

PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

This project review report includes findings raised during Verra's review of the project specified below. The VVB must address the findings before the project request can be considered for approval by Verra. The project review report will be made publicly available on the Verra Registry. Confidential information may be provided in separate attachments.

Project ID	2502
Project Name	Tahuamanu Amazon REDD+ Project
Review Type	Verification Approval Request
Program(s)	CCB and VCS
Verification Period	01/01/2020 to 31/12/2021
Project Proponent	Maderera Rio Acre Sac (Maderacre Sac)
Methodology	VM0006. Methodology for Carbon Accounting for Mosaic and Landscape Scale REDD Projects v 2.2 and VM0015 Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation v.1.1
VVB	Colombian Institute for Technical Standards and Certification – ICONTEC
Assessment Criteria	VCS Standard v4.5 and CCB Standard v3.1
Date of First Issue	16 August 2024
Review Conclusion	Approved
Date of Final Issue	28 October 2024

FINDINGS

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
1	Missing information on the verification schedule		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 2.2.1 of the monitoring report does not clarify the activity that marked the project start date and the specific activities conducted in 2023. It does not include all key project development and implementation dates and activities from the projects start date as to create a continuation of events. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must ensure that Section 2.2.1 of the monitoring report is updated to include all key dates and milestones from the project’s development and implementation from the prior monitoring period. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> CCB & VCS Monitoring Report Template CCB v3.0, VCS v4.3, Section 2.2. VCS Standard v4.5, Section 4.1.21 Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standard, v3.1, Section G1.9	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> Section 2.2.1 has been modified to reflect the compliance efforts for each of the activities defined by the project proponent from 2017 (project start) until the closure of the verified years (2020-2021). The dates of key project activities, compliance mechanisms, and the continuity of events over the years are detailed. Only key events (2017 and 2019) and specific events (2020-2021) that are part of the current verification process have been considered, not subsequent years of activity. Section 2.2.1 of the Monitoring Report has been updated, detailing the activities carried out from the beginning of the project until 2021, in accordance with the current monitoring period. Activities corresponding to the year 2023 are not included, as they do not correspond to the current monitoring period. <u>Verra Response</u> The response provided is sufficient to close this finding	Closed
2	Missing reporting and assessment of PD deviation		
	<u>Issue</u> 1. Section 2.1.5 of the monitoring report (MR) mentions other entities involved in the project that differ from the entities that are listed in the registered project description This change has not been reported and assessed as a project description deviation.	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> 1. Section 2.1.4 of the Monitoring Report, which corresponds to the project proponent, has been verified and remains unchanged. Section 2.1.5 of the Monitoring Report has been revised to include Eco Development Group S.A.C. as co-developer of the Monitoring Report. In addition, section 2.2.5 has	Closed

	2. Sections 2.1.4 and 2.1.5 of the monitoring report refer to “ECO DEVELOPMENT GROUP SAC” but does not include them in Section 2.1.4. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure Section 2.1.5 of the MR is updated to report the other entities involved in the project as PD deviation. 2. The VVB must update Section 3.4 of the Verification Report to assess the appropriateness of the abovementioned deviation. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> CCB & VCS Monitoring Report Template, CCB v3.0, VCS v4.3 and CCB & VCS Project description CCB v3, VCS v3. VCS Standard v4.5, Sections 3.5.5 and 3.21	been updated to describe Eco Development Group S.A.C.'s contribution to the drafting and structure of the Monitoring Report as a project description deviation. 2. Section 3.4 of the Verification Report has been adjusted to include Eco Development Group S.A.C. as “Other Entities Involved in the Project”, in recognition of their collaboration in the drafting of the Monitoring Report. <u>Verra Response</u> The response provided is sufficient to close this finding	
--	--	---	--

3	Incomplete mapping of deforestation		
	<u>Issue</u> 1. The project has not produced a LULC matrix for the reference region during the monitoring period 2. The project has not produced an updated LULC map for the reference region during the monitoring period (see background section) <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure the MR is updated to include: a. The LULC matrix for the RR during the monitoring period	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> The project has added an updated benchmark map depicting the deforestation occurred in the monitoring period (2020-2021) for the reference region (including leakage and project area), a LULC matrix of the changes was introduced as well in section 3.2.2 of the monitoring report. <u>Verra Response</u> The response provided is sufficient to close this finding	Closed

	b. The LULC map for the RR during the monitoring period 2. The VVB must assess the updated documents and revise the VR accordingly <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VM0006, v2.2, Sections 8.2.1.4 and 9.3.2 <u>Background</u> VM0006 requires that these LULC maps and matrices are produced for the wider reference region (i.e., including leakage belt and project area)		
--	--	--	--

4	Incorrect assessment of “Baseline Reassessment” section		
	<u>Issue</u> 1. Section 3.6 of the VR has been incorrectly completed despite the project did not undergo any baseline reassessment during the current monitoring period (see background section) <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must update Section 3.6 of the VR to align with the information provided in the MR. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Standard, v4.5, Sections 3.2.6 and 4.1.21 CCB & VCS Verification Report Template CCB v3.0, VCS v4.3, Section 3.6. <u>Background</u> Section 2.2.2 of the MR does not describe any baseline reassessment. Although the project modified the spatial model	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> An adjustment has been made to section 3.6 of the Verification Report, indicating that a reassessment of the baseline is not carried out in the current monitoring period. In addition, section 3.2 of the Verification Report has been supplemented. <u>Verra Response</u> The response provided is sufficient to close this finding	Closed

	for projecting deforestation, this change was described as methodology and PR deviation and does not count as baseline reassessment. The assessment provided by the VVB in Section 3.6 is not pertinent. Rather, it should be used to complement the assessments provided in Sections 3.2 and 3.4 of the VR.		
--	--	--	--

5	Sustainable Development Contributions		
	<u>Issue</u> In Section 2.1.12, Table 2.10 of the monitoring report, the following issues were identified: 1. In row 1, in the current project contributions it is unclear which specific metrics the project is using and what project-specific activities those numbers account for (see background 'a'). 2. Row 4 presents duplication of the information provided already in row 2. 3. In rows 2 and 4 - the claims to contribute to SDG targets 12.8.1 and 13.3.1 depend on national-level variables beyond the project scope and control (see background 'b'). 4. In rows 1 to 4, the indicators do not align with the official language of the SDG indicators. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates the relevant section in the monitoring report to revise the issues raised above. 2. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates Section 2.1.12, Table 2.10, Rows 2 and 4 of the monitoring report to	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> 1. Table 2.11 (Sustainable Development Contributions) is updated, adjusting SDG indicator 8.8.2 to detail the benefits generated for project workers. In addition, an adjustment is made to the official language of the SDG indicators. 2. Table 2.11 (section 2.1.12) is updated to verify the exclusion of SDG indicators 12.8.1 and 13.3.1, as they depend on national level variables that are beyond the scope and control of the project. 3. The modifications in Table 2.11 and their corresponding supports are revised. Also, section 4.1 of the Verification Report is updated in accordance with the adjustments made in the Monitoring Report. <u>Verra Response</u> The project proponent has updated Section 2.1.12 of the monitoring report to provide metrics corresponding to project activities and use SDG indicators relevant to the scope and control of the project. This is sufficient to close the finding, and no further action is required.	Closed

	a. Provide concrete evidence proving the direct impact of the claimed contributions on the respective national indicators b. Clarify whether there has been a baseline measurement for this indicator and explain it. 3. The VVB must assess the updates in the monitoring report and update the relevant sections of the verification report accordingly. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> VCS Standard, v4.5; Section 3.17 UN Metadata <u>Background</u> a. Row 1 in the abovementioned table provides totals and percentages of females and males but does not specify what those numbers are representing. b. While workshops on sustainable development topics are provided, the explanation of the contribution does not demonstrate the attributable correlation to Peru's national education progress.		
--	--	--	--

6 Risks to the Project			
Issue		Round 1	Closed
		VVB Response	
	1. Section 2.2.7 of the monitoring report refers to patrolling and surveillance as mitigation actions against '<i>invasion of the area by adjacent communities and towns</i>'. Considering the proximity with the Madre de Dios Indigenous Territory Reserve, and presence of isolated nomadic indigenous peoples in the region, it does not clarify whether such risk is related to those or other indigenous communities (see background 'a').	1. The risk identified in section 2.2.7, '<i>invasion of the area by adjacent communities and towns</i>', it refers to the rural communities located adjacent to the eastern zone of the project, which represent the most significant deforestation risk. For this reason, a surveillance and monitoring system is being implemented in the project area. The Madre de Dios Territorial Reserve (RTMDD), which is located near the western zone of the project (though not adjacent), is where indigenous peoples in	

	2. Section 2.2.7 of the monitoring report identifies the risk of ‘internal conflicts with local settlements’, however no description of these local settlements can be found anywhere else in the document or the project description. It is also unclear who the project refers to as ‘local settlements’ and whether those are located inside the project area. 3. The Madre de Dios region is known for conflicts involving isolated indigenous communities (see background ‘b’). Considering that the project involves patrols (also in the Tahuamanu River basin where the project has identified presence of one of these groups) and there is a precedent of violent encounters involving timber companies and these communities, Section 2.2.7 of the monitoring report does not clarify whether the project identified any similar issue and if they have implemented any prevention and mitigation actions against the occurrence of violence in the monitoring period. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates the relevant section in the monitoring report with information relating to all the issues raised above. 2. The VVB must clarify how they have assessed the risks related to invasion and internal conflicts with local settlements. 3. The VVB must assess the updates in the monitoring report and update the relevant sections of the verification report accordingly.	isolation and initial contact (PIACI) are found. They do not pose a deforestation threat to the project, as their activities and livelihood are not related to land-use change but rather to the consumption of wild flora and fauna resources, without altering the ecosystem. Meanwhile, the custody and monitoring actions carried out by the project, which prioritize areas based on their vulnerability level, contribute to protecting the RTMDD and the PIACI populations living within it. 2. ‘Local settlements’ refer to the geographic area where a population is established, which is usually organized around natural resources, cultural traditions, or local economic activities. The description of the local settlements of the project is found in section 4.1.1 of the PD. It is important to note that these groups are located in the areas surrounding the project, but not within it. 3. The PIACI population present in the Madre de Dios Territorial Reserve belongs to the Mashco Piro ethnic group, which is believed to have occupied this territory as part of the social dynamics that occurred in the area during the ‘Rubber Boom’. They are characterized as a semi-nomadic population, meaning they do not remain in one place for long periods, but instead periodically move throughout their territory, engaging in hunting, fishing, and gathering as part of their traditional livelihood. Although the project area does not directly border the RTMDD and the project workers have not encountered these populations to date, who do not pose a risk to the project, the project proponent has implemented an Anthropological Contingency Plan to address risk situations in the event of evidence or encounters with PIACI. These actions are guided by the precautionary principle of No Contact and include training project	
--	--	--	--

	<u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards</i>, v3.1; Section G1.10 <u>Background</u> a. Section 4.1.1 also mentions the presence of isolated indigenous communities in the watersheds inside the project area. b. Different organizations such as Survival International, Inter American Commission on Human Rights and OHCHR have highlighted severe conflicts involving indigenous communities such as the Mashco Piro in the Madre de Dios region, involving timber companies with concessions in the region.	workers to establish actions to avoid or reduce risks in various situations involving the PIACI population. The PIACI Anthropological Contingency Plan is presented to the relevant authorities, such as the Ministry of Culture and the Forest Authority, and is also shared with various local organizations. The project proponent generates actions that benefit the protection of the Madre de Dios Territorial Reserve, which are detailed in Table 4.5 of the RM. The supports of the training on communities in isolation (PIACI) provided to the company's workers were verified. The annual training plan was also reviewed, which includes training for PIACI communities, as well as contingency plans and associated reports. During the audit team's on-site visit, training on preventive measures was conducted with the PIACI communities as part of the contingency and safety plans. Interviews with surveillance and custody personnel demonstrated the implementation of the guidelines during their activities. In addition, the cartographic analysis made it possible to identify the buffer zones delimited as conservation areas to prevent impacts on PIACI communities. The communities adjacent to the project area were also identified and visited during the site visit. It was found that the Madre de Dios protected area is not adjacent to the project area; however, protocols have been established for its protection. Sections 4.3.11, 4.5.1 of the Verification Report describe the verifications carried out in relation to the PIACI communities. Regarding the risks associated with the communities adjacent to the project area (identified in the project's Reference Region), interviews were conducted with	
--	---	--	--

		several members of these communities, as detailed in Section 2.4 of the Verification Report. These interviews confirmed that the communities are not encroaching into the project area. Supplemental multi-temporal mapping analysis also confirms that no encroachment occurred during the monitoring period.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The project proponent has clarified and confirmed that the risk referred to as invasion by communities does not involve PIACI, but relates to eastern communities identified by the project as associated to deforestation risks. The project also clarified the local settlements they refer to, confirming that the local settlements related to the identified risk of internal conflicts are located outside the project area. The updated section also states that there have not been encounters with PIACI within the project area, and custody and monitoring actions contribute to protecting the reserve mentioned and the PIACI communities. The updated section also states that the project is engaging with RTMDD (through CGdPNAP) instead of FENAMAD until “<i>concrete actions can be taken with the organization</i>”. Additionally, the VVB confirmed they verified that workers are being trained in PIACI and topics relevant to preventing adverse impacts to their communities. This is sufficient to close the finding and no further action is required.	

7	Information sharing with stakeholders		
	Issue Sections 2.3.2 to 2.3.7 of the monitoring report refer to information, documentation and meetings made available to stakeholders. However, it is unclear: 1. Whether and how the project ensured that information through documents and meetings was understood by any stakeholders or their representatives who speak a relevant language other than Spanish (see background). 2. Whether and how the costs, risks and benefits of the project have continued to be communicated to those stakeholders mentioned above. 3. Whether and how the project ensured that those stakeholders referred to above were given information about and understood the process for CCB verification by the VVB before the site visit. Action Required 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates the relevant section in the monitoring report with information relating to all the issues raised above. 2. The VVB must assess the updates in the monitoring report and update the relevant sections of the verification report accordingly. Program Rule(s) <i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1; Sections G3.1, G3.2 and G3.3</i>	Round 1 VVB Response 1. The shared documents, disseminated information, and implemented meetings have been conducted in Spanish, which is spoken and understood by all stakeholders. Similarly, the Belgica Native Community belongs to the Yine ethnic group of the Peruvian Amazonian culture. However, due to significant interaction with external agents and proximity to urban areas, the community's inhabitants no longer speak their native language. This is supported by the Indigenous or Native Peoples Database (BDPI), which states that 0% of the community's population has an indigenous language as their mother tongue: (https://bdpi.cultura.gob.pe/index.php/localidades/belgica) 2. The benefits, costs, and risks of the project are shared with stakeholders through Citizen Participation Workshops (see section 2.3.4 of the MR). Section 2.3.6 of the MR has been modified to clarify the description of the project's benefits, costs, and risks. 3. Section 2.3.4 details how the meetings with stakeholders were conducted and the information provided to them. The meetings were led by the project's technical team and had an average duration of three hours, during which the activities carried out by the project proponent and those planned for future implementation were described, focusing on the climate, community, and biodiversity components. The presentation was supported by digital materials that displayed key information, location maps, flowcharts, and other elements that facilitated a clear understanding of the project's development. The workshop is a participatory mechanism, where participants ask questions and raise	Closed

	Background For instance, indigenous communities and/or their representatives.	concerns throughout the session. Additionally, they are provided with forms to fill out where they can express doubts, queries, complaints, claims, requests, or suggestions for the project's updates. Each of these forms is addressed and responded to by the project's Social Responsibility department. Evidence of all the above is included in the 2020-2021 Citizen Participation Workshop reports submitted to the VVB during the audit. Although it has been demonstrated that the project has made sufficient communications about its particularities through the citizen participation workshops, the need to intensify these efforts was evidenced. Therefore, in Annex 2 of the Verification Report, under Future Action Request (FAR) 02, the need to strengthen communications with stakeholders was indicated. In the next verification period, it should be demonstrated that activities have been carried out with stakeholders that demonstrate an adequate understanding of communications. Section 2.4 of the Verification Report mentions information, documentation and meetings between the proponent and stakeholders. The adjustment made in section 2.3.6 of the Monitoring Report, where the benefits, costs and risks of the project are described, is verified.	
		Verra Response The project proponent and VVB have confirmed that all stakeholders engaged speak Spanish as “<i>communities no longer speak their native language</i>”, that costs, risks and benefits were communicated to stakeholders through Citizen Participation Workshops and the Community Relations Advisory Committee, and during this verification period. Furthermore, the VVB has raised a Forward Action Request	

		FAR02] to further strengthen the communication with the project stakeholders. This is sufficient to close the finding.	
--	--	--	--

8	Stakeholder engagement and consultation		
	<u>Issue</u> 1. In Section 2.3.4 of the monitoring report, it is unclear whether and how in the informational and consultation meetings held during the current monitoring period the project engaged representation from PIACI/FENAMAD, identified as stakeholders in the project description (see background). 2. While Section 2.2.7 of the monitoring report identified the issue of 'invasion of the project area by residents of towns and adjacent communities' in the current monitoring period, Section 2.3.9 does not specify whether those towns and communities have participated in stakeholder consultation activities. 3. Section 2.3.9 of the monitoring report does not clarify whether the issue has been discussed and addressed with those communities, 4. Section 2.3.9 of the monitoring report also does not clarify whether and how the project has addressed the issue identified in Section 2.2.7 with the local settlements mentioned. 5. In Section 2.3.12 of the monitoring report, it is	<u>Round 1</u> <u>VVB Response</u> 1. FENAMAD is an indigenous organization that advocates for the enforcement and respect of the rights of indigenous peoples in the department of Madre de Dios, including PIACI. However, there is no formal presence or actions by this organization on the ground within the project's area of influence. Therefore, the project proponent has been working closely with the administration of the Alto Purus National Park, whose buffer zone includes the RTMDD, which in turn is part of the project's area of influence. In this regard, the project proponent has been actively participating in the meetings of the Alto Purus National Park Management Committee (CGdPNAP) since 2019 and has been a member since that same year. Additionally, the committee is considered part of the project's stakeholder list. The Committee coordinates inter-institutional actions for the surveillance, control, and protection of PIACI territory, the conservation and promotion of natural resources, and participatory management and environmental education. Within this framework, the project proponent manages activities in favour of PIACI, aiming to tackle illegal logging in the RTMDD through river patrols and the construction of Surveillance Posts along the banks of the Tahuamanu River, the main access route to the RTMDD in the	Closed

	unclear whether and how the project has ensured representation and participation from PIACI/FENAMAD in decision making during the monitoring period, identified as stakeholders in the project description, especially in issues related to the project activity focused on protecting natural areas and PIACI territory. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates the relevant section in the monitoring report with information relating to all the issues raised above. 2. The VVB must clarify why they do not include an assessment of the engagement of and consultation with representatives from these stakeholders in Sections 4.3.3, 4.3.4 and 3.4.6 of the verification report. 3. The VVB must assess the updates in the monitoring report and update the relevant sections of the verification report accordingly. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1; Sections G3.3, G3.4 and G3.6</i>	project's area. Additionally, actions are implemented for the management and conservation of the taricaya turtle populations, whose eggs are part of the PIACI diet, among other measures described in Finding 6, response 3. Finally, the project proponent has decided to continue its actions for the protection of PIACI territory in collaboration with the Alto Purus National Park administration, together with the active members of the CGdPNAP, which they lead, and to remove FENAMAD from the stakeholder list, which will be described in section 2.2.5. However, it is important to note that the company's interest is to foster interactions with various actors to combine efforts in protecting the PIACI population. Therefore, in 2023, the project proponent held a meeting with representatives of FENAMAD, where they presented the strategies being implemented by the project in favour of forest conservation, the protection of flora and fauna resources, and the protection of Indigenous Peoples in Isolation living in the RTMDD. As a result, it was agreed to carry out joint strategic actions in favour of indigenous population. 2. The consultation processes detailed in section 2.3.9 refer to the citizen participation workshops mentioned in Finding 7, response 3, in which representatives of the communities, private and state associations adjacent to the project area participate. In the "Stakeholder Input" section, the contributions of the participants and the organization or association they represent are noted. Therefore, the "towns and communities" identified in section 2.2.7 actively participate in the citizen participation processes, generally through their representatives. 3. Section 2.3.9, the project proponent details the	
--	---	---	--

		following: "The main activities were described, detailing the actions that will be carried out to achieve the objectives, highlighting the project's contribution to the environmental component and the development of the surrounding communities.", this refers to the custody and monitoring efforts in the project area as part of the TOC activities, mentioning the invasion risks the project faces and the actors involved. 4. According to the previous paragraph, the project has communicated during the workshops the latent risk of invasions into the project area and the project proponent's efforts to safeguard and monitor the project's boundaries, focusing on the areas with higher terrestrial and riverine vulnerability. 5. The context for this issue is provided in response 1. No interviews or evaluations were conducted with FENAMAD, as it was not present during the monitoring period. Instead, an interview was conducted with Alto Purus National Park personnel, where the project developer participated in the Alto Purus National Park Management Committee. This committee coordinates inter-institutional actions for the surveillance, control and protection of the PIACI territory. In this context, the project proponent manages activities in favor of PIACI, such as confronting illegal logging in the Madre de Dios Territorial Reserve (RTMDD) through river patrols and the construction of surveillance posts along the banks of the Tahuamanu River, the main access route to the RTMDD in the project area. In addition, actions are being implemented for the management and conservation of taricaya turtle populations, whose eggs are part of the PIACI's diet.	
--	--	---	--

		Section 3.4 of the Verification Report are updated according to the evaluations carried out.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The project proponent has updated Sections 2.2.5 of the monitoring report to clarify they held a meeting with FENAMAD – the federation of indigenous peoples from the Madre de Dios River – to present the project and agree on undertake joint strategic actions. This is sufficient to close the finding.	

9	Negative Community Impact Mitigation		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 4.1.1 of the monitoring report states that there is an isolated indigenous community present in the watershed areas inside the project area. While Section 4.1.2 states that the project protects biodiversity, it does not specify how the project has prevented negative impacts on that group. For example, on their access to water and food. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent updates the relevant section in the monitoring report with information relating to the issues raised above. 2. The VVB must assess the updates in the monitoring report and update the relevant sections of the verification report accordingly. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1; Sections CM2.2 and CM2.4</i>	<u>Round 1</u> <u>VVB Response</u> The project does not have any negative impact on PIACI, but rather implements mechanisms aimed at supporting their protection, as described in Table 4.5 of the Monitoring Report: - Preparation of the Anthropological Contingency Plan: This plan is designed to address risk situations in case of evidence or encounters with indigenous people in isolation or initial contact (PIACI), following the precautionary principle of No Contact and defining concrete actions to safeguard the lives of PIACI. - Worker training: Training is provided on the Anthropological Contingency Plan for dealing with risk situations in the event of evidence of or encounters with PIACI. - Dissemination of the Anthropological Contingency Plan: The plan is disseminated to stakeholders to address risk situations in the event of evidence or encounters with PIACI. - Management of taricaya populations: Management of taricaya (aquatic turtle) populations in the Tahuamanu River to contribute to the conservation of this species, which is part of the diet of the PIACI and, therefore, to the food security of these highly vulnerable populations. - Inter-institutional cooperation agreement: A tripartite	Closed

		agreement has been established between the Alto Purús National Park administration, the project proponent and AVISA Frankfurt Zoological Society Peru. - Virtual meeting with the Alto Purús National Park: Alliances were proposed to improve control and surveillance of the Tahuamanu River, the main access waterway to the Madre de Dios Territorial Reserve, PIACI territory. - Vaccination of workers: Workers have been vaccinated in order to comply with the Anthropological Contingency Plan to address risk situations in case of evidence or encounters with PIACI. - River patrols: River patrols are conducted in the Tahuamanu river basin. In addition, section 4.5.1 of the Verification Report is supplemented.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The project proponent refers to measures that contribute to protecting the PIACI and prevent risks and negative impacts. This is sufficient to close the finding and no further action is required. However, this is insufficient to close the finding and no further action is required.	

10	Audit Team Composition		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 2.1 of the verification report states that the auditors are “Colombian forestry engineers with experience in GHG mitigation projects in the AFOLU sector” but does not confirm whether the team holds social and cultural expertise that is relevant to Peru, as well as ecological and biodiversity expertise. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must update the relevant section in the validation	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> Section 2.1 of the Verification Report is updated to detail the audit team's experience in the AFOLU sector and in social issues. The team is qualified according to the ICONTEC qualification scheme for VCS/CCB validation and verification. Both auditors are Colombian forestry engineers with experience in GHG mitigation projects in the AFOLU sector, as well as in working with indigenous communities in the Amazon in Colombia and Peru, and with indigenous communities in the Darien in Panama. In addition, the technical reviewer has extensive experience in	Closed

	report to clarify the issues raised above.	the AFOLU sector. The team also receives administrative, legal and social support from the Technical Unit for Validation and Verification, strengthening its capacity to address complex issues and ensure the quality of AFOLU projects.	
	<u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Program Rules, v3.1; Section 4.3.1</i>	<u>Verra Response</u> The VVB has confirmed their social and cultural, and biodiversity expertise. This is sufficient to close the finding and no further action is required.	

11	Interviews		
	<u>Issue</u> In Section 2.4 of the verification report it is unclear why interviews do not include representatives of the PIACI/FENAMAD, who have been identified as stakeholders and the project has reported presence of one group around the watersheds inside the project area. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must update the relevant section in the validation report to provide information on the issues raised above. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>CCB Verification Report Template Version v3.0, VCS Version 4.3; Section 2.1</i>	<u>Round 1</u> <u>VVB Response</u> No interviews or evaluations were conducted with FENAMAD, as it was not present during the monitoring period. Instead, an interview was conducted with Alto Purus National Park personnel, where the project developer participated in the Alto Purus National Park Management Committee. This committee coordinates inter-institutional actions for the surveillance, control and protection of the PIACI territory. In this context, the project proponent manages activities in favor of PIACI, such as confronting illegal logging in the Madre de Dios Territorial Reserve (RTMDD) through river patrols and the construction of surveillance posts along the banks of the Tahuamanu River, the main access route to the RTMDD in the project area. In addition, actions are being implemented for the management and conservation of taricaya turtle populations, whose eggs are part of the PIACI's diet.	Closed
		<u>Verra Response</u> The VVB has confirmed that they interviewed Alto Purus National Park staff, entity that is relevant to verifying implementation of the project. This is sufficient to close the finding and no further action is required.	

12	Level of Assurance		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 1.3 of the verification report does not provide a conclusion about the level of assurance for <i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards</i>, v3.1. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must update the relevant section in the validation report to provide information on the issues raised above. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> CCB Verification Report Template Version v3.0, VCS Version 4.3; Section 1.3	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> Section 1.3 of the Verification Report is updated, including the assurance level of CCB standard V3.1.	Closed
		<u>Verra Response</u> The VVB has updated Section 1.3 of the verification report to confirm the assurance level of the <i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards</i>, v3.1. This is sufficient to close the finding and no further action is required.	

13	Assessment of risk identification and mitigation		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 4.3.9 of the verification report does not explain how the VVB independently verified that the risk identification and mitigation actions implemented are consistent and sufficient to reduce or diminish the negative impacts on the community and biodiversity arising from the project benefits. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must update the relevant section in the validation report to provide information on the issues raised above. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> CCB Verification Report Template Version v3.0, VCS Version 4.3; Section 4.3.9	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> Section 4.3.9 of the Verification Report is supplemented with the following information: Verification of Cartographic Information: The veracity of the cartographic information described in the Monitoring Report is confirmed, particularly in relation to the fires identified in the leakage belt. Interviews were conducted with workers, with special emphasis on those in charge of surveillance and custody, who confirmed the existence of contingency plans for fire management. The company's training materials were also verified. Multitemporal Cartographic Analysis: The multitemporal cartographic analysis revealed that the deforestation hotspots are not located within the project area. Interviews with surveillance and custody personnel corroborated the implementation of contingency plans to deal with possible invasions. In addition, interviews with the communities closest to the project area showed that there has been significant awareness of encroachment, thanks to the citizen participation workshops held.	Closed

		Community Awareness: The interviews conducted evidence that some awareness has been achieved in the communities through the citizen participation workshops and committees. The communities have defined the limits of their land for agricultural activities and are aware of the established limits of the project area. Internal Conflicts and Protocols: Interviews were conducted with the communities surrounding the project and with company workers, where it was indicated that there have been no internal conflicts. The protocols established for managing potential internal conflicts were also verified. <u>Verra Response</u> The VVB has provided more information about how they assessed that mitigation actions against risks identified. This is sufficient to close the finding.	
--	--	--	--

14	Assessment of workers' training		
	<u>Issue</u> Section 4.3.11 of the verification report does not explain whether and how the VVB has independently assessed that orientation and training for the project's workers (1) increase local participation in the project implementation, (2) ensures that capacity building targets a wide range of community people including women and vulnerable and/or marginalized people, (3) training is passed on to new workers in the case of staff turnover, (4) how workers are selected by the project for position and the measures taken to ensure inclusion of women and vulnerable and/or marginalized people as well as a fair opportunity to fill positions. <u>Action Required</u> The VVB must update the relevant section in the validation report to provide information on the issues raised above. <u>Program Rule(s)</u>	<u>Round 1</u> <u>VVB Response</u> Section 2.3.15 of the MR has been modified to provide greater detail on the training conducted in 2020-2021, including the number of workers trained, the contracts of the presenters, and the training reports with participant lists. Section 4.3.11 of the Verification Report is supplemented with the explain how the VVB has independently assessed that orientation and training for the project's workers comply with what is requested. <u>Verra Response</u> The project proponent and the VVB have updated Section 2.3.15 of the monitoring report and Section 4.3.11 of the verification report, respectively, to provide more information about training for workers. The VVB has explained their assessment and has confirmed training for workers is compliant with the <i>Climate</i>,	Closed

	CCB Verification Report Template Version v3.0, VCS Version 4.3; Section 4.3.11	Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1. This is sufficient to close the finding.	
--	--	--	--