

VERIFICATION REPORT FOR TAHUAMANU AMAZON REDD PROJECT

AENOR
Confía

Report ID	CCB VCS VR 2502 01012022-31122022
Project title	Tahuamanu Amazon REDD Project
Project ID	2502
Verification period	01 January 2022 to 31 December 2022
Crediting period	19 April 2017 to 18 April 2047
Original date of issue	07 March 2025
Most recent date of issue	~~07 October~~ 2025
Version	~~3~~
VCS Standard version	4.7
CCB Standards version	3.1
Project location	Perú, Madre de Dios.
Client	MADERERA RIO ACRE SAC (MADERACRE SAC)
Prepared by	AENOR CONFÍA S.A.U.
Approved by	Jose Luis FUENTES PEREZ
Work carried out by	Lead auditor: Richard Daniel GONZALES TOLEDO Auditor: Javier CÓCERA CAÑAS Technical reviewer 1: Pablo MORENO CERERO Technical reviewer 2: Joao Pedro BARATA LEVITA GONCALVES

Eliminado: 10 July

Eliminado: 2

Summary:

AENOR CONFIA S.A.U (AENOR) has performed the third verification of the project “TAHUAMANU AMAZON REDD PROJECT” in Perú 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 reports is from 01 January 2022 to 31 December 2022.

AENOR conducted the verification under VCS Standard version 4.7 and the CCB Standard Third Edition, by reviewing the monitoring report and supporting evidence submitted by the project proponent.

The project is located in Madre de Dios, a region in the south-east of the Peruvian Amazon with the most accelerated deforestation rate of Peru. The REDD+ project, with 169,956.81 hectares is located within the Tahuamanu Province, covering the districts of Iñapari, Iberia, Tahuamanu and Las Piedras in the department of Madre de Dios. The area faces increasing threats from unsustainable agrarian practices from neighbouring local communities.

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 implementation, and the project's compliance with relevant VCS and CCB requirements.

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; 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 3 corrective actions and 1 clarification were raised, all have been successfully closed.

The purpose of the visit assessment was to determine the conformance of the project with respect to the VCS Standard v4.7; the Third Edition of the CCB Standard; the project description and the information provided in the monitoring report. The field visit took place from 25 to 28 November 2024 in which the lead auditor visited the project area, interviewed key stakeholders, staff and other related experts, and also reviewed the CCB-VCS-MR and supporting documents. Additional to site visit, a meeting in Lima was carried out in 3 December 2024; in order to review the emission reductions calculation and verify the processing data from satellite images.

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

This verification report has been submitted to the PP in which 3 CARs and 1 CLs were reported (see verification protocol in appendix 4) for VCS and CCB. However, all these issues raised during the verification process where appropriately closed by means of corrections, more clear explanations and other supported documents.

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

AENOR verification team assessed the calculations and confirms the GHG emission reductions, during this monitoring period amounts 588,900 tCO₂e (without discounting buffer emissions). AENOR's verification team is able to confirm that the project is well managed, and results are well supported. Monitoring plans are effective, and MADERACRE has developed enough procedures and tools to manage data. AENOR verification team also assessed the compliance of the Climate, Community, and Biodiversity (CCB) Standard, for Biodiversity Gold Level.

Thus, AENOR has carried out this verification report and deems with reasonable level of assurance that the project implementation complies with all verification requirements of the VCS and CCB Standard. The assessment team has no restrictions or uncertainties with respect to the compliance of the project with the verification criteria; hence, the audit team concludes that the net GHG emissions reductions or removals 588,900 tCO₂e (without discounting buffer emissions) and 527,068 VCUs, over the monitoring period has been quantified in accordance with VCS rules.

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	6
1.1	Objective (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.2)	6
1.2	Scope and Criteria (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.2)	6
1.3	Level of Assurance (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.2)	7
1.4	Summary Description of the Project (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.2)	7
2	VERIFICATION PROCESS	9
2.1	Audit Team Composition (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.3.1)	9
2.2	Method and Criteria (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.3.1)	11
2.3	Document Review (VCS, 4.1, CCB Program Rules, 4.3.1)	12
2.4	Interviews (VCS, 4.1, CCB Program Rules, 4.3.1)	13
2.5	Site Visits (VCS, 4.1, CCB Program Rules, 4.3.1)	16
2.6	Public Comments (VCS, 3.18; CCB Program Rules, 4.6)	16
2.7	Resolution of Findings (VCS, 4.1, CCB Program Rules, 4.3.1)	17
2.8	Eligibility for Validation Activities (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.1)	19
3	VALIDATION FINDINGS	20
3.1	Participation under Other GHG Programs (VCS, 3.23, Appendix 2; CCB Program Rules, 3.1)	20
3.2	Methodology Deviations (VCS, 3.20)	20
3.3	Minor Changes to Project Description (CCB Program Rules, 3.5.6)	20
3.4	Project Description Deviations (VCS, 3.21; CCB Program Rules, 3.5.7 – 3.5.10)	20
3.5	New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects (VCS, 3.6; CCB, G1.13 – G1.15)	22
3.6	Baseline Reassessment (VCS, 3.2.6, 3.2.7)	22
4	VERIFICATION FINDINGS	22
4.1	Project Details	22
4.2	Summary of Project Benefits	30
4.3	General	33
4.4	Climate	47
4.5	Community	73
4.6	Biodiversity	78
4.7	Additional Project Implementation Information	88
4.8	Additional Project Impact Information	88
5	VERIFICATION CONCLUSION	89
5.1	Verification Summary	89
5.2	Verification Conclusion	89
5.3	Ex-ante vs. Ex-post ERR Comparison	91
	APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION	92

APPENDIX 2: PROJECT RISKS TABLE	93
APPENDIX 3: LIST OF EVIDENCE	98
APPENDIX 4: VERIFICATION FINDINGS	102

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.2)

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

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

1.2 Scope and Criteria (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.2)

Verification Scope: The scope of the verification audit is to verify the emissions reductions and/or removals of the project, against the Verified Carbon Standard, the identified methodology and the validated PD throughout the monitoring period from 01 January 2022 to 31 December 2022.

The objectives of this audit included a verification of the projects calculated removals with the Verified Carbon Standard requirements and any additional requirements of VCS AFOLU projects. In addition, the audit assessed the project with respect to the validated baseline scenarios presented in the PD and the fulfilment of the Climate, community and biodiversity criteria against the CCB Standard.

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

Standard Criteria: The verification assessment was performed in accordance the requirements of VCS and CCB standards, including the following documents:

- VCS Program Guide v4.4 /1/
- VCS Standard v4.7 /2/
- VCS Methodology requirements v4.4 /3/

- VCS Programme definition v4.5 /4/
- VCS Validation and verification manual v3.2 /5/
- VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.2 /6/
- Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1 /7/
- CCB Program Rules, v3.1 /8/

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

Finally, according to instructions from IAF (International Accreditation Forum), based on ISO 14065, the VVB is attaching the following accreditation information: AENOR CONFÍA, S.A. (Unipersonal) verification/validation entity accredited by ANAB with AEN accreditation number 8993

1.3 Level of Assurance (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.2)

The verification assessment was conducted in accordance with ISO 14064-3 (ISO 14064-3: 2019) with reasonable level of assurance.

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

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

1.4 Summary Description of the Project (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.2)

The project is located in Madre de Dios, a region in the south-east of the Peruvian Amazon with the most accelerated deforestation rate of Peru. The REDD+ project, with 169,956.81 hectares is located within the Tahuamanu Province, covering the districts of Iñapari, Iberia, Tahuamanu and Las Piedras in the department of Madre de Dios. The area faces increasing threats from unsustainable agrarian practices from neighbouring local communities.

The project plans to combine an increase in protection measures (patrolling, working together with other forest concessions and the forest and political authorities) with the promotion of productive activities for neighbouring communities, as a strategy to offer alternative sources of income that do not imply the clearing of forest areas. Based on this approach, the project expects to reduce projected deforestation.

Project activity has already implemented different actions with neighboring communities in topics as health, employment and education. In addition, the project has implemented actions regarding biodiversity and borders protection. Also, project proponent participates actively in inter institutional task force to consolidate forestry sector in Tahuamanu province.

In 2022, Tahuamanu province experienced 5,871 hectares of forest loss, posing a threat to the project area. To address this, a monitoring and surveillance system was implemented, covering 646.85 kilometers of river and land with 42 patrols. No impacts were recorded in the project area. Education and health agreements were maintained with the local community, including the Native Community of Bélgica, providing monthly stipends for teachers and nurses, as well as medicines for the health post in the latter community. Schools received educational materials, infrastructure improvement supplies, and financial incentives throughout the year. Biannual meetings were held to prioritize activities that benefit the local community. The verification period, comprising from 01 January 2022 to 31 December 2022, amounts 588,900 tCO₂e of emission reductions (without discounting buffer emissions).

Therefore, the project is contributing to the mitigation of climate change, conserving biodiversity and generating benefits for the population of the community. The project goals include the conservation and reduction of deforestation; contribute to improve the quality of life of neighbourhood and local stakeholders; and the conservation of biodiversity.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Audit Team Composition (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.3.1)

AENOR is accredited by ANAB and ONAC to carry out the auditing activities under different standards such as VCS or CCB.

ANAB is the ANSI National Accreditation Board (ANAB) is the largest multi-disciplinary accreditation body in the western hemisphere, with more than 2,500 organizations accredited in approximately 80 countries. ANAB is a recognized global leader in accreditation and prides itself on world-class service while maintaining the highest level of quality. ANAB accredited certificates, inspections, reports, and persons drive confidence in the marketplace. ANAB-accredited laboratories and ANAB-accredited certification bodies (personnel, management systems, validation and verification, and products, processes and services) working in the industry can be trusted when certifying, testing, and/or inspecting those working in the industry.

ONAC is the Colombia's National Accreditation Body. ONAC's main purpose is to provide accreditation services to conformity assessment bodies in order to accredit their competence, to act as the monitoring authority for good laboratory practices of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and to perform the functions of the National Accreditation Body of Colombia. The accreditation service opens opportunities for CABs and the producers they certify to demonstrate the quality of their products and services and even compete in international markets.

AENOR passes the accreditation exams and audits every year to still maintaining the required skills and assurance that its certifications are competent. The team involved in this verification is summarized below:

Name	Position	Experience and expertise
Richard GONZALES	Lead auditor	He is mechanical an electrical engineer and has a Master in energy. He has more than 10 years of experience in auditing, consulting and training activities related to environmental and carbon management projects. 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). He has experience as lead auditor in CCB validation and verification process. He started auditing CCB in 2015. Richard Gonzales, lead auditor, he is local auditor (Peruvian) who knows relevant regulation, social al cultural situation of the country.
Javier CÓCERA	Auditor	He 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: in 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; and in developing environmental footprint projects and sustainability reports. Currently, Javier is working in AENOR as auditor focused in AFOLU projects.
Joao BARATA	Technical reviewer	Joao is an environmental engineer from the forestry school of the technical university of Madrid. He is a native Portuguese and Spanish speaker with a high English level who has worked in several projects from different standards such as VCS, CCB, GS and others. He has received trainings and participated in projects working with GIS and currently, he works at the Climate Change Unit in AENOR and is seeking to become a validator/verifier under the ISO-14000 family requirements.

Name	Position	Experience and expertise
Pablo MORENO	Technical reviewer	Pablo Moreno is a Forest Engineer, and he has a master's degree in Forest engineering and management, both carried out in Polytechnic University of Madrid. Pablo has more than 3 years of experience in forestry and sustainability. He has worked since he stated his master's studies close to the environment in different ways. The main branch of his career has been forest management, operations management, technical analysis, working with GIS and field work as well as quality assessment and R&D development in forestry production-related topics in search of efficiency and process optimization. The other path of his career has been focused to sustainability consultancy and research and climate change. He has worked in different countries: Spain, U.S.A. and Australia.

2.2 Method and Criteria (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.3.1)

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.

Verification is performed in accordance with the relevant requirements for VCS and CCB rules. The verification ex-post emission reductions has been conducted by AENOR in accordance with ISO 14064-3:2019 with a reasonable level of assurance. Sampling was carried out taking into account the tools, guides of VERRA programs, which are the provisions of the "Standard for Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Program of Activities" as well as the "Guidelines for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programs of activities".

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.

AENOR reproduced and verified 100% of sheets in the spreadsheet of emission reduction calculations /13/ and the data/calculations carried out in those sheets for the monitoring period from 01 January 2022 to 31 December 2022 for the project area and leakage belt. The project boundary and deforested areas in the project area and leakage belt for the monitoring period were 100% checked using the GIS database and shape files. The carbon stock changes, forest classes in the project area and leakage belt were also 100% verified and crosschecked with validated values. Verification team also requested

supporting evidence of community and biodiversity monitoring plan (complete list of assessed documents are detailed in appendix 3)

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

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

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

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

- Sufficient evidence available: The project participant has provided the 100% of data used in the calculations to achieve the final amount of GHG emission reductions reported.
- Nature of evidence: The raw data were collected from reliable sources. They are detailed in the project documents and have been provided to the verification team and the most relevant are appropriately detailed in the appendix 3.
- Cross-checked evidence: AENOR cross-checked the collected information through an on-site inspection to the project area and reproducing calculations.

Desk review started, after PP sent the MR to public comments (public comment was from 28/10/2024 to 27/11/2024, desk reviewed started on 15 November 2024. The field visit took place from 25 November to 28 November 2024 in which the lead auditor visited the project area, interviewed key stakeholders, staff and other related experts, and also reviewed the CCB-VCS-PD and supporting documents. In addition to the site visit, a meeting in Lima took place on 03 December 2024, the verification team conducted the reviewing of baseline calculation; the processing data from satellite images. Verification report were drafted on March 2025, after closing all findings.

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

2.3 Document Review (VCS, 4.1, CCB Program Rules, 4.3.1)

The monitoring report /9/ /10/, validated PD /11/ Previous verification report /12/, spreadsheet of emission reduction calculation /13/ 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, including, The Non-Permanence Risks Reports /14/. Appendix 3 to this report details the list of documents provided by PP and reviewed by AENOR during the process.

2.4 Interviews (VCS, 4.1, CCB Program Rules, 4.3.1)

The AENOR's audit team (lead auditor) 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 kick off meeting was on 15 November 2024; the field visit took place from 25 to 28 November 2024, in which the auditors visited the project area, interviewed key stakeholders, staff and other related experts, and also reviewed the PD and supporting documents. The people interviewed were those directly affected or involved in the project activity and in some cases were just indirectly affected.

Additional to site visit, additional meeting were carried out in Lima on 03 December 2024 to review GIS processing data; processing satellite images and emission reduction calculation.

The people interviewed were those directly affected or involved in the project activity and in some cases were just indirectly affected are summarized following:

Audit Date	Name	Title	Activities
25/11/2024	Nelson Kroll	General Manager/ MADERACRE	Initial meeting Status of the project activity (Operation and implementation) Property and land use rights Community monitoring plan Biodiversity monitoring plan Project Communication & Grievance Mechanism Characteristics of the project
	Cesar Carcheri	SSEE chief/MADERACRE	
	Alessandra Crisanto	SSEE Assistants/MADERACRE	
	Luis Naña	Forestry management chief/MADERACRE	
	Fernando Ramos	SOMA supervisor/MADERACRE	
	Leslie Monteagudo	RS Coordinator/MADERACRE	
26/11/2024	Agustin Sama	Pacahuara community	
	Edgard Chicoma		
	Nohimi Huaman		
	Fernando Salazar		
	Pedro Ajagahui		

Audit Date	Name	Title	Activities
	Ruth Vargas		Comments and opinions about the project
	Hilio Ochoa		Benefits of project activities
	Edmar Mamani		Activities implemented by the project proponent to mitigate risks local stakeholders
	Pascual Piñares	Flor de Ucayali Community	The processes used by the project proponent to communicate and consult with local stakeholders during the monitoring period
	Gladys Alvarado	San Francisco Community	Monitoring results dissemination
	Noelia Lopez	Villa Primavera Community	Control and patrolling activities
			Training activities
			Satisfaction and perception of the project
			Local employment. Men/women. Work insurance.
			Improving of livelihood
			Antidiscrimination and grievance policies
			Communication plan
	Felicia Mendoza	Principal of I.E. Iñapari School	Comments and opinions about the project
	Efrain Ramos	Administrative I.E. Iñapari School	Benefits of project activities
	Jorge Bailon	Principal of Noaya School	Project dissemination of monitoring results
	Leonor Tárraga	Principal of San Isidro School	Agreements
	Marcial Pereyra	Caldero Control and surveillance guard/MADERACRE	Patrolling activities
	William Noa	Caldero Control and surveillance guard/MADERACRE	Illegal activities within the project
	Reynaldo Pacheco	Coordinator of Control and surveillance guar/MADERACRE	Working conditions
			Health and safety at work
27/11/2024	Yisela Suaña	Park ranger - SERNAMP	

Audit Date	Name	Title	Activities
	Willy Neyra	Park ranger - SERNAMP	Patrolling activities Illegal activities within the project activities
	Demtrio Ibarra	Park ranger - SERNAMP	Project dissemination of monitoring results
	Erick GrandeZ	Tahuamanu - Forest and wildlife management unit (UGFFS -TAH)	Forestry plan approval Forest harvesting permits Legal status Permits and approvals Sanctions
28/11/2024	Mercedes Perales	Management committee of Alto Purus National Park	Biodiversity benefits Biodiversity monitoring
	Luis Naña	Forestry management chief/MADERACRE	Forest harvesting Working conditions Health and safety at work
	Nelson Kroll	General Manager/ MADERACRE	Biodiversity monitoring results Community monitoring results
	Cesar Carcheri	SSEE chief/MADERACRE	Biodiversity indicators Community indicators
	Leslie Monteagudo	RS Coordinator/MADERACRE	Monitoring report Final meeting
03/12/2024	Natalia Woo	Consultant/PASCAY	Monitoring report results (climate) CCB-VCS-MR content Supporting evidences of monitoring report Emission reduction calculation Project area, leakage belt area and project zone area results Project emissions, baselines emission and leakage emission calculation

2.5 Site Visits (VCS, 4.1, CCB Program Rules, 4.3.1)

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

- Ensure that the geographic area of the project, as reported in the PD and the accompanying KML file, is in conformance with Section 3.11.2 of the VCS Standard;
- Observe 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.
- Select 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 of the VCS Standard;
- Perform 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;
- Interview local stakeholders to confirm that the project operates in accordance with current permits and authorizations and its relationship with local actors and communities.
- Interview the key personnel involved in the mentoring and observe monitoring practices.
- Verify patrolling and security access in the project zone

During the interview with different actors (refer to section 2.4 of this report) of project activity, verification team was able to confirm that the project activity has been operating as per stated in the validated project design document.

Site visit was conducted from 25 to 28 November 2024, in which the audit team visited the project area and check points; interviewed key stakeholders, staff and other related experts, and also reviewed the MR and supporting documents. Also, a meeting was carried with project representants and personnel in charge of carrying out the calculations, image processing, monitoring results. Details of the interviews are summarized in section 2.4 of this report.

2.6 Public Comments (VCS, 3.18; CCB Program Rules, 4.6)

The monitoring report (CCB-VCS-MR) was submitted to the VCS website for a 30-day public comment period from 28/10/2024 to 27/11/2024. No public comments were received during the verification process. Verification team confirmed this issue against public information in VERRA registry database

Comments received	Actions taken by the project proponent	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
No comments were received	N/A	N/A

2.7 Resolution of Findings (VCS, 4.1, CCB Program Rules, 4.3.1)

All documentation provided by the Project Proponent was assessed against the most recent version of the relevant VCS guidance document. Some 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, 3 CARs and 1 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 4 of this report.

2.7.1 Forward Action Requests (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.3)

No FARs were raised to the PP during the verification process.

In previous verification, VVB in charge, raised 4 FARs. Audit team assessed then and confirmed that they were properly addressed by PP.

FAR 1: *For the next verification period, the relevance of adapting to the “FSC Responsible Forest Management Standard for Peru” (FSC-STD-PER-02-2023_ESP_PSU_2023-11- 09) in relation to the modification of the percentage of conservation **area should** be assessed.*

Maderacre Operations holds FSC certification since 2007, the largest in the country. They maintain and renew their FSC principles and criteria for over 17 years. Their track record ensures they adapt to changes in FSC standards, including conservation areas, forest landscape protection, biodiversity, and carbon sinks.

Audit team assessed FSC certificate (registration code: NC-FM/COC-002176) and last FSC audit report /22/, it confirm the conservation areas reported in the PD was not affected.

FAR 2: *For the next verification period, it is necessary to ensure the participation of the majority of the inhabitants, including the most retired, in the settlements, where it is possible, through evidence, to guarantee the involvement of all who are part of the project, including different actors.*

Based on the transparency of information to be carried to all boundaries of the project area, and sharing the results and progress that has been made.

It is necessary for the villagers to differentiate the benefits obtained specifically from the "Tahuamanu Amazon REDD+ Project" and to avoid confusion with the "Mother of God REDD + Project" project.

Training and communication on the project should be improved through participatory processes that ensure the social and environmental protection of all participants, giving clarity to the obligations, rights and duties of each party.

The dissemination of the projects should be improved, to ensure that more people in the area of influence of the project apply.

The Tahuamanu Amazon REDD+ Project was socialized through the Citizen Participation Workshop (TPC) and Community Relations Consultative Committee (CCRC) during 2022. The project's activities were presented, considering all community groups and stakeholders, including Iñapari and Iberia districts. Letters were delivered to community representatives, associations, private and state institutions, and interested parties to ensure greater representation of the population and not just leaders. This process aimed to ensure the project's success.

Evidence of attendance at the Citizen Participation Workshop (TPC) and Community Relations Consultative Committee (CCRC) is displayed through the attendance lists of each event /38/ /39/, where attendees provide their personal information and specify the group to which they belong. Likewise, when the events are disseminated, each representative signs and/or identifies the group they belong to.

The Madre de Dios Amazon REDD+ Project and Tahuamanu Amazon REDD+ Project were presented differentiatedly during the Citizen Participation Workshop and Community Relations Consultative Committee. These projects detail their characteristics, objectives, activities, implementation importance, environmental and social impact, costs, and risks. Recommendations will be taken to further differentiate the projects, strengthen relationships with community groups, and differentiate between information provided by each. Socialization workshops will be held in Iñapari and Iberia districts. Audit team assessed the presentation of monitoring results /40/ and during the site visit confirming the awareness of the project.

Audit team considers that dissemination process meet VCS and CCB requirements, audit team accessed to the website (as stated in the PD); also reviewed advertising spots (local radios) /42/; allowing people to be informed of dissemination events.

FAR 3: *In the Third verification, the proponent must demonstrate the additional actions and activities that are implemented in the project under a scheme that allows differentiating the activities and benefits that are executed as a result of the concession from those that are specifically a **product of the REDD+ project**.*

The project actions aimed at community development are detailed in Section 4.1.1 of the MR, distinguishing them from forest concession activities and quantifying beneficiaries. Tables 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, support these actions, focusing on community development, improving well-being, and protecting Indigenous Peoples in Voluntary Isolation and Initial Contact (PIACI). These actions include strengthening access to education, health services, infrastructure, and ensuring the defense of territories and ways of

life. Audit team confirms that validated monitoring plan meets CCB requirements and allows to verify the benefit in communities with included indicators.

FAR 4: *In the Third verification, the proponent must demonstrate the outline measures needed and taken to mitigate these risks:*

- *Productive activities are not enough attractive to change the pattern of land use of agrarian neighbors.*
- *New migrants that are not part of the original beneficiaries of the REDD+ project will become new deforestation drivers as they do not participate in the project activities.*

The project completed the sale of its first carbon credits at the end of 2022, corresponding to the first verification period (2017–2019). As a result, during the current monitoring period (2022), sufficient financial resources were not available to carry out all the originally planned activities. Even that during this monitoring it was conducted:

- The project facilitates biannual participatory workshops with local communities, organizations, and authorities. These sessions foster transparent dialogue about development and conservation efforts while collecting valuable implementation feedback. This engagement model has successfully strengthened livelihoods while reducing forest pressure - contributing to measurable declines in deforestation.
- The Community Engagement Advisory Committee - comprising community reps, organizational leaders, and project staff - meets biannually to prioritize and plan activities based on urgent local needs and available project resources.
- Environmental education talks and workshops for children and youth in local educational institutions aim to foster early awareness of the importance of local forests. These sessions encourage the sharing of acquired knowledge within the family, thereby promoting the adoption of a forest conservation culture as an integral part of daily practices.

Despite these activities, this FAR remains open to confirm the mitigation measures after the entry of VCUs in the next monitoring period.

2.8 Eligibility for Validation Activities (VCS, 4.1; CCB Program Rules, 4.1)

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 (VCS, 3.23, Appendix 2; CCB Program Rules, 3.1)

The project is not included in an emissions trading program; This program does not exist in Peru to date..

3.2 Methodology Deviations (VCS, 3.20)

In previous verification /12/ Project activity implemented a methodology deviation:

It consisted in the readjustment of the spatial model for projecting future deforestation, following the indications of VM0015 v.1.1 Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation. The analysis was performed using TerrSet v.2020 software, under its Land Change Modeler (LCM) module. Because the historical reference period ran from 2007 to 2016, it was decided to use three images close to the beginning of the crediting period (2012, 2014, and 2016), since the deforestation rates between these intervals were more similar than those occurring in the initial years. The first two years were used for the calibration phase of the spatial factors, while the last year was used as a reference image to validate the results.

A model based on neural networks (Artificial Neural Networks, ANN) was generated, which is a process that establishes relationships between certain drivers or spatial factors with the LULC (Land Use Land Cover) classes and their derived transitions; these relationships are expressed through multiple combinations (linear or nonlinear) of the spatial factors, evaluating the best possible combination that allows predicting the behavior of the transition evaluated in the determined time. As a result, the process provides a set of transition potentials for each combination considered. The detailed steps describing the modelling and location of unplanned deforestation is detailed in Appendix 7.

Once this procedure was completed, the allocation of future deforestation was performed following Section 4.2 and 5.1 of VM0015 v1.1, instead of Sections 8.1.5.1, 8.1.5.3 and 8.1.5.4 of VM0006 v.2.2. In practice, Equations 37 from VM0006 v.2.2 was not used.

Audit team verified that PP has applied stated deviation during this monitoring as approved in previous verification.

3.3 Minor Changes to Project Description (CCB Program Rules, 3.5.6)

No minor changes for project description have been applied for this period.

3.4 Project Description Deviations (VCS, 3.21; CCB Program Rules, 3.5.7 – 3.5.10)

During this monitoring PP is requesting the following deviation in community indicators:

- ✓ The implementation of Table 4.11 from the CCB-VCS-PD is ruled out as it includes indicators that do not have a real impact from the project's activities. The indicator "**Deforested areas in Forest Concessions inside Reference Region**" is neither directly nor indirectly related to the project's activities, as forest cover loss will occur similarly in other forest concessions within the reference region due to the lack of sufficiently robust monitoring and surveillance systems to halt the deforestation threatening these forests. Additionally, the values for the indicator "**Income from PDAF paid to the Regional Forest and Wildlife Administration by Forest Concessions located inside the Reference Region**" are not accessible, as such payments for usage rights cannot be disclosed to third parties. For this reason, **the indicator cannot be quantified and should not be reflected as part of the analysis.**
- ✓ The indicators from "Table 4.7. **Number of families per community**" and "**4.8. Subsistence economy**" should not be applicable in subsequent monitoring starting from the current audited period. These indicators are not part of the project's activities but rather informational elements that allow the project to determine if there is any use of natural resources within the project area to meet the basic needs of local communities. This information also helps assess the feasibility of considering HCV 05: Community Needs, as part of the protection process, a case which was not applicable to the project as described in Section 4.1.2. Additionally, this information, included in the baseline studies, also identifies whether any illegal activities are taking place within the project area or if there are attempts to engage in such activities. **Therefore, these tables will not be implemented for the 2022 audited period results or in any future periods.** Instead, the project will focus on further developing the activities described in the TOC (Section 2.1.11 of the CCB-VCS-PD).

Audit team considers that not including indicator from table 4.7, 4.8 and 4.11 of monitoring plan do not impact community monitoring plan due to Project activity account with other indicators that allow verifying community benefits, for example indicator included in table 4.5 and 4.6. Also in previous verification /12/, indicators from table 4.7, 4.8 and 4.11 /12/, were not recorded (not reported as deviation).

CCB rules /8/ allows minor changes to the validated project design at verification (section 3.5.6) and should be documented in the verification report. Due to the impossibility of obtaining data to measure these indicators and since there are others that allow verifying the benefits to the community audit team considers that this deviation is not significant; does not affect community additionally and is in line with CCB rules /8/.

In previous verification /8/ PP included 3 methodology deviation, summarized following;

Stakeholder engagement: the project's area of influence. However, the project proponent collaborates with other institutions to protect the Madre de Dios Territorial Reserve and its indigenous peoples. They are a member of the Alto Purus National Park Management Committee, which coordinates actions for PIACI territory protection, natural resource conservation, and environmental education. The project proponent plans to continue their actions in collaboration with the Alto Purus National Park administration

Change in the Project area extension: The project area initially covered 171,584.07 ha, but was updated to reflect the forest area at the start of the project, removing deforestation and non-forest areas until the end of 2016. This resulted in a corrected project area of 169,956.81 ha.

Recalculation of the baseline deforestation rate for the reference region. Due to methodology deviation, described in section 3.2, The VM0015 methodology v.1.1 requires a conceptual change in the reference region definition, including the project area and leakage belt. This means the deforestation rate calculation must be modified to include existing deforestation in the project and leakage areas, which the VM0006 methodology v.2.2 excluded. Thus, there is a change in the historical data, which modifies the beta regression and therefore the deforestation rate in the reference region. The results are shown in the validated PD /11/

Audit team confirms that PP applied previous project description deviation in the current monitoring period and is still valid.

3.5 New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects (VCS, 3.6; CCB, G1.13 – G1.15)

Not applicable. This is not a grouped project

3.6 Baseline Reassessment (VCS, 3.2.6, 3.2.7)

Did the project undergo baseline reassessment during the monitoring period?

☐ Yes

☒ No.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Details

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion:
Audit history (VCS, 4.1)	AENOR verified the project against VCS and CCB requirements. Audit team review carefully all information included in the MR first and last versions /9/ /10/. The audit process included desk review of the project design implementation, the baseline and monitoring plan; site visit to the project area; follow-up interviews with project stakeholders and local authorities. This monitoring correspond to the third verification of the first crediting period; then, verification report of previous verification was assessed in order to confirming whether there are any pending findings (FARs).

During the verification some findings were raised, which were solved by PP before drafting the verification report. The initial verification report, project design document and supporting evidence were submitted to technical review.

Audit team gathered information about

- Project proponent, developers/management team.
- Project status
- Monitoring plan
- Deforested areas during monitoring period
- Measurement records.
- Controls established to detect and correct any error or omission in monitoring parameters.
- Carbon calculations.
- Estimates and assumptions for determining GHG data.
- Remote sensing.
- Property and land use rights of the local stakeholders
- Activities implemented by the project proponent to mitigate risks local stakeholders
- The processes used by the project proponent to communicate and consult with local stakeholders during the monitoring period
- Project Communication & Grievance Mechanism
- Project activity dissemination; among others

Complete list of assessed evidence are listed in appendix 3 of this report.

Provided information allowed to the verification team:

- Carefully review the monitoring report and supporting documentation.
- Examine the GHG data gathered from the determined ERRs, spreadsheets used to enter, and compile information required by the methodology.
- Reproduce the sheets for ex-post calculation emission reductions for the project area crosschecking with used methodology requirements
- Reproduce the GHG emissions reductions calculations presented in the spreadsheet and crosscheck with the VCS-CCB-PD

- Check the project boundary and land cover changes in the project area for the monitoring period using the GIS database.
- Verify and crosschecked with validated values the carbon stock changes, and the land used classes in the project area.
- Carefully review the NPRR and supporting documentation for conformance to the verification criteria and consistency with the Project Description.
- Verify Non-Permanent Risk Report results using the NPRR tool and considering the standard requirements and validated Project Description.

The audit team has confirmed that the project is implemented. During the monitoring, auditor team confirmed that PP has followed established monitoring plan as per VM0006 /15/ and deviation included applying VM0015 /15/, due to following reasons:

- During the desk review monitoring parameters included in the applied methodology were compared with the ones included in the monitoring plan of the validated CCB-VCS-PD and they were found consistent.
- During the verification process no need was identified for a revision of the monitoring plan.
- No other relevant aspects for monitoring not included in the methodology were identified.
- Approved deviation were applied as per validated PD
- A community monitoring plan deviation were identified and included in this verification report

In addition, monitoring of reductions in GHG emissions has been implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan. The monitoring mechanism is effective and reliable. In accordance with the monitoring plan,

Auditing process included site visit and interviews, detailed in section 2.4 and 2.5 of this report

	The verification process has been conducted by AENOR in accordance with ISO 14064-3:2019, on the basis of all issues and criteria of CCB and VCS standards. The conclusions of this report show that the project, as it was described in the project documentation, is in line with all criteria applicable for the validation. The review of the project design documentation and additional documents related to baseline and monitoring methodology; and the subsequent background investigation, follow-up interviews and review of comments by parties have provided AENOR with sufficient evidence to validate the fulfilment of the stated criteria. Finally, during desk review and site assessment, it was confirmed that the project has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit for the project. Also, it was verified that the project has not been rejected from other GHG program. Overall the project activity was implemented as described in the validated CCB-VCS-PD /11/. Verification team confirmed that the component project implementation is in accordance with the project description contained in the validated CCB-VCS-PD. No material discrepancies were identified between project implementation and the project description.
Double counting and participation under other GHG programs (VCS, 3.23; CCB, G5.9)	Not applicable. The project is not registered under other GHG program. Verification team reviewed different GHG online registry platforms to confirm this issue.
No double claiming with emissions trading programs or binding emission limits (VCS, 3.24.3-3.24.4)	Verification team reviewed other than VCS GHG platform, such as CDM, GS, etc. in order to confirm that the project is not claiming GHG emission reduction or carbon dioxide removal by more than one entity towards separate mitigation targets or emissions inventories. Verification team confirms that the project activity is not part of another emissions Trading Program.
No double claiming with other forms of environmental credit (VCS, 3.24.5-3.24.6)	Verification team confirmed by reviewing GHG trading platforms that no other forms of environmental credits are requested by project activity
Supply chain (scope 3) emissions double claiming (VCS, 3.24.7)	Project activity does not affect the emissions footprint of any product(s) (goods or services) that are part of a supply chain. No emissions footprint is changed by the project activity.

Sustainable development
contributions (VCS, 3.17)

Peru has prioritized four strategies linked to the SDGs: people's well-being, environmental management, inclusive competitiveness, and effective democratic governance.

The project aids local development by providing jobs that comply with legislation, enhancing economic levels for women and locals. It educates citizens on sustainable development and forest management, preventing carbon emissions through monitoring and surveillance activities. It also collaborates with forest conservation and indirectly protects indigenous populations through voluntary isolation and initial contact (PIACI).

Verification team confirmed the sustainable contribution by confirming the achievement of reported indicator detailed in the MR, section 2.1.12 It includes:

SDG target	SDG indicator	Current project co/ntributions
1.3	Social protection systems and measures for everyone	A total of 258 workers (33 women) who are part of the project, maintain health and accident insurance, and food security during their working days. Audit team reviewed Payroll 2022 /17/, confirming this indicator.
3.1	Reduction in maternal mortality rate	Risk prevention to ensure the physical and psychological well-being of 02 pregnant mothers working for the project. Audit team confirmed this indicator against Certificates of delivery of health support /18/

	3.3	Neglected tropical diseases	09 workers with a confirmed case of dengue and 05 with leishmaniasis were treated, both considered tropical diseases. It was confirmed against Tropical Diseases Report 2022 /103/
	3.8	Cover access to quality essential health services and access to medicines	A total of 258 workers (33 women) who are part of the project have insurance that covers 100% of all their health care. Audit team reviewed Payroll 2022 /17/, confirming this indicator.
	3.9	Disease reduction through vaccine immunization	A total of 182 project workers have been vaccinated to prevent different diseases, with emphasis on common ones. The vaccines provided are Yellow Fever, Hepatitis B, Diphtheria Tetanus Toxoid (dT), Influenza and Measles. Audit team confirmed this indicator against Employees' vaccine records /19/.
	4.3	Ensure equal access to technical education	10 students have participated in the "Iberia Higher Education Institute" due to the agreement signed between the project proponent and the Institute. It was confirmed against Certificates of educations support /20/,

	5.1	End all forms of discrimination against women	The project proponent implements 01 Anti-discrimination policy and promotes labor equality. There are 0 reported records of discrimination cases. Audit team reviewed Employment Equality and Anti-discrimination Policy /50/ and interviewed women from the staff confirming that there are no record of any discrimination case.
	8.5	Achieve full and productive employability and decent work for men and women	The Project proponent generated 258 jobs with average salaries of 14.17 USD/day. Audit team reviewed Payroll 2022 /17/, confirming this indicator.
	10.3	Ensure equal opportunities and reduce inequality	The project proponent implements 01 Anti-discrimination policy of any form and promotes labor equality. There are 0 reported records of discrimination cases. Audit team reviewed Employment Equality and Anti-discrimination Policy /50/ and interviewed the staff confirming the indicator
	11.4	Expenses allocated to the preservation, protection and conservation of natural heritage	The project proponent implements actions that allow conserving 169,956.81 hectares of project area considered natural forest heritage. It was confirmed against KML files /70/

	13	Tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions avoided	By conserving 169,956.81 hectares of tropical rainforest, Tahuamanu Amazon REDD Project has prevented the release of 603,942 thousand tons of carbon into the atmosphere during the monitoring period. Audit team reviewed the spreadsheet of emission reduction calculation /13/, confirming the result
	15.1	Forest area conserved in proportion to the total area	100% of the forest area has been conserved during the present vintage. Audit team reviewed satellite images /73/ confirming that there is no deforestation in the project area
	15.2	Promoting progress towards sustainable forest management	The project area is part of the certified areas by the FSC in 2022, with the project proponent being a responsible forest manager. Udit team reviewed FSC certificate /22/ confirming that the project activity is developed in certified forest area.
	15.5	Protection of threatened species in danger of extinction	The project proponent conserves 04 species of wild flora and fauna categorized in the IUCN red list: - <i>Ateles chamek</i> (EN) - <i>Sylvilagus brasiliensis</i> (EN) - <i>Amburana cearensis</i> (EN) - <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> (EN) Audit team reviewed Forest census report /91/ confirming the presence of those species

	15.7	Adoption of measures to end poaching and trafficking of protected species of wild flora and fauna	Poaching is prohibited within the project area, and custody and surveillance actions are carried out. 0 events of poaching and commercialization species have been recorded. Audit team interviewed project guard and park rangers during the site visit and confirms that poaching activities

Audit team assessed each indicator against provided evidence , confirming the reported values.

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 communities' representatives 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 MR in its section 1.1 states:

- 130 beneficiaries in health of indigenous peoples as a result of project activities.
- 61 beneficiaries in education of indigenous peoples as a result of project activities.
- 72 women of indigenous peoples benefiting through project activities.
- 6 promotional activities for the protection of indigenous peoples in isolation, PIACI.

Verification team reviewed the life plan 2022 of Belgica community /24/ in order to confirm the number of beneficiaries in education of indigenous peoples and the number of women of indigenous peoples benefiting through project activities. The number of beneficiaries in education of indigenous people was verified against the agreements with the native community of Belgica /25/. Finally, the number of promotional activities for the protection of indigenous peoples in isolation (PIACI) was verified against Contingency Plan for PIACI /23/.

As specific and remarkable achievements for the current monitoring period the monitoring report in its section 1.2 states:

Metric	Achievements during Monitoring Period	WB Assessment
Net estimated emission reductions in the project area, measured against the without-project scenario	588,900	Verification team reviewed the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet /13/ in order to confirm reported value.
For REDD projects: Number of hectares of reduced forest loss in the project area measured against the without-project scenario	1,129.95	Verification team reviewed Project Area Map /68/, Leakage Belt Map /69/, GIS data /71/, Deforestation rates and Official deforestation rates from GEOBOSQUES webpage /72/.
Total number of community members who have improved skills and/or knowledge resulting from training provided as part of project activities	160	Verification team reviewed the Annual training activity programme /27/ and, Training records 2022/28/ in order to confirm reports values.
Number of female community members who have improved skills and/or knowledge resulting from training provided as part of project activities of project activities	28	
Total number of people employed in of project activities, expressed as number of full time employees	258	Verification team reviewed the Payroll 2022 /17/ in order to confirm people employed in the project
Number of women employed in project activities, expressed as number of full time employees	33	
Total number of people with improved livelihoods or income generated as a result of project activities	262	
Number of women with improved livelihoods or income generated as a result of project activities	33	
Total number of people for whom health services were improved as a result of project	2,521	It corresponds to the population of the Native

Metric	Achievements during Monitoring Period	WB Assessment
activities, measured against the without-project scenario		Community Belgica, as registered in the Life Plan /24/. Agreement signed whit this community /25/, includes improves on health. PP has given support by providing medicines and vaccines /18/
Number of women for whom health services were improved as a result of project activities, measured against the without-project scenario	1,074	
Total number of people for whom access to, or quality of, education was improved as a result of project activities, measured against the without-project scenario	87	It corresponds to the students from Belgica community, Villa Primavera district, Noaya District and Iñapari district, where the organization has agreements /26/
Number of women and girls for whom access to, or quality of, education was improved as a result of project activities, measured against the without-project scenario	26	
Total number of people who experienced increased water quality and/or improved access to drinking water as a result of project activities, measured against the without-project scenario	3,256	According to the official report included in the national census 2017.
Number of women who experienced increased water quality and/or improved access to drinking water as a result of project activities, measured against the without-project scenario	1,388	
Total number of community members whose well-being was improved as a result of project activities	206	It corresponds to the population of the Native Community Belgica, as registered in the Life Plan /24/.
Number of women whose well-being was improved as a result of project activities	91	
Change in the number of hectares significantly better managed by the project for biodiversity conservation, measured against the without-project scenario	169,956.81	It correspond to the size of the project area

Metric	Achievements during Monitoring Period	VB Assessment
Number of globally Critically Endangered or Endangered species benefiting from reduced threats as a result of project activities, measured against the without-project scenario	IUCN Red List Fauna: Endangered: 2 Flora: Endangered: 2	Biodiversity monitoring report

The standardized benefit metrics, including: GHG emission reductions or removals; Forest cover; Improved land management; Training; Employment; Livelihoods; Health; Education; Water; Well-being and Biodiversity conservation. The audit team reviewed information reported in this section against supporting evidence listed in appendix 3; also, 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 (CCB, G1.9)

Item	Assessment and conclusion
Material misstatements	Section 2.2 of the monitoring report provides 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. Section 3.1.3, 4.3.1 and 5.3.1 of the MR detail the monitoring plan regarding climate, community and biodiversity. Verification team found that there is no material misstatements between the project implementation and the project description; neither material misstatements between the actual monitoring system and the monitoring plan set out in the project description and the applied methodology. Audit team reviewed documents listed in appendix 3 of this report; also reviewed validation and verification documents uploaded in the VERRA's platform, confirming that there are no material discrepancies between

	the current monitoring system and the monitoring plan established in the project description and the applied methodology.
Monitoring plan implementation status	The audit team reviewed the MR and confirmed, by comparison with the information provided in the registered PDs, that the project information collected during the site visit and the description of the implementation status of the project activity is in line with the applicable provisions of the standard. This means that, in accordance with the monitoring plan, the applied methodology and the VCS and CCB requirements, the project proponent successfully monitors the parameters to determine emission reductions and the parameters for community and biodiversity monitoring. In previous verification, a Methodology deviation was introduced, It consisted in the readjustment of the spatial model for projecting future deforestation, following the indications of VM0015 v.1.1 Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation. Audit team reviewed that deviation was applied as approved in previous verification. During this verification PP requested a deviation in community monitoring plan of not including indicator from table 4.7, 4.8 and 4.11 due Project activity account with other indicators that allow to verify community benefits, for example indicator include in table 4.5 and 4.6. Also in previous verification /12/, indicators from table 4.7, 4.8 and 4.11 /12/, were not recorded (not reported as deviation). Section 2.2.1 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 related to the success to implement and achieve the goals established by the project in the community and biodiversity areas. Furthermore, the project has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit and has not become eligible to do so since validation or verification, in addition, the project has not participated or been rejected by any other GHG program. AENOR confirms that the project is complying with what is stated in the project description

4.3.2 Stakeholder Identification (VCS, 3.18, 3.19; CCB, G3.6)

The stakeholder involvement in project design as well as the stakeholder communication system is described in the PD. During the interview with communities' members, the audit team audit team was able to verify the stakeholder's involvement through the different interviews and meetings conducted and through records of different meetings and workshops.

In opinion of AENOR, the communication and consultation plan are being implemented as described in the project design document /11/. The project design document, monitoring report and other documents related to REDD project activities are public available and were disseminated as per VCS and CCB requirements. These documents have been made accessible to communities through socialization events, workshops, and community participation spaces, and have been delivered via printed, digital, and audio-visual materials created specifically for communities and other interested stakeholders.

Audit team, after desk review and interviews during the site visit confirms that the project were implement considering the governance and decision-making forms of the native community. Community authorities and assemblies are involved in the process, with a mechanism in place to address suggestions, complaints, and claims. The process considers cultural differences, languages of each ethnic group, opinions, and consultations with gender and intergenerational equity.

The Degradation Potential Diagnosis by Maderacre S.A.C. (2021) /33/ was used for stakeholder identification, providing data on population groups and project activity area characteristics. A mixed methodology was employed, involving surveys and questionnaires for general population and community board representatives. The collected information complements ongoing research. Fuhtrmore, Project proponent developed many procedures in order to establish community relations; including Community Development Plan /29/; communication plan /30/; social monitoring plan /31/; anthropological contingency plan for dealing with risk situation during the contact with an isolated population (PIACI) /32/.

Verification team reviewed the plans developed and their implementation; also, it was reviewed the diffusion support of the project activity to the local stakeholder, including Dissemination of REDD Component report 2022 /34/; Citizen participation workshop report /35/; Agreements of the meetings minutes /36/; Flyers of project diffusion /37/; among other (complete list of evidence is included in appendix 3).

During the on-site visit, project proponent provided photographs, surveys results and workshop reports; also, the responsible for community relationships were intervened. Then, AENOR's Verification team is able to confirm that the consultation process is effective and fulfil the requirement of VCS and CCB requirements. Also, verification team confirm that community demonstrated awareness and consent of the project's activities and the process used to identify stakeholders likely impacted as requested by CCB standard.

4.3.3 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication (VCS, 3.18; CCB, G3.4)

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Community groups and other stakeholders	The composition of stakeholders did not change during the current monitoring period. They are the same as identified in section 2.1.9 of the validated PD. The audit team verified through documentary evidence and interviews (section 2.4) the compliance associated with the continuous identification of the groups or stakeholders of the project
Ongoing consultation	As described in section 2.3.4. of the monitoring report, the project proponent convenes two annual meetings inviting representatives of all communities, community groups and stakeholders that are part of the project activity region. The meetings establish two working mechanisms: the TPC (Citizen Participation Workshop), a space for open dialogue involving the largest number of community actors, and the CCRC (Community Relations Advisory Committee), a space for dialogue established by the proponent of the project, civil society representatives. The TPC aims to involve the largest number of actors in the project's area of influence, contributing to its continuous construction and implementation. The CCRC is part of the citizen participation mechanisms, where proposals for action and investment in specific issues related to improving the quality of life of populations are raised and discussed. Verification team reviewed the plans developed and their implementation; also, it was reviewed the diffusion support of the project activity to the local stakeholder, including: Dissemination of REDD Component report 2022 /34/; Citizen participation workshop report /35/; Agreements of the meetings minutes /36/; Flyers of project diffusion /37/; among other (complete list of evidences are included in appendix 3). During the on-site visit, project proponent provided photographs, surveys results and workshop reports; also, the responsible for community relationships were intervened. Then, AENOR´s Verification team is able to confirm that the consultation process is effective and fulfil the requirement of VCS and CCB requirements.
Date(s) of stakeholder consultation	The two meeting took place on: First Meeting (TPC): 29-April-2022

	Second Meeting (CCRC): 16-December-2022
Communication of monitored results	The results of the project were communicated in each of the communities through meetings with the assembly. Audit team asked the communities (during the site visit) about the dissemination of the project and confirmed its accessibility to documentation. Also, PP communities website, which include monitoring results.
Consultation records	The presentation and consultation with interested parties were documented through photographs, attendance lists, and a report summarizing the topics discussed and collecting participant comments. Audit team assessed the two meeting attendance list /38/ /39/ confirming stated date; PPT presentation of monitoring results /40/; Flyers of project diffusion/37/; dissemination of REDD Component report 2022 /34/; Citizen participation workshop report /35/; Agreements of the meetings minutes /36/ During the on-site visit, project proponent provided photographs, surveys results and workshop reports; also, the responsible of committee for community relationships was interviewed, confirming activities carried by PP. Then, AENOR´s Verification team is able to confirm that the consultation process is effective and fulfil the requirement of VCS and CCB requirements.
Stakeholder input	The project involves distributing consultation sheets to all participants, generating contributions and consultations. The project proponent receives praise for good management, requests for community development support, and proposals for activities for PPAMAs public tender. These contributions are part of the project's objectives. The TPC and CCRC are priority and binding participation mechanisms for the project's development and continuous implementation.
Influence of stakeholder input	The project's objectives are set by each participant's contributions and consultations, ensuring no modifications in implementation. The TPC and CCRC serve as priority and binding participation mechanisms for the project's development and continuous implementation.

4.3.4 Stakeholder Access to Information (VCS, 3.18; CCB, G3.1- G3.3)

According to the section 2.3.2. of the monitoring report, the information is public available in the company webpage (www.maderacre.com). Also, the information had been shared with stakeholders through letters, radio advertisements and through citizen participation workshops and the Consultation Committee.

In 2022, information about the project was accessible to communities and stakeholders, including previous documents, such as Monitoring Reports vintage 2017-2019 and 2020-2021; and Project Description (1st validation) are available on the company's website, freely accessible to all.

A month before the audit team's visit, letters were sent to stakeholders and communities announcing that the Tahuamanu Amazon REDD Project's verification process by an independent certification organization (VVB), they informed about field work dates; and during the visit they should express their views on the project

Verification team reviewed the public information, regarding project activities, in the stated 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 (section 2.4) that the information generated for the design of the project has been explained to the community. Also it was confirmed whether they were informed about the audit visit.

Therefore, audit team confirms that the information has been made accessible to communities and other stakeholders. Also, summary documents has been actively disseminated to communities in relevant local language (Spanish). Audit team's visit was informed to communities in timely manner. Also, during the site visit PP facilitated direct and independent communication with stakeholders.

Based on interviews conducted during the site visit audit team confirms that Monitoring results have been exposed to the communities. Moreover, the documentation developed by the project proponent, including previous studies as well as the project description document and monitoring report, were delivered to local stakeholders. In addition, any persons from the communities can directly communicate with the project representatives in their office located in Iñapari and request project information.

AENOR accede to the webpage, confirming that information is available; furthermore, during the on-site visit and through the review of the attendance list meetings /38/ /39/ and PPT presentation of monitoring results/40/and conclude that the stakeholders have access to information regarding project activity.

4.3.5 Grievances (VCS, 3.18.4; CCB, G3.8)

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Grievance received and steps taken to resolve the grievance including the outcomes of the resolution	No grievances were received by PP during this monitoring period. Audit team consulted during the on-site visit confirming this fact.
Grievance redress procedure	Project proponent has established a flowchart for receiving, hearing, responding and resolve grievances, taking into account traditional conflict resolution methods, described in the validated PD. Verification team reviewed and confirmed the process, during the on-site visit. Also,

the project proponent has developed a procedure for complaints and consultations /41/.

Audit team reviewed and confirmed the process flow, during the on-site visit. Community members confirmed the awareness of the grievances mechanism procedure and that during the monitoring period no grievances were recorded. Therefore, AENOR's audit team is able to confirm that the feedback and grievances producers meets VCS and CCB (G.3.8) requirements

4.3.6 Stakeholder Participation in Decision-making and Implementation (VCS, 3.18, 3.19; CCB, G3.6)

The stakeholder involvement in project design as well as the stakeholder communication system is described in the PD. During the site visit, the audit team was able to verify the stakeholder's involvement through the different interviews and meetings conducted and through records of different meetings and workshops.

In opinion of AENOR, the communication and consultation plan are being implemented as described in the project design document. The project design document, monitoring report and other documents related to REDD+ project activities are public available and were disseminated as per VCS and CCB requirements. These documents have been made accessible to communities through socialization events, workshops, and community participation spaces, and have been delivered via printed, digital, and audiovisual materials created specifically for communities and other interested stakeholders.

The communities present in the project's area of influence correspond to groups of settlers who have migrated to these territories from different towns or cities in the country, with the exception of Belgica Native Community, mainly Yine ethnic group, which is fully integrated into the social and economic dynamics of the area. The interaction with all the actors has been designed through the same mechanism, which corresponds to the citizen participation workshops and the community relations advisory committees. Regarding gender, in the community relationships advisory committee, a representative of the women has a permanent seat and brings the approach of local communities' women to be part of the main discussion and prioritization.

AENOR's verification team checked provided information during the on-site visit, by interviewing various local actors (summary and detail of the topics and activities carried out during the on-site visit are in section 2.4). Also, the community responsibly from Maderacre detailed the communication process. Hence, verification team confirm that community demonstrated awareness and participation in project implementation.

4.3.7 Risks from the Project and No Net Harm (VCS, 3.18, 3.19)

Section 2.2.7 of the Monitoring Report it is summarized main risk to the project, including:

- ✓ Fires cannot be controlled, and enter in the project area
- ✓ Invasion of the project area by residents of towns and adjacent communities
- ✓ Increased land use change areas in project activities region
- ✓ Productive activities are not enough attractive to change the pattern of land use of agrarian neighbors
- ✓ New migrants that are not part of the original beneficiaries of the REDD+ project will become new deforestation drivers as they do not participate in the project activities.
- ✓ Internal conflicts within local settlements

For those risks, the Project Proponent has established different mitigation procedures, including Forest fire prevention training material /43/; Forest management plan /44/ and Procedures for handling and resolving conflicts /45/. The increase in the agricultural frontier in the leakage belt is verified using remote sensors. Actions needed and designed to mitigate identified risk are detailed in appendix 2.

Based on the site observation, conducted during the site visit, audit team confirmed that the surveillance system in place in the concession; also, by interviewing project guards, who confirms training activities /46/, audit team confirms that the project is complying with what is stated in the monitoring report and the steps taken to minimize or reduce natural and human-induced risks.

In addition, the PP has developed a Non-Permanence Risk Report to estimate the risks on Climate benefits in accordance with the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v 4.2.

AENOR deems that the Project Proponent identified correctly 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.

4.3.8 Community and Biodiversity Benefit Permanence (CCB, 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 project's education and training activities in communities extend its climate benefits beyond its duration, promoting future generations' awareness about forest management, carbon sequestration, and fewer emissions, ultimately extending the project's lifespan and extending its benefits. During the current monitoring period, the project proponent's main social component activities focus on education, health, communication, and information for surrounding communities and stakeholders. These benefits remain in the social factor of the project, prior to the income from carbon sales.

PP account with a social responsibility plan /48/ where informative workshops and meetings with the consultative committee are developed with the communities; community development program /29/ with health and education support programs, mainly, developed in Iñapari and Iberia district. Following these plan /29/ /48/, PP conducted training activities regarding sustainable forest management; collaborated

with the protection and good practices in relation to PIACI populations to safeguard their physical integrity and not be disturbed by activities related to the intrusion of their territory.

Also, PP conducted a study to measure degradation potential (DPDD) /49/ to know the current status of the surrounding populations in the use of forest lands found in the region of project activities. The conclusion of this study state that the agricultural and forestry activities carried out by surrounding families do not pose a potential risk of deforestation and forest degradation in the Tahuamanu Amazon REDD project.

Verification team assessed the agreements with the native community of Belgica /25/ and Agreements with the educational institutions /26/; also Principal of I.E. Iñapari School; Administrative I.E. Iñapari School; Principal of Noaya School and Principal of San Isidro School were interviewed and confirmed the education support program. In addition park ranger from SERNAMP was interviewed in order to confirm the supports provided by the project proponent. Interviewed persons respond with positive comments to the project activity.

Therefore, AENOR confirm that PP is taking reasonable measures + to enhance project benefits beyond the project lifetime in accordance with the validated project description document, VCS standard and CCB standard.

4.3.9 Risks to the Project (CCB, G1.10)

The risks identified by the proponent are summarized in section 2.2.7 of the monitoring report. It includes: *Fires cannot be controlled, and enter in the project area; Invasion of the project area by residents of towns and adjacent communities; Increased land use change areas in project activities region; Productive activities are not enough attractive to change the pattern of land use of agrarian neighbors; and New migrants that are not part of the original beneficiaries of the REDD+ project will become new deforestation drivers as they do not participate in the project activities; Internal conflicts within local settlements for the project and the activities associated with their mitigation were evaluated as follows:*

The project is currently taking active measures to mitigate identified risk and 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 includes:

- ✓ The education and training activities in the communities, regarding climate benefits that will extend beyond the life of the project, as useful mechanisms to develop long-term sustainable forest management skills.
- ✓ The education, health communication and information for the surrounding communities and identified stakeholders and other stakeholders

Based on the information collected in the interviews, it was found that stakeholders consider that project activities have a direct positive impact on the well-being of neighboring communities and encourage the creation of strategic ties with institutions, to ensure the permanence of the project's benefits beyond its useful life through capacity building and continuous accompaniment. Also, the education and training actions for communities will help raise awareness of the flora and fauna and the benefits of maintaining biodiversity. Then, AENOR considers that reasonable measures have been taken to ensure that the benefits of the project remain in the territory.

4.3.10 Anti-discrimination (VCS, 3.19; CCB, G3.7)

Project proponent has implemented an Employment Equality and Anti-Discrimination Policy /50/; it establishes a series of guidelines for internal personnel and business partners, stating that discrimination and any form of mistreatment, verbal or physical violence, and segregation by workplace authorities toward personnel and among personnel is strictly prohibited. As well as the emphasis that the hiring processes do not incur discriminatory procedures and, on the contrary, are available to any person who meets the required qualification requirements regardless of their socio-cultural or gender characteristics.

Project proponent forbidden any kind of physical or verbal violence or discrimination based on disability, language, gender, age, social, legal or economic condition, culture or ethnicity, civil status, religion, opinions, sexual preferences, migratory situation or others. This policy is published in the web page of MADERACRE and is accessible for anyone. AENOR's Verification team reviewed the policy, confirming information provided in the monitoring report. In addition, during the site visit, during the interview with the project activity staff, they confirmed the awareness of the policy and that they had not observed any kind of discrimination in the working place.

4.3.11 Worker Relations (CCB, G3.9 – G3.12)

The project has implemented an Annual Training Plan /51/ , and each year training is developed on various capacity building topics, which are developed on a regular basis to update and refresh the knowledge of workers, as well as new personnel joining the operations. Also, as previously mentioned, project proponent has implemented an Employment Equality and Anti-Discrimination Policy /50/; providing equal opportunities for project personnel to change jobs, receive higher remuneration, and develop their skills. It also encourages career progression in leadership and management positions, regardless of race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, nationality, disability, or other factors.

Audit team by reviewing training records 2022 /28/ confirms that current monitoring period, MADERACRE SAC has provided training to its workers and third-party partners in different topics (summarized in section 2.3.15 of the MR). Also, during the onsite visits some workers and local actors in the project were interviewed in order to confirm whether they have received the necessary training to perform their activities, all of them confirmed this fact. Therefore, AENOR's Verification team is able to confirm that project proponent provides orientation and training for those employed through project activities and relevant people from the communities and meet the VCS an CCB (G.3.9) requirements.

On the other hand, Project developer has analyzed the main legal framework related to occupational safety and also has done a specific analysis of the main risks associated to its operations. Based on that, the company provides periodically training to its workers on a module called IPERC (Identification of Dangers, Risk Assessment and Measures of Control).

Verification team reviewed IPERC matrix /52/, that was delivered to each worker, in order to verify the measures to reduce and mitigate identified risks. Also, the main safety regulation was assessed, including law N° 29783 health and safety law /53/; DS N° 009-2005-TR health and safety regulation /54/; Decree 148-2007-TR regulation of committee for supervision of security and health at work /55/; Law N° 26842 General Health Law /56/.

Furthermore, The project proponent has carried out an assessment of the risks associated with each of the job positions linked to the project during the 2022 period. Based on this assessment, preventive and mitigation measures have been established and implemented to reduce the likelihood and severity of potential risk events during the workday. The effectiveness of the established occupational health and safety measures is confirmed by the indicators included in the Occupational Safety and Health Statistics report /109/, no accidents were recorded.

Audit team interviewed to project activity staff in order to confirm whether they received their applicable IPERC matrix and the awareness of the risk related to their job position. They confirmed that received training about risk and mitigation measures. Therefore, AENOR is able to confirm that the project developer is taking the necessary measures regarding occupational safety of workers; PP Informed workers of risks and how to minimize risk using best work practices.

4.3.12 Management Capacity (VCS, 3.19; CCB, G4.2 – G4.3)

The monitoring report states in its section 2.4.2 skills and capacities of the key personnel for implementing and monitoring the project.

The technical team in charge of the implementation of the project combines different profiles with more than 20 years of experience managing tropical natural forests and is responsible to manage one of the largest forest management units in Peru. The area is managed under FSC standards since January 2007. As part of the integrated forest management, the team is implementing a REDD project since 2009, who has achieved the CCB Gold and VCS certification.

AENOR´s verification team reviewed the resume of responsible for the project /57/ Nelson Kroll, who is a Forest Engineer with more than 20 years of experience in the management of Tropical Natural Forests, is responsible for the management of one of the largest forest management units in Peru with more than 220 thousand hectares located in the south eastern Amazon, MF/CoC FSC certified operation since January 2007. As part of the integral management of the forest it has been implementing a REDD+ project since 2009, a project that holds the CCB Gold and VCS accreditations. In 2019, it has obtained the accreditation of FSC Ecosystem Services for conservation of diversity and carbon sequestration.

Verification team also reviewed the resume of consultant responsible: Natalia Woo /58/, she is Forest engineer with experience in designing and monitoring carbon projects, handling international methodologies for quantifying greenhouse gas emissions/reductions of the Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry sector and certification processes.

AENOR´s audit team reviewed the resumes of responsible for the project and key personnel and conclude that the organization has the expertise and prior experience implementing land management and carbon projects at the scale of this project.

AENOR´s Audit team verified the project cash flow /60/ related to forestry operations and revenues from the sales of carbon credits, it confirms the financial health and support to develop project activities over the expected horizon. Then, in AENOR´s opinion financial health of the organization is well supported.

In addition, PP complies with the guidelines of the anti-corruption policies. The organization has developed and implements an Ethics and Anti-Corruption Policy /59/ aimed at directors, managers, collaborators, suppliers and clients so that they apply ethical principles in their efforts and activities inside and outside the company.

As conclusion, AENOR considers that the project activity staff has the skills and professional expertise to carry out the management and management of forestry and project activities. PP established guidelines to generate a robust and transparent legal framework.

4.3.13 Commercially Sensitive Information (VCS, 3.5.2 – 3.5.4; CCB Program Rules, 3.5.13 – 3.5.14)

The public version of the monitoring report does not contain commercially sensitive information regarding cashflow, contracts and employees' salary (refer to appendix 1)

4.3.14 Legal Status and Property Rights

4.3.14.1 National and Local Laws (VCS 3.1, 3.6-7, 3.14, 3.18-19; CCB, G5.6)

In section 2.5.1 of the monitoring report are listed the most relevant national legal framework and summarize the most important aspects that apply to the project activity. In this sense, AENOR's audit team interviewed a local authority (a representative of Tahuamanu - Forest and wildlife management unit/UGFFS -TAH) during the on-site visit and confirmed that the project proponent has not been sanctioned for non-compliance with the current legal framework and complies with local regulation.

4.3.14.2 Relevant Laws and Regulations Related to Worker's Rights (VCS, 3.18.2; CCB, G3.11)

The relevant legal framework is listed sin section 2.5.2 of the monitoring report. AENOR's audit team is able to confirm the project's adherence to all relevant laws and regulations covering worker's rights and the measures needed and designed to inform workers about their rights. This was corroborated, through various interviews with workers in the project zone (Control and surveillance guard and Coordinator of Control and surveillance guard).

4.3.14.3 Human Rights (VCS, 3.19)

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Human rights	MADERACRE has policies, regulations, and safeguards to guarantee respect for the population with whom it works in the project, whether indigenous populations or local population, ensuring their rights, safety and access to work opportunities in an equitable manner. In addition, to ensure respect for the traditions of the local population, as well as protect them. The project proponent acknowledges the rights of indigenous peoples and communities through its Social Development Plan /61/, incorporating their social and cultural characteristics. The Belgica Native Community benefits from agreements strengthening their local culture, customs, crafts, health, and

intercultural education. The project proponent also proposes actions for the preservation of indigenous people's voluntary isolation areas.

Audit team assessed Employment Equality and Anti-Discrimination Policy /50/; Ethics and Anti-Corruption Policy /59/; and Policy on ethics, anti-corruption, anti-terrorism and prevention of money laundering /62/and confirm that they would prevent rights violations in operations, products, services, and business relationships. Also, confirm that the project respects and promotes the project of rights of IPs, LCs, and customary rights holders in line with applicable international human rights law, and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and ILO Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal. During site observation audit team was able to confirm that project activity respect human rights.

4.3.14.4 Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage (VCS, 3.18, 3.19)

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Preservation and protection of cultural heritage	Project activity contributes to the local culture preservation through the good relations and benefits it provides to the local communities and Belgica Native Community, mainly. In this sense, it contributes to the cultural heritage of the community and the population of Iñapari. The audit team verified Life plan 2022 of Belgica community /24/and Agreements with them /25/ and confirms that project contributes to the preservation of the local culture through the good relations and benefits it provides to the local communities. Agreements are established for the benefit of the members of the community; protocols are also established for the preservation of indigenous people in voluntary isolation. Then, in AENOR´s opinion the project's actions ensure the preservation of high conservation value, recognizing the cultural relevance of communities'

4.3.14.5 Recognition of Property Rights (VCS, 3.19, CCB, G5.1)

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Disputes over rights to territories and resources	No ongoing disputes are pending to be solved within the project area. To confirm that, the borders of the concession are clearly signaled with physical milestones, settled at approximate

	equivalent distances, that cover the 100% of the project boundaries. No dispute were identified during the site visit.
Respect for property rights	The property right is demonstrated with the concession contracts with the Peruvian Government /63/ and its approval /64/. Project activity is developing in a concession and there are no indigenous groups or traditional uses of forest resources that have been limited with the assignment of the forest concession. Therefore, there will not be any restitution or compensation. The project area has been used for timber extraction for many decades, so no other rights are disputed over this area. AENOR confirms that all property rights are recognized, respected, and supported by the project through the evaluation of the evidence provided and interviews conducted on-site, the information provided is considered reliable and accurate, and there is no evidence of violation of property rights or development of illegal activities.

4.3.15 Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (VCS, 3.18, 3.19; CCB, G5.2)

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Consent	Not applicable. Project activity is developed in a private area granted by concession contracts /63/ and approvals /64/.
Outcome of FPIC discussion	Not applicable Project activity is developing in a private area. The project has not encroached on land, relocated people without consent, or forced physical or economic displacement as the project is located within a private property owned by MADERACRE since 2003. No stakeholder has rights over the project area.

4.3.16 Property Rights Protection (VCS, 3.19; CCB G5.1-G5.5)

As mentioned in section 2.5.8 of the MR, concessions for timber products in permanent production forests are contracts between the concessionaire and the State /63/ /64/. The project area has been used for timber production purposes since decades and since 2003, through a concession contract valid for 40 years, renewable automatically every 5 years.

Project activity is developing in a private area. The project has not encroached on land, relocated people without consent, or forced physical or economic displacement as the project is located within a private property owned by MADERACRE since 2003. No stakeholder has rights over the project area.

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

4.3.17 Benefit Sharing Mechanisms (VCS, 3.18, 3.19)

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Process used to design the benefit sharing plan	Not applicable. The project does not impact property rights.
Summary of the benefit sharing plan	Not applicable. The project does not impact property rights.
Approval and dissemination of benefit sharing plan	Not applicable. The project does not impact property rights.

4.3.18 Identification of Illegal Activities (VCS, 3.19; CCB G5.4)

The audit team verified through an on-site visit and interview with concession workers (project area guards) that the project proponent assigns control and surveillance activities along the project boundaries. They stated that have not observed the presence of illegal activities in site of the project area. Also, project proponent has a management plan /44/ framed in the monitoring of illegal activities and the dissemination of environmental crimes.

4.4 Climate

4.4.1 Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations (VCS, 2.5, 3.2, 3.6, 3.15, 4.1, 4.3)

Procedures for quantifying the baseline emissions were conducted in accordance with the methodology. The verification team performed an intensive review of all input data, parameters, formulas, calculations, conversions, statistics and resulting uncertainties and output data to ensure consistency with the VCS documentation, methodology and associated tools, and the PD. Also, it was reviewed whether approved methodology deviation was applied following the procedures approved in previous verification.

Further, the verification team reproduced calculations for selected samples to ensure accuracy of the results. Conversion factors, formulas, and calculations were provided by project proponents in spreadsheet format to ensure all formulas were accessible for review. The verification team recalculated subsets of the analysis to confirm correctness. Project proponent also provided a step-by-step overview of select calculations to ensure the verification team understood the approach and could confirm its consistency with the methodologies and PD. Where applicable, references for analysis methods or default values were checked against relevant scientific literature for best practice.

The procedures for quantifying emission reductions and removals were carried out according to the criteria described in Methodology VM0006 v2.2 /15/ and the methodological deviation in VM0015 v1.1. /16/

Baseline Emissions

The baseline was calculated following the approved deviation, combining VM0015 V1.1 and VM006. Procedure was validated in previous verification. As per both methodologies baseline is fixed during baseline validity period. Each component of baseline emission are calculated using EQ107, EQ113 and EQ117, all procedure are detailed in the spreadsheet of emission reductions calculation /13/

Baseline emissions from deforestation excluding ANR and harvest areas

Δ GHG from avoided deforestation:

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

Baseline emissions/removals in long-lived wood products

Δ GHG from changes in long-lived wood products:

$$\textcircled{2} = \frac{44}{12} \cdot (C_{LWP.project}(t) - C_{LWP.baseline}(t)) \quad [\text{EQ113}]$$

Baseline emissions of deforestation in harvesting zones in the project area

$$\textcircled{3} = \Delta C_{areaWithHarvest}(t) \quad [\text{EQ117}]$$

Verification team assessed the parameters listed in section 3 of the final version of the monitoring report, including fixed and monitored parameters and considered that they are complete and in accordance with the applied methodologies and validated PD. Verification team assesses the significant sources identified in the registered monitoring plan, confirming that the same sources as established in the applied methodology. Audit team assessed carefully 2022 Operational Plan /65/ /66/ and spreadsheet of

emission reduction calculation /13/, confirming extracted wood volume used to estimate Carbon Stock in harvested wood products.

Baseline emissions/removals summary

Year	{1} (tCO ₂ *ha-1)	{7} (tCO ₂ *ha-1)	{10} (tCO ₂ *ha-1)	Total (tCO ₂ *ha-1)
2022	523,280.2	-6,773.9	48,452.13	564,958.4

Project emission

In accordance with the guidelines described in section 9.3.2 of the VM0006 v2.2 methodology, it was verified that the quantification of the ex-post emissions of this verification period are derived from the analysis of deforestation observed in 2022. LULC matrix for monitoring period (change from Forest at the start of 2022 to the end of 2022) in reference region, project area, leakage belt were confirmed against KML files /70/ and GIS data /71/. The change in carbon stocks from deforestation processes at the project boundaries was correctly analyzed through the official information from GEOBOSQUES (<https://geobosques.minam.gob.pe>) platform, by calculating the annual rate of change that evidences the transition from Forest Lands to Grasslands during the monitoring period. The project's emissions or removals are derived from Equation 105 of Section 8.4.4 of the methodology, from which three equations containing the actual project emissions and removals are derived: EQ107 + EQ113 + EQ117.

Project emissions/removals summary

Year	{1} (tCO ₂ *ha-1)	{7} (tCO ₂ *ha-1)	{10} (tCO ₂ *ha-1)	Total (tCO ₂ *ha-1)
2022	8,014.73	-6,773.9	-25,182.68	-23,941.9

Leakage emission

In accordance with the guidelines described in the project description deviation, and using the VM0015 v.1.1 indications, it was verified that the quantification of leakage emissions during this verification period is derived from the analysis of deforestation that occurred in 2022 outside the project areas.

For the period 2022, the amount of deforestation was estimated using the GEOBOSQUES data of forest loss for the period mentioned, by overlapping the leakage area with the class that represents the deforested pixels and quantifying its total area in hectares.

As the project scenario (monitoring data) represents a lower deforestation scenario than the baseline estimations, the difference between them is positive. Given that Leakage cannot be positive, the avoided emissions in the leakage belt are rounded to zero.

Emissions in the leakage area (tCO₂e)

Year	{2}	If {2} > 0, then {2} is = 0
2022	614,037.36	0

Verification team assessed the parameters listed in section 3.1 of the final version of the monitoring report, including fixed and monitored parameters and considered that they are complete and in accordance to the applied methodology and validated PD and applied deviation. Verification team confirms that the emission reductions, including accuracy of spreadsheet formulae, conversions and aggregations are consistent in the using 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.

To quantify current carbon stocks in the project area, was used the procedure defined in the methodology to prevent unplanned deforestation, VM0006, version 2.2 /15/ and Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation, VM0015, v1.1./16/

Complete steps to calculate emission reduction are detailed in section 3.2 of the PD /9/ and the results derived from validate project design document are listed in section 3.2 of the MR, including applied deviation. Verification team assessed the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet /13/; Reference Region Map /67/; Project Area Map /68/; Leakage Belt Map /69/; KML files /70/; GIS data /70/; Deforestation rates /71/; official deforestation rates /72/; and Landsat images /73/. Result are summarized following:

Final emission reduction is calculated as per equation 105 of the applied methodology:

Net Emission Reductions (NERs)	=
ΔGHG from avoided deforestation excluding ANR and harvest areas	1
+ ΔGHG from deforestation due to leakage	2
+ ΔGHG from avoided degradation	3
+ ΔGHG from degradation due to leakage	4
+ΔGHG from leakage by unconstrained geographic drivers	5
+ ΔGHG from assisted natural regeneration	6
+ ΔGHG from changes in long-lived wood products	7
+ ΔGHG from improved cook stoves	8
+ ΔGHG from other and secondary sources	9
+ΔGHG from avoided deforestation from areas under harvest	10

The following table shows the summary of the results for baseline, leakage and project emissions in tCO₂e:

Year	Net Emission Reductions (NERs) [tCO ₂]	1	2	7	10
2022	588,900	515,265.50	0.00	0.00	73,634.81

The calculation Voluntary Carbon Units (VCUs) amounts were made by subtracting 12% of the net annual emission reductions, as per equation 106 of the applied methodology, calculated according to the AFOLU non-permanence risk report /10/.

Verified Carbon units = **NERs** – **buffer**. (1 + 3 + 6 + 7 + 10)

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Buffer pool allocation (tCO ₂ e)	Reductions VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Removals VCUs (tCO ₂ e)
01-Jan-2022 to 31-Dec-2022	564,958.4	-23,941.9	0.00	61,832	527,068	-
Total	564,958.4	-23,941.9	0.00	61,832	527,068	-

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

For all these parameters reported in the monitoring report, AENOR cross-checked with the PD and the spreadsheet calculations that values/calculations/methods match and are free of mistakes and errors. AENOR did not find inconsistencies between the project design document, technical annex, monitoring report and spreadsheet calculation.

In order to verify the accuracy and consistency of parameters monitored and used to calculate the removals achieved for the monitoring period, the AENOR verification team reproduced the calculations checking the correctness of the formulae applied and assumptions used, when applicable and that values used matched with data sources.

In essence, the methodologies were correctly applied following the requirements. All values in the PD are considered reasonable in the context of the proposed VCS CCB project activity. Data sources are quoted correctly. Hence, the calculation of baseline emissions, project emissions and the estimated net GHG emission reductions are considered correct.

4.4.2 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals (VCS, 2.5, 3.2, 3.6, 3.15, 4.1, 4.3)

AENOR was able to confirm that the calculations are based on monitored data (GEOBOSQUES deforestation rate /72/ and Landsat images /73/). The spreadsheets of emission reductions and VCUs calculations /13/ and all figures were tracked, checked and found to be consistent. The monitoring information is stored as per the monitoring plan.

The quality of supporting evidence submitted to the VVB for verification is adequate and found to be verifiable. The ER calculation spreadsheet /13/ and other supporting documents related to QA/QC were checked by the verification team during the site visit to confirm the authenticity of the documents and to check the correctness of the calculation.

Verification team confirms that the quality of evidence to determine the GHG reductions and removals produced was found satisfactory. The detailed information flow with the roles and responsibilities of the individuals and the monitoring system have been provided in section 3.1.3 of the MR.

4.4.3 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis (VCS 2.4, 3.2, 3.5, 3.6, 3.15, 3.23, 4.1)

PP has elaborated VCS Non-permanence Risk Report /14/ for the verification process according to the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.2 /6/. Below, it is explained the assessment of the non-permanence risk rating determined by the project participant in the last version.

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
Project Management	Q1 Does the project have an adaptive management plan in place that includes a monitoring plan? If No, the project fails the risk assessment. If Yes, proceed to	Yes	The forest operations includes an Adaptive Management System, which includes different management tools that define the activities to be implemented (Forest Management Plans /44/ and instructions for the implementation of the activities), the same that identify the procedures for monitoring, the systematization of the information and the feedback for continuous improvement of the procedures by updating the instructions and the system itself.
	Q2 Do any of the following project management risks apply to the project ?	-	-
	a) Species planted (where applicable) associated with more than 25 percent of the stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued are not native nor proven to be adapted to the same or similar agro-ecological zone(s) as the project area.	0	Not applicable. Is not a forestation project
	b) Ongoing enforcement to prevent encroachment by outside actors is required to protect more than 50 percent of stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued	0	Not applicable. Project area has not been affect by outside actor.
	c) Management team does not include individuals with significant experience in all skills necessary to successfully undertake the project activities (i.e., any area of required experience is not	0	The project proponent has a multidisciplinary team with experience in the development and implementation of REDD projects. Verification team

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	covered by an individual with at least five years' experience in that area).		reviewed the Curriculum vitae of key personnel /57 in order to confirm the management experience.
	d) Management team does not maintain a presence in the country or is located more than one day of travel from the project site, considering all parcels or polygons in the project area.	0	The project proponent have offices in project area in Iñapari, where the project is located
	e) Management team has previously failed to submit a loss report within two years of detecting a loss event.	0	Not applicable. Previous monitoring were successfully issued.
	f) ALM projects: Some or all of the farmers participating in the project have not received training on the improved ALM practices implemented as part of the project or the monitoring and reporting procedures implemented during the crediting period.	0	Not applicable. It correspond to REDD project
	g) ALM projects: Some or all of the farmers participating in the project are unaware of the potential for yields to decrease temporarily due to the transition to improved agricultural practices	0	Not applicable. It correspond to REDD project
	Q3 Do any of the following mitigations apply to the project?	-	-
	h) Mitigation: Management team includes individuals with significant (i.e., more than five years) experience in AFOLU project design and implementation, carbon accounting, and reporting (e.g., 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 project proponent has a multidisciplinary team with experience in the development and implementation of REDD projects. Verification team reviewed the Curriculum vitae of key personnel /57/ in order to confirm the management experience.
	i) Mitigation (ALM projects): A comprehensive training plan for all farmers participating in the project is in place, covering implementation of	0	Not applicable. It correspond to REDD project

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	planned ALM practices, monitoring and reporting obligations and their potential costs.		
Total Project Management (PM): (a + b + c + d + e + f+h+i): 0 Total shall not be less than zero.			

In accordance with provided evidence, MADERACRE is an organization that has been working with conservation concessions in the Peruvian Amazon, by implementing alternative programs for the community's economy and simultaneously protect existing forests and recovering degraded lands. Management team maintain a strong presence in the zone and within the project area, including local office, near to the project area. Management team engaged carbon project developer team has extensive technical expertise in developing AFOLU projects, as well as in-depth knowledge of national and international carbon market.

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

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
Financial Viability	<i>Q1 How long is the project's payback period (i.e., how many years will it take to breakeven)?</i>	e	-
	a) The payback period is greater than 20 years from the current risk assessment.	0	-
	b) The payback period is greater than 10 years from the current risk assessment, but less than or equal to 20 years.	0	-
	c) The payback period is greater than seven and up to and including 10 years from the current risk assessment.	0	-
	d) The payback period is greater than four and up to and including seven years from the current risk assessment.	0	-
	e) The payback period is four years or less from the current risk assessment.	0	The project cash flow shows that that it has financial resources for more than 80%. Verification team reviewed

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
			the project cash flow 10 years /60/ and sensitive analysis in order to confirm the financial resources..
	Q2 What percentage of funding has the project secured to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven?	i	-
	f) Project has secured less than 15 percent of funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven.	0	-
	g) Project has secured 15 percent to less than 40 percent of the funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven.	0	-
	h) Project has secured from 40 percent to less than 80 percent of the funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven.	0	-
	i) Project has secured 80 percent or more of the funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven.	0	The project cash flow shows that that it has financial resources for more than 80%. Verification team reviewed the project cash flow 10 years /60/ and sensitive analysis in order to confirm the financial resources..
	Q3 Does the following mitigation apply to the project?	No	-
	j) Mitigation: Project has available, as callable and secured financial resources, at least 80 percent of total cash out before the project reaches breakeven.	-2	-
Total Financial Viability (FV) = [as applicable, ((b, c, d or e) + (f, g, h or i + j))]: 0			

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	Total shall not be less than zero and the sub-total for question two with the mitigation j shall not be less than zero (note: the mitigation only applies to Q2)Total shall 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 10 years /60/ and supporting evidence 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 v4.2

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
Opportunity Cost	<i>Q1 Are the baseline activities subsistence-driven? If No, proceed to Q2. If Yes, proceed to Q3.</i>	No	-
	<i>Q2 What is the NPV of the most profitable alternative land use activity compared to the NPV of the project activity? A response is only required if the answer to Q1 is No.</i>	f	-
	a) Net present value (NPV) of the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be at least 100 percent more than that of the project activities.	0	-
	b) NPV of the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be greater than 50 percent and up to 100 percent more than that of project activities	0	-
	c) NPV of the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be greater than 20 percent and up to and including 50 percent more than that of project activities.	0	-

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	d) NPV of the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be 20 percent or less than that of project activities.	0	-
	e) NPV of project activities is expected to be greater than 20 percent and up to 50 percent more profitable than that of the most profitable alternative land use activity.	0	-
	f) NPV of project activities is expected to be over 50 percent more profitable than that of the most profitable alternative land use activity.	-4	The REDD Project has a Net Present Value of US\$ \$219.98 per hectare, whereas the NPV of baseline scenario is US\$ \$10.06 per hectare. It implies that the most profitable alternative land use is less than 100% profitable than the REDD+ Project.
	Q3 Does the project have net positive community impacts? A response is only required if the answer to Q1 is Yes.	N/A	-
	g) Net positive community impacts of project activities are not demonstrated.	0	-
	h) Net positive community impacts of project activities are demonstrated.	0	-
	Q4 Do any of the following mitigations apply to the project?	J	-
	i) Mitigation: Project is protected by a legally binding agreement to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over the duration of the project crediting period.	0	-
	j) Mitigation: Project is protected by legally binding agreement to continue management practices	-4	The project is developed in an area that is determined by law as a permanent productive forest. The project

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	that protect the credited carbon stocks for at least 100 years.		proponents signed a concession with Peruvian government for 40 years renewable, so it covers the lifetime of the project. This fact was confirmed against concession contracts /63/ and its approvals /64/ Furthermore, the project proponent has provided documentation verifying the extension of the timber concession contracts, originally scheduled to expire in 2042. Article 1 of the Resolutions /106/ includes the extension period for each concession contract. Peruvian forestry law /105/ allows for the renewal of forest concession contracts every five years, provided certain conditions are met—primarily related to the forest management evaluation conducted by OSINFOR.
	k) Mitigation: Where there is a potential for revenue loss compared to the most profitable alternative land use activity, project is a not for profit or has additional financial support (e.g., via grants, government funding, ecosystem services payments or SD VSta assets) to overcome expected revenue loss.	0	-
Total Opportunity Cost (OC) = [as applicable, (a, b, c, d, e, f, g or h) + (i or j) + k]: 0 Total shall not be less than zero.			

Tahuamanu Project is developed in an area that is determined by law as a permanent productive forest. The project proponents signed a concession with Peruvian government for 40 years renewable /63/ /64/, so it covers the lifetime of the project. Furthermore, local regulation establishes the project area cannot be changed in the future for non-forest uses so even if the project proponent does not renew it, the area would still be considered a permanent productive forest. Then, in AENOR's opinion, total opportunity cost risk rating (0) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.2.

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
Project Longevity	Q1 Did the project request registration on or after 1 January 2024?	No	-
	Q2 Does the project have a legally binding agreement that covers at least a 100-year period from the project's start date? If Yes, the project is given a zero score for this risk category. If No, proceed to Q3.	Yes	The Tahuamanu REDD project area is implemented in a forest concession, granted by the Peruvian state through a concession contract signed /63//64/ for a period of 40-years renewable every 5 years. The project proponent has provided documentation verifying the extension of the timber concession contracts, originally scheduled to expire in 2042. Article 1 of the Resolutions /106/ includes the extension period for each concession contract. Peruvian forestry law /105/ allows for the renewal of forest concession contracts every five years, provided certain conditions are met—primarily related to the forest management evaluation conducted by OSINFOR.
	Q3 What is the project longevity in years? If you answered Yes to Q1 and the project longevity is less than 40 years, the project fails the risk assessment. If you answered No to Q1 and the project longevity is less than 30 years, the project fails the risk assessment. Please note that projects with project longevity of less than 40 years will be ineligible for the Core Carbon Principles label.	0	The Tahuamanu REDD Project area is implemented over a forest concession, granted by the Peruvian State through a Concession Contract signed in 2002 /63/ /64/ for a period of 40-years and renewable prior inspection by OSINFOR every 5 years. This means that there is a legal requirement to continue maintaining the forest. <u>Maderacre holds forest concessions granted from the Peruvian State, for 40 years renewable, with limitless renewals. Maderacre has already renewed its forest concessions one time. The renewal process depends on an FSC certification or the Peruvian Regulation Body (OSINFOR) favorable inspection every 5 years. Maderacre has complied with OSINFOR inspections for 23 years, and holds an</u>

Eliminado: , even if the contract is not renewed. In that case, that responsibility is transferred to the Government as the areas are classified as "Permanent Production Forests", recognized by ...

Eliminado: , being their conservation as such guaranteed,

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
			<u>FSC certificate since 2007 continuously. So, Maderacre holds forest concessions contracts with limitless validity.</u> <u>These arguments are based on the following terms found in the Peruvian Law and Regulation:</u> <u>i. Irrevocability: Forestry concessions are irrevocable, as long as the holder complies with their contractual obligations and the applicable forestry regulations. The competent authority cannot arbitrarily deny its extension or renewal.</u> <u>ii. Validity and Extension: Forestry concessions have a validity of up to forty (40) years; However, MADERACRE is eligible to request the extension of its forestry concession contracts, as many times as needed, if it meets certain conditions, such as having favorable results from a five-year audit approved by OSINFOR or having a current voluntary forestry certification (Forest Stewardship Council).</u> <u>iii. Renewal at Term: Forest regulations do not establish prohibitions or restrictions for the renewal of a contract at the end of its term, as long as the corresponding requirements and obligations are met.</u> <u>In addition, Maderacre's forest concessions are part of forests defined by the Peruvian Law as "Permanent Production Forest" (PPF).</u> <u>- A PPF is an area intended for responsible use of the forest resources, including timber and environmental services, through a</u>

Eliminado: they are defined

Eliminado: Legislation as

Eliminado: areas that due to their biotic and abiotic characteristics

Eliminado: suitable for permanent and sustainable production of

Eliminado: other

Eliminado: goods and

Eliminado: .

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
			<u>forest management model, which enables it to keep it as standing forest overtime.</u> - <u>As the forest concessionaire complies with the regulation (including FSC Certification), it will renew the concession limitless.</u> - <u>When a forest concessionaire fail to comply with the regulation, the concession contract is terminated, and the PPF is reverted to the State. The State has the obligation to custody the forest, and to grant it to a new concessionaire. So, the cycle continues.</u> <u>Therefore, based on the analysis of forest regulation and Concession contracts, AENOR considers that the project longevity is properly addressed.</u>
	Q4 Does the project have a management, financial and monitoring plan for the entire project longevity? If No, the project fails the risk assessment. If Yes, proceed to Q5.	Yes	Forest operations includes an Adaptive Management System, which includes different management tools that define the activities to be implemented (Forest Management Plan /44/ and instructions for the implementation of the activities /81/ /88/), the same that identify the procedures for monitoring, the systematization of the information and the feedback for continuous improvement of the procedures by updating the instructions and the system itself.
	Q5 Is the project an ARR or IFM project with harvesting? If No, proceed to Q7. If Yes, proceed to Q6.	No	Project is REDD.
	Q6 Can the project demonstrate a commitment to continue the management practice, replant or allow re-growth? If No, the project fails the risk	N/A	-

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	<i>assessment. If Yes, proceed to Q7.</i>		
	Q7 Does the project have a legal Agreement or requirement to continue the management practice(s)? If No, proceed to a. If Yes, proceed to b.	Yes	The Tahuamanu REDD project area is implemented in a forest concession, granted by the Peruvian state through a concession contract signed /63//64/ for a period of 40-years renewable every 5 years. Furthermore, the project proponent has provided documentation verifying the extension of the timber concession contracts, originally scheduled to expire in 2042. Article 1 of the Resolutions /106/ includes the extension period for each concession contract. Peruvian forestry law /105/ allows for the renewal of forest concession contracts every five years, provided certain conditions are met—primarily related to the forest management evaluation conducted by OSINFOR.
	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.	0	As per NPR tool Any project with a legally binding agreement that covers at least 100 years from the project start date will be assigned a score of zero.
	Q8 Is the project a grouped project where contract durations with individual project activity instances are less than the project longevity?	0	Not applicable. It is not a grouped project
Total Project Longevity (PL): 0 Total Project Longevity (PL) = [as applicable, (a or b)] Total shall not be less than zero. Any project with a legally binding agreement that covers at least 100 years from the project start date will be assigned a score of zero.			

Internal Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	Any project that requests registration on or after 1 January 2024 with a project longevity of less than 40 years fails the risk assessment. Any project that requests registration before 1 January 2024 with a project longevity of less than 30 years fails the risk assessment. The selected project longevity shall be supported by a management, financial and monitoring plan.		

The Tahuamanu REDD+ project area is implemented in a forest concession, granted by the Peruvian state through a concession contract signed /63 /64/ for a period of 40-years renewable every 5 years.

Furthermore, the project proponent has provided documentation verifying the extension of the timber concession contracts, originally scheduled to expire in 2042. Article 1 of the Resolutions /106/ includes the extension period for each concession contract.

Peruvian forestry law /105/ allows for the renewal of forest concession contracts every five years, provided certain conditions are met—primarily related to the forest management evaluation conducted by OSINFOR.

Therefore, as per VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.2 /6/ the risk score for project longevity is zero. Then, in AENOR´s opinion, Total Project Longevity (0) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.2.

Therefore, **total internal risk** is calculated as the sum of (PM + FV + OC + PL), totalling 0.

External Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
Land and Resource tenure	Q1 Has due process been undertaken to discover any disputes over ownership and land, resource access, or use rights? If No, the project fails the risk assessment. If Yes, proceed to Q2.	Yes	-
	Q2 Has the project executed a binding legal agreement(s) (such as a contract) securing the legal right to control and operate project activities over the entire project area with all entities that have verified ownership claims or verified land, resource access, or use rights (such as customary	Yes	The Tahuamanu REDD project area is implemented in a forest concession, granted by the Peruvian state through a concession contract signed /63//64/ for a period of 40-years renewable every 5 years. Furthermore, the project proponent has provided documentation verifying the extension of the timber concession contracts, originally scheduled to expire in 2042. Article 1 of the Resolutions

External Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	<i>rights holders)? If No, the project fails the risk assessment. If Yes, proceed to Q3.</i>		/106/ includes the extension period for each concession contract. Peruvian forestry law /105/ allows for the renewal of forest concession contracts every five years, provided certain conditions are met—primarily related to the forest management evaluation conducted by OSINFOR.
	Q3 Do the same or different entities hold land ownership and resource access or use rights?	b	-
	a) Ownership and resource access or use rights are held by the same entity(ies).	0	-
	b) Ownership and resource access or use rights are held by different entity(ies) (e.g., the government own the land, and the project proponent holds a lease or concession).	2	The Tahuamanu REDD project area is implemented in a forest concession, granted by the Peruvian state through a concession contract signed /63//64/ for a period of 40-years renewable every 5 years.
	Q4 Is the project in a country/jurisdiction with a history of national, sub-national, or local government ("Government") intervention in land or resource use?	e	-
	c) Government has previously expropriated significant areas of land (i.e., 10% or more) in the project area in the past 20 years.	0	-
	d) Government has previously changed land rights in the project's jurisdiction (e.g., cancelled, or blocked land titles, expropriated land or issued overlapping land titles) in the past 20 years.	0	-

External Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	e) No instances of Government intervention in the past 20 years or specific instances of expropriation and government intervention in land rights in the project area have been conclusively resolved against the government in a court of competent jurisdiction.	0	The Tahuamanu REDD project area is implemented in a forest concession, granted by the Peruvian state through a concession contract signed /63//64/ for a period of 40-years renewable every 5 years. Project proponent has been operation the concession del 2003.
	Q5 What percent of the project area is affected by disputes over land tenure or ownership?	h	-
	f) Disputes exist in more than 5 percent of the project area.	0	-
	g) Disputes exist in up to and including 5 percent of the project area.	0	-
	h) No disputes exist.	0	Project activity is developing in a private area. The project has not encroached on land, relocated people without consent, or forced physical or economic displacement as the project is located within a private property owned by MADERACRE since 2003. No stakeholder has rights over the project area.
	Q6 What percent of the project area has disputes over access or use rights?	k	-
	i) Disputes exist in more than 5 percent of the project area.	0	-
	j) Disputes exist in up to and including 5 percent of the project area.	0	-
	k) No disputes exist.	0	There are no disputes over land ownership between the state and the concessionaire and/or any other third party. This issue was confirmed during the on-site assessment.

External Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	Q7 Have the risks of upstream and sea impacts undermining the carbon stocks of a WRC project been demonstrated as insignificant or effectively mitigated for the ten years that follow the risk assessment?	m	-
	l) Potential upstream and sea impacts are not demonstrated to be insignificant or effectively mitigated.	0	-
	m) Potential upstream and sea impacts are demonstrated to be insignificant or effectively mitigated.	0	No significant impact are identified upstream of the project activity.
	Q8 Do any of the following mitigations apply to the project?	n	-
	n) Mitigation: Project area is protected by a legally binding commitment (e.g., a license, conservation easement, conservation servitude, or protected area) to continue management practices that protect carbon stocks for the duration of the project crediting period.	-2	The Tahuamanu REDD project area is implemented in a forest concession, granted by the Peruvian state through a concession contract signed /63//64/ for a period of 40-years renewable every 5 years. Project proponent has been operation the concession del 2003.
	o) Mitigation: Where disputes over land tenure, ownership or access or use rights exist, documented evidence is provided that demonstrates the project is taking action to try to resolve the disputes or clarify overlapping claims.	0	-
Total Land Tenure (LT) = [as applicable, ((a or b) + (c, d, or e) + (f, g or h) + (i, j or k) + (l or m) + n + o)]; 6 Total shall not be less than zero.			

The ownership and resources access are given by the concession contract /63/ /64/. While, the use rights are government owned. The project is developed in an area that is determined by law as a permanent productive forest. Local regulation establishes that the project cannot be changed in the future for non-forest uses so even if the project proponent does not renew it, the area would still be considered a permanent productive forest. 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, v4.2.

External Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
Stakeholder Engagement	<i>Q1 Are local populations, including those living in the project area or within 20 km of the boundary of the project area, reliant on the project area? If No, the risk rating for stakeholder engagement is zero and you can proceed to political risk. If Yes, proceed to Q2.</i>	No	-
	<i>Q2 Have more or less than 50 percent of stakeholders living within and reliant on the project area been consulted?</i>	-	-
	a) Less than 50 percent of stakeholders living within the project area and who are reliant on the project area have been consulted.	0	-
	b) More than 50 percent of stakeholders living within the project area and who are reliant on the project have been consulted.	0	-
	<i>Q3 Have more or less than 20 percent of stakeholders living outside the project area within 20 km of the project area, and who are reliant on the project area been consulted?</i>	-	-
	c) Less than 20 percent of stakeholders living outside the	0	-

External Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	project area within 20 km of the project area, and who are reliant on the project area have been consulted.		
	d) More than 20 percent of stakeholders living outside the project area within 20 km of the project area, and who are reliant on the project area have been consulted.	0	-
Total Stakeholder Engagement [as applicable, (a or b) + (c or d)]: 0 Total shall not be less than zero			

As the project area is a forest concession granted to a private company, no families live inside them. During the on-site visit, Verification team confirms that consultations were carried out outside the project area. Then, in AENOR's opinion, total community engagement (0) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.2.

External Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
Political Risk	Q1 What is the governance score for the country?	c	
	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.	0	The score was obtained from the "Governance score", calculated by "World Bank Institute's Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI)". The average value is -0.20 for the period of 2018-2022.
	d) Governance score of 0.19 to less than 0.82.	0	-
	e) Governance score of 0.82 or higher.	0	-
	Q2 Does the following mitigation apply to the project?	f	-

External Risk	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk Rating	DOE Assessment
	f) Mitigation: The project is in a country that: 1) is party to the Paris Agreement and has submitted an NDC to the UNFCCC Secretariat in the last five years, 2) includes AFOLU commitments (conditional or unconditional) in its NDC, and 3) has a documented and active climate change plan that includes the project activity.	-2	Perú is a party of the Paris Agreement and submitted the NDC to the UNFCCC secretariat in the last five years. Peru First NDC (Updated submission) is publicly available on https://unfccc.int/documents/499569 Submission date 18 Dec 2020
Total Political (PC) ((a, b, c, d or e) + f): 0 Total may not be less than zero.			

Verification team confirms the governance score against the world bank platform: <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/Home/Reports>; the average indicator was calculated for the last 5 year. Also Peruvian NDC is publicly available on <https://unfccc.int/documents/499569>. Then, in AENOR's opinion, total political risk (0) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.2.

Therefore, **total external risk** is calculated as the sum of (LT + CE + PC), totalling 0.

Natural Risk	Score (LS)	Mitigation	DOE Assessment
Fire	1	1	PP account with Operating Plan /65/ /66/. This procedure outlines the objectives, scope, responsibilities, and resources for a fire detection and fighting system. It outlines prevention measures, decision-making functions, and guidelines. Preventive measures include roads, firebreak streets, guard surveillance, smoke column detection towers, cameras, radio communication systems, and combat machinery. Training courses are provided for MADERACRE /46/ to the staff and neighboring communities, and educational programs are implemented to raise awareness about fire risks and prevention measures.
Pest and Disease Outbreaks	0	0	In the Amazon forest there are no reports on plagues and endemic diseases in natural forests of Madre de Dios
Extreme weather	0	0	The official information confirms that there are many weather events considered natural

Natural Risk	Score (LS)	Mitigation	DOE Assessment
			emergencies. However, the region of Madre de Dios only has records of floods as recurrent and severe emergency for the population, affecting agricultural areas, pastures and urban areas mostly. For the forests, periodic flooding of the floodplain is part of its natural dynamics and does not represent a risk of change in carbon stocks. This fact was confirmed against the statistical compendium 2022 of the Civil Defence National Institute (INDECI) /74/
Geological Risk	3	1	Madre de Dios is a geologically stable department. According to the National Centre of Geophysical Data is a region with no seismic activity. This fact was confirmed against the statistical compendium 2024 of the Civil Defence National Institute (INDECI) /74/
Total Natural Risk (as applicable, F + PD + W + G + ON): 4 Determined by LS × M.			

During the on-site visit, Verification team confirmed that project proponent has a plan for prevention and control forest fire /66/. Then, in AENOR's opinion, **total natural risk (4)** is properly justified and in accordance with AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.2.

Future Climate Impact on Natural Risk	Aggregated Subtotal Risk	Future Impact Factor	Total
Natural risk associated with climate change impact (NR-c)	1	1.20	1.2
Natural risk NOT associated with climate change impact (NR-nc)	3	1	3
Sea Level Rise(SLR)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Natural Risk	4.2		

In addition future Impact Factor were confirmed from NPR report /14/, then total natural risk is 4.2.

Risk Category	Rating
---------------	--------

a) Internal Risk	0
b) External Risk	0
c) Natural Risk	4.2
Overall Risk Rating (a + b + c) The minimum risk rating shall be 12	12

AENOR has checked that information provided in the last version of the Non-Permanence Risk Report /14/, and supporting evidences (complete list are detailed in appendix 3), for the monitoring period. The assumptions and justifications provided to determine the risk rating of each risk factor are developed and they are based on provided documents using conservative assessments. AENOR deems that information provided is reliable and appropriate from official sources, thus, the overall risk rating is credible and realistic.

4.4.4 Dissemination of Monitoring Plan and Results (VCS, 3.18; CCB, CL4.2)

AENOR confirmed during the on-site visit by interviewing local stakeholders the awareness about the results of the projects, its implementation, monitoring. 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.

In order to verify the dissemination of monitoring plan and results; the audit team, during the on-site visit, interviewed local authorities and identified stakeholders to confirm the awareness about the results of the projects, its implementation and monitoring results. Section 2.4 (interviews) of this report includes the names of stakeholders and authorities interviewed during the on-site assessment. Also, main topics covered are described in this section.

Verification team also reviewed the Dissemination of REDD Component report 2022 /34/; including: Citizen participation workshop report /35/; Agreements of the meetings minutes /36/; Flyers of project diffusion /37/; First Meeting Attendance list - 29-April-2022 /38/; Second Meeting attendance list- 16-December-2022 /39/; and PPT presentation of monitoring results /40/. Information regarding monitoring results are publicly available on Maderacre's website: www.maderacre.com.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

4.5 Community

4.5.1 Community Impacts (CCB, CM2.1)

Project proponent has identified following expected impacts:

- **Improvement in crop productivity:** The effectiveness of technical assistance supplied by the project activity contributes with the necessary incomes to sustain their families without the necessity to clear new forest areas. For the year 2022 there are no changes recorded since the implementation of projects and actions for this impact will be executed after the carbon revenues.
- **Agrarian frontier stabilization:** The project plans to stabilize the expansion of agrarian frontier in the project area and also in the leakage belt. For the year 2022 there are no changes recorded since the implementation of projects and actions for this impact will be executed after the carbon revenues
- **Improved quality and access to education and health services.** The Belgica Native Community and the project proponent have signed an agreement /25/ to support the community's primary and initial level education sector by providing extra bonuses to teachers. The proponent will distribute 400 *nuevos soles* (103 US\$) per month to the two teachers, aiming to supplement their hours and education services. In 2022, the project delivered 4,025 *nuevos soles* (1,025 US\$), benefiting 29 children. The initial education activities benefited 12 children and 17 children in primary education, resulting in a total of 29 children benefiting from these support efforts.

PP, Belgica Native Community and CEBA (Centre for Educational Support and Teaching) Dos de Mayo have signed an agreement /75/. The project proponent will support monitoring community student attendance, coordination of registration processes, fuel for admissions, transport tickets, and monthly bonuses for teachers. In 2022, the total amount delivered was 4410 *nuevos soles* (1131 US\$), benefiting 32 students, 19 of whom were women. Only 21 people completed their school year, demonstrating the commitment of the CEBA institution to the Belgica Native Community. The project aims to provide alternative education for the Belgica Native Community inhabitants.

The project proponent and Iberia Tahuamanu Institute of Higher Education have signed an agreement to provide facilities to students in the "Studies in Forest Resources Management" and "Agricultural Production" programs. The agreement includes appointing a coordinator, coordinating registration processes, facilitating monitoring by authorities, allocating educational spaces, facilitating pre-professional internships, participating in cultural events, and conserving the institute's adjacent area through periodic surveillance and patrolling. In 2022, 10 students (01 female) participated in the institute classes, with only 0 students completing satisfactorily.

The project proponent and Belgica Native Community have signed an agreement to support the community's health sector. The proponent will provide monthly bonuses to nursing technicians and purchase medicines for the community health post. The total sum of what was delivered in

2022 has been 3000 *nuevos soles* (770 US\$) to the nursing and medicine technician with a total value of 2400 *nuevos soles* (616 US\$).

The project proponent and Iñapari Health Post have signed an agreement /78/ to improve medical care for Maderacre S.A.C. workers and the Iñapari community. The agreement includes support for fuel maintenance, infrastructure improvements, ambulance use, extra compensation for health personnel, paint buckets, health campaigns, and vaccination campaigns. The project has vaccinated 93 workers in two interventions, and the Iñapari Health Post will care for 2,391 inhabitants, including 1,002 women. The agreement aims to ensure quality medical care for the community.

- **Improved vulnerable population livelihood and infrastructure to well-being population:** The project proponent supports investments in improving infrastructure and living conditions for vulnerable populations in the community. They subsidize requests for support, including construction expenses for the entrance bridge, fuel contributions for urban development, wood donations for military unit improvements, pallet donations for supply maintenance, and Christmas toys for 21 girls and 17 boys.

Contribution to sustaining environmental conditions for access to water: The project aims to conserve water resources in the upper and middle reaches of watersheds, promoting conservation of forest cover, low-impact management practices, and environmental safety for downstream populations. To evaluate the environmental impact, project activity included many indicators, including *alteration and/or obstruction of watercourses* (during this monitoring the indicator was zero, it was confirmed against watercourse assessment report in PC 18-19 /104/.

- **Improved living conditions for indigenous groups in isolation.** Alto Purús National Park administration and the Zoological Society of Frankfurt have signed an agreement /77/ to establish coordination, planning, and participation in conservation efforts. The agreement aims to promote environmental education, surveillance, and control activities. The project proponent will participate in surveillance and control activities, generate early warnings, and strengthen capacities through forest custodian training. The actions will help protect *taricaya* eggs and their food security, as illegal collectors threaten the region's resources. In this framework, PP The project proponent has developed an anthropological contingency plan /23/ to address potential risks in case of encounters with indigenous populations in isolation or initial contact (PIACI). The plan involves training workers in logging operations and forest custodians to establish preventive behaviors to ensure the respect and protection of PIACI populations. The plan has been disseminated to nine stakeholders and forestry workers have been vaccinated in coordination with the Iñapari Health Post. The aim is to comply with the plan and ensure the safety of the company's workers.

In the opinion of AENOR, the assessment of impacts is accurate and reflects faithfully the project benefits on communities. This fact was verified against Agreements with the educational institution "Dos de Mayo" Iberia /75/; Agreements with technological institute Iberia – Tahuamanu /76/; Agreement with National Park Alto Purús /77/; Agreements with Health post "Iñapari CLAs Tres Fronteras/78/; Certificates of

health support /18/; Certificates of disease prevention support /21/; Employee's vaccine records /19/; Certificates of educations support 20/. Then, AENOR's audit team confirms that the information reported is accurate and as per VCS and CCB requirement

In addition to reviewing provided evidence, community well-being was confirmed during the on-site visit through interviews with local stakeholders. Then, AENOR's Verification team confirms that the information reported in the MR are properly addressed and is accurate.

4.5.2 Negative Community Impact Mitigation (VCS, 3.19; CCB, CM2.2)

As described in section 4.1.2 of the Monitoring Report, the monitoring results of the General Forest Management Plan /44/ showed the non-occurrence of negative impacts such as invasions, hunting or capture of wildlife, or uncontrolled burning.

It was evidenced that the activities described in section 4.5.1 of this report promote the productive activities of families from surrounding communities and discourage the unsustainable use of natural resources within the concession forest, as well as the implementation of corporate policies of local contracting.

During the interviews conducted by the audit team, the existence of negative impacts derived from the implementation of the project was not declared. AENOR agrees that the project proponent identifies and mitigates the potential negative impacts of the REDD+ project on surrounding communities.

4.5.3 Net Positive Community Well-being (VCS 3.19; CCB, GL1.4, CM2.3)

The net impact is positive due to activities associated with supporting education, health, water maintenance and improving indigenous livelihoods, as detailed in section 4.5.1 of this report. In general, the net positive impact is evident in the educational agreements /25/ /75/ /76/ that are carried out in the different institutions of the communities, the support to the communities with health /18/ /19/ /21/ problems, the conservation of water sources that supply the communities of the area of influence and the buffering of border areas with the PIACI communities.

This means that the indicator income, skills and training, and access to natural resources was positive for the communities involved, as mentioned in section 4.1.3 of the Monitoring Report. During the interviews conducted by the audit team, it is evident that the members of the communities experience positive impacts derived from the implementation of the project. Audit team visited and interviewed the principals of Educational institution (refer to section 2.4 of this report), confining the support given by project activity.

Furthermore, section 1.3 of the Monitoring Report lists the metrics of training, employability, livelihoods, health, education, water, and well-being achieved during this monitoring period.

Therefore, AENOR considers that the net impact of the project on the well-being of the community is positive, the benefits described in the Monitoring Report are credible and transparent and have the due documentary support.

4.5.4 Protection of High Conservation Values (CCB, CM2.4)

It was verified that the measures and actions carried out promote the protection of indigenous peoples and thus their culture and cultural, environmental and social diversity. Also, it has been verified that the project implements protection actions, such as agreements, custody or training of personnel in favor of the PIACI peoples and providing an effective buffer zone for their territory in the Madre de Dios Territorial Reserve.

In addition, it was verified from the interviews conducted during the site visit and the supporting documents, that during this monitoring, the project has not registered social conflicts due to project occupation, environmental or cultural impacts, or illegal use of community resources.

Audit team through interviews (Park ranger from SERNAMP) and supporting documentation /98//104/ confirms that HCVs are not being negatively affected by project activity. Furthermore, it considers that the net impact of the project on the well-being of the community is positive, the benefits described in the Monitoring Report are credible and transparent and have proper documentary support.

4.5.5 Other Stakeholder Impacts (VCS, 3.18; 3.19; CCB CM3.2-CM3.3)

The project enhances community communication through meetings, workshops, reports, and PPT summaries. It strengthens communal governance, promotes gender issues and social inclusion, and conducts training events. Monitoring the project, positive impacts include increased motivation for participation, respect for agreements, and job creation. Women's participation in forestry use has been promoted and achieved. The project's activities have also led to increased awareness and job creation in the community.

PP monitored indicators, stated in section 4.4.1 of the project design document, in the localities close to the project, they are reported in Table 4.11 (Monitoring matrix) in section 4.3.1 of the MR. Based on it result, in AENOR's opinion the potential impacts would impact in favorable manner in well-being of the other local stakeholders

AENOR has assessed that the project doesn't result in net negative impacts on the wellbeing of other stakeholder groups. Assessment by the audit team concluded that the likelihood of net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups is adequately addressed in the monitoring report and the net impacts of project activities on the well-being are positive.

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

Section 4.3.1 of the Monitoring Report presents the design and monitoring of the community monitoring plan, which provides the monitoring activities and indicators that are developed by strategic lines of the project. The promotion of activities with partners whose objectives are focused on protecting the ANP

and the PIACI territory is evident, it is an activity that is constantly developed. Also, biodiversity, dissemination and collaboration with community development actions have been implemented and results have been achieved.

In order to assess and continually monitor the impacts that the project is having on communities; as well as allowing affected groups within the community to also have effective participation in the evaluation of such impacts, audit team contrasted provided information against Community developed plan /79/; social monitoring report /80/; agreements with stakeholders and institutions /25/ /75/ /76/ /77/ /78/; Annual training activity programme /27/; Training records 2022 /28/ Based on this information, AENOR confirms dates, frequency and sampling methods used are in accordance with the validated project design and with the procedures and systematics used in the verification event.

Moreover, during the on-site visit the activities of community monitoring plan were confirmed through interviews with stakeholders. AENOR confirms that community monitoring plan is implemented as the monitoring report and the validated PD. furthermore, results of the monitoring confirms the effectiveness of measures taken to maintain or enhance all identified high conservation values related to community well-being. Also, demonstrate Well-being impacts on community members and women.

4.5.7 Community Monitoring Plan Dissemination (CCB, CM4.3)

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 Dissemination of REDD Component report 2022 /34/; including; meetings attendance list /38/ /39/; PPT presentation of monitoring results /40/; Flyers of project diffusion /37/; Citizen participation workshop report /35/. Information regarding monitoring results are publicly available on Maderacre's website: www.maderacre.com

Audit team verified the results of the social monitoring /80/, including management indicators, have been disseminated through a letter sent to each community group and interest group. This document is called. In addition, the project has promoted spaces for permanent meeting and socialization with communities and other stakeholders.

AENOR, through stakeholder interviews and associated desk review, considers that the dissemination of the monitoring plan has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the CCB Standard and the supporting information is credible and accurate.

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

4.6 Biodiversity

4.6.1 Biodiversity Changes (CCB, B2.1)

Section 5.1.1 describes the biodiversity monitored changes; the project area's forested extensions, as measured by satellite images, have not changed due to robust custody and surveillance systems and reduced impact logging practices. The forest's diversity, composition, and structure are monitored through Permanent Monitoring Plots (PPM) in Maderacre's Forest Management Unit (FMU) /81/. The results show that the forest is dynamic compared to harvesting operations and maintains variables and indicators without intervention in the Peruvian tropical forest. Annual Report of Custody and Surveillance of the FMU /81/, shows the surveillance activities during this monitoring , for example: patrols have been carried out (27 river and 15 land); no illegal activities have been recorded in the project area; 81 information posters were established in the FMU.

Regular forest patrols can protect biodiversity by detecting and stopping illegal activities like poaching and logging. Clear signage can deter deforestation and identify protected areas. Forest managers can monitor and control these areas by highlighting critical areas and taking corrective measures to strengthen the Custody and Surveillance Plan. This helps safeguard biodiversity and the integrity of the project area. Also, the project evaluates forest harvesting impact /82/ to plan and execute activities effectively, identifying areas affected by tree cuts over the years. The annual evaluations of Permanent Monitoring Plots (PPM) /83/ confirms that Forest management practices have enabled the conservation of natural state and wild flora and fauna, maintaining ecosystem function.

Maderacre S.A.C. uses selective harvesting methods for silviculture, focusing on certain species with commercial potential. The company ensures sustainable harvests over time, ensuring future harvests while maintaining ecological roles in the forest. Operations minimize impacts on water, soil, and

biodiversity. Maderacre adheres to the Forest Stewardship Council's Principles and Criteria, which evaluate the environmental, economic, and social performance of forest management, considering conservation of timber and non-timber interest species, as well as those listed in the IUCN Red List and CITES. This approach ensures sustainable harvests and symbiotic relationships in the forest.

In the project area has been conducting wild fauna studies /83/ to understand the impact of logging operations on the biological diversity of the area. The studies have focused on priority and practical issues for long-term monitoring, focusing on endangered species and representative species that provide information about ecosystem health, resources, and critical habitats. In 2022, a post-logging operation wild fauna study was conducted, evaluating species registered in CP 18. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species platform is used to determine the project's contribution to the conservation of identified species at high risk of extinction. The project also supports species classification in appendices I, II, and III of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), aiming to ensure the survival of species threatened by international trade. The number of species in the Vulnerable (VU) category is 5 (2 mammals, 2 birds, 1 reptile); Endangered category (EN) is 1 mammal. In addition, the project proponent makes a second classification under CITES standards, where most species are found in Appendix II and only the species *Ara militaris* in Appendix I.

The project has identified 26 priority species for monitoring, categorized as "umbrella" species /85/ due to their significant impact on natural ecosystems and "representative" species associated with hunting, habitat destruction, and loss. Out of these, 23 were recorded in 2017 and 03 individuals /86/ were added in 2021, resulting in a total of 165 species for monitoring.

The evidence associated with changes in biodiversity has been verified through review of annexes and during interviews and on-site visits, so all the changes described are a direct result of the implementation of the planned project activities. Therefore, AENOR agrees that the changes in biodiversity derived from the implementation activities of the project during the current verification period show an improvement in biodiversity and preservation of the species of fauna and flora present in the forested areas of the forest concession.

4.6.2 Mitigation Actions (VCS, 3.19; CCB, B2.3)

Section 5.2.1 of the monitoring report detail se measures taken in order to mitigated and conserve the HCV, including the measures to maintain the flora and fauna species; measures to maintain conservation areas; measures to maintain the integrity of the landscape; and the measures to maintain water quality.

Verification team reviewed the Silvicultural Plan /87/; Forestry Operations Manual /88/; The Custody and Surveillance Plan /89/; confirming that PP has implemented the measures to reduce the potential negative effects on biodiversity. During the tracks of the interior of the forest and the on-site interviews (Park ranger - SERNAMP), it was evident that there were no activities or procedures that would be detrimental to ecosystem dynamics. 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 (CCB, B2.2)

Section 5.1.2 and 5.2.2 provides relevant information about biodiversity changes and actions lead to positive biodiversity impacts. For example, wild fauna monitoring in a project area has been conducted using various methodologies to understand the impact of logging operations. The indicators provide insights into the biological diversity of the area. The focus is on priority and practical issues for long-term monitoring, with a particular emphasis on endangered species and representative species.

In 2022, a post-logging operation study evaluated species registered in CP 18 /90/. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species platform is used to assess the project's contribution to the conservation of identified species at high risk of extinction. The project also supports species classification in appendices I, II, and III of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), aiming to ensure the survival of species threatened by international trade.

AENOR's audit team, after reviewing wild life monitoring report /90/; and developed procedures and plan /87/ /88/ /89/ consider that wild fauna monitoring, indicator and conservation mechanisms of species threats confirms that the net impact of the project's activities on biodiversity are positive. Therefore, the project is generating a positive net gain for biodiversity in the project area. In addition, implemented activities promote adaptation to the probable impacts of climate change.

-	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Species and habitat	The location of species identified as endangered (EN) by the IUCN Red List, are distributed throughout the project area, this is supported by the forest censuses /91/ that are carried out annually, where it was registered 4 endangered species ✓ -<i>Ateles chamek</i> ✓ -<i>Sylvilagus brasiliensis</i> ✓ -<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> ✓ <i>Amburana cearensis</i> AENOR's audit team, after reviewing wild life monitoring report /90/; and developed procedures and plan /87/ /88/ /89/ consider that wild fauna monitoring, indicator and conservation mechanisms of species threats confirms that the net impact of the project's activities on biodiversity are positive. Therefore, the project is generating a positive net gain for biodiversity in the project area.

Areas needed for habitat connectivity	The project proponent emphasizes the importance of adjoining large areas of forest concessions and native communities for healthy maintenance and viable populations, as it ensures high genetic exchange in species. They implement actions such as forest surveillance, custody monitoring, wild fauna monitoring, and reduction of forest impact due to harvest, among others, to benefit the population The project area has a robust custody and surveillance system that does not allow the entry of invaders into the forest concession, protecting habitat connectivity.
---------------------------------------	--

4.6.4 Species Used (VCS, 3.19; CCB, B2.5, B2.6)

The project proponent developed a forest management plan /44/ and forest operation manual /88/ based on natural regeneration, excluding plantations and enrichment strips, to enhance the valorization of forest natural resources.

Harvestable specie and maximum cutting diameters are detailed in the forest management plan /44/ granted by the government approval /92/ /93/. In addition, a representative from Forest and wildlife management unit (UGFFS -TAH) was interviewed, confirming the approvals forestry plan and operation manual. The forestry management favors the growth of commercial species without eliminating undesirable species. Therefore, there would be no possibility of the area being affected by invasive species (there are no invasive species within the project area.).

	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Species introduced	Not applicable
Existing invasive species	Not applicable

4.6.5 High Conservation Values Protected (CCB, B2.4)

PP has identified HCVs 1, 2, and 4 throughout the FMU. The project activities have not negatively affected these values, as they help maintain biodiversity values. The annual impact of the forest management plan has been minimal due to reduced impact logging techniques. This keeps the area environmentally healthy with a healthy presence of flora and fauna. Surveillance actions were maintained in 2022 /82/ /89/, preventing third-party entry, deforestation, and invasions. All these factors were reported in the integrated Custody and Surveillance system /82/.

As mentioned in previous sections (4.6.2 and 4.6.3) of this report, there were no negative impacts of the implementation of the project activities on biodiversity or HCVs. On the contrary, data from the forest inventory /91/ and wildlife monitoring /90/ demonstrate that the intensity of exploitation used in the

concession does not affect, and may even have a positive impact, on the diversity and abundance of some species.

The monitoring report of HCV 2022 in PC 18-19 /98/ confirms that the disturbances to water flows are in good condition and infrastructure remains intact. The study also assesses the maintenance and conservation status of important sites in CP 18 and 19, which remain intact and correctly signposted despite disturbances by forestry operation.

The project proponent also implemented prevention and mitigation measures (forest inventories, small impact measures in forestry use, protection of trees and seedlings important to fauna, among others) that ensure the high conservation values identified and demonstrate the health of the ecosystem in terms of its fauna and flora. Therefore, verification team considers that activities proposed in the framework of the project do not affect the High Conservation Values since they are implemented taking into account approved management plans /44/ and in compliance with the regulations /105/.

4.6.6 GMO Exclusion (CCB, B2.7)

Not applicable.

Site observation allowed to audit team to confirm that no GMOs are used to generate GHG emission reductions or removals. Moreover, FSC certification /22/ does not allow using GMOs.

4.6.7 Inputs Justification (VCS, 3.19; CCB, B2.8)

Not applicable. No fertilizers or biological control agents are used in the project activity.

4.6.8 Negative Offsite Biodiversity Impacts (CCB, B3.1) and Mitigation Actions (VCS, 3.19; CCB, B3.2)

According to section 5.2.1 of the Monitoring Report, not negative impacts are expected outside of the project area. The project actions do not foresee negative impacts on off-site biodiversity; However, leakage belt defined as probable deforested areas due to the prohibition of entry and logging of commercial forest species in the project area is a latent impact identified in the project design, as well as agricultural expansion due to deforestation and hunting illegal. The actions to mitigate possible negative impacts include:

- ✓ Promotion of activities with institutions with ANP and PIACI territory protection objectives
 - ✓ Dissemination of environmental education to children, adolescents and adults in the surrounding communities
- Initiatives of the population with environmentally friendly projects that propose a responsible use of the land and reduction of the agricultural frontier

- ✓ Participation in dialogue spaces for the management and protection of ANPs and the Madre de Dios Territorial Reserve-generation of alliances for protection
- ✓ Promotion of activities with institutions whose objectives are oriented to the protection of flora and fauna; among others.

Verification team assessed the mitigation measures by reviewing the agreements with local stakeholders /25/ /26/ /75//76/ /77/ /78/ and interviewing the local authority and local actors during the on-site visit, confirms that included measures designed to mitigate negative impacts on biodiversity outside of the project zone are implementing. Therefore, Audit team considers that the supporting information is correct and consistent with the data presented in the Monitoring Report; In addition, these data are consistent with the information recorded in the on-site interviews, where the parties stated that these mitigation measures implemented are effective.

4.6.9 Net Offsite Biodiversity Benefits (CCB, B3.3)

Project proponent adopted resorbable and likely measures, focused on continuously training to local population. It includes continuously training to the local population on the benefits and appropriate use of the forest resources through informative and educational talks.

In addition, deforestation pressure has increased in order to expand the agricultural and livestock frontier in the areas adjacent to the concession; then, the unsustainable agricultural practices of the local communities living in the frontier of concession area are likely to increase a without project scenario; therefore the deforestation and degradation resulting from them would increase having a negative impact not only on the biodiversity but also in the resilience of the ecosystems to face extreme weather conditions.

Management activities reduce the negative impacts over the natural ecosystems and fauna, favouring the protection of vulnerable and endangered species. As a result, the net impact on biodiversity of the project is positive.

PP implemented biodiversity conservation action to ensure net positive benefits. The activities listed below are further detailed in Section 5.2.2 of the MR:

- The project has organized environmental education workshops and talks for local schoolchildren, fostering awareness of sustainable forest management, biodiversity conservation, and climate action. These efforts empower students to join the project's transformative impact through collaborative learning. This was corroborated during the site visit by intervening principals of schools visited in the project area (refer to section 2.4 of this report)
- The illegal harvesting and trade of *Podocnemis unifilis* (taricaya) eggs threaten the species' survival. Climate change exacerbates this crisis by disrupting river ecosystems—altering hydrology, water levels, and nesting beaches—leading to declining reproduction rates and ecological imbalances.

To address these threats, the project has partnered with Alto Purús National Park (PNAPU) to protect taricaya turtles along the Tahuamanu River, where poaching and illegal egg extraction by local fishermen severely endanger the species and river ecosystem. Together, they safeguard eggs through controlled artificial incubation and release hatchlings into the wild, enhancing the river's ecological health and supporting dependent species like ichthyofauna.

Audit reviewed Report of Handling of taricaya turtle /110/ and Report of Training on management and conservation of the taricaya turtle /111/ confirming the action taking by project in order to protect *Podocnemis unifilis* (taricaya) eggs.

- The project also operates an early warning system with PNAPU to combat illegal incursions along the Tahuamanu River toward the protected Madre de Dios Indigenous Reserve - a biodiversity hotspot with untouchable status. Targeting suspected illegal loggers and fishers, the system relies on two strategic riverbank control posts staffed by forest custodians. These teams monitor river traffic year-round, triggering alerts for suspicious activity while conducting regular patrols to detect and report threats to the project zone. During the site visit a representative from PNAPU (Mercedes Perales from the Management committee of Alto Purus National Pack) was interviewed, confirming biodiversity benefits.

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 that the project has net positive biodiversity impact. 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..

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

The project proponent has developed a comprehensive monitoring plan, which includes environmental, social and economic aspects of the REDD project.

As presented in section 5.3.1 of the Monitoring Report, the biodiversity monitoring plan provides the list of indicators subject to monitoring (frequency, methodology, indicator, measuring, outcome), which are directly related to the implementation results of the project activities and are addressed by monitoring the impact on biodiversity. Environmental monitoring include:

- *Water courses.*
- *Forest Degradation*
- *Impacts on indicator fauna*
- *Impact prevention and correction.*
- *Surveillance and monitoring*

Table 5.6, 5.7, 5.8 and 5.9 detail all the indicators to be monitored as per registered PD. Annual monitoring forestry operation (MOF) /94/ reports that there was no watercourses obstruction.

Forest degradation is estimated by measuring areas affected by harvesting operations, including roads, trees, landings, and camps, indicating partial loss of forest cover and negative impact, enabling better decision-making for immediate and future precautions. Forestry operation report confirms; that in parcel cut (CP) 18 shows a forest affectation of 4.46% of the current harvest area, while CP 19 shows a 2.56 % affectation.

The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species /96/ platform is used to assess the project's contribution to the conservation of identified species at high risk of extinction. The project also supports species classification in appendices I, II, and III of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) /95/, aiming to ensure the survival of species threatened by international trade. The Assessment report of wildlife on cut plot 18 /90/, confirms the presence of *Tayassu pecari*, *Tapirus terrestris*, *Ara militaris*, *Tinamus tao*, *Chelonoidis denticulata*, and *Ateles chamek*. Also, the project has identified 26 priority species for monitoring, categorized as "umbrella" species due to their significant impact on natural ecosystems and "representative" species associated with hunting, habitat destruction, and loss. Out of these, 23 were recorded in 2017 and 03 individuals were added in 2021, resulting in a total of 165 species for monitoring. During this monitoring t was identifies 18 out of 26 species, indicating optimal ecosystem health. The forest supports wild fauna, housing numerous "umbrella species." The controlled development of human practices under an adequate logging plan minimizes impact on terrestrial ecosystems of wild fauna.

The activities of the custody and surveillances were verified against patrolling reports /97/ in order to verify reported activities in the MR and confirms the results. Also, verification team assessed forestry monitoring forestry operation /94/ confirming reported indicators.

PP has identified *Panthera onca* (jaguar) as Trigger Species. The project proponent, in partnership with the San Diego Zoo Wildlife Alliance, has implemented camera trap monitoring for felines and their prey in the Forest Management Unit (FMU) managed by Maderacre. The results show *Panthera onca* (jaguar) is the fourth most frequently recorded wildlife species, with 628 events and a 99% occupancy rate across the entire FMU. This indicates that the species maintains homogeneous movement patterns and conservation mechanisms contribute to these outcomes.

Audit team satisfactorily verified the implementation of the biodiversity monitoring plan through interviews and on-site visit and considers that the information recorded in the field is consistent with the information described in the project documents.

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 biodiversity monitoring plan is implemented as the MR and the validated PD. Also, the results of this monitoring period and the effectiveness of the measures taken to maintain or improve the identified biodiversity-related HCVs are considered reasonable and credible.

4.6.11 Biodiversity Monitoring Plan Dissemination (CCB, B4.3)

AENOR confirmed during the on-site visit by interviewing local stakeholders the awareness about the results of the projects, its implementation, monitoring. 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.

In order to verify the dissemination of monitoring plan and results; the audit team, during the on-site visit, interviewed local authorities and identified stakeholders to confirm the awareness about the results of the projects, its implementation and monitoring results. Section 2.4 (interviews) of this report includes the names of stakeholders and authorities interviewed during the on-site assessment. Also, main topics covered are described in this section.

Verification team also reviewed the Dissemination of REDD Component report 2022 /34/; including: Citizen participation workshop report /35/; Agreements of the meetings minutes /36/; Flyers of project diffusion /37/; First Meeting Attendance list - 29-April-2022 /38/; Second Meeting attendance list- 16-December-2022 /39/; and PPT presentation of monitoring results /40/. Information regarding monitoring results are publicly available on Maderacre's website: www.maderacre.com.

4.6.12 Optional Gold Level: Trigger Species Population Trends (CCB, GL3.3)

A flora and fauna study identified the presence of are considered under CITES Appendix II and IUCN Red List. The Trigger specie is: *Panthera onca* (jaguar)

The project proponent, in partnership with the San Diego Zoo Wildlife Alliance, has implemented camera trap monitoring for felines and their prey in the Forest Management Unit (FMU) managed by Maderacre. The results show *Panthera onca* (jaguar) is the fourth most frequently recorded wildlife species, with 628 events and a 99% occupancy rate across the entire FMU. This indicates that the species maintains homogeneous movement patterns and conservation mechanisms contribute to these outcomes. Studies conducted by SDZ and the project proponent have provided valuable data on the species' population densities, with 76 jaguars in the project area, and the second highest density in the world after the Pantanal in Brazil. The project area, free of hunting and logging, supports healthy jaguar populations and expands their range. San Diego Zoo Global is installing annual camera traps to study the size of conservation areas in the Amazon and connectivity requirements for jaguar populations. This helps determine the species' maintenance and viability of these areas.

Trigger species: CITES and IUCN Red List species

- ✓ *Dipteryx micrantha* "shihuahuaco"
- ✓ *Handroanthus capitatus* "tahuari"
- ✓ *Amburana cearensis* "ishpingo"

- ✓ *Swietenia macrophylla* “caoba”
- ✓ *Cedrela odorata* “cedro”

To ensure their sustainable management in the project area, MADERACRE SAC has defined a diameter at breast height for each species, which is higher than the values established by the Peruvian forestry authority. DBHs are higher than national regulations to reduce species harvesting intensity and ensure healthy populations for ecological roles. Each exploited species has a network of seed trees, allowing them to fulfill their ecological role in the forest.

During the current monitoring, forest operations were conducted in Cutting Lands (CLs) 18 and 19 of the Maderacre concession. CL 18 operations completed harvesting activities initiated in 2021, while CL 19 was fully harvested. Both operations complied with national forestry regulations and were authorized under approved Operational Plans and Resolutions /92/ /93/. The official execution reports /107/ /108/ for both parcels confirm harvested volumes of just 0.2 trees/ha (CL 18) and 0.16 trees/ha (CL 19) - well below thresholds that could affect forest structure or ecological dynamics. These documented extraction rates, submitted to forest authorities, demonstrate sustainable harvesting practices with minimal environmental impact

Verification team reviewed biodiversity reports, conducted by the project proponent, including, inter alia: Assessment report of wildlife on cut plot 18 /91/; Forest census report /92/; Monitoring report of HCV 2022 in PC 18-19 /98/; also contrasted the information against study on the health of forest ecosystems under management from the composition of birds in forest concessions of Tahuamanu - Madre de Dios /99/; mammal diversity in forest concessions /100/; high jaguar densities and large population sizes in the core habitat of the southwestern Amazon /101/. Therefore, audit team is able to confirm that the project activity has positive and exceptional impacts on biodiversity.

4.6.13 Optional Gold Level: Effectiveness of Threat Reduction Actions (CCB, GL3.4)

Results of indicator reported in section 5.3.1 of the MR (biodiversity monitoring plan) and 5.4.1 (5.4.1 Trigger Species Population Trends), confirms that measures taken are effective, maintaining and enhancing the population status of trigger species.

The project proponent implemented forestry operations under Reduced Impact logging techniques according to the Forestry Operations Manual /88/, which allows the reduction of ecosystem disturbances.

The Comprehensive Custody Plan for 2022 /89/ includes a control and surveillance system for poaching and hunting prohibition, as well as access and boundary control of concessions. This plan aims to safeguard the biological heritage of the forest management unit and surrounding areas. Also, the project area, free of hunting and using reduced impact logging techniques, allows for healthy jaguar populations to expand their range adjacent to the Jaguar REDD+ Project in Tahuamanu province.

Moreover, San Diego Zoo Global is installing camera traps to study the size and connectivity requirements of conservation areas in the Amazon for jaguar maintenance and viability. Images confirms that *Panthera*

onca (jaguar) is the fourth most frequently recorded wildlife species, with 628 events and a 99% occupancy rate across the entire FMU. This indicates homogeneous movement patterns and conservation mechanisms contributing to these outcomes. Studies by SDZ and the project proponent have provided valuable data on the species' population densities, with 76 jaguars within the project area. It has the second highest density in the world, after the Pantanal in Brazil.

Therefore, based on indicator results and biodiversity monitoring results audit team confirms that measures taken are effective at maintaining and enhancing the population status of trigger species.

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

5.1 Verification Summary

AENOR has performed the verification of the project: “Tahuamanu Amazon REDD Project” and has verified that the project is in compliance with the Verified Carbon Standard version v4.7; the VCS Methodology Requirements, v4.4; and Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1 without qualifications or limitations. Verification team, ensures that GHG statement is the responsibility of the project proponent

AENOR confirms that verification of the GHG statement was conducted in accordance with ISO 14064-3 (ISO 14064-3: 2019) with reasonable level of assurance. The conclusions of this report show that the project, as it was described in the project documentation, is in line with all criteria applicable for the verification.

The verification consisted of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the project design and the baseline and Monitoring Plans; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) the resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and opinion. In the course of the validation process corrective actions and clarifications were raised; all have been successfully closed as explained in the validation protocol annexed to this report.

5.2 Verification Conclusion

AENOR has performed the verification of the emission reductions that have been reported for the “Tahuamanu Amazon REDD Project” (VCS ID 2502) for the period 01 January 2022 to 31 December 2022.

AENOR has verified that the project is in compliance with the verification criteria of Verified Carbon Standard version 4.7 and the CCB Standards Third Edition without qualifications or limitations. The verification of ex-post emission reductions has been conducted by AENOR in accordance with ISO 14064-3:2019 with a reasonable level of assurance

AENOR conducted the verification on the basis of Methodology:

- ✓ VM0006: Methodology for Carbon Accounting for Mosaic and Landscape-scale REDD Projects, v2.2

And applied deviation due to readjustment of the spatial model for projecting future deforestation, following the indications of:

- ✓ VM0015: Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation, v1.1.

In AENOR's opinion the GHG emissions reductions of the "Tahuamanu Amazon REDD Project" for the period 01 January 2022 to 31 December 2022 are fairly stated in the final monitoring report; the GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly on the basis of the applied methodology.

The verification assessment covered the monitoring period from 01 January 2022 to 31 December 2022 and verified that calculated emission reductions and/or removals were achieved during the monitoring period with a reasonable level of assurance. The overall risk rating was 12%. Therefore, the total number of credits to be deposited in the buffer account is 61,832 VCUs and the total VCUs to be issued are 527,068.

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 4, dated on 10 July 2025. In opinion of the AENOR verification team the project is achieving their community and biodiversity objectives.

Verification period: From 01 January 2022 to 31 December 2022

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

The non-permanence risk rating (%)	12%
If applicable, the long-term average, whether it has been properly updated, and if it has been reached.	N/A
Whether a loss has been appropriately accounted for, in accordance with the VCS Program rules, if applicable.	No lost event were registered during monitoring period /72/.

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Buffer pool allocation (tCO ₂ e)	Reductions VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Removals VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCU Issuance (tCO ₂ e)
01-Jan-2022 to 31-Dec-2022	564,958.4	-23,941.9	0.00	61,832	527,068	-	527,068
Total	564,958.4	-23,941.9	0.00	61,832	527,068	-	527,068

5.3 Ex-ante vs. Ex-post ERR Comparison

Vintage period	Ex-ante estimated reductions/removals	Achieved reductions/removals	Percent difference	Explanation for the difference
01-Jan-2022 to 31-Dec-2022	435,295	545,986.7	25.43%	In the current monitoring period, there were no deductions for leakage because the monitored deforestation in the leakage area was less than the estimated amount in the project scenario of the PDD.
<i>Total</i>	435,295	545,986.7	25.43%	

APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION

Section	Information	Justification	Assessment method and conclusion
Cash flow	It contains information on the revenue generated by the sale of timber and carbon credits, the expenses of activities execution linked to the project and operations, as well as administrative expenses.	It reveals the company's financial health and ability to generate revenue, which directly affects its value in the market and can influence the investment decisions of investors and other stakeholders.	Commercial information as prices, contracts and costs are considered commercially sensitive, included in the cash flow, contracts and salaries of employees. These three information meets the VCS Program definition /4/ of commercially sensitive information. They prejudice the outcome of contractual or other negotiations between PP employees and supporting contracted organization.
Contracts	It contains significant legal, financial, and competitive implications for the parties involved.	Protect the confidentiality and security of the parties.	
Salary	Compensation that an employee receives for their work in relation to the type of job position they occupy.	It safeguards worker privacy and security, as well as is a measure to maintain labor company equity and the strategic confidentiality.	Even it was not public, it was shared with audit team to verify the incomes an expensed included in the cashflow.

APPENDIX 2: PROJECT RISKS TABLE

Item	Identified risk(s)	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Natural and human induced risks to stakeholders' wellbeing	Encroachment for agriculture and development	The project proponent is committed to the development of local communities, in this way, environmentally friendly productive projects will be implemented to improvement in agricultural productivity, even contemplating tourist activities, which will generate benefits for stakeholders in the short and medium term, and indirectly for local communities, reducing human induced risks by finding greater opportunities for improvement For the year 2022 there are no changes recorded since the implementation of projects and actions for this impact will be executed after the carbon revenues (2023). The proponent of the project establishes the rules of the Environmentally Friendly Productive Projects competition (PPAMA) /102/ in 2022 disseminated in the communities and stakeholders of the region of activities. It aims to generate economic alternatives for local community members.
Risks to stakeholder participation	Lack of financial incentives	The project has allocated 5% of the revenue from selling carbon credits for direct investment in biodiversity and community components, ensuring transparency in the development of concrete actions. Investments are directed towards community groups, following guidelines for PPAMA projects. Audit team confirmed the support given by PP against Certificates of health support /18/ and Certificates of educations support /19/, confirming financial incentives. t

Working conditions	Lack of local expertise and knowledge	The project implements annual training for all workers who work directly for the project, topic are detailed in Annual training activity programme /27/. Audit team reviewed Training records 2022 /28/, confirming that workers received training regarding safety condition in work place; including their risk and mitigation measures.
Safety of women and girls	Limited access to participation and representation in project activities	The project promotes women's involvement in decision-making, including in dialogue spaces like the Community Relations Advisory Committee. Girls are also involved in environmental awareness talks in primary and secondary schools, promoting good forest management practices, biodiversity, and climate change fight. The project also provides education and health support. It was evidenced during the site visit by interviewing principal of educational institutes as detailed in section 2.4 of this report.
Safety of minority and marginalized groups including children	Inequitable benefit distribution without considering indigenous people, women, elderly, disabled and children	The project focuses on improving the well-being and livelihood of vulnerable populations through citizen participation workshops. Decisions are made with community relations advisory committee. The project also implements gender equity, anti-discrimination, and labor equality policies /50/ /59/ /62/ throughout its development, ensuring that the needs of the local population are met.
Pollutants (air, noise, discharges to water, generation of waste, and release of hazardous materials and chemical pesticides and fertilizers)	a. Air and noise pollution produce from machinery and vehicles. b. Generation of waste from REDD+ activities implemented.	The project proponent is responsible for overseeing the maintenance of minor and heavy-duty vehicles to ensure low emissions and noise levels, minimizing environmental impact. Monitoring forestry operations manual /88/ helps in determining the quality of operations based on forest degradation levels and environmental impacts. Project activity account with a solid waste system /103/ that allows classified waste to be disposed properly. Procedure was observed during the site visit.

Discrimination	Disability discrimination during the execution of project activities	The project proponent prohibits discrimination, mistreatment, verbal or physical violence, and has implemented gender equity, anti-discrimination, and labor equality policies /50/ /59/ /62/ throughout its development and activities.
Sexual harassment	Personal and psychological impact in project workers	The project promotes a safe and respectful work environment free from sexual harassment, ensuring all workers are treated fairly. Complaints are addressed in accordance with the law, and the project's activities are guided by an ethics, anti-corruption, anti-terrorism, and anti-money laundering policy /62/.
Equal pay for equal work	No risk identified	The project proponent is committed to attracting, retaining, and motivating workers, ensuring a fair compensation and benefits system for similar-skilled individuals. Employment contracts comply with national legislation, and an Employment Equality and Anti-Discrimination Policy is implemented throughout the project /50/
Gender equity in labor and work	Unequal access to employment opportunities	The project proponent is committed to attracting, retaining, and motivating workers, ensuring a fair compensation and benefits system for similar-skilled individuals. Employment contracts comply with national legislation, and an Employment Equality and Anti-Discrimination Policy is implemented throughout the project /50/
Forced labor ¹	Forced labor infringes on basic human rights	The project proponent strongly opposes child labor and forced labor, requiring customers and suppliers to adhere to Peruvian Law Legislation Law 27337, the III National Plan for the Fight against Forced Labor 2019
Child labor	Child labor can severely impact on health and development	

¹ The identified risks and commensurate mitigation or preventative measure(s) for forced labor, child labor, and human trafficking, must be inclusive of staff and contracted workers employed by third parties.

Human trafficking	Severe exploitation	– 2022, and Convention No. 105 of the International Labor Organization (ILO). During the site visit no evidence of forced labor, child labor nor human traffic were found.
Recognition of, respect of, and promotion of the rights to IPs, LCs and customary rights holders	No risk identified	The project area is a forest concession granted /63/ /64/ in cession of use by the Peruvian state for responsible forest management, so the project does not contemplate the use of indigenous population or local community lands
Preserving and protecting cultural heritage	No risk identified	
Protecting and preserving property rights, customary rights, or protecting legal or customary tenure/access rights to territories, property, and resources, including collective and/or conflicting rights	No risk identified	
Impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems	Possible loss of biodiversity of wild flora and fauna.	The project proponent uses reduced impact logging techniques in forest harvesting operations /88/, reducing negative impacts on the ecosystem and promoting resilience. The area has a robust custody and surveillance system, preventing invaders from entering. The project promotes sensitization and awareness of forest conservation and environmentally friendly projects, aiming to reduce the impact of activities on unprotected areas.
Soil degradation and soil erosion	No risk identified	The project proponent uses reduced impact logging techniques in forest harvesting operations /88/, reducing negative impacts

Water consumption and stress	No risk identified	The project aids in the preservation of biodiversity and local ecosystems through effective forest management /44/, promoting the natural cycle and conservation of resources like water.
Habitats (and areas needed for habitat connectivity) for rare, threatened, and endangered species	Possible loss of keystone species	The project proponent uses reduced impact logging techniques in forest harvesting operations /88/, reducing negative impacts on the ecosystem and promoting resilience.
Areas needed for habitat connectivity	No risk identified	The project proponent emphasizes the importance of adjoining large areas of forest concessions and native communities for healthy maintenance and viable populations, as it ensures high genetic exchange in species. They implement actions such as forest surveillance, custody monitoring, wild fauna monitoring, and reduction of forest impact due to harvest, among others, to benefit the population
Invasive species	No risk identified	The forestry management /44/ favors the growth of commercial species without eliminating undesirable species. Therefore, there would be no possibility of the area being affected by invasive species (there are no invasive species within the project area.).
Ecosystem conversion	Loss of biodiversity, disruption ecosystem services, soil degradation and greenhouse gases emissions	The project proponent uses reduced impact logging techniques in forest harvesting operations /88/, reducing negative impacts on the ecosystem and promoting resilience. The area has a robust custody and surveillance system, preventing invaders from entering. The project promotes sensitization and awareness of forest conservation and environmentally friendly projects, aiming to reduce the impact of activities on unprotected areas.

APPENDIX 3: LIST OF EVIDENCE

N°	Documents reviewed or referenced
1	VCS Program Guide v4.4.
2	VCS Standard v4.7
3	VCS Methodology requirements v4.4
4	VCS Programme definition v4.5
5	VCS Validation and verification manual v3.2
6	VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.2
7	Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1
8	CCB Program Rules, v3.1
9	CCB-VCS-MR, initial version (version 1, dated on 01 October 2024)
10	CCB-VCS-MR, final version (version 4, dated on 10 July 2025)
11	Validated VCS-CCB-PD
12	Previous Verification Report
13	Spreadsheet of emission reduction calculation:
14	The Non-Permanence Risks Reports – Last Version
15	VM0006: Methodology for Carbon Accounting for Mosaic and Landscape-scale REDD Projects, v2.2
16	VM0015: Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation, v1.1.
17	Payroll 2022
18	Certificates of health support
19	Employees vaccine records
20	Certificates of educations support
21	Certificates of disease prevention support
22	FSC certificate (registration code: NC-FM/COC-002176) and FSC audit report
23	Contingency Plan for PIACI
24	Life plan 2022 of Belgica community
25	Agreements with the native community of Belgica
26	Agreements with the educational institutions
27	Annual training activity programme
28	Training records 2022
29	Community Development Programme
30	Communication plan

N°	Documents reviewed or referenced
31	Social monitoring plan
32	Anthropological contingency plan for dealing with risk situation during the contact with an isolated population (PIACI)
33	Degradation Potential Diagnosis by Maderacre S.A.C. (2021)
34	Dissemination of REDD Component report 2022
35	Citizen participation workshop report
36	Agreements of the meetings minutes
37	Flyers of project diffusion
38	First Meeting Attendance list - 29-April-2022
39	Second Meeting attendance list- 16-December-2022
40	PPT presentation of monitoring results
41	Complaints and consultations procedure
42	Local media advertising spots
43	Forest fire prevention training material
44	Forest management plan
45	Procedures for handling and resolving conflicts
46	Training activity reports
48	Social Responsibility Plan
49	Diagnosis of potential deforestation and forest degradation in the region of project activities
50	Employment Equality and Anti-Discrimination Policy
51	Annual Training Plan
52	IPEC (Identification of Dangers, Risk Assessment and Measures of Control) matrix
53	law N° 29783 health and safety law
54	DS N° 009-2005-TR health and safety regulation
55	Decree 148-2007-TR regulation of committee for supervision of security and health at work
56	Law N° 26842 General Health Law
57	Curriculum vitae of project manager from MADERACRE
58	Curriculum vitae of consulting team - PASCAY
59	Ethics and Anti-Corruption Policy
60	Project cash flow
61	Social Development Plan
62	Policy on ethics, anti-corruption, anti-terrorism and prevention of money laundering

N°	Documents reviewed or referenced
63	Forest connection contracts (Contract N°: 17-TAH/C-J-024-02; 17-TAH/C-J-025-02; 17-TAH/C-J-026-02; 17-TAH/C-J-033-02; 17-TAH/C-J-035-02; 17-TAH/C-J-036-02; 17-TAH/C-J-054-02)
64	Concession contract approval: Directorate Resolution N° 131-2017-GOREMAD-GRRNYAG-DRFFS/DRFFS-TAH issued on March 20, 2017
65	Implementation report of the 2022 Operational Plan / PC 18
66	Implementation report of the 2022 Operational Plan / PC 19
67	Reference Region Map
68	Project Area Map
69	Leakage Belt Map
70	KML files
71	GIS data
72	Official deforestation rate: GEOBOSQUES - http://geobosques.minam.gob.pe/geobosque/view/perdida.php
73	Landsat images
74	Statistical compendium 2022 of the Civil Defence National Institute (INDECI).
75	Agreements with the educational institution "Dos de Mayo" Iberia
76	Agreements with technological institute Iberia - Tahuamanu
77	Agreements whit National Park Alto Purus
78	Agreements with Health post "Iñapari CLAs Tres Fronteras
79	Community developed plan
80	Social monitoring report 2022
81	Forest Management Unit (FMU)
82	Annual Report of Custody and Surveillance of the FMU
83	The annual evaluations of Permanent Monitoring Plots (PPM)
84	Technical information 002-2023-JRTM-FaunaSilvestre
85	Wildlife Report 2017 J.Loja
86	Study of Ecosystem Health by Bird Composition. F.Angulo
87	Silvicultural Plan - MRA 2020
88	Forestry Operations Manual
89	The Custody and Surveillance Plan
90	Assessment report of wildlife on cut plot 18
91	Forest census report
92	Approval resolution PC 18
93	Approval resolution PC 19

N°	Documents reviewed or referenced
94	Annual monitoring forestry operation (MOF)
95	List of species of wild flora CITES – Peru
96	Red List of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature
97	Patrolling reports 2022
98	Monitoring report of HCV 2022 in PC 18-19
99	Study on the health of forest ecosystems under management from the composition of birds in forest concessions of Tahuamanu - Madre de Dios
100	Mammal diversity in forest concessions
101	High jaguar densities and large population sizes in the core habitat of the southwestern Amazon
102	Environment-friendly Productive Projects rules
103	Waste management procedure
103	Tropical Diseases Report 2022
104	Watercourse assessment report in PC 18-19
105	Law No. 29763 “Forestry and Wildlife Law”
106	Resolution approving term extension of the contracts: N°: 17-TAH/C-J-024-02; 17-TAH/C-J-025-02; 17-TAH/C-J-026-02; 17-TAH/C-J-033-02; 17-TAH/C-J-035-02; 17-TAH/C-J-036-02; 17-TAH/C-J-054-02)
107	2022-2023 Operational Plan Execution Report – CP 18
108	2022-2023 Operational Plan Execution Report – CP 19
109	Occupational Safety and Health Statistics report
110	Report of Handling of taricaya turtle
111	Report of Training on management and conservation of the taricaya turtle

APPENDIX 4: VERIFICATION FINDINGS

Non Conformities (NCs)/Corrective Action Request (CARs)

NC/CAR id.	01	Date: 03/01/2025
NC/CAR description		
The following section has not been filled following the instructions of the CCB-VCS-MR template - Cover page (Gold Level criteria) does not describe: <i>List which Gold Level criteria are being used and provide <u>a brief description of the activities implemented and results achieved that enable the project to qualify for each relevant Gold Level</u></i> - Section 2.1.1 does not include: <i>A summary description of the implementation status of the technologies/measures) included in the project, including <u>relevant implementation dates</u>.</i> - Section 2.3.1 does not include: <i>Where the stakeholder make up has changed since validation, or stakeholders were not identified at verification, <u>describe the stakeholder identification process</u>.</i> - Section 2.3.8 does not include: <i>Describe how communities and other stakeholders <u>will be or have been informed</u> of the validation/verification body's site visit in a timely manner before the site visit occurs, (...)</i> - Section 2.5.1 does not include: <i>(...) <u>Provide assurance that</u> the project is in compliance with all national and local laws and regulations in the host country that are relevant to the project activities and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.</i> - Section 2.5.2 does not include: <i>(...) <u>demonstrate how compliance was achieved</u> and describe activities and/or processes implemented to <u>inform workers about their rights</u>.</i> - Section 3.1.4 does not include: <i>(...) <u>Describe the means</u> by which summaries (at least) of the results have been communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.</i>		
Project proponent's response		Date: 23/01/2025

1. The description of the Gold Level criteria was modified, briefly outlining the actions implemented during the audited period and the achievements attained.
2. The first two paragraphs of section 2.1.1 were revised to include the stages of activity implementation.
3. The stakeholder identification process for the audited period was added.
4. The dissemination mechanism used to inform stakeholders of the VVB's field visit dates for the audited period was detailed.
5. For each of the cited local laws, the project's compliance mechanism was described.
6. It was detailed how the project proponent complies with workers' labor rights in accordance with the cited laws. Additionally, the induction and training processes on labor rights for workers were described.
7. The communication channel through which the monitoring results of the project's climate component were disseminated was described.

Documentation provided by the project proponent

The documentation has already been provided through the submitted database.

VVB's evaluation

Date: 30/01/2015

PP has updated the MR accordingly. It includes all requested information by template. Then, **CAR 1 is closed.**

NC/CAR Id.	02	Date: 03/01/2025
NC/CAR description		
Monitoring report does not include all indicators of Community Monitoring Plan (section 4.4.1 of the CCB-VCS-PD). PP is requested to updated MR including all stated indicators.		
Project proponent's response		Date: 23/01/2025
The results of the indicators proposed in the CCB-VCS-PD are detailed and modified in the CCB-VCS-MR:		
Table (CCB-VCS-PD)	Indicator (CCB-VCS-PD)	CCB-VCS-MR
4.4. Project diffusion	Number of meetings and training sessions held with the community	Table 4.11
	Participate in dialogue spaces and management of Protected Areas, including the Territorial Reserve Madre de Dios	Table 5.8
4.5. Strengthen /develop skills and capacities in family members that are part of selected projects, including local company workers	Number of meetings and training sessions held with the community	Table 4.13
4.6. Support pilot sustainable productive initiatives of surrounding communities, reducing the expansion of agrarian activities and improving livelihood conditions with 2% of project incomes	Number of implementing sustainable productive initiatives of surrounding communities	Table 4.12
4.7. Number of families per community	• Trend of future land use • Average size of agricultural area • Average size of pasture area • Average density of cattle per hectare • Level of consumption of firewood • Level of consumption of charcoal] • Level of consumption of timber for non-commercial purposes • Average distance to collect firewood / charcoal / timber • Origin of firewood / charcoal / timber	Section 2.2.5

4.8. Subsistence economy	• Level of consumption of firewood • Level of consumption of charcoal] • Level of consumption of timber for non-commercial purposes	Section 2.2.5
4.9. Community monitoring form – Health and Education	No detailed	Table 4.15
4.10. Community indicators	Productivity (tons/ha)	Table 4.12
	Unit Price (compared with price of families who do not access to project benefits)	Table 4.12
	Number of trainings received	Table 4.13
4.11. Other Stakeholders indicators	Deforested areas in Forest Concessions inside Reference Region	Section 2.2.5
	Income from PDAF paid to the Regional Forest and Wildlife Administration by Forest Concessions located inside the Reference Region	Section 2.2.5
Documentation provided by the project proponent		
The documentation has already been provided through the submitted database.		
WB's evaluation		Date: 30/01/2025
PP has requested a deviation from community monitoring plan due some indicator do not impact on project activity; the indicator from table 4.7, 4.8 and 4.11 of PD are not included and will not be monitored. Audit team considers that it is a minor change in the community monitoring plan due to PP monitor relevant indicators in order to measure the impacts on communities. Then, CAR 2 is closed.		

NC/CAR id.	03	Date: 03/01/2025
NC/CAR description		
Monitoring report does not include all indicators of Biodiversity Monitoring Plan (section 5.3.1 of the CCB-VCS-PD). PP is requested to updated MR including all stated indicators.		
In addition, stion 5.4.1 does not describe <u>population trends</u> of each trigger species and actions identified in the CCB-VCS-PD.		

Project proponent's response		Date: 23/01/2025
The results of the indicators proposed in the CCB-VCS-PD are detailed and modified in the CCB-VCS-MR:		
Table (CCB-VCS-PD)	Indicator / Activity (CCB-VCS-PD)	CCB-VCS-MR
5.11. Biodiversity monitoring system	The table presents generalized indicators for the project, as indicated by the title, which are described in greater detail in Table 5.12 and should be considered for the monitoring plan, except for the cost indicators, which are detailed in the cash flow.	Tabla 5.12
5.12. Monitoring plan for AVC maintenance measures	Measures to Maintain Flora Species	
	Evaluate the state of Natural Regeneration of forest species of commercial interest	Table 5.6 (Objective 2 – Indicator D)
	Measure the growth of each forest species	Table 5.6 (Objective 2 – Indicator E)
	Establish adequate silvicultural variables for each species and according to the Cutting Cycle (CC) defined for the MU.	Table 5.7 (Objective 1 – Indicators A, B, C, D and E)
	Define the need and feasibility of implementing silvicultural treatments by species.	Table 5.7 (Objective 1 – Indicators A, B, C, D and E)
	Implement a reduced impact harvesting system (AIR)	Table 5.7 (Objective 2 – Indicator G; Objective 3 – Indicators A and B)
	Establish an adequate system of control and surveillance of the accesses and limits of the concession.	Table 5.6 (Objective 1 – Indicators A, B, C and D)
	Measures to Maintain Fauna Species	
	Prohibit the hunting of fauna species within the concession.	Table 5.6

		(Objective 3 – Indicators A, B and E)
	Periodically assess wildlife important for monitoring through sighting log	Table 5.7 (Objective 3 – Indicators C and D)
	Evaluate the state of wildlife in general, in addition to the evolution of its population indicators over time	Table 5.9 (Objective 1 – Indicators B, C and F)
	Identify important sites for wildlife during forest census work	Table 5.7 (Objective 3 – indicator A)
	Exclude from harvesting areas that host sites of importance for wildlife	Table 5.7 (Objective 3 – Indicators A and B)
	Establish an adequate system of control and surveillance of the accesses and limits of the concession to prevent poaching.	Table 5.6 (Objective 1 – Indicators A, B, C and D)
	Measures to Maintain Conservation Areas	
	Exclude conservation areas from forest extraction. Make a use compatible with the conservation of the area.	Table 5.7 (Objective 2 – Indicators H)
	Prohibit the hunting of fauna species within the concession	Table 5.6 (Objective 3 – Indicators A, B and E)
	Delimit and mark conservation areas with the use of pedestrian paths and information signs	Table 5.6 (Objective 1 – Indicators D and F)
	Establish an adequate surveillance system for the accesses and limits of the conservation areas	Table 5.6 (Objective 1 – Indicators A, B, C and D)
	Measures to Maintain the Integrity of the Landscape	
	Establish an adequate system of control and surveillance of the accesses and limits of the concession	Table 5.6

		(Objective 1 – Indicators A, B, C and D)
	Implement a reduced impact harvesting system (AIR)	Table 5.7 (Objective 2 – Indicator G; Objective 3 – Indicators A and B)
Measures to Maintain Water Quality		
	Establish an adequate system of control and surveillance of the accesses and limits of the concession	Table 5.6 (Objective 1 – Indicators A, B, C and D)
	Establish fiscal strips in rivers and open streams of up to 25 meters on each side	Table 5.7 (Objective 3 – A indicator)
	Implement a reduced impact harvesting system (AIR)	Table 5.7 (Objective 2 – Indicator G; Objective 3 – Indicators A and B)
	Identify and mark water sources (springs) to avoid being affected by forestry operations	Table 5.7 (Objective 3 – Indicator A)

Section 5.4.1 supplements the information with population trends of the species and actions carried out to support their conservation and monitoring.

Documentation provided by the project proponent

The documentation has already been provided through the submitted database.

VB's evaluation

Date: 30/01/2025

PP has clarified how is reported the biodiversity indicators and monitoring results. They are in accordance to the validated monitoring plan. Then, **CAR 3 is closed.**

Clarifications (CLs)

CL ID	01	Date: 03/01/2025
CL description		
PP is requested to provide the following evidence: 1. GIS file and Satellite images of monitored areas during this verification 2. KML files for project area, leakage area, reference region, reference forest region 3. Clarify whether any loss of carbon stock has occurred during the monitoring period (section 2.2.1 of the CCB-VCS-MR)		
Project proponent's response		Date: 23/01/2025
1. Attached in the previously delivered drive: "196 GIS file and Satellite images" 2. Attached in the previously delivered drive: "197 KML files for project" 3. No loss events or reversals have occurred during the monitoring period. The information was added to Section 2.2.1		
Documentation provided by the project proponent		
WB's evaluation		Date: 30/01/2025
PP has provided requested information and included information about loss event. Then, CL 1 is closed		