

VERIFICATION REPORT FOR RIO PEPE Y ACABA REDD+ PROJECT



Contact Information

AENOR INTERNATIONAL S.A.U
6 Génova 28004. Madrid- SPAIN

Project Title	Rio Pepe y ACABA REDD+ Project
Version	2
Report ID	ACABA_RioPepe_Verification Report_v2

Report Title	Verification Report for Rio Pepe y Acaba REDD+ Project
Client	Consejo Comuntario de Río Pepé Consejo Comunitario de ACABA
Pages	136
Date of Issue	29-August-2024
Prepared By	AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U.
Contact	Génova 6. 28004 Madrid- Spain. Telephone +34 914326000 jfuentes@aenor.com; jcocera@aenor.com www.aenor.com
Approved By	Jose Luis Fuentes
Work Carried Out By	Lead Auditor: Sergio Guzmán Lead Auditor (until July 2022): Juan Carlos Gómez Auditor: Javier Cócera Cañas Auditor (until September 2022): Marina Arroyo Auditor: Daniel Bermejo

Auditor in trainee: Adrián Vidal
Auditor in trainee: Daniel Masika
Technical Reviewer: José Luis Fuentes

Summary

AENOR INTERNATIONAL S.A.U (AENOR) has performed the second verification of the “Rio Pepe y ACABA REDD+ Project” in Colombia on the basis of Voluntary Carbon Standard (VCS) and Climate, Community & Biodiversity standard (CCB), as well as the host country criteria. The period covered by this verification report is from 1 January 2018 to 31 December 2019.

AENOR conducted the verification under VCS Standard version 4.4 and the CCB Standard Third Edition, by reviewing the monitoring report and supporting evidence submitted by the project proponent.

The purpose of verification is to have an independent, third party assess the project design. In particular, the project's emission reduction calculation; the monitoring plan implementing, and the project's compliance with relevant VCS and CCB requirements.

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. The project area is located in the collective territories of Río Pepé and Acaba, in the municipalities of Medio y Alto Baudó, on the Pacific coast of Colombia.

Throughout this monitoring period, the project has continued to implement project activities that contribute to the creation of GHG emissions reductions. The project's main goals during this monitoring period were to continue developing the community engagement of the project, and to further implement alternative livelihood methods. Additionally, continuing the alleviation of deforestation and degradation pressures on the forests and monitoring progress towards this alleviation. Capacity building for community members during this monitoring period included training in zoning for future monitoring and verification processes, as well as agriculture training focusing on pest-control, sexual and asexual reproduction of crops, and fertilization. With provision of alternative economic activities and income sources, the need to pursue traditional economic activities, which often contribute to deforestation and degradation pressures, decreases.

In order to confirm that the monitoring report as documented meets the stated requirements and identified criteria, the verification consisted of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the project monitoring report and monitoring plan implementation; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders with an on-site visit as well as review of project activities; iii) the resolution of outstanding issues and internal technical review followed by the issuance of the final verification report and opinion. In the course of the verification process 21 Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) and 17 Clarifications (CL) were raised for both VCS and CCB, all have been successfully closed.

The purpose of the visit assessment was to determine the conformance of the project with respect to the VCS Version 4 Standard; the Third Edition of the CCB Standard; The field visit took place from 09/06/2022 to 11/06/2022 in which the auditor visited the project area, interviewed key stakeholders, staff and other related experts, and also reviewed the CCB-VCS-MR and supporting documents. The scope

of the verification was to assess the conformance of information in the project design document with the VCS and CCB standards.

AENOR verification team assessed the calculations and can confirm the GHG emission reductions, during this monitoring period amounts to 748,684 tCO₂e (without discounting buffer emissions) for the whole crediting period. AENOR's verification team is able to confirm that the project is well managed, and results are well supported. Monitoring plans are effective, and the project proponent has developed enough procedures and tools to manage data.

Hence, once all issues detected were appropriately solved, AENOR carried out a final verification report and deems with reasonable level of assurance that the project complies with all the verification criteria for VCS and CCB. 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, for the lands included in the project boundary at verification stage has been quantified in accordance with VCS rules.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	5
1.1 Objective	5
1.2 Scope and Criteria	5
1.3 Level of Assurance.....	6
1.4 Summary Description of the Project	6
2. Verification Process.....	7
2.1 Audit Team Composition (<i>Rules 4.3.1</i>)	7
2.2 Method and Criteria.....	9
2.3 Document Review	10
2.4 Interviews	10
2.5 Site Inspections	11
2.6 Resolution of Findings.....	13
2.7 Eligibility for Validation Activities	14
3. Validation Findings.....	14
3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs	14
3.2 Methodology Deviations.....	14
3.3 Project Description Deviations (<i>Rules 3.5.7 – 3.5.10</i>)	14
3.4 Minor Changes to Project Description (<i>Rules 3.5.6</i>).....	15
3.5 Grouped Project (G1.13 – G1.15, G4.1)	15
4. Verification Findings.....	16
4.1 Public Comments (<i>Rules 4.6</i>)	16
4.2 Summary of Project Benefits.....	16
4.3 General.....	16
4.4 Climate	27
4.5 Community	57
4.6 Biodiversity	64
4.7 Additional Project Implementation Information	70
4.8 Additional Project Impact Information	70
5. Verification Conclusion	71
APPENDIX I: LIST OF EVIDENCE.....	73
APPENDIX II: CORRECTIVE ACTION, CLARIFICATION AND FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS	79
APPENDIX III: ATTENDANCE SHEETS	132

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 reported in the monitoring report are materially accurate.
- The accuracy of the processes and activities carried out under the CCB standards which have also been implemented under the monitoring plan.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

Verification Scope: The scope of the verification audit is to verify the emissions reductions of the project, against the Verified Carbon Standard, the identified methodology and the validated CCB and VCS PDD throughout the monitoring period from 1 January 2018 to 31 December 2019.

The objectives of this audit included a verification of the projects calculated emission reductions 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 CCB-VCS-PD and the fulfilment of the Climate, community, and biodiversity criteria against the CCB Standard.

The scope was defined as follows:

- The project and its baseline scenarios;
- The physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the project;
- The GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs those are applicable to the project;
- The types of GHGs that are applicable to the project; and
- The project monitoring period
- The climate, community, and biodiversity benefits, including gold distinctions

The verification assessment was performed in accordance with the requirements detailed in section 4 of the VCS standard; including the following documents:

- VCS Program Guide, v4.3
- VCS Standard, v4.4
- Program Definitions, v4.3
- AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.0
- Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1
- CCB Program Rules, v3.1

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

1.3 Level of Assurance

The assessment was conducted to provide a reasonable level of assurance of conformance against the defined audit criteria and materiality thresholds within the audit scope. Based on the audit findings, a positive evaluation statement reasonably assures that the project GHG 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.

The threshold for materiality with respect to the aggregate of errors, omissions, and misrepresentations relative to the total reported GHG emission reductions was one percent (1%), as established for large projects by the VCS Standard.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

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. This is not a grouped project.

The project area is located in the collective territories of Río Pepé and Acaba, in the municipalities of Medio y Alto Baudó, on the Pacific coast of Colombia. The Project Proponents are communities organized as Community Councils (Consejos Comunitarios, or CC), in northwest Colombia. The entire project area lies within the areas awarded to these communities through executive resolution and has a total extension of 48,177 ha.

Illegal timber extraction is historically an important source of income within the project zone and is the major focus of the REDD+ project. Following from the gradual degradation of forests caused by continual timber extraction, many forest areas are ultimately converted to agriculture and pasture. The project aims to alleviate these pressures on the forests through the support of governance capacity (including individual property titling, land-use planning and conservation zone demarcation), the generation of alternative economic activities and income sources, and through capacity building in administration and management. These project activities, beyond protecting local forests and biodiversity, contribute to social and economic development in one of the poorest areas of Colombia.

Strengthening governance has occurred throughout this monitoring period 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 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 worked towards creating 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 748,684 tCO₂e. 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.

Continuing with the implementation, the development of the project has been strengthened by a new USAID program, Paramos & Bosques. Like BIOREDD+, Paramos & Bosques is executed by USAID-implementer, Chemonics International. Fondo Acción, an implementing partner from the project's validation, continues to act as the main implementing partner of this project. Project partners Wildlife Works and EP Carbon, both entities with extensive experience in the formulation and verification of REDD + projects, continue their key support for project activity implementation; monitoring and reporting activities; remote sensing and land use change analyses; and other verification support services.

2. VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Audit Team Composition (*Rules 4.3.1*)

Name	Position in the team
Sergio Guzmán	Lead Auditor
Juan Carlos Gómez	Lead Auditor (until July 2022)
Javier Cócera	Auditor
Marina Arroyo	Auditor (until September 2022)
Daniel Bermejo	Auditor
Adrián Vidal	Auditor in trainee
Daniel Masika	Auditor in trainee
José Luis Fuentes	Technical Reviewer

The auditors are native Spanish speakers and they are fluent in English. The auditors have experience in social and cultural issues and they have been auditing CDM, VCS, CCB and GS projects in AENOR for more than 6 years all around the world.

Considering the BioREDD+ Projects Verification rule exemption request response letter of March 12th 2020 (provided as an annex of the verification report), referring the ID projects 1389, 1390, 1391, 1392, 1395, 1399 and 1400, the PP is allowed to maintain the same VVB instead of change it according to the six-year VVB rotation requirement of VCS.

Sergio Guzman has a Master's Degree in Forest Management in the Tropics and Subtropics. He has more than 14 years of experience in climate change, forest management, monitoring processes of forest projects,

mainly REDD + projects, and expertise in audits (validation / verification) of forest under VCS and other schemes such as CCB, CERCARBONO, ICONTEC, PROCLIMA and FSC. He also has experience as a manager of REDD+ projects and community development.

Juan Carlos Gómez has more than 6 years of professional experience in climate change. He is a Forestry Engineer and holds Master in Sustainable Development and Corporate. He has developed his entire career in the field of climate change. He is an expert in the development of climate change mitigation and adaptation policies and has worked in LATAM countries and Africa, auditing REDD+ under VCS and CCB, and forestry projects under the CDM and JI.

Javier Cócera is a forest engineer with a Master in forest management. He has developed his career focused to the forest management. Mainly he has been working through sustainability in two ways: the main one as forestry consultancy, developing forest management plans, working with GIS and LiDAR both in the field and the office and getting experience of the forest resources. The second one was developing environmental footprint projects and sustainability reports. Currently Javier is working in AENOR as auditor focused in AFOLU projects. Javier participated in courses about ISO lead auditing and have performed audits in projects in Europe, LATAM, Africa and Asia.

Marina Arroyo is a geographer environmentalist with a Master's in Environmental Engineering and Management. She has over 5 years of professional experience in climate change both in the fields of mitigation and adaptation, with projects all over the world. Marina worked in AENOR auditing CDM, VCS and other projects in Africa as well as other regions. She perfectly understands the technical aspects of this standard.

Adrián Vidal holds a Master's degree in Forest Engineering from the Technical University on Madrid, and a Postgraduate Diploma in Climate Change from the National University of Quilmes and the National University of Jujuy, with the support of UNEP. Adrián works at the Climate Change Unit in AENOR and has more than 5 years of professional experience in forestry and sustainability. Prior to joining AENOR, he worked at the Basque Center for Climate Change (BC3) in carrying research in global governance, national policies, and modelling of Agriculture, Forestry and other Land Use (AFOLU) mitigation measures. He worked as an intern at the AFOLU Unit of the Transparency division of UNFCCC, providing support to the intergovernmental climate change process on issues related to land-use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF), agriculture and REDD+. He also worked in urban forestry, landscape forest restoration and environmental consultancy, and collaborated in the Global Forest Survey project of FAO.

Daniel Bermejo is a Forest Engineer with a master's degree in sustainable finance. He began his career in private consulting, working on topics such as climate risk analysis and TCFD risks, forestry development, agriculture and forestry banking standards, environmental footprint projects and sustainability reporting. He has worked at AENOR since 2022 and has already participated as an auditor in several AFOLU projects in different carbon schemes, such as VCS, CCB, FCPF, Cercarbono and BCR. He is an expert in Climate, Community and Biodiversity aspects and has worked in LATAM, North America, Africa and Europe countries. He speaks Spanish, English and French fluently.

Daniel Masika is an agroforestry expert with experience in similar assessments in Climate Change, food and livelihood, for more than 10 years. His background studies in the bachelorette were in Agriculture, soil Sciences and agroforestry systems at the Master of philosophy level. Daniel has worked extensively in CCB

& VCS assessments and issues related to food security, livelihood programs, agroforestry, disaster risk reduction, natural resources management, climate-smart agriculture technologies among other matters, providing technical assessments. Daniel can speak Swahili and has a deep knowledge of the social and cultural livelihoods of Africa.

José Luis Fuentes is the manager of the Climate Change Unit of AENOR. He is a Forestry Engineer with a master's in business administration and a Post-Graduate in Environmental Management. He is fluent in Spanish and English. He has over 20 years of experience in auditing, consulting and training activities related to environmental and carbon management projects. Jose Luis has actively participated in the audit of international sustainable development projects in several carbon schemes, such as the Clean Development Mechanisms (CDM), Verified Carbon Standard (VCS), Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards (CCB), Gold Standard (GS) and carbon footprints (ISO 14067 and ISO 14064). Jose Luis has extensive technical knowledge about the regulatory framework, policies and technical provisions emanating from the Paris Agreement, the Kyoto Protocol and the Conferences of the Parties.

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 the verification criteria.

The verification has been performed through a deep desk review, site visit to the project, interviews with local stakeholders, and interviews with relevant personnel responsibly for monitoring. 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. The sample methods assessed the project components that match with key characteristics in the entire documentation to be examined and the requirements of the VCS and CCB. In addition, sampling was designed to yield insights and observation that closely align with the real context onsite, the current project status and its alignment with the validated project documentation.

AENOR reproduced and verified 100% of sheets in the spreadsheet of emission reduction calculations /4/, land use analysis /5/ and the data-calculations carried out in those sheets for the monitoring period 1 January 2018 – 31 December 2019 for the project area. The project area was 100% checked using the GIS database and shape files /26-32/. The carbon calculations were also 100% verified and crosschecked with validated values.

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 emission reductions 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 I.
- 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 reductions based on verifiable and reliable evidence.

2.3 Document Review

The monitoring report /2/, 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 Report /214/ for this monitoring period were assessed, as well.

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

2.4 Interviews

The AENOR's verification team conducted interviews with project developers; local stakeholders; and key personnel involved in the project activity, in order to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review.

The field visit took place from 09/06/2022 to 11/06/2022 in which the auditor visited the project area, interviewed key stakeholders, staff and other related experts, and also reviewed the monitoring report and supporting documents. The people interviewed were those directly affected or involved in the project activity and in some cases were just indirectly affected. Finally, some activities stated within the MR were also reviewed during the on-site visit and verified with the information provided.

Additional to site visit, some meetings via teleconferences were carried during the year 2022 in order to additionally review the calculation and verify the processing data from satellite images. The scope of the verification was to assess the conformance of information in the monitoring report with the VCS and CCB requirements.

The following table summarizes the interviews carried out during the process.

Name	Role/Relation to the project	Date of the meeting
Marlin Valencia	Representante legal CONCOMARPE Rio Pepe	June 9th 2022
Deyler Mosquera	Coordinador jurídico CONCOMARPE Rio Pepe	June 9th 2022
Jose Quinto	Asistente fiscal CONCOMARPE Rio Pepe	June 9th 2022
Jairo Mosquera	Vocal CONCOMARPE Rio Pepe	June 9th 2022
Juan Mosquera	Director financiero CONCOMARPE Rio Pepe	June 9th 2022
Yuli Moreno	Tesorera CONCOMARPE Rio Pepe	June 9th 2022
Dilma Rodríguez	Coordinadora REDD+ CONCOMARPE Rio Pepe WWC-P&B	June 10th 2022
María Rosima	Fiscal CONCOMARPE Rio Pepe	June 10th 2022
Manuel Mosquera	Promotor CONCOMARPE Rio Pepe	June 10th 2022
Jhon Fredis Mosquera	Técnico agropecuario CONCOMARPE Rio Pepe	June 10th 2022
Jair Mosquera	Representante legal ACABA	June 11th 2022
Maria Diana Mosquera	Tesorera ACABA	June 11th 2022
Arlenís Rivas	Promotor SIG ACABA	June 11th 2022
Deber Lozano	Gerente ACABA	June 11th 2022
Carlos Hurtado	Presidente ACABA	June 11th 2022
Mirsa Mosquera	Promotor REDD+ ACABA	June 11th 2022
Jeferson Quinto	Coordinador REDD+ ACABA WWC-P&B	June 11th 2022

The completed participant list can be found on Appendix III, at the end of this report.

2.5 Site Inspections

The objectives of the on-site inspections performed were mainly to cross check the description provided in the monitoring report, related to the VCS and CCB requirement implemented by the proponent, including:

- Ensuring that the geographic area of the project, as reported in the CCB-VCS-PD and the accompanying KML file, is in conformance with Section 3.11.1 of the VCS Standard.

- Performing a risk-based review of the project area to ensure that the project conforms to all other requirements of the VCS rules and the methodology.
- Observing the Project Proponent's evidence and collect and record data in order to assess whether data collection techniques conform to the monitoring plan and related documentation and to evaluate data quality control systems.
- Selecting samples of data and information for verification in order to meet a reasonable level of assurance and to meet the materiality requirements of the project, as required by Section 4.1.8 of the VCS Standard.
- Performing a risk-based review of the project area to ensure that the project is in conformance the eligibility requirements of the VCS rules and the applicability conditions of the methodology; and
- Interviewing local authorities to confirm that the project operates in accordance with current permits and authorizations and its relationship with local actors and communities.
- Interviewing key personnel involved in the mentoring and observing monitoring practices.
- Verify activities in the project zone.

The following issues, among others, were assessed in-situ during the field visit:

- Project Zone /26-28/
- Illegal activities
- Monitoring System /200/
- Trainings /54-60/
- Annual capacitation /50-170/
- Biodiversity monitoring /201-209/
- QA/QC
- Dissemination documents
- Governance activities
- Types of beneficiaries
- SOPs and Policies /42-49/

The schedule that the audit team followed during the visit was similar to the following:

Activities	Location	Date
Arrival Apartado - Quibdo 9:30am	Quibdo	09/06/2022
(Opening meeting) Technical interview with consejos comunitarios, Legal Representative of Rio Pepe and ACABA, Fondo Accion, (Chemonics) Paramos y bosques, EP Carbon, Wildlife Works Carbon. 1:30 pm	Puerto Meluk	09/06/2022
Review of documents experiences on training, employment, well-being, different beneficiaries.	Puerto Meluk	09/06/2022
Baseline determination: Scope and methods, roles, schedule, activities, MR, Pools and GHG, Carbon stock calculations.	Puerto Meluk	09/06/2022
Field visit and interview with beneficiaries of Improved land management. New productive agricultural activities (Achiote)	Acaba Rio Pepe	10/06/2022
Field visit, beneficiaries of the productive alternatives of the REDD + project (corteros interview) review of patrolling reports. People from the community hired for patrolling. Loggers participating in monitoring tours	Acaba Rio Pepe	10/06/2022
Field visit. Examples of biodiversity monitoring interviews. fauna records registered. Involvement of the community in the surveillance and patrolling of forests	Acaba Rio Pepe	10/06/2022
Participation of woman, surveillance and patrolling of forests. Cocoa cacao, banana, sugar cane, livestock and aquaculture cultivation beneficiaries and value chains (sales)	Acaba Rio Pepe	11/06/2022
Stakeholder Access to Project Documents, Grievances, Benefit Sharing Mechanisms implementation.	Acaba Rio Pepe	11/06/2022
Final meeting	Puerto Meluk	11/06/2022

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 CLs and CARs were fully resolved. Specifically, 21 CARs and 17 CLs were reported.

All findings issued by the AENOR audit team during the verification process have been closed for both VCS and CCB Standards. All findings issued during the verification process, and the inputs for their closure, are described in Appendix II of this report.

2.6.1 Forward Action Requests

The following forward action requests (FAR), has been raised during the current monitoring period.

According to section 2.1.9 of the MR: “Article 40 of Resolution 1447 states that a Maximum Mitigation Potential (MMP) for GHG emissions that were generated from January 2016 until December 2019 should be calculated based upon the submitted FREL.

In the absence of a geographically-appropriate FREL (for the project area), RENARE, MADS, and IDEAM have stated that they will instead establish an MMP based on official data from the national monitoring system.”

However, the calculations have not yet been finalized. Although it is understood that project verification processes can continue in parallel or in advance of the final MMP calculations, this must be monitored in future verification events.

Hence, the VVB (validation and verification body) who carries out the next verification will need to verify verifies that the final Maximum Mitigation Potential (MMP) calculations are available and legally applicable to the project case.

2.7 Eligibility for Validation Activities

AENOR has not conducted validation activities as part of this verification. Nonetheless, AENOR holds accreditation for validation and verification for the sectoral scope 14. Agriculture, Forestry, Land Use.

3. VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

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

3.2 Methodology Deviations

There have been no methodology deviations or the criteria and procedures for monitoring that affect the applicability of the methodology, additionality, or the baseline scenario's appropriateness. Therefore, the project remains in compliance with the applied methodology: VM0006 V2.2 Methodology for Carbon Accounting for Mosaic and Landscape-scale REDD projects.

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

The following project description deviations were identified during the current monitoring period. Regarding the other entities involved in the project, since its formulation and implementation has had the support of international cooperation, specifically USAID and it is clear that the resources for the projects are not executed directly by the cooperation, but by different operators who apply to the calls periodically opened by USAID. For the period 2019 USAID was implementing the program called Páramos y Bosques which among its components included support for the implementation and monitoring of BioREDD+ projects. It should be recalled that the BioREDD+ program was the one that structured and accompanied the validation of 8 REDD+ initiatives including the current project. USAID's Paramos y Bosques program was

implemented by Chemonics International and its allies EP Carbon and WildLife Works Colombia, hence they are new entities that were temporarily linked to the monitoring and implementation processes. The table of the section “project description deviations” of the monitoring report enumerates the roles of the people involved in the project in this verification. AENOR considers that the changes are deemed correct, since the VVB has interviewed most of these representatives during the onsite visit, and they explained the changes that the project suffered since its validation, as well as the changes of different companies involved in the validation or verification, such as EP Carbon or Wildlife Works Carbon. Therefore, AENOR considers that the project description deviation is properly assessed and the roles and responsibilities explained do match with the testimonies gathered onsite. This deviation does not affect the feasibility of the project.

Also, the project proponent enumerated some deviations that occurred in previous verification event. The previous project description deviations are described in the MR, and their assessment was done by the previous verification event by the VVB and deemed that the previous PD deviations 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. Some of these changes are for example the change in the frequency of monitoring for several parameters in the community or biodiversity sections.

In the current monitoring event, AENOR has reassessed the previous deviations and crosschecked with PDD and last MR. AENOR deems that the information provided is reliable and correct.

3.4 Minor Changes to Project Description (Rules 3.5.6)

There have been no community or biodiversity changes to project design that would either require or not require a project description deviation that occurred during the monitoring period compared with the validated project description. Project implementation and monitoring have been done in conformance with the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards criteria and indicators.

However, the PDD project document was updated, and AENOR checked the changes and justifications provided by PPs. During the verification process, AENOR required further information to check the category of changes and deems that 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 (Rules 4.6)

No public comments were received during the verification process. The audit team confirmed this issue against public information in VERRA database platform.

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 interview with stakeholders, review of activities implemented 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 748,684 tCO₂e for the monitoring period. The standardized benefit metrics, including: GHG emission reductions or removals; Forest cover; Training; Employment; Livelihoods; Health; Education; Water; Well-being and Biodiversity conservation. The audit team reviewed information reported in this section against supporting evidences listed in Appendix I and further information referenced in proper sections stated in standardized benefits; complementary, due to the onsite audit visit, the VVB was able to personally evidence and crosscheck all this information, the audit team has verified that all achievements reported are substantiated with information provided in the body of the CCB-VCS-PD.

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

4.3 General

4.3.1 Implementation Status (G1.9)

Section 2.2 of the monitoring report provides the 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 2.2.1 of the monitoring report provide complete information of activities carried out and impacts of these activities for the goals of the project. Project objectives and activities to reach them are analysed with their outputs and outcomes for the present monitoring period.

The most important milestones are described in the in section 2.2.1 of the monitoring report. The following table summarizes the assessment carried out by the audit team:

Date	Milestone(s) in the project's development and implementation	VVB Assessment
Dic-14	Project start date, based on the date in which the letter of intent was signed by the then most recent signatory community authority (consejos comunitarios)	Assessed by the review of the PDD and previous MRs. Some relevant information was also gathered during the onsite interviews. Also Verra Registry is a source of information.
Mar-15	Successful VCS and CCBA Validation of project.	Assessed by the review of the PDD and previous MRs. Some relevant information was also gathered during the onsite interviews. Also Verra Registry is a source of information.
Sep-15	USAID support to the project to initiate the planning and execution of activities designed in the PD project document, through the Connected Landscapes Program.	Assessed by the review of the PDD and previous MRs. Some relevant information was also gathered during the onsite interviews.
Feb-16	Conformation and training of REDD + units for project management	Assessed by the review of the PDD and previous MRs. Some relevant information was also gathered during the onsite interviews.
Jun-16	Implementation of productive alternatives. Technical assistance, training, tools and supplies, improvement and management of existing crops, exchange tours on achiote.	Assessed by the review of the PDD and previous MRs. Some relevant information was also gathered during the onsite interviews.
Oct-Dic 2016	PDDs disseminated and translated into locally appropriate language	Assessed by the review of the PDD and previous MRs. Some relevant information was also gathered during the onsite interviews.
Apr-2017	Initial Mechanism of Distribution of Benefits Agreement and Mitigation Actions Document for the implementation of REDD activities	Assessed by the review of the PDD and previous MRs. Some relevant information was also gathered during the onsite interviews.
Jun-17	Conformation of Interethnic Agenda: as a space for decision making and community participation under the leadership of local representatives of the 8 REDD+ projects in the Pacific.	Assessed by the review of the PDD and previous MRs. Some relevant information was also gathered during the onsite interviews.
Nov-17	Participation spaces and participatory adjustment of the PDDs and elaboration of SOPs for all REDD + activities	Assessed by the review of the PDD and previous MRs. Some relevant information was also gathered during the onsite interviews.
Feb-18	Meeting of Legal Representatives Community REDD+ Portfolio. Verification Process and ERPA	Assessed during the on-site visit and the assessment of some evidence such as the table of social indicators.
Mar-18	USAID support to the project to continue with the implementation of activities focused on the project's objectives, through: Paramos and Forests Program	Assessed during the on-site visit and the assessment of some evidence such as the table of social indicators.
Jun-18	Meeting with community leaders to explain the activities and costs of the verification process. Lead by Paramos y Bosques / Fondo Acción	Assessed during the on-site visit and the assessment of some evidence such as the table of social indicators.

Sep-18	LIDAR flights to adjust emission factors. Contract CPS 016 de 2018	Assessed during the on-site visit and the assessment of some evidence such as the table of social indicators.
Feb-19	MRV team starts monitoring REDD+ activities and social indicators.	Assessed during the on-site visit and the assessment of some evidence such as the table of social indicators.
Mar 2019	Socialization meeting of FCS BID Program	Assessed during the on-site visit and the assessment of some evidence such as the table of social indicators.
Mar 2019	Verification visits from auditor team (first verification)	N/A
Apr-May 2019	Start of the public comment period of the project monitoring document MR1	N/A
May-2019	Meeting Agenda Interethnic	Assessed during the on-site visit and the assessment of some evidence such as the table of social indicators.
Jun-19	Development of community assemblies and community participation spaces to strengthen knowledge on REDD+, governance board sessions and discussions aimed mainly at cutters, governance board members and community for the socialization of governance agreements and project documents and community participation spaces for the planning of monitoring activities.	Assessed during the on-site visit and the assessment of some evidence such as the table of social indicators.
Jul- Sept 2019	Development of community monitoring tours and community zoning activities	Assessed during the on-site visit and the assessment of some evidence such as the table of social indicators.
Ago_Sept 2019	Activities focused on strengthening the Achote value chain. Activities focused on sustainable agriculture, maintenance of plantations and marketing of achote; good agricultural practices in cocoa cultivation."	Assessed during the on-site visit and the assessment of some evidence such as the table of social indicators.
Mar-2022	Start of the public comment period of the project monitoring document. First version of the draft verification 2 monitoring report on the Verra platform	Verra Registry review
May-2022	Socialization of advances period 2018-2019. Socialization of the results of the second verification period	Assessed during the on-site visit and the assessment of some evidence such as the table of social indicators.
June-2022	Verification visits from auditor team (first verification)	AENOR visits the project
Dec-2023	Updated version of the draft verification monitoring report 2 is open for public comment	Review of the Verra Registry

After reviewing listed documents AENOR's Verification team confirm the most important dates of the project schedule.

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, that result in the SD contributions described in the MR.

Besides, the project has not participated nor been rejected under any other GHG programs. GHG emission reductions 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.

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 validated CCB-VCS-PD and final version of the monitoring report /2/. There are not material discrepancies between project implementation and the monitoring report.

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

Section 2.2.6 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.

The project states that all the risks were identified by a participatory process with community members, which means that also the management of the risks were considered by the communities' stakeholders. Members of the community first 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 /214/ developed for this reporting period. However, the risks of natural causes are considered minimal. The PP also used the tool "DesInventar System". DesInventar /210/ is a conceptual and methodological tool for the generation of National Disaster Inventories and the construction of databases of damage, losses and in general the effects of disasters. For example, flooding is a form of extreme weather event that does occur naturally within the region with a frequency of less than every 10 years, it poses a negligible risk to carbon stocks, as floods affecting annual crops rather more than forests.

Other risks identified by the communities were for example the possibility that income generated by socioeconomic alternatives to deforestation would not be sufficient to cover the opportunity cost of reduced logging, or that the communities implementing the project may have to bear the costs of implementing the project, including investing in the production of new crops and generating emission reductions on a constant basis. The risk associated with investments in productive activities has been mitigated through the financial support mechanism for activities, within the framework of the implementation of the Sustainable Colombia Fund programs and the Paramos and Bosques project during the 2018-2019 period.

The PP has calculated the risk through the Non-Permanence Risk Report /214/, and it is clear that there has been no great changes in any risk category: internal, external, and natural since the previous verification.

As stated, the changes are minimum, and the audit team has reviewed both, the information provided in the MR, the information provided in the validated PDD, the previous MR and the NPRR /214/. Specifically, an exhaustive assessment of the NPRR /210-216/ has been carried out, analysing the complementary information and attached evidence to the NPRR. During the visit, the audit team asked about the potential risks of the project, and the interviewees mentioned that they were discussing about the possible risks of

the project during different meetings and seminars. Also mentioned the likelihood of natural risks and how they affect the project.

AENOR deems that the Project Proponent correctly identified the risks to the project, and it is implementing actions to reduce or diminish the negative impacts of these risks in the benefits on the Climate, community and biodiversity. Complementarily, the PP has provided several information about the hierarchy of these community groups, and has explained everything based on the current legislation. AENOR reviewed the legislation and confirmed that the information is the same than the information explained during the onsite visit.

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. The measures proposed to guarantee the permanence of climate, community and biodiversity benefits are among others:

- Strengthening of land tenure and forest governance: during the current monitoring period, spaces for inclusive community participation were developed focused on informing the long-term objectives of the project, spaces for dialogue with local environmental authorities and neighbouring communities, sessions of the governing board as a decision-making mechanism for implementation in the territory, improvement of management capacities, formation of REDD+ units, forest conservation activities, patrolling and control of the territory.
- The communities will continue with these, and other activities set out in the PDD, taking into account the requirements of the project as proposed measures to ensure the permanence of the benefits. These measures will also be developed throughout the life 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. The communities have different meetings and socialize all the aspects to develop a proper management plan. The land use analysis is vital to this planification.
- Sustainable intensification of productive activities identified for the area and continued development of alternative livelihoods during the present monitoring period: Technical assistance activities were carried out for annatto and cocoa crops, capacity building in sustainable agricultural practices, plantation maintenance, good cultivation and marketing practices.

AENOR has verified those activities though the desk review and during the on-site visit. Some of the evidence used for the desk review were the PDD, monitoring report and supporting documents law 70 of 1993, under this law, articles are established related to the duties and rights of the communities regarding the conservation of natural resources and environmental protection several meetings with communities and through different interviews by the onsite visit in June 2022.

Hence, AENOR deems that the benefit permanence and the measures implemented are in accordance with the validated PDD and they are reasonable and apparent to further implemented.

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

According to the section 2.3.1, Fondo Acción has established a stakeholder engagement and project management structure that ensures the active participation of all stakeholders in the planning and execution of project activities. The MR lists all the documents that were shared with the communities. 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. The REDD+ training workshops have the objective to socialize the objectives and scope of the verification process, elements of the program, and concepts of climate change and adaptation. Among other objectives, the sharing of documentation is provided in these meetings. Information related to the REDD+ project has been made accessible to the communities through: community assemblies, meetings and different spaces for participation such as board sessions and workshops.

During the onsite visit, the Audit team asked to the interviewees about different topics such as the well reception and understanding of the documentation, the costs risks and benefits of the projects and the comprehension of the verification process. The PP has provided in the monitoring report, section 2.3.4, clear information regarding the structure of the community councils as well as the election of legal representatives. These details do match with the information gathered on the mentioned legislation and with the testimonies obtained from the onsite interviews in 2022. Therefore, AENOR considers that the clarification provided by the PP is correct.

They stated that the documentation was received by different means, but mainly in paper during these workshops and explained publicly. They showed to the auditor the monitoring reports, the summaries and other information that were shared with them to understand the process. Complementary, they also explained that different visual material was provided and showed to improve the understanding of the project verification and REDD+ project. ACABA and Rio Pepé, the community was informed through the presentation of the technical and financial report, an activity that takes place every year. The REDD+ Unit and the board of directors prepare the technical report on the execution of the POA for presentation to the General Assembly in the last month of the year. Finally, the auditor asked about the benefits, costs and risks that the project could cause, and all of the interviewees recognized to be aware of the risks of the project and project activities, the high benefits of the projects and also the costs that they could cause to the project in case they do not follow the correct management.

Monitoring reports are also published online for all stakeholders and interested people to access and presented to communities during face-to-face training and communications.

Verification team reviewed the public information, regarding project activities, in the Fondo Acción webpage and confirm that information regarding project activity is accessible. Furthermore, during the on-site visit, Verification team confirmed by interviews with various local actors that the information generated for the design and distribution of the project has been explained to the community. Some of the material used were: presentations, audio/visual communication materials, booklets, banners, game kits, radio programs, etc.

In all workshops and meetings, a presentation of the Rio Pepe y ACABA REDD+ Project is made, summary documents, brochures, technical sheets, operating manuals have also been disseminated, and in assembly meetings the progress and results achieved in the implementation of the project are presented as a form of accountability.

The summary and other project documents have also been shared, discussed, and explained to communities in various meetings, or trainings and decision-making spaces. These facts were corroborated during the visit assessment and the desk review. AENOR assessed this during the on-site visit and through the review of the participatory workshops and conclude that the stakeholders have access to information regarding project activity.

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

As described in section 2.3.7 of the MR, Fondo Acción has established a stakeholder engagement and project management structure that ensures the active involvement of all stakeholders in project planning and execution. This approach respects the existing community governance structure, where Afro-Colombian communities within the project area are organized as Community Councils, constituted by a General Assembly and a Governing Board, and with an appointed Legal Representative. The Community Council acts to enforce established government laws as well as the internal laws (*derecho propio*) specific to each community. In communities such as those of this project, with significant populations distributed over very large and often isolated areas, subordinate-level community-based organizations called Minor Councils (*consejos menores*) are formed to facilitate efficient governance.

As part of adhering to the main project proponents' normal governance structures and processes, the project's on-going engagement process has involved both formal and informal exchanges between Fondo Acción personnel and the communities. This has been facilitated by the long-term, physical presence of Fondo Acción MRV liaisons (*enlaces*) who live and work in the project areas. These liaisons receive continual professional support from Fondo Acción.

The main structural design of the project has not been affected by stakeholder input since the original validation, however the day to day implementation of the main activities of the REDD+ project (Alternative livelihood activities, MRV, governance and capacities) have been adjusted and contextualized by the project teams and community government representatives to the realities of their territory. This can be seen mainly in the preparation of their annual operational plans (POAs), where technicians and the community jointly define the future implementation of project activities and priorities. Evidence of such processes can be seen in the POA approval assemblies and in the minutes of the POA preparation committees

Verification team reviewed the evidence provided such as the meetings between Fondo Acción and stakeholders to get information and receive inputs and found that the projects did not receive any project design and/or implementation input from stakeholders not directly involved in project implementation or from the communities themselves. Also, during the onsite visit, the verification team asked for the consultation process and the participation of the different stakeholders in this process. All the interviewees answered to be part of the consultation process, being part of the communication and being considered for the taking decisions process. They mentioned that some of the ways they used to participation are; general assemblies, accountability spaces (virtual and in person). Inter-ethnic agenda and Webinars for decision making.

The project proponent, according to the interviews, accepted suggestions provided from the stakeholders directly involved in the project and the project design was developed with the recommendations of those stakeholders. The audit team during the visit met the different liaisons that were part of the Rio Pepe y ACABA REDD+ project and also, they were part of the audit and were interviewed by the VVB.

Then, AENOR's Verification team is able to confirm that the consultation process is effective and fulfil the requirement of VCS and CCB requirements.

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

As described in section 2.3.10. All fundamental aspects of decision making and project implementation have been conducted in coordination with the governing boards of community councils or by smaller designated groups with the authority of the council.

This structure of decision making has respected the existing community governance structure, where communities within the project area are organized in indigenous councils, which in turn are led by a governing board, and represented by a legal representative

Verification team reviewed the evidence provided (annex 2 section 3) and during the site visit the verification team asked participants about their involvement in the implementation and decision making and they assured that they have an open participation, also the verification team asked about how the selection of beneficiaries for productive activities is based. The proponents explained that is based on; vocation and productive interest, being linked to logging activities, being from the territory, percentage of representation of women and the willingness to sign a conservation agreement. Furthermore, during the site visit the verification team could observe how the community governance structure works to convene people and develop a meeting in an ordered way.

Then, AENOR's Verification team is able to confirm that the proponent has enabled effective participation of all communities that want and need to be involved in the project and that they fulfil the requirement CCB requirements.

4.3.7 Anti-discrimination (G3.7)

The PP, and the main implementers (Fondo Accion) and P&B has developed and are implementing an equal opportunity policy in order to ensure compliance with CCB Standards and to avoid discrimination or harassment based on gender, race, religion, and sexual orientation. As they stated in section 2.3.11 of the MR

The audit team confirmed that the main implementer FONDO ACCION has different policies and procedures that assure that they are not involved in or complicit in any form of discrimination or sexual harassment with respect to the project They have and presented in the supporting documents (policies of gender, ethics code, policies anti-corruption among others). Also, the community councils of Rio Pepe_ACABA showed their internal regulations during the site visit and presented them in the supporting documents (CCB-CL5).

Site visit interviews by AENOR with staff and community members did not reveal any instances of discrimination or sexual harassment.

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

The audit team reviewed the supporting documents and identify a Grievance and Redress Mechanism. PDD (2.7.5). During the site visit interviews there was special box at the office and they had a mobile box that is used during the visits to the different sites or meetings in order to receive any complains.

At the site visit AENOR could verify that, both the Fondo acción and the community have not received any complaints about the project's activities.

The grievance procedure, as described in the validated PD, is being followed as confirmed by AENOR.

4.3.9 Worker Relations (G3.9 – G3.12)

The site visit interviews and observations confirm effective training is being given to both staff and community members involved in project activities, according to its positions and relation to the project. These trainings have specifically focused on the several areas of professional development (annex 2 section 3). local hiring is preferred when local applicants are qualified. The project also particularly encourages women to join. Training opportunities are available to all.

As stated in section 2.3.13 of the MR, Over the course of the second monitoring period, Fondo Acción has provided a number of training and capacity building activities for both people working directly under the REDD+ project as well as for any other willing and able community members

- Training in Participatory zoning for governance strengthening: Use of cartography for zoning, 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: pest control, sexual and asexual reproduction of crops, fertilization and crop overview

At the time of the closure of this monitoring period (2018-2019), the project continues to operate under the umbrella employment law of 1950 titled “Codigo Sustantivo del Trabajo”, beneath which all worker rights in Colombia are established. Since 1950, several by-laws have been approved to further regulate, complement, or modify the “Codigo”. The project and implementers follow and respect all this national laws.

Fondo Acción has complied with all relevant Colombian law regarding worker safety, as have all occupational activities created under the project. All staff members are covered with insurance for work-related risks. The proponent was asked to present an assessment of substantial risks for the project implementation. (matrix of risks) was obtained in the supporting documents and reviewed by the audit team

Relations between the project and employees are as intended by the validated project description; and AENOR deems that the project fulfills with CCB requirements related to labor relations.

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

The project proponent and main implementers involved in this project have a large amount of experience in international forest carbon projects and other development projects, regarding monitoring and quantification of project GHG emissions reductions, biodiversity monitoring

Due to previous project experience and credentials of the project development team, all the skills needed to implement a project of this nature can be supplied by the project proponents and associates. On site Interviews with PP project management staff, P&B staff, Fondo Accion and EP Carbon LLC as support for the carbon project confirmed their knowledge and abilities.

The project provided confidential documents, including the budget and cash flow break even and other documents (annex 2 section 1), including costs of all aspects of the project, as well as opportunity cost of selective logging.

The project's main implementing partner, Fondo Acción has a very clear cut process, protocol, and policy to ensure that any entity involved with the project is not involved in or complicit in any form of corruption such as bribery, embezzlement, fraud, favoritism, cronyism, nepotism, extortion, and collusion:

The project has the capacity to implement the project in accordance with the validated project description. The audit team considers that the project management has defined and set a strong and comprehensive framework to prevent the commitment any kind of illicit acts by project staff. No evidence of any form of corruption or illegality was found during the review of the provided evidence and the site visit. Internal procedures, audits, and best management practices to avoid the involvement of the teams and collaborators in in any form of corruption such as bribery, embezzlement, fraud, favoritism, cronyism, nepotism, extortion, and collusion are implemented.

4.3.11 Commercially Sensitive Information (Rules 3.5.13 – 3.5.14)

All documentation related to the financial health of the implementing organizations and the projects have been provided to the auditor team in a separate confidential annex. In the opinion of AENOR, the exclusion of this financial information of the MR is justified due to be considered commercially sensitive information.

There is no commercially sensitive information related to the monitoring of GHG emissions reductions. Additionally, all the information on the financial statements of Fondo Acción, being a mixed public/private entity, is available to the public on its website: <https://fondoaccion.org/estados-financieros/>

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

The project area has clearly established boundaries. The main project proponents, the communities themselves, are still the legal owners of the land and forests in the project areas as described in the validated (PD). Boundaries have not changed since the project start date. These lands still belong to the communities and cannot, be sold, transferred, or have liens set upon them

The communities consider that they have not invaded private property, because the entire REDD+ project is framed within the territories granted by INCORA (Colombian Institute of Agrarian Reform, currently INCODER) for ethnic communities, which means that there have been no invasions nor have territories other than those of the communities themselves been affected.

At the site visit AENOR audit team could review the official title for the Acaba Community Council that was granted by Resolution 01152 of May 23, 2001, and the the official title for Río Pepé Community Council, 8,191ha were recognized in the municipality of Medio Baudó by Resolution 01125 of May 23, 2000;

None of the project activities carried out by the project have required any relocation, voluntary or involuntary; nor have any rights holders been forced to relocate activities important to their culture and livelihood. These conditions have not changed since the project's validation as mentioned in section 2.5.3.

The site visit did not find any instances of the project encroaching on private property. Additionally, after onsite interviews with community members, interviews with project management, and rangers and observations during the site visit, there is no clue that indicates that anyone was involuntarily relocated as a result of the project. Project activities will not at any time lead to the involuntary removal or relocation of land ownership rights and do not oblige communities associated with the project to relocate activities important to their culture or livelihood.

As section 2.2 states; within the collective territory in the 2018-2019 period, due to the implementation of the project, the most predominant illegal activity is associated with the illegal extraction of wood for consumption and commercialization in the local and regional market, this activity has been significantly reduced, especially for the internal work with the people of the community who depended economically on the illegal extraction of wood and today have been linked to the alternative productive activities and to the groups that protect the territory and the forests, within the framework of the REDD+ project. The Project does not and has not benefited from any illegal activity. At site visit the audit team interview several people that work at the project or that is beneficiary of the project that used to do, illegal extraction of wood for consumption and commercialization. So they mention that the project gave them an alternative for their livelihood.

According to information provided in the MR and gathered from PP, Fondo Acicon, P&B and on site interviews, AENOR can confirm that the project protects the rights of local peoples, communities, and other stakeholders in accordance with the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards and the validated project design.

4.3.13 Legal Status (G5.6)

The MR lists all the relevant national and local laws and regulations in section 2.5.6. Evidence of its fulfillment is considered complete. All of these laws were, and are still, applicable at the end of the second reporting period. Multiple new decrees and resolutions have come into effect since project validation. The project is in compliance with all of these new relevant regulations

During the site visit a series of interviews were done with different people from the project, community members and local authorities in order to verify compliance. AENOR did not detect during the verification process any incompliance 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 CCB-VCS-PD. Further, the verification team reproduced the calculations to ensure accuracy of the results. Inventory data, 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. If needed, 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 CCB-VCS-PD. Where applicable, references for analysis methods or default values were checked against relevant scientific literature for best practice. Some meetings with the PP were performed remotely and onsite during the audit in June 2022.

Verification team assessed the parameters listed in section 3.1 of the final version of the monitoring report, including fixed (available at validation) and monitored parameters and considered that they are complete and in accordance with the applied methodology and validated CCB-VCS-PD. Verification team confirms that the emission reductions, including accuracy of spreadsheet formulae, conversions and aggregations are consistent in the use of the data and parameters. Also, the methods and formulae set out in the project description for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage have been followed.

The parameters available at validation are the following:

Parameter	Description	Value	Assessment
CF	Carbon fraction of dry matter in wood	0.485	Review of the source IPCC and the annex AA GeoECOMap Task 8&9. Review of the correct application in the spreadsheet.
E	Average combustion efficiency of the aboveground tree biomass	0.3	Review of Table 3.A.14 of IPCC GPG LULUCF. Review of the correct application in the spreadsheet.
P	Average proportion of mass burned from the aboveground tree biomass.	83.9	Review of GPG-LULUCF Table 3A.1.13 and the correct usage in the spreadsheet
GWP_{CH_4}	Global Warming Potential for CH ₄	25	Review of the IPCC default value and the correct usage in

			the spreadsheet (carbon calculations)
ER_{CH_4}	Emission ratios for CH ₄	0.012	Review of the Table 3A.1.15 in IPCC GPG-LULUCF 2003 and the correct usage in the carbon calculation spreadsheet
sc_1	First shape factor for the forest scarcity equation; steepness of the decrease in deforestation rate (greater is steeper).	-0.497	The VVB reviewed the PDD and the correct usage in current MR and previous ones. AENOR reviewed the Methodology to confirm the applicability and the justification
sc_2	Second shape factor for the forest scarcity equation; relative deforested area at which the deforestation rate will be 50% of the initial deforestation rate.	12.63	The VVB reviewed the PDD and the correct usage in current MR and previous ones. AENOR reviewed the Methodology to confirm the applicability and the justification
$wwf(ty)$	Fraction of carbon in harvested wood products that are emitted immediately because of mill inefficiency for wood class <i>ty</i> . This can be estimated by multiplying the applicable fraction to the total amount of carbon in different harvested wood product category.	24%	Review of the evidence from Winjum et al, and the correct description in the PDD and application in the spreadsheet
$slp(ty)$	Proportion of short lived products	0.2	Review of the evidence from Winjum et al, and the correct description in the PDD and application in the spreadsheet
$fo(ty)$	Fraction of carbon that will be emitted to the atmosphere between 5 and 100 years of harvest for wood class <i>ty</i> .	0.84	Review of the evidence from Winjum et al, and the correct description in the PDD and application in the spreadsheet
$\rho_{wood,j}$	Average basic wood density of species or species group <i>j</i>	No change from validation	Review of the PDD and the spreadsheet to crosscheck the value.

BEF_2	Biomass expansion factor for converting volumes of extracted round wood to total aboveground biomass (including bark).	Broadleaf = 3.4 (2.0 – 9.0)	Review of the Table 3A.1.10 in IPCC GPG-LULUCF 2003 and the correct usage in the carbon calculation spreadsheet
$EF_{rice,max}$	Maximal emission factor for methane	36	Review of the evidence from Le Mer and Roger, 2001 et al, and the correct description in the PDD and application in the spreadsheet
$NCV_{biomass}$	Net calorific value of non-renewable biomass that is substituted.	0.015	Review of the PDD

The parameters monitored are the following:

Parameter	Description	Value	Assessment
$size_{projectArea}$, $size_{leakageArea}$, $size_{referenceRegion}$, $size_{referenceForest}$	Size of project area, leakage area, reference region, and forest area in the reference region	Size_projectArea: 48,177 ha Size_leakageArea: 25,159 ha Size_referenceRegion: 282,914 ha Size_referenceForest: 155,778 ha	Through GIS information and KML
$\Delta area_{projectAreaEAH,ProjectScenario}(t,i)$	Hectares undergoing transition i within the project area, excluding ANR and harvest areas, under the project scenario during year t . [ha yr ⁻¹].	Values detailed in the Ex-Post calculation	Review of the ex-post calculation and the correct usage according to the methodology and PDD
$\Delta area_{projectAreaEAH,baselineScenario}(t,i)$	Hectares undergoing transition i within the project area, excluding	Same as PDD. Values detailed in the Ex-Post calculation	Review of the ex-post calculation

	the ANR area, and harvest areas, under the baseline scenario for year t .		and the correct usage according to the methodology and PDD
$\Delta area_{projectAreaWithANR,baselineScenario}(t,i)$	Hectares undergoing transition i within the project area with ANR under the baseline scenario for year t .	N/A	N/A
$\Delta area_{leakageArea,projectScenario}(t,i)$	Hectares undergoing transition i within the leakage area under the project scenario for year t	Values detailed in the Ex-Post calculation	Review of the ex-post calculation and the correct usage according to the methodology and PDD
$\Delta area_{leakageArea,baselineScenario}(t,i)$	Hectares undergoing transition i within the leakage area under the baseline scenario during year t	Same as PDD. Values detailed in the Ex-Post calculation	Review of the ex-post calculation and the correct usage according to the methodology and PDD
$\Delta area_{historical}(CS_1 \rightarrow CS_2, t_1 \rightarrow t_2)$	Area of transition from LULC class or forest stratum 1 to 2 from time 1 to 2 during the historical reference period	Same as PDD	Review of the ex-post calculation and the correct usage according to the

			methodology and PDD
$RFRGrate(CS_1 \rightarrow CS_2)$	Relative annual forest cover increase and regeneration factor for the transition from class or stratum 1 to 2.	N/A	N/A
$area_{historical}(CS_1, t_1)$	Total area of LULC class or forest stratum 1 at time 1	Same as PDD	Review of the ex-post calculation and the correct usage according to the methodology and PDD
$area_{biomassLoss}(i)$	Total annual area of LULC class that was cleared for creating firebreaks	N/A	N/A
$area_{fireBiomassLoss}(i)$	Annual area of forest stratum that was cleared by using prescribed burning	N/A	N/A
$area_{fireBiomassLoss,ANR}(t, i)$	Area of biomass removed by prescribed burning within ANR stratum i during year t	N/A	N/A
$area_{projectAreaWithANR,projectScenario}(t, i)$	Amount of land on which ANR activities are planned under the project scenario for year t and in stratum i	N/A	N/A

$area_{harvest}(t, i)$	Area of forest in harvest stratum i that is harvested at time t .	N/A	N/A
$area_{projectAreaWithHarvest, projectScenario}(t, i)$	Size of strata i within the project area with harvest activities during year t under the project scenario.	N/A	N/A
$\Delta area_{projectAreaWithHarvest, baselineScenario}(t, i)$	Hectares undergoing transition i within the harvest areas under the baseline scenario during year t .	N/A	N/A
$BetaReg_{DF}(t)$ and $BetaReg_{DG}(t)$	Beta regression model describing the relationship between time and deforestation/degradation rate in the reference region during the historical reference period.	N/A	N/A
Area under agricultural intensification	Size of the area of agricultural intensification separated for each agricultural intensification measure	N/A	N/A
Yields under agricultural intensification	Harvested yield for agricultural intensification practices	N/A	N/A
NTFP Harvest rate	Annual volumes of non-timber products extracted	N/A	N/A

Local NTFP price	Price of non-timber forest products on local markets	N/A	N/A
$CFW_{baseline}$	Annual volume of fuel wood gathering for commercial sale and charcoal production in the baseline scenario	N/A	N/A
$DFW_{baseline}$	Annual volume of fuel wood gathered for domestic and local energy in the baseline scenario	N/A	N/A
$DFW_{project}$	Biomass (dry matter) of fuel wood collected by project participants under the project scenario.	N/A	N/A
$DFW_{allowed}$	Biomass (dry matter) of allowed fuel wood collection in the project area under the project scenario. This amount is typically fixed in a management plan. [m3 yr-1]	N/A	N/A
$VG_{baseline}$	Biomass (dry matter) of understory vegetation extraction by project participants under the baseline scenario. [Mg DM yr-1]	N/A	N/A
$VG_{project}$	Biomass (dry matter) of understory vegetation extraction by project participants under the project scenario.	N/A	N/A

$VG_{allowed}$	Biomass (dry matter) of allowed as understory vegetation extraction under the project scenario. This amount is typically fixed in a management plan	N/A	N/A
$CT_{baseline}(h, j, ty, t)$	Annually extracted volume of harvested timber round-wood for commercial on-sale under the baseline scenario during harvest by species j and wood product class ty during year t	Detailed in the PDD	Reviewed and contrasted with the PDD and the carbon calculations
$CT_{allowed}$	Annually allowed volume of harvested timber round-wood for commercial on-sale under the project scenario	N/A	N/A
$CT_{project}(h, j, ty, t)$	Annually extracted volume of harvested timber round-wood for commercial on-sale inside the project area under the project scenario during harvest h by species j and wood product class ty during year t .	N/A	N/A
$DT_{baseline}(h, j, ty, t)$	Annually extracted volume of timber for domestic and local use, round wood under the baseline scenario during harvest h by species j and wood	Value detailed in the PDD	Reviewed and contrasted with the PDD and the carbon calculations

	product class ty during year t .		
$DT_{allowed}$	Annually allowed volume of harvested timber round-wood for domestic and local use under the project scenario	N/A	N/A
$DT_{project}(h, j, ty, t)$	Annually extracted volume of timber for domestic and local use, round wood inside the project area under the project scenario during harvest h by species j and wood product class ty during year t .	N/A	N/A
$contribution_{DF}(d)$ and $contribution_{DG}(d)$	Relative contribution of driver i respectively to total deforestation and forest degradation	Same as PDD	Review of the ex-post calculation and the correct usage according to the methodology and PDD
$RelativeDriverImpact_{DF}(t, d)$ and $RelativeDriverImpact_{DG}(t, d)$	Relative impact of the geographically unconstrained driver d at time t of the crediting period respectively on deforestation and forest degradation.	Same as PDD	Reviewed and contrasted with the PDD and the carbon calculations
$leakage_{unconstrained}(d)$	Leakage cancellation rate for avoiding deforestation/degradation from geographically unconstrained drivers.	Values detailed in the Ex-Post calculations and in the PDD.	Review of the ex-post calculation and the correct usage

			according to the methodology and PDD
$effectiveness(a, d)$	Effectiveness of every project activity a in decreasing any deforestation driver d relative to that driver's contribution to deforestation and forest degradation,	Values detailed in the Ex-Post calculations and the PDD	Reviewed and contrasted with the PDD and the carbon calculations
$\Delta A_{rice}(t)$	Annual increase in harvested area of rice due to leakage prevention measures.	N/A	N/A
$t_{flooded,max}$	Maximal period of time a field is flooded	N/A	N/A
$GR_{baseline}$	Number of grazing animals of type g within the project boundary baseline	N/A	N/A
$GR_{allowed}$	Number of grazing animals of type g allowed for grazing within the project boundary in the project scenario	N/A	N/A
$Fuelwood(t)$ and Fuel t	Average annual volume of biomass fuel consumed by households in the absence of the project activity in year t for cooking purpose.	N/A	N/A
$HH_{non-CFE}(t)$	Total number of households in the	N/A	N/A

	project area that collect biomass fuel from the project area and do not use CFE in year t .		
η_{old}	Efficiency of the project cook stoves or appliances.	N/A	N/A
η_{new}	Efficiency of the baseline cook stoves or appliances.	N/A	N/A
$U_{CFE}(t)$	Fraction of cumulative usage rate for technologies in project scenario in year t .	N/A	N/A
$DF_{LeakageCFE}(t)$	Leakage discount factor applicable to GHG emissions reduction benefits from CFE activities [-]	N/A	N/A
$EF_{non-CO2,fuel}, EF_{CO2,fuel}$	Respectively, non-CO2 emission factor of the fuel that is reduced and CO2 emission factor for the substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers.	N/A	N/A
EF_{forest}	Derived from project specific carbon stock data, estimated through field measurements and LiDAR data collection.	Values detailed in the Ex-Post calculations according to the LiDAR measurements	Reviewed and contrasted with the PDD and the carbon calculations spreadsheet
$OM_o(i)$	Plant-derived organic matter of LULC class or	Values detailed in the Ex-Post calculations according to the	Review of the ex-post calculation

	forest stratum i in pool o . [Mg DM ha ⁻¹]	LiDAR measurements	and the correct usage according to the methodology and PDD
$proportion_{DF}(d)$ and $proportion_{DG}(d)$	Proportion of the gradual carbon loss that leads to deforestation or forest degradation, respectively, due to driver d	Same as validation	Reviewed and contrasted with the PDD and the carbon calculations spreadsheet
$C(t, i)$	Carbon stock density at time t in stratum i .	Values detailed in the Ex-Post calculations	Reviewed and contrasted with the PDD and the carbon calculations spreadsheet
$f_{allometric}(y)$	Allometric relationship to convert a tree metric such as DBH or tree height into biomass	Same as validation	Reviewed and contrasted with the PDD and the carbon calculations spreadsheet
$f_{belowground}(y)$	Relationship between aboveground and belowground biomass, such as a root-to-shoot ratio	Same as validation	Reviewed and contrasted with the PDD and the carbon calculations

			spreadsheet
$C_{Harvest}(t, i)$	Biomass carbon stock density at time t in stratum i in harvested areas.	N/A	N/A
$CE_{inventory, harvest}(t, i)$	Combined error in estimate of average biomass stock density in harvest areas in stratum i at time t .	N/A	N/A
$CE_{inventory, ANR}(t, i)$	Combined error in estimate of average biomass stock density in ANR areas in stratum i at time t .	N/A	N/A
$u_{classification}$	Discounting factor for NERs from avoided deforestation, based on the accuracy of classification, i.e. dividing land into broad land use types.	0.9	Reviewed in the carbon calculations
$u_{stratification}$	Discounting factor for NERs from avoided degradation, based on the accuracy of stratification, i.e. dividing forest into individual forest biomass classes.	0.75	Reviewed in the carbon calculations
$u_{transition}(i)$	Discounting factor for the emission factor for the transition from LULC class or forest stratum 1 to class 2 according to the	Values detailed in the Ex-Post calculations	Reviewed in the carbon calculations

	uncertainty of the biomass inventory.		
--	---------------------------------------	--	--

To quantify current carbon stocks in the project area, the project proponent used the procedure defined in the methodology VM0006 V2.2 Methodology for Carbon Accounting for Mosaic and Landscape-scale REDD projects. The steps to calculate emission reduction are detailed in section 3.2 of the CCB-VCS-PD and the results derived from the validated project design document are listed in section 3.2 of the CCB-VCS-MR. Verification team assessed the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet /4-25/, KML files; GIS data /26-32/, remote sensing imagery /5/ and land use changes /4/.

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 baseline emissions have been calculated appropriately using the validated baseline scenario and verified carbon stock densities.

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 emission types. There are no estimated emissions from project activities as outlined in the VM0006 Methodology.

While the VM0006 methodology does not calculate project activity 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:

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

Project emissions were calculated for both deforestation and forest degradation. Total project emissions were equivalent to 68,454 tCO₂e during this monitoring period. They have been divided between the years as shown in table below:

Project Year	Degradation Emissions within Project Area (tCO ₂ e)	Deforestation Emissions within Project Area (tCO ₂ e)	Total Annual GHG Emissions in Project Area (tCO ₂ e)
--------------	--	--	---

2018	24,292	9,739	34,031
2019	24,641	9,782	34,423
Total 2018-2019 (MP)	48,933	19,521	68,454

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 Ex-Post Leakage (tCO2e)
		Degradation	Deforestation		
2018	260,102	8,752	5,113	95,901	95,901
2019	262,122	8,884	5,135	94,399	94,399
Total 2018-2019 (MP)	522,224	17,636	10,248	190,300	190,300

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.

Regarding the information on the Validated PDD, “based on VCS requirements, a market-effects leakage discount factor of 0.2 was applied to the net change in carbon stock (baseline minus project emissions less carbon stored in long-lived wood products in the project area).”

Net GHG emission reductions 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:

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

Equations 107-110 from the methodology were used to calculate each of these emission 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 v2.2)

$\Delta\text{GHG from avoided deforestation:}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{EQ 107} = & \sum_{i=1}^{nrFNFTtransitions} \sum_{tt=1}^t u_{classification} \cdot u_{transition}(i) \\
 & \cdot \left(\begin{aligned} &+ \Delta\text{area}_{projectAreaEAH,projectScenario}(t,i) \\ &- \Delta\text{area}_{projectAreaEAH,baselineScenario}(t,i) \end{aligned} \right) \\
 & \cdot (EF_{AGL}(i) + EF_{AGD}(i, t - tt) + EF_{BG}(i, t - tt) + EF_{SOM}(i, t - tt))
 \end{aligned} \quad [\text{EQ107}]$$

$\Delta\text{GHG from deforestation due to leakage:}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{EQ 108} = & \sum_{i=1}^{nrFNFTtransitions} \sum_{tt=1}^t u_{classification} \cdot u_{transition}(i) \\
 & \cdot \left(\begin{aligned} &+ \Delta\text{area}_{leakageArea,projectScenario}(t,i) \\ &- \Delta\text{area}_{leakageArea,baselineScenario}(t,i) \end{aligned} \right) \\
 & \cdot (EF_{AGL}(i) + EF_{AGD}(i, t - tt) + EF_{BG}(i, t - tt) + EF_{SOM}(i, t - tt))
 \end{aligned} \quad [\text{EQ108}]$$

$\Delta\text{GHG from avoided degradation:}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{EQ 109} = & \sum_{i=1}^{nrStrataTransitions} \sum_{tt=1}^t u_{stratification} \cdot u_{transition}(i) \\
 & \cdot \left(\begin{aligned} &+ \Delta\text{area}_{projectAreaEAH,projectScenario}(t,i) \\ &- \Delta\text{area}_{projectAreaEAH,baselineScenario}(t,i) \end{aligned} \right) \\
 & \cdot (EF_{AGL}(i) + EF_{AGD}(i, t - tt) + EF_{BG}(i, t - tt) + EF_{SOM}(i, t - tt))
 \end{aligned} \quad [\text{EQ109}]$$

$\Delta\text{GHG from degradation due to leakage:}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{EQ 110} = & \sum_{i=1}^{nrStrataTransitions} \sum_{tt=1}^t u_{stratification} \cdot u_{transition}(i) \\
 & \cdot \left(\begin{aligned} &+ \Delta\text{area}_{leakageArea,projectScenario}(t,i) \\ &- \Delta\text{area}_{leakageArea,baselineScenario}(t,i) \end{aligned} \right) \\
 & \cdot (EF_{AGL}(i) + EF_{AGD}(i, t - tt) + EF_{BG}(i, t - tt) + EF_{SOM}(i, t - tt))
 \end{aligned} \quad [\text{EQ110}]$$

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) (tCO ₂ e)	ΔGHG from deforestation due to leakage (EQ108) (tCO ₂ e)	ΔGHG from avoided degradation (EQ109) (tCO ₂ e)	ΔGHG from degradation due to leakage (EQ110) (tCO ₂ e)	ΔGHG due to market effects leakage (EQ111) (tCO ₂ e)	ΔGHG due to wood products (EQ113) (tCO ₂ e)	ΔGHG due to other sources (EQ115) (tCO ₂ e)	Net Emission Reductions (EQ106) (tCO ₂ e)
2018	-231,831	0	-247,677	0	95,901	6,355	0	377,250
2019	-218,413	0	-253,583	0	94,399	6,162	0	371,434
Total 2018-2019 (MP)	-450,244	0	-501,260	0	109,300	12,517	0	748,684

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

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)
2018	507,183	34,031	95,901	377,250
2019	500,256	34,423	94,399	371,434
Total 2018-2019 (MP)	1,007,439	68,454	190,300	748,684

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

$$VCUs = NERs - buffer$$

$$* (\Delta GHG \text{ from avoided deforestation} + \Delta GHG \text{ from avoided degradation} + \Delta GHG \text{ from changes in long lived wood products})$$

The non-permanence risk rating for this project is 10%, according to the NPRR /214/ explained below. Final annual VCUs for this project during this monitoring period were calculated by removing buffer credits from NERs, as shown in the table below. Therefore, during this monitoring period the amount of buffer credits is 93,898 tCO₂e and the Rio Pepe y ACABA REDD+ Project generated 654,786 VCUs.

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

Year	Net Emissions Reductions (tCO ₂ e)	Buffer credits (tCO ₂ e)	Verified Carbon Units (tCO ₂ e)
2018	377,250	47,315	329,935
2019	371,434	46,583	324,851

Total MP	748,684	93,898	654,786
----------	----------------	---------------	----------------

AENOR reproduced the calculations to achieve the same results and deems they are 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, project design document and methodology. Monitored parameters and fixed parameters 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 validated CCB-VCS-PD.

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 reductions were quantified correctly in accordance with the project description and applied methodology.

For all these parameters reported in the monitoring report /2/, AENOR cross-checked with the PDD and the spreadsheet calculations /4/ and deems that values/calculations/methods match and are free of mistakes and errors. AENOR did not find inconsistencies between the project design document, technical annexes, monitoring report and spreadsheet calculation. 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. In relation to the GIS data /26-32/, AENOR has reviewed the satellite images. AENOR has performed an external analysis of the land use change calculation through QGIS, and after the external calculation, AENOR confirmed that the values of land use change and satellite images are also reliable and well calculated.

In order to verify the accuracy and consistency of parameters monitored and used to calculate the emission reductions 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.

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

According to section 3.1.3 of the MR, to ensure that the 2018 LULC classification map produced for this monitoring period met the accuracy thresholds of VM0006, a thematic accuracy assessment was conducted by comparing the results of the classification against reference data. 467 accuracy assessment points were randomly assigned to forest and non-forest classes within the union of the project, leakage, and reference areas. A minimum of 75 points were allocated to each class that was greater than 50,000 ha. AENOR has reviewed the evidence provided by the PP to check the accuracy points and this information was crosschecked with the MR and GIS files to comply with the requirements of classes allocation referred in the VM0006 methodology. According to the MR, the accuracy achieved was 91%. This value was explained through one of the technical meetings between the VVB and the PP, and crosschecked afterwards with the LULUC spreadsheet /4/.

The PP states that internal QA/QC checks are always completed by qualified staff before the dissemination of data, releasing of monitoring reports, or submission of other data. The audit team, during the onsite visit plus some of the technical reviews inspected the QA/QC processes, which were explained and showed by the PP. Among these QA/QC steps, the PP mentions: Review of LULC classification by experts to ensure proper match-up of data and pixel sizes; Checking for and correcting any errors in equations and calculations in carbon stock data or models; or audit checks of the carbon accounting model through the creation of independent manually calculated accounting models. AENOR was able to crosscheck the information of the MR with the information gathered from the auditing process, and deems that the information is reliable and correct.

AENOR's verification team 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. They showed to the VVB the process of carbon and biodiversity monitoring through the onsite visit. In these explanations, the teams showed how they performed the different monitoring activities, where they are performed, the material used and the way in which they store the data.

Interviews with project proponents and inspection of data and results demonstrated that the project proponents possess all 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 emission reductions.

AENOR deems the information, and the sources are reliable and appropriate. AENOR deems that evidence is enough to reproduce calculations in quantity and quality.

4.4.3 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

Verification team has assessed the final version of Non-permanence Risk Report /214/ for the validation and verification process according to the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.0.

Below, it is explained the assessment of the non-permanence risk rating determined by the project participant.

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
Project Management	a) Species planted (where applicable) associated with more than 25% of the stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued are not native or proven to be adapted to the same or similar agro-ecological zone(s) in which the project is located.	0	GHG credits are not based on planted species. It is a REDD+ project, and the audit team visited the project area.
	b) Ongoing enforcement to prevent encroachment by outside actors is required to protect more than 50% of stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued.	2	Community members were employed by the project to perform ongoing patrols of illegal forest use. The VVB reviewed the plans to avoid illegal activities and performed several interviews with different local actors who were in charge of the patrolling activities. The PP also showed the patrolling activities during VVB visit in June 2022.
	c) Management team does not include individuals with significant experience in all skills necessary to successfully undertake all project activities (ie, any area of required experience is not covered by at least one individual with at least 5 year experience in the area).	0	Management team includes individuals with significant experience in all skills necessary to successfully undertake project activities. AENOR has reviewed the CV of the staff as well as other projects performed by them.
	d) Management team does not maintain a presence in the	0	Management team is Fondo Acción, Chemonics, and WWC, who are all

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	country or is located more than a day of travel from the project site, considering all parcels or polygons in the project area.		located within the country. AENOR has reviewed the location of these companies and deems that the information is correct.
	e) Mitigation: Management team includes individuals with significant experience Management team includes individuals with significant experience in AFOLU project design and implementation, carbon accounting and reporting (eg, individuals who have successfully managed projects through validation, verification and issuance of GHG credits) under the VCS Program or other approved GHG programs.	-2	The management team from the Paramos and 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 EP Carbon team, with extensive experience in AFOLU project design and carbon accounting under the VCS Standard. AENOR has reviewed the CV and performed technical interviews with the MT to analyse their performance in Carbon aspects.
	f) Mitigation: Adaptive management plan in place	-2	Section 4.3.1 of the MR provides details on ways in which community members are able to provide feedback in 'Participatory Evaluation of Social Impact' surveys ("ACABA Evaluacion Participativa Impactos 2022.docx") /195/. Additionally, the project has an established Grievance and Redress Mechanism , as outlined in Section 4.1.2 of the MR, which provides community members with opportunities to present grievances to the Community Council. However, the project is viewed positively by the local communities and no grievances were presented during this monitoring period. AENOR has reviewed the evidence mentioned remotely and onsite and deems that the information is reliable. Complementary, the GRM was assessed onsite in June 2022.
	Total Project Management (PM): (a + b + c + d + e + f): -2		

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	Total may be less than zero.		

In AENOR's opinion, total project management risk rating (-2) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool: VCS V4.0 and the short form V.1.2.

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
Financial Viability	a) Project cash flow breakeven point is greater than 10 years from the current risk assessment	0	Not applicable.
	b) Project cash flow breakeven point is between 7 and up to less than 10 years from the current risk assessment	0	Not applicable.
	c) Project cash flow breakeven point between 4 and up to less than 7 years from the current risk assessment	0	Not applicable.
	d) Project cash flow breakeven point is less than 4 years from the current risk assessment	0	AENOR has reviewed the Budget and Cashflow breakeven, and after the analysis, AENOR deems that the calculation has been done properly.
	e) Project has secured less than 15% of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven	0	Not applicable.
	f) Project has secured 15% to less than 40% of funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven	0	Not applicable.
	g) Project has secured 40% to less than 80% of funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven	0	Not applicable.

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	h) Project has secured 80% or more of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven	0	The project has been funded completely through BioREDD+ using funds from USAID which covered all project development and validation costs. AENOR has reviewed the Budget and Cashflow breakeven as well as performed several interviews to confirm this information. Also, AENOR has reviewed the previous MP to understand the process of funding from USAID.
	i) Mitigation: Project has available as callable financial resources at least 50% of total cash out before project reaches breakeven	0	Not applicable.
	Total Financial Viability (FV): (a + b + c + d + e + f): 0 Total may not be less than zero.		

In accordance with provided evidence, the project has secured the funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven. It was verified against cash flow and supporting evidences of incomes and outcomes. Then, in AENOR's opinion, total financial viability risk rating (0) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool: VCS v4.0.

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
Opportunity Cost	a) NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be at least 100% more than that associated with project activities; or where baseline activities are subsistence-driven, net positive community impacts are not demonstrated	0	Not applicable since NPV from project activities is expected to be at least 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity.
	b) NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be between 50% and up to 100% more than from project activities	0	Not applicable since NPV from project activities is expected to be at least 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity.
	c) NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be between 20%	0	Not applicable since NPV from project activities is expected to be at least 50%

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	and up to 50% more than from project activities		more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity.
	d) NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be between 20% more than and up to 20% less than from project activities; or where baseline activities are subsistence-driven, net positive community impacts are demonstrated	0	Not applicable since NPV from project activities is expected to be at least 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity.
	e) NPV from project activities is expected to be between 20% and up to 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity	0	Not applicable since NPV from project activities is expected to be at least 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity.
	f) NPV from project activities is expected to be at least 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity	-4	It is expected that the project activities are 259,06% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use. AENOR has reviewed the opportunity cost of selective logging in the financial health annex /(confidential)/ and deems that the information provided is correct, and project activities are expected to be at least 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity.
	g) Mitigation: Project proponent is a non-profit organization	0	Not applicable: the PP is not a non-profit organization.
	h) Mitigation: Project is protected by legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period	-2	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. AENOR has reviewed PDD and MR.
	i) Mitigation: Project is protected by legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect the	0	Not applicable.

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	credited carbon stocks over at least 100 years.		
	Total Opportunity Cost (OC) (a, b, c, d, e or f) + (g + h or i): -6 Total may be less than 0.		

Then, in AENOR's opinion, total opportunity cost risk rating (-6) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.0.

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
Project Longevity	a) Without legal agreement or requirement to continue the management practice	0	Not applicable
	b) With legal agreement or requirement to continue the management practice	15	The Implementation Plan states that project activities related to protected carbon stocks will continue from years 30-60 of the project. While community agreements and implementation plans are devised for a period of 60 years, the financial plans, which have been approved by the project's legal representatives, are only devised for a 30-year period. Thus, the project has a longevity period of 30 years. The risk associated with project longevity = $30 - (30/2) = 15$
	Total Project Longevity (PL): 15		

In AENOR's opinion, Total Project Longevity (15) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.0.

Therefore, **total internal risk** is calculated as the sum of (PM + FV + OC + PL), totalling 7 (according to the NPR tool the total may not be less than zero).

External Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
Land tenure and access resource	a) Ownership and resource access/use rights are held by same entity(s).	0	Not applicable since they are different entities.
	b) Ownership and resource access/use rights are held by different entity(s) (eg, land is	2	Mangrove areas are considered public goods but also fall under the land titled to the Community Councils.

External Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	government owned and the project proponent holds a lease or concession).		As such, ownership and resource access/ use rights are held by different entities. AENOR has reviewed section 3.2 of the PD to crosscheck with the current information, and deems that the information of the NPRR is correct.
	c) In more than 5% of the project area, there exist disputes over land tenure or ownership.	0	Not applicable
	d) There exist disputes over access/use rights (or overlapping rights).	0	Not applicable
	e) WRC projects unable to demonstrate that potential upstream and sea impacts that could undermine issued credits in the next 10 years are irrelevant or expected to be insignificant, or that there is a plan in place for effectively mitigating such impacts.	0	Not applicable
	f) Mitigation: Project area is protected by legally binding commitment (eg, a conservation easement or protected area) to continue management practices that protect carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period.	-2	Considered a protective forestry reserve, mangrove protection falls under the ecological function assigned to the titled lands under Law 70/93.
	g) Mitigation: Where disputes over land tenure, ownership or access/use rights exist, documented evidence is provided that projects have implemented activities to resolve the disputes or clarify overlapping claims.	0	Not applicable.
	Total Land Tenure (LT) ((a or b) + c + d + e + f +g): 0 Total may not be less than zero.		

The ownership and resources access are given by the contracts. No disputes or conflicts were identified during the on-site visit. Then, in AENOR's opinion, total land tenure (0) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.0.

External Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
Community Engagement	a) Less than 50 percent of households living within the project area who are reliant on the project area, have been consulted.	0	General Assemblies representing all community members have been consulted, and have endorsed the project. See community consultation records. AENOR has reviewed the evidence provided by the PP and also crosschecked with interviews during the onsite visit to demonstrate the consultation process.
	b) Less than 20 percent of households living within 20 km of the project boundary outside the project area, and who are reliant on the project area, have been consulted.	0	General Assemblies representing all community members have been consulted, and have endorsed the project. See community consultation records. AENOR has reviewed the evidence provided by the PP and also crosschecked with interviews during the onsite visit to demonstrate the consultation process.
	c) Mitigation: The project generates net positive impacts on the social and economic well-being of the local communities who derive livelihoods from the project area.	-5	The project generates positive impact in the communities. The interviewees recognized the benefits of the project and the good impact to their communities and wellbeing.
	Total Community Engagement (CE), (a + b + c): -5 Total may not be less than zero.		

Then, in AENOR's opinion, total community engagement (-5) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.0.

External Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
Political Risk	a) Governance score of less than -0.79	0	Not applicable.
	b) Governance score of -0.79 to less than -0.32	0	Not applicable.
	c) Governance score of -0.32 to less than 0.19.	2	Colombia presents -0.16 according to the World Bank Institute's Worldwide

External Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
			Governance Indicators. AENOR has reviewed the World Bank indicators and confirms that the information provided is true.
	d) Governance score of 0.19 to less than 0.82.	0	Not applicable.
	e) Governance score of 0.82 or higher.	0	Not applicable.
	f) Mitigation: Country is implementing REDD+ Readiness or other activities, as set out in this Section 2.3.3.	-2	Colombia is implementing REDD+ readiness activities.
	Total Political (PC) ((a, b, c, d or e) + f): 0 Total may not be less than zero.		

The verification team confirms the governance score against the World Bank platform: <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wqi/Home/Reports>; the average indicator was calculated for the last 5 years.

Then, in AENOR's opinion, total political risk (0) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.0.

Therefore, **total external risk** is calculated as the sum of (LT + CE + PC), totalling 0. (According to the NPR tool the total may not be less than zero).

Natural Risk	Score (LS)	Mitigation	DOE Assessment
Fire	0	1	The project area has a very low risk of loss due to significant fires because it is composed of wet tropical rainforest. In fact, Global Fire Data (http://www.globalfiredata.org/analysis.html) shows that there have been no major fires in the area based on data collected from 1997 to 2014. The DesInventar system and IDEAM dataset also contain no reports of recent forest fires in region through 2020. AENOR reviewed this information and crosschecked with interviews and MR.

Natural Risk	Score (LS)	Mitigation	DOE Assessment
Pest and Disease Outbreaks	0	1	The possibility of pest and disease outbreaks was evaluated via participatory process with community members and the occurrence pestilence and found insignificant. The risk and disaster database of the DesInventar risk monitoring system was consulted at the municipal level for the monitoring period (2018-2019) and no relevant event associated with a natural disaster was reported between 2018 and 2019.
Extreme weather	2	1	Flooding is a relatively frequent occurrence in the area but poses a negligible risk to forest carbon stocks. These events mostly affect annual crops and not forests as demonstrated in the DesInventar data. While the area is at risk of flooding, the floods do not pose high risk to forest carbon stocks. No other extreme weather events have been observed since last risk report. AENOR reviewed the evidence provided, Emergencias 2018 and 2019 spreadsheet /210/, and it is enough demonstrated that there were new cases after 2018, but there were no reports of these incidents affecting forest carbon stocks.
Geological Risk	0	1	There have been no major earthquakes registered in the DesInventar system since the original assessment of risk in 2014. Thus, risk remains unchanged. AENOR has reviewed the USGS Earthquake Hazards Program (https://earthquake.usgs.gov/) webpage to contrast such information. Other risks such as volcanoes and landslides are no relevant for the project and carbon stocks.
Total Natural Risk (as applicable, F + PD + W + G + ON): 2 Determined by $LS \times M$.			

During the on-site visit, the verification team confirmed that the information provided in the sections above is reliable, and in AENOR's opinion, total natural risk (2) is properly justified and in accordance with AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.0. AENOR has also reviewed the DesInventar system to crosscheck the natural phenomena, which provides information about flooding, forest fire and seismic events.

Therefore, overall non-permanence risk rating and buffer determination are calculated as follow:

Risk Category	Rating
a) Internal Risk	7
b) External Risk	0
c) Natural Risk	2
Overall Risk Rating (a + b + c)	10

AENOR has checked that information provided in the Non-Permanence Risk Report is consistent with documents of support provided. AENOR deems that information provided is reliable and appropriate, thus, the overall risk rating is credible and realistic. Then, non-permanence risk deduction to be applied for the project is 10%.

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

AENOR confirmed during the on-site visit by interviewing local stakeholders the awareness about the results of the projects, its implementation and monitoring. Through different interviews, the audit team was able to contrast and confirm the information provided in the MR according to the dissemination of the monitoring plan and results. All of the interviewees recognized to know about the process and got access to the documents and summaries of the monitoring plan. Results of the climate benefits were provided in a spreadsheet calculation. 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 monitoring plan. Complementary, during the meetings that the PP organized with the stakeholders while the development of the MR, the information and the results were provided to them, and proof of that are the pictures that the PP has provided as evidence to be evaluated for the VVB. Specifically, the summary results of the second monitoring period were socialized verbally with local communities through workshops called pre-audits held on May 26, 2022, and in different community participation spaces, where local REDD+ teams informed government boards and the community in general of the results obtained for the second verification period. This was double checked with the evidence provided (minutes and PPTs of the presentation and the dissemination) as well as with onsite interviews with neighbours and stakeholders. All the interviewees recognized that all information was shared, such as the summaries, the reports, conclusions, but also other materials very relevant to understand the purpose of the project and other information about carbon and audits.

Verification team also reviewed the webpage links where the PP has shared further information complementary to the dissemination process and deems that the information stated on the MR does match with the information obtained from the onsite visit and the review of the documentation.

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

Not applicable, as the project is not seeking Gold Level verification for climate change adaption benefits at this time.

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

Not applicable, as the project is not seeking Gold Level verification for climate change adaption benefits at this time.

4.5 Community

4.5.1 Community Impacts (CM2.1)

The impacts described in the monitoring report are reasonable and many of them to improved livelihoods through capacity building in productive activities, Loggers participating in REDD+ activities. The impacts are largely due to the increased availability of jobs due to the project and other alternative income generating activities. Verification team review (annex 2 section 3 ind soc)

In order to assess and continually monitor the impacts that the project is having on communities; and to allow for the participation of affected groups in the evaluation of such impacts, Participatory Evaluation of Social Impact surveys were conducted as part of the project's monitoring efforts. These have documented equitable training and benefit-sharing to date through the high marks received on social well-being and stakeholder satisfaction with regard to project outcomes. Verification team review (annex 2 section 3.5) in order to verify the information.

It was confirmed during the site visit, there are several beneficiaries such as: beneficiaries of productive activities such as Achiote, Beneficiaries of the REDD+ local team, beneficiaries of community families and Government Boards and Loggers, or Corteros beneficiaries that now work in REDD activities.

According to the evidences provided, in opinion of AENOR the impacts described in the monitoring report are reasonable and were evident during the site visit.

4.5.2 Negative Community Impact Mitigation (CM2.2)

According to the MR, all activities implemented by the project have improved the livelihoods and wellbeing of different community groups.

According to section 4.1.2 of the MR. The project has been designed to improve the social and economic well-being of community groups and to enhance and maintain the HCV attributes of the project

Participatory Evaluation of Social Impact surveys have also 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 social well-being and stakeholder satisfaction of project outcomes and no negative impacts were found. Verification team review (annex 2 section 3.5) in order to verify the information.

During the site visit, stakeholder attitudes toward the project and the conservation of the forest were noted as very positive, since they have now alternatives instead of logging. During the interviews with communities, no negative impacts have been identified and no major grievances have been presented through the established Grievance and Redress Mechanism

Community-related HCVs cannot be negatively impacted by a project of this nature, as they are dependent on conservation of the forest resource.

Assessment by the audit team through the desk review and further onsite analysis concluded that the likelihood of net negative impacts on the well-being of the community is unlikely, and at the moment no negative impact on the communities was identified and therefore no measures or activities need to be implemented in this regard.

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

According to section 4.3.1 of the MR 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.

The audit team reviewed the supporting documents (annex 2 section 3.5) to verify the information about the Participatory Evaluation of Social Impact survey and confirm that according to the documents 103 people participated, 43 of them women. The attendees considered 4 different social issues which have presented improvements within their territory as a result of the project.

In general results show that participants considered 4 social aspects have presented improvements in the territory. 88% of the participants consider that income, technical capacities and the appropriation of the territory have improved, and 59% of the participants consider that the conservation of the forests has improved. These proportions are maintained when the information is broken down by gender. The changes have been felt in the same way by men and women

Interviews with community groups and site visit observations confirmed project income generating activities have multiple positive impacts on the majority of community populations, wherever the project activities have been implemented. And that, technical capacities and the appropriation of the territory have improved along with the conservation of the forests.

One of the clear observations made during the site visit was the greater the presence of project activities and project personnel in a part of the project zone, the more satisfied the people were with the project

Thus, in opinion of AENOR, the overall impact of the project on stakeholders is positive.

4.5.4 Protection of High Conservation Values (CM2.4)

According to the MR the following HCV have been identified:

- HCV-4: Areas that provide Critical Ecosystem Services
- HCV-5: Areas that meet fundamental needs
- HCV-6: Areas that are vital for the preservation of cultural identity

The community-related HCVs all depend on reducing pressure on the forest by diversifying livelihoods away from direct natural resource exploitation and enhancing forest protection. The conservation and restoration of this forest is the purpose of the project, for both community and biodiversity sustainability. There are no negative effects on HCVs anticipated because of the project activities.

As per confirmed during the on-site visit, project proponent is providing improvement for environmental services and the activities carried on during the MR have covered the basic need of local people. Different employees and trainings have been obtained by the local people.

Therefore, verification team is able to confirm high conservation values have not been negatively affected by the project.

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

AENOR had no evidence of negative impacts on anyone aside from the illegal loggers; on the other hand, it is not probable that someone is not benefited at least indirectly from the project.

PP states in section 4.2.1 y 4.2.2 At the time of validation, the project proponents conducted an analysis of potential negative impacts on external stakeholders and identified potential negative impacts and mitigation measures. Such as decreased access to areas of high conservation value for offsite communities as a result of an increase in unregulated logging, Increased cost of living for communities surrounding the project area by losing income from illegal logging and higher costs of other goods, reduction in income of loggers who live outside the project zone and have traditionally logged within the project area because of increased governance in the project zone.

For the current monitoring period, the project proponent implemented activities such as: a) Implementation of productive activities, b) Strengthening of governance, and c) Establishment of forest patrols. These activities have occurred within the project area and have influenced neighboring areas. These proposed project activities are the mitigation measures for the potential impacts mentioned above and following the provisions of the leakage plan described in section 5.2 of the PD.

The relationship between the potential impacts identified and the mitigation plan as a method for monitoring these potential negative impacts on external stakeholders for the current monitoring period, was check in the (Seguimiento impactos negativos _Proyecto REDD+ Rio Pepe ACABA 2018_2019.xlsx) from the supporting documents.

The audit team, during the visit, interviews with community groups and site visit observations to income generating activities confirmed their multiple positive impacts on the majority of community inhabitants (including these specific stakeholders, who were present during the meetings), wherever the project activities have been implemented. In conclusion, there are no other stakeholders to which the negative impacts derived from the Project have not been adequately mitigated by the project activities.

The net impact on other stakeholders is positive because the only impact, outside the project zone, is the protection of the forest for many communities beyond the project zone. The project proponent has adopted measures such as the implementation of the activities in the governance, productive and social investment components that have been reduced in this monitoring period. AENOR has reviewed the evidence, which is the "social indicators" for the Rio Pepe Project, and complementarily to the explanations, the VVB considers that the information is valid. Complementarily, this information was crosschecked onsite.

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

The impact of the activities is measured through the Community Monitoring Plan (section 4.3.1 of the MR) the "Social Impact Evaluations and "MTC_IndSociales ACABA_RioPepe_V2 (Annex 2 section 3.5 y 3.8)

Community monitoring plan are detailed in section 4.3.1. of the monitoring report. The specific variables measured are related to: 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, Strengthened governance, Involvement of women in the surveillance and patrolling of forests and Women participation in decision-making processes.

Since the project is validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits, additional monitoring data has been collected, analysed, and reported to demonstrate that the project meets all required criteria. This was done by assessing the increase in adaptation benefits for communities for which monitoring indicators; Short- and long-term benefits, Benefits for marginalized and/or vulnerable community groups, Net positive impacts on women, Effective participation through governance and implementation structures, Capacity building for small farmers and community members, are specifically meant, and data on these indicators were collected, analysed, and reported.

All these impacts were positive, and there were no negative impacts. Hence, the net impact of the project on all the above has been assessed to be positive.

Verification team assessed the evidence provided (Annex 2 section 3.5 y 3.8) that evidence the community participation. The documents have been contrasted with questions to the community members during the visit to confirms dates, frequency and sampling methods used.

4.5.7 Community Monitoring Plan Dissemination (CM4.3)

The project field offices maintain a full, printed copy of the monitoring report and executive summary for the PD, which contains the community monitoring plan, and the monitoring report has been posted in public places in communities throughout the Project Zone

According to section 4.3.2. The project proponent recognizes the importance in ensuring that both the monitoring plan and the results of monitoring be communicated to communities. The monitoring activities were divided between organizations in support of the proponents for social (community), carbon (climate), and biodiversity. The plan for completing the monitoring report was discussed in community meetings in virtual meeting in May 12 – 13, 2021.

During the field visit, audit team identify the PP has informative webpages <https://portafolioredmascomunitario.org/> and <https://fondoaccion.org/2020/10/16/paisajes-conectados-pacifico/>

According to section 4.3.2 of the MR, the elements adopted by the project proponent, according to available resources and cultural traditions, are:

- Community Council participation spaces (meetings, assemblies, board sessions, dialogues, governance spaces, etc.).
- Community radio station
- Printed material

In these spaces the most information is disseminated and results are shown, copies of the year-end reports are passed on to the participating leaders so that they can replicate the information in their communities.

As per confirmed during the on-site visit, project proponent is providing the information thought several ways as described in the MR. The audit team had several interviews with community members and all of them recognized the results and were aware. Also, the audit team review the VERRA web page were the

monitoring report was available online one month before the start of the verification site visit for a period of public comments.

At community meetings, members said they were made aware of the MR summary that contains the results of the community monitoring. The results of the monitoring are disseminated in accordance with the validated project description. Specifically, the summary results of the second monitoring period were socialized verbally with local communities through workshops called pre-audits held on May 26, 2022, and in different community participation spaces, where local REDD+ teams informed government boards and the community in general of the results obtained for the second verification period. This was double checked with the evidence provided (minutes and PPTs of the presentation and the dissemination) as well as with onsite interviews with neighbours and stakeholders. All the interviewees recognized that all information was shared, such as the summaries, the reports, conclusions, but also other materials very relevant to understand the purpose of the project and other information about carbon and audits.

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

All community members in the Project Zone are mainly dependent on forest resources and are thus benefiting from their conservation, restoration, and sustainable management.

The exceptional community benefits among others include the following: strengthened governance over natural resources, improvements in land-use planning and implementation, support for the development of alternative livelihoods through training and technical assistance, improved social well-being, enhanced administrative and leadership capacity, and strengthening of local institutions

At the community level, progress made since project validation in the strengthening of both the Community Council and local agro-organizations' capacity also tangibly contributes to the probability of long-term net positive benefits for community well-being

Verification team assessed the evidence provided in section 4.3.1 and 4.4.1 (Annex 2 section 3.5 y 3.6) that evidence the community benefits.

The audit team has assessed these benefits through the interviews performed during the onsite visit and deems that the information provided by the PP according to the short-term and long-term community benefits is right and reliable and is in accordance with the requirements of VCS/CCB

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

AENOR carried out interviews with representatives of the communities involved in the project and all of them declared to be informed about the risk of the projects and the activities.

Hence, AENOR considers that the PP is managing properly these risks in order to prevent negative effects into the communities.

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

The PP has identified the following groups under this section:

- Women
- *Loggers* (loggers)

The audit team has assessed these criteria with the interviews performed during the onsite visit in the project area, through several questions to different participants and stakeholders to crosschecked with the information stated in section 4.4.2 of the MR.

The audit team review the evidences such as: Procedures to guarantee equal opportunities for all community members, including vulnerable and/or marginalized people. which provides an overarching statement of the project desire for avoiding all forms of discrimination

These procedures follows a joint construction of the terms of reference with community leaders, in which the technical requirements for the activity to be carried out or position to be filled are included and the eligibility criteria in which the preference for persons is manifested and detailed, mainly that they be members of the community or residents of the territory, and, whenever possible, that these include women and other vulnerable and/or marginalized people

Therefore, AENOR deems that the information provided, and the evidence analyzed fulfill the requirements of GL2.4 of the CCB standards.

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

The project has generated net positive impacts on the well-being of perceived by women as checked at the Social Impact Evaluation report (annex 2 section 3.5)

According to section 4.4.3 of the MR, Traditionally, women are already involved in agricultural activities because they have access to land. Unlike many other cultures, there is no inherent barrier to Afro-Colombian women being able to inherit land; this is significant as the principal source of wealth transfer in rural areas. Both women and men have full rights to property inheritance: "direct blood relatives have full rights; hence, women and men have the same right to claim their part [of their inheritance]" (Camacho 1999). Since women have access to land, they are involved in productive activities

women are not excluded from decision-making processes. In terms of women participating in or influencing decision making, the PP reported in this monitoring period, 8 women are now active participants in representative bodies, such as is in the Governing Board and Zonal Board of the territory as stated in the (community monitoring plan indicator).

The audit team has performed interviews and a group meeting with representatives of women organization and women benefiting from the REDD+ project. The interviewees names and information are found in the list of participants that the auditor used during the onsite visit.

With these interviews, the women recognized to be part of the consultation process and also that they were benefited by the activities and improvements from the project.

Therefore, AENOR deems that the information stated in the MR according to the benefits in the women group is reliable and correct and complies with the CCB requirements

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

During the site visit the audit team has assessed the benefit sharing mechanisms structure and crosschecked with the section 4.4.4 of the MR and additional information of (PD).

Ethno-Development Plans (EDP) are "instruments that define the Community Councils' own (endogenous) vision of development, whose main objective is to guarantee the preservation of cultural integrity and a better life or Buen Vivir". An Ethno-Development Plan becomes a valuable tool to promote the socio-economic and sustainable wellbeing of ethnic communities, preserving their autonomy, cultural identity, traditions and customs, promoting in a safe, orderly and sustainable manner over time, the use and exploitation of the territory, the exercise of autonomy, the protection of cultural identity and their ancestral practices. The project proponent for the period 2018-2019, reached community agreements on the distribution of the benefits obtained through different spaces for participation and dialogue, where it was agreed that the equitable distribution of resources in the first year would be 50%-50% and from the second year the level of commitment of each Community Council in the territory with respect to the conservation of biodiversity, the reduction of degradation and deforestation of forests and social impact would be measured

For this verification the project has not transferred any VCU's nor received benefits (income) and for ended not used an official benefit sharing mechanism

The audit team has reviewed the information and interview different social groups to verify that the information provided in the MR and PD is right. The AENOR team did not find any evidence to demonstrate that the information stated on the MR is not correct.

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

According to section 4.4.5 of the MR, to ensure that the project's governance and implementation structures enable full and effective participation of smallholders/community members in project decision-making and implementation, the project governance and implementation structure is guided by the existing self-governance structures in the Afro-Colombian communities. By definition, a Community Council is an Afro-Colombian community that decides to constitute legally; specifically, that it is formally associated to the State to acquire "the maximum authority of Administration within the territory of the Afro-Colombian Community." The State then acknowledges by a Resolution of the Ministry of Interior, that this Council and every Community Council has right to its defined territory.

The Community Council is constituted by the General Assembly and the Governing Board of the Community Council, the law also creates the position of Legal Representative of the Community Council, The Community Council is required by law to make "the rules of territorial administration and management of natural resources, and ensure their compliance," which are only valid with the approval of the Assembly.

Thus, most aspects of the REDD+ project have been written into law, and approved by the General Assembly.

During the site visit the audit team has assessed the project's governance and implementation structures and crosschecked with the section 4.4.5 of the MR and additional information of (PD).

The audit team has performed different meetings with some stakeholders to verify that the information provided on the MR is reliable and right. The VVB has carried out interviews with men and women groups to ensure effective participation community members in project decision-making and implementation. Complementary, through individual interviews has asked about the individual participation and their option to participate in public process.

The audit team did not find inconsistencies with the MR information and deems that the information is reliable and right and complies with the CCB requirements.

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

The audit team has performed an onsite visit to verify that the information stated on the MR is right. Through several interviews, the VVB interviewed different community members from several groups that recognized they had the opportunity to develop their skills on several activities to improve their wellbeing or basics needs.

PP states in section 4.4.6 that 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.

During the site visit the audit team has assessed how the project is developing the capacity of community members, and crosschecked with the section 4.4.6 of the MR and additional information from the social indicator table (annex 2 section3.8)

The interviewees recognized to be part of different trainings and meetings. Therefore, AENOR deems that the information stated in the specific section of the MR is reliable and complies with the CCB requirements.

4.6 Biodiversity

4.6.1 Biodiversity Changes (B2.1)

Steps taken to verify reported changes in biodiversity in the project zone due to project activities included review of expected biodiversity changes identified in the validated PD; review of biodiversity changes identified in the MR; review methodology (M006 methodology); on site interview to biodiversity monitoring team to review data collection techniques, compilations and quantitative results; interviews to forest guards regarding the law enforcement activity and results of the vigilance patrols supported to site visit to patrol and interviews to community members regarding the wildlife abundance perception.

The principal technique to monitor biodiversity changes during the monitoring period could be summarized as observing remotely the “changes in measurable forest vegetation cover conditions.”

As stated in section 3.2. This approach 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. During the site visit the audit team has assessed and crosschecked with the PD.

This monitoring period was introduced ground-based bio-resource data collection to strengthen and corroborate the change parameters, which will be increased in frequency over time and during future monitoring periods. The audit team verify on site the technics used in the field biodiversity monitoring. (biodiversity transects)

Finally, different interviews were performed and, in those interviews, questions about biodiversity improvement were done. The verification team visited that biodiversity transects places and had the

opportunity to insight the presence of important species that, contrasted with interviews, were not present in the project area few years ago, so, it was an indicator that the quality of the project area has increased

Therefore, verification team is able to confirm that the project's assessment of changes in biodiversity resulting from project activities in the project zone during the monitoring period are accurate.

4.6.2 Mitigation Actions (B2.3)

Section 5.1.2 of the monitoring report detail the measures taken specifically designed, planned and implemented to create positive impacts for biodiversity through reducing direct or indirect threats to biodiversity and HCVs; maintaining or enhancing species, sites, habitats and landscapes for maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity and HCVs; preventing and reducing human-wildlife conflict; stakeholders sensitization, mobilization/organization, engagement and capacitation; and increased availability and provision of different types of resources for biodiversity and HCVs conservation.

The mitigation of negative impacts on forest habitat is the predominant strategy of REDD+ projects in the conservation of biodiversity and HCV, which are therefore low risk for negative impacts.

According to MR section 5.1.2. Important efforts were carried out during the verification period to maintain and enhance HCV attributes. The main approach to do this, as stated in the project PD, was to conserve and maintain the forest cover and HCV habitat condition and quality. By guaranteeing the latter, HCV attributes were protected and maintained, always procuring umbrella strategies stirred by the precautionary principle.

Steps taken to verify the actions taken by the project to mitigate negative impacts on biodiversity and measures taken for maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes included review of mitigation measures identified in the validated PD; review of mitigation efforts identified in the MR; interview to biodiversity monitoring team and interviews to forest guards supported in the site visit.

The main mitigation for negative impacts on biodiversity was to provide alternative livelihood for community members whose primary source of income came from logging or clearing of forest. Alternative livelihood opportunities included training, workshops, and in many cases, supplies. This ensured that participants had a proper foundation to pursue their alternative livelihood and that such livelihoods would be reliable sources of income moving into the future. Alternative livelihoods that were created were locally based and did not create new and separate issues in relation to biodiversity.

The audit team has verified the actions taken by the project to mitigate negative impacts on biodiversity and measures taken for maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes, and crosschecked with the section theory of change and supporting documents (annex 2 section3.6)

Verification team during the onsite visit confirmed that the information stated in section 3.3 and along the whole biodiversity section is right. Therefore, verification team concludes that the mitigation actions taken are appropriate and in accordance with validated project description

4.6.3 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts (B2.2)

Steps taken to verify that the project's net impacts on biodiversity are positive included review of projected net positive impacts identified in the validated PD, review of net positive impacts identified in the MR, review

of biodiversity monitoring records (annex 2 section 4), interview to biodiversity monitoring team and interviews to guards and REDD local team.

Due to the demonstrated reductions in relation to deforestation and degradation in the project area between 2018-2019, owing to project activities and outcomes, the net impacts on biodiversity were positive. As demonstrated in the data parameter tables from 5.1.1 (biodiversity changes), intact forest s would be significantly less in the without-project scenario. The above-ground forest biomass was not measured in the current monitoring report.

AENOR deems the project is having and going to have a positive net gain for biodiversity in the project area. Thus, it is the opinion of AENOR, based on monitoring data, site observations, and site interviews, that the project has reduced the pressure for land-clearing and poaching, justifying an overall conclusion that the net impact of the project's activities on biodiversity are positive. The audit team deems that the PP has demonstrated that project activities will assist the biodiversity to adapt to the probable impacts of climate change, as per GL1.4 of the CCB Standard v3.1.

4.6.4 High Conservation Values Protected (B2.4)

Steps taken to verify that High Conservation Values (HCVs) were not negatively affected by the project included review of high conservation values identified in the validated (PD), review of HCVs protected by the project as identified in the (MR), interview to biodiversity monitoring team, interviews to REDD+ patrol team, and interviews with community members

According to section 5.1.4 of the MR, 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. As mentioned, field-based measurements and observations will corroborate results of remote sensing analyses in future monitoring periods.

PP indicated that, Important efforts were carried out during the verification period to maintain and enhance HCV attributes. The main approach to do this, as stated in the project PD, was to conserve and maintain the forest cover and HCV habitat condition and quality. By guaranteeing the latter, HCV attributes were protected and maintained, always procuring umbrella strategies stirred by the precautionary principle.

It is unlikely that a project of this nature would negatively affect the habitat it is protecting. Based on the evidence provided by the PP and the opinion of the stakeholders consulted by the audit team, AENOR deems that HCV is not negatively affected by the project: furthermore, the project is actively working on protecting these HCVs.

4.6.5 Invasive Species (B2.5)

According to the MR section 5.1.5. There were no known invasive species introduced to the project during the monitoring period.

This condition remains as per the validated PDD, thus there has been nothing new to report. No other project activities involved the introduction of invasive species into the project area

Steps taken to verify that not invasive species has been introduced into any area affected by the project included interviews with stakeholders and site visits to the areas where there are species designated for use within project activities such as cocoa and achiote. Recently, interest in banana and sugar cane has been part of the project. These species are native or naturalized

There is no evidence of affections due to invasive flora in the project, as observed during the onsite visit and supported in conversation with the management team and other stakeholder.

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

The project activity is not using non-native species.

According to section 5.1.6 There were no new non-native species introduced to the project during the monitoring period. Cacao and achiote are native to the region. There are no impacts to report during the monitoring period involving non-native species.

This was also confirmed through discussion with the project team, and observed during the onsite visit.

4.6.7 GMO Exclusion (B2.7)

The exclusion of GMOs issued at the time of project validation remains in effect. No GMOs were used during the monitoring period nor will they be used by the project in the future.

The project proponent state that no GMOs were used to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals in the project. This was also confirmed through discussion with the project team and observed during the onsite visit

AENOR has checked that no GMOs are used to generate GHG emission reductions or removals

4.6.8 Inputs Justification (B2.8)

Project proponents state that no inputs such as fertilizers, chemical pesticides or biological control agents have been or will be used for the project. This was confirmed through discussions with the project team.

They confirmed that they use Organic fertilization/pest control. PP justifies that, these are the methods which have been effectively used in the project region long into the past, without any negative consequences. Furthermore, community members are used to using these methods.

Steps taken to verify that there are not adverse effects of any inputs used by the project included interviews with stakeholders and site visits to the areas where there are species designated for use within project activities such as cocoa and achiote.

AENOR has checked that there are not adverse effects of any inputs used by the project

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

The project does not negatively affect offsite biodiversity, which is why no actions were taken to mitigate negative impacts. On the contrary, the protection of these forest areas ensures connectivity between the surrounding areas improving in-site and offsite biodiversity.

During the period of implementation, the potential negative impacts on biodiversity outside the project zone were evaluated through remote sensing of the leakage belt. The analyses examined the displacement of deforestation or forest degradation outside the project zone to characterize negative impacts related to decline in available forest habitat for species in the project region. 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 not any evidence of activity-shifting leakage in the leakage area during the monitoring period as such, it was concluded that there were not negative impacts on offsite biodiversity.

This was also confirmed through discussion with the project team and observed during the onsite visit

AENOR has checked that there are not biodiversity impacts produced by the project activities.

4.6.10 Net Offsite Biodiversity Benefits (B3.3)

PP stated in section 3.2.2 that the reduction of deforestation and forest degradation due to the implementation of the activities of the Rio Pepe - Acaba REDD+ Project has made it possible to maintain the integrity of forest ecosystems and improve connectivity at the landscape scale, favoring ecological and environmental processes outside of the project area, such as the dispersal of the Jaguar (which requires large areas for its habitat), and the regulation of water sources that discharge their waters into other territories, thereby reducing the threat of flooding that hangs over this region.

Since, only positive biodiversity impacts have resulted from different project interventions and there have been no negative biodiversity impacts, either on-site or offsite, therefore the net effect of the project on biodiversity is assessed to be positive.

The net offsite benefits have been assessed at the same time than the rest of biodiversity impacts and benefits, performed with onsite interviews with stakeholders and crosschecking the information with the statements of the MR.

AENOR deems that the information provided on the MR is correct.

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

According to section 3.3.1 of the MR. The biodiversity indicators were defined in the PDD and based upon the theory of change; and they are:

1) changes in forest cover; 2) changes in forest biomass; 3) tree species dynamics; 4) populations of rare, endemic, and endangered species; 5) health of mangrove swamps; and 6) hunting pressure.

In design of the monitoring protocol, the methods proposed for indicators 3 and 4 identified the indicator species that would be the most evident, conspicuous, and possible to identify by community members, while still being important indicators of faunal and floral diversity. In this monitoring period, the project monitored indicators 1 and 2, laying the grounds for future monitoring incorporating more field wildlife surveys.

Project activities are aimed at reducing pressure on the forest. Since all HCVs are related to the conservation of habitats and their species, the project activities are also protecting HCVs. According to the monitoring results, the measures are effective

The monitoring activities and biodiversity status updates were used to initiate processes that will be used to confirm the state of species diversity in the project area and to revisit the status of biodiversity as it was reported during project validation. Monitoring activities were executed following the monitoring protocol developed by the project implementation team of Fondo Accion. Between 2018-2019, in ACABA and RP, 468 fauna records were registered, of which 152 (34%) were mammals, 282 birds (63%), 10 records were reptiles (2%) and 3 Amphibians were recorded (1%)

The impact of the activities was measured through the Biodiversity Impact Monitoring (section 3.3.1 of the MR) and Annex 2.4 – and crosschecked with Ecopartners and Wildlife Works field protocol for faunal transects, “Protocolo censos fauna v1.4” (annex 2 section 4) that was used for monitoring of selected indicator species, especially rare, threatened, and endangered species.

Complementarily, for the 2018-2019 period, a research agreement was developed between the ACABA community council and the PACIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE IIAP – John Von Neuman for the development of various investigations, monitoring and characterization in the area of REDD+ ACABA Project – Río Pepe, called “ECOLOGICAL CHARACTERIZATION OF LAGUNERAL SYSTEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE BERREBERRE RIVER, MIDDLE BASIN OF THE BAUDO RIVER (CHOCÓ)”, in which professionals from the community council and the IIAP, experts, baqueanos and field promoters from the community council participate (see annex). The studies carried out summarize the floristic, faunal composition and species richness of this period and in the project area and demonstrate the participation of the community in the monitoring and information processing work.

The data obtained from the afore mentioned ACABA-IIAP research study and those corresponding to the monitoring of the local REDD+ team will be presented in the following sections Wildlife Monitoring by IIAP of the report. The local REDD+ team also collected additional information in the biodiversity monitoring that was implemented for this purpose, and the results were also included in the current monitoring period and are evidenced in the section named as Wildlife Monitoring Results

According to interviews with project staff and observations during the site visit, AENOR confirms dates, frequency and sampling methods used are in accordance with the validated PD and with the procedures and systematics used in the verification event. AENOR confirms that community monitoring plan is implemented according to the MR and the validated PD.

4.6.12 Biodiversity Monitoring Plan Dissemination (B4.3)

According to section 3.3.2 of the MR. The summary of the monitoring results was shared with the community members of the ACABA-Rio Pepe REDD+ project in June 2019 during an in-person visit and meeting. The community members were provided with a simplified version and the public summary of the complete monitoring report, both in Spanish. Fondo Accion and P&F presented the findings and discussed these publicly. The plan for implementing monitoring as related to biodiversity was discussed in community meetings.

The REDD+ liaison maintain a full, printed copy of each monitoring report for public viewing. The executive summary for the PD, which contains the biodiversity monitoring plan, and the monitoring report is posted in public places in communities throughout the Project Zone

AENOR confirmed during the on-site visit by interviewing local stakeholders the awareness about the results of the projects, its implementation and monitoring. Verification team reviewed the documents shared

in various meetings and workshops as well as the participation evidence of those meetings. AENOR has also reviewed the website where the PP has uploaded the information to share with the stakeholders and finally it has assessed with the community members to verify if the information has been shared properly with them.

Therefore, AENOR deems that the information provided on the MR is reliable and correct. Hence, the dissemination of the monitoring plan is under the CCB requirements

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

This item is not applicable for this project.

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

This item is not applicable for this project.

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 4.4 and the CCB Standards Third Edition without qualifications or limitations.

The project has been implemented in accordance with the validated project description and any subsequently validated minor changes.

The verification of the ex-post emissions of the Rio Pepe y ACABA REDD+ Project has been conducted by AENOR in accordance with ISO 14064-3:2019.

AENOR is able to issue a positive verification opinion for the 748,684 tCO₂e of verified emissions reductions, which discounting the buffer, corresponds to an amount of 654,786 VCUs, as reported in the Monitoring Report version 2.10.

The verification assessment covered the monitoring period from 1 January 2018 to 31 December 2019 and verified that calculated emission reductions 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 93,898 tCO₂e.

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 2.10. In opinion of the AENOR verification team, the project is achieving their community and biodiversity objectives with net impact benefits and have achieved gold level status for community criteria, in compliance with CCB Standards v.3.1.

It is opinion of AENOR, with a reasonable level of assurance, that the reasonableness of assumptions, the described limitations, the methods that supported each one of the claims about the outcome of future activities and the claimed ex-post emissions removals are free from major errors, omissions, or inaccuracies.

Monitoring period: From 1 January 2018 to 31 December 2019

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

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)
2018	507,183	34,031	95,901	377,250
2019	500,256	34,423	94,399	371,434
Total	1,007,439	68,454	190,300	748,684

NER's, buffer credit allocation, and VCUs generated during the 2018-2019 monitoring period:

Year	Net Emissions Reductions (tCO ₂ e)	Buffer credits (tCO ₂ e)	Verified Carbon Units (tCO ₂ e)
2018	377,250	47,315	329,935
2019	371,434	46,583	324,851
Total	748,684	93,898	654,786

Overall non-permanence risk rating: 10%

VCUs buffer to be deposited: 93,898 tCO₂e.

Total VCUs to be issued: 654,786 tCO₂e.

Date: 29 August 2024



Lead Auditor
Sergio Guzmán

APPENDIX I: LIST OF EVIDENCE

Monitoring report	
1	RioPepe_ACABA Monitoring Report v 3.0 M2 2018-2019_13082024_trackchange
2	ACABA_RioPepe Monitoring Report v 3.0 M2 2018-2019_08032023_limpio.pdf"
3	ACABA_RioPepe Monitoring Report V 3.0 M2 2018-2019_08032023Control cambios.docx"
Spreadsheet and carbon calculation	
4	VM0006_RIO PEPE Y ACABA_Ex_Post_v2.7.xlsm"
5	4C-InformeCapturaLiDAR_Final_20182912_v2.pdf"
6	Accounting_Manual.xlsx"
7	Analisis_QA_QC_RioPepe_CDD_200519.docx"
8	Protocolo inventario forestal v1.26.docx"
9	RP ACABA Treelist_v1.2.xlsx"
10	Spatial Modeling Report v1.11.pdf"
11	VM0006_RIO PEPE Y ACABA_Ex_Post_v2.6.xlsm"
12	GeoEcoMap_task1_revised.pdf"
13	GeoEcoMap_task2.pdf"
14	GeoEcoMap_task3.pdf"
15	GeoEcoMap_task6.pdf"
16	GeoEcoMap_task7_final.pdf"
17	GeoEcoMap_task7_new (2).pdf"
18	GeoEcoMap_task8&9_new_13015.pdf"
19	GeoEcoMap_task12_final_2.pdf"
20	GeoEcoMap_task13_020115.pdf"
21	GeoEcoMap_Task14_MRV_020315.pdf"
22	GeoEcoMap_Task14_MRV_031215.pdf"
23	GeoEcoMap_task16_020215.pdf"
24	GeoEcoMap_workplan_new.pdf"
25	GeoEcoMap_workplan_supplement.pdf"
Geospatial data	
26	Acaba y Rio Pepe Geospatial Data\Jan08_RIOPEPE_LA_WGS_dissolved.shp"
27	Acaba y Rio Pepe Geospatial Data\RIO_PEPE_Consejos_WGS84.shp"
28	Acaba y Rio Pepe Geospatial Data\Sept17_RIO_PEPE_PA_WGS84.shp"
29	EBM_v09ZH_LULCTrans2020_RIOPEPE_CJ.tif"
30	EBM_v09ZH_LULCTrans2020_RIOPEPE_LA.tif"
31	EBM_v09ZH_LULCTrans2020_RIOPEPE_PA.tif"
32	Phase1and2_AllProjects_ForestAndNonforest_DensityEqualizedPoints.shp"
Soportes pdd	
33	Revisión_ajustes_PDD_Rio_Pepe.docx"
34	Soportes\Acta Reunion ACABA, octubre.docx"
35	Soportes\Acta Reunion RIO PEPE. octubre.docx"
36	Soportes\FOTOS REUNIONES.docx"

37	Soportes\img197.pdf"
Comunicación stakeholders	
38	Leyendo y jugando_mezcla.wav"
39	Lista productos comunicaciones.xlsx"
40	Nuestro territorio hoy.jpg"
41	Nuestro territorio pasado.jpg"
Standard operative procedure	
42	Capacitacion REDD.docx"
43	Compras_adquisiciones.docx"
44	Contratacion_capacitacion_patrullas_monitoreo REDD.docx"
45	Demarcacion_Zonas REDD.docx"
46	Diseminacion_informacion.docx"
47	Mapeo_Participativo.docx"
48	Mecanismos_QuejasReclamos.docx"
49	Toma de decisiones.docx"
Governance	
50	2. CPS 47 de 2019 info 4.docx"
51	44 de 2019 Info 6.docx"
52	CPS 47 de 2019 info 3.docx"
53	CPS_079_Mayo2019.docx"
54	Presentacion_SMART_TallerGenero_20112019_Transversal.pdf"
55	Socializacion actividades productivas 052019.pdf"
56	Socialización del protocolo de monitoreo a la unidad REDDD+ .docx"
57	Taller_AsisAdmin_062019_Gobernanza_Transversal.pdf"
58	Taller_FortalecimientoComercialización_Rio_Pepe_02122019.pdf"
59	Taller_FortalecimientoComunicacionesREDD_012020_Gobernaza_Transversal.pdf"
60	Taller_MRV_Zonificacion_13062019_Gobernanza_Transversal.pdf"
61	Taller_Zonificacion_Acandi_102019_Gobernanza_Transversal.pdf"
62	10. Contrato 044 de 2019 Tecnico agricola.PDF"
63	17_07_N4 20992 L7 17425 1ER CONTRATO 047 RODRIGUEZ VALENCIA DILMA SUDELI.pdf"
64	53. O S Jairo Jobino Mosquera Cordoba_Promotor.pdf"
65	56_07_N4 21182 L7 17587 2DO CONTRATO 47 RODRIGUEZ VALENCIA DILMA SUDELI.pdf"
66	57. O S Jose Hector Moreno Mosquera_Promotor.pdf"
67	OS 10 Jesus Murillo_Promotor.pdf"
68	OS 11 David Mosquera_Promotor.pdf"
69	OS 12 Luis Carlos Valencia_Promotor.pdf"
70	OS 20_BENYAIR ROMANA ANDRADE_Asis_Admon.pdf"
71	CPS 47 de 2019 info 1.docx"
72	CPS 47 de 2019 info 2.docx"
73	CPS 47 de 2019 info 4.docx"

74	CPS 47 de 2019 info 5.docx"
75	CPS 47 de 2019 info 6.docx"
76	CPS 47 de 2019 info 7.docx"
77	CPS 47 de 2019 info 8.docx"
78	CPS47 de 2019 info 9.docx"
79	CRONOGRAMA DE ACTIVIDADES (1).docx"
80	POA_ Río Pepé - Acaba DEFINITIVO.xlsx"
81	Aleci\1- Informe 01.docx"
82	Aleci\2- Informe 02 Julio.docx"
83	Aleci\Informe 4 OS 10 de 2019.docx"
84	Aleci\OS 10 de 2019_info3.docx"
85	Aleci\OS010 de 2019 informe5.docx"
86	Aleci\OS010 de 2019 informe7.docx"
87	Aleci\OS010 de 2019 informe8.docx"
88	David\1. Informe 01.docx"
89	David\2- Informe 02 Julio.docx"
90	David\Informe 3 OS 11 de 2019. sept..docx"
91	David\OS 11 de 2019_info3.docx"
92	David\OS011 de 2019 informe 9.docx"
93	David\OS011 de 2019 informe 10.docx"
94	David\OS011 de 2019 informe5.docx"
95	David\OS011 de 2019 informe7.docx"
96	David\OS011 de 2019 informe8.docx"
97	David\OS11 de 2019 informe 11.docx"
98	Luis\1- Informe 01.docx"
99	Luis\2- Informe 02 Julio.docx"
100	Luis\Informe 3 OS 12 de 2019.docx"
101	Luis\OS 12 de 2019_info3.docx"
102	Luis\OS012 de 2019 informe 9.docx"
103	Luis\OS012 de 2019 informe 10.docx"
104	Luis\OS012 de 2019 informe5.docx"
105	Luis\OS012 de 2019 informe7.docx"
106	Luis\OS012 de 2019 informe8.docx"
107	Luis\OS12 de 2019 informe 11.docx"
108	Advo\20. O S Benyair Romaña.pdf"
109	Jobino\1. OS53DE 2019_ POA.xlsx"
110	Jobino\Informe 2 OS 53 de 2019.docx"
111	Jobino\OS 53 de 2019_info1.docx"
112	Jobino\OS 53 de 2019_info2.docx"
113	Jobino\OS053 de 2019 informe 6.docx"
114	Jobino\OS053 de 2019 informe 7.docx"

115	Jobino\OS053 de 2019 informe3.docx"
116	Jobino\OS053 de 2019 informe4.docx"
117	Jobino\OS053 de 2019 informe5.docx"
118	Jobino\OS53 de 2019 informe 8.docx"
119	Jobino\OS057 de 2019 informe5.docx"
120	Hector\1. OS57DE 2019_ POA.xlsx"
121	Hector\Informe 2 OS 57 de 2019.docx"
122	Hector\OS 57 de 2019_info1.docx"
123	Hector\OS057 de 2019 informe 6.docx"
124	Hector\OS057 de 2019 informe 7.docx"
125	Hector\OS057 de 2019 informe3.docx"
126	Hector\OS057 de 2019 informe4.docx"
127	Hector\OS57 de 2019 informe 8.docx"
128	Acta de Entrega Equipos ACABA y Pepe.docx"
129	Actas_Entrega_Dotación_ACABA_RIO_PEPE_GPS_17112019.pdf"
130	Actas_Entrega_Dotación_ACABA_RIO_PEPE_Lenovo_Binoculares_GPS_28012020.pdf"
131	Acta Asamblea RioPepe_Elección Junta 2019.pdf"
132	LISTADOS DE ASISTENCIA ELECCION DE JUNTA RIO PP.pdf"
133	Actas dialogos con vecino 1.pdf"
134	Actas dialogos con vecinos 2.pdf"
135	Ajuste_Propuesta_Tecnica_Sesion_Junta_27052019.pdf"
136	Espacio de Socialización del PDD 022019.pdf"
137	Espacio_Gobernanza_MDB_04112019.pdf"
138	Formulario_Monitoreo_comunitario_07082019.pdf"
139	Formulario_Monitoreo_comunitario_09082019.pdf"
140	Listados de Asistencia y Recorridos jul.ago.sep.docx"
141	Listados de Asistencia y Recorridos.nov-dic.docx"
142	Mecanismo distribución beneficios 112019.pdf"
143	Recorrido_Gobernanza_09082019.pdf"
144	Recorrido_Gobernanza_10082019.pdf"
145	Recorrido_Gobernanza_23072019.pdf"
146	Recorrido_Gobernanza_24072019.pdf"
147	Recorrido_Gobernanza_30072019.pdf"
148	Recorrido_Gobernanza_31072019.pdf"
149	Reunion_AgendaInteretnica_Gobernanza_24052019_Trasversal.pdf"
150	Reunion_CoordinadoresREDD_012020_Transversal.pdf"
151	Acta Mecanismo de Distribución de Beneficios 2019.pdf"
152	Acta Socializacion proyecto REDD+ a vecinos del proyecto REDD+.pdf"
153	Actas Socializacion proyecto REDD+ a vecinos del proyecto REDD+ 2.pdf"
154	Mecanismo de distribución de beneficiosMDB_04112019.pdf"
155	Sesion Junta ACABA_planificación actividades monitoreo.pdf"

156	Sesion Junta Rio Pepe_ACABA_planificación actividades monitoreo.pdf"
157	Socialización acuerdos gobernanzaZona_1_12112019.pdf"
158	Socialización acuerdos gobernanzaZona_2_14112019.pdf"
159	Socialización acuerdos gobernanzaZona_3_13112019.pdf"
160	Espacio_Gobernanza_Reglamento_interno_26102019.pdf"
161	Listados de asistencia sep-oct-nov-Gobernanza Acaba.docx"
162	SESION~1.PDF"
163	SESION~2.PDF"
164	Sesion_Junta_20092019.pdf"
165	Sesion_Junta_28102019.pdf"
166	Sesion_Junta_Zona_1_12112019.pdf"
167	Sesion_Junta_Zona_2_14112019.pdf"
168	Sesion_Junta_Zona_3_13112019.pdf"
169	Sesiones de junta 072019.pdf"
170	Sesiones de junta 04092019.pdf"
Activities	
171	Beneficiarios del proyecto Achiote.xlsx"
172	DIAGNOSTICO PREDIOS BENEFICIARIOS PY ACHIOTE puerto meluk Rev - MS.xlsx"
173	10. Convenio 193 de 2020 (1).pdf"
174	10-01. Modificación 1 y Novedad 193 de 2020.pdf"
175	TDR CV ACABA_dic2020 VFinal.pdf"
176	Acta de inicio ACABA (1).PDF"
177	Acta de inicio RIO PEPE (1).PDF"
178	Capacitación cultivo cacao 092019.pdf"
179	Certifacado de venta_2020.pdf"
180	Certificado de venta 2_2020.jpg"
181	Comité técnico achiote 2019.pdf"
182	Listado_asistencia_ComiteDirectivoAnualAchioteChocoano_22022020.pdf"
183	Listado_asistencia_tecnica_102019.pdf"
184	TdR - Adecuacion Centros de Acopio.pdf"
185	TDR Achiote compras adicionales CZ(29-09-2020) firmado.pdf"
186	TdR- HerramientasMaterialesdotación Achiote Medio y Bajo Baudó.pdf"
187	Visitas_Asiistencia_Tecnica_Acaba_042020.pdf"
188	Visitas_Asiistencia_Tecnica_Acaba_052020.pdf"
189	Visitas_Asiistencia_Tecnica_Acaba_122019.pdf"
190	Visitas_Asiistencia_Tecnica_Acaba_10012020.pdf"
191	Visitas_Asiistencia_Tecnica_Acaba_A_012020.pdf"
192	Visitas_Asiistencia_Tecnica_Acaba_B_012020.pdf"
193	Visitas_Asiistencia_Tecnica_Rio_Pepe_042020.pdf"
194	Visitas_Asiistencia_Tecnica_Rio_Pepe_052020.pdf"
Social impacts	

195	ACABA Evaluacion Participativa Impactos 2022.docx"
196	T1_5BD_ACABA_Pepe.xlsx"
197	_IndSociales RioPepe ACABA_V2.xlsx"
198	_PortafolioREDD+_ACABA Rio Pepe 2018_2019 detallada.xlsx"
199	2.2.1 CronogramaImplementacionPortafolio.xlsx"
200	MTC_IndSociales RioPepe ACABA_V2.xlsx"
Biodiversity	
201	ACABA RIO PEPE CENSO FAUNA 25.04.2019.xlsx"
202	ACABA RIO PEPE OBSERVACIONES 25.04.2019.xlsx"
203	ACABA-RP Biodiversity Analysis V1.xlsx"
204	Acta_dialogo con vecinos_Alto Baudó.pdf"
205	Acta_dialogo con vecinos_Medio Baudó.pdf"
206	Aplicacion - C.C Acaba.docx"
207	Aplicación C.C Río Pepé.docx"
208	Informe IIAP 2018-Berreberre-ACABA.pdf"
209	Protocolo Operativo de Monitoreo de Biodiversidad-Proyectos REDD+ Pacifico.pdf"
NPRR	
210	DesInventar_Rio_Pepe_2021.xlsx"
211	Rio Pepe Non-Permanence Risk Report M2 2018-2020 v1.1.doc"
212	wgidataset_2021_v1.1.xlsx"
213	ACABA & Pepe Resultados Evaluacion Impactos Sociales .docx"
214	Rio Pepe y Acaba Non-Permanence Risk Report Short form_v1.2.pdf"
215	VCS-Risk-Report-Calculation-Tool-v4_RP_Acaba_MP2.xlsm"
216	wgidataset_2021_v1.2.xlsx"

APPENDIX II: CORRECTIVE ACTION, CLARIFICATION AND FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS

VCS Corrective action requests (CARs)

VCS CAR ID	01	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
According to Verra Registry, the name and the ID of the project are incorrect in the MR		
Project proponent response		Date: 23/09/2022
The name and ID of the project have been updated to reflect the Verra Registry listing.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
View updated report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
The name and the ID have been modified. Therefore, CAR 01 is closed		

VCS CAR ID	02	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
The following errors have been found according to the follow up of the MR CCB and VCS template: 1. All items in the box on the title page must be completed. However, report ID box is empty. 2. The date of issue is the date when the document was issued. However, this date is being updating constantly. Therefore, it does not show the original date of the document. 3. The template requires specific format for the different parts of the document. However, the font in the header 3.1.1, does not met the requirement.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
1. Updated ID. 2. The date had an automatic update application, Deleted and added date of elaboration of the document. 3. Updated format.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
View updated report.		

VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
- the template has specific formats for the document, including the initial box. However, the report ID information does not match the template requirements. Complementary, explain why the Report ID is named as Verification Report while this is not the Verification report. - Dated changed and deemed correct. - Corrected.		
Project proponent response		Date: 24/11/2022
Indeed, the auditor's observation is correct, and the adjustment is made in the indicated section.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/12/2022
The section has been updated and deemed correct. Therefore, CAR 02 is closed		
VCS CAR ID	03	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
There is an incongruence between the GHG accounting/crediting period of the initial table of MR and the date of PDD.		
Project proponent response		Date: 23/09/2022
The audit team is correct, incorrect crediting period dates were listed in the summary table of the MR. The crediting period has been updated to the correct period of 01 December 2014 - 01 December 2044, as reported in the PD.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
View updated report.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
The crediting period has been updated and matches with the PDD. Therefore, CAR 03 is closed		

VCS CAR ID	04	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
The following errors have been found within section 1.1 unique benefit of the MR: 1. The 2 days of goal prioritization for the POA of the PDD, which is reported in the project lifetime column under the period 18-19 is not shown in the column of the MP. 2. The 17 people in the 2 follow-up meetings on the application of the management plan are not reported within the project lifetime column 3. The 1 team REDD+ trained in the following topics is not reported within the MP column. Also, for 1 REDD+ team with equipment. The template requires both columns need to be the same.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
1. Adjustment is made according to observation. 2. Adjustment is made according to observation. 3. Adjustment is made according to observation.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
View updated report.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
1. Is still incorrect. Explain why have been removed the benefits of the Project Life time which were performed in the current MP. 2. Ídem 3. Ídem		
Project proponent response		Date: 24/11/2022
The decision had been made to include in the project lifetime column only the total data reported in each outcome of the current monitoring period because the lifetime project column was too long; however, following the observation made by the auditor and according to the template, the adjustment is made in the three points of the findings and the complete information is included in the monitoring report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/12/2022
There are still inconsistencies between both columns. There are differences from the achievements for the MP in the right and left column. For example, the socialization sessions.		
Project proponent response		Date: 18/01/2023
In accordance with the auditor's observation, an adjustment is made to section 1.1 and section 1.2 of the monitoring report. View updated report.		
VVB Assessment		Date:

The PP has updated both sections, therefore, CAR 04 is closed

VCS CAR ID	05	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
The following errors have been found within section 1.2 standardized benefits of the MR: 1. there is inconsistency between the 1667 ha of reduced forest loss in the project area and the table 27 of the same document 2. 1.2. □ the sum between the MR1 and MR2 of the Number of hectares of reduced forest loss in the project area measured against the without-project scenario does not match with the total stated on the MR 3. According to the 48 participants trained in maintenance of achiote/BPA plantations overview, the project lifetime value does not match with the information provided in the MP column 4. The 242 and 12 women stated in project life time column of table 1.2 are not stated in the column beside of MP. 5. The 3 people in gender workshop are not stated in the column of project lifetime. 6. It is stated that the total number of people that improved the well being was 167, distributed in different categories. However, the sum of the categories does not match with the vale 167. 7. Within biodiversity conservation, the column of project lifetime of number of endangered species is for the period 2013-2019, however the values of this period is lower than for the MR period. Also, the 603 individuals of flora are not stated in the project lifetime column.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
1. The audit team is correct that the total area of reduced forest loss in the project area measured against the without-project scenario was incorrect. The values in Table 27 and the values in Section 1.2 of the MIR were updated to the correct values. 2. The audit team is correct that the total area of reduced forest loss in the project area measured against the without-project scenario does not match with the sum of the current and the previous MP. An error was made in copying the value of hectares for the "Achievements during Monitoring Period", and another error was made in summing the areas from MP1 and MP2. These errors were corrected and the values in the "Achievements during Monitoring Period" and "Achievements during the Project Lifetime" columns were updated for this metric. 3. Adjustment is made according to observation. 4. Adjustment is made according to observation. 5. Adjustment is made according to observation. 6. Adjustment is made according to observation. 7. Adjustment is made according to observation; VOC species only are reported.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
View updated report.		

VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
1. The surface has been updated and deemed correct 2. Ídem 3. It has been modified. However, both columns do not match. Total achievement is the sum of all Monitoring Periods. 4. It has been modified. However, both columns do not match. Total achievement is the sum of all Monitoring Periods. 5. It has been modified. However, both columns do not match. Total achievement is the sum of all Monitoring Periods. 6. It has been modified. However, both columns do not match. Total achievement is the sum of all Monitoring Periods. 7. It has been modified. However, both columns do not match. Total achievement is the sum of all Monitoring Periods. Complementary, there are sentences highlighted in other color, which is not a requirement of the template.	
Project proponent response	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
1. Ok 2. Ok 3. the adjustment is made according to the observation 4. the adjustment is made according to the observation 5. the adjustment is made according to the observation 6. the adjustment is made according to the observation 7. In accordance with the observation made by the auditor, an adjustment is made to the monitoring report.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/12/2022
3. adjustment made properly. 4. adjustment made properly 5. adjustment made properly. 6. adjustment made properly 7. adjustment made properly Therefore CAR 05 is closed	

VCS CAR ID	06	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
According to the template: 1. The section 2.1.1 should not be more than one page. However, this requirement is not met. 2. In section 2.1.8, provide the title, reference and version number of the methodology or methodologies applied to the project. Include also the title and version number of any tools applied by the project. However, this requirement is not met. Also provide explanations of the numbers tool 03, tool 06 and tool 09 of some methodologies due to these are not the real name of the methodologies. 3. Compliance with the latest version of the standard is mandatory. However, in section 2.1.8 there is reference to an outdated document.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
1. Adjustment is made and the text is reduced according to the observation. 2. The requested information is entered. The information requested for our concept was detailed in the paragraph of section 2.1.8. The methodological tools were developed in the same section. 3. Adjustment is made as indicated.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
View updated report.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
1. Adjustment done 2. Adjustment done 3. It has been updated Therefore CAR 06 is closed		

VCS CAR ID	07	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
According to section 4.3 of the validated PD, there were two methodology deviations which still apply to the current monitoring period. However, within the section 2.2.2 of the MR no deviations are stated. In addition, there have been minor changes in other entities, such as ecopartners renamed EP Carbon and change in contact people in WWC which are not stated as minor changes to project description in section 2.2.3.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
1. Adjustment is made according to the observation. 2. Adjustment is made according to the observation, including information from EP Carbon and WWC.		

Documentation provided by Project proponent	
View updated report.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
1. According to the template: Describe and justify any methodology deviations applied during this monitoring period. Include evidence to demonstrate the following: The deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals; The deviations relates only to the criteria and procedures for monitoring or measurement, and do not relate to any other part of the methodology. This criteria is not followed. 2. Explain if tables of minor changes in section 2.2.3 are actually the same. Complementary, it is stated that the project period is 2108-2019.	
Project proponent response	Date: dd/mm/yyyy
1. According to the observation made in the second round of findings, it was verified that section 4.3 of the project description describes two methodological deviations that were applied only for the construction of the baseline and for the estimation of the carbon stock in the project validation process. Nowhere in the document is it mentioned that these deviations should be applied for the monitoring period, and it is not relevant because they were used exclusively for the construction of the baseline. It is also clarified that: A. The deviations applied at the time of validation do not negatively affect the conservative nature of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals; and validation time do not negatively affect the conservative nature of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals; the deviations relate only to the monitoring or measurement criteria and procedures, and not to any other part of the methodology. B. That as the deviations do not affect the continuous monitoring of the project, then these were not included, as accepted in the last verification period. C. The monitoring report is adjusted again for this period with the above information supporting that there are no methodological deviations for this monitoring period. See report section 2.2.2 2. In the first round of findings the auditor indicated that it was necessary to include the information related to the change of name from ecopartners to EP Carbon and the change of contact persons at WWC in section 2.2.3 of the report; indeed, the change was made following this indication. Understanding the second round for this finding, an adjustment is made in the change justification column.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/12/2022
1. Section updated accordingly. 2. Section updated and deemed correct Therefore, CAR 07 is closed	

VCS CAR ID	08	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
The numbering [EA1] and successive of section 3.1.1 does not match with the PD nor methodology.		
Project proponent response		Date: 11/20/2022
The numbering of the parameters have been updated in the MIR to match the methodology and PD.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
Parameters have been updated. However, the number of the section 3.1.1 and onwards, does not appear nor matches with the template.		
Project proponent response		Date: 08/12/2022
The project team has reviewed and updated section numbers to match with the latest CCB & VCS Monitoring Report, CCB v3.0, VCS v3.4 template.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/12/2022
Numbers of section updated as per requirements of the template. CAR 08 is closed		

VCS CAR ID	09	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
The following errors have been found according to section 3.1.1, data and parameters: - the parameter SC1, SC2, states see project description. However, it is empty in the PDD - the following parameters value are empty at validation, while in the MR the value is referenced to the PDD: $size_{projectArea}, size_{leakageArea}, size_{referenceRegion}, size_{referenceForest},$ $\Delta area_{projectAreaEAH,baselineScenario}(t,i)$ $\Delta area_{leakageArea,baselineScenario}(t,i),$ $area_{historical}(CS_1, t_1) ,$ $CT_{baseline}(h,j,ty,t),$ $DT_{baseline}(h,j,ty,t)$ $contribution_{DF}(d)$ and $contribution_{DG}(d),$ $RelativeDriverImpact_{DF}(t,d),$ $proportion_{DF}(d)$ and $proportion_{DG}(d),$ $uclassification, ustratification$ - For the parameters which the value applied is referred to the spreadsheet document, please, if possible, state within the box value. - There is one parameter with the name written wrong, also this parameter is empty at validation. - For the value $OM_o(i)$ ☐ provide information of the other strata		

Project proponent response	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
-----------------------------------	-------------------------

1. The audit team is correct, no values were provided for these parameters in the PD, although section 5.3.5.3 of the PD does discuss the spatial model that was used to determine these parameters. The MIR has been updated with the correct values for SC1 and SC2 of -0.497 and 12.63, respectively. These values are taken from PD Annex AS: Spatial Modeling Report v1.11.pdf, provided separately to the audit team.
2. The following corrections have been made to each of these parameters:
 - a. The MIR parameter table has been updated with the correct values
 - b. The MIR has been updated to the following: Values for each baseline transition in the project area can be generated on the 'Report - LULC Change' of the accounting model, "VM0006_RIO PEPE Y ACABA_Ex_Post_v2.7.xlsm". Baseline areas transitioned remain unchanged since initial validation. See PD Section 5.3.5.4 for more information on methods for estimating transition rates and results of this analysis.
 - c. The MIR has been updated to the following: Values for each baseline transition in the leakage area can be generated on the 'Report - LULC Change' of the accounting model, "VM0006_RIO PEPE Y ACABA_Ex_Post_v2.7.xlsm". Baseline areas transitioned remain unchanged since initial validation. See PD Section 5.3.5.4 for more information on methods for estimating transition rates and results of this analysis.
 - d. This parameter refers to areas of historical forest classes within the reference area and is only required to be updated at a baseline update, so it is correct to state that it has not changed since validation. However, the parameter table has been updated in the monitoring report to clarify that the values for this parameter are reported in Section 3.5.1.1 of the PDD. Specifically, areas of forest strata within the reference area at the project start are reported in Table 39 of the PDD.
 - e. This parameter refers to extracted volume of timber. The parameter table has been updated to specify that information on calculating this parameter can be found in Section 5.6.2 of the PDD and that specific values are available in the 'Harvested Wood Products Data' tab of the updated accounting model.
 - f. This parameter refers to extracted volume of timber. The parameter table has been updated to specify that information on calculating this parameter can be found in Section 5.6.2 of the PDD and that specific values are available in the 'Harvested Wood Products Data' tab of the updated accounting model.
 - g. While the MIR was accurate in stating that these values remain unchanged since validation, the parameter table in the MIR has been updated to provide additional information on where in the PDD this parameter is discussed. Specifically, Table 26 in Section 5.3.3.1 of the PDD has parameter values for each driver category.
 - h. While the MIR was accurate in stating that these values remain unchanged since validation, the parameter table in the MIR has been updated to provide additional information on where in the PDD this parameter is discussed. Specifically, Table 26 in Section 5.3.3.1 of the PDD has parameter values for each driver category.
 - i. While the MIR was accurate in stating that these values remain unchanged since validation, the parameter table in the MIR has been updated to provide additional information on where in the PDD this parameter is discussed. Specifically, Table 26 in Section 5.3.3.1 of the PDD has parameter values for each driver category.
 - j. The audit team is correct, applied values were not reported in the MIR. Parameter tables have been updated to report values of 0.9 and 0.75 for u_classification and u_stratification, respectively.
3. The proponent has reviewed parameters tables and added more specificity when possible.

4. The proponent has identified the parameter $\Delta area_{\{historical(CS1 \rightarrow CS2, t1 \rightarrow t2)\}}$ was incorrectly named. It has been updated in the MIR. Additionally, the parameter table has been corrected with appropriate information on values being found in Table 41 of the PDD and procedures reported in Section 5.3.5.1 of the PDD. 5. The parameter table has been updated with a reference to the table in the MIR that reports carbon stock values for each pool and LULC class.	
Documentation provided by Project proponent	
Spatial Modeling Report v1.11.pdf VM0006_RIO PEPE Y ACABA_Ex_Post_v2.7.xlsm	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
1. Values updated according to the evidence properly 2a. values do not match with the GIS evidence 2b. updated and deemed correct 2c. updated and deemed correct 2d. there are incongruences between the statement in the finding response and the new update within the parameter historical area. 2e. updated and deemed correct 2f. updated and deemed correct 2g. updated and deemed correct 2h. updated and deemed correct 2i. updated and deemed correct 2j. updated and deemed correct 3. updated and deemed correct 4. updated and deemed correct 5. updated and deemed correct	
Project proponent response	Date: 09/12/2022
2a. The audit team is correct, while the provided spatial data was correct the monitoring report had been updated with incorrect values in the parameter table. The table has been updated with the correct values from validation. 2d. The project team agrees that their response was inconsistent with the correct information that was provided in the monitoring report. The report correctly refers to Section 5.3.5.1 of the PDD but the response mentioned Section 3.5.1.1. The information in the monitoring report has been confirmed as accurate and no updates to the report have been made as this information can be found in Table 39 of the PDD.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/12/2022

2.a. values updated according to the project
2.d. value updated
Therefore, CAR 09 is closed

VCS CAR ID	10	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
As per requirement of the methodology, present tables with the LULC class and forest-strata specific land transitions for the project and leakage area under the baseline and project scenarios.		
Project proponent response		Date: 23/09/2022
A table has been added to section 3.2.2 which displays the LULC class specific land transition areas for the project area under the baseline scenario and compares these values to the LULC class specific land transition areas for the project area in the project scenario. A table has been added to section 3.2.3 which displays the LULC class specific land transition areas for the leakage area under the baseline scenario and compares these values to the LULC class specific land transition areas for the leakage area in the project scenario.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
View updated report.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
Please, include the units of such table		
Project proponent response		Date: 09/12/2022
The appropriate units (ha) have been added to the headers of Tables 19 and 22.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/12/2022
Units added in both tables. Therefore, CAR 10 is closed		

VCS CAR ID	11	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
The following issues have been found according to Non-Permanence Risk Report: 1. According to Non-Permanence Risk Report, the template used is not the most updated. 2. It is stated that the document has been prepared by Bioredd+. However, this collaborator is not named within people involved in the project on the MR. 3. The automatic issuance date does not allow the knowing of the original creation date. 4. Within internal risk, it is stated that no GHG credits have been previously issued. However, this is wrong. 5. Within internal risk, please, clarify whether the ongoing patrols are required to protect more than 50% of stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued. 6. Within project management risk, there is a section filled up with N/A. However according to the NPRR template, where a section is not applicable, explain why the section is not applicable. 7. Within political risk, the value 0.18 does not match with the evidence provided. 8. Within pest and disease outbreaks, it is stated that the last assessment was in 2014. However, this statement is wrong. 9. According to the template, there is a specific type of lettering. However, within natural risks the requirement is not met.		

Project proponent response	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
1. The audit team is correct that an old version of the NPR template was used (VCS Version 3). The NPR report has been updated to the latest VCS Template (v4.0). 2. The audit team is correct, it is not appropriate to state that BioREDD prepared the document when it was EP Carbon, a listed collaborator, who completed this document preparation. The NPR Report has been corrected with the appropriate contributor. 3. The audit team is correct, the automation feature of the date cell does not allow the original creation of the file. The updated report has been provided. 4. The audit team is correct and the report has been updated to clarify that the project has been previously verified and issued credits. 5. The NPR Report has been updated to conservatively apply this deduction. 6. The audit team is correct, the previous document does not justify the Not applicable answer. The MIR has been updated to apply this mitigation The project encourages participation from local community members in order to provide them with the agency to make project implementation decisions. Section 2.3.8 of the MIR broadly outlines the adaptive approach undertaken by the project so that local communities are provided with greater ownership of the project, as well as details specific meetings that provided community leaders with an opportunity to plan project activities. Section 4.3.1 of the MIR provides details on ways in which community members are able to provide feedback in 'Participatory Evaluation of Social Impact' surveys (SUPP Resultados Evaluacion Impactos Sociales.docx). Additionally, the project has an established Grievance and Redress Mechanism, as outlined in Section 4.1.2 of the MIR, which provides community members with opportunities to present grievances to the Community Council, although the project is rated positive by local communities and no grievances were presented during this monitoring period. These activities have been intentionally implemented as part of the project so that planning can be adaptive and receptive to feedback from all community members, justifying this mitigation. 7. The audit team is correct, the value presented was incorrect. The value used for the calculation considered "Regulatory Quality" data for 2016 as 0 when the right value was 0.40201. The correct total average is -0.16468. The correct value doesn't alter the overall risk classification. 8. The audit team is correct, the statement in the previous NPR report is incorrect. However, as stated in section 2.2.7 of the MIR, the possibility of natural risks was evaluated via participatory process with community members and the occurrence pestilence and found insignificant. The risk and disaster database of the DesInventar risk monitoring system was consulted at the municipal level for the monitoring period (2018-2019) and no relevant event associated with a natural disaster was reported between 2018 and 2019. Thus, given no indication of significant carbon loses or indication of outbreaks to jeopardize the carbon stocks, no actions is further required to mitigate the risk. Rio Pepe y Acaba Non-Permanence Risk Report Short form_v1.2 9. The audit team is correct. The NPR report has been updated to the latest VCS Template (v4.0). Rio Pepe y Acaba Non-Permanence Risk Report Short form_v1.2	

Documentation provided by Project proponent	
Rio Pepe y Acaba Non-Permanence Risk Report Short form_v1.2.pdf VCS-Risk-Report-Calculation-Tool-v4_RP_Acaba_MP2.xlsm Participatory Evaluation of Social Impact' surveys (ACABA & Pepe Resultados Evaluacion Impactos Sociales.docx wgidataset_2021_v1.2.xlsx DesInventar_Rio_Pepe_2021.xlsx	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
1. Please, send the NPRR again. Although the version has been updated, the format does not follow the requirements. Points 2 to 9 will be reviewed after new modifications.	
Project proponent response	Date: 09/12/2022
The NPRR has been re-shared with the audit team. Some issues with the formatting have been corrected, but the NPRR remains largely unchanged. The project proponent has selected to update the NPR Report to use the 'VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report (Short Form), v4.0' and the supporting 'VCS Risk Report Calculation Tool', as permitted under VCS Standard v4.3. Templates for these tools are available on Verra's website: https://verra.org/programs/verified-carbon-standard/vcs-program-details/.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/12/2022
The NPRR has been reassessed and it is deemed correct. Therefore, CAR 11 is closed	

VCS Clarification requests (CLs)

VCS CL ID	01	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
In section 2.1.7, although the project (GIS) matches with the sum of the community council areas stated in section 2.1.7 of the MR, the surface of each community council does not match with the shapefile of the Councils. Explain that.		
Project proponent response		Date: 11/10/2022
The audit team is correct that there is non-compliance in the reported areas and the provided consejo/community council shapefile as the provided shapefile is not the originally validated file and is incorrect. The project team has identified the appropriate shapefile in validation records and has updated the community council shapefile in the monitoring database. The correct shapefile, "Sept17_RIO_PEPE_Consejos_WGS84" has been shared with the audit team. The total area estimated in the provided shapefile is consistent with the areas reported in the PD and MIR.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Sept17_RIO_PEPE_Consejos_WGS84.shp		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
The GIS file has been updated and deemed correct. Therefore, CL1 is closed		

VCS CL ID	02	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
Please, provide the source of the 467 accuracy assessment points of section 3..1.3.2.2.		
Project proponent response		Date: 23/09/2022
The audit team is correct that the accuracy assessment points were not provided. The accuracy assessment points have now been added to the Fondo Accion sharepoint folder in shapefile format with file name "Phase1and2_AllProjects_ForestAndNonforest_DensityEqualizedPoints".		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Phase1and2_AllProjects_ForestAndNonforest_DensityEqualizedPoints		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
The file has been provided and deemed correct. Therefore, CL 02 is closed		

VCS CL ID	03	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
In section 3.2.2, table 16, As per requirement of the methodology, present tables with the LULC class and forest-strata specific land transitions for the project and leakage area under the baseline and project scenarios.		
Project proponent response		Date: 23/09/2022
A table has been added to section 3.2.2 which displays the LULC class specific land transition areas for the project area under the baseline scenario and compares these values to the LULC class specific land transition areas for the project area in the project scenario. A table has been added to section 3.2.3 which displays the LULC class specific land transition areas for the leakage area under the baseline scenario and compares these values to the LULC class specific land transition areas for the leakage area in the project scenario.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
View updated report.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
The tables have been added to the document as per requirement. Therefore, CL 03 is closed		

VCS CL ID	04	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
In section 3.1.4, under dissemination of MP and results, please, update the section for the current MP as well as the results obtained estimated for march 15, 2022.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Adjustment is made according to the observation. A virtual meeting was held with the participation of the boards of directors of Rio Pepé and ACABA, technical team of the RED+ unit, action fund and paramos and Bosques where the results and progress of the verification were socialized: Results monitoring period 2018-2019. Wildlife Works Colombia, socialized the Biodiversity Results Monitoring and Verification Report and Fondo Acción, socialized the results of the emissions reduction and the participatory evaluation of social impacts.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
View updated report.		

VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
Updated and deemed correct. Therefore, CL 04 is closed	

VCS CL ID	05	Date: 14/07/2022
Description		
Some of the SOP provided as evidence does not correspond to ACABA – Rio Pepe Project. Please, provide the right evidence.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Update. Adjustment is made as indicated.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
File provided does match with the current council.		
CL05 is closed		

CCB Corrective action requests (CARs)

CCB CAR ID	01	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.3.1. PP refers to: the document; "2.2.1 CronogramalImplementacionPortafolio_Acaba_RioPepe_20182019" as brief summary of the events of accessibility of all project documentation (PDDs and other documents related to REDD+ activities) to the participating communities and to other stakeholders. However, the file contains a schedule for implementation of activities of the project. Provide the right file with a brief summary of how full project documentation has been made accessible to communities and other stakeholders. As required by the template.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
According to the description, an adjustment is made and the requested file is attached. A virtual meeting was held with the participation of the boards of directors of Rio Pepé and ACABA, the technical team of the RED+ unit, Fondo Acción and Paramos y Bosques, where the results and progress of the verification were socialized: Results of the 2018-2019 monitoring period. Wildlife Works Colombia, socialized the Biodiversity Results Monitoring and Verification Report. Fondo Acción, socialized the results of emissions reduction and participatory evaluation of social impacts. A planning meeting was held with boards of directors and the technical team to socialize the results in the communities. Invitations were sent to the communities through official letters, then the results were socialized in the local councils of Rio Pepé and ACABA, and the communities were informed about the visit of the audit to the territory. The communities were informed about the audit visit to the territory through the ethnic radio station.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
This section must describe "Stakeholder Access to Project Documents" not about the visit of the audit to the territory nor verification results. So, the project proponent response above is not right. However the requested file is presented with references to the socialization events.		
Project proponent response		Date: 24/11/2022

Information related to the REDD+ project has been made accessible to the communities through: community assemblies, meetings and different spaces for participation such as board sessions and workshops. Different spaces for participation have served as a platform to communicate to the communities the progress of REDD+ projects according to the oral tradition that the territories manage. The local REDD+ teams, government boards and other people involved in the project have been responsible for communicating and reporting results and progress. The local REDD+ teams and government boards belonging to the REDD+ projects have the project description documents and summaries in Spanish of the verified monitoring periods, which have been shared with the communities in the community spaces mentioned above.

For the monitoring period, the REDD+ project proponent interacted almost exclusively with the entities involved in the development of the projects, such as IDB-FCS, Fondo Acción, Chemonics WWC and EP Carbon; which have the documents related to the project for its implementation.

Other stakeholders were not contacted directly during the monitoring period, but information dissemination mechanisms open to the public were used, as can be seen in the following web page where you can find documents related to the project, videos, summaries of the PDD in simple language.

VVB Assessment

Date: 20/12/2022

Section updated and links included. Therefore, CAR 01 is closed

CCB CAR ID	02	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.3.6. There is a description about how the communities were informed about the VVB site visit but not a description about how other stakeholders were informed. Provide a description about how other stakeholders have been informed of the validation/verification body's site visit in a timely manner before the site visit occurs as required by the template.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
The stakeholders involved for this verification period were FA, WWC and EP Carbon. Paramos & Bosques, in charge of contracting the auditing entity, maintained continuous communication with the implementing agent FA, WWC and EP Carbon, informing about the verification schedule 2 of the REDD+ projects. The spaces in which information was shared were the virtual meetings for the COVID-19 health emergency. As a security measure in the field, for the auditing agent and the communities themselves, the legal representatives and technical committees of the REDD+ project verbally agreed not to announce the arrival of the field audit to other entities, so as not to generate "ruido" (noise), given the presence of illegal armed groups.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
None		

VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
The groups mentioned by the proponent more than being stakeholders are considered other Entities Involved in the Project. Stakeholders are for example (corporations, Universities, neighbours, NGOs of the area, etc. It is understandable the security reasons, but PP should describe stakeholders around, and the ways direct and independent communication between communities and other stakeholders or their representatives and the validation/verification body has been be facilitated.	
Project proponent response	Date: 24/11/2022
For the 2018-2019 monitoring period, the communities belonging to the REDD+ project only had limited contact and coordination with other stakeholders outside of their territory regarding project implementation, and thus dealt almost exclusively only with entities involved in the development of the projects, such as BID-FCS (Fondo Colombia Sostenible), Fondo Acción, Chemonics WWC and EP Carbon. Under this context, the projects did not see the need to contact or inform any other stakeholders about the upcoming audit visit. The autonomy of the communities to make their own decisions on their participation in REDD+, project operation and decisions on their relationship with others governed this decision. In accordance with the observations made by the auditor, this information has been adjusted and updated in the MIR.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 20/12/2022
Section updated and links included. Therefore, CAR 02 is closed	

CCB CAR ID	03	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.3.7. There is a description about how the communities have influenced project implementation, but not about how project design has been affected by stakeholder input. Document consultations and indicate if and how project design has been affected by stakeholder input as required by the template.		

Project proponent response	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
The general design or structure of the project has not been affected by the contributions made by other stakeholders. No parties have been identified as being affected by the implementation of the Project. To date, no complaints or comments have been received that could affect the development of the project. Fondo Acción, USAID, CHEMONICS, P&B, and the Ministry of Environment and Development (as a beneficiary of the Sustainable Colombia Fund program) have highlighted the positive contributions of the project to the sustainable development of the country and the achievement of the national deforestation reduction target. There is no evidence of any aspects that could affect the project's development. According to the VCS V 4.3 standard, section 3.17.10, no impacts to stakeholders have been evidenced or described with the implementation of the project.	
Documentation provided by Project proponent	
None	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
When a project is working well in coordination with stakeholders there is a stakeholder consultation and stakeholders influence project implementation. If project design has been affected by stakeholder input it is plausible. So, the project proponent response is not right. Or did not understand the meaning of the section 2.3.7 "Describe how communities, including all community groups and other stakeholders, have influenced project implementation. Document consultations and indicate if and how project design has been affected by stakeholder input" Correct the response to close the CAR	
Project proponent response	Date: 24/11/2022

1. How communities have influenced project implementation:

The main structural design of the project has not been affected by stakeholder input since the original validation, however the day to day implementation of the main activities of the REDD+ project (Alternative livelihood activities, MRV, governance and capacities) have been adjusted and contextualized by the project teams and community government representatives to the realities of their territory. This can be seen mainly in the preparation of their annual operational plans (POAs), where technicians and the community jointly define the future implementation of project activities and priorities. Evidence of such processes can be seen in the POA approval assemblies and in the minutes of the POA preparation committees.

2. How other stakeholders have influenced project implementation:

For the 2018-2019 monitoring period, the communities belonging to the REDD+ project only had limited contact and coordination with other stakeholders outside of their territory regarding project implementation, and thus dealt almost exclusively only with entities involved in the development of the projects, such as BID-FCS, Fondo Acción, Chemonics WWC and EP Carbon.

Under this context, the projects did not receive any project design and/or implementation input from stakeholders not directly involved in project implementation or from the communities themselves. The autonomy of the communities to make their own decisions on their participation in REDD+, project operation and decisions on their relationship with others governed this circumstance and decision. In accordance with the observations made by the auditor, this information has been adjusted and updated in the MIR.

VVB Assessment

Date: 20/12/2022

Section updated and links included. Therefore, CAR 03 is closed

CCB CAR ID	04	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.3.8 Explain the processes the project proponent has used to consider Continued Consultation and Adaptive Management input and how this communication and consultation has influenced the project through adaptive management as required by the template.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
The capacity-building process carried out by the communities on elements of governance, MRV, control and surveillance, biodiversity monitoring, among others, from the beginning of the project until now, has allowed the Consejos Comunitarios ACABA_Rio pepe to exercise greater authority over community monitoring. Regarding adaptive management, the implementers have given more responsibilities to the communities in the planning of activities, management and administration of the lines of action and investment of the REDD+ project, as an adaptive strategy. This is a process in which the implementers must give more responsibility to the communities and continuously improve the installed capacities.		

Documentation provided by Project proponent	
The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
In this section capacity-building is not the main topic related with communication and consultation and adaptive management. So, the project proponent response is not right. Or did not understand the meaning of the section 2.3.8 “Describe how communication and consultation about the project has continued between the project proponent(s) and communities and other stakeholders. Explain the processes the project proponent has used to consider this input and how this communication and consultation has influenced the project through adaptive management” Correct the response to close the CAR.	
Project proponent response	Date: 24/11/2022
Communication and consultation between the project proponent(s) and the communities has been ongoing throughout the monitoring period via numerous community participation spaces, including: 1. General assemblies 2. Accountability spaces (virtual and in person). 3. Inter-ethnic agenda 4. Webinar for decision making https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4EcVxw8bn4 The management and implementation of the REDD+ project within the territory and the challenges to its implementation are shared during these mentioned spaces. Understanding that adaptive management is based on a learning process that improves management results in the long term, the information obtained and the agreements reached in each participation space have served as a reference for decision making regarding changes or adjustments in the execution of activities and management in the search for financing for REDD+ activities. For the 2018-2019 monitoring period, the communities belonging to the REDD+ project only had limited contact and coordination with other stakeholders outside of their territory regarding project implementation, and thus dealt almost exclusively only with entities involved in the development of the projects, such as BID-FCS, Fondo Acción, Chemonics WWC and EP Carbon. Under this context, the projects did not receive any concerns or comments from stakeholders not directly involved in project implementation or from the communities themselves.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 20/12/2022
Section updated and links included. Therefore, CAR 04 is closed	

CCB CAR ID	05	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.3.9 PP presents; that consultations and participatory processes have been undertaken directly with communities. But do not present how this is or was done with other stakeholders. Provide justification that adequate levels of information sharing have occurred with other stakeholders as required by the template.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Consultations and participatory processes have been carried out with other stakeholders such as Páramos & Bosques, Ep Carbon and WWC, IDB, where the results of the REDD+ ACABA_Rio pepe Project have been shown through technical meetings, where agreements have been reached on the implementation of activities or support. The Community Councils socialized the REDD+ project with their neighbors.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
The groups mentioned by the proponent more than being stakeholders are considered other Entities Involved in the Project. Stakeholders are for example (corporations, Universities, neighbours, NGOs of the area, etc. Widen the description and justification about information sharing that have occurred with the neighbour among other stakeholders. As stated by the template "Demonstrate that all consultations and participatory processes have been undertaken directly with communities and other stakeholders or through their legitimate representatives. Provide justification that adequate levels of information sharing have occurred." Correct the response to close the CAR.		
Project proponent response		Date: 24/11/2022
The project did not carry out any participatory processes, information exchanges and other consultations with other stakeholders during the monitoring period because none were needed. For the 2018-2019 monitoring period, the communities belonging to the REDD+ project only had limited contact and coordination with other stakeholders outside of their territory regarding project implementation, and thus dealt almost exclusively only with entities involved in the development of the projects, such as BID-FCS, Fondo Acción, Chemonics WWC and EP Carbon. Under this context, the projects did not receive any concerns or comments from stakeholders not directly involved in project implementation or from the communities themselves, hence no further consultations or participatory processes with such groups was necessary during the monitoring period.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 20/12/2022
Section updated and links included. Therefore, CAR 05 is closed		

CCB CAR ID	06	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.3.10 PP describes processes implemented to enable the effective participation, as appropriate, of all communities and mention that selection of the beneficiaries of productive activities by means of pre-established criteria was made. Describe how this selection of the beneficiaries of productive activities was made with the decision-making and implementation by the communities and stakeholder (criteria procedure). Provide such information and demonstrate the culture- and gender-sensitivity of implementation of such actions as required by the template.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
The community, within its autonomous jurisdiction, developed the prioritization processes of productive activities and through broad participation (assembly), they were approved with the community. This allowed the participation of men, women, adults, children and new families in these decisions. It should be noted that the assemblies are those broad spaces where there is no discrimination, as they are community spaces for decision making. In the Rio Pepé and ACABA community councils, the selection of beneficiaries for productive activities is based on the following pre-established criteria: - Vocation and productive interest - Being linked to logging activities - Being from the territory - Percentage of representation of women - Sign a conservation agreement. For this verification period, continuity was given to the productive activities developed since 2016 in the cultivation of Achiote.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
Description provided and documentation is enough. CAR 06 is closed		

CCB CAR ID	07	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.3.16. PP describes the activities and processes implemented by Fondo Accion however do not present the assessment of substantial risks for the project implementation. Provide an assessment of substantial risks to worker safety that have arisen due to project implementation. Describe activities and/or processes implemented to inform workers of risks and how to minimize such risks. Show how risks have been minimized, as required by the template.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
According to Colombian law, service provision contracts (CPS)/service provision orders (OPS) are of a civil nature, which implies that there is no labor relationship or link between the contractor and the contractor, since the contractor acts independently. Therefore, people who carry out activities under the REDD+ project are not classified as workers, but as contractors due to the modality by which they were hired. Examinations are conducted prior to hiring or at the time of hiring, in which health risks are assessed and recommendations are made to contractors for the execution of activities. During the different activities, meetings or participation spaces, the teams are informed and oriented by the local REDD+ coordinator on the activities to be carried out in the field and the precautionary measures		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
The VVB is not questioning the procedures of Fondo Accion nor the procedures for hiring as it is understood that REDD+ project workers are not classified as workers but as contractors due to the modality by which they were hired. However, as per required by the template. PP (not Fondo accion) must provide an assessment of substantial risks to worker safety that have arisen due to project implementation. (independent of who hired them) Describe activities and/or processes implemented to inform workers of risks and how to minimize such risks. Show how risks have been minimized. Correct the response to close the CAR.		
Project proponent response		Date: 24/11/2022
The document "Safety protocol for field work activities" compiles activities/processes to be implemented by field collaborators and local work teams. This document was prepared in 2019 by Fondo Acción and shared with local REDD+ teams, with the purpose of minimizing risks in the work carried out in the field. See folder CAR_07 The document includes a risk matrix where recommendations to follow according to the level of risk, protocols for travel in the field, protocol in case of boarding or illegal detention and other safety recommendations are identified. Ongoing communication between employees, contractors, and project governance boards allows us to know what is happening in the territory and when it is safe or unsafe to carry out activities in the field. Information is handled discreetly and verbally.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 20/12/2022

As per required by the template. PP (not Fondo accion) must provide an assessment of substantial risks to worker safety that have arisen due to project implementation in the area. (independent of who hired them) as for example identify in the area all the substantial risks (snake bites, machete wounds, encounters with illegal groups, risk of shipwreck, etc, etc)	
Project proponent response	Date: 19/01/2023
In accordance with the auditor's observation and clarification, the matrix of risks identified by the project proponents in their daily work in the field and in the office is attached. The project proponent has identified potential risks in the execution of the activities of the people hired for the different tasks for which they were hired; the risks are especially related to the activities carried out in the field and the measures taken to reduce them. The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested. View updated report.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 20/02/2023
The assessment of substantial risks for the project implementation have been added to the document as per requirement. And a document called matrix of substantial risks for the project implementation is provided. Therefore, CAR 07 is closed	

CCB CAR ID	08	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.4.5 PP describes how Fondo Accion is not involved in or complicit in any form of corruption, but do not describe how the project proponent and any other entities involved in the project implementation are not involved. Demonstrate that the project proponent and any other entities involved in the project implementation are not involved in or complicit in any form of corruption such as bribery, embezzlement, fraud, favoritism, cronyism, nepotism, extortion, and collusion. Describe any activities and/or processes implemented to be able to provide this assurance as required by the template.		

Project proponent response	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
These policies provide guidelines for the proper management of resources, generate organizational strengthening and transparency and control in the execution of projects. The construction of the manuals and procedures of the organizations is carried out with the support of the P&B Program's socio-business team, seeking to articulate them to the USAID and Chemonics management principles and adjusted to the dynamics of each organization. Additionally, it is worth mentioning that the organizations have their own internal regulations or life plans, which provide for various mechanisms for control and accountability before the Assembly or governing or supervisory body of each organization. The entities related to the implementation of REDD+ projects correspond mainly to USAID, which finances the resources and through its guidelines, regulations and principles determines the codes of ethics and conduct for the management of projects and resources, which flow and are applied to project implementers and beneficiaries. Chemonics / P&B Program, in its capacity as project implementer, additionally has its own policies, which involve the ethical standards defined by USAID and has an Office of Ethical Conduct that allows stakeholders and beneficiaries to denounce and process any event against the established principles. Additionally, under the framework contract between USAID and Chemonics International, the company implementing the Paramos y Bosques Project, and in the clauses of each donation agreement, anti-corruption policies are included (see list below). On the other hand, REDD+ projects, beneficiaries of the Program, to whom the regulations of the other actors flow and apply; with the acceptance of the donation agreement, its "Mandatory Standard Provisions" and the signature of the "certifications and assertions" (see list and link below), commit themselves not to promote or participate in anti-corruption practices such as embezzlement, fraud, favoritism, cronyism, nepotism, extortion and collusion, according to the provisions and to denounce them. As additional actions and with the purpose of guaranteeing good practices, P&B foresees the obligation on the part of the executing organizations to constitute operational and oversight committees for the implementation of the projects. The operating committee is an instance of monitoring and control that guarantees the technical and financial transparency of the project and has the participation of P&B and the oversight committee is an instance that promotes social control from within the organizations and is constituted by representatives of the beneficiaries of the project elected by the community. In addition, the program trains organizations, legal representatives, boards of directors and project teams on procedures, regulations and requirements for the administrative and financial management of resources, and provides information on standards of conduct and complaint procedures. To date, P&B has not been notified and has not been required to take any action regarding cases of corruption. According to information provided by the community councils of ACABA and Rio Pepé for the implementation of the POAS, the community councils have manuals and procedures for administrative policies, which define the scope of the actions of managers and support staff, seeking to increase efficiency, effectiveness and transparency in the internal processes of the organization. The community councils hold annual general assemblies to present technical and financial reports on project execution. In addition to having an oversight committee to ensure proper management of resources and keep the community informed of the entire project execution process, we have the following manuals and procedures - Internal regulations - Operating Manual - Administrative policy manuals and procedures - Oversight Committee - Complaints and claims procedure	

Documentation provided by Project proponent	
Provisions that regulate and sanction anti-corruption practices: i. Certification Regarding Lobbying (22CFR 227) ii. Standard Provisions for Non-U.S., Non-governmental Recipients: - M10. Pilot program for enhancement of grantee employee whistleblower protections. - M12. Prohibition on requiring certain internal confidentiality agreements or statements - M14. Mandatory disclosures - M16. Conflict of Interest The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
Description provided and documentation is enough. Therefore CAR 08 is closed	

CCB CAR ID	09	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.5.2 As per required by the template. Demonstrate with documented consultations and agreements that: • The project has not encroached uninvited on private property, community property, or government property. • The free, prior, and informed consent has been obtained of those whose property rights will be or are affected by the project. • Appropriate restitution or compensation has been allocated to any parties whose lands have been or will be affected by the project. Furthermore, there is a section in Spanish that should be corrected.		

Project proponent response	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
The entire project is framed by the territories granted by INCORA (Instituto Colombiano de la Reforma Agraria, actual INCODER) for the ethnic communities, which means that there has been no encroachment and no territories other than those of the communities themselves have been affected. Articles 63 and 330 of the Political Constitution of Colombia and Article 6 of Law 70 of 1993 (Community Councils) recognize "the right of the black communities as a whole to own and occupy their ancestral lands" and to direct the use of the land. Specifically, the communal lands of ethnic groups are "inalienable, imprescriptible and unseizable". INCORA's resolutions establish the following for each of the Community Councils: - The official title for the Acaba Community Council was granted by Resolution 01152 of May 23, 2001, issued by Incora (currently INCODER) where 174,253 ha, in the municipality of Bajo Baudó, were recognized for this community; - In the case of the Río Pepé Community Council, 8,191ha were recognized in the municipality of Medio Baudó by Resolution 01125 of May 23, 2000;	
Documentation provided by Project proponent	
The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
The official titles for the Acaba and Rio Pepe, demonstrate ownership. But, as per required by the template. Demonstrate with documented consultations and agreements that • The project has not encroached uninvited on private property, community property, or government property. • The free, prior, and informed consent has been obtained of those whose property rights will be or are affected by the project. • Appropriate restitution or compensation has been allocated to any parties whose lands have been or will be affected by the project.	
Project proponent response	Date: 24/11/2022

Consultations and agreements that relate to encroachment on private property, community property or government property, free, prior and informed consent of those whose property rights will be or are affected by the project and consultations on restitution or adequate compensation to parties whose lands have been or will be affected by the project; were provided at the validation stage, as mentioned in the validation document named PROJ_DESC_1396_10APR2015 , in section 3.1 ; where it emphasizes " The project proponents commit to comply with all laws, statutes, property rights and other regulatory frameworks. The extensive stakeholder consultation process will ensure compliance."

For the 2018-2019 verification period the project proponents did not evidence changes in the conditions of the territory related to property rights since the time of validation; for such reason no new consultations are presented.

The communities consider that they have not invaded private property, because the entire REDD+ project is framed within the territories granted by INCORA (Colombian Institute of Agrarian Reform, currently INCODER) for ethnic communities, which means that there have been no invasions nor have territories other than those of the communities themselves been affected.

Articles 63 and 330 of the Political Constitution of Colombia and Article 6 of Law 70 of 1993 (Community Councils) recognize "the right of the black communities as a whole to own and occupy their ancestral lands" and to direct the use of these lands. Specifically, the communal lands of ethnic groups are "inalienable, imprescriptible and unsuitable". INCORA's resolutions establish the following for each of the Community Councils:

The official title for the Acaba Community Council was granted by Resolution 01152 of May 23, 2001, issued by Incora (currently INCODER) where 174,253 ha, in the municipality of Bajo Baudó, were recognized for this community;

In the case of the Río Pepé Community Council, 8,191ha were recognized in the municipality of Medio Baudó by Resolution 01125 of May 23, 2000;

VVB Assessment

Date: 20/12/2022

Section updated and links included. Therefore, CAR 09 is closed

CCB CAR ID

10

Date: DD/MM/YYYY

Description

Section 4.3.1. For projects validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits, include all additional monitored data to demonstrate the project meets all required criteria.

Project proponent response	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
In accordance with the criteria established in the PDD for exceptional values for the community, the Acaba_Riopepe REDD+ project in the period 2018-2019, developed activities related to the management of the territory: • Community monitoring and territorial control as a forest governance mechanism: The local REDD+ team and community companions, information to the community on their patrol tours, the importance of carrying out a process of conservation and sustainable management of natural resources. During the monitoring tours, verbal information and recommendations for the protection of the forests were provided, points of deforestation were identified and areas of high importance for conservation. • Quarterly Participatory Zoning Workshops and activities: held in the third of 2019, they aimed to determine and prioritize the areas of participation in the REDD+ Project in which agreements were built and the Governance, Productive, Training activities that lead to the reduction of deforestation and degradation, and to the increase of carbon credits. • Recruitment, training and equipment of the local REDD+ team: they allowed to exercise control in the territory, increase governance and achieve greater empowerment of the territory through the conservation and sustainability of the REDD+ project, • 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, in previous verification process and actual process (second verification), 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. Benefits distribution mechanism will also be made as necessary, and according to the result of these surveys Under the context indicated in section 6.3 of the PDD Acaba_Rio Pepe Project, on general poverty rates in the communities, households and individuals that compose it and the criteria of the CCB standard related to human development, the REDD+ Acaba Rio pepe project carried out the following activities for the period 2018-2019: • Improvement and establishment of productive hectares. • Technical assistance visits and field schools for farmers-ECAs. • Recruitment of specialized personnel. The aforementioned activities have allowed the construction and strengthening of capacities in value chains other than forestry. Additional data and supports to the data reported in section 4.3.1 can be found in the findings round folders.	
Documentation provided by Project proponent	
The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested. MTC_IndSociales RioPepe ACABA_V2/ Ind sociales Riopepe ACABA	

VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
There was presented a big amount of information, but no information related to monitored data to demonstrate the project meets all required criteria. Since this section is related to Community Monitoring Plan, please follow the template and Present the results of the community impact monitoring which should include: Dates, frequency, sampling methods used, and other information regarding the monitoring process. Results and evaluation of monitoring, including evaluations by the affected communities For projects validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits, include all additional monitored data to demonstrate the project meets all required criteria.	
Project proponent response	Date: dd/mm/yyyy
1. Adjustments are made to the tables related to section 4.3.1 of the follow-up report. The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested. 2. It is clarified that for the data for the parameter Involvement of Corteros in the regeneration and maintenance of the conservation areas, the project proponent has as evidence local REDD+ team reports and databases with the following information: 15 timber-dependent people in REDD+ activities were conducting carbon and biodiversity plot establishment activities. See report April 2019 12 timber dependent people who participated in REDD+ project related activities, board sessions and others. See Excel database. reported on Involvement of Corteros in the regeneration and maintenance of the conservation areas, the information contained in the April and October 2019 reports is considered as evidence. See folder CAR_10.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 20/12/2022
Section updated and links included. Therefore, CAR 10 is closed	

CCB Clarification requests (CLs)

CCB CL ID	01	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.2.5 PP refers to; Deviations During Monitoring Period 2 as title. In the template there is a section called Grouped Projects. According to the template Where a section is not applicable, same must be stated under the section (the section must not be deleted from the final document unless instructions specifically state so).		

Project proponent response	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Update. Adjustment is made as indicated.	
Documentation provided by Project proponent	
View updated report.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
Adjustment is made as indicated Therefore CL 01 is closed	

CCB CL ID	02	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.2.6. PP refers; this project uses the VCS Non-Permanence Risk Tool as the basis for a comprehensive assessment of risk evaluation. However, the tool is not in the supporting evidence/documentation. Provide the VCS Non-Permanence Risk Tool and calculations used.		
Project proponent response		Date: 23/09/2022
This documentation has been provided to the auditor in response to VCS CAR ID 11. Please review the documentation provided in response to that finding.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Rio Pepe y Acaba Non-Permanence Risk Report Short form_v1.2.pdf VCS-Risk-Report-Calculation-Tool-v4_RP_Acaba_MP2.xlsm		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
Information is provided Therefore CL 02 is closed		
Project proponent response		Date: dd/mm/yyyy

CCB CL ID	03	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.2.7. PP states that; the VCS project crediting period is 30 years, starting in 2013 and ending in 2043. In the second page of the monitoring report in the section GHG Accounting/ Crediting Period, PP states: 26 June 2013 – 25 June 2043; 30-year total period. And in the section 2.1.6 PP, states the project's crediting period is 30 years, starting on 01 December 2014 and ending on 01 December 2044. Indicate the right project crediting period, specifying the day, month and year for the start and end dates and the total number of years and correct the dates along the document. Describe how the measures implemented will go beyond the project		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
The date is adjusted according to the observation. The correct start date of the REDD+ project is the one established in PDD Rio Pepe_ACABA and verified on the VERRA website: 01 December 2014- 01 December 2044. This has been corrected throughout the report.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
The right date is corrected along the document; however, the section is about Benefit Permanence. Describe how the measures implemented will go beyond the project.		
Project proponent response		Date: 24/11/2022

The REDD+ project is an instrument to promote conservation and environmental protection activities that communities are required by law to comply with. With or without REDD+, the communities work in accordance with the state requirements established in Law 70 of 1993. The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested.

The activities developed within the framework of strengthening the governance of the REDD+ project guarantee, in a way, that the communities will have more elements, knowledge and awareness to continue exercising conservation actions beyond the project's implementation period.

Law 70 of 1993 establishes mechanisms for the protection of the cultural identity and rights of Colombia's black communities and the promotion of their economic and social development. Under this law, articles are established related to the duties and rights of the communities regarding the conservation of natural resources and environmental protection, which guarantee that the measures and activities developed in the territories during the implementation of REDD+ will go beyond the implementation period of the project.

These include:

Article 5: mentions that communities must ensure the conservation of natural resources.

Article 6: With respect to soils and forests included in the collective titling, the property will be exercised in a social function and has an inherent ecological function.

Article 20: Consequently, the owners shall comply with the obligations to protect the environment and renewable natural resources and contribute with the authorities in the defense of this heritage.

Article 21: the members of the black communities, holders of the right to communities, holders of the right of collective property, shall continue to conserve, maintain, or promote the regeneration of the maintain or promote the regeneration of the protective vegetation of waters and guarantee the guaranteeing through adequate use the persistence of especially fragile ecosystems, such as mangroves and wetlands, and protecting and conserving threatened or endangered species of wild flora and fauna.

This shows that communities by law must go further with conservation issues.

VVB Assessment	Date: 20/12/2022
Section updated and links included. Therefore, CL 03 is closed	

CCB CL ID	04	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.3.2. PP refers, (see "Resumen del Reporte de Monitoreo Rio Pepe- ACABA"). The document is not in the supporting evidence/documentation.		
Provide the document "Resumen del Reporte de Monitoreo Rio Pepe- ACABA") and describe how summary project documentation and summary information on monitoring results, has been actively disseminated to communities as required by the template, for the verification 2018-2019. The project documentation and summary information on monitoring results should be shared with the communities.		

Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
1. See summary in folder CL_04 2. Spaces have been generated to disseminate the information: According to information provided by the community councils of ACABA and Rio Pepé, the community was informed through the presentation of the technical and financial report, an activity that takes place every year. The REDD+ Unit and the board of directors prepare the technical report on the execution of the POA for presentation to the General Assembly in the last month of the year. In the framework of the implementation of agreements signed between Fondo Acción and the community councils of Acaba and Rio Pepé, with the objective of strengthening the community management of the REDD+ project ACABA-Río Pepé in 2018 and 2019, activities were developed to socialize the progress of the REDD+ project in the communities, in the spaces of board meetings and governance spaces. With the creation of the social and community radio station Radio étnica - 2019, we began to disseminate the implementation of REDD+ activities through this medium.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
Information required is provided in the supporting documents, however the hyperlinks are not provided in the MR. This and other supporting documentation must be available in the MR as hyperlinks.		
Project proponent response		Date: dd/mm/yyyy
According to the observation the hyperlink is included.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 20/12/2022
Section updated and links included. Therefore, CL 04 is closed		

CCB CL ID	05	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.3.11. PP refers, that Fondo Acción is an Equal Opportunity Employer which aims to include community members in its work regardless of age, gender, ethnicity or other characteristics. And also presents a series of policies of Fondo Accion. Describe the activities and/or processes implemented to ensure that all the other entities involved in project design and implementation are not involved in or complicit in any form of discrimination.		

Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
To promote inclusion and non-discrimination within the projects developed under the program, P&B follows USAID guidelines referring to gender inclusion established in the "Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Policy 2020" which has as one of the pillars: - "to reduce disparities between women and men in access to control over and benefits from economic, social, political, educational, and cultural resources, as well as wealth, opportunities, and services", and - the policy guidelines "To promote the rights of indigenous peoples" also applicable to the Afro-descendant population, ensuring "to strengthen the participation of peoples as meaningful partners in development processes, safeguarding them from harm and increasing their capacities to promote their rights, to determine their own priorities and to foster their self-reliance." Under these guidelines, P&B has a gender and vulnerable populations strategy as a key pillar for project sustainability. The goal is gender mainstreaming and overcoming disparities between women and men in decision-making and in the access, ownership and management of resources. Each grant project financed under the program must contain, from its structuring, a chapter related to the gender and social inclusion strategy, promoting the inclusion of population groups that have been historically excluded, including the rural population, indigenous communities and Afro-Colombian communities. Within these groups, gender equity is promoted by involving men and women in the training and technical assistance processes, as well as in decision-making, considering the participation of young people in the various actions proposed. The community councils of Rio Pepe_ACABA have an internal regulation, which is the constitution or navigation chart of the communities within their territory, which promotes policies of equality, gender equity, highlights the participation of women, youth and the elderly, in all spaces of participation and decision making. The internal regulations also establish clear norms on autonomy and territorial ethnic rights, for a better relationship with entities that implement projects or carry out actions within the territory.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
Information required is provided in the supporting documents and in the MR. Therefore CL 05 is closed		

CCB CL ID	06	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 2.4.1 PP describes key technical skills in community and carbon, but do not in biodiversity assessment. Provide technical skills in biodiversity assessment and monitoring skills, as required by the template.		

Project proponent response	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
In 2018 last quarter, thorough biodiversity efforts were laid down. Taking advantage of carbon plots activities, thru the P&B Program Acaba-RP community members were trained on Biodiversity Protocols and Censuses. In total 5 Biodiversity “Monitors” were trained on biodiversity guidelines, transects, opportunistic records and fauna reconnaissance. Based on this training, two monitoring transects were installed: Berreberre quebrada Cosme y Michurra. These efforts were backstopped by the large experience on Biodiversity Monitoring of Wildlife Works Carbon, a conservation company that is part of the coalition of organizations supporting Acaba- RP, and that has developed Biodiversity Plan and Protocols for REDD+ Project since late 2000` s in REDD+ Projects such as Kasigau in Kenya and Mai Ndombe in Congo through its Biodiversity and Society Division based in Kenya.	
Documentation provided by Project proponent	
View updated report.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
PP has made the respective descriptions, however needs to document these descriptions as stated by the template. Document the maintenance of the key technical skills required to implement the project successfully, including community engagement, biodiversity assessment and carbon measurement and monitoring skills.	
Project proponent response	Date: dd/mm/yyyy
The original and initial CCB CL ID 06 states “PP describes key technical skills in community and carbon, but do not in biodiversity assessment. Provide technical skills in biodiversity assessment and monitoring skills, as required by the template”. In response to such finding, PP provided details and supporting documentation of the skills in biodiversity and monitoring brought forward through capacity building and learning by doing actions in the field during the period of the Monitoring Report. As indicated before, taking advantage of the carbon plot activities, and thru the P&B Program, Acaba-RP community members were trained during the reporting period on Biodiversity Protocols and Censuses. In total, 5 Biodiversity “Monitors” were trained during the period on biodiversity guidelines, transects, opportunistic records and fauna reconnaissance to maintain key technical skills. Based on this training, two monitoring transects were installed: Berreberre quebrada Cosme y Michurra. The documentation backing up such efforts is compiled in the attached files: ACABA RIO PEPE OBSERVACIONES PDF, ACABA RIO PEPE CENSO FAUNA.PDF, MRV team photo, Informe de Monitoreo de carbono y biodiversidad Rio Pepe_Maiber 30abr2019; Informe de Monitoreo de carbono y biodiversidad Rio Pepe_Elber 30abr2019; Cronograma rio pepe acaba, ACABA RIO PEPE QAQC. See Folder CL_06 The technical skills gained by the PP during the MR period were the results of efforts led by the USAID funded P&B Program that initiated in March 2018. As registered in the documentation, the Biodiversity assessment and monitoring skills instructed by WWC on behalf of P&B, were planned during the second semester of 2018 and undertaken during the first half of 2019.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 20/12/2022
Section updated and links included. Therefore, CL 06 is closed	

CCB CL ID	07	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 4.1.1 PP describes in the tables the community group that has impact, benefit/risk, but in most of the community group PP writes (All community members or community members) Describe all the impacts on each community group resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario as required by the template. For example "corteros"		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
According to the observation, adjustments are made to the tables, specifying the community group.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
View updated report.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
Information required is provided in the updated MR. Therefore CL 07 is closed		

CCB CL ID	08	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 4.1.4 PP describes in that 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. Provide the documentation about the identification of the three specific types of HCVs relating to community well-being.		

Project proponent response	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
HCV 04- Critical Ecosystem Services. Community monitoring and territorial control as a forest governance mechanism: The local REDD+ team and community accompaniers inform the community in their patrols of the importance of carrying out a process of conservation and sustainable management of natural resources. During the monitoring patrols, the local REDD+ teams provide verbal information and recommendations for forest protection, identify deforestation points and mark areas of high conservation importance. The evidence for this HCV category is supported by the reports of patrols and community monitoring carried out by the Community Councils. HCV 05-Satisfying fundamental needs. Implementation of activities to strengthen community management in the Community Councils: Training, recruitment, and equipping of the local REDD+ team, has allowed to exercise control in the territory, increase governance and achieve greater empowerment of the territory through the conservation and sustainability of the REDD+ project through training, information dissemination, board sessions, other governance spaces, etc. HCV 06-Preservation of cultural identity The main norms in the recognition of territorial rights of black and indigenous communities are: ILO Convention 169 of 1989 (Law 21 of 1991), Political Constitution of 1991, Law 70 of 1993, Law 152 of 1994. The ecological function that the collective territories of black and indigenous communities must fulfill based on these regulations: the REDD+ project can contribute to the fulfillment of this legal obligation, because it strengthens the conservation practices of the communities, while at the same time favoring the implementation of economic alternatives for the families in the territories. The board sessions held during this verification period allowed for the socialization of ethnic regulations, such as Law 70 of 1993, which recognizes black communities that have been occupying vacant lands in riparian zones of the rivers of the Pacific Basin using traditional production practices, and the right to collective property. Emphasis was placed on the traditional production practices established in this law and the protection of the environment, understanding the relationships established by the black communities with nature.	
Documentation provided by Project proponent	
View updated report. The Project Proponent has updated the documents requested.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
Provide the documentation about the identification of the three specific types of HCVs relating to community well-being. How was the process to identify them? Because It seems that in several of the other REDDD+ projects of the pacific have identify the same HCVs. Documentation provided do not math with the topic. This documentation is provided in several sections.	
Project proponent response	Date:24/11/2022

For the validation period, three specific types of HCVs related to community well-being were identified in the forests of the project area:

HCV 04- Critical Ecosystem Services.
HCV 05-Satisfying fundamental needs.
HCV 06-Preservation of cultural identity

The documentation that supports the identification of the mentioned HVCs is the project description PROJ_DESC_1396_10APR2015 Section 1.3.8 of the document describes the methodology used for the identification and justifies the choice of these particular HCVs.

HCV Resource Network guidance (e.g. Brown, Dudley, Lindhe, Muhtaman, Stewart & Synnott (eds.) 2013. For HCV assessment was consulted for the identification of project HCVs. This guidance recommends that the intensity of HCV assessment reflect the nature of the project.

For projects presenting a lower risk of negative impacts to HCVs, i.e. conservation oriented projects such as REDD+, a lower intensity of assessment is appropriate versus that for resource extraction oriented projects. With a focus on reducing threats to the degradation of natural forest structural attributes and landscape connectivity, this project presents a low risk to biodiversity HCVs.

A stepped approach was used which first considers reference scale information available at the national level for Colombia, the Colombian Pacific Region and the Chocó - Darién Bioregion. At these levels as noted previously, there is ample documentation available with respect to the very high significance of the region in a global context with respect to species richness as well as threatened and endemic species. At the project level, field identification of species presence is significant but nowhere near complete. Information from territorial and forest management plans has been utilized to help with determining species related HCVs, and Humboldt biodiversity plots established for the BioREDD program in four locations along the Pacific Region will serve to further expand HCV information relevant to the project and the coastal region. This information will be supplemented over time through monitoring plan activities and continued consultation with local communities. Given the incomplete nature of information available, HCV identification has been undertaken with consideration of the precautionary principle. That is, where there is a lack of complete information but reference scale data suggests a strong probability of the existence of high conservation value, HCV is assumed to occur.

Supporting documentation is attached

VVB Assessment

Date: 20/12/2022

Section updated. Therefore, CL 08 is closed

CCB CL ID	09	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 4.2.1 PP describes that; an analysis of potential negative impacts on offsite stakeholders was carried out by the project proponents at time of validation, and no potential negative impacts and mitigation measures were identified for offsite stakeholders PP should provide the analysis of potential negative impacts in the supporting documentation.		

Project proponent response	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Indeed, in section 6.2 of the validated PD it mentions that, "The BioREDD+ team, with community members, conducted an analysis of potential negative impacts where no potential negative impacts or mitigation measures for off-site stakeholders were identified." In this context, the document in question was validated by the standard but was not found according to the observation; it was not considered for verification given that activities continue to be implemented within the project areas in collective territories and these have not demonstrated affectations outside the project site.	
Documentation provided by Project proponent	
None	
VVB Assessment	Date: 19/10/2022
PP should provide the analysis of potential negative impacts in the supporting documentation. Even if it was validated, it should be in the supporting documents for this verification in order to know it and corroborate that there were not potential negative impacts or know the description of the activities and/or processes implemented to mitigate the negative well-being impacts on other stakeholders as per the template requires.	
Project proponent response	Date: 24/11/2022
There is no separate document that summarizes the analysis of the potential negative impacts on external stakeholders other than what is already included in the validated PD. Conditions that make it unlikely for the project to have negative impacts on offsite stakeholders have not changed since time of validation, nor have any complaints or comments been received that would hint towards any negative impacts on offsite stakeholders during the reporting period. In accordance with the auditor's observation, an adjustment is made in the follow-up report .	
VVB Assessment	Date: 20/12/2022

PP. Refers to the document project description V4.3. **Section 6.2 NEGATIVE OFFSITE STAKEHOLDER IMPACTS.** It is expected that the net impact of the project on offsite stakeholders will be positive, as downstream value chain affects are felt. However, an analysis of potential negative impacts on offsite stakeholders was carried out by the BioREDD+ team with community stakeholders and **potential negative impacts and mitigation measures were identified.**

In the event that **leakage** is not managed adequately, offsite communities may experience an increase in unregulated logging in their forest. Negative impacts from this logging could be felt as a decrease in access to High Conservation Value areas including access to non-timber forest products and declining watershed health.

These potential negative impacts can be mitigated by successfully adhering to the leakage management plan. See Section 5.2. Transportation that takes wood out of the project zone also brings in daily commodities.

Thus, the **reduction in logging and transportation of materials may increase the cost of living for communities surrounding the project zone.** To mitigate this potential impact, the project is aiming to replace timber that is currently transported out of the project zone with agricultural commodities.

Given the logistics and costs of transport in the remote Pacific Coast region, there is an obvious economic rationale for reducing overall costs by importing commodities using available space on boats and road transport, when available.

Loggers and others within the value chain located outside the project zone (who traditionally have logged within the project zone) **could potentially see a reduction in revenue due to increased governance in the project zone.** In addition, logging in surrounding areas could be intensified.

The Project is mitigating this potential negative impact by involving those currently involved in logging in alternative livelihood activities, reducing the likelihood that they will move into other areas. Additionally, the participation of the municipality in developing appropriate regulations and regional environmental authorities in control measures (e.g. land use planning) serves to mitigate this impact.

Since the validated document mention "**potential negative impacts and mitigation measures were identified**". Therefore pp should describe the follow up to these potential negative impacts on offsite stakeholders

Project proponent response

Date: 10/02/2023

After a detailed review of the observations made by the auditor regarding this finding related to "analysis of potential negative impacts on offsite stakeholders", the following can be concluded:

Indeed according to information consigned in the PD of the REDD+ project an analysis of potential negative impacts of other stakeholders outside the project area was performed at the beginning of the project; this document does mention some potential negative impacts and mitigation measures that were not described in previous versions of the monitoring report.

At the time of validation, the project proponents conducted an analysis of potential negative impacts on external stakeholders and identified potential negative impacts and mitigation measures.

The potential negative impacts detailed in the REDD+ project PD are as follows:

- Decreased access to areas of high conservation value for offsite communities as a result of an increase in unregulated logging, including a resulting decrease in access to non-timber forest products, and in a deterioration of watershed health
- Increased cost of living for communities surrounding the project area by losing income from illegal logging and higher costs of other goods.
- Reduction in income of loggers who live outside the project zone and have traditionally logged within the project area because of increased governance in the project zone.

For the current monitoring period, the project proponent implemented activities such as: a) Implementation of productive activities, b) Strengthening of governance, and c) Establishment of forest

patrols. These activities have occurred within the project area and have influenced neighboring areas. These proposed project activities are the mitigation measures for the potential impacts mentioned above and following the provisions of the leakage plan described in section 5.2 of the PD. Meanwhile the following description substantiates how each potential negative impact to other stakeholders have been mitigated during the current monitoring period using these three categories of project activities.

- a. **Mitigation measures for:** Decreased access to areas of high conservation value for offsite communities as a result of an increase in unregulated logging, including a resulting decrease in access to non-timber forest products, and in a deterioration of watershed health.

The PD predicted possible declines in accessing the project area and its high conservation values because of displaced deforestation and forest degradation pressures into the leakage belt. The project activities that have been described in the following two sections and elsewhere in the MIR have mitigated the effects of these predicted negative impacts. -The monitored data in the leakage belt suggests that deforestation and degradation in the leakage belt has not only been held to below baseline predictions but has been decreasing relative to the previous monitoring period. The basis for this assertion is described next.

The project activities have included the implementation of forest patrols which may have discouraged illegal logging in the project area, but also in the leakage belt that directly borders the project zone boundaries. For the current monitoring period, 10 forest patrol campaigns were carried out with the participation of 187 people including both men and women. The evidence for these forest patrol campaigns can be found MTC_IndSociales RioPepe ACABA_V2, and are re-summarized here:

From a monitoring perspective, the land cover transitions that were quantified within the leakage belt during this monitoring period, and which are presented in Table 22 and Figure 4 (sections 3.2.3, and 3.1.3.2 respectively) suggest that monitored deforestation and forest degradation in the leakage belt is far less than the predicted baseline. The negative impacts that were dependent on this predicted land cover change are extremely low (~45ha) and therefore are not creating meaningful negative impacts during this monitoring period. Observed changes in forest carbon stocks in the leakage belt are the quantitative indicator used to infer whether there have been negative impacts created on communities in the leakage belt, since without illegal deforestation/degradation, the related impacts to communities from uncontrolled deforestation/degradation cannot logically occur. The amount of monitored deforestation and forest degradation was nearly 1,700 ha less than was estimated for this monitoring period in the baseline scenario according to Table 22 in section 3.2.3. This table shows the monitored land cover changes in the leakage belt in the project scenario versus the estimated baseline scenario in the same area. Further, the pattern of land cover change in the leakage belt suggests that any unmitigated negative impacts that have occurred result are minor and diffuse because they are distributed widely throughout the leakage belt. Figure 4 in section 3.1.3.2 shows the location of land cover changes in the leakage belt and shows these areas to be sporadic, are relatively low in size and concentration, and are dominated by forest degradation totaling over just under 45 ha, with very little deforestation present..

Additionally, the monitored annual deforestation and degradation emissions are lower than was observed in the previous monitoring period (Table 21 in Section 3.2.3). Specifically, the results of monitored emissions in the leakage belt in Table 22 indicate that the total emissions in the leakage belt from activity –displaced leakage during this monitoring period are just under 27,890 tCO₂e, while monitored emissions during the previous monitoring period were nearly seven and half times greater at just under 214,375 tCO₂e. This implies that project activities have not resulted in a significant displacement of illegal logging activities from the project zone into the leakage belt, and that the identified potential negative impacts on offsite communities from offsite illegal logging have therefore not materialized to a significant degree. Instead, these results suggest that project activities may be having a positive impact on conservation of forests in the leakage belt and are instead decreasing the threat and consequences from activity-displaced leakage.

- b. **Mitigation measures for:** Increased cost of living for communities surrounding the project area by losing income from illegal logging and higher costs of other goods.

Traditionally, the transportation that took illegal timber from the project area also brought products for daily consumption into the project zone, since communities within the project zone took advantage of this available transport space to bring in goods from outside the project zone. Thus, it was reasoned that reducing illegal logging could lead to an increase in the cost of living for communities in the project zone by increasing transport costs of other goods that had previously been brought within the project zone via this method. To mitigate this potential impact, the project intended to replace the income from illegal timber transported out of the project area and to partially substitute the dependency on goods external to the project zone, with agricultural products and related value chains within the project zone. For the current monitoring period, productive activities were focused on the supporting and developing and improving local production of Achiote and Cocoa, as summarized in section 4.3.1

- c. **Mitigation measures for:** Reduction in income of loggers who live outside the project zone and have traditionally logged within the project area.

Loggers and others within the value chain located outside the project zone and who traditionally have logged within the project areas, may have potentially seen a reduction in household income due to increased governance in the project zone. In addition, illegally harvesting trees in the leakage belt was postulated to potentially have intensified as a result of project activities. However, the project has mitigated this potential negative impact by trying to engage those currently involved in wood cutting in alternative livelihood activities, reducing the likelihood that they will move into other adjacent areas. Numerous households that have historically relied on illegal logging income have been specifically prioritized during the current monitoring to receive capacity building and other support in order to participate in alternative productive activities as a means for substituting income from illegal logging. This progress is described in section 5.2.1 of this document.

Moreover, there have been activities to improve the ability of community councils to manage local participation project activities, such as board sessions, assemblies and decision-making spaces (See section 4.4.1), that can generate alternative income in the future (not from illegal logging), and to effectively distribute those economic benefits, thereby mitigating the incentive for illegal logging over time. More specifically, the community councils have participated in, and continue to build and expand their active management of the implementation of project activities through i). Actively engaging fellow community members to participate and contribute to decision-making making processes (see Section 4.3.1); ii) Overseeing and coordinating community monitoring plans and their dissemination (see Sections 4.3.1, 4.3.2); iii) actively participating in updating benefit sharing agreements (see Section 4.4.4), iv). Supporting women's participation and project benefits (see Section 4.4.3); and overseeing and coordinating efforts to build capacity within beneficiary communities (see section 4.4.1). Specifically, during this monitoring period, the involvement of communities in developing appropriate regulations and regional environmental authorities in control measures (e.g. land use planning) has also served to mitigate this impact.

Furthermore, there have been project activities aimed at developing economic alternatives and implementing other actions within the project area to prevent illegal logging in the surrounding areas, which have likely discouraged illegal logging in the leakage zone that directly borders the project area boundaries; with the participation of 32 people. This has been highlighted in Mitigation Measures (a), already explained previously in this section.

Supporting documentation is attached

VVB Assessment

Date: 20/02/2023

The pp described in the new version of the MR the follow up to the potential negative impacts on offsite stakeholders. Also presented a document in the supporting documents. Therefore, CL 09 is closed.

CCB CL ID	10	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 4.2.2 PP describes that; as part of the social impact evaluation assessments (" Social Impact Evaluations"), the project's communities identified some negative situations, or situations that have not improved, since the project began. Demonstrate that the project activities have not resulted in net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholders as per required by the template.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
The work focused on gathering community perception of the REDD+ project, it is not an impact assessment involving other stakeholders; the methodology focused on the existence or not of changes in the social benefits of the community during the years 2018 to 2019.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
None		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
Even when the work focused on gathering community perception of the REDD+ project, as it was not an impact assessment involving other stakeholders; PP should demonstrate that the project activities have not resulted in net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholders as per required by the template.		
Project proponent response	Date: 24/11/2022	
While section 4.2.2 indeed mentions some "negative situations" as part of the social impact evaluations conducted, the same section clarifies that such situations were related to activities that were deemed to NOT be part of the planned project activities, or as a direct consequence of any REDD+ project related activities. Furthermore, conditions that make it unlikely for the project to have negative impacts on offsite stakeholders have not changed since time of validation, nor have any complaints or comments been received that would hint towards any negative impacts on offsite stakeholders during the reporting period.		
VVB Assessment	Date: 20/12/2022	
Section updated. Therefore, CL 10 is closed		

CCB CL ID	11	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 4.3.2. During the field visit there was poor evidence of dissemination of results to the communities and other stakeholders. As required by the template describe how any results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan have been disseminated and made publicly available on the internet. Describe the means by which summaries (at least) of the monitoring results have been communicated to the communities and other stakeholders		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
The document was submitted for public comment on Verra's platform. The results have been shared with P&B, EP Carbon, WWC. Information related to the objectives and progress of the community REDD+ projects can be consulted by other stakeholders at https://portafoliorreddmascomunitario.org/ The platforms will be adjusted to make the documents available to the public. According to information provided by the community councils of ACABA and Rio Pepé, the community was informed through the presentation of the technical and financial report, an activity that takes place every year. The REDD+ Unit and the board of directors prepare the technical report on the execution of the POA for presentation to the General Assembly in the last month of the year.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
None		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
This section responds to Monitoring Plan Dissemination, not about presentation of the technical and financial report, nor progress of the community REDD+ projects. There should be dissemination of the monitoring plan. As per required by the template. "Describe how any results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan have been disseminated and made publicly available on the internet. Describe the means by which summaries (at least) of the monitoring results have been communicated to the communities and other stakeholders"		
Project proponent response		Date: 24/11/2022

The project proponent has taken some of the elements described in the Information Dissemination SOP, a procedure that is part of the monitoring plan described in section 8.1 of the REDD+ project PD, to disseminate and make available to the general public the results of follow-up, monitoring summaries and information related to project progress. See SOP in folder CL_11

The elements adopted by the project proponent, according to available resources and cultural traditions, are:

1. Community Council participation spaces (meetings, assemblies, board sessions, dialogues, governance spaces, etc.).
2. Community radio station
3. Printed material

Supporting documentation is attached

VVB Assessment

Date: 20/12/2022

As per required by the template. "Describe the means by which summaries (at least) of the monitoring results have been communicated to the communities and other stakeholders"

Project proponent response

Date: 19/01/2023

In accordance with the auditor's observation, the information addressed in the previous response is detailed below:

To disseminate and make available to the general public the results of the follow-up, monitoring summaries and information related to the progress of the project to the community and other stakeholders, the following activities:

1. Pre-audit workshop second verification: on June 11, 2019 a socialization space was held with the boards of directors of ACABA and Rio Pepe.
2. Socialization of the REDD+ project to neighbors of the REDD+ Rio Pepe ACABA-Alto Baudó project: September 20, 2019.
3. Socialization of the REDD+ project to neighbors of the REDD+ project RioPepe ACABA-Bajo Baudó: September 21, 2019.

See supports in local REDD+ team reports, folder

VVB Assessment

Date: 20/02/2023

Section updated in the MR. Therefore, CL 11 is closed

CCB CL ID	12	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description		
Section 5.1.2. Describe activities and/or processes implemented for maintenance or enhancement of the HCV attributes. Explain how such actions are consistent with the precautionary principle as required by the template. Describe activities and/or processes implemented to mitigate negative impacts on biodiversity and any measures taken for maintenance or enhancement of the HCV attributes. Explain how such actions are consistent with the precautionary principle.		
Project proponent response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Important efforts were carried out during the verification period to maintain and enhance HCV attributes. The main approach to do this, as stated in the project PD, was to conserve and maintain the forest cover and HCV habitat condition and quality. By guaranteeing the latter, HCV attributes were protected and maintained, always procuring umbrella strategies stirred by the precautionary principle. As described in the section 5.1.2, forest cover and HCV habitat was maintained by a fourfold strategy: 1. Conservation Agreements were signed with multiple community families, 2. Governance surveillance trips were carried out to prevent forest from being tore down, 3. Zoning efforts were drawn to properly manage land use, 4. Sustainable agriculture was strengthened to keep people away from logging.		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
None		
VVB Assessment		Date: 19/10/2022
PP response meet requirements, however need to include this response in the monitoring report section 5.1.2		
Project proponent response	Date: 24/11/2022	
The information is included in the monitoring report according to the auditor's observation.		
VVB Assessment	Date: 20/12/2022	
As per required by the template. All sections must be completed using Arial 10pt, black, regular (non-italic) font, unless deviations are merited. Where a section is not applicable, same must be stated under the section (the section must not be deleted from the final document unless instructions specifically state so).		
Project proponent response	Date: 19/01/2023	
In accordance with the auditor's observation, a new adjustment is made to the numbering of section 5, including section 5.1.2 and addressing formatting observations.		

VVB Assessment	Date: 20/02/2023
Section updated in the MR. Therefore, CL 12 is closed	

FAR – Forward Action Request

VCS FAR ID	01	Date: 19/08/2024
Description		
According to section 2.1.9 of the MR: “Article 40 of Resolution 1447 states that a Maximum Mitigation Potential (MMP) for GHG emissions that were generated from January 2016 until December 2019 should be calculated based upon the submitted FREL. In the absence of a geographically-appropriate FREL (for the project area), RENARE, MADS, and IDEAM have stated that they will instead establish an MMP based on official data from the national monitoring system.” However, the calculations have not yet been finalized. Although it is understood that project verification processes can continue in parallel or in advance of the final MMP calculations, this must be monitored in future verification events. Hence, the VVB (validation and verification body) who carries out the next verification will need to verify verifies that the final Maximum Mitigation Potential (MMP) calculations are available and legally applicable to the project case.		

APPENDIX III: ATTENDANCE SHEETS



Asociación Española de Normalización y
Certificación

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Proyecto: REDD-Acaba-Rio-Pepe
Ubicación: Rio Pepe - Rio de Pepe
Fecha: 11 Junio 22 Participación de mujer

No.	Nombre	Organización /comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Correo Electrónico	Firma
1	Mariadiviana Hostua F.	ACABA	Tesorera	diviana@acaba.com	M. Diviana H.F.
2	Balbirio Hurtado V.	ACABA	Vocal		Balbirio H.
3	Mary Yuseka R. V.	Asomuecomue		MaryYuseka@gmail.com	Mary Yuseka R. V.
4	Mary Luz Castro	ACABA	fiscal.	3560031166706	Mary Luz Castro
5	Arlenis Pivay P.	ACABA	Promotora	arlenispivay@gmail.com	Arlenis Pivay P.
6	Benjamin Serna	ACABA	Secretario	benjaminserna@gmail.com	Benjamin Serna
7	Mario Baicy M.P.	Promotora	Visc. Presidencia	3207244857	Mario Baicy M.P.
8	Tatiana Diaz Martinez	CONCOMARPE	Secretaria	3122994352	Tatiana Diaz Martinez
9	Janeth Palacios H.	ACABA	Gerente de consultas	3217794132	Janeth Palacios H.
10	José O. Huicoba	CONCOMARPE	Tesorera	326739661	José O. Huicoba



Asociación Española de Normalización y
Certificación

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Proyecto: REDD+ Acaba-Rio Pepe
Ubicación: Rio Pepe - Ciarro
Fecha: 11 Junio

No.	Nombre	Organización /comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Correo Electrónico	Firma
1	Alexis Alejandro Rodriguez	CONCOMARPE	A. Admón		Alexis R. H.
2	Striarin Guerrero M.	CONCOMARPE	Psico. enf.		Striarin G. M.
3	José Edgardo Quintan	CONCOMARPE	Asist. social		José Edgardo Quintan
4	Ala S. Miquel	CONCOMARPE	Local 2		Ala S. Miquel
5	Samira Elysa Renteria	ACABA-Rio Pepe	Enlace Técnico	0@gmail.com	Samira Elysa Renteria
6	Janeth Palacios H.	ACABA	Gerente de consultas	3217794132	Janeth Palacios H.
7	Mario Baicy Hostua F.	ACABA	Promotora		Mario Baicy Hostua F.
8	Mary Luz Castro	ACABA	fiscal	3560031166706	Mary Luz Castro
9	Deyber Lozano	ACABA	Gerente	benjandeyber@gmail.com	Deyber Lozano
10	Benjamin Palacios H.	ACABA	Vocal	benjandeyber@gmail.com	Benjamin Palacios H.

2

AENOR
Confía

Asociación Española de Normalización y
Certificación

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Proyecto: REDD+ Acaba - río Papo
Ubicación: Rio Papo - cierra
Fecha: 11 Junio 22

No.	Nombre	Organización /comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Correo Electrónico	Firma
1	Belina Hurtado Valois	ACABA	Vocal		Belina
2	Octavio Páez	ACABA	Secretario suplente		Octavio
3	Charlana Rodríguez N.	CONCOMARPE	Promotor REDD	marilindarodriguez135@gmail.com	Charlana R.N.
4	José Omar M.	CONCOMARPE	Tesoro	longonitodepepe@yahoo.com	
5	María Rosma M.R.	CONCOMARPE	Asistente Administrativo	mxo23@gmail.com	Ma R.H.
6	José María Rodríguez	CONCOMARPE	Asistente Administrativo	thaliana30@hotmail.com	José María
7	Diego Armando Rodríguez	CONCOMARPE	Vicepresidente		Diego
8					
9					
10					

7

AENOR
Confía

Asociación Española de Normalización y
Certificación

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Proyecto: REDD+ Acaba - Río Papo
Ubicación: Rio Papo
Fecha: 9 Junio 2022

No.	Nombre	Organización /comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Correo Electrónico	Firma
1	Marjorie Valeriano	CONCOMARPE	Representante legal		Marjorie
2	John Fredy Mosquera	CONCOMARPE	Técnico agropecuario	johnfredy222@hotmail.com	John
3	Bongora Román A.	ACABA	Revisor fiscal	bongora2@hotmail.com	Bongora R.A.
4	María Diana Mosquera T.	ACABA	Tesoro	dianamocrochales66@gmail.com	M. Diana M.T.
5	Ana Rocío Palacios	ACABA	Promotora	adana113361992@gmail.com	Ana Rocío
6	Yohana Mosquera M.	ACABA	Promotora	yanahm13361992@gmail.com	Yohana
7	Bárbara Sierra P.	ACABA	Secretaria	barbarasilerra@gmail.com	Barbara Sierra
8	Aseluis Rivas Rojas	ACABA	Promotora SIG.	asleuis@hotmail.com	Aseluis
9	Octavio Palacios	ACABA	Secretario auxiliar		Octavio
10	Elmer Palacios Ariza	ACABA	Gerente Radio etnográfica	elmerariza99@hotmail.com	Elmer

AENOR
Confía

Asociación Española de Normalización y
Certificación

Proyecto: REDD+ Acaba - Río Pepe

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Ubicación: Río Pepe

Fecha: 9 Junio 2022

No.	Nombre	Organización /comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Correo Electrónico	Firma
1	Enrique Díaz	WUC-PAB	Coord. Biología	enrique.diaz@wildlife.world.com	[Firma]
2	Luis Carlos GP	ACABA	A. ADM.	Luis Carlos GP	[Firma]
3	Jeyson Quinto Hoyos	WUC-GTB	Coordinador REDD+	Jeyson Quinto Hoyos	[Firma]
4	Juan Mosquera Córdoba	ACAISA	Rep. legal	Juan Mosquera Córdoba	[Firma]
5	Samuel Elvira Rentería	ACABA Río Pepe	Enlace técnico	Samuel Elvira Rentería	[Firma]
6	Carlos Mario Corchero	Acaba	Apoyo	Carlos Mario Corchero	[Firma]
7	Mirsa Mosquera	ACABA	Promotora REDD+	Mirsa Mosquera	[Firma]
8	Jairo Tobinoma	Piedepépe	Bocal	Jairo Tobinoma	[Firma]
9	Jose Eder Quintana	Piedepépe	Asi. Fis. Cap.	Jose Eder Quintana	[Firma]
10	DEYER MOSQUERA	CONCOMARPE Río Pepe	COORD. JURIDICO	DEYER MOSQUERA	[Firma]

AENOR
Confía

Asociación Española de Normalización y
Certificación

Proyecto: REDD+ Acaba - Río Pepe

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Ubicación: Río Pepe

Fecha: 9 Junio 2022

No.	Nombre	Organización /comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Correo Electrónico	Firma
1	SORGE ISAAK Hurtado	ACABA	Promotor REDD+	SORGE ISAAK Hurtado	[Firma]
2	John James Mosquera	Acaba	Promotor REDD+	John James Mosquera	[Firma]
3	Franco Hurtado	ACABA	Presidente	Franco Hurtado	[Firma]
4	Deyber Lozano M	ACABA	Gerente	Deyber Lozano M	[Firma]
5	Nefer F. Palacios	ACABA	Gerente Budsas	Nefer F. Palacios	[Firma]
6	Benjamin Palacios	ACABA	Vocal	Benjamin Palacios	[Firma]
7	Luis Amador	CONCOMARPE	Vice presidente	Luis Amador	[Firma]
8	JUAN MIGUEL MOSQUERA	Río Pepe	D. FINANCIERO	JUAN MIGUEL MOSQUERA	[Firma]
9	JOSE HERNANDEZ	BOA de la CA	PROCESISTA	JOSE HERNANDEZ	[Firma]
10	ADIS ORTIZ	Las de las	Promotor	ADIS ORTIZ	[Firma]

4

AENOR
Confía

Asociación Española de Normalización y
Certificación

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Proyecto: REDD+ Acaba - Río Pepe
Ubicación: Río Pepe
Fecha: 9 Junio 2022

No.	Nombre	Organización /comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Correo Electrónico	Firma
1	Aurelio Páez Mesa	Acaba	Promotor	x	
2	Manuel Oscar Mosquera	concomarpe	Promotor	manuel@concomarpe.com	
3	Natasha Redman	concomarpe	Escal	natasha@concomarpe.com	
4	Yuli Ochoa Mora	concomarpe	Tesorero	yuliochoa@concomarpe.com	
5	Dilma Rodríguez V	CONCOMARPE	Coordinadora U. REDD+	dilmasudela@hotmail.com	
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					

7

AENOR
Confía

Asociación Española de Normalización y
Certificación

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Proyecto: REDD+ Acaba - Río Pepe
Ubicación: Río Pepe - Biodiversidad
Fecha: Junio 10 2022

No.	Nombre	Organización /comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Correo Electrónico	Firma
1	Dilma Sudela Rodríguez	Río Pepe	Coordinadora U. REDD+	dilmasudela@hotmail.com	
2	Derber Lozano	ACABA	Gerente	derberlozano@gmail.com	
3	Manuel Oscar Mosquera	Río Pepe	Promotor	manuel@concomarpe.com	
4	Striarin Cuervo ti	Río Pepe	Promotor Socio. Gmp	Letelmar@hcl.com	
5	Jairo Tobino Mosquera	Piedra Pepe	Bocal	jairo@concomarpe.com	
6	John Fredy Mosquera	CONCOMARPE	Técnico Producción	johnfredy@concomarpe.com	
7	Enrique Díaz	WWC	Gerente Parque	enrique.diaz@worldagro.com	
8					
9	Alejo Bivas	ACABA	Promotor	alejo@concomarpe.com	
10	Corpe Isaac Hualde	ACABA	Promotor	corpe@concomarpe.com	

2



Asociación Española de Normalización y
Certificación

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Proyecto: REDDT Acaba - Río Papa
Ubicación: Biodiversidad Río Papa
Fecha: Junio 10 2022

No.	Nombre	Organización / comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Correo Electrónico	Firma
1	John James Macquena C.	Acaba	promotor	Jimacordoba@gmail.com	[Firma]
2	Alexandro Palacios Nari	Acaba	Promotor	x	[Firma]
3	Mariela Valencia	CONCOMARPE	representante legal		[Firma]
4	Joel Herrera	Bocun de la ON	Promotor	x	[Firma]
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					

1



Asociación Española de Normalización y
Certificación

LISTADO DE PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

Proyecto: REDDT Acaba - Río Papa
Ubicación: Río Papa - Río de Papa
Fecha: 17 Junio 22 [Firma]

No.	Nombre	Organización / comunidad	Puesto u ocupación	Correo Electrónico	Firma
1	Judy Llaneta Rodriguez	ASOMUECONA	Representante L.	judy.llaneta@gmail.com	[Firma]
2	Mariela Valencia	CONCOMARPE	Representante legal	valencia.rosa@concomarpe.org	[Firma]
3	Samira Elisa Renteria	ACABA	Enlace técnico	elaserentier@gmail.com	[Firma]
4	Olivia Rodriguez Valencia	CONCOMARPE	Coordinadora. U. REDD+	olivasdelos@hotmail.com	[Firma]
5	Flor Maria Mosquera M.	ASOTOCOMA			[Firma]
6	Lesly Soalla Rodriguez	CONCOMARPE	Asistente Administrativa	tholianaasotocoma@gmail.com	[Firma]
7	Maria Maryath Rodriguez	ASOMUECONA		maryathmari1995@gmail.com	[Firma]
8	Marilina Rodriguez V.	ASOMUECONA y Proyecto REDD+	Vicepresidenta Promotor REDD+	marilinarodriguez1991@gmail.com	[Firma]
9	Dalia Iris Rengifo Macquena	ASOMUECONA			[Firma]
10	Enrique Diaz O.	WILDFL WILKS	Enlace técnico	enrique.diaz@wildfllwils.com	[Firma]