VERIFICATION REPORT FOR THE PROJECT

BAJO CALIMA Y BAHÍA MÁLAGA (BCBM) REDD+ PROJECT

AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U

Document Prepared By AENOR
Contact Information
6 Génova. 28004 Madrid – Spain
www.aenor.com

Project Title	Bajo Calima y Bahía Málaga (BCBM) REDD+ Project
Version	3
Report ID	Verification report 20190404

Report Title	Verification report 20190405 for the project: Bajo Calima y Bahía Málaga (BCBM) REDD+ Project
Client	Chemonic International Inc
Pages	77
Date of Issue	4 April 2019
Prepared By	AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U.
Contact	Génova 6. 28004 Madrid- Spain. Telephone +34 914326000 jlfuentes@aenor.com , www.aenor.com
Approved By	Jose Luis Fuentes
Work Carried	Sergio Guzmán

Out By	Richard Gonzales Juan Carlos Gómez Elena Llorente

Summary

This project is an Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) project under the Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) project category. Specifically, the project is of the "Avoided Unplanned Deforestation & Degradation" (AUDD) project category.

AENOR started the verification under VCS Standard version 3.7 and the CCB Standard Third Edition process in 7 December 2018 when the Project Proponent submitted the monitoring reports for VCS/CCB and other supporting documents, such as the calculation spreadsheet, GIS package, the non-permanence risk assessment, etc.

The field visit took place from 9 to 19 January 2019, in which the auditor visited the project area, interviewed key stakeholders, staff and other related experts and verified the implemented activities.

The purpose of the verification was to determine the conformance of the project with respect to the VCS Standard version 3.7, the CCB Project Design Standards Third Edition and the validated VCS Project Description and CCB Project Design Document.

The implementation period covered by this verification reports is from 26 August 2013 – 31 December 2017.

This is the first verification event. The project is well managed, and results are well supported. Monitoring plans are effective and CHEMONIC INTERNATIONAL INC developed enough procedures and tools to manage data. As a result of the CHEMONIC INTERNATIONAL INC experience with the VCS and CCB requirements, documents are well detailed. In this regard, this is a verification report that contains the findings to be resolved by the Project Proponent, 5 CL and 4 CAR were reported for VCS and 6 CL and 6 CAR were detected for CCB. These issues rose during the verification process and were resolved.

Thus, AENOR has carried out this verification report and deems with reasonable level of assurance that the project implementation complies with all verification requirements of the VCS+CCB Standard. The assessment team has no restrictions or uncertainties with respect to the compliance of the project with the verification criteria; hence, the audit team concludes that the net GHG emissions reductions or removals 1,852,924 tones CO2 equivalent over the monitoring period has been quantified in accordance with VCS rules.

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION 4
1.1 Objective 4
1.2 Scope and Criteria 4
1.3 Level of Assurance 4
1.4 Summary Description of the Project 5
2 VERIFICATION PROCESS 6
2.1 Audit Team Composition (*Rules* 4.3.1) 6
2.2 Method and Criteria 6
2.3 Document Review 7
2.4 Interviews 8
2.5 Site Inspections 9
2.6 Resolution of Findings 9
2.7 Eligibility for Validation Activities 10
3 VALIDATION FINDINGS 10
3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs 10
3.2 Methodology Deviations 10
3.3 Project Description Deviations 10
3.4 Minor Changes to Project Description 13
3.5 Grouped Project (G1.13 – G1.15, G4.1) 13
4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS 13
4.1 Public Comments 13
4.2 Summary of Project Benefits 13
4.3 General 14
4.4 Climate 20
4.5 Community 32
4.6 Biodiversity 39
4.7 Additional Project Implementation Information 43
4.8 Additional Project Impact Information 43
5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION 43
APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED 46
APPENDIX 3: CLARIFICATION REQUESTS AND CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS 53

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, including the monitoring plan.

- The extent to which GHG emission reductions and removals reported in the monitoring report are materially accurate.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

Verification Scope: The scope of the verification audit is to verify the emissions reductions and/or removals of the project, against the Verified Carbon Standard, the identified methodology and the validated PD throughout the monitoring period from 26 August 2013 – 31 December 2017.

The objectives of this audit included a verification of the projects calculated removals 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 presented in the PD and the fulfilment of the Climate, community and biodiversity criteria against the CCB Standard.

Standard criteria: Criteria from the following documents were used to assess this project:

- VCS Program Guide v.3.7
- VCS Standard v.3.7
- CCB Rules v 3.1
- Third edition CCB Standard
- VCS AFOLU Requirements v.3.6
- VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v.3.3

Unless otherwise indicated, the assessment was performed against the most recent version of the relevant VCS guidance document. Describe the scope and criteria of the verification.

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 assertion is materially correct and is a fair representation of the GHG data and information.

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

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The Project Proponents are the communities of Bajo Calima y La Plata-Bahía Málaga. The communities are organized as Community Councils (Consejos Comunitarios, or CC), in northwest Colombia. The project area has a total extension of 83,452 ha.

Strengthening governance has occurred throughout this monitoring through various measures. These include community-based land use planning, community and forest patrols, as well as updating forest and land use management plans. The project has also established conservation agreements as well as demarcated conservation zones.

Through capacity building in administration and management; occurrence of training workshops; technical assistance with agricultural, logging, and fishing activities; as well as the provision of direct employment by the project (forest patrols to monitor and catch illicit forest use), the project has created alternative economic avenues.

Leakage and non-permanence risk factors have been appropriately monitored and managed during this monitoring period. During this monitoring period, the net GHG emission reductions generated by the project amount to 1,852,924 tCO2e.

Some changes to project proponents and other participating entities have occurred since the validation of the project. From initial project development through project validation in 2017, BIOREDD+ was the project developer. Since 2018, the continued implementation and development of the project has been strengthened by a new USAID program, Paramos y Bosques. Like BIOREDD+, Paramos y Bosques is executed by USAID-implementer, Chemonics International.

The project is minimizing risks to the expected climate, community, and biodiversity benefits in order to maintain those benefits beyond the lifetime of the project. Specifically, the VCS project crediting period is 30 years, starting in 2013 and ending in 2043. The VCS project lifetime is also 30 years.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Audit Team Composition (*Rules* 4.3.1)

Name	Position in the team
Sergio Guzmán	Team leader and verifier
Richard Gonzales	Team leader and verifier
Jose Luis Fuentes	Team leader and verifier
Elena Llorente Pérez	Verifier
Juan Carlos Gómez	Verifier

The auditors have the Spanish as mother language which is the official language in Colombia where the project is located. The auditors have experience in social and cultural issues.

Sergio Guzmán has a Degree in Natural Resources, Aquatic Sciences and Wildlife and he has more than 13 years of years of experience in protected areas, forest management, forest audits, management and monitoring of forestry projects.

Richard Gonzales is engineer with high experience in CDM for more than 7 years. Richard Gonzales has participated in other VCS+CCB projects in Latin America.

Jose Luis Fuentes is engineer with an MBA and Post grade in Environment with experience in LULUCF activities in VCS, CDM and GS schemes from more than 10 years.

Elena Llorente has the Degree in Environmental Sciences and she has more than 12 years of experience in Sustainable development projects having worked as lead validator/verifier in CDM and other voluntary schemes. She is expert in Climate, Community and Biodiversity aspects.

Juan Carlos Gómez is a Forestry Engineer and holds a Master in Sustainable Development and Corporate Responsibility. He has more than 4 years of experience in the development of climate change mitigation and adaptation policies, energy transition and support mechanisms for renewable energies and forestry matters.

2.2 Method and Criteria

The verification was performed through a combination of document review, interviews and communications with relevant personnel and on-site inspections. The project was assessed for conformance to the criteria described in Section 1.2 of this report. As discussed in this report, findings were issued to ensure that the project was in full conformance to all requirements.

AENOR carried out this verification report and deems with reasonable level of assurance that the project complies with all of the verification criteria.

The verification has been performed through a deep desk review and on-site inspection including interviews with relevant personnel.

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 spreadsheet calculations.

AENOR reproduced and verified 100% of sheets in the VM0006 spreadsheet calculations and 50% of the data/calculations carried out in those sheets for the monitoring period 26 August 2013 – 31 December 2017 for the project area and leakage belt.

The project boundary and deforested areas in the project area and L.B for the monitoring period were 100% checked using the GIS database.

The carbon stock changes, forest classes in the project area and L.B were also 100% verified and crosschecked with validated values. For data provided for the reference region, AENOR carried out samples of at least 5% of data since they had already been previously validated and posed a lower risk to the emissions reductions achieved by the project.

AENOR decided to carry out a deep and meticulous review of the sheets due to the following reasons:

To verify the correct application of the methodology (formulae, equations.) and checked that data required to calculate the GHG removals are appropriately provided.

Based on the assessment carried out, AENOR confirms with a reasonable level of assurance that the claimed emission reductions are free from material errors, omissions or misstatements.

In addition, AENOR confirms that sufficient evidence was presented for the reported net anthropogenic GHG emission reductions 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 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 the most relevant are appropriately detailed in the appendix 1.

- Cross-checked evidence: AENOR cross-checked the collected information through an on-site inspection to the project area and reproducing calculations.

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

2.3 Document Review

The monitoring report, project description, and supporting documentation were carefully reviewed for conformance to the verification criteria and consistency with the Project Description. The audit team

examined the baseline data gathered from the baseline determined for this Region, spreadsheets used to enter, and compile information required by the methodology and reproduced the GHG emissions reductions calculations presented in the spreadsheet models to obtain same results than those appearing in the Monitoring report. The Non-Permanence Risks Reports for this monitoring period were assessed, as well.

Appendix 1 to this report details the list of documents provided by PP and reviewed by AENOR during the process.

2.4 Interviews

The list of the interviewed people is following detailed. The people interviewed were those directly affected or involved in the project activity, and in some cases were just indirectly affected.

Day	Place	Activities	Interviewed
2019-01-09	Bogotá FA o PyB office	Initial verification meeting ✓ Presentation of the verification team ✓ Review of the plan of activities to be developed Review and analysis of available documentation: • Internal Procedures • Monitoring Report • Different monitored data Verification of project benefits • Records of Technical Assistance to the Communities: • Training records for local people • Life Quality Plans of the communities in the project area	• Páramos y Bosques. • Fondo Acción • USAID (For a detailed list of people interviewed, see annex 2)
2019-01-09/18	REDD+ Projects BCBM/CAJAMBRE/ MUTATÁ Valle del Cauca, Antioquia y Choco Colombia Departments	Visit to the project area: ✓ Project benefits ✓ Verification of activities developed by Project development. ✓ Development of quality of life plans ✓ Conversation with a member of the community monitoring team. HCV Conversation about the complaint mechanism. Understanding of the benefit distribution plan or mechanism. ✓ Estimates and assumptions to determine GHG data. ✓ Established controls to detect and correct any error or omission in the	• Páramos y Bosques. • CMIM (For a detailed list of people interviewed, see annex 2)

		monitoring parameters ✓ Testing of monitoring equipment and observation of monitoring practices. Calibration and / or verification of equipment used (if applicable) ✓ Execution of specific controls and tests on data sources and data management practices where risks are detected. Meeting with local actors (stakeholders): ✓ Project benefits ✓ Verification of activities developed by project proponent ✓ Development of quality of life plans ✓ Environmental management of the community	
2019-01-19	Bogotá FA o PyB office	Meeting with local authorities and actors ✓ Project benefits ✓ Verification of activities developed by CIMA ✓ Development of quality of life plans ✓ Environmental management of the community ✓ Environmental projects	• Páramos y Bosques. • Fondo Acción • USAID (For a detailed list of people interviewed, see annex 2)

2.5 Site Inspections

Site inspections were conducted from 9 January to 19 January 2019. The objectives of the site visit were to assess the accuracy of the Monitoring Report including project implementation status, to assess conformance to the monitoring plan, to assess whether project activities are being implemented according to the project description, and to assess the quality of field data collection techniques.

2.6 Resolution of Findings

All documentation provided by the Project Proponent was assessed against the most recent version of the relevant VCS guidance document. Several clarification requests (CL) and corrective action requests (CAR) were raised and submitted to the Project Proponent, 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 Project Proponent and the audit team reassessed them against the guidance documentation. This process was repeated iteratively until all CL and CAR were fully

resolved. Specifically, 5 CL and 4 CAR were reported for VCS and 6 CL and 6 CAR were detected for CCB.

All findings issued by the AENOR audit team during the verification process have been closed for both VCS and CCB Standards. In accordance with Section 5.3.6 of the VCS Standard, all findings issued during the validation process, and the inputs for their closure, are described in Appendix 3 of this report.

2.6.1 Forward Action Requests

No FARs were raised to the PP during the verification process

2.7 Eligibility for Validation Activities

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

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

The project was not validated under another GHG program. Therefore, there are no Gap Validation findings to report. The Project Description was subject to validation under VCS Standard and was found to conform to the VCS requirements. CCB verification will demonstrate positive climate, community and biodiversity impacts, but does not produce any registered emissions reductions or credits. The project is in compliance with the existing legislation passed by Colombia establishing a national GHG program (Resolution 1447).

3.2 Methodology Deviations

No methodology deviations were applied during the monitoring and quantification of VCUs for this monitoring period

3.3 Project Description Deviations

The project proponents include in thbe M.R changes to the project design. They refer mostly to the data/parameters gathered under the validated community monitoring plan. These alterations mostly refer to variations as to the frequency and methods by which these parameters are collected and checked, and do not impact the applicability of the methodology, additionality, or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario. Every change is detailed in the M.R appropriately described and justified.

The below table states the proposed changes:

Parameter	Description Category for Proposed Changes	Proposed Changes	Explanation/Justification
Involvement	Description of	Rather than monthly frequency	Change would be more

of the community in the surveillance and patrolling of forests	measurement methods and procedures to be applied; Frequency of monitoring/recording:	of recording, the project proponents propose doing it every three months	in line with the current project MRV practices between the field and home office
Involvement of Corteros in the regeneration and maintenance of the conservation areas	Data unit; Frequency of monitoring	Rather than specifically referring to "corteros", the unit should refer to all those persons who are dependent upon logging for their income; frequency of monitoring to be done every three months rather than monthly	New description would better capture those beneficiaries for which the project is trying to provide alternatives to logging; More in line with project MRV practices between the field and home office
Trained and equipped people	Data unit; description; and Frequency of monitoring	rather than households receiving technical assistance, records will be kept for all individuals receiving assistance; frequency of monitoring to be done every three months rather than monthly	Change would help harmonize indicator monitoring with standardized benefit matrices; More in line with project MRV practices between the field and home office
Establishment of new productive agricultural activities	Data unit; Description	"new and/or improved" hectares will replace "new" hectares	Change will better capture the number of hectares undergoing changes due to project activities and objectives
Families benefitted from the social investments of the REDD+ projects	Sources of data; Description; and Monitoring equipment	A Participatory Impact Evaluation Survey will be conducted, where subjective perception of the changes in four aspects of the quality of life of the communities (income, technical capabilities, governance and conservation): These surveys will replace the originally proposed annual household surveys	Change would be more in line with the current project MRV practices between the field and home office
Strengthened governance	Description of measurement	Rather than monthly frequency of recording, the project	Change would be more in line with the current

	methods and procedures to be applied; Frequency of monitoring/recording:	proponents propose doing it every three months	project MRV practices between the field and home office
Effectiveness of the Grievance Redress Mechanism	Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied; Frequency of monitoring/recording:	Rather than monthly frequency of recording, the project proponents propose doing it every three months	Change would be more in line with the current project MRV practices between the field and home office
Women benefited from the Social investments of the REDD+ Projects	Data unit; description; and Frequency of Monitoring	In addition to number of beneficiary women, a Participatory Impact Evaluation Survey will be conducted, where subjective perception of the changes in four aspects of the quality of life of the communities (income, technical capabilities, governance and conservation): These surveys will replace the originally proposed annual household surveys	Change would be more in line with the current project MRV practices between the field and home office
Involvement of women in the surveillance and patrolling of forests	Frequency of monitoring	Rather than monthly frequency of recording, the project proponents propose doing it every three months	Change would be more in line with the current project MRV practices between the field and home office

AENOR verified during site visits the suitability of proposed changes by interviewing the community´s stakeholders, monitoring crews and project participants.

The deviations of the project do not impact on the applicability of the methodology, additionality, or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario. The changes relate to changes to social investments, project benefits, and involvement of local stakeholders. These changes have no impact on the applicability of VCS methodology and design of the project. The methodology's applicability criteria pertain to agents and drivers of deforestation as well as landscape configuration, none of which is affected by the deviations listed. The deviations listed also do not affect the project's compliance with the CCB standard requirements and indicators and are markers of the project's implementation of adaptive management in order to improve the project's implementation.

They have been accepted by AENOR because they represent a more accurate description of the project implementation and will result in a more efficient monitoring of activities.

3.4 Minor Changes to Project Description

In November of 2017, the project proponents held a participatory adjustment of the PDs workshop with relevant stakeholders. producing a substantive list of suggested corrections and minor changes to the original project design document.

These changes were provided in the documents "Propuesta Ajustes PD Bajo Calima-Malaga.docx" due to the length. For each suggested change or correction a justification is provided and also the section and page of the PD,

AENOR checked the changes and justifications provided by PPs. During the verification process AENOR required further information to check the categorized of changes, AENOR deems they are all minor changes since they are related to spelling mistakes, minor errors, and other updates made for report accuracy. None of the changes made had any effect on the project's design or compliance with CCB requirements. Thus, all changes are still in conformance with the CCB Standards criteria and indicators.,

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

This is not a grouped Project.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Public Comments

No comments were received during the public comment period.

4.2 Summary of Project Benefits

Section 1 of the monitoring report provides information about the project benefits. Achievements for the current monitoring period and for the project lifetime are detailed with specific data per categories.

Data are supported with evidence and records checked during the on-site visit and desk review. The section has been completed appropriately with data from the sources provided such as GIS package, records of trainings activities, employees etc.

As specific and remarkable achievements for the current monitoring period the monitoring report in its section 1.2 states the net emission reduction of 1,852,924 tn CO2e for the monitoring period. Other benefits in community and biodiversity components are the number of training actions for local people and employments generated as a result of the project implementation affecting both outputs to disadvantaged groups such as women. The climate targets directly affect to the biodiversity due to the conservation of forests. 41.06 hectares of farmland are managed under more sustainable practices (23.06 hectares of cacao and 18.0 hectares of plantain).

In opinion of AENOR, the project benefits are credible based on the supporting documents provided by PPs and evidence received during the AENOR on site visit from stakeholders interviewed, records checked and field records.

4.3 General

4.3.1 Implementation Status (G1.9)

Section 2.1 of the monitoring report provides a few relevant milestones occurred during the last years in the project area related to the management and development of the project to understand its implementation status. These milestones are directly linked with the success to implement and achieve the goals established by the project in the community and biodiversity areas.

Tables in section 2.1.10 of the monitoring report provide complete information of activities carried out and impacts of these activities for the six goals of the project. Project objectives and activities to reach them are analyzed with their outputs and outcomes for the present monitoring period.

During this verification process, AENOR has not detected project changes in regards of the project title, its purposes and objectives. As such, the project activity accurately reflects the proposed project which mainly consists in alleviating deforestation and degradation pressures on the forests, improving the quality of life of population in the area and strengthening relationships with government agencies to insure the proper long-term management of the Project Proponent. Through interviews with key staff and evidence provided, the auditor team ratified the main objectives of the project activity.

AENOR checked the monitoring plans contained in the project documents and supporting documents and compared it with the monitoring report to verify whether there was any difference that would cause an increase in estimates of the GHG emission reductions in the current monitoring period or that would prevent the implementation of any project activity to achieve the goals for the community and biodiversity. AENOR has confirmed that there are no material discrepancies between the actual monitoring system, and the monitoring plan set out in the project description and the applied methodology. The project implementation is in accordance with the project description, there´s no discrepancies.

Also, as required by the monitoring plan, the applicable methodology and the VCS and CCB requirements the project proponent effectively monitors the required parameters to determine the project's removals by sinks and emissions by sources and parameters for biodiversity and community monitoring, hence, AENOR deems monitoring plan is complete and suitability.

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 validated monitoring plan. Necessary management system procedures including responsibility and authority of monitoring activities have been verified to be consistent with the PD. Knowledge of personnel associated with the project activity was also found to be satisfactory. For this monitoring period there are no remaining issues from the previous verification, since it is the first verification.

The project has not participated nor been rejected under any other GHG programs. GHG emission reductions or 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.

The sustainable development contributions of the project are intrinsically related to the design of the project. As states the monitoring report in its section 2.1.10 the project was designed to create positive impacts on reducing emissions but also to enhance and maintain the ecosystems services and livelihood of local communities and to take part of the country reduction efforts.

Some minor changes and project deviations have occurred and have been explained in section 1.14 and 1.15 of this monitoring report.

Hence, after a complete review of the different documents provided and the on-site visit, AENOR is able to confirm that the project implementation is in accordance with the project description contained in the PD. There are not material discrepancies between project implementation and the project description.

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

Section 2.2.5 of the monitoring report addresses the natural and human induced risks and how the project considered several initiatives to diminish these risks to the project benefits.

This REDD + project has been developed in such a way that the risks are identified via a participatory process with community members and different mitigation actions have been carried out during the monitoring period.

The main risks identified by the members of the community are the natural risks, such as: the occurrence of fire, pestilence, climate and geological risks and beyond that, community members also identified possible risks related to food safety.

Communities form the project area also identified as a potential risk the possibility that the income generated by the alternative income activities would not be sufficient enough to cover the loss of income (the opportunity cost, for example) generated by the reduction of logging.

Also, a social risk was identified relates to the management and sufficiency of resources, such as the unequal distribution of benefits among the different communities that make up the indigenous major council and that, given the current conditions of carbon markets, the project may not be generating sufficient resources to provide adequate legal jobs for enough members.

For those risks, the Project Proponent has established different mitigation activities such as helping communities adapt to climate change, such as carrying out participatory mapping of project areas, improving management plans, demarcating boundaries, and implementing additional environmental protection and strengthening the communication between institutions and communities in order to resolve conflicts.

AENOR deems that the Project Proponent identified correctly the risks to the project benefits but the most important is that created, and it is implementing actions to reduce or diminish the negative impacts of these risks in the benefits on the Climate, community and biodiversity.

4.3.3 Community and Biodiversity Benefit Permanence (G1.11)

The project is currently taking active measures to enhance the climate, community, and biodiversity benefits of the project beyond the project crediting period by implementing the following long-term activities throughout the project lifetime:

- Continuing to strengthen land tenure and forest governance. The communities will update internal by-laws every 10 years, taking into account requirements of the project.

- Continuing to develop and implement sustainable forest and land use management plans. The communities will continue to assess and update forest management plans, based on current priorities for sustainable land use.

- Developing alternative livelihoods. The communities will continue to increase household incomes, reducing the need for income from timber extraction, through the production, processing and marketing of agricultural and other projects, such as fish.

AENOR has verified these activities though the desk review and during the on-site visit and consider the activities correct.

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

Fondo Acción has put in place a stakeholder engagement and project management structure so as to ensure the active involvement of all stakeholders in the planning and execution of all project activities.

AENOR could check during the on-site visit that the following documents were shared with the stakeholders:

- PD project description document
- Validation report
- Written communication: REDD + Portfolio, Information sheets REDD + Projects
- REDD + Activities and Social Indicators (Matrix Theory of Change)
- Standard operating procedures (SOP) for all activities
- Benefit-sharing mechanism -MDB,

These documents were made accessible to communities through socialization events, workshops, and / or community participation spaces, and have been delivered via printed, digital, and audiovisual materials created specifically for communities and other interested stakeholders.

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

Fondo Acción has facilitated and provided a number of training and capacity building activities for both people working directly under the REDD+ project as well as for willing and able community members and stakeholders.

Several activities were developed in this period and evidence was provided to the audit team. In interviews with technicians the audit team verified that they receive ongoing training, some of them are engaged in specific courses.

During the present monitoring period training courses were carried out as the monitoring report states in bullet 2.3.13. Evidence was provided. Likewise, equal opportunities are provided for local communities as they received training programs to be ready for working. They evidence the implementation of activities for improving options to them

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

The stakeholder involvement in project design as well as the stakeholder communication system is described in the PD. During the site visit the audit team was able to verify the stakeholder's involvement through the different interviews and meetings conducted and through records of different meetings and workshops. Community members demonstrated awareness and consent of the project's activities. In opinion of AENOR, the communication and consultation plan is being implemented as described in the project design document.

PDs and other documents related to REDD+ activities were published for the communities and other stakeholders to participate. Since the beginning of the REDD + project up to date, different dissemination strategies have been used to allow access to all of the project documentation to communities and other relevant stakeholders in order to promote knowledge and participation of the Community Councils of all REDD + activities, and to help strengthen their capacities in sustainable management and territorial governance.

These documents have been made accessible to communities through socialization events, workshops, and / or community participation spaces, and have been delivered via printed, digital, and audiovisual materials created specifically for communities and other interested stakeholders.

4.3.7 Anti-discrimination (G3.7)

Fondo Acción is an Equal Opportunity Employer which aims to include community members in its work regardless of age, gender, ethnicity or other characteristics. They have provided in-depth training for their own staff as well as for local community members involved in project implementation.

AENOR checked the Additional procedures and protocols that guarantee equal opportunities for community members, including women and vulnerable and/or marginalized people, to fill all positions, including management positions as stated in section 2.3.11 of the MR.

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

Each Community Council jurisdiction has the presence of a REDD+ Implementation Unit, which consists of an MRV coordinator and a team of rangers, who are assigned a series of responsibilities and duties relevant to the project. These responsibilities included the operation of a grievance and redress mechanism associated with the REDD+ project activities. At the time of project validation, each REDD+ Implementation Unit established a Grievance and Redress Mechanism in order to receive, respond to, and solve inquiries, complaints, and potential claims in accordance with recognized guidelines for a Grievance and Redress Mechanism.

Additionally, Fondo Acción also has a formal Complaints and Grievances Procedure of its own as part of its Quality Control System (ISO 9000 – 2008).

AENOR checked though desk review and during the on-site visit the Grievance and Redress Mechanism to receive complaints and according to information and evidence provided, since the project's validation there have been no formal grievances or complaints that have passed through, or that or have been recorded and/or resolved, via the established Grievance and Redress mechanism.

4.3.9 Worker Relations (G3.9 – G3.12)

Fondo Acción has facilitated and provided a number of training and capacity building activities for both people working directly under the REDD+ project as well as for willing and able community members and stakeholders.

Several activities were developed in this period and evidence was provided to the audit team. In interviews with technicians the audit team verified that they receive ongoing training, some of them are engaged in specific courses.

During the present monitoring period to training courses were carried out as the monitoring report states in bullet 2.3.13. Evidence was provided. Likewise, equal opportunities are provided for local communities as they received training programs to be ready for working. They evidence the implementation of activities for improving options to them.

Bullet 2.3.15 of the monitoring report states the main laws and regulations related to worker´s right.

Workers are informed of their rights through contracts with Fondo Acción. Fondo Acción contracts (staff and consultants, including community members) are governed by all worker-rights-related laws.

To ensure that the project meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering worker rights, the technical teams of Fondo Acción conduct a startup workshop called Preparation for Project Management with all project implementers.

AENOR did not detect incompliances with them checking the documents provided and interviewing to the workers. They have been informed about risks of the works and they received training about safety matters. Then, the project fulfils with CCB requirements related to worker relations.

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

The monitoring report states in its section 2.4.3 skills and capacities of the key personnel for implementing and monitoring the project.

Since the validation of the projects and with the completion of the BioREDD program (year 2014-2015) funded by USAID, Fondo Acción assumed all functions to implement the REDD + activities for the project.

By 2018, this program is now executed by Chemonics International, with partners Wildlife Works and EcoPartners, both entities with extensive experience in the formulation and verification of REDD + projects at the international level.

With the linkage of these new actors, and with Fondo Acción still acting as the main implementing partner of the REDD + project, a new cooperation agreement with Chemonics International was signed at their Colombia Branch in August of 2018.

They have the suitable and appropriate technical and management capacity to develop the project, as it was checked by AENOR during the on-site visit.

4.3.11 Commercially Sensitive Information (Rules 3.4.13-3.5.14)

All documentation related to the financial health of the implementing organizations and the projects is considered commercially sensitive information.

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

The main project proponents are the communities themselves, who have been granted property rights on their lands by means of INCORA resolutions, and that plan to remain in their territory in perpetuity.

Forced resettlement was never a component of the project design nor would it be acceptable under Colombian Law.

Through a broad socialization process, the communities themselves agreed to receive support to develop their own REDD+ projects; and signed Hojas de Ruta documents.

As said above, the main project proponents, the communities themselves, are still the legal owners of the land and forests in the project areas. The lands still belong to the communities and has not, and cannot, be sold, transferred, or have liens set upon them

AENOR interviewed during this verification with people of Fondo Accion and Chemonic Inc to confirm this situation.

According to information provided in the monitoring report and gathered from authorities and the project proponent. AENOR can confirm that the project protects the rights of Indigenous Peoples, communities and other stakeholders in accordance to the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards and the validated project design.

4.3.13 Legal Status (G5.1)

In the PD was listed all the relevant national and local laws and regulations. In addition, the monitoring report detailed updated information regarding new laws and regulation. They are detailed in bullet 2.5.1. Evidence of its fulfilment is considered complete. AENOR did not detect during the onsite visit or desk review incompliances related to laws and regulations.

4.4 Climate

4.4.1 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

Procedures for quantifying the baseline emissions were conducted in accordance with the methodology. 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, methodology 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 project proponents in spreadsheet format to ensure all formulas were accessible for review. The verification team recalculated subsets of the analysis to confirm correctness. Project proponent 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.

Baseline Scenario Emissions:

Section 3.2.1 of the Monitoring Report and the calculation spreadsheet submitted to AENOR provide information related to the baseline emissions calculations.

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

Calculation of Project Emissions:

Calculation of emissions from project activities has been determined following identified methodology and validated PD.

Ex-post project emissions for this verification period were calculated by summing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation transitions observed during this monitoring period. Per Section 5.4 of the PD, all project activities are meant to reduce these two emissions types. No emissions estimates outlined in VM0006 are included in this project since they are not part of the project activities.

While the VM0006 methodology does not calculate project emissions separately, instead requiring the calculation of NERs on category by category basis such as avoided deforestation or degradation, it is possible to calculate project emissions separately by using the following equation adapted from equation 106 of the methodology:

$$ProjectEmissions_t = \sum_{i=1}^{nr} \Delta area_{projectAreaEAH,projectScenario(t,i)} \times (EF_{AGL}(i) + EF(i,t-tt)_{AGD} + EF(i,t-tt)_{BG} + EF(i,t-tt)_{SOM}) \times u^* \times u_{transition}(i)$$

Project emissions have been calculated for both deforestation and forest degradation.
Total project emissions are equivalent to 1,029,065 tCO2e during this monitoring period. They have been divided between the years as shown in the below table:

Total annual GHG emissions during the current monitoring period are the following:

Project Year	Degradation Emissions within Project Area (tCO2e)	Deforestation Emissions within Project Area (tCO2e)	Total Annual GHG Emissions (tCO2e)
2013	55,787	21,776	77,563
2014	164,547	64,345	228,892
2015	168,761	66,105	234,866
2016	173,055	67,896	240,950
2017	177,175	69,619	246,794
Total	**739,325**	**289,741**	**1,029,065**

Calculation of emissions from project activities has been determined following monitoring plan in the methodology and validated PD. The deforestation in the project area was defined in accordance with the methodology.

Calculation of Leakage:

Leakage GHG emissions were estimated from LULC transition data and calculated using the adapted equation referenced below.

$$
\begin{aligned}
LeakageEmissions_t &= \sum_{i=1}^{nr} \Delta area_{leakageArea,projectScenario(t,i)} \times (EF_{AGL}(i) + EF(i,t-tt)_{AGD} \\
&+ EF(i,t-tt)_{BG} + EF(i,t-tt)_{SOM}) \times u^* \times u_{transition}(i) \\
&- \sum_{i=1}^{nr} \Delta area_{leakageArea,baselineScenario(t,i)} \times (EF_{AGL}(i) + EF(i,t-tt)_{AGD} \\
&+ EF(i,t-tt)_{BG} + EF(i,t-tt)_{SOM}) \times u^* \times u_{transition}(i) - EQ111
\end{aligned}
$$

PP provided the GIS package generated for the monitoring period to cross-check data in monitoring report, as well as calculations.

Total annual GHG emissions within the leakage area during the current monitoring period are the following:

Project Year	Baseline Leakage (tCO2e)	Ex-Post Activity Shifting Leakage (tCO2e)		Market Leakage (tCO2e)	Total Annual GHG Em Total Ex-Post Leakage (tCO2e)
		Degradation	Deforestation		
2013	48,729	9,189	5,437	39,201	39,201

2014	136,998	27,110	16,061	114,528	114,528
2015	132,076	27,811	16,496	107,235	107,235
2016	136,055	28,526	16,939	106,766	106,766
2017	135,692	29,211	17,365	106,571	106,571
Total	**589,550**	**121,847**	**72,298**	**474,301**	**474,301**

Calculation of emissions reductions or avoided emissions due to the project:

Calculation of emission reductions has been provided. Audit team has found the calculation traceable and in accordance with the applied methodology.

Net GHG emission reductions and removals are calculated using equation 105 of the methodology. This project only credits project and leakage area emissions for avoided deforestation and degradation as explained in the above sections. Thus, equation 105 for calculating NERs have been simplified for this project:

$$\begin{aligned} Net\ Emission\ Reductions\ (NERs) \\ &= \Delta GHG\ from\ avoided\ deforestation\ (EQ107) \\ &+ \Delta GHG\ from\ deforestation\ due\ to\ leakage\ (EQ108) \\ &+ \Delta GHG\ from\ avoided\ degradation\ (EQ109) \\ &+ \Delta GHG\ from\ degradation\ due\ to\ leakage\ (EQ110) \end{aligned}$$

Equations 107-110 from the methodology were used to calculate each of these emissions types. All the parameters for these equations have been explained in the preceding sections, including area transitioned, emissions factors, and uncertainty.

Required step equations for calculating NERs (Source: VM0006 Methodology v2.1)

ΔGHG from avoided deforestation:

$$❶ = \sum_{i=1}^{nrFNFtransitions} \sum_{tt=1}^{t} u_{classification} \cdot u_{transition}(i) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} +\Delta area_{projectAreaEAH,projectScenario}(t,i) \\ -\Delta area_{projectAreaEAH,baselineScenario}(t,i) \end{pmatrix} \cdot \left(EF_{AGL}(i) + EF_{AGD}(i,t-tt) + EF_{BG}(i,t-tt) + EF_{SOM}(i,t-tt)\right) \quad \text{[EQ107]}$$

ΔGHG from deforestation due to leakage:

$$❷ = \sum_{i=1}^{nrFNFtransitions} \sum_{tt=1}^{t} u_{classification} \cdot u_{transition}(i) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} +\Delta area_{leakageArea,projectScenario}(t,i) \\ -\Delta area_{leakageArea,baselineScenario}(t,i) \end{pmatrix} \cdot \left(EF_{AGL}(i) + EF_{AGD}(i,t-tt) + EF_{BG}(i,t-tt) + EF_{SOM}(i,t-tt)\right) \quad \text{[EQ108]}$$

ΔGHG from avoided degradation:

$$❸ = \sum_{i=1}^{nrStrataTransitions} \sum_{tt=1}^{t} u_{stratification} \cdot u_{transition}(i) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} +\Delta area_{projectAreaEAH,projectScenario}(t,i) \\ -\Delta area_{projectAreaEAH,baselineScenario}(t,i) \end{pmatrix} \cdot \left(EF_{AGL}(i) + EF_{AGD}(i,t-tt) + EF_{BG}(i,t-tt) + EF_{SOM}(i,t-tt)\right) \quad \text{[EQ109]}$$

ΔGHG from degradation due to leakage: [EQ110]

$$❹ = \sum_{i=1}^{nrStrataTransitions} \sum_{tt=1}^{t} u_{stratification} \cdot u_{transition}(i) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} +\Delta area_{leakageArea,projectScenario}(t,i) \\ -\Delta area_{leakageArea,baselineScenario}(t,i) \end{pmatrix} \cdot \left(EF_{AGL}(i) + EF_{AGD}(i,t-tt) + EF_{BG}(i,t-tt) + EF_{SOM}(i,t-tt)\right)$$

The results of these equations are listed annually in the following table:

NERs generated during this monitoring period are as follows:

Year	ΔGHG from avoided deforestation (EQ107) (tCO2e)	ΔGHG from deforestation due to leakage (EQ108) (tCO2e)	ΔGHG from avoided degradation (EQ109) (tCO2e)	ΔGHG from degradation due to leakage (EQ110) (tCO2e)	ΔGHG due to market effects leakage (EQ111) (tCO2e)	ΔGHG due to wood products (EQ113) (tCO2e)	ΔGHG due to other sources (EQ115) (tCO2e)	Net Emission Reductions (EQ106) (tCO2e)
2013	-70,611		-125,395		39,201	3,728		153,076
2014	-203,184		-369,458		114,528	10,649		447,465
2015	-157,361		-378,812		107,235	10,123		418,815
2016	-145,485		-388,346		106,766	9,963		417,102
2017	-135,351		-397,506		106,571	9,819		416,466

Total	**-711,992**	**0**	**-1,659,517**	**0**	**474,301**	**44,282**	**0**	**1,852,924**

See as follows the baseline, project, and leakage emissions as well as NERs achieved by the project during this monitoring period:

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO2e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO2e)	Leakage emissions (tCO2e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO2e)
2013	269,841	77,563	39,201	153,076
2014	790,886	228,892	114,528	447,465
2015	760,916	234,866	107,235	418,815
2016	764,818	240,950	106,766	417,102
2017	769,832	246,794	106,571	416,466
Total	**3,356,293**	**1,029,065**	**474,301**	**1,852,924**

Finally, after calculating NERs, VCUs are calculated by removing the buffer credits. Per equation 106 of the methodology, applied to this project:

$$VCUs = NERs - buffer * (\Delta GHG\ from\ avoided\ deforestation + \Delta GHG\ from\ avoided\ degradation + \Delta GHG\ from\ changes\ in\ long\ lived\ wood\ products)$$

The non-permanence risk rating for this project is 10%. Final annual VCUs for this project during this monitoring period were calculated by removing buffer credits from NERs, as shown in table **¡Error! No se encuentra el origen de la referencia.** below. Therefore, during this monitoring period, the BCBM project generated 1,620,202 VCUs.

NERs, buffer credit allocation and VCUs generated by the project, are the following:

Year	Net Emissions Reductions (tCO2e)	Buffer credits (tCO2e)	Verified Carbon Units (tCO2e)
2013	153,076	19,228	133,849
2014	447,465	56,199	391,266
2015	418,815	52,605	366,210
2016	417,102	52,387	364,715
2017	416,466	52,304	364,162
Total	**1,852,924**	**232,723**	**1,620,202**

AENOR reproduced the calculations to achieve the same results and deems they are depicted clearly and correctly in the provided sheets. The AENOR verification team was able to trace calculations directly

from the data sources of inventory´s field measurements. Formulae used are in compliance with monitoring plan, P.D and methodology like the default values used to determine the parameters, they are appropriate. Thus, the net amount of VCUs to be issued is accurate and realistic.

In order to calculate the above terms, the monitoring report details the data and parameters used during the verification process in section 3. Data and parameters available at validation are the ones stated in section 3.1.1. of the MR.

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 Project Proponent. AENOR checked the values of these parameters to be appropriate and correctly used in equations

On the other hand, the data and parameters monitored to calculate the VCUs to be issued are the ones stated in section 3.1.2. of the MR.

AENOR checked that the list of parameters to be monitored was complete and consistent with information in the monitoring plan of the P.D.

Regarding the accuracy of spreadsheet, formulae, conversions and aggregations and consistent use of data and parameters, the Project Proponent 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 Project Proponent conducted a rigorous QC/QA procedure of its field measurements and an assessment of uncertainty. Thus, AENOR deems the Project Proponent performed good practices in this assessment and concludes that GHG removals were quantified correctly in accordance with the project description and applied methodology.

In order to calculate the above terms, the monitoring report details the data and parameters used during the verification process. For each of them, AENOR checked its accuracy, consistency and reliability by reproducing the spreadsheets calculations, verifying the correctness of formulae and methods used and crosschecking the data values with sources (Appendix 1).

AENOR carried out a deep review of the monitoring report and the calculations.

AENOR verified the consistency and accuracy of each parameter detailed in its section 3 by crosschecking the information in the M.R with the information in PD as well as checking values and reproducing the calculations in the spreadsheet calculation package (see appendix 1) and did not find inconsistencies between them after the closing of CARs and CLs requested. Therefore, AENOR deems that values reported for the parameters are accurate and consistent.

Moreover, AENOR also verified a complete GIS package provided to cross check the information with data values used in calculations and monitoring report. Other default values used are from sources well accredited and validated at validation stage.

For all these parameters reported in the monitoring report, AENOR cross-checked with the PD and the spreadsheet calculations that values/calculations/methods match and are free of mistakes and errors.

AENOR did not find inconsistencies between the PD, technical annex, monitoring report and spreadsheet calculation.

In order to verify the accuracy and consistency of parameters monitored and used to calculate the removals achieved for the monitoring period, the AENOR verification team reproduced the calculations

checking the correctness of the formulae applied and assumptions used, when applicable and that values used matched with data sources.

After a deep and thorough review and reproduction of calculations and the corresponding tracks to the other spreadsheets, 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, consistency and accuracy.

AENOR checked that the list of parameters to be monitored was complete and consistent with information in the monitoring plan of the P.D.

By crosschecking samples of original data sources from PP and taken by AENOR from the on-site visit with data in the spreadsheet calculation and other supporting documents such as the GIS package, AENOR verified the consistent between data and did not detect manual transposition errors between data sets.

4.4.2 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

The data and parameters used to determine greenhouse gas emission reductions and removals are listed in section 3 of the monitoring report.

This REDD+ project has implemented two different quality checks, the Field-based Quality check and data and technical quality check.

For the Field-based Quality Check, once the field data is collected, a QA/QC team is sent into the field to verify the consistency and reputability of the field measurements. The team inspect 5% of the parcels established in the project area.

The QA/QC team evaluate the original data, correcting any measurements, providing feedback, and reconciling any other data discrepancies. A report is then returned to the field team which presented the evaluation alongside the original data. All comparisons and corrections by the QA/QC team were made in agreement with the Measurement Quality Objectives (MQO).

AENOR has verified that the monitoring crews implemented the monitoring plan as it is established in the validated P.D. AENOR also found evidence during the on-site visit that key workers are fully involved in monitoring events (training, measuring, archiving, reporting, quality control, etc.).

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.

In this regard, AENOR paid close attention to the knowledge of field teams about procedures for measuring, the frequency of measurements and the quality of metering equipment including maintenance/calibration requirements.

After field QA/QC assessments had been completed, the data was then entered into a database. This data was diligently reviewed by field supervisors and compared to information from the digital archives, ensuring field data accuracy.

Interviews with project proponents and inspection of data and results demonstrated that the project proponents possess all of the competencies required for reporting of GHG emissions reductions in an accurate way.

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

The monitoring plan provides means for internal data review and quality control, and the data presented by the project proponent included the results of these internal assessments. AENOR considers that information provided is sufficient and the quality of that information is appropriate to determine the GHG removals.

AENOR deems they are reliable and appropriate. AENOR deems that evidence is enough to reproduce calculations in quantity and quality.

4.4.3 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

The Project Proponent has elaborated the project VCS Non-permanence Risk Report version 1.7, dated on 25 March 2019, for the monitoring event according to the latest AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool.

Below, it is explained the assessment of the non-permanence risk rating determined by the project participant and issues rose to them in the assessment.

Risk factor	Risk Rating	Findings and mitigation activities	Corrective Actions/Clarifications
Internal Risks			
Project Management: It is assessed using table 1 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool.	-2 (total may be less than zero)	a) This criterion is not applicable since this is a not a reforestation or forestation project. Risk rating=0 is justified. b) previously issued credits. No enforcement at the moment. Patrols will be created to promote conservation commitments PP has given the risk number of 0 which it is well justified. c) In accordance with the evidence provided, Management team is located in the country and the project area can be accessible in one day. Risk rating=0 is justified. d) Management team is located in the country and the project area can be accessible in one day. The Reguardo will have a REDD+ implementation team hired by FONDO ACCION. PP has given the risk number of 0 which it is well justified. e) The management team from the Paramos and	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested.

		Forests Program includes individuals with significant experience in all skills necessary to successfully undertake project activities. The management team consists of Wildlife Works Carbon, with 20+ years of REDD+ project development experience, and the ecoPartners team, including Kyle Holland (Ph.D.), with extensive experience in AFOLU project design and carbon accounting under the VCS Standard. Then, it is well justified the rating=-2. f) N.A.	
Financial viability: It is assessed using table 2 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool.	0(total may not be less than zero)	a)-i) The project has been funded completely through BioREDD+ using funds from USAID which covered all project development and validation costs. Thus, the rating chosen=0 is correct.	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested.
Opportunity Cost: It is assessed using table 3 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool.	-6(total may be less than zero)	a)-e) N/A f) Illegal logging has been identified as the most profitable alternative land use scenario identified in Section 4.6.4 of the Project Description. The Net Present Value of project activities is expected to be more than 50% more profitable than from illegal logging. Then, rating chosen =-4 is correct. g) Project proponent is not a non-profit organization as defined in Section 2.2.3 of the VCS Non-Permanence Risk Tool V3.2. Then, rating chosen =0 is correct. h) Project is protected by a legally binding agreement to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period. Then, rating=-2 is conservative. i)N/A Then, rating chosen = 0 is	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested.

		correct.	
Project Longevity: It is assessed using table 4 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool.	15(total may not be less than zero)	a) N/A b) The project has a legally binding agreement to continue management practices in place throughout the project crediting period (2013-2043) and for 30 years thereafter. The Project Description has been formally approved by the General Assemblies of the each resguardo and commits the resguardos to the REDD project for a period of 60 years. Then rating=15 is correct.	No corrective actions or clarifications were requested.
Total internal risk=7 (total may not be less than zero)			
External Risks			
Land Tenure and resources access/impact: It shall be assessed using table 6 of the Risk Tool.	0 (total may not be less than zero)	a) N/A. Thus, the rating chosen=0 is correct b) Mangrove areas are considered public goods but also fall under the land titled to the Community Councils. As such, ownership and resource access/ use rights are held by different entities. Even though mangrove areas considered land titled to the Community Councils, risk factor (b) is chosen as a conservative value under the non-permanence risk tool given that certain areas are also considered public goods. Thus, the rating chosen=2 is correct c)-d) N/A. Clear property rights. Thus, the rating chosen=0 is correct e) N/A. Then, rating chosen =0 is correct. f) Considered a protective forestry reserve, mangrove protection falls under the ecological function assigned to the titled lands under Law 70/93. Then rating=-2 is correct. g) N/A. Mitigation not requested. Then rating =0 is correct.	No Corrective Actions or Clarifications were requested.

Community engagement: It shall be assessed using table 7 of the Risk Tool.	-5 (total may be less than zero)	a)-b) N/A General Assemblies representing all community members have been consulted and have endorsed the project. Thus, rating =0 is correct. c) The project will be validated under the Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Standards. Then the rating=- 5 is correct.	No Corrective Actions or Clarifications were requested
Political Risks: It shall be assessed using table 8 of the Risk Tool.	0(total may not be less than zero)	a)-b) N/A Thus, rating =0 is correct. c) Colombia presents -0.21 according to the World Bank Institute´s Worldwide Governance Indicators. Then the rating=2 is correct AENOR verified the value and reliability of source. f) Colombia is implementing REDD+ Readiness activities. Then, rating= -2 is correct.	No Corrective Actions or Clarifications were requested.
Total external risks=0 (Total may not be less than zero)			
Natural risks			
Fire Risk: It shall be assessed using table 10 of the Risk Tool.	LS*M=0	No new reports of fires that pose risks to carbon stocks have been recorded since the preparation of the last risk assessment report. Significance and Likelihood (LS): Thus LS=0 is correct. Mitigation (M) measures. None, Then, M=1 is correct	No Corrective Actions or Clarifications were requested
Pest and disease outbreaks: It shall be assessed using table 10 of the Risk tool.	LS*M=0	Since the last assessment of risk in 2014, the DesInventar system still contains no reports of significant pest of disease outbreaks in the region. The Food and Agriculture Organization published a report stating that insects infect only about 1.2% of forest plantations Significance and Likelihood (LS): Thus LS=0 is correct. Mitigation (M) measures. None, Then, M=1 is correct	No Corrective Actions or Clarifications were requested.
Extreme weather: It shall be assessed using table 10 of the Risk tool.	LS*M=2	Since the last assessment of risk in 2014, no extreme weather events have occurred that would change weather risk for the project. Extreme weather events still pose relatively small risk to forest carbon stocks, with most frequent events being floods and wind storms that pose	No Corrective Actions or Clarifications were requested

		highest risks to urban areas rather than forest. Significance and Likelihood (LS): Thus LS=2 is correct. Mitigation (M) measures. None, Then, M=1 is correct	
Geological risks: It shall be assessed using table 10 of the Risk Tool.	LS*M=1	There have been no major earthquakes registered in the DesInventar system since the original assessment of risk in 2014. While seismic events occur every 10-25 years on average, they pose very little risk to forest and vegetation Significant and Likelihood (LS). Geological risks are insignificant and likelihood is every 10 to less than 25 years. Thus, it is reasonable the value LS=1. Mitigation (M) measures. None, then rating=1.	No Corrective Actions or Clarifications were requested
Total natural risks=3			
OVERALL RISK RATING=7+0+3=10, Overall Risk rating value of 10% is applied.			

AENOR has checked that information provided in the Non-Permanence Risk Report version 1.7 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 developed and they are based on provided documents using conservative assessments. AENOR deems that information provided is reliable and appropriate from official sources, thus, the overall risk rating is credible and realistic.

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

The project's MRV liaisons conducted workshops in the project area communities to report on the results and evaluations of the project activities to date, as well as provide descriptions and a timeline for the verification audit activities that are to follow (preparation of final monitoring reports, public comment period, auditor visits and possible interviews, verification report and results.)

In November 2018, once the Implementation and Monitoring Report was finalized, pedagogical material was designed to help present the results of the monitoring, reporting and verification process to the communities in a summarized fashion. This report was presented at publicized community meetings, which informed stakeholders about the visit of the auditing entity, the place, date, and purpose of that visit, and of the possibility of stakeholders' ability to interacting freely with this verifying entity during the visit

AENOR confirmed during the visit to the different communities the awareness about the results of the projects, its implementation, monitoring, etc. Results of the climate benefits were provided in a spreadsheet calculation were emission reductions are determined. AENOR reproduced the calculation to achieve the same results, checked baseline and project emissions and leakage. Further information on the process and data checks is provided in sections above. In opinion of AENOR the monitoring plan and the results were disseminated in accordance with the validated PD.

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

Not applicable. The project is not seeking Climate Gold Level validation or verification at this time.

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

Not applicable. The project is not seeking Climate Gold Level validation or verification at this time.

4.5 Community

4.5.1 Community Impacts (CM1.1)

The following impacts have been detected in the community groups:

- 4 updated, participatory land-use maps of the Bajo Calima-Bahia Malaga Afro-Colombian territory, based on identified community priorities;
- 3 updated forest management plan drafts, encompassing management & sustainable use of natural resources, territorial control, and protection of Community Council forest conservation areas;
- 14 meetings to monitor/guide progress in the implementation of new management plans: 3 General Assemblies, 6 Pacific REDD+ Portfolios, 1 Accountability workshop, 1 REDD+ Activities Action Plan workshops, 1 REDD+ management plan meeting with Ministry of Environment & Sustainable Development, 1 Panorama REDD+ Portfolio planning meeting, and 1 REDD+ node meeting;
- 9 loggers participating in regeneration and/or maintenance of areas of carbon reserves and/or biodiversity conservation;
- A forest monitoring and surveillance team for community monitoring of the territory and to facilitate project communication, comprised by 8 local REDD+ promoters and 1 MRV liaison;
- 1 kit for project monitoring activities, consisting of: 2 LENOVO 640-30 laptop computers, 2 Garmin GPS, 2 Bushnell binoculars, 2 cameras, 7 backpacks, 2 dry bags;
- 123 families trained via workshops, 160 technical assistance visits, and ECA field methods; 23.06 new or improved hectares of sustainable cacao plantation; 1 community member hired/trained as an agricultural technician; purchase of tools & agricultural products required for production; cacao drying beds improved; 1 cacao growers cooperative (ACABAC) with 35 members legally constituted, and with office installations completed; 9,500 kilos of cacao sold in 2017;
- 20 families trained in the harvest, processing, and quality control of wild açaí; 1 community leader specialized in açaí from harvest to pulp processing stages; 1 management plan for wild açaí harvest; 1 açaí growers cooperative (Naidi SAS del Pacifico) legally constituted, with members in 7 Community Councils;
- 1 comprehensive analysis of ecotourism potential in the territory, 1 local organization (Ecomanglar) strengthened for ecotourism development, 1 infrastructure design plan & budget, 1 updated lodging installation, 1 marked/established ecological trail, 2 outboard motors for tourist transport, operating permits from regional Tourism Board;
- 1 updated baseline study of artisanal fishing practices in Bahia Malaga; 1 PNNUBM fisheries census; 1 social, environmental, technical, and economic feasibility study of the value chain for piangua and

other local marine products; 1 workshop on the biology, monitoring, recolonization, and commercial strategies of piangua;

- 36 capacity-building workshops attended by 875 community members (435 of them women); courses specifically relevant to REDD+ project success included: preparation for validation audits, leadership coaching & communication, territorial appropriation, basic REDD+ and climate change concepts, MRV, and participatory project document development; 9 local workshop facilitators trained; 2 local governance institution strengthened (*Consejo Comunitario Bajo Calima* and *Consejo Comunitario Bahia Malaga*);
- 1 environmental education workshop on REDD+ and gender equity, specifically targeted at women; 1 female participant;
- 12 meetings to elaborate, discuss, and approve community by-laws (*reglamento interno*), including trips by local governing bodies to strengthen project presence in far-reaching communities of the territory.

In opinion of AENOR, the assessment of impacts is accurate and reflects faithfully the project benefits in communities.

4.5.2 Negative Community Impact Mitigation (CM2.2)

Participatory Evaluation of Social Impact surveys have been conducted as part of the project's monitoring efforts, and these have shown equitable training and benefit sharing to date through the high marks received on the quantitative community surveys of social well-being and stakeholder satisfaction attributable to project activities.

In addition, no unanticipated negative community well-being impacts have been identified during the monitoring period and no major grievances have been presented through the established Grievance and Redress Mechanism, implemented by the REDD+ Implementation Unit of the Community Council.

In accordance with the reported information, the project doesn't result in net negative impacts on the wellbeing of the community. Assessment by the audit team concluded that the likelihood of net negative impacts on the well-being of the community is adequately addressed in the monitoring report.

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

Section 4.1.3 of the monitoring report includes the details of the positive community well-being impacts.

The project proponents have carried out Participatory Evaluation of Social Impact surveys which show that the activities of the project carried out to date have resulted in net positive community well-being results.

65% of the participants said that income, work, and productivity had improved; 83% of participants said that technical capacity had improved; 43% said that territorial consolidation, or strengthening of tenure, had improved; and 71% of participants consider that the conservation of forests in the project area has also improved.

Of the total of activities identified by participants as generators of positive change, 61% were identified as activities directly implemented by the REDD + project. For activities valued by the community as

generators of positive change in terms of income, work and productivity, community members felt that 42% of all those activities could be attributed directly to the REDD + project. Regarding the generation of technical skills in the community, 53% attributed improvements in this category to the REDD+ project. Project activities related to the appropriation of rights and to the sustainable use of the territory contributed to 69% of these benefits overall, according to participants. Finally, 79% of forest conservation benefits were generated by the REDD+ project according to the survey. In this case, female perception of positive change was higher for each of the four survey categories at 61%, 66%, 74%, and 90%, respectively.

It is clearly that project activities are providing net positive impacts on community groups.

4.5.4 Protection of High Conservation Values (CM1.2)

Forests in various locations throughout the project zone were identified as having High Conservation Value (HCV) using the methodologies outlined by the HCV Resource Network. Three specific types of HCVs relating to community well-being were identified in forests in the project area at time of validation: areas that provide Critical Ecosystem Services (HCV-4), areas that meet fundamental needs (HCV-5), and areas that are vital for the preservation of cultural identity (HCV-6).

Section 4.1.4 of the M.R provides a full description of the measures carried out to protect the HCV. In this regard, AENOR took the opportunity to check during site visit the implementation of some activities focused to protect these areas, such training activities, patrolling, etc. Given that forest conservation, including the protection and maintenance of HCV areas, is one of the key objectives of the project, and multiple project activities are dedicated specifically to maintaining or enhancing forest ecosystems, impacts on HCVs have been positive as compared to the without project scenario. Project activities such as training and capacity building for improved governance, demarcation of degraded “reserve” and conservation areas, and strengthening of land tenure for communities, have all served to protect community HCVs.

Therefore, AENOR confirms that project activities are not negatively affecting to the HCVs.

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

In accordance with the reported information, the project doesn’t result in net negative impacts on the wellbeing of other stakeholder groups. Assessment by the audit team concluded that the likelihood of net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups is adequately addressed in the monitoring report.

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

Community monitoring plan comprises seventeen parameters:

- Involvement of the community in the surveillance and patrolling of forests
- Involvement of Corteros in the regeneration and maintenance of the conservation areas

- Trained and equipped people
- Households receiving technical assistance
- Establishment of new productive agricultural activities
- Employed people in the value chains
- Sales volume of the Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) companies
- Net income of the Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) companies
- Sales volume of cash crops established by the REDD+ Project
- Families benefited from the Social investments of the REDD+ Projects
- Strengthened governance
- Operation of the Grievances Redress Mechanism
- Effectiveness of the Grievances Redress Mechanism
- Women benefited from the Social investments of the REDD+ Projects
- Employed women in the value chains
- Involvement of women in the surveillance and patrolling of forests
- Women participation in decision-making processes

In order to assess and continually monitor the impacts that the project is having on communities; as well as allowing affected groups within the community to also have effective participation in the evaluation of such impacts, the project has conducted Participatory Evaluation of Social Impact surveys.

AENOR confirms dates, frequency and sampling methods used are in accordance with the validated project design and with the procedures and systematics used in the verification event. AENOR confirms that community monitoring plan is implemented as the monitoring report and the validated PD.

The project is explicitly pro-poor in terms of targeting benefits to globally poorer communities and the poorer, more vulnerable households and individuals within them.

4.5.7 Community Monitoring Plan Dissemination (CM4.3)

AENOR verified how the information about the project is disseminated.

The monitoring report has been presented at publicized community meetings, which inform stakeholders about the visit of the auditing entity, the place, date, and purpose of that visit, and of the possibility of stakeholder's ability to interacting freely with this verifying entity during the visit.

Per the CCBA rules, this monitoring report was also be made available online one month before the start of the verification site visit for a period of public comments.

In opinion of AENOR the results of community monitoring were disseminated in accordance with the validated PD.

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

The project continues to expect to generate long-term net positive well-being benefits for community members at the individual and/or family level, based on the theory of change model developed at the time of validation and put into use during the monitoring period.

At the family level, multiple achievements currently indicate that the project is on track to generate well-being benefits for communities as planned, including:

- 123 households trained in cacao cultivation and agroforestry techniques
- 141 households that received technical assistance visits for establishing or improving cacao plantations
- 20 households trained in sustainable wild açaí harvesting techniques
- 18 households trained in plantain cultivation
- 1 community leader trained as an açaí harvest/processing expert
- 1 agricultural technician hired from the community

It is expected that the short-term net positive benefits generated by these investments in productive activities will manifest at a broad scale in the near future, as market-driven income streams begin to gain momentum. This is especially true in the case of cacao, due to the number of participants. At present, employment as part of the REDD+ unit and patrolling squads is a definitive short-term positive benefit that the project has generated.

At the community level, progress made since project validation in strengthening the capacity of both the Community Council and the local organization Ecomanglar is also contributing to the probability of long-term net positive well-being benefits.

AENOR during the on-site visit could check the cacao and acaí cultivations, the silvo-pastoral systems and the patrolling squads and considers that the project is giving short-term and Log-term community Benefits.

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

Over the course of the monitoring period, Fondo Acción has facilitated and provided a number of training and capacity building activities for both people working directly under the REDD+ project as well as for community members and stakeholders. The trainings have specifically focused on the following areas.

- Improving the administrative capacity of community members: courses and/or workshops offered in i) accounting, ii) financial analysis and evaluation of projects; iii) environmental and social project management; iv) marketing; v) administration and management; and vi) leadership

- Environmental education, specifically aimed at women

- Training in MRV: REDD+ concepts, GPS data management, social and biodiversity monitoring, verification processes

- Forest patrolling and community environmental promoters (promoters that help publicize the activities and objectives of the REDD + project, and who collect community comments to prioritize social investment).

- Agriculture: Techniques to increase crops and yields, pest control, development of value chains

As said above, AENOR during the on-site visit could check the cacao cultivations, the silvo-pastoral systems, the patrolling squads, the environmental education, trainings in MRV and considers that the project is giving capacity development to the community members.

AENOR could check the information in the following reports “MTC_IndSociales BCBM VF2” and “BCBM_SOPs”.

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

Throughout the monitoring period, a number of activities and processes were put in place to ensure that vulnerable and/or marginalized groups, such as women and corteros, were able to participate in project design and development activities.

The following activities were carried out and AENOR could check this though the on sites visit:

- 38 women have benefited from workshops and technical assistance in sustainable agriculture techniques.

- 9 corteros involved in the regeneration and maintenance of conservation areas as an alternative livelihood option.

AENOR could check documented evidence regarding the people contracted.

4.5. 11 Optional Gold Level: Net Impacts on Women (GL2.5)

The project, as explained in this verification report and the MR, has generated net positive impacts on the welfare of women and has also ensured that women have participated in key decision-making as it relates to the project. The project continues to work with the organizational structures that are already in place, rather than imposing external conditions on project activities.

10 women are now voting members of the newly formed ACABAC cooperative cacao association and the newly strengthened local ecotourism organization Ecomanglar is comprised by a team of all women (4 people in total).

AENOR has assessed this during the on-site visit, talking with the women and check also this though the desk review of the BCBM Social Impact Evaluation report.

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

The original benefit sharing mechanism provided at validation has been implemented for the project. The communities are currently working in collaboration with Fondo Acción on the development of an Integrated Development Plan that will include an updated benefit sharing mechanism. The new benefit sharing mechanism is in early stages of development and has not yet been officially approved or adopted by the communities, as AENOR could check during the on-site visit.

The design and implementation of a benefits sharing mechanism will be developed in a participatory manner with community members, based on existing Development Plans. If a legitimate Development Plan does not exist, Fondo Acción will invest in a broader planning exercise.

AENOR during the on-site visit could check this with Fondo Acción's staff.

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

The project governance and implementation structure are guided by the existing self-governance structures in the Afro-Colombian communities. A Community Council is an Afro-Colombian community that decides to constitute legally.

The Community Council follows both the laws stated by the Government and the internal laws that are assigned by each community, as long as they are not contrary to the Constitution. Internal laws (derecho propio) is the set of customs, traditions, norms and duties commonly accepted by all members that share an identity and serve to auto-regulate. These internal laws are only valid between members of the community within the territory.

The law also creates the position of Legal Representative of the Community Council (Article 12) whose role is to legally represent the community in the efforts and actions before institutions or businesses. The legal representative is elected by the General Assembly but operates under the direction of the Governing Board of the Council.

In the case of a REDD+ project, it should be noted that the law does not exclude the possibility that the Councils are constituted in business development instruments or ventures which seek to produce, distribute and consume jointly and efficiently, goods and services to meet the needs economic conditions of its members. Additionally, under Colombian law non-profits are able to have surpluses so long as they are distributed amongst community members. Thus, the productive activities of the project have and will be differentiated between the actions of individuals or families and those of the community, which have collective benefits, administered by the Community Council.

AENOR, during the on-site visit, met with members of the Community Council and could check that project's governance and implementation structures enable full and effective participation of smallholders and community members in project decision-making and implementation.

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

As said in the monitoring report and the verification report, Fondo Acción has facilitated and provided a number of training and capacity building activities for both people working directly under the REDD+ project as well as for community members and stakeholders.

AENOR during the on-site visit could check the trainings in agriculture, the silvo-pastoral systems, the forest patrolling, the environmental education, trainings in MRV and considers that the project is giving capacity development to the community and smallholders members.

AENOR could check the information in the following reports “MTC_IndSociales BCBM VF2” and “BCBM_SOPs”.

4.6 Biodiversity

4.6.1 Biodiversity Changes (B1.1)

The causal model and theory of change for attribution of net-positive biodiversity impacts expected and realized by the project was stated in the PD that the change in biodiversity will be primarily measured through: Greater area of intact forest and connectivity between intact areas and Improved plant species composition, forest structural integrity and natural habitat.

The principle technique to monitor these impacts was planned around the “changes in measurable forest vegetation cover conditions.” In following the PD, the biodiversity changes were subject to monitoring at species and ecosystem level. The original strategy proposed to achieve this mostly by remote sensing and to be corroborated through ground-based bio-resource inventories in future monitoring periods. This has been justified in Richards and Panfil (2011) in that biodiversity change correlates strongly to changes in vegetation cover and Pitman (2011) that size and connectedness of forest ecosystems correlate with levels of natural ecological function.

The results of the project activities on biodiversity are positive in general, not affecting to the HCVs.

In opinion of AENOR, information about benefits on biodiversity from project activities is accurate since is based on record taken from project stakeholders and project proponents, based on sources reliable and appropriate and the attribution of biodiversity changes to the project’s activities is well justify.

4.6.2 Mitigation Actions (B2.3)

The mitigation of negative impacts on forest habitat is the predominant strategy of REDD+ conservation projects, which are therefore low risk for negative impacts. The HCV assessment and monitoring of negative impacts are at a relatively low-intensity, emphasizing changes in forest cover, either by conversion of intact forests to degraded forests or non-forest land uses and the further degradation of semi-intact forests

Mitigation activities have been made by Fondo Accion during the monitoring period, the principle achievements were:

-Strengthen the sense of ownership, self-determination and governance of the project stakeholders so that they could promote and to some extent enforce improved uses of their territories

- Increase technical capacities across a wide-range of REDD+ project management and implementation skills, which enable increased participation and understanding of the REDD+ project objectives and help to change behavior;

- Promote productive activities that can generate employment and income through economic development that serves as a viable alternative to logging or forest clearing. To establish these mitigation activities, various workshops, training, and meetings were hosted by Fondo Accion

AENOR checked this during the on-site visit and with documented evidence and consider it is correct.

4.6.3 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts (B2.2)

During the monitoring period, the estimation of biodiversity impacts within the project area was monitored according to two data parameters. The first parameter was amount of intact forest area as a measure of forest habitat cover. The second parameter was the amount of above-ground forest biomass as a measure of the maintenance or recuperation of biodiversity attributes in semi-intact forests. These data parameters were measured and analyzed utilizing remotely-sensed data representing the land use classification and land use change during the monitoring period.

A biodiversity monitoring protocol was developed by Fondo Accion in consultation with the project proponents during the monitoring period. The biodiversity monitoring protocol served as a guide that was adapted for use by the project as a standard operating procedure for biodiversity monitoring prepared by the Southpole Group.

AENOR checked during the on-site visit the positive effects of the project activity.

4.6.4 High Conservation Values Protected (B1.2)

The HCVs identified in this project activity are the followings:

HCV1 – Concentrations of biological diversity

HCV2 – Landscape level ecosystems and mosaics

HCV3 – Rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems

For HCV1, HCV2 and HCV3, AENOR has checked this through the remote sensing data analysis and the field-based measurements particularly plants, birds, and mammals. No HCV were negatively affected by the project.

For HCV1, as the results from the remote sensing analysis show, the project has maintained intact habitat for species, presumably including those potentially threatened and endemic species. Thus, there have been no negative impacts on HCV1 due to the project.

For HCV2 and HCV3 the suggested approach is predominantly through remote sensing data analysis, as well. The primary means of demonstrating net positive impact through the REDD+ project protection of HCVs was through habitat protection, intact and semi-intact forest cover and connectivity. As the results

from the remote sensing analysis show, the project has protected intact and semi-intact forest cover thus there have been no negative impacts on HCV2 and HCV3 due to the project.

4.6.5 Invasive Species (B1.3)

The project is not using invasive or exotic species.

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

The Project activity is using native species.

4.6.7 GMO Exclusion (B1.5)

No GMOs were used in the project activities during the monitoring period nor will they be used by the project in the future.

4.6.8 Inputs Justification (B2.8)

Organic fertilization/pest control are the methods which have been effectively used in the project region long into the past, without any negative consequences. Furthermore, community members are accustomed to using these methods.

AENOR could check this during the on-site visit talking with the community members.

There are no potential or realized adverse effects on biodiversity in the region or on communities.

4.6. 9 Negative Offsite Biodiversity Impacts (B3.1) and Mitigation (B3.2)

During the period of implementation, the potential negative impacts on biodiversity outside the project area were evaluated through remote sensing of the leakage belt. The activities potentially related to such negative impacts were identified as mining, logging, animal husbandry, and agricultural conversion that may have been displaced to locations outside the project zone. There was no observed leakage that occurred within the project during this monitoring period as compared with the baseline scenario. As such, there were no significant observed negative impacts on habitat, and thus, biodiversity outside of the project area.

In opinion of AENOR after visiting the project region, project has adequately identified all potentially negative offsite biodiversity impacts and has taken actions to mitigate the impacts.

4.6. 10 Net offsite Biodiversity Benefits (B3.3)

The project is generating net positive benefits on biodiversity in the project area and project zone. In addition, no negative impacts are expected offsite due to the project activities, then, there are not likely unmitigated negative offsite biodiversity impacts.

4.6.11 Biodiversity Monitoring Plan (B4.1, B4.2, GL 3.4)

Monitoring activities for biodiversity were carried out in 2018 in accordance with the methodology and VCS Standard. Monitoring activities and biodiversity status updates were used to confirm the state of species diversity throughout the project region and to revisit the status of biodiversity as it was reported during project validation. Also significant was the development of a formal biodiversity monitoring protocol. Monitoring activities were executed following this monitoring protocol developed by the project implementation team of Fondo Accion

The biodiversity monitoring protocol prepared by Fondo Accion is the first tangible planning document needed for regular biodiversity monitoring.

The results as commented above are detailed in the monitoring report and supported by the following documents, “BCBM Biodiversity Analysis V1.” and “Protocolo censos fauna v1.4”. Many of them were provided during the site visit and others checked in the office. The monitoring plan is in compliance with the validated PD. In opinion of AENOR the monitoring plan is effective to have a real idea of the situation. Measures scheduled and designed by the project proponent to maintain or enhance the biodiversity are correct and results confirm their effectiveness.

4.6. 12 Biodiversity Monitoring Plan Dissemination (B4.3)

The plan for completing the monitoring report as related to biodiversity was discussed in community meetings in Bogota, Cali, and during visits from Fondo Accion, Wildlife Works, and members of Paramos y Bosques.

The timeline for completion has been discussed, especially as it was updated. The summary of monitoring results was shared with the community members of the REDD+ project in December through in-person visit.

The AENOR verification team kept meetings in the headquarter offices of the project proponent in the project area with people in charge of the project, but also with local authorities of some communities involved. In these meetings AENOR verified how the information about the project is disseminated. In addition. The monitoring report states in section 5.3.2 some of the actions carried out to disseminate the results of the monitoring plan and the own plan.

AENOR visited a representative number of places and interviewed many stakeholders affected by the project and the feedback from all of them along with evidence and records provided allows to AENOR confirms that results of biodiversity monitoring were disseminated in accordance with the validated project design.

4.6.13 Optional Gold Level: Trigger Species Population Trends (GL3.3)
Not applicable.

4.6.14 Optional Gold Level: Effectiveness of Threat Reduction Actions (GL3.4)
Not applicable.

4.7 Additional Project Implementation Information

There is no more additional information; all was discussed in the above sections.

4.8 Additional Project Impact Information

There is no more additional information; all was discussed in the above sections.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

AENOR has verified that the project is in compliance with the verification criteria of Verified Carbon Standard version 3.7 and the CCB Standards Third Edition without qualifications or limitations.

The project has been implemented in accordance with the validated project description and its validated variations.

The present verification event did not include validation activities.

AENOR is able to issue a positive verification opinion for the 1,852,924 tones CO2e of verified emissions reductions, as reported in the Monitoring Report version 2.7 dated on 26 March 2019.

The verification assessment covered the monitoring period from 26 August 2013 – 31 December 2017 and verified that calculated emission reductions and/or removals were achieved during the monitoring period with a reasonable level of assurance. The overall risk rating was 10 %. Therefore, the total number of credits to be deposited in the buffer account is 232,723 VCUs and the total VCUs to be issued are 1,620,202.

It is not applicable any conclusion about adaptive activities and resilience for this project. Likewise, AENOR confirms the project benefits on community and biodiversity for the current monitoring period as described in the Monitoring Report version 2.7 dated on 26 March 2019. In opinion of the AENOR verification team the project is achieving their community and biodiversity objectives.

Verification/monitoring period: 26 August 2013 – 31 December 2017

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

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO_2e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO_2e)	Leakage emissions (tCO_2e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO_2e)
2013	269,841	77,563	39,201	153,076
2014	790,886	228,892	114,528	447,465
2015	760,916	234,866	107,235	418,815
2016	764,818	240,950	106,766	417,102

2017	769,832	246,794	106,571	416,466
Total	**3,356,293**	**1,029,065**	**474,301**	**1,852,924**

Overall non-permanence risk rating: 10%

VCUs buffer to be deposited: 232,723 tn CO2e.

Total VCUs to be issued: 1,620,202 tn CO2e.

APPENDIX 1: LIST OF EVIDENCE PROVIDED

Final M.R version 2.7, dated on March 26th, 2019
First version of the M.R
Registered VCS PD version 5.14, dated on April 10th, 2015
Non-Permanence Risk Report version 1.7, dated on March 25th, 2019
Package of calculations
CVs of management team
USAID report
GIS package
Financial information
Survey report
Operative procedures for monitoring activities.
Evidence of the implementation status of the project
Pitman (2011)
Community meetings minutes of community meetings in Bogota (June 1), Cali (June 21-22), and during visits from Fondo Accion, Wildlife Works, and members of Paramos y Bosques (July – August 2018)
Agreement between Communities
Spreadsheet Budget_and_cashflow_breakeven
MTC_IndSociales BCBM VF2 and BCBM_SOPs
BCBM Social Impact Evaluation report
Development Plans
Records Richards and Panfil (2011)
Monitoring reports on Community and biodiversity. Results of parameters and indicators.
Training actions records.
BCBM Biodiversity Analysis V1
Environmental action plans
Protocolo censos fauna v1.4
Standard operating procedures (SOP) for all activities
2.2.1 CronogramaImplementacionPortafolio
Acta Consentimiento Asamblea Bajo Calima
Acta Consentimiento Asamblea Bahía Málaga
Plan REDD BCBM
Carta de intención BCBM
Carta de Cooperación y Compromiso BCBM
Protocolo de inventario forestal v1.28

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

AENOR

Asociación Española de Normalización y Certificación

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Chemonics

Proyecto: Proyecto Paramos y Bosques

Ubicacion: Bogota

Fecha: 9/01/2010

No.	Nombre	Organización/comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Teléfono	Firma
1	Juan Carlos Briascos	P y B	Subdirector		[signature]
2	JUAN FERNANDO PHILLIPS	P&B	EXPERTO MRV		JUAN PHILLIPS
3	Sarah Lapidus	P&B	Comunicaciones		[signature]
4	Luis Fdo. Jara	P y B	Director		[signature]
5	JEFF HAYWARD	P y B	REDD+ COORDINADOR		[signature]
6	David A. Amado	P y B	Gerente Seguridad		[signature]
7	Andrés Echavarría	P&B	Esp. Mercados Negocios Verdes		[signature]
8	Mauricio Mira P	P o B	GTE. Mec y NV.		[signature]
9	Todd Hamner	USAID	Dir. Med. Amb		[signature]
10	Maria Paula Vargas	P&B	Dir. Operaciones y Finanzas		[signature]
11	Sergio Guzmán	AENOR			

AENOR

Asociación Española de Normalización y Certificación

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Proyecto: Fondo accion

Ubicacion: Bogota

Fecha: 9/01/2019

No.	Nombre	Organización/comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Teléfono	Firma
1	Juan C. Riascos	PyB	Subdirector		[signature]
2	Jeff Hayward	PyB	Coordinador REDD		[signature]
3	Nibia Bonilla H	Fondo Acción	Coordinadora Jurídica		[signature]
4	Juan Phillips	P&B	Experto MRV		Juan Phillips
5	Andrés Sierra B.	Fondo Acción	Coord. REDD+		[signature]
6	Elizabeth Valenzuela	Fondo Acción.	Directora Técnica		[signature]
7	Thomas Bucy	USAID	SES		[signature]
8	Una Sofía Cuenca	Fondo Acción	Directora Jurídica		[signature]
9	Brayan Rodriguez	Fondo Accion.	Financiero/Contador		[signature]
10	Mauricio Salazar	Fondo Acción	Coord. Ambiental		[signature]

AENOR

Asociación Española de Normalización y Certificación

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Proyecto: Fondo Acción
Ubicacion: Bogota
Fecha: 9/01/2019

No.	Nombre	Organización/comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Teléfono	Firma
1	Dianne Peña	Fondo Acción	Ing. SIG		
2	German Botero	FONDO ACCIÓN	DIR. FINANCIERO		
3	Luis Felo. Jara	Paramo y Bosques	Director		
4	Natalia Arango	Fondo Acción	Directora Ejecutiva		
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					

AENOR

Asociación Española de Normalización y Certificación

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Proyecto: REDD + BCBM
Ubicacion: Bahia Malaga
Fecha: 13-01-2019

No.	Nombre	Organización/comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Teléfono	Firma
1	Palmiro Garcia	Concejo la plata	miembro		[signature]
2	David A. Amado	P y B	Apoyo Logistico		[signature]
3	Yolima Rodriguez C	B & B	Lider equipo Parcelas		[signature]
4	Mireya Diaz Mosquera	C.C La Plata	Secretaria suplente		Mireya Diaz M.
5	Mauricio Salazar	Fondo Acción	Coord. Ambiental		[signature]
6	Andrés Sierra B.	Fondo Acción	Coord. REDD		[signature]
7	Arcenio	Diaz	6174745		
8	Neyda Molano	CC la plata	Aux. Contable.		[signature]
9	Bernardo Orobio	Fondo Accion	En Coce MRV		[signature]
10	Ferney Valencia	C.C. la plata	lider comunitario		[signature]

AENOR

Asociación Española de Normalización y Certificación

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Proyecto: REDD+ B cBm
Ubicacion: Bahia Malaga
Fecha: 13/01/2019.

No.	Nombre	Organización/comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Teléfono	Firma
1	David Banguera	ONCAprotéca	lider		[signature]
2	Freddy Hinojosa A	Negra Lacierpe	secretario		[signature]
3	Eladio Ballestero	CC Rio calima	cgcomutario		[signature]
4	Jose Daniel Mosquera	CC La plata BM	Lidera Ecomingler		[signature]
5	ALBEIRO PALMA	LA PLATA	Fiscal J		ALBEIRO
6	Carlos Jimmy	monseña	planeación		[signature]
7	FERNANDO	MURILLO-SANMIGUEL			[signature]
8	David Manguera	CC. la plata	lider.		David
9	Zacaria [illegible]	CC	africanador		africator
10	Mari melido Lopez	La Plata			

AENOR

Asociación Española de Normalización y Certificación

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

BcBm

Proyecto: REDD+ BcBm

Ubicacion: bahia Malaga – la Plata

Fecha: 13/01/2019

No.	Nombre	Organización/comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Teléfono	Firma
1	Luis Eugenio Cifuentes	WWC.	Exp. en sist. Prod.		
2	Jeff Hayward	WWC / PyB	Coordinador REDD+		
3	Farley Mosquera G.	CC. Río Calima	Junta de Consejo		
4	Lorenzo Gonzalez R.	C.C. Río Calima	R/le legal C.C. Calima		
5	Maria Angelica Moreno	C.C. Rio Calima	Coor. Educación		
6	Victor Manuel				
7	Jhon Harold Gonzalez				
8	NILSON GARCIA V	COMPACIFICO	coodinador		
9	Argenis Garcia V	C.C Malaga	Tesorero		
10	Sais Torres B.	Rio Calima	Coor comunicación		

USAID
DEL PUEBLO DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA

Programa Páramos y Bosques

Listado de Asistentes - Programa Páramos y Bosques de USAID[1]

Nombre del Evento: Resultados visita de Auditoria Proyectos REDD+ parte I - AENOR

Lugar / Municipio: Bogotá

Fecha:

#	Cédula	Nombres y apellidos	Municipio	Institución/ Organización	Cargo	Correo Electrónico	Teléfono	Firma
1	51915	Maria Paula Vargas	Bogotá	P&B	Oficial For			
2	19167051	Luis Fdo. Jara	Bogotá	PyB	COP			
3	19456648	Thomas Sikes	"	USAID	SES			
4	7509785	Mauricio Salazar	Manizales	Fondo Acción	Coord Ambiental			
5	98566064	Andrés Sierra R.	Bogotá	Fondo Acción	Coord. REDD			
6	31970033	Natalia Arango	Bogotá	Fondo Acción	Dir. Ejecutiva			
7	2017421	Jeff Haynard	Bogotá	PyB/WWC	Coord. REDD+			
8	18582646	Sergio Guzmán	Bogotá	AENOR	Auditor			
9								
10								

APPENDIX 3: CLARIFICATION REQUESTS AND CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS

Clarification Request (CLs) from the VCS Verification process

VCS CL ID	**01**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CL		
Clarify what Colombian Government Regulation on Jurisdictional Baselines and/or Private Projects vs National Accounting Systems *means (section 2.1.9) and whether the project complies with it or not.*		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
Resolution 1447 (http://www.minambiente.gov.co/images/normativa/app/resoluciones/98-RES%201447%20DE%202018.pdf) establishes the regulations for monitoring, reporting, and verification of national mitigation actions through the National Registry of GHG Emission Reductions (RENARE). It sets forth the procedures that mitigation initiatives must follow in order to register on the RENARE platform and comply with the Forest Reference Emission Levels. At the present time, the Colombian government has not submitted its NREF to the UNFCCC, so much of the resolution that relates to what happens after an NREF is established is not yet applicable. In addition, there is not a Jurisdictional Baseline established for the Pacific Biome nor is there a recognized REDD+ program in the Pacific. This means that for the monitoring period the projects are not subject to either a biome-level or national level NREF. See below for discussion on eligibility and compliance of projects in the pacific REDD+ portfolio. *In particular, Article 41 of the Resolution states that REDD projects must establish their baseline using the most up-to-date national Forest Reference Emission Level (FREL) that has been formally submitted by Colombia and evaluated by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Nevertheless, the only FREL that has been submitted by Colombia to the UNFCCC is the sub-national FREL for the Amazon Biome. There is no national FREL or any subnational FREL for the Pacific Biome, where CCCHD is located.* *In this situation, Article 40 of Resolution 1447 indicates that when applicable reference levels for the Project Area have not yet been established, the project's maximum potential GHG mitigation results generated between January 1st, 2018 and the start date of the resolution will be determined by its validated baseline. The mitigation results from the original validation are 100% valid for national accounting (and thus valid for the carbon tax) until the date on which the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development submits a national FREL to the UNFCCC as per Article 21.* *Furthermore, Paragraph 1 of Article 41 stipulates that projects which were validated*		

prior to the date of issuance of Resolution 1447 shall abide by the provisions of Article 40 regarding the maximum GHG mitigation potential for the period between January 2016 and December 2019. The maximum mitigation potential referred to in Article 41 will be taken into account only once such submission takes place. This means all verifications before this submission will enter RENARE in full according to the baseline on the project's original validation. Therefore, Resolution 1447 does not entail any changes to the project or to the vintages of emission reductions to be issued for the current verification period. *Finally, RENARE and the technical guidelines for specific procedures are not operating yet. Upon commencement of operation, the project will be duly registered; by 2020 the Project could be adapted to an eventual FREL that is applicable to the project area, according to the Resolution's article 41, Paragraph 2.*	
Documentation provided by project participant	
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3	
DOE assessment	**Date:** 04/03/2019
CL closed.	

VCS CL ID	**02**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CL		
Further details regarding the organizational structure, responsibilities and competencies of the personnel that carried out the monitoring activities and the procedures used for handling any internal auditing performed and any non-conformities identified shall be provided (section 3.1.3).		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
A flow chart of the organizational structure for climate monitoring activities has been provided, alongside detailed descriptions of responsibilities and competencies. Descriptions of QAQC and internal auditing procedures have been provided in section 3.1.3 of the Monitoring Report as well.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CL closed.		

VCS CL ID	**03**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CL		
In section 3.2.1 it is stated the following: "The first change is the use of the equations detailed in Section 3.2, due to the fact that the VM0006 methodology calculations do not provide equations to estimate baseline emissions." *Further clarification on why this is not considered as a methodology deviation shall be provided.*		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
The calculation of baseline emissions using a different method from the VM0006 Methodology is not considered a methodology deviation because this estimate of baseline emissions does not impact the final calculation of VCUs, which is done using the VM0006 Methodology equations. The equations applied in section 3.2.1 are only being used to estimate baseline and project emissions as required by the VCS template and they are not being used for final accounting of NERs and VCUs as is required by the VM0006 Methodology. *As stated in section 3.2 of the monitoring report, "Project, baseline and leakage emissions were estimated by parameterizing the VM0006 equations EQ107-EQ113 in a new form that is equivalent to EQ106, though these values are never directly applied in accounting. Rather in accounting EQ107-EQ113 are applied to determine NERs per EQ106." Later in that same section, the monitoring report states, "These parameterizations are required for the VCS monitoring report template but for which equations are not explicitly provided in VM0006." Thus, these equations and calculations for emissions should be understood as estimates in order to fulfill the requirements of the VCS template, but ultimately have no impact on the final estimate of VCUs as is calculated by VM0006. Since these estimates have no impact on final accounting, and the final accounting estimates were found by applying the VM0006 Methodology in full, the estimate of baseline emissions in this section would not qualify as a methodology deviation.*		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CL closed		

VCS CL ID	**04**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CL		
In section 3.2.1 it is stated the following: "Second, baseline emissions have changed slightly due to the use of updated carbon stocks in the degraded forest class collected during this monitoring period." *Further clarification on why this is not included in Project Description Deviations shall be provided.*		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
A Project Description Deviation, as defined in the VCS Program Definitions v3.7, is any deviation in the project design, procedures, and other specifications set out in the project description. The monitoring and updating of carbon stocks in degraded areas was specified in the original Project Description and Monitoring Plan as a project activity that would occur at the first verification. Additionally, the continued measurement of carbon stocks in degraded areas is encouraged by the VM0006 Methodology to reduce uncertainty. Thus, these changes are in keeping with the original Project Description and the VM0006 Methodology requirements and would not constitute a Project Description Deviation. *In addition, the noted change in estimated baseline emissions has no impact on the applicability of the methodology, additionality, or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario. Under the VM0006 methodology (v2.1 Section 9.3.2), updating carbon stocks densities are permissible and required "at least once before every baseline update using ground-based biomass inventories, as described in Section 8.1.4.4". The project's re-measured carbon stocks for degraded forests do not impact the baseline data or modeling. Rather, changes in the carbon stocks result in a change in the emission factors, which are used in combination with the baseline activity data (LULC transitions) to calculate the baseline emissions, but this does not have an effect on the validated baseline activity data or model.*		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CL closed		

VCS CL ID	**05**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CL		
Regarding emissions calculation, further clarification on the process followed to spread over time the carbon stock changes in aboveground deadwood and belowground biomass.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
In order to calculate the spread of carbon stock changes over time in the decay pools of aboveground deadwood (AGD) and belowground (BG) biomass, emissions factors have been calculated in these pools using EQ27 and EQ29 respectively based on a decay period of ten years, the default requirement according to the VM0006 methodology version 2.1 (pg. 50). Per the VM0006 methodology, these emissions factors must then be applied over a period of 10 years following an emissions event in order to distribute decay emissions over time. The calculated emissions factors are based on an entire year of 365 days, the results of which can be found in the 'Report - Emissions Factors' worksheet of the accounting model. Thus, a correction must be made during accounting to correct the emissions factor based on the number of days of decay in each year of the project. As a result, an emissions event in the first year of the project will have fewer AGD and BG emissions in the first year than that same event generates in later years as a result of the project start date not beginning on the first day of the year. The document "CL5_Evidence for emissions calculations in decay pools" provides further explanations and examples of how these emissions are calculated.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
CL5_Evidence for emissions calculations in decay pools.doc		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CL closed		

Corrective Actions Request (CARs) from the VCS Verification process

VCS CAR ID	**01**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CAR		
Provide a KML file with the project area location.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
KML files of the project area have been generated and provided to auditors.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM_PA.KMZ		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CAR closed.		

VCS CAR ID	**02**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CAR		
The assessment of the impacts of project description deviations on the applicability of the methodology is not provided (section 2.2.4).		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
An assessment of the impacts of deviations on the applicability of the methodology revealed that the deviations listed have no impact on applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario. All applicability conditions related to eligible land conditions and project activities in section 4.1 of the VM0006 methodology are still satisfied by the project and the project description deviations are not impacting the project's ability to meet these conditions. *The following language has been added to section 2.2.4 to address this finding:* *The deviations of the project in the first monitoring period detailed in 2.2.4 do not impact on the applicability of the methodology, additionality, or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario. The deviations listed in this section relate to changes to social investments, project benefits, and involvement of local stakeholders that have no impact on the project's VCS design or the applicability of methodology. The methodology's applicability criteria pertain to agents and drivers of deforestation as well as landscape configuration, none of which is affected by the deviations listed. The deviations listed also do not affect the project's compliance with the CCB standard requirements and indicators and are markers of the project's implementation of adaptive management in order to improve the project's implementation.*		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CAR closed.		

VCS CAR ID	**03**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CAR		
The purpose of the data and parameters available at validation and of the data and parameters monitored is not provided (sections 3.1.1 & 3.1.2).		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
The purpose of the data and parameters available at validation as well as the purpose of the parameters and data monitored have been updated and provided in the monitoring report in sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CAR closed.		

VCS CAR ID	**04**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CAR		
In section 3.2.1 it is stated the following: "Additional biomass inventories and LiDAR flights have led to new carbon stocks for various carbon pools within degraded areas. No change in emissions factors has occurred for any LULC classes other than degraded forest, as shown in Table 14." *However, Table 16 shows changes in emission factor for all LULC classes.*		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
Section 3.2.1 of the Monitoring Report stated: "Additional biomass inventories and LiDAR flights have led to new carbon stocks for various carbon pools within degraded areas. No change in emissions factors has occurred for any LULC classes other than degraded forest, as shown in Table 14". While this statement is correct, the auditors correctly identified that in Table 16 there were changes of emission factors for all LULC classes, not just those involving degraded forests. Upon reviewing the accounting models, it was identified that the incorrect emission factor values were included in the report due to a copy-paste error. The correct validated emission factors for the project have been updated in VM0006_BCBM_Ex_Post_v1.20 and in Table 16, which shows that no change in emissions factors has occurred for any LULC transitions other than those involving degraded forest.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3 VM0006_BCBM_Ex_Post_v1.20		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CAR closed.		

Clarification Request (CLs) from the CCB Verification process

CCB CL ID	**01**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CL		
In Table 2 (Section 1.2), clarify if the metric "Number of women employed in project activities, expressed as number of full-time employees*" does not apply to the project, no data are available or the value of the metric is zero.*		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
There were no women hired on contracts for the entire length of the project period. All women hired were on part time contracts for specific services, products, or activities. Thus, this metric of the number of women hired full time is zero, since all women hired were part time. This has been clarified in Table 2.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CL closed.		

CCB CL ID	**02**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CL		
Further information shall be provided regarding the actions required to mitigate fire, pestilence, climate and geological risks (section 2.2.6).		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
The following language has been added to section 2.2.6 of the report to provide clarification: *Specifically, members of the community evaluated the possibility of natural risks, such as: the occurrence of fire, pestilence, climate and geological risks, the results of which are reflected in the Non-Permanence Risk tool developed for this reporting period. As was done at time of validation, the project communities found that the risks posed from fire, pest and disease outbreaks, extreme weather, and geologic events were insignificant. Data from the DesInventar system once more shows no reports of forest fires, significant pest or disease outbreaks, or significant seismic events within the region. While flooding is a form of extreme weather event that does occur naturally within the region with a frequency of less than 10 years, it poses a negligible risk to carbon stocks, as floods affect annual crops rather than forests, as demonstrated in the DesInventar data. Further, the protection of natural forests from deforestation and degradation will reduce the impact of flooding events as a result of forest ecosystem services. Thus, no actions were further required to mitigate these risks.*		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CL closed.		

CCB CL ID	**03**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CL		
Provide evidence of the registration of the project in the national carbon projects database and its compliance with Resolución 1447 de 2018 *(section 2.5.6).*		
Project participant response		**Date:** DD/MM/YYYY

Section 2.5.6 has been updated to add clarity on the ways in which the project is in compliance with Resolution 1447. The Resolution 1447 that was published and came into effect on August 1, 2018 has 50 articles over 34 pages. Within this extensive piece of legislation there are detailed and exhaustive chapters on MRV systems, on national and project level accounting, on the national registry (RENARE), on sectoral and programmatic mitigation, on REDD+ projects, on the relationship between REDD+ projects and programs, on the NREF (FREL), and on timeframes and processes for transition, etc. When draft legislation was advanced for public comment, in June 2018, Fondo Accion, Paramos and Forests, and USAID were immediately in several meetings with the MADS with the specific intention of determining any and all impacts this legislation may have on the BioREDD+ projects. Similar meetings continued after publication of the resolution. These were summarized by WWC (supporting analysis provided to Sergio Guzman.)

Notwithstanding, it's important to clarify how and why the REDD+ projects are compliant with the legislation:

- Article 2 provides a general disposition for initiatives that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, which in the full scope of the law resolves for the due consideration of both public programs and private projects.

- Article 6 specifies that Validation and Verification Bodies in conformance with Decreto Unico 1074 de 2015 and ISO14065, respective accreditation requirements are eligible to realize activities of Validation and Verification. (WWC has analyzed these requirements and received the verbal confirmation from the lead authority, ONAC, that these VCS projects can be validated or verified by internationally accredited auditing firms.

- Articles 10 through 17 that define various requirements for a project proponent/owner to register within the RENARE platform and follow its Technical Guideline, and provide necessary documentation on project design and implementation, as well as to report results, are all dependent upon RENARE platform and accounting system being functional. This registry that REDD+ projects will need to inscribe, is not yet functional. As of January 30, 2019, it remains in a beta / testing phase.

- Article 54 is clear that projects have a period of 3 months to register their initiative within the RENARE platform, once it is operational.

- Article 39 starts those related to REDD+ project accounting. This is important with

respects to acceptance of VCS programs and requirements, as Article 39 establishes the characteristics for project methodologies. It is evident that VCS methodologies and programmatic requirement meet all of these criteria.

- Article 40, in the first bold paragraph, it is established that projects with validated baselines may use these, at a minimum, through January 1, 2018 if there is not an applicable NREF for the area of the project and furthermore that the Maximum Mitigation Potential accepted will be that of the validated project baseline.

In addition, with the support of USAID, various actors in the carbon market convened on November 27, 2018 an event that included the MADS, DIAN, and ONAC, among other key authorities for the very purpose of validating that the BioREDD+ projects are eligible to participate in the existing domestic and international voluntary carbon markets without prejudice or penalty respective of the new legislation. In early 2019, WWC joined a newly-formed association of carbon market organizations and businesses, ASOCARBONO for the expressed objective that this association would be able to facilitate understanding, improvement, and implementation of the resolution 1447 and other existing laws, for the intent of assisting members with project compliance. Finally, RENARE and the technical guidelines for specific procedures are not operating yet. Upon commencement of operation, the project will be duly registered; by 2020 the Project could be adapted to an eventual FREL that is applicable to the project area, according to the Resolution's article 41, Paragraph 2.

Additionally, the VITAL line of the ministry in which the projects were already registered is not working well so the link referenced in the MIR does not provide information regarding the project registration. The registration of projects in the VITAL database and the website is currently being updated by the person who manages the project registration in the Ministry and the person responsible for the registration was only able to provide the project registration code (BCBM VITAL Number: 6000830077866317003) on February 15, 2019 as this information was not available prior. It is also important to clarify that all the projects were registered in the VITAL system according to Resolution 1259 of 2015. The projects are registered and following the new RENARE resolution, and when the new RENARE platform is in operation, their registration information will automatically migrate to the new platform.

Documentation provided by project participant	
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3 Reporte Proyectos REDD FA	
DOE assessment	**Date:** 04/03/2019
CL closed.	

CCB CL ID	04	Date: 02/01/2019
Description of CL		
In section 4.1.1, further information shall be provided regarding key assumptions, rationale and methodological choices, and how the affected groups have participated in the evaluation of impacts.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019

The following language has been added to section 4.1.1 of the reports:

The project team has utilized appropriate methodologies to assess the predicted impacts, including direct and indirect benefits, costs, risks and changes in well-being, on each of the identified Community Groups presented below. The assessment of impacts has been carried out in a participatory manner with community stakeholders and is based on clearly defined and defendable assumptions about changes in well-being of these Community Groups under the with-project scenario, and as presented in the original project design document at time of validation.

An initial socio-economic baseline was conducted with the help of University of Antioquia to develop these socio-economic assessments. The socio-economic assessment for SUPP was conducted using the following methods:

• Initial identification of local and regional stakeholders, which included: the governor of Chocó, territorial governments, municipalities, NGOs, Community Councils, Indian Associations, Corporations, Social and Indigenous Communities of African Descent;

• Through a literature review, secondary information about different social, economic, productive, environmental and other studies were analyzed;

• Tools were designed, along with facilitators of African and indigenous descent, contextually aware of the social, cultural, economic, productive, and environmental realities in the territories;

• The statistical parameter set by the team of professionals corresponded to a sampling unit of 10% of the total population for implementation of the survey, with the family as the sampling parameter; and

• Participatory workshops were held with Legal Representatives of Community Councils, Indigenous Governors, and other key stakeholders.

As the project's main implementing partner, the Fondo Accion team has been systematically engaged with stakeholders in socialization meetings from the start of the project. Through these meetings, community stakeholders have been participating in the identification of deforestation and degradation drivers, agents, and the best strategies to address and mitigate them. The project activities have resulted from these participatory meetings where stakeholders have set priorities

with the support of the Fondo Accion team, including the climate change technical team and outside specialists. Throughout the socialization process, emphasis has been placed on the development of appropriate community level engagement processes and materials to ensure complex issues are presented in a way that communities can understand. This included participatory mapping of the project area, identification of risks to the communities, prioritization of project activities, and role-playing to better understand potential financing and implications for the project. *In order to assess and continually monitor the impacts that the project is having on communities; as well as allowing affected groups within the community to also have effective participation in the evaluation of such impacts, the project has conducted Participatory Evaluation of Social Impact surveys as part of the project's monitoring efforts, and these have shown equitable training and benefit sharing to date through the high marks received on the social well-being and stakeholder satisfaction of project outcomes. Adjustment to the benefits distribution mechanism will also be made as necessary, and according to the result of these surveys. Please refer to "Social Impact Evaluations" for details and documentary evidence of the social impact evaluations carried out by the project proponents at the end of the reporting period.*	
Documentation provided by project participant	
Social Impact Evaluations BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3	
DOE assessment	**Date:** 04/03/2019
CL closed.	

CCB CL ID	**05**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CL		
In section 4.1.2, further information shall be provided to demonstrate which measures have been taken to identify any marginalized and/or vulnerable smallholders/community members.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
The following language has been added to section 4.1.2 of the reports. *Project activities have been focused at the family or household level and decisions have all been made at a local level, by "veredeles" and zonal boards, which has guaranteed that marginalized and vulnerable groups – such as women, children, and elderly – have benefited and have been involved in decision-making and benefits distribution decisions. Furthermore, in order to identify community groups that are the most marginalized and/or vulnerable, the project team engaged the Autonomous University of the Department of Valle, the University of Antioquia, and the Laurel Foundation (former professors from the University of Nariño) to develop socio-economic assessments at the time of validation. The socio-economic assessment of the communities involved in the project determined that most of the families in the project area are economically marginal and/or vulnerable, generating only roughly 200,000- 400,000 pesos per month, respectively from the sale of agricultural products, fishing and forest use for a family of four people. These data demonstrate that most families are considered below the poverty line, with incomes below 482,352 pesos per nuclear family of four people.* *To ensure that benefits (including employment opportunities) reach women and the most vulnerable and/or marginalized people in the community, Fondo Acción continues consulting with the project communities to enact a benefits distribution scheme that has, as a key component, the selection of beneficiaries based on clearly established criteria (i.e. to support those with the greatest need and who request to be included in the project activities). There are also a number of other activities in place to ensure that vulnerable and/or marginalized people are able to participate in project design and development activities such as participatory risk assessments and community meetings. Specifically:* *• The project has provided the transportation needed to attend project meetings, and other stipends, particularly for those who set aside basic daily subsistence activities to attend meetings;* *• The "veredales" Committees and Zonal Boards have had clear information about the project activities and have had full participation in any decision-making, including individual cases that require special attention;* *• The project is ensuring the most vulnerable groups have access to training that enhances their capacity to participate in productive chains;*		

• In cases where families do not have clear usufruct rights, the Community Council has advanced procedures for assignment of such rights; *• The selection of personnel has been based on clear procedures that ensure equal opportunities for employment for vulnerable and marginalized groups; and* *• The project considers the household as the basic unit of intervention and has analyzed the different roles of men and women within the productive processes in order to address the needs of men and women differently and improve conditions within households.*	
Documentation provided by project participant	
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3	
DOE assessment	**Date:** 04/03/2019
CL closed.	

CCB CL ID	**06**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CL		
In section 5.3.1, further information shall be provided regarding: • *Dates, frequency, locations, sampling methods used, and other information concerning the monitoring process.* • *Results and evaluation of monitoring.*		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
As described in section 5.1, remote sensing data and analysis was used to determine a proxy monitoring indicator for biodiversity and ecosystem health. In addition to the development of field protocols for biodiversity monitoring, remote sensing data was collected and analyzed in order to determine the amount of forest lost or degraded in the project and leakage areas as compared to the "without project" or baseline scenario. As discussed in Richards and Panfil (2011), changes in biodiversity are strongly correlated with changes in forest cover, making it possible to measure and analyze biodiversity health by using proxy indicators within the environment. The fact that biodiversity abundance is directly correlated with habitat (i.e. forest cover), and ecosystem health is possible to determine impacts on biodiversity from broader-scale assessments on an ecosystem or regional level. Sentinel imagery and PALSAR data covering the project and leakage areas from late 2017-early 2018 was classified in order to determine the intact and degraded forest cover as of January 2018. The forest cover area classified in the 2018 LULC map was then compared with the validated 2012 LULC map at the start of the monitoring period to determine the total area of deforestation and degradation transitions observed. This allowed the project to compare the ex-post land use changes with the predicted ex-ante land use change in the project and leakage areas. If the project achieved a reduction in the expected area deforested between the ex-ante baseline estimates and ex-post monitoring, this was interpreted as a net positive impact achieved by the project for onsite and offsite biodiversity. *Language was added to section 5.3.1 to clarify this and to add additional detail on monitoring frequency, data etc.*		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CL closed.		

Corrective Actions Request (CARs) from the CCB Verification process

CCB CAR ID	**01**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CAR		
Provide a KML file with the project area location.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
KML files of the project area have been generated and provided to auditors.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM_PA.KMZ		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CAR closed.		

CCB CAR ID	**02**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CAR		
Description in the front cover of the activities implemented and results achieved that enable the project to qualify for each relevant Gold Level, under the Gold Level Criteria, is missing.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
The following language has been added to the front covers of the reports: *The project seeks to be verified at the gold level for exceptional community benefits, using the following criteria for this purpose: short-term and long-term benefits; benefits for marginalized and/or vulnerable community groups; net positive impacts on women; implementing an equitable benefit sharing mechanism; effective participation through governance and implementation structures; and building capacity development for smallholders and community members.* *The project is explicitly pro-poor in terms of targeting benefits to globally poorer communities and the poorer, more vulnerable households and individuals within them. The project has generated both long-term and short-term net positive well-being benefits for community members at the individual and/or family level, based on the theory of change model developed at the time of validation and put into use during the monitoring period. All of the REDD+ project activities implemented have been designed to ensure that vulnerability is reduced and benefits accrue to the most marginalized and vulnerable groups, including strengthening land tenure for these groups and reaffirming use rights over natural resources; developing alternative economic activities to reduce financial vulnerability; protecting natural resources to reduce environmental vulnerability; increasing governance capacity, and enhancing relationships and contacts with other institutions, thereby reducing the general vulnerability of the community.*		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CAR closed.		

CCB CAR ID	**03**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CAR		
Assurance that the project has met or exceeded each relevant law and regulation covering worker's rights in the host country is not provided (section 2.3.15).		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
The following language has been added to sections 2.3.15 of the reports: *In summary, Fondo Accion's worker's rights policy, which has been implemented as part of the project's activities since its inception, not only ensures compliance with all existing national laws regarding workers and their rights, but also exceeds many of these national regulations in various instances.*		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CAR closed.		

CCB CAR ID	**04**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CAR		
In section 2.2.3 demonstration that the changes are in conformance with the requirements of the CCB Standards criteria and indicators is missing.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
The following language has been added to section 2.2.3 of the report: *All of the minor changes proposed were related to spelling mistakes, minor errors, and other updates made for report accuracy. None of the changes made had any effect on the project's design or compliance with CCB requirements. Thus, all changes are still in conformance with the CCB Standards criteria and indicators.*		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CAR closed.		

CCB CAR ID	**05**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CAR		
Section 3.1.4 Dissemination of Monitoring Plan and Results is not complete.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
The following language has been added to section 3.1.4 of the report: *The project's MRV liaisons conducted workshops in the project area communities to report on the results and evaluations of the project activities to date, as well as provide descriptions and a timeline for the verification audit activities that are to follow (preparation of final monitoring reports, public comment period, auditor visits and possible interviews, verification report and results.)* *In November 2018, once the Implementation and Monitoring Report was finalized, pedagogical material was designed to help present the results of the monitoring, reporting and verification process to the communities in a summarized fashion. This report was presented at publicized community meetings, which informed stakeholders about the visit of the auditing entity, the place, date, and purpose of that visit, and of the possibility of stakeholders' ability to interacting freely with this verifying entity during the visit (see "Lista de Productos de Comunicaciones" for references).* *Per the CCBA rules, this monitoring report will also be made available online one month before the start of the verification site visit for a period of public comments.*		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.6		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 18/03/2019
CAR closed.		

CCB CAR ID	**06**	**Date:** 02/01/2019
Description of CAR		
Evaluation of monitoring, including evaluations by the affected communities, in section 4.3.1 is not provided.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 15/02/2019
The following language has been added to section 4.3.1 of the report: *In order to assess and continually monitor the impacts that the project is having on communities; as well as allowing affected groups within the community to also have effective participation in the evaluation of such impacts, the project has conducted Participatory Evaluation of Social Impact surveys as part of the project's monitoring efforts, and these have shown equitable training and benefit sharing to date through the high marks received on the social well-being and stakeholder satisfaction of project outcomes. Adjustment to the benefits distribution mechanism will also be made as necessary, and according to the result of these surveys. Please refer to "Social Impact Evaluations" for details and documentary evidence of the social impact evaluations carried out by the project proponents at the end of the reporting period.*		
Documentation provided by project participant		
BCBM Monitoring Report M1 2013-2017 v2.3		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 04/03/2019
CAR closed.		