 ha both in the PDD and the current MR, while in the spreadsheet it has a different value (45.658,57ha) 2. Area of activity-shifting leakage area has different value between the PDD and the spreadsheet of the current MR 3. In the parameter <i>nd</i> “number of spatial points” it is stated that “the points were 2600 in 2013, but 18 were eliminated” and the value reported is 2588. However, 2600-18 is not 2588 4. The parameter “t” is 3744, but this parameter and the justification are not right.		
Country participant response		Date: 01/03/2022
1. <i>The area of 42.794 ha is correctly reported. The value in the NER spreadsheet has been changed to reflect this, and version 2 is attached, however this does not affect the NER calculations. The value is correctly recorded in the Carbon stocks spreadsheet (LZRP_M9_AppendixC_CarbonInv > 20201125_Master_stocks_calculations.xlsx), where it feeds into the uncertainty calculations.</i> 2. <i>The area of the activity-shifting leakage area described in the PDD, 27.805,55 ha, describes the forested area with a slope of less than 20 degrees. The figure in the NER spreadsheet, 40.833,22 ha, reflects the total area of the leakage zone, including grassland and higher slopes. The value does not affect the NER calculations, however it has been changed to match the PDD value, in the attached version 2 of the spreadsheet.</i> 3. <i>The parameter should be 2582. It has been changed in the updated MR.</i> 4. <i>The correct value for the parameter ‘t’ is 4475. This and the justification have been changed in the updated MR.</i>		
Documentation provided by the Country Participant		
20211020_LZRP_ER_Calc_M9_v2.xlsm		
VVB Assessment		Date: 10/03/2022

1. The parameter has been modified and it is deemed correct. 2. Please, explain what document is referred as version 2 of the spreadsheet. The different versions of the files should be shared in different folders of the drive, to make easier the checking between versions. Try to organize the drive documents according to the round of finding and the type of annex. 3. The modification is deemed correct. 4. The modification is deemed correct.	
Country participant response	Date: 14/03/2022
The document referred to as version 2 is the “20211020_LZRP_ER_Calc_M9_v2.xlsm” which was mistakenly not shared. We have however uploaded the file in the Audit_Findings_Round_2 folder(CAR#4 folder)	
VVB Assessment	Date: 24/03/2022
The section has been updated and clarified. Therefore CAR 04 is closed	

CAR ID:	05	Date: 01/02/2022
Description of CAR		
The following errors have been found according to section 4.2 “Data and parameters monitored”: 1. The parameter $C_{B\ SOC}^{[m]}$ Carbon not decayed in SOC at the end of the current monitoring period, has the value -350.223 tCO2e. however, this value does not correspond to the end of the current MP but the beginning. 2. The parameter $C_P^{[m]}$ Project carbon stocks at the end of the <u>current</u> monitoring period, states that the values were updated in the current MR after completion of the 5 years carbon stocks inventory cycle. However, the current MR is the 9th 3. The values of the following parameters should be updated or modified because they are not correct: a. $E_{\Delta GER}^{[m]}$ b. $E_{\Delta GER}^{[i]}$ c. $E_{\Delta NER}^{[i]}$ d. $E_B^{[m]}$ e. $E_B^{[m-1]}$ f. $E_{B\Delta}^{[m]}$ g. $E_{B\Delta SOC}^{[m]}$ h. $E_{BBGB}^{[m]}$ i. $E_{BBGB}^{[m-1]}$ j. $E_{BBM}^{[m]}$ k. $E_{BSOC}^{[m]}$ l. $E_{BSOC}^{[m-1]}$ m. $E_{BA}^{[m]}$ n. $P_{L\ DEG}^{[m]}$ o. $t^{[m]}$ p. $t^{[m-1]}$		
Country participant response		Date: 01/03/2022

1. This figure has been adjusted accordingly to -386,973 which is the correct value.
2. The comments here have been deleted as it refers to a previous monitoring period.
3. a) The value is changed to 221,813
- b) This value is changed to 1,953,003
- c) This value is changed to 1,714,662
- d) The new value is 1,934,812
- e) The new value is 1,731,190
- f) This value remains unchanged as 221,813 (change in baseline emissions) – see NER sheet
- g) This value is changed to 71,488.
- h) This value is changed to 602,587
- i) This value is changed to 536,985
- j) This value is changed to 1,714,662
- k) This value is changed to 621,481
- l) This value is changed to 549,993
- m) This value is changed to -220,146
- n) This value is changed to 4,475
- p) This value is changed to 4,110

Documentation provided by the Country Participant

20220310_LZRP_MR9_v1.1
20211020_LZRP_ER_Calc_M9_v2.xlsm

VVB Assessment

Date: 10/03/2022

1. the value has modified, and it is deemed corrected.
2. the section has been modified and it is deemed corrected.
3.
 - a. the value has been modified and it is deemed correct
 - b. the value does not match between the answer to the finding and the value reported in the MR.
 - c. the value has been modified and it is deemed correct
 - d. values between finding's answer and MR do not match.
 - e. the value has been modified and it is deemed correct
 - f. the value has been modified and it is deemed correct
 - g. the value has been modified and it is deemed correct
 - h. the value has been modified and it is deemed correct
 - i. the value has been modified and it is deemed correct
 - j. the value is not correct
 - k. the value has been modified and it is deemed correct
 - l. the value has been modified and it is deemed correct
 - m. the value has been modified and it is deemed correct
 - n. the value is not correct
 - o. The value has been modified and it is deemed correct. Actually is "n" in the response. Respond to the correct letter
 - p. the value has been modified and it is deemed correct

Country participant response

Date: 14/03/2022

- 3(b) – We have updated the Monitoring Report with the correct value.
- 3(d)- We have updated the Monitoring Report with the correct value.
- 3(J) – We have updated the Monitoring Report with the correct value.
- 3(n)– The Correct value is 0.073 and the Monitoring report has been modified accordingly.
- 3(o) - The correct value is 4,475 (This was misplaced on (n))

VVB Assessment

Date: 24/03/2022

3b. the value $E_{\Delta GER}^{[i]}$ is referred to GERS for monitoring period. The value 1,953 does represent cumulative baseline emissions according to the spreadsheet. 3d. the value $E_B^{[m]}$ (cumulative baseline emissions) does not match with the reported on the spreadsheet at the end of the current monitoring period 3j. the value $E_{BBM}^{[m]}$ has been updated and deemed corrected 3n. the value $P_{L DEG}^{[m]}$ has been updated and deemed corrected 3o. ok, clear.	
Country participant response	Date: 28/03/2022
Response(3b) – Please recheck the MR9_v1.3 because the $E_{\Delta GER}^{[i]}$ value of 1,934,812 in MR9_v1.1 was updated to 1,953,003 and not 1953 in MR 1.2 . The value 1,953,003 is what is in the 20211020_LZRP_ER_Calc_M9_v2 spreadsheet (Numeric Output tab, Cell J3) Response(3d) – Please recheck the MR9_v1.3 because the value for $E_B^{[m]}$ is 1,934,812 which is exactly what is in the 20211020_LZRP_ER_Calc_M9_v2 spreadsheet(Numeric Output tab, Cell J5)	
VVB Assessment	Date: 29/03/2022
Clarifications provided are deemed correct. Therefore, CAR 05 is closed	

CAR ID:	06	Date: 01/02/2022
Description of CAR		
The following incongruences have been found according to the section 4.3: In the section MR.91 it is stated that a total of 186 circular plots are located in Rufunsa. According to the GIS supporting documentation, there are 184 plots in this location. Also, it is stated that there are 160 plots in the light tree stratum but compared with the supporting documentation, the value of plots is 158.		
Country participant response		Date: 01/03/2022

Two of the plots in the light tree stratum could not be re-measured due to transcription errors in the initial inventory, explaining why the number of light tree stratum plots in the supporting documentation is 158, and the total number of plots is 184.		
Documentation provided by the Country Participant		
VVB Assessment		Date: 11/03/2022
The explanation is deemed clear. However, this information is not reflected in the text.		
Country participant response		Date: 14/03/2022
The text in the last paragraph of section MR.91 has the following explanation “Two of the 160 plots in the light tree stratum could not be located due to a GPS waypoint transcription error during the first inventory and they were thus not re-sampled and excluded from calculations” We have however included additional information in the last paragraph under MR.91		
VVB Assessment		Date: 24/03/2022
The explanation is deemed correct. Therefore, CAR 06 is closed		
CAR ID:	07	Date: 01/02/2022
Description of CAR		
The following incongruences have been found according to the section 5, quantification of GHG emission reductions and removals: 1. Within the section MR 15-17 it is stated that the light tree carbon stratum has a carbon stock of 166.7 tCO₂e and the dense tree stratum has a stock of 169.1 tCO₂e. These values do not match with the supporting documents. 2. In the table 10 it is reported that the VCU's eligible for issuance are 199.632, but this value does not match with the reported on the spreadsheet calculation document. 3. Section MR 83 states that the ex-ante estimated NERs for this MP were 189.663 tCO₂e, but this value is wrong.		
Country participant response		Date: 01/03/2022

1. This was an error and the correct values are now inserted. These value were updated after completion of the 5-years carbon stocks inventory cycle. The light density stratum is estimated at 168.4 tCO₂e, while the dense stratum is estimated at 179.5 tCO₂e. 2. The difference in values is likely due to a rounding misalignment, and the original value in the MR (199,632) given in Table 10 has been amended to reflect that within the NER sheet (199,631). 3. This section was amended to reflect the ex-ante estimated NERs value for this MP to be 199,631 tCO₂e, and does not differ from that of the ex-post value. Section MR.84 has been amended to provide a description as follows: There was no difference between the ex-ante and ex-post NERs for this monitoring period due to zero project emissions and zero leakage recorded during this monitoring period.	
Documentation provided by the Country Participant	
20220310_LZRP_MR9_v1.1	
VVB Assessment	Date: 11/03/2022
1. please, provide the origin of both values 168,4 tCO₂e and 179,5 tCO₂e 2. the value has been modified and it is deemed correct 3. the section <u>has not</u> been modified as mentioned in the answer.	
Country participant response	Date: 20/03/2022
1. The calculation(source) of both 168.4 tCO₂e and 179.5 tCO₂e are in the forest Inventory data titled "20201120_MR_V_LZRP_M4-M8_5years_update_ForestInv" already provided in the LZRP_M9_AppendixC_CarbonInv folder. We have however provided the same document in the Audit_Findings_Round_2 folder (CAR#07 folder). 3.The MR (MR.83) has been amended with the correct value.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 24/03/2022
1.the source provided and the data required are deemed correct. 2.the section has been modified and deemed correct. Therefore CAR 07 is closed	

Clarifications (CLs)

CL ID	01	Date: 01/02/2022
Description of CL		
The following explanations are required: 1. Please, explain the meaning of the <u>PL</u> from the project ID PL 1202 2. Please, explain the meaning of <u>2 lima portion</u> of land of section 3.1 3. Please, explain if the spreadsheet Master Carbon 20201125 is the most updated version of this spreadsheet		
Country participant response		Date: 01/03/2022
1. <i>PL Means Project Locator, but we have removed it from the monitoring report as it is not required.</i> 2. <i>One(Lima) is equal to ¼ Ha there for 2 Lima means ½ ha</i> 3. <i>The most updated carbon stocks calculations sheet is 20201125_Master_carbon_stocks_calculations_v2.xlsx located in Appendix D.</i>		
Documentation provided by the Country Participant		
20201125_Master_carbon_stocks_calculations_v2.xlsx		
VVB assessment		Date: 11/03/2022
1. Ok, clear 2. Ok, clear 3. In the current appendix D of google drive folder, this calculation sheet is not found. 4. Please, explain the letter “a” previous to section 1.4 other entities involved		
Country participant response		Date: 20/03/2022
3. This was an oversight. The dataset has been uploaded in the designated folder. We have also provided the dataset in the in the Audit_Findings_Round_2 folder (CL#1 folder) 4. “a” was a typo which has been corrected.		
VVB assessment		Date: 25/03/2022
CL 01 is closed		
CL ID	02	Date: 01/02/2022
Description of CL		

Please, provide evidence for the following topics:

1. The 1536 people that attended village meetings from January to October 2021.
2. 100 community scouts of which 35 are patrolling within LZRP area
3. The evidence provided of the horticulture lead farmers does not match with the stated in the MR (8 lead farmers)
4. 996 beehives delivered for assembly to the Ndubulula zone.
5. The eco-charcoal production during 2021 reported in table 5

Country participant response

Date: 01/03/2022

1. We have Uploaded the LZRP engagement Tracker that has all the meeting details that took place in 2021 with Gdrive Links to the Meeting minutes. The tracker is in the LZRP_M9_Appendix3_ComEng folder
2. BCP Conservation effort including Patrols data is managed using Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool (SMART) and to show that the 35 scouts patrol within LZRP, we have shared an LZRP SMART report for 2021, that shows the names of the 34 scouts, their teams, patrol hours, distances covered and a map showing their patrol coverage in LZRP.(The report is in the Monitoring Activities folder in the LZRP_M9_Evidencerequests folder). Please note that the 1 scout out of the 35 reported in the MR is working in the LZRP Operations room doing debriefs and assisting with patrol data management for SMART, therefore not appearing in the report for the patrols.
3. The horticulture training report shows that 23 farmers were trained and not 8 as reported in the MR because this was a combined training for all lead farmers in Rufunsa that includes lead farmers from LCFP (Mpanshya and Shikabeta), Therefore the 15 out of the 23 in the Report provided are under LCFP and not LZRP.
4. We have Uploaded a beehive delivery note for the 996 beehives. The delivery note is in the Sustainable honey production folder in the LZRP_M9_AuditEvidenceRequests folder. We have further shared Ndubulula farmer contracts that are signed upon hanging of the beehives. They have been uploaded in the Ndubulula_Beekeepers_Contracts in the Sustainable honey production folder.
5. We have uploaded the GRN-Goods Received Notes(Source documents) from the Charpeneurs as evidence of production numbers in Table 5.(The GRN are in the Sustainable Eco-Charcoal Production Folder in the LZRP_M9_AuditEvidenceRequest folder). Please note that the GRNs only has number of big bags produced and not the kgs/tons produced. The kgs/tons produced are conversions based on weight of individual bags.

Documentation provided by the Country Participant

2021_Chinyunyu_Engagement Tracker_Bk - SMART_LZRP Jan_Dec Report 996_Beehives_Delivery_Note - Goods Received Notes_EcoChacoal_2021	
VVB assessment	Date: 11/03/2022
- Waiting for the server entrance acceptance. (https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IWdkiQQwVKy6-nGK-AD_ovoRsNW-oKo2/view?usp=sharing) - The name of the 34 scouts patrol is not provided in the evidence - Ok, it is clear - The evidence provided is deemed correct - Please, explain the process to calculate the amount of tons from the number of big bags - Please, provide the KML. File of the project as Verra requirements	
Country participant response	Date: 14/03/2022
1. We have provided you access to the meeting minutes' Gdrive folder. We have also uploaded all the meeting minutes in the Audit_Findings_Round_2 folder (CL#2 folder). 2. We have provided a SMART report (<i>SMART_LZRP Jan Dec Report.pdf</i>) that has names of the 34 scouts (pages 5 and 6) and their individual conservation efforts in LZRP included. The report is in the Audit_Findings_Round_2 folder (CL#2 folder). 5. Each individual big bag is weighted using a scale in Kgs. The total weight of all the big bags in Kgs is then converted to Tons by dividing the figure by 1000. The Eco charcoal team is however working on establishing an average weight /big bag so there is some consistency moving forward. 6. We have provided a KML file ("<i>VCS_LZRP_Project_Area.kml</i>") for the LZRP Project Area. The KML file is in the Audit_Findings_Round_2 folder (CL#2 folder).	
VVB assessment	Date: 25/03/2022
- Ok, clear and assessed. - Ok, clear - Ok, clear - ok, provided Therefore, CL 02 is closed	

CL ID	03	Date: 01/02/2022
Description of CL		
The following explanations according to the section 4.2 Data and parameters monitored are required: 1. It is stated that the area of project account area stratum prior to first verification event $A_{P1}^{[m=0]}$ is 27.322 ha. Please provide the source of the data precedence. 2. Provide explanation of the precedence of the following values: $C_P^{[m=0]}$; $C_{P1BM}^{[m=0]}$; $C_{P2BM}^{[m=0]}$; $C_{PBM}^{[m=0]}$ 3. Explain why the value $t^{[i-1]}$ "time from the project start date to beginning of monitoring period i, is in blank		
Country participant response		Date: 01/03/2022
1. Land cover in the project area was assessed via a supervised classification of 2009 Landsat TM image as described in the MR on pg 70. Unfortunately we do not have any further information on the precedence of this classification. 2. These parameters refer to the total carbon stock value of the project accounting area, the strata within it, and from biomass, prior to the first verification event. The figures represent the values measured in the first forest inventory in 2013. Attached is the sheet 'BCP_LZRP_CarbonData_MonitoringPeriod1_27Nov_2013_Resp1.xlsx' that shows these values in cells B10, C10 and B39 in the summary stats tab. 3. This parameter is only required in the case of a grouped project, as it represents the time from the project start date to the beginning of the monitoring period for a new instance.		
Documentation provided by the Country Participant		
BCP_LZRP_CarbonData_MonitoringPeriod1_27Nov_2013_Resp1.xlsx		
VVB assessment		Date: 11/03/2022
1. Ok, clear 2. Ok, clear 3. Ok, clear CL 03 is closed		

CL ID	04	Date: 01/02/2022
Description of CL		

Please, provide further explanations in the MR about the following topics of section 3.1:

1. The process of completing the poultry house in 2021, due to within the MR it is stated that the poultry house was completed in 2021 and during the interviews, the beneficiaries said that it is still under construction.
2. The tree planting activities carried on in 2021 due to no activities are being reported during 2021.
3. The monitoring of leakage that is undertaken annually: Explain deeper about how this monitoring is carried on and how is developed the data collection within the Community-Based Forest Biomass and Carbon Stock Monitoring .
4. The social monitoring program of 2021 in case some activities have been developed for this period (2021)
5. The community covenants of 2021 in case some activities have been developed for this period (2021)
6. The monitoring of biodiversity in 2021: explain the monitoring of different species carried on during the period 2021.

Country participant response

Date: 02/03/2022

1. *The monitoring report indicates that the construction of the poultry house was completed in 2021 because the actual construction was completed and a construction completion certificate was given. The beneficiary referred to the project not being completed because of the solar system and incubator that has not been installed yet- This additional information has also been included in the updated version of the monitoring report (see page 42). We have also uploaded a Construction Completion report from District Works Supervisor to the Community Improved Village Chicken Project folder in the LZRP_M9_AuditEvidenceRequest folder.*
2. *The Lead farmers are always encouraged to promote the tree planting activities in their training with their follower farmers.*
3. *For a comprehensive procedure on how leakage monitoring is conducted. Please look at the Leakage monitoring SOP in the LZRP_M9_AppendixF_LeakageProt Gdrive folder in the 2022_M9 Folder.*
4. *See page 61 of the Updated MR for details*
5. *See page 62 of the updated MR for details*
6. *See page 53-54 of the updated MR for details*

Documentation provided by the Country Participant

1. 1X2 CRB-Poultry House- Completion Certificate
2. LZRP_Annex_M_BCP_Biomass_Sampling_LeakageMon_8June_2013
3. 20220310_LZRP_MR9_v1.1

VVB assessment

Date: 11/03/2022

1. The explanation is deemed correct
2. The explanation is considered clear
3. The evidence and the explanation provided is deemed correct
4. The section has been modified and it is deemed correct
5. The section has been modified and it is deemed correct
6. The section has been modified and it is deemed correct

Therefore CL 04 is closed