

VERIFICATION REPORT CHINKO CONSERVATION AREA REDD+ PROJECT, CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC



Contact Information

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

Project Title	Chinko Conservation Area REDD+ Project, Central African Republic
Version	10
Report ID	VCS CCB_Chinko_Verification Report_v10_20112023

Report Title	Verification Report Chinko Conservation Area REDD+ Project, Central African Republic
Client	African Parks CAR
Pages	77
Date of Issue	20-November-2023
Prepared By	AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U.
Contact	Génova 6. 28004 Madrid- Spain. Telephone +34 914326000 jfuentes@aenor.com ; jcocera@aenor.com www.aenor.com
Approved By	Jose Luis Fuentes
Work Carried Out By	Lead Auditor: Javier Cócera Auditor: Carlos Jiménez Auditor: Elena Llorente CCB expert: Daniel Masika Technical reviewer: José Luis Fuentes

Summary

AENOR has carried out the verification of the Chinko Conservation Area REDD+ Project under the VCS and CCB Programs. The project is a conservation project (REDD+) implemented in the Chinko Conservation Area, in Central African Republic. Eastern Central African Republic (CAR) is a unique area where savannah and tropical forest meet, the diversity of habitats, such as humid Congolian lowland forests, Sudanian woodland savannas, dry edaphic grasslands and swampy floodplains, creates a complex ecosystem with an extraordinary diversity of wildlife and sustains an abundance of natural resources. The Chinko conservation area REDD+ project is an initiative held by African Parks CAR (AAPP CAR) to protect this zone. The project is intended as a grouped one, in the eastern CAR in the prefectures of Mbomou, Haute-Kotto, Haut-Mbomou.

The project start date is 15 September 2016 and the crediting period runs from 15 September 2016 to 14 April 2045. The project began with hunting zones 39, 40, 41 and 48; and on April 15, 2020 the hunting zone 36 was incorporated; in both cases as public-private partnership agreement of African Parks CAR with the Ministry of Water, Forest, Hunting and Fishing in representation of the Government of the Central African Republic. The length of the crediting period is 28 years and 7 months. The monitoring period for this verification event is 15 September 2016 to 31 December 2020.

AENOR conducted the verification under VCS Standard version 4.1 and the CCB Standard Third Edition, by reviewing the monitoring report and supporting evidence submitted by the project proponent.

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

Overall, as a result of the different activities carried out during this monitoring period, it has been possible to reduce deforestation in the project area compared with the baseline scenario, resulting in the generation of 1,438,468 (tCO₂e) net emission reduction for the 2016 – 2020 period, according to the Non-Permanence Risk assessment the buffer discount obtained was 6.5% but the minimum assumed is 10%, therefore, after applying the buffer the amount of tradable VCUs in the period is 1,294,618. The project has contributed to the sustainable development of Central African Republic, and specifically the project zone by:

- Increasing employment opportunities for the local population
- sustainable use of natural resources in line with the land-use plan and to establish sustainable transhumant pastoralism corridors.
- Promoting an integrated management scheme with the ecosystem, achieving HCV conservation
- Creating and developing a new mechanism to finance projects in the forestry sector

In order to confirm that the monitoring report as documented meets the stated requirements and identified criteria, the verification consisted of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the project monitoring report and monitoring plan implementation; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders with an on-site visit as well as review of project activities; iii) the resolution of outstanding issues and internal technical review followed by the issuance of the final verification report and opinion. In the course of the verification process 3 corrective actions (CAR), 1 clarification (CL) and 1 Forward Action Request were raised, all have been successfully closed.

The purpose of the assessment was to determine the conformance of the project with respect to the VCS Version 4 Standard; the Third Edition of the CCB Standard; The field visit took place from 16 November 2022 to 21 November 2022 in which the audit team visited the project area, interviewed key stakeholders, staff and other related experts, and also reviewed the CCB-VCS-MR and supporting documents. The scope of the verification was to assess the conformance of information in the project design document with the VCS and CCB standards.

Hence, once all issues detected were appropriately solved, AENOR carried out a final verification report and deems with reasonable level of assurance that the project complies with all 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.

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	5
1.1	Objective	5
1.2	Scope and Criteria	5
1.3	Level of Assurance.....	6
1.4	Summary Description of the Project	6
2	VERIFICATION PROCESS	7
2.1	Audit Team Composition (<i>Rules 4.3.1</i>)	7
2.2	Method and Criteria.....	8
2.3	Document Review	9
2.4	Interviews	14
2.5	Site Inspections	18
2.6	Resolution of Findings.....	21
2.7	Eligibility for Validation Activities	21
3	VALIDATION FINDINGS	21
3.1	Participation under Other GHG Programs	21
3.2	Methodology Deviations.....	22
3.3	Project Description Deviations (<i>Rules 3.5.7 – 3.5.10</i>)	24
3.4	Minor Changes to Project Description (<i>Rules 3.5.6</i>).....	24
3.5	Grouped Project (G1.13 – G1.15, G4.1)	24
4	VERIFICATION FINDINGS.....	24
4.1	Public Comments (<i>Rules 4.6</i>)	24
4.2	Summary of Project Benefits.....	24
4.3	General.....	25
4.4	Climate	39
4.5	Community	61
4.6	Biodiversity	65
4.7	Additional Project Implementation Information	69
4.8	Additional Project Impact Information	69
5	VERIFICATION CONCLUSION.....	70
6	Appendix 1: Verification findings	71
7	Appendix 2: attendance lists of the onsite audit	76

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

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

- The extent to which methods and procedures, including monitoring procedures, have been implemented in accordance with the validated project description, including the monitoring plan.
- The extent to which GHG emission reductions and removals reported in the monitoring report are materially accurate.
- The accuracy of the processes and activities carried out under the CCB standards which have also been implemented under the monitoring plan.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

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 CCB and VCS PDD, throughout the monitoring period from 15 September 2016 – 31 December 2020.

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 CCB and VCS PDD 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 applicable to the project;
- The types of GHGs that are applicable to the project; and
- The project monitoring period
- The climate, community, and biodiversity benefits.

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

- VCS Standard v4.1 issued 22 April 2021
- VCS Program Guide v4.0 issued 19 September 2019
- Program Definitions v4.0 issued 19 September 2019
- AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v4.0 issued 19 September 2019
- CCB Program Rules v3.1 issued 21 June 2017
- CCB Standard v3.1 issued 21 June 2017
- CCB Program Definitions v3.0 issued 21 June 2017

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

1.3 Level of Assurance

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

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

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

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

Chinko is a unique area where savannah and tropical forest meet; the diversity of habitats, such as humid Congolian lowland forests, Sudanian woodland savannas, dry edaphic grasslands and swampy floodplains, creates a complex ecosystem with an extraordinary diversity of wildlife and sustains an abundance of natural resources. The Chinko Conservation Area REDD+ Project (CCA) is an initiative held by African Parks CAR through a public-private partnership agreement with the Ministry of Water, Forest, Hunting and Fishing. The project is intended as a grouped one, in eastern CAR in the prefectures of Mbomou, Haute-Kotto, Haut-Mbomou.

The overall objective of the project is to secure the core protected area of eastern CAR and to ensure positive influence over the surrounding areas in order to restore and improve ecosystem functions and habitat for wildlife, through law enforcement and conservation activities. The project will also bring opportunities for community development and for nature conservation and continue to strengthen the African Parks (AAPP) management team. This will be an effort oriented towards improving the lives and livelihoods of local communities, who have been consulted extensively through a participatory approach and have identified several activities that will have a positive impact on their lives and livelihoods. A comprehensive land use plan will ensure that positive benefits are maximized, guaranteeing that the area is protected in the future and that critical ecosystem services are maintained.

The project has also implemented activities focused on the restoration and maintenance of ecosystems and enhancing the status of endangered species, as well as increasing the wildlife population. Buffer areas have been established for sustainable fishing, hunting and the use of non-timber products for local communities and a comprehensive land-use plan that will establish pastoralism corridors for the herders to utilize in the long term is being finalized, during this monitoring period African Parks succeeded to actively involve all major communities in the periphery of Chinko to contribute to the land use plan to establish long-term strategies to use natural resources sustainably. Extensive engagement and sensitization activities have been carried out with all local communities and transhumant pastoralists in the area.

The measures to be implemented are focused on targeting the main agents and drivers of deforestation and conversion, in order to give new opportunities that create change in the agents' behaviour. These activities include: sensitization of the local communities and transhumance pastoralists, the establishment of sustainable practices, increase of employment opportunities, and continuation of biodiversity monitoring and protection of forest and grassland areas from human intervention among others. The success in the implementation of these activities has resulted in the generation greenhouse gases (GHG) emission reductions. Additionally, by preserving the natural ecosystems in Chinko, the biodiversity in the protected area is impacted positively due to a reduction in anthropogenic disturbance.

The project start date is 15 September 2016 and the crediting period runs from 15 September 2016 to 14 April 2045. Overall, as a result of the different activities carried out during this monitoring period, it has been possible to reduce deforestation in the project area compared with the baseline scenario, resulting in the generation 1,438,468 (tCO₂e) net emissions reduction for the 2016 – 2020 period, according to the Non-Permanence Risk assessment the buffer discount obtained was 6.5% but the minimum assumed is 10%, therefore, after applying the buffer the amount of tradable VCUs in the period is 1,294,618.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Audit Team Composition (*Rules 4.3.1*)

Name	Position in the team
Javier Cócera Cañas	Lead auditor
Carlos Jiménez	Auditor
Elena Llorente	Auditor
Daniel Masika	CCBs Technical Expert
José Luis Fuentes	Technical Reviewer

The auditors have both English and Spanish language proficiency. The auditors have experience in social and cultural issues. They have been auditing CDM, VCS, CCB and GS projects in AENOR for more than 6 years all around the world.

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

Carlos Jimenez is a Forestry Engineer and holds Master in Rural Development. He has 10 years of experience in natural resources management and sustainable development. His experience covers working with public and private sector, as well as civil society organizations; with focus in forest risk commodities, community-based development projects, and consultancy on ecosystem services. Since

2016 he works as an auditor of sustainable forest management (FSC) and forest carbon certification schemes (VCS, CCB) in Latin America and Asia.

Elena Llorente has a degree in Environmental Sciences, she has more than 15 years of experience in Sustainable development projects having worked as lead validator/verifier in CDM and other voluntary schemes. She is expert in Climate, Community and Biodiversity aspects.

Daniel Masika is a Kenyan-based expert with experience in Climate Change, food security, and livelihood programs. His background consists of a bachelor in Agriculture and soil Sciences with modeling of cropping and agroforestry systems at the Master of philosophy level. Daniel has worked extensively in the NGO world to provide technical expertise and support food security, livelihood programs, agroforestry, disaster risk reduction, and natural resources management, and climate-smart agriculture technologies. In the past three years, Daniel has supported many REDD+ and forest restoration project audits under VCS and the CCBs protocols. Daniel can speak Swahili and has a deep knowledge of the social and cultural livelihoods of Africa.

José Luis Fuentes is the manager of the Climate Change Unit of AENOR. He is a Forestry Engineer and has a Master in Business Administration and a Post-Graduate in Environmental Management. He has more than 15 years of experience in auditing, consulting and training activities related to environmental and carbon management projects. Jose Luis has actively participated in the audit of international sustainable development projects in several carbon schemes, such as the Clean Development Mechanisms (CDM), Verified Carbon Standard (VCS), Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards (CCB), Gold Standard (GS) and carbon footprints (ISO 14067 and ISO 14064). Jose Luis has extensive technical knowledge about the regulatory framework, policies and technical provisions emanating from the Paris Agreement, the Kyoto Protocol and the Conferences of the Parties.

2.2 Method and Criteria

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

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

Previous to the start of the auditing process, the VVB developed an audit and sampling plan to obtain a general view of the audit, managing the times, the method and the criteria among other topics, and including as relevant part of the document, the way in which the VVB is going to assess the different parts of the project. In this sampling plan, there is a schedule for each activity, considering the field visit, stakeholder interviews, desk review and so on. The sampling of the different activities, such as the stakeholder interviews has been performed randomly, getting the whole boundaries of the project, with enough representation to reach the confirmed uncertainty. In this case of Chinko, as the project area is uninhabited, and only Chinko staff is working inside, the limits have been expanded to interview people from communities and external stakeholders.

AENOR reproduced and verified 100% of sheets in the spreadsheet of emission reduction calculations /86-92/ and the data-calculations carried out in those sheets for the monitoring period for the project area. The project area was 100% checked using the GIS database and shape files /153-172/ and also it was contrasted by GPS coordinates during the onsite visit. The carbon calculations were also 100% verified and crosschecked with validated values.

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

- To verify the correct application of the methodology (formulae, equations.) and checked that data required to calculate the GHG 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 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 are appropriately detailed in section 2.3 of this report.
- Cross-checked evidence: AENOR cross-checked the collected information through an on-site inspection to the project area and reproducing calculations. Also, complementary technical meetings were carried out to ensure the accuracy of the data and improve the following.

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

2.3 Document Review

The monitoring report /2/, project description, and supporting documentation were carefully reviewed for conformance to the verification criteria and consistency with the validated project. The audit team examined the baseline data gathered from the baseline determined for this Region, spreadsheets used to enter, and compile information required by the methodology and reproduced the GHG emissions reductions calculations presented in the spreadsheet models to obtain same results than those appearing in the Monitoring report. The Non-Permanence Risks Report /113/ for this monitoring period was assessed, as well.

The list of all documents reviewed from the client for this validation is the following. Note that along this validation report, supporting evidences (documents, interviews) are referred by its number in first column of the lists in sections 2.3 and 2.4, as well as the onsite visit activities carried out and reported in section 2.5.

Evidence assessed	
Main documents	
1	231115_MR_Chinko_REDD_CAR_2R.docx
2	231115_MR_Chinko_REDD_CAR_2R_clean.docx
3	MR_Summary_Chinko_REDD_CAR_EN.docx
4	MR_Summary_Chinko_REDD_CAR_FR.docx
Supports	
5	Profil socio-économique du Mbomou.pdf
6	Profil socio-écq HKoto.pdf
Contracts women	
7	Avenant Contrat de Travail MAYE Manuela.pdf
8	Consultancy Agreement Inas Basha 20201105@1510_LL sign 20201106(1).pdf
9	Contrat Consultante SDAT BOLIDI Kéranie.pdf
10	Contrat de Travail MAYE MANUELA.pdf
11	Contrat Evelyne.pdf
12	Contrat KATCHIAMATCHI Ida.pdf
13	Contrat Lisa.pdf
14	Contrat.pdf
15	Signed contract-FRANCINE LAURE MELA FOKAM_09-12-2020-080554 (002)_DG_SIGN.pdf
Reports	
16	APN_AnnualReport_2014_English.pdf
17	APN_AnnualReport_2015_English.pdf
18	APN_AnnualReport_2016_English.pdf
19	APN_AnnualReport_2017_English.pdf
20	APN_AnnualReport_2018_English.pdf
21	APN_AnnualReport_2019_English.pdf
22	APN_AnnualReport_2020_English.pdf
23	2016(Oct)-2017(Dec) - USAID_GCPA.pdf
24	2018(Jan)-2018(Dec) - USAID_GCPA.pdf
25	2019(Jan)-2019(Dec) - USAID_GCPA and 2018(Jun)-2019(Dec)_CBCWT.pdf
26	2020(Jan)-2020(Dec) - USAID_GCPA and CBCWT.pdf
27	Fiche de presence.pdf
28	Fiche de suivi des séances de distribution.pdf
29	Fiche de suivi des séances de sensibilisation.pdf
30	Suivi Radio.pdf
31	Transhumance Revue.pdf
32	Transhumance.pdf
33	Pastoralism_2016-2021_Chinko_Aebischer-Thierry.pdf
34	Pastoralisme_durable-controlé_SDAT_APN-Chinko_Aire-de-Conservation-de-Chinko_Aebischer-Thierry.pdf
35	Pastoralisme-non-controlé_SDAT_APN-Chinko_Aire-de-Conservation-de-Chinko_Aebischer-Thierry.pdf
36	1 - Dry season 2018-2019 - Pastoralism events.pdf
37	2 - Dry season 2019-2020 - Pastoralism events.pdf

38	3 - Dry season 2020-2021 - Pastoralism events.pdf
39	4 - Dry season 2021-2022 - Pastoralism events.pdf
40	2017 - 2018 - Transhumance Awareness Program.pdf
41	2018_2019.jpg
42	2019_2020.jpg
43	2020_2021.jpg
44	2021_2022.jpg
Stakeholder engagement	
45	agroforestrie et foresterie APN small.pdf
46	Pastoralism_APN-Chinko_Aire-de-Conservation-de-Chinko_Aebischer-Thierry.pdf
47	Stakeholder engagement summary.pdf
48	Février 2020_Fiches de sensibilisation.pdf
49	Fevrier 2020_sensibilisation faites par les chasseurs formés.pdf
50	janvier 2020.pdf
51	juillet 2020_Fiche de présence pour les réunion et sensibilisation.pdf
52	lettre de demande de création du groupement envoyée par la communauté..pdf
Grievances	
53	1er PV Negociation Grille Salariale.pdf
54	2nd PV Négociation Grille Salariale.pdf
55	APN Grievance Mechanism V1.1.1_2020.pdf
56	PV CONTENTIEUX GERES AVEC LE DRT ET LA DELEGATION.pdf
57	PV de la rencontre Delegués-Chefs des Departements-Consultant RH.pdf
58	PV Election delegués.pdf
59	PV signé Reunion de 08 Mai à Kocho.pdf
Trainings	
60	2016 Final Training Report.pdf
61	2017 - AP LAW ENFORCEMENT SOPs V. 1.2017.pdf
62	2020 - APN Law Enforcement SOP Manual V1.1.1_2020.pdf
63	2020.01.12 - MelSys-Comprehensive Course Report-APN-CHINKO-CAR-JAN2020.pdf
64	2020.01.12 - MelSys-Ranger Competency Reports-APN-CHINKO-CAR-JAN2020.pdf
65	2022 - RAPPORT FINAL BFR CHINKO 2022.pdf
CVs and contracts	
66	Aebischer_Thierry_CV.pdf
67	Career Summary BLAISE 1 page summary (1).pdf
68	CURRICULUM VITAE-Armand Program-112020.docx
69	CV - Christian Makaya.doc
70	CV henry Engv20191128@1213.ok.pdf
71	CV Lisa Innotti 2020.pdf
72	CV LUNGREN Loren 2020 English.docx
73	Dr Arsène WETESHE_CV.pdf
74	Contrat Eco-Moniteur BAMBALO Modeste.pdf
75	Contrat Eco-Moniteur MABINGUI Lebon.pdf
76	Contrat Eco-Moniteur WAGALET Serge.pdf

77	Contrat Ranger ABROU Teddy.pdf
78	Contrat RANGER NDARAKOTTO Parfait.pdf
79	Contrat RANGER TOMORO Ali.pdf
80	Lettre d'engagement RANGER ABROU Teddy.pdf
81	Lettre d'engagement RANGER NDARAKOTTO Parfait.pdf
82	Lettre d'engagement RANGER TOMORO Ali.pdf
Financial health and Cash flow	
83	210317_CashFlow_2017_2030.xlsx
Policies and SOPs	
84	APN Human Rights Statement of Principles.pdf
85	APN Law Enforcement SOP Manual.pdf
Climate and spreadsheets	
86	MR 99-103 Allometry.docx
87	MR 33_Burned_areas_dNBR_plots.xlsx
88	MR 90_Data analysis.pdf
89	MR 92_Carbon Plots Coordinates.xlsx
90	MR 92_Carbon plots.shp
91	MR 99-103 Allometry.pdf
92	231115_ExPost_ER summary.xlsx 231115_VM0009_FU3_ExPost_ER_PAA1.xlsx 231115_VM0009_FU3_ExPost_ER_PAA2.xlsx 231115_VM0009_FU3_Expost_ER_PAA3.xlsx
Other evidence	
95	Records of animals.JPG
96	Records of animals.JPG
97	Chimpanzee-nests_Western-CCA_5.912582N 23.463645E 20200810_112519.jpg
98	First documentation of breeding chimpanzees far west of the Chinko River - 5.871289N 23.443788E ccf - Aebischer Thierry - 06300176.JPG
99	First documentation of breeding chimpanzees far west of the Chinko River - 5.871289N 23.443788E ccf - Aebischer Thierry - 06300177.JPG
100	Chinko focal species estimated densities and actual numbers 2012-2020 - Densité estimée et nombre réel d'espèces focales de chinko 2012-2020.xlsx
101	2013_An Update on African Elephant Loxodonta Africana in the ChinkoMbari Drainage Basin, CAR.pdf
102	2013_Chinko - Evidence of African wild dogs in the Central African Republic.pdf
103	2017_Chinko - Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii - Aebischer et al Supplement.pdf
104	2017_Chinko - Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii.pdf
105	2019_Apex predators decline after an influx of pastoralists in former Central.pdf
106	2020_A sparse occupancy model to quantify species interactions in time and space.pdf
107	Chinko Large Mammal Survey 2012-01.pdf
108	Chinko Large Mammal Survey 2017-01.pdf
109	Chinko Large Mammal Survey 2018-01.pdf
110	Chinko Large Mammal Survey 2019-01.pdf
111	Comptage des animaux - Aire de Conservation de Chinko - 2020 - Aebischer Thierry.pdf
112	diversity_of_forest_carnivores_in_Chinko_recorded_at_one_location_within_few_weeks.PNG
170	Etude socioéconomique de Chinko et sa Périphérie. African Park Network. 2020.

NPRR – Non-Permanence Risk Report	
113	221209_Chinko-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report PDD.docx
114	221209_Chinko-Risk-Report-Calculation-Tool.xls
115	1. Internal Risks\210818_CashFlow_2017_2030.xlsx
116	1. Internal Risks\Conservation agreements\2014_Chinko 50 year agreement signed.pdf
117	1. Internal Risks\Conservation agreements\2020_Chinko 25 year agreement signed.pdf
118	1. Internal Risks\Conservation agreements\Journal Officiel.pdf
119	1. Internal Risks\CVs\Operations manager - Loren Lungren\CV LUNGREN Loren 2020 English.docx
120	1. Internal Risks\CVs\5. Research Manager Thierry Aebischer\Aebischer_Thierry_CV.pdf
121	1. Internal Risks\CVs\2. Head of Finance Christian Makaya\CV - Christian Makaya.doc
122	1. Internal Risks\CVs\4. HR & Admin Manager Henry Dunia\CV henry Engv20191128@1213.ok.pdf
123	1. Internal Risks\CVs\6. SPM Alizath Minoti\CV Lisa Minotti 2020.pdf
124	1. Internal Risks\CVs\3. Health Manager Dr Arsene\Dr Arsène WETESHE_CV.pdf
125	1. Internal Risks\CVs\Park manager - Olivier Blaise\Career Summary BLAISE 1 page summary (1).pdf
126	1. Internal Risks\CVs\1. ECOFAC Cordin Armand Serge\CURRICULUM VITAE-Armand Program-112020.docx
127	1. Internal Risks\Project Longevity\Institutional path PPP 2020\0 - Introduction.docx
128	1. Internal Risks\Project Longevity\Institutional path PPP 2020\01 - CHINKO - Chinko 50 year agreement signed.pdf
129	1. Internal Risks\Project Longevity\Institutional path PPP 2020\1 - Dec 2018 - Participatory workshop to review the draft of PPP-Chinko.pdf
130	1. Internal Risks\Project Longevity\Institutional path PPP 2020\02 - MOU APN-CP signed.pdf
131	1. Internal Risks\Project Longevity\Institutional path PPP 2020\2 - Jav 2019 - Meeting to review articles of the draft PPP-Chinko.pdf
132	1. Internal Risks\Project Longevity\Institutional path PPP 2020\3 - May 2019 - Communication to the Council of Ministers regarding the PPP agreement to be signed with APN.pdf
133	1. Internal Risks\Project Longevity\Institutional path PPP 2020\4 - July 3 2019 - Interministerial committee to review & approve the PPP agreement.pdf
134	1. Internal Risks\Project Longevity\Institutional path PPP 2020\5 - July 9-10 2019 - Fifth interministerial committee workshop to review & approve the PPP between CAR and APN.pdf
135	1. Internal Risks\Project Longevity\Institutional path PPP 2020\6 - July 17-18 2019 - Briefing note for the Council of Ministers regarding the PPP between APN & CAR gvt.pdf
136	1. Internal Risks\Project Longevity\Institutional path PPP 2020\7 - July 29 2019 - Notification of approval from the Council of Ministers to have the Chinko PPP signed by the Minister of W&F.pdf
137	1. Internal Risks\Project Longevity\Institutional path PPP 2020\8 - July 31 2019 - Request to the CAR Assembly from the Ministry of Water and Forest to get the approval to sign the Chinko PPP with APN.pdf
138	1. Internal Risks\Project Longevity\Institutional path PPP 2020\9 - Jan 15 2020 - Audition of the Ministry of W&F by the Assembly Office regarding the Chinko PPP to be signed.pdf
139	1. Internal Risks\Project Longevity\Institutional path PPP 2020\10 - Apr 2 2020 - Decision of the Assembly notified by its President to authorize the Minister of W&F to signed the Chinko PPP.pdf
140	1. Internal Risks\Project Longevity\Institutional path PPP 2020\A. Letter from the President of the Economic & Social Council of the Assembly to the President of the Assembly regarding the PPP Chinko.pdf
141	2. External Risks\Political Risk\wgidataset.xlsx
142	2. External Risks\Community Engagement\SDAT 2019-2020.pdf

143	3. Natural Risks\Fire analysis\Burned_areas_dNBR.xlsx
144	3. Natural Risks\Fire analysis\Fire management plan Eastern CAR.pdf
145	3. Natural Risks\Extreme Weather\Flood Risk_CAR.pdf
146	3. Natural Risks\Extreme Weather\Droughts\2014_Koerner et al.pdf
147	3. Natural Risks\Extreme Weather\Droughts\2015_Ruppert et al.pdf
148	3. Natural Risks\Extreme Weather\Droughts\2015_Zeppel et al.pdf
149	3. Natural Risks\Extreme Weather\Droughts\2019_Sankaran.pdf
150	3. Natural Risks\Pest and Disease\1999_Knops et al.pdf
151	3. Natural Risks\Pest and Disease\2008_Heong.pdf
152	3. Natural Risks\Pest and Disease\2015_Pfaffle et al.pdf
GIS	
153	André Félix National Park.shp
154	Country limit .shp
155	Hunting_Zones.shp
156	Project Area.shp
157	Reference Areas.shp
158	Villages.shp
159	Yata Ngaya Wildlife Reserve.shp
160	Zémongo Wildlife Reserve.shp
161	Project Area.shp
162	Villages.shp
163	20221214_Leakbelt_Chinko.shp
164	Carbon plots.shp
165	PAAAs.shp
166	HCV_Chinko.shp
167	Land_cover_2015_2016.tif
168	LC_eligible_sa_amend.tif
169	ASLAs.shp
171	PAA1_Eligible.kmz PAA2_Eligible.kmz PAA3_Eligible.kmz Leakage_Eligible.kmz Project Area.kmz Reference Area.kmz Proxy Area.kmz Instance Area.kmz

2.4 Interviews

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

The field visit took place from 16/11/2022 to 21/11/2022 in which the audit team visited the project area, interviewed key stakeholders, staff and other related experts, and also reviewed the monitoring report and supporting documents. The people interviewed were those directly affected or involved in the project

activity and in some cases were just indirectly affected. Finally, some activities stated within the MR were also reviewed during the on-site visit and verified with the information provided. AENOR was the responsible of selecting the people to interview after the PP provided the full list of employees, the organizational chart or the roles of different people among the communities. AENOR decided which ones of the lists were selected to be interviewed, individually or in group. The interviews were carried out in different rooms in which the audit team had the opportunity to ask about everything related to the project, engagement, grievances or whatever without their declarations being affected. In the places out of Kocho, for example in Bangassou, where AENOR interviewed community people, the VVB used two school rooms to perform the interviews.

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

	Name	Role/Relation to the Project	Date of Physical interview
1	Cathrine Hoffman Jensen	AP CAR Special Projects Manager	16/11/2022
2	Ellie Lamare	AP CAR – Funding & Reporting Manager in Chinko	16/11/2022
3	Matthias De Beenhouwer	Nature based Solutions Manager	16/11/2022
4	Davor Basanic	Law Enforcement Mentor	16/11/2022
5	Pierre-Etienne Martineau	Financial Controller	16/11/2022
6	Arsene Weteshe	Doctor	16/11/2022
7	Thierry Aebischer	Conservation Manager AP CAR	16/11/2022
8	Adama Bourba	Community Representative Damaye	17/11/2022
9	Ramabu Adamou	Community Representative Hauda	17/11/2022
10	Alima Bourba	Community Representative damage	17/11/2022
11	Awa Oussman	Community Representative Orda	17/11/2022
12	Naruam Tilne	Community Representative Damaye	17/11/2022
13	Manon Labourer	Transhumance coordinator AP CAR	17/11/2022
14	Adam Bilal	Responsable De la FNEC - Fédération Nationale des Eleveurs Centrafricains National Fédération of Central African Herders	17/11/2022
15	Hamza Mahamat	Rakaja tribesman merchant	17/11/2022
16	Ibrahim Suleiman	Livestock Merchant	17/11/2022
17	Mahamat Ibrahim	Livestock Merchant	17/11/2022
18	Hiszome Bello	Livestock Merchant	17/11/2022
19	Ali Osman	Livestock Merchant	17/11/2022
20	Amadai Oumon	Livestock Merchant	17/11/2022
21	Mahamat Dazi	Livestock Merchant	17/11/2022
22	Mahamat Abdalla Oussman	Livestock Merchant	17/11/2022
23	Amadou mahamat	Livestock Merchant	17/11/2022
24	Paul Nestor Nodji	Technicien SUP Chief Sector	17/11/2022
25	Joshua Jackman	Pilot AP CAR	17/11/2022
26	Alfaya Aroune	Transhumance pastoralist	17/11/2022
27	Hamza Amat	Transhumance pastoralist	17/11/2022
28	Oussman Soudami	Transhumance pastoralist	17/11/2022

29	Nora Idriss	Transhumance pastoralist	17/11/2022
30	Amat Adulaya	Transhumance pastoralist	17/11/2022
31	Aladji Siroma	Transhumance pastoralist	17/11/2022
32	Tignassi Iocéis Armard	AP CAR worker Welding	18/11/2022
33	Mamadou Aroun	AP CAR worker Mechanic	18/11/2022
34	Balinga Privat	AP CAR worker Cook/chef	18/11/2022
35	Mohamed Hady Oumazo	AP CAR Assistant Director Transhumance	18/11/2022
36	Boukar Ghislain	AP CAR Responsible for ECHO team	18/11/2022
37	Mahamat Adoun	AP CAR Responsible for TANGO team	18/11/2022
38	Kpemalema Edjand	AP CAR instructor	18/11/2022
39	Moundougou Erica	AP CAR Ranger (woman)	18/11/2022
40	Nandanest Cyrc	AP CAR Responsible for the laboratory	18/11/2022
41	Kikili Saint	AP CAR Assistant Supretendant control room	18/11/2022
42	Bassoumba Justin	AP CAR Controller (Control room)	18/11/2022
43	Saad Zakaria	AP CAR Chef Dop	18/11/2022
44	Florine Kolobo	AP CAR Responsible for logistics	18/11/2022
45	Siguindo Guy	AP CAR SDAT	18/11/2022
46	Kabba Dalui Sonzo	AP CAR Admin Human resources	18/11/2022
47	Bazenko Urbain	Community President Hunting Association Bakouma	18/11/2022
48	Babili Armand	Community President Hunting Association Ouanda	18/11/2022
49	Foulou Samson	Community President youth Association Nzako	18/11/2022
50	Baka Grace Odieu	Community President youth Association Ndéguirou	18/11/2022
51	Yangolimi Peguy	Community President OFCA women group Kitika	18/11/2022
52	Dagboute Odile	Community President OFCA women group Vougba Balifondo	18/11/2022
53	Lafandeya Peter A	Community President of farmers group Bakouma	18/11/2022
54	Manzaya Lorista	Community President of youth Vougba	18/11/2022
55	Dadagba Jean	Community representative Ndéguirou	18/11/2022
56	Nasrou Ruffin	Community President Miners Fode community	18/11/2022
57	Boka Ambroise	Cultivator fisherman Lengo community	18/11/2022
58	Magazin Roger	Chief of Gbolo Village	18/11/2022
59	Mbolifouefele Gabin	Depute Bakouma	19/11/2022
60	Maleyad A cyrice	Sous Prefect Bangassou	19/11/2022
61	Guekpou Armand	President Federal Peche Bangassou	19/11/2022
62	Ali Theophile	Directeur régional d'élevage et de la santé animale du Mbomou	19/11/2022
63	Ngbassayo Jean	AP CAR Point Focal Djemah	19/11/2022
64	Bengeure Pionette	Prefect Mbomou	19/11/2022
65	Adam Idris Sende	Depute Bakouma Ouanda-Djallé	19/11/2022
66	Bendot-Gueguet Yacka	Sous Prefect Yalinga	19/11/2022
67	Jean M. Zepio	Sultan Rafaï	19/11/2022
68	Masango Iréné	President De La Jeunesse Nzacko	19/11/2022
69	Bolongo Daniel	Animateur Groupe de Concertation pour le Développement Local Local Committee of Concertation and Development - (GCDL) Dembia	19/11/2022
70	NHI-Lecket Geoffrey	Representative of artisanal Miners Fodé	19/11/2022
71	Presley Koyaweda	AP CAR Community development manager	19/11/2022
72	Jean Baptiste Mamang Kanga	Park Manager Chinko	20/11/2022
73	Binza Bongo	Sultan of Rafaï representative	20/11/2022

	Joseph		
74	Akoumbayo Simon	Counsellor of Rafaï	20/11/2022
75	Rafaï Marcel	Representant Pecheur in Rafaï	20/11/2022
76	Ngama Germain	Representative of Agriculture in Rafaï	20/11/2022
77	Makadounga Christoph	Representant Chasseur	20/11/2022
78	Kitipou Junior	English teacher in Rafaï	20/11/2022
79	Abdamane Ndjaiga	Head of herders group	20/11/2022
80	Salle Bamy	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
81	Aladji Amadou Dingi	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
82	Aladji Oumarou	Imam Rafaï	20/11/2022
83	Manoum Amadou	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
84	Doubairou Ndjaiga	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
85	Salli Issa	Chef Village in Arolo	20/11/2022
86	Adamou Salle	President Jeunesse	20/11/2022
87	Seni Amadjoda	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
88	Nounou Labi	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
89	Issa Anadjoda	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
90	Arouna Labi	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
91	Ismael Oumarou	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
92	Mamoud Issa	Conveilleur	20/11/2022
93	Amadou Laby	Cultivateur Eleveur	20/11/2022
94	Kangamago Arubeni	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
95	Molinabarani Fulbert	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
96	Kindo Meshin	Echo-monitor AP CAR Chinko	20/11/2022
97	Lifaky Reny	Echo-monitor AP CAR Chinko	20/11/2022
98	Padio Wilfrid	Echo-monitor AP CAR Chinko	20/11/2022
99	Saraka Nanasse	Echo-monitor AP CAR Chinko	20/11/2022
100	Jounoussa Alihou	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
101	Hadhamou Issa	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
102	Oumarou Aridou	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
103	Jahouba Sali	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
104	Hanadou Adamou	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
105	Alison Anadjoda	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
106	Abdoukarine Labi	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
107	Boubakari Sali	Herder Rafaï	20/11/2022
108	Soule GILdas	Chief of Staff in the General Ministry of Environment CAR	21/11/2022
109	Mageot Serge	In Charge of the Mission of the Ministry of Environment	21/11/2022
110	Ndedti Celestin	Director of cabinet Ministry of Environment	21/11/2022
111	Yatolimepale Achille	Director Police de Environment	21/11/2022
112	Ndjiki Master	In Charge of the Mission of the Ministry of Environment	21/11/2022
113	Leif Brottem	Grinnel College - Expert in transhumance and pastoralism in protected areas in Western and Central Africa	26/10/2022
114	Simon Rico Correa	Senior Project Coordinator at South Pole	Throughout the audit
115	Jonathan Konz	Technical Advisor at South Pole	30/07/2021
116	William Martinez	GIS Expert at South Pole	30/07/2021
117	Sofia Lozano	GIS expert at South Pole	28/09/2023

The original attendance lists of interviewees are found in Appendix 2.

2.5 Site Inspections

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

- Ensure that the geographic area of the project as reported in the MR and PDD and the supporting KML is in accordance with the VCS standard 4.1
- Perform a risk-based review of the project area to ensure that the project conforms to all other requirements of the VCS rules and the methodology.
- 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 4.1.8 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; and
- Interview local authorities 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
- Interview local stakeholders, staff and other people involved in the project
- Review activities such as patrolling, monitoring or trainings.

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

Activities	Location	Date	Duration (hours estimated)	Day
Arrival Bangui	Bangui	15/11/2022	Not applicable	0
Stay in Bangui	Bangui	15/11/2022	Not applicable	
Flight from Bangui to Kocho	Bangui	16/11/2022	Not applicable	1
Initial meeting Presentation of the audit team. Confirmation of the audit plan	Kocho	16/11/2022	2h	
Working with Chinko management team day 1 • The audit team will dedicate to Interview and perform meetings with stakeholders such as: ○ Project proponent ○ African Parks' workers • Verification of the implementation schedule • Review of the installations • Verification of tourism implementation	Kocho	16/11/2022	6h	
Trip to International Herders Area	Kocho – Sam-Ouandja	17/11/2022	1h	2

Meetings with International Herders - Interviews and meetings with stakeholders: Transhumant pastoralists - Observation of herder's area delimitation - Activities implemented to control damages from pastoralists.	Sam-Ouandja	17/11/2022	6h	
	Trip to Kocho	Sam-Ouandja – Kocho	17/11/2022	
Working with Chinko management team day 2 - Continue with verification of implementation activities of previous day. - Stakeholder engagement: - Access and dissemination of documentation - Informational meetings and information about costs, risks and benefits as well as the verification visit. - Stakeholder participation in decision. - Policies of the project Equal opportunities and rights laws	Kocho	18/11/2022	8h	3
Flight from Kocho to Bangassou	Kocho – Bangassou	19/11/2022	1,5h	4
Discuss with the communities' representatives. Group meetings. - Interviews and meetings with stakeholders: - Local communities - Land-use and economic activities (slash-burn agriculture, Livestock, Hunting, Fishing, Harvesting of NTFPs, Artisanal mining, Trade...)	Bangassou	19/11/2022	5 h	
Flight from Bangassou to Kocho	Bangassou - Kocho	19/11/2022	1,5h	
Working with Chinko management team day 3 - The audit team checked the implementation of activities in the project area related to training, patrolling, monitoring, reporting, etc. Other activities would be regarding climate impacts but also to Community and Biodiversity such as inventories, reports of monitoring. Definitely the assessment of evidence physical, documental and testimonial for pending issues and others. - Wrap up in Kocho and pending issues	Kocho / Rafai	20/11/2022	8h	5

Flight to Bangui	Kocho - Bangui	21/11/2022	1,5	6
Final day /pending issues/ • Project ownership • Climate and carbon calculation • Ministry of environment (representatives) • Other topics depending on logistic • Final meeting and closure of the audit	Kocho	21/11/2022	6,5h	

Specifically, day 1 was dedicated to arriving at the HQ of AP CAR (Kocho), where the management team and the employees are working in the CCA project. The initial meeting was conducted and a brief presentation about Chinko, benefits and problems was carried out by Thierry Aebischer. After that, the management team was presented, and some interviews were carried out. The review of the facilities was the last task of the day.

Day 2 was dedicated in the morning to fly to the transhumant pastoralists area. It was a two-hour flight in which the VVB had the chance to view the Chinko and CAR landscape, analyzing the different ecosystems mentioned in the PDD while discussing with the pilots of each aircraft. The pilots also explained their roles in the daily task of patrolling and surveillance from the air as well as the way in which the data and parameters they gathered from the air were shared with the rest of the team. On arrival at Sam-Ouandja (Sam-Ouandja is a town located in the Central African Republic prefecture of Haute-Kotto near the border with Sudan. It has historically served as important arms trafficking hub for armed groups in Central African Republic), several interviews were performed with merchants, women, and the important group of transhumant pastoralists. The whole day was dedicated to interview these relevant groups and during the return to Kocho, more explanations about the project were provided by the pilots. The aerial view of Kocho from the aircraft was the last task of the day.

Day 3 was fully dedicated to interviewing staff from Chinko such as employees and other community members that were invited to Kocho. In these cases, the interviews were carried out individually or in groups of 2-3 people together with the audit team. The interviews were focused on assessing the risks, costs and benefits; the documents and information sharing; the participation in the process; their rights about employees; the outside effects of the projects; the conditions in the area pre and post project implementation, etc.

Day 4, the audit team moved to Bangassou, where the CAPEP was being carried out. There, several interviews were performed with local communities, and within this group, there were people from various roles and sectors, such as hunters, fishermen, miners, leaders, or chiefs, etc. At the end, AENOR was introduced into all the CAPEP participants and asked about comments, doubts, or suggestions about the auditing process or comments about the project. Nothing relevant was mentioned.

Day 5, the audit team was divided in two groups: the first one stayed in Kocho, viewing the infrastructure such as the garage, the storage, the houses, or the chapel, and later, following the echo-monitoring team and the conservation manager in the BD monitoring activities. The installation of trap cameras was explained and showed by the echo team, as well as the track identification activity. The group followed a transect until arriving close to a waterhole. During these tracks, several animals were seen such as warthogs, waterbuck, giant forest hogs and mongoose among others. Finally, the echo-monitoring team

created some early preventing fires as explained in the fire management plan to mitigate the fire risk. The second group flew to Rafai (is a town and sub-prefecture on the Chinko River, in the Central African Republic prefecture of Mbomou) and performed interviews with other community members, including local pastoralists and stakeholders from this area. At the end of the day, both groups went to see the groups of Giant Eland that AP CAR had in captivity for future monitoring and social experiments.

The last day, in the morning, the VVB reviewed policies, cashflow, trainings, medical kits and other topics. The final meeting was carried out in Kocho with all the management team. After that, the VVB flew to Bangui for a final meeting with representatives of the Ministry of Environment. Finally, a review of the calculations was performed between the VVB and the PP (30/07/2021, 15/12/2022 and other communications along the process).

2.6 Resolution of Findings

All documentation provided by the Project Proponent was assessed against the most recent version of the relevant VCS guidance document. Several clarification requests (CL) and corrective action requests (CAR) were raised and submitted to the Project Proponent, which addressed them either by providing to the audit team the requested information or by making the appropriate corrections. Updated versions of the documentation were submitted by the Project Proponent and the audit team reassessed them against the guidance documentation. Specifically, 3 CAR and 1 CL were raised and properly closed.

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 1 of this report.

2.6.1 Forward Action Requests

One Forward Action Requests were raised to the PP during this process.

FAR #1: The entire PAAs will continue to be monitored and managed regardless of the exclusion of certain forest classes in the eligible area of the PAAs (OWS excluded in PAA1, and CCF excluded in PAA2 and PPA3). And activity-shifting leakage area 2 (ASLA2) will continue to be monitored entirely (CCF and OWS land cover), regardless of the exclusion of CCF land cover in PAA2 and PAA2. However, in the next verification event, the PP is requested to prove that no coverage is displaced from OWS land cover in PAA2 and PAA2 to CCF land cover within this PAAs, or if not, consider that area within ASLA2.

2.7 Eligibility for Validation Activities

AENOR has conducted the verification at the same time considering the paragraph 4.1.23 VCS standard. AENOR holds accreditation for validation and verification for the sectoral scope 14. Agriculture, Forestry, Land Use.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

The project has not been registered, and is not seeking registration, under any other GHG programs. The project is looking for validation under the VCS and CCB Program at the same time the verification is being carried out.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

The PP has reported three methodology deviations within this verification event, and are the following:

1. Increase in the number of carbon plots in the project accounting and proxy areas: the project is a grouped one, therefore, have the option to expand the project to new areas in coming verification periods. One of the requirements of the Methodology is that “all plots should be measured for the first verification. All leakage plots should be measured every verification, and all proxy and project accounting area plots at least every five years, or after a significant event that changes stocks”. However, the future limits of the project are not currently within the control of African Parks, so only the controlled areas will be monitored for the first verification. However, the reduction of the area is an improvement of the accuracy, adjusting the monitoring to the biomass estimations of the area. Once the new areas are incorporated to the project, the PP will add new plots and the data will be also available for these sectors. Due to AP is working with the local communities, such carbon plots can be established and used as a community education program.
2. Fire management and biomass emissions: The east of the CAR is one of the few places in the world where conditions can be created that allow processes to run naturally without significant human intervention. Quasi-natural savannah fires do not exist anywhere in the world at present and creating the conditions to bring them about is very complex, notoriously difficult and costly. However, if there is one place that could do it in the next 10-20 years, it is the east of the CAR. To ensure effective management of the habitats of the project area, it is necessary to implement a fire management plan in accordance with the conservation objective of the protected area. Early dry season fires are part of the management tools in protected areas and are a means of preventing late fires which can go easily out of control and potentially harm the parks infrastructure, people or habitats of high conservation value like old growth humid dense forest in the Central African forest-savanna ecotone. Indeed, they promote the production of grasses very appreciated by herbivores and participate in soil conservation. The PP has provided some pictures from NASA in the MR to demonstrate that between February and March of 2019 (which is the driest period), and December 2020 to February of 2021, Chinko is the largest area in the Sudanese and Sahelian savanna belt of North Africa with altered fire patterns that keep larger blocks unburned during the early and main dry seasons and allow for localized hot fires in the late dry season caused by natural events such as lightning strikes during storms in the early rainy season. The cause of this reduction of forest fires is due to the activities implemented by AP such as the avoiding of illegal grazing and mainly the fire management plan, with early dry season preventive fires and aerial burning using pyroshots, which creates small and controlled fires to avoid the great forest fires with devastating consequences and great amounts of GHG emissions to the atmosphere.

The African savannahs evolved with fires, and it can be assumed that over millions of years, storms in the late dry season and early rainy season created localized hot fires due to large amounts of available dry biomass that is easily flammable. Such localized high intensive fires at the early rainy season could alter climax vegetation and initiate natural succession events by killing young trees and shrubs in dense woodlands and creating productive grassland patches that were most likely enhanced and maintained by large herbivore densities. The interaction of late dry season fires and locally intensive herbivory in a humid dystrophic woodland savanna most likely created a heterogeneous landscape with many big trees in an open savanna with thickets of regenerating woodlands as well as productive grassland patches in different succession status on top of the dry and humid edaphic grasslands. Such a landscape with many

large trees in a dynamic mosaic of dense humid forests, open woodland savannas and different grasslands is likely to maximize carbon stocks per unit area over time. Exact conditions, ecological interactions and carbon stock capacities remain therefore speculative and need empirical evidences by a large scale experiment which mimics conditions before human became the main driver of fires and wildlife in the Central African savannah belt.

Then, there is a project activity that leads to GHG emissions, however, as the activity is performed in order to avoid uncontrolled larger fires, the GHG emissions are actually lower than in a baseline scenario without the project, therefore, the deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals, on the opposite, the assumption is conservative since we are not claiming the net gain in biomass obtained due to the fire management activities. In particular, the PP has provided the fires management plan /144/ which has been assessed by AENOR, and also the PP showed to the VVB during the onsite visit the different firebreaks within Chinko that were being performed in November as well as the creation of new ones.

3. Activity-shifting leakage areas delimitation and monitoring: PDR 109 requests “results of a spatial analysis to demonstrate the activity- shifting leakage area is no larger than the project accounting area” for the delineation of the Activity- Shifting Leakage Area. However, given the characteristics of movements of the agents of deforestation, especially the transhumant pastoralists, the PP delineated ASLAs bigger than the PAAs, in order to cover the areas most likely of displacement by the agents based on the monitoring of their movements.

Additionally, it was not possible to perform the assessment of proportion of degradation set out in section B.2.8 of the methodology in all the sectors included as ASLAs through on the ground sampling methods. Therefore, the PP performed a remote sensing monitoring process in which the deforestation occurring within the ASLAs during the first monitoring period will be included as part of the leakage emissions and deducted for the net GHG emission reductions. Once the PP secures funding from carbon credits, the monitoring process of the leakage areas will involve a combination of on the ground sampling and remote sensing techniques.

Deviations from the applied methodology are permitted where they represent a deviation from the criteria and procedures relating to monitoring or measurement set out in the methodology, as it is the case. On the hand, the deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals. In fact, having a bigger area to monitor and using remote sensing processes for evaluating the deforestation occurring within the ASLAs is more conservative.

Overall conclusion

The stated deviations meet with the criteria and specifications for permitted methodology deviations, as they do not negatively affect criteria and procedures relating to monitoring or measurement set out in the methodology. The results of the application of these measures in both cases are conservative, so they do not overestimate the calculation of the reduction of emissions but increase results accuracy. Therefore, in AENOR's opinion, the above deviations are valid. Therefore, the methodology deviations applied to the project are valid, since does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission removals.

This is the first monitoring period, and then there are no previous deviations to be reported. On the other hand, since the process is a joint validation and verification, these three deviations are reported similarly in the PDD.

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

According to the MR, no project description deviations were identified during this monitoring period. The event is a joint validation and first verification.

3.4 Minor Changes to Project Description (*Rules 3.5.6*)

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

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

No new areas have been added to the project since the validation. Therefore, The project area and the project accounting areas are the same ones explained in the PDD.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Public Comments (*Rules 4.6*)

The monitoring report was submitted to the VCS website for a 30-day public comment period from 28 July 2021 to 27 August 2021. No public comments were received during the verification process. The audit team confirmed this issue against public information in VERRA database platform.

4.2 Summary of Project Benefits

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

Data are supported with evidence and records checked during the interview with stakeholders, review of activities implemented and desk review. The section has been completed appropriately with data from the sources provided such as GIS package /153-172/, records of trainings activities /60-65/, employees /66-82/, etc.

As specific and remarkable achievements for the current monitoring period the monitoring report in its section 1.2 states the net emission reductions of 1,438,468 tCO₂e for the monitoring period. It has been assessed with the proper review of the calculations /92/ as final step of the desk review process. The standardized benefit metrics, including: GHG emission reductions or removals; Forest cover; Training; Employment; Livelihoods; Health; Education; Water; Well-being and Biodiversity conservation. The audit team reviewed information reported in this section against supporting evidence listed in section 2.3 and further information referenced in proper sections stated in standardized benefits; complementary, due to the onsite audit visit, the VVB was able to personally evidence and crosscheck all this information, the audit team has verified that all achievements reported are substantiated with information provided in the body of the CCB/VCS-MR.

Some of these benefits are for example job creation for approximately 400 employees including 9 women, some of them were interviewed by AENOR, or the protection of 8 critically endangered and 10 endangered species, assessed by the AP plans or results of the inventories or sightings.

In opinion of AENOR, the project benefits are credible based on the supporting documents provided by PP and evidence received during the AENOR's stakeholders interviewed, records checked and field records and all the achievements have been demonstrated by the PP along the body of the Monitoring Report /2/.

4.3 General

4.3.1 Implementation Status (G1.9)

Section 2.2 of the monitoring report provides the relevant milestones occurred during the last years in the project area related to the management and development of the project to understand its implementation status. These milestones are directly linked with the success to implement and achieve the goals established by the project in the community and biodiversity areas.

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

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

Date	Milestone(s) in the project's development and implementation	VVB Assessment
13 June 2014	Chinko project and the government of the CAR sign an agreement for the management of the hunting zones N° 39, 40, 41 and 48.	Assessed on the PDD
December 2014	Chinko became the eighth protected area in AP's portfolio.	assessed on the PDD and annual reports /16-22/
December 2014	Strategic relationships were developed with conflict research groups and regional military task forces based in the area to improve governance in the Eastern CAR region and overall stability.	assessed on the PDD and annual reports /16-22/
January – December 2015	Management and infrastructure: construction of the headquarters, securing a core protection zone within the park	assessed on the PDD and annual reports /16-22/
15 September 2016	Project start date: sensitisation meetings with transhumance herders regarding Chinko's boundaries	Assessed with the PDD and the proof of start date

2016-2017 dry season	Community development: focus on sensitisation and relationship building with local leaders and community members	Assessed with the PDD and evidence of the stakeholder engagement /45-52/
March 2017 – April 2018	Humanitarian assistance: Chinko's staff provided safety and security to around 380 internally displaced people (IDP) who have fled the violence in neighbouring towns held by rebels. The refugees remained for several months until the ethnic violence subsided and they were able to safely relocate back to their villages. Some of them have been hired as transhumance sensitisation officers to help their community and reduce the threats that arise from armed cattle herders.	Assessed with the PDD and evidence of the stakeholder engagement /45-52/
July 2017	Upon the arrival of the transhumance herders from the north, sensitisation teams were deployed to speak with the herders and raise awareness about Chinko and its borders. They were able to direct the herders around the protected area.	Assessed with stakeholder engagement evidence /45-52/, annual reports /16-22/ and interviews with both, transhumant pastoralists and sensitisation teams
November – December 2017	All the rangers completed refresher training and advanced tactical training.	Assessed with the annual reports /16-22/ and interviews with rangers
4 December 2017	Park management and infrastructure development: CCA organised a conference focused on 'Exploring the intersection between conservation and peacebuilding in Central Africa', and targeted key stakeholders including donors, conservationists and institutions.	assessed with the stakeholder engagement evidence /45-52/
2017-2018 dry season	Sensitisation teams continue to be deployed in the field on the known cattle roads to divert groups around the park.	Assessed with stakeholder engagement evidence /45-52/, annual reports /16-22/ and interviews with both, transhumant pastoralists and sensitisation teams
Second semester 2018	Law enforcement: Chinko also recruited, trained and deployed 32 transhumance sensitisation officers to monitor and educate transhumant herders coming into the CAR from Sudan, one of the major threats in the area.	

17 September 2018	Community development: community sensitisation meeting held in Bangassou saw significant results. Through direct communication with the community, the meeting opened the door to future socio-economic development opportunities.	Assessed with the stakeholder engagement evidence /45-52/ and the visit of AENOR into the CAPEP and Bangassou
November 2018	30 transhumance sensitisation officers were recruited and went through an extensive training programme, learning how to navigate with locus software and use satellite devices.	Assessed with the annual reports /16-22/
2018-2019 dry season	Multiple teams of rangers, transhumance sensitisation officers and eco-monitors were deployed. This not only helps secure the CCA but also contacts numerous herders from Sudan and has a significant impact on directing the grazing of these people and reducing the risk of conflict. The CCA remained cattle-free for most of the season.	Assessed with the annual reports /16-22/
January-February 2019	Biodiversity conservation: through the Chinko and Vovodo River expedition, 200 km of the Chinko River and 15 km of the Vovodo River were surveyed.	Assessed with the annual reports /16-22/ and interviews with AP staff
March 2019 – July 2020	Community development: local stakeholder consultation and discussions about a comprehensive land-use plan for the periphery of the CCA. The meetings covered all communities (permanent settlements) in the west, south and east of the CCA.	Assessed with interviews and review of the preliminary land-use plan. Also, with stakeholder engagement evidence and meetings into the CAPEP
July 2019	Biodiversity conservation: the first standardised aerial minimum count along major floodplains was executed. The observation of a herd of 52 eastern giant elands, six independent groups of 75 eastern buffalo and 11 events of 32 Defassa waterbucks, as well as the sighting of an adult roan male antelope along the 580 km transect, indicate that larger herbivores are widely distributed across the CCA and continue to recover.	Assessed with the annual report /16-22/ and performance of actual aerial transects and corresponding brief daily meetings attendance during the visit.
26-27th September 2019	Community development: the CCA was pleased to host various dignitaries, ambassadors and ministers including the CAR's United States (US) ambassador, USAID director and the Minister of	Assessed with interviews with the CAR Representatives of the Ministry of Environment (see interviews list in sections above)

	Water, Forestry, Hunting and Fishing.	
Nov 2019 – Jan 2020	Law enforcement: training was carried out for the entire ranger unit.	Assessed with interviews with trainers as well as annual reports /16-22/ and training camp observation during the visit.
2019 – 2020 dry season	Unarmed monitors and transhumance teams in the field, working to sensitise the local communities in the periphery of the park. The CCA remained free of cattle.	Assessed by annual reports /16-22/ and procedures of work explained by interviews and SOPs
February 2020	Community development: a presentation of the Chinko project was made at the US ambassador's residence to key stakeholders in the region. Attendees included representatives from the World Bank, Chinese Embassy, French Embassy, AFD (French Development Agency), Head of UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), US Embassy, Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance, National Assembly and Minister of Water and Forestry. It was followed by a similar presentation held at OCHA during inter-cluster meetings with all UN bodies and international non-governmental organisations.	Assessed with interviews with the CAR Representatives of the Ministry of Environment (see interviews list in sections above)
15 April 2020	An agreement to expand the protected area to 5.5 million ha was signed, with a start date for the PAA3.	Assessed with interviews with AP, Representatives of the Ministry of Environment and evaluation of the agreements.
October 2020 –early 2021	Community development: local stakeholder consultation and discussions about a comprehensive land-use plan for the periphery of the CCA.	Assessed with interviews with AP and communities in Bangassou, where the CAPEP was carried out and the Land-use plan was discussed.
26 November 2020	The last illegal mine within Chinko's borders was peacefully closed on 26 November.	Assessed with the annual report /16-22/ and interviews with the staff about the procedure to close the mine
November 2020	The forest monitoring process started.	Assessed with interviews with AP staff, biodiversity and monitoring department and raw data from this period. Also, evidence showed on

		site.
--	--	-------

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

Complementary to the table above, the PP has provided in depth explanations about the times of activities carried out related to the transhumance situation since the transhumance pastoralists are the main driver of deforestation and degradation of woodland savannas, so the PP has explained the schedule specified for these activities.

During this verification process, AENOR has not detected project changes in regards of the project title, its purposes and objectives. As such, the project activity accurately reflects the proposed project which mainly consists in alleviating deforestation and degradation pressures on the forests, improving the quality of life of communities in the area and strengthening relationships with government agencies to ensure the proper long-term management by the Project Proponent. Through interviews with key staff and evidence provided, the audit team ratified the main objectives of the project, that result in the SD contributions described in the MR. The PP has provided a deep chart of SDGs achieved by the project and the way in which these goals are monitored as well as the results. For example, for the SDG 1,8 and 10, No poverty, reduced inequalities and decent work, AENOR has reviewed the evidence provided about the social conditions of CAR and crosschecked with the list of employees, organisational chart and interviews with workers and staff. The interviewees declared the advantages of the CCA and the benefits to be part of the CCA staff, getting security, health and more incomes that not being part of Chinko project staff. For the other SDGs, AENOR has reviewed the spreadsheet /92/ and carbon calculations as well as biodiversity monitoring plans, records of species and direct confirmation of the successful implementation.

Besides, the project has not participated nor been rejected under any other GHG programs. GHG emission reductions or removals generated by the project are not included in an emission trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading. The project has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit.

As this is the first verification event, there are not previously validated methodology deviations except the ones explained in sections above in relation to the current verification event.

Hence, after a complete review of the different documents provided and the on-site visit, AENOR is able to confirm that the project implementation is in accordance with the project description contained in the validated CCB-VCS-PDD and final version of the monitoring report /2/. There are no material discrepancies between project implementation and the monitoring report.

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

Section 2.2.6 of the monitoring report addresses the natural and human induced risks and how the project considered several initiatives to diminish these risks to the project benefits. The main possible risk identified by project proponent are:

- Natural:

Fires are common during the dry season in the savanna. These fires could pose a risk to the carbon stock in the project area. The PP has provided a deep analysis of the fires in the region and the mitigation and preventive measures that the PP is carrying out to reduce or avoid the risk

of forest fires. The PP has provided a fire management plan /144/ which has been reviewed and assessed by AENOR. Also, the VVB, during the onsite visit has followed the AP staff while they created small early-season fires for prevention of late intense fires in dry season. Also, during the aerial survey, AENOR had the chance to see recent fires distributed within the whole CCA territory. PP explained the different methods to create prevention fires.

- Human induced:

The main risks identified by the PP related to human activities are political and community risks. CAR is one of the least developed and poorest countries in the world and scores low across all World Bank governance indicators (average score of -1.55 for the period 2015-2019) /141/, and also the instability in neighbouring countries such as the Republic of South Sudan could result in the displacement of people in the region which may result in an influx of people in the project area, including pastoralists, poachers, armed groups and foreign fighters. Finally, various rebel groups are active in the region where the project area is located. This could result in violence towards staff, local communities and put project activities at risk.

The PP has signed an agreement with the government to take responsibility for the management and financing of the project /116-117/ and the PP is performing activities to sensitize transhumant pastoralists and corridors have been created to avoid the transitions and illegal activities spilling over from other countries.

In addition to the agreement with the government, the PP has taken several actions to mitigate political risk. These mitigation activities were explained by the PP during the onsite visit, and AENOR was able to check that the PP is implementing measures to mitigate the political risk. AENOR had the opportunity to meet some members of political institutions and discussed about the situation of the Project and the comparison with the country situation. AENOR deems that the information is correct and accurate and also, considers that the measures are appropriate to mitigate the risks determined by the PP. Complementary, in section 2.2.6 of the Monitoring Report /2/, the PP has explained some actions and activities that demonstrate the effort that they are implementing to reduce the political risk. AENOR has reviewed such working lines, such as the collaboration with Government agencies or the collaboration and support to the project by many international institutions and philanthropic groups. AENOR can confirm that the activities explained by the PP in section 2.2.6 to mitigate the political risk are reliable and correct.

The increase in security through trained people from AP is considered an effective measure to avoid conflicts with these rebels groups within CCA and surrounding communities. AENOR has reviewed the contracts /116-117/ and the stakeholder engagement with pastoralists /45-52/, performed onsite interviews with government, pastoralists and ECHO and TANGO teams, and reviewed the *WorldBank* indicators of the CAR. Also, to avoid conflicts regarding the use of natural resources by surrounding communities, the PP is in continuous contact with communities in the periphery and created buffer zones to allow the sustainable use of natural resources in those areas. AENOR has interviewed people from communities and asked about their opinion to the current exploitation, the benefits, and the conditions of the buffer zones.

Complementary, the PP has calculated the risk through the Non-Permanence Risk Report /113/, and there are no differences in any of risk category compared with the report provided during the validation.

As stated, the changes in the PDD are minimal, and the audit team has reviewed both, the information provided in the MR and the information provided in the validated PDD. Complementary, an exhaustive assessment of the NPRR /113/ has been carried out, analysing the complementary information and attached evidence to the NPRR. During the visit, the audit team asked about the potential risks of the project, and the interviewees mentioned that the project staff were briefed on all the possible risks relevant to their position. There is also a worker's policy /84-85/ which they follow during field work. The audit team has also reviewed this policy, which is a group of rules to follow for the proper development of project activities. The PP has developed trainings specifically for each position and has given material to the employees to avoid risks such as personal protective equipment (PPEs), technical clothes, medical kits etc.

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

4.3.3 Community and Biodiversity Benefit Permanence (G1.11)

The project is currently taking active measures to enhance the climate, community, and biodiversity benefits of the project beyond the project crediting period. The measures proposed to guarantee the permanence of climate, community and biodiversity benefits are among others the recruitment and training of rangers and other teams, the sensitization activities, and the land-use plan. The land use plan is the basis for the management of the CCA project, this plan allows the correct connection and adaptation of between activities in Chinko and surroundings. The land-use plan, among others will ubicate the grazing corridors in such places that reduce conflicts with communities while the cattle have optimum conditions.

AENOR has verified those activities though the desk review and during the on-site visit. Some of the evidence used for the desk review were the reports of the trainings /60-65/, the annual reports /16-22/ or the Law enforcement manual /85/. Complementary, AENOR interviewed rangers and pastoralists to crosscheck the information. During the visit to Bangassou, AENOR also interviewed several people who were discussing about the land-use plan. This plan was also analysed with the AP responsible to see the future perspective.

AENOR had several interviews with relevant workers from Chinko, and all of them declared that the project is very positive by hiring people from communities. Furthermore, the communities asked for more vacancies and job opportunities in the future. AENOR considers that the job opportunities and constant recruitment is a positive sign of the community benefit permanence of the project. Regarding biodiversity, the land-use plan has a strong relevance. It aims to achieve more sustainable land use in areas that it considers has important biodiversity, therefore the activities will have a positive impact on community well-being and biodiversity conservation.

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

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

African Parks employees, local communities, transhumant pastoralists, governmental institutions and private philanthropic and international institutions are the stakeholders involved in the project. The PP has

provided in the PDD and in the MR section 2.3.1 an explanation about the way in which information has been shared with them and how they are able to access to the different documents.

AENOR has interviewed people from these groups and all of them recognized to have received the documentation in one or other way. Some of the interviewees showed the documentation received when they were on site. For example, the Representatives of the Ministry of Environment showed to AENOR the copies of the documents that the PP shared with them in person. AENOR interviewed people from all the groups and deems that the information provided in the MR is correct.

AENOR also asked about the costs, risks and benefits of the project in relation to the daily tasks of AP employees and rest of stakeholders. AENOR gathered valuable information about the risks, considering that the conditions of CAR are not easy according to health, economy, and safety. The interviewees recognized that they were informed about potential risk related to their job and what measures were provided by AP to mitigate such risks. Also, they were informed about the costs and benefits. The interviewees mentioned that thanks to CCA, they have a better wellbeing compared to the without project scenario. AENOR has also reviewed the HR policy /84/ to crosscheck the information of the MR with the responses of stakeholders.

To explain the verification process to the people with less technical knowledge, AP provided easy understandable materials, such as presentations or posters. AENOR asked about the general knowledge of the project to different stakeholders from communities and they in one way or another, knew how the verification and REDD process was structured.

AENOR reviewed the communication for the stakeholders in which it was explained that the process will continue with the visit of an auditor, and they could be convened to a group or personal interview. AENOR also saw the notification of the VERRA and AENOR visit to Kocho in the bulletin board of the Chinko Headquarters in Kocho.

The VVB has reviewed the evidence provided by AP to demonstrate the consultations performed to develop the project together with communities /45-52/ which also was assessed by crosschecking the information by onsite interviews with all the groups stated above. Therefore, AENOR deems that the access to the documentation and information for all the stakeholders is correct.

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

AENOR has carried out interviews with all the stakeholders 'groups, who were supportive of the project development and design. AENOR has reviewed the evidence provided by AP such as the stakeholder engagement summary /45-47/ which is a deep document explaining how the consultation process was carried out with different groups, the explaining documents about the issues of illegal pastoralism and the Chinko status and finally the attendance lists of such consultation meetings /48-52/. In the MR there are also several pictures about the process.

AENOR had interviews with all these groups and asked about the level of participation and consultation. The interviewees recognized to have participated in the design of the project. For example, pastoralists provided an idea about the design of the corridors, while different people in the community helped with the designing of the buffer zone due to their knowledge in hunting and fishing.

During the visit of AENOR to the CAPEP, the VVB was able to verify that the PP is performing a continuous consultation and design for the land-use plan and well doing of the project.

Verification team reviewed the evidence provided such as the presentation /47/ or the letter among others. Also, during the onsite visit, the verification team asked for the consultation process and the participation of the different stakeholders in this process. All the interviewees answered to be part of the consultation process, being part of the communication and being considered for the taking decisions process. The project proponent, according to the interviews, accepted suggestions provided from the stakeholders and the project design was developed with the recommendations of those stakeholders.

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

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

The PP states that African Parks management team performs periodical meetings with the employees of their team to inform them about the results of relevant activities as well as to plan the correct development of the future ones, employees are heard, and suggestions are considered. Regarding local communities and pastoralists, African Parks has community liaisons and sensitisation teams in the region to engage with them on a regular basis throughout the year. AENOR has crosschecked this information with testimonies of communities and has verified the presence of the liaisons such as the one in Sam-Ouandja related to pastoralists, the one in Rafai as well and the multiple liaisons available during the CAPEP.

AENOR asked about the flow of communication with the stakeholders and considers that communication is performed constantly, and AP carries out several meetings and workshops /48-52 / 16-22/. Women are actively encouraged to participate during the community engagement and the attendance registers from these meetings demonstrate that women are well represented in these consultation sessions. AENOR has reviewed these attendance lists and deems that the information is correct.

Several interviews were carried out in Rafai, and AENOR also visited Rafai in November 2022 and crosschecked this information with in-person interviews and deems that the information is correct.

AENOR's verification team checked the above information, during the on-site visit, by interviewing several stakeholders as well as verified with the information provided on the MR followed by evidence, annual reports /16-22/ and attendance lists /45-52/. Therefore, AENOR deems that the information provided in the MR which has been strengthened with other evidence and supported with the onsite visit and questions to different stakeholders, is reliable, and confirm that the participation in decision making and implementation is in accordance with VCS and CCB requirements.

4.3.7 Anti-discrimination (G3.7)

AP has a strict policy /84-85/ to avoid sexual harassment of other forms of discrimination. Such Policy has been assessed by AENOR and implementation and follow-up was crosschecked with interviews with communities and workers or employees of AP.

The verification team has reviewed the information provided in the MR and crosschecked with the evidence mentioned such as the non-discrimination and non-harassment policy and others. Complementary, through the onsite visit carried out by the verification team, AENOR had the opportunity to ask to the stakeholders and beneficiaries if they had knowledge of any sign of discrimination. None of the interviewees declared to know proofs of discrimination. Furthermore, among the interviewees, there were women who declared to be part of the project without being discriminated.

Therefore, AENOR deems that the project implementation is being carried out without any type of discrimination and is reliable. Hence, the implementation is in accordance with the VCS and CCB requirements.

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

AP has a grievance mechanism, which was explained in the MR and assessed by evidence and onsite interviews. AENOR has reviewed the information of the grievance mechanism and contrasted with the information of the PDD. AENOR asked the interviewees about their knowledge of the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) and if they had knowledge of any type of complaint as well as knowledge of the process.

AENOR has reviewed the grievance evidence /53-59/ and deems that the information is correct and matches with the assessment of the onsite interviews. There are two types of complaints: sensitive and non-sensitive complaints. For the non-sensitive complaints were managed in an ad-hoc manner appropriate for the context of operations during the first monitoring period. Considering the high illiteracy levels in the local communities, complaints were received orally by AP's personnel during community engagement activities. On the other hand, for the sensitive complaints, the mechanism explained in the PDD and MR is always followed, and written records were kept. The complaints received during the monitoring period were assessed by AENOR, the information of the MR was crosschecked with the interviews carried out during the site visit. AENOR has analysed the complaints /53-59/ and considers that the process carried out by the PP to address the complaint follows the mechanism and the information of the MR is reliable regarding the evidence and the information gathered during the onsite visit. AENOR has checked the grievances received during the MP and the way in which the PP has addressed and solved the issue. AENOR considers that the process follows the description on the PDD and MR and therefore, the information is correct.

AENOR has assessed the information provided in the MR and validated PDD and crosschecked with the consultations performed during the onsite visit, and confirms all of the interviewees are aware of the existence of the grievance mechanism as well as the organigram until the closure of any complaint.

Therefore, AENOR's verification team is able to confirm the grievances procedures were applied as per validated CCB-VCS-PDD and in accordance with VCS and CCB (G.3.8) requirements.

4.3.9 Worker Relations (G3.9 – G3.12)

AP has two major training dimensions. One of them is oriented to employees and the second to community development. In the first, the objective is to recruit and train a sufficient number of Chinko rangers, eco-monitors, eco-transhumant officers and control room operators. Within this group, there are other employees with tasks related with the implementation of project activities on the ground, such as welders, tailors, or carpenters, who have received also trainings for their daily operations considering that they have an important role in keeping the logistics and operations in order. Local communities are receiving orientation and training, enhancing local skills, welfare development, and self-sustaining business development. Eco-monitors sensitised dozens of local hunters, fishermen, miners, loggers and local communities and authorities to promote sustainable use of natural resources in line with the land-use plan.

AENOR has interviewed people from both sides, workers and local communities and asked them about trainings. Based on such interviews, AENOR can confirm that the information of the MR about trainings is

correct. Complementary, it has been crosschecked with the training report /60/, the report of the ranger's promotion /41-44/, and the forms of attendance of the workers to these trainings /63-65/. AENOR also reviewed the annual reports /16-22/ and onsite saw the training camp of Kocho, which is stated in the MR.

In regard to not losing local capacity, when a management employee leaves, they do a handover session with the new one taking the role. This ensures that the capacity and flow of the activities are not lost during staff turnover. AENOR asked about the HR department and some workers about this topic, and deems that the information is consistent with that stated in the MR.

To ensure that all individuals are given an equal opportunity in work and hiring terms, the PP developed a HR policy /84/ and a law enforcement manual /85/. In both documents, the hiring process is regulated under equality. AENOR interviewed during the onsite visit people from all type of genders, ages, and positions, and no one declared to be aware of any sign of discrimination.

The project also has an onboarding procedure that is used to inform workers about their rights; at the signing of their contract, the new employee is informed of all these rights and duties. Once a new hire has been selected, there are onboarding and induction programmes that must be completed during a probationary period before joining the organisation full time and this was checked with the HR department as well as the workers of Chinko. AENOR asked if they were aware of their rights, duties, and benefits as well as the Laws govern the work. All the interviewees recognized to be aware of their rights and duties, as well as they were informed by the HR department about the Laws of CAR about work, health and safety etc.

The risks form a very important part of the Chinko project, due to the location of the project as well as some of the activities performed by some staff. Some of the risks are:

- Transport and logistic: due to the remoteness of Chinko, the transport can be done by aircraft or helicopter among other ways. To minimize the risk, AP has a very well trained team of pilots and drivers, as well as having a well-equipped hangars for careful review of the fleet. AENOR interviewed some pilots of CCA and visited the installations and the place in which the maintenance of the vehicles was done, for aerial and terrestrial fleet and deems that the risk is well mitigated.
- Field work: the field work in CAR could be sometimes difficult due to the natural and non-natural hazards. AP gives a full equipment to these people working in the field constantly, such as PPEs, camel bags, medical kit, etc. these kits were reviewed by AENOR and verified as well with interviews with rangers and ECHO/TANGO teams. AENOR has also reviewed the storage room in which the AP team store all the equipment for the rangers and other field workers. AENOR confirms that there is a good quality control to avoid possible risks.
- Human-wildlife conflicts: encounters with dangerous wildlife are rare in Eastern CAR. The main threat are pathogens, vectors, or venomous animals. The PP provides a kit to reduce the risk of suffering mosquito bites. Regarding the venomous animals, the PP provides an antivenom to the workers and it has been verified by AENOR.
- Risk of confrontation with armed groups: During field patrols, one of the main objectives is to ensure the area remains free of poachers and pastoralist. This means they are regularly exposed to armed poachers or armed pastoralists. However, it is important to note that despite all the

challenges in the past, there have been zero collisions and none of the staff has ever been injured this way. Complementary, the PP has a specific mechanism to mitigate these risks, and it is defined in the PDD (Tiered Deterrence Approach). AENOR has reviewed such mechanisms and also visited the training camp near to Kocho.

- Other incidents: together with the mentioned above, AP has developed trainings to teach all the staff about the possible risks of their duties. AENOR reviewed this with each interviewee and also assessed the trainings evidence /60-65/ and deems that the information is reliable.

Therefore, AENOR is able to confirm that the project developer is taking the necessary measures regarding occupational safety of workers. The occupational safety procedure explained in the MR is very clear on the safety of the workers and the VVB considers that such rules are the key for the safety improvement.

Verification team is able to confirm that all activities are carried out within the framework of the project are in accordance with current regulations. AENOR did not detect incompliance with them checking the documents provided and interviewing the workers. They have been informed about risks of the works and they received training about safety matters. Therefore, the project fulfils with CCB requirements related to worker relations.

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

The monitoring report states in its section 2.4 the management capacity of the PP, including the skills, the experience, and the financial health.

The PP has identified 3 key technical skills required to implement the project successfully: i) carbon accounting, ii) community and biodiversity, iii) project management.

Based on the specific nature of the project and its activities, it is the opinion of AENOR that the PP has properly documented the key technical skills required to implement the project successfully. The statement in the MR and PDD clearly explains the skills of AP according to the 3 previous indicators. Also, during the visit the auditor was able to see the good structure of AP as well as the knowledge in sectors such as Biodiversity or community engagement.

AENOR reviewed the webpage of AP, the CV of some of the personnel of AP /66-82/ as well as the on site verification of the knowledge of AP about the topics mentioned above. Also, based on the interviews with the representatives of the Ministry of Environment, the interviews recognized to have plenty of confidence with AP in the management of Chinko.

South Pole has a technical and professional team that combines extensive knowledge in GHG ER certification for forestry and land-use projects and VMR systems, enabling them to comprehensively address all aspects of the project.

The project is managed and operated from the project headquarters, which have been given the mandate by the project proponent (African Parks) to manage carbon revenue and develop management strategies, collaborate with the operation partners on the ground and oversee general implementation of project activities and project operations on behalf of the project partners.

It is the opinion of AENOR, by the information of the MR and PDD and the onsite visit, that the management team can ensure that project management and carbon activities are implemented.

AP has adopted financial mechanisms to provide an adequate actual and projected cashflow for project implementation in order to achieve the objectives. During the project's initial years, Chinko covered its expenditures using the revenue from the activities and funds obtained from donor organisations and used an endowment fund to cover the rest. Currently, the project has only 27% of the funds required without the projected revenues from selling verified carbon units. One of the strategies to ensure adequate financial support over the project lifetime is the signing of ER purchase agreements with buyers willing to obtain credits from the project for various years, in order to guarantee an income for the implementation of the activities. Considering that this is a grouped project, AP plans to gradually increase the protected area – the financial information has taken this into account. AENOR has reviewed the cashflow /83/, the annual reports /116-22/ and the agreements with the government /116-117/ and such information has been compared with the one of the MR and the information obtained from the interviews with AP management team, such as the Director of the Park, and the representatives of the Ministry of Environment.

Related to corruption, AP has a strict Code of Conduct that the organisation and its employees are obliged to follow. The Code of Conduct forms part of AP's HR Policy and Standard Operating Procedure /84-85/ and it was assessed by AENOR. Also, asked to the interviews about their knowledge of such SOP and possible forms of corruption or unethical behaviour.

Through the onsite visit, the verification team did not obtain any proof of corruption signs, and none of the interviewees recognized to have the knowledge of corruption signs. Therefore, AENOR deems that the information is reliable and does not have evidence to demonstrate any sign of corruption. Hence, AENOR confirms that the project is in accordance with the VCS and CCB requirements.

Based on all the assessments explained above, AENOR deems that the PP has the capacity to implement the project in accordance with the validated project description.

4.3.11 Commercially Sensitive Information (Rules 3.5.13 – 3.5.14)

No commercially sensitive information has been presented in the MR.

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

According to the MR, the PDD, the evidence assessed, the visual confirmations of the VVB during the onsite visit and the interviews with stakeholders and communities, the statement about the absence of communities in the project area is considered reliable. Also, AENOR carried out interviews with the representatives of the ministry of Environment and checked the agreements /116-117/ of public-private partnership to manage the CCA.

Although the area is uninhabited and the project has not encroached private property, the project has conducted stakeholder engagement sessions with local communities living on the periphery of the project to inform them about the project and explain that the project will not encroach on private or community property. AENOR has reviewed such agreements and engagement documents /45-52/ with communities and asked in person during the onsite visit and considers that the information on the MR is reliable.

According to the HR statement of principles and other policies /84-85/, AP conforms with Free, Prior and informed Consent. The VVB asked the interviewees about the process, and also about the language in which its material or process was carried out. All of the interviewees recognized to be able to understand the information.

Project activities will not at any time lead to the involuntary removal or relocation of land ownership rights and do not oblige communities associated with the project area to relocate activities important to their culture other than those considered as illegal under the laws of the Central African Republic. AENOR asked the communities if they had any type of problem according to relocation and property rights, and nobody declared anything about that, so the audit team does not have evidence to demonstrate that the information of the MR and PDD is incorrect.

Regarding illegal activities, the region in which the project area is located is characterized by insecurity, often perpetuated by the activities of foreign armed groups. The impacts of the activities of these armed groups, as well as illicit cross-border movements, have resulted in instability in the region. The main illegal activities that have been recognized, and could affect the project's activities, are illegal grazing, poaching and illegal wildlife trade. Bushmeat hunting is an important source of income for most communities living around the reserve, and most offtake is sold to local buyers. Transhumance pastoralists have also been identified as posing a serious risk to the area with high incidences of overgrazing, illegal human-induced fires and poaching all recorded as regular and realistic threats to the area. The transhumant pastoralists are also actively involved in trafficking of wildlife, and of ivory and leopard skins in particular. As well as bushmeat, traders sell ivory, and big cat skins, fat, teeth and claws. In CAR, the first points of sale for illegally procured wildlife products are the towns of Rafaï and Zemio.

According to these groups, AENOR has reviewed the information of the PDD and MR and crosschecked with evidence such as the Assessment of Poaching and Wildlife Trafficking in the Garamba-Bili-Chinko Transboundary Landscape from Gervais Ondoua Ondoua. AENOR by the onsite visit, asked both, the communities and the Representatives of the Ministry of Environment about these illegal activities, and all of them recognized that these illegal activities had an important role in the CCA surroundings and directly affected the conservation of Chinko and its biodiversity.

The project has a number of law enforcement initiatives that are designed to prevent illegal activities in the project area, as well as steps for reducing the reliance of local communities on illegal activities, such as the identification and implementation of alternative income-generating activities. There are also activities for reducing the reliance of local populations on illegal activities, such as the creation of sustainably managed buffer zones and the identification and implementation of alternative income-generating activities and sustainable management of natural resources in long-term like selective hunting/fishing and size-selective logging in combination with no-take reserves, low impact grazing, efficient agroforestry, responsible mining with minimal negative effects on human health, local biodiversity, ecosystem functions.

AENOR confirms that the illegal activities were correctly identified, and that the PP has measures to reduce these activities so that project benefits are not derived from illegal activities. For example, the transhumant pastoralists interviewed recognized that they are contacted many times by the Chinko team, TANGO or ECHO, when they are close to the border. Pastoralists also mentioned the measures that TANGO performs when they repeat illegal grazing on several occasions, and also that they were informed about the borders by the implementation of signals and providing posters in the areas (normally inaccessible by car) by plane to inform about the border. patrolling activities are performed everyday by air and land, the Chinko staff meet to discuss daily occurrences and address urgent issues. AENOR deems that the illegal activities are well managed, and the measures implemented by the PP are correct according to each situation.

The PP states in section 2.5.5 of the MR about the ongoing disputes. AENOR has reviewed such disputes about illegal mines and hunting zones, and considered that they are well reported, managed and solved. All the interviewees knew the disputes and the respective resolution mechanisms.

During the visit, the audit team did not find any inconsistency or proof to demonstrate that the information provided by the PP in the MR regarding Rights Protection and Free, Prior and Informed Consent was wrong.

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 with the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards and the validated project design.

4.3.13 Legal Status (G5.6)

AENOR has reviewed the Laws stated in the MR to verify the compliance with the Project as well as the expiration dates if any. AENOR did not detect during the interview with local authorities or desk review incompliance related to laws and regulations.

4.4 Climate

4.4.1 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

Procedures for quantifying the GHG emissions reduction were conducted in accordance with the methodology VM0009 for Avoided Ecosystem Conversion, v3.0. 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 PDD. Further, the verification team reproduced calculations for selected samples to ensure accuracy of the results. Conversion factors, formulas, and calculations were provided by the PP in spread sheet format to ensure all formulas were accessible for review. The verification team recalculated subsets of the analysis to confirm correctness. Where applicable, references for analysis methods or default values were checked against relevant scientific literature for best practice.

AENOR reproduced and verified 100% of sheets in the spreadsheet of emission reduction calculations /86-92/ and the data-calculations carried out in those sheets for the monitoring period for the project area. The project area was 100% checked using the GIS database and shape files /153-172/. The carbon calculations were also 100% verified and crosschecked with validated values.

Baseline Emissions

The change in baseline emissions for the first monitoring period [m=1] ($E_{BA}^{[m=1]}$) was calculated using equation [F.15] of the methodology. This process was applied separately for each project accounting area.

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

This is a function of the cumulative emissions at the beginning ($E_B^{[m-1]}$) and end ($E_B^{[m]}$) of the monitoring period as given by equation [F.16].

$$E_B^{[m]} = E_{B\ BM}^{[m]} + E_{B\ SOC}^{[m]} - C_{B\ SOC}^{[m]} - C_{B\ BGB}^{[m]} - C_{B\ DW}^{[m]} - C_{B\ WP}^{[m]} \quad [F.16]$$

Where:

$E_{B\ BM}^{[m]}$ = Cumulative baseline emissions from biomass at the end of the current monitoring period;

$E_{B\ SOC}^{[m]}$ = Cumulative baseline emissions from soil carbon at the end of the current monitoring period;

$C_{B\ SOC}^{[m]}$ = Carbon not decayed in SOC (soil organic carbon) at the end of the current monitoring period;

$C_{B\ BGB}^{[m]}$ = Carbon not decayed in BGB (below ground biomass) at the end of the current monitoring period;

$C_{B\ DW}^{[m]}$ = Carbon not decayed in DW (dead wood) at the end of the current monitoring period; and

$C_{B\ WP}^{[m]}$ = Carbon not decayed in WP (wood products) at the end of the current monitoring period.

The project does not include SOC, wood products or deadwood; therefore, so that variables of equation [F.16] were not calculated.

Calculating Baseline Emissions from Biomass

The baseline emissions from biomass were determined based on the baseline type applicable (F-U3) and the carbon pools selected.

The cumulative emissions from biomass ($E_{B\ BM}^{[m]}$) were calculated using equation [F.21]. However, considering that the baseline type is F-U3, the Spatial Algorithm for Biomass, expected in equation [F.24], was used. This algorithm is the most conservative spatial model for depleting carbon stocks.

$$E_{B\ BM}^{[m]} = BEM_{U2,3}(c_{p\ BM}^{[m=0]}, c_{B\ BM}^{[m]}, t^{[m]}, x^{[m]}) \quad [F.21]$$

$$E_{B\ BM}^{[m]} = BEM_{U2,3}(c_{p\ 1\ BM}^{[m=0]}, c_{B\ BM}^{[m]}, t^{[m]}, x^{[m]}) \quad [F.24]$$

The Baseline Emissions Model (BEM) for baseline type F-U3 is presented in equation [F.4].

$$BEM_{U2,3}(c_P, c_B, t, x) = \frac{A_{PAA}(c_P - c_B) + \frac{HA_{U2,3}(c_P, c_B)t}{t_{PL}}}{1 + e^{\ln\left(\frac{1}{r_U}\right) - \beta(t+0.5q) - \theta(x)^T}} - HA_{U2,3}(c_P, c_B)$$

where

$$HA_{U2,3}(c_P, c_B) = \frac{A_{PAA}(c_P - c_B)}{1 + e^{\ln\left(\frac{1}{r_U}\right) - \beta(0.5q) - \theta(x_0)^T}} \quad [F.4]$$

To implement the spatial algorithm, the average carbon stocks in biomass per stratum were ordered from lowest to highest. Open Woodland Savannah (OWS) is the stratum with the lowest stock (179.98 tCO₂e/ha, in PAA2 and PAA3) and was assigned as the first, while Closed Canopy Forest (CCF) has the highest stock (652.7 tCO₂e/ha, in PAA1) and was assigned as the second.

Calculating Carbon Not Decayed in BGB

The carbon non-decayed in BGB was calculated using equation [F.32].

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

Project Emissions

Project emissions for the first monitoring period [$m=1$] ($E_{P\ \Delta}^{[m=1]}$) were calculated using the equation [F.41], this process was applied separately for each project accounting area.

$$E_{P\ \Delta}^{[m]} = E_{P\ \Delta\ BRN}^{[m]} + E_{P\ \Delta\ LS}^{[m]} + E_{P\ \Delta\ SF}^{[m]} + A_{PAA} \left(c_p^{[m-1]} - c_p^{[m]} \right) - C_{p\ \Delta\ WP}^{[m]} \quad [F.41]$$

Where

$E_{P\ \Delta\ BRN}^{[m]}$ = Cumulative project emissions due to burning at the end of the current monitoring period,

$E_{P\ \Delta\ LS}^{[m]}$ = Cumulative project emissions due to livestock grazing within the project area,

$E_{P\ \Delta\ SF}^{[m]}$ = Cumulative project emissions due to the use of synthetic fertilizers within the project area,

A_{PAA} = Area of project accounting area,

$c_p^{[m-1]}$ = Project carbon stocks at the beginning of the current monitoring period,

$c_p^{[m]}$ = Project carbon stocks at the end of the current monitoring period,

$C_{p\ \Delta\ WP}^{[m]}$ = Project carbon stocks in wood products at the end of the current monitoring period.

The project does not consider emissions from the use of synthetic fertilizers, due to burning nor wood products, therefore, the parameters $E_{P\ \Delta\ SF}^{[m]}$, $E_{P\ \Delta\ BRN}^{[m]}$ and $C_{p\ \Delta\ WP}^{[m]}$ are assumed as zero in the equation.

Calculating Emissions from Changes in Project Stocks

In accordance with section 2.3 of the methodology, single measurements from monitoring plots were used to estimate carbon stocks as the validation and first verification occur simultaneously. Considering the project is requesting a joined validation and first verification none of the carbon plots have been measured more than once.

The project carbon stocks at the beginning and at the end of the monitoring period are the same, therefore, there is no calculation of changes in project stocks: considering that this is the first monitoring period, there are no emissions from changes in carbon stocks.

$$A_{PAA} \left(c_p^{[m-1]} - c_p^{[m]} \right) = 0$$

Emissions from forest fires, grass fires, natural disturbance, logging and other events within the project accounting areas were nevertheless inherently captured by the carbon stock determined in each stratum (according to section 8.2.1 of the methodology), and carbon plots were measured at the end of the monitoring period and areas affected by the disturbances were considered as location of some of the plots.

Following the methodology requirements, the carbon stocks in the project will be remeasured at least every five years.

The PP demonstrated that part of the carbon plots measured during the validation and first verification of the project were installed in areas affected by disturbance events during the monitoring period: considering that woodland savannas are subject to fire events, the majority of the carbon plots in the OWS stratum were installed in areas subject to such events during the monitoring period; while 24% of the plots in CCF stratum were installed in disturbed areas). A map of the satellite monitoring of the project boundaries and the significant disturbances during the monitoring period was presented to the VVB, as well as the location of the plots and reviewed remotely, while during the onsite visit disturbed and non-disturbed areas were visited and crosschecked with the map of boundaries of significant disturbances in the PAAs during the monitoring period. Therefore, the carbon stocks of each stratum were determined considering the influence of the disturbance events. By doing so the PP guaranteed that carbon stocks measured capture the influence of fires.

Calculating GHG Emissions from Livestock Grazing

According to the methodology, emissions from livestock grazing, when occurring, are calculated using equation [F.43]

$$E_{P \Delta LS}^{[m]} = \sum_{i \in T} \left(\frac{f_{LSi} * n_{LSi}}{10^3} \right) * 21 \quad [F.43]$$

In the context of the project, these emissions are considered when the pastoralists graze within PAA2 and PAA3. Even though the livestock is owned by the transhumant pastoralists, not by African Parks, these emissions are accounted. In addition, considering the migratory characteristics of the pastoralists, the livestock, when illegally entering the project boundaries, is not roaming during the full year but only during the beginning of the dry season, therefore, when applying the equation [F.43] a minor adjustment is applied: the emission factor defined for the livestock population is multiplied by a factor of the number of months in which the livestock grazed during the year.

During the monitoring period the amount of cattle that grazed within the PAAs was reduced year by year thanks to the effectiveness of the implementation of the project activities. However, some cattle were still able to stay within the borders for short periods of time during the dry season. Evidence of the cattle inventory was provided to AENOR.

It is important to note that African Parks during its first years implementing the project activities did not try to obtain the exact number of livestock heads, they focused in the law enforcement and moving the stock out of the project accounting area, therefore, the values used to obtain the GHG emissions are linked to secondary evidence such as information from the aerial surveys done in the region and ground data from the rangers and eco-transhumance monitors and approximations of the total number were done based on the area free of cattle per year. An improvement in the approximation of cattle heads inside the borders is expected for the following monitoring reports considering that since 2021 African Parks will start collecting information with regard to the number of heads entering the borders.

The above assumptions are supported in Annex 3 ER calculations, provided by the PP according to methodology monitoring requirements.

Leakage

The PP presented the leakage mitigation strategies that are being implemented, that will reduce the demand of and impact on forest resources, including pastoralists and local communities sensitization through several means, income-generating opportunities for local communities, local skills enhancements, and transhumant pastoralism corridors establishment; according to a Theory of Change design. During the onsite visit, the leakage strategy activities were verified.

Estimating Emissions from Activity-Shifting Leakage

As described in the methodology, for the first monitoring period, cumulative emissions from activity-shifting leakage are zero. However, during this period, the project proponent carried out the first monitoring of the leakage plots to estimate the parameter $p_{L\text{DEG}}^{[m=0]}$. This parameter will be used to fit the leakage emissions model and $p_{L\text{DEG}}^{[m]}$ will be estimated at least once every five years using field measurements as specified in the methodology.

However, the PP monitored the area deforested within the ASLAs during the 2016 – 2020 period using Global Forest Watch data and, as described in the methodology deviation, in order to perform conservative emission reduction claims the deforestation was included as leakage emissions. The results show that a total of 497.1 ha were loss (447.8 ha in ASLA1 for PAA1; and 49.3 ha in ASLA2 for PAA2 and PAA3). That area was transformed into biomass and discounted from the project emission reductions. The result is: 200,086.3 tCO₂e deducted as leakage emissions.

It is important to note that the entire CCA will continue to be monitored and managed regardless of the delineation of project accounting areas and that activity-shifting leakage areas will continue to be monitored regardless of the exclusion of certain forest classes in the eligible area of the PAAs (OWS excluded in PAA1 and CCF excluded in PAA2 and PPA3).

Determining Emissions from Market Leakage

As described in the PDD, emissions from market leakage will not be accounted for, and the cumulative emissions from market leakage for every monitoring period will be zero.

Quantification of Gross Emissions Reductions

The gross ERs (GERs) for the first monitoring period $[m=1]$ ($E_{\Delta\text{GER}}^{[m=1]}$) and project accounting area were quantified using the equation [F.53].

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

Where:

$E_{B\Delta}^{[m]}$ = Change in baseline emissions;

$E_{P\Delta}^{[m]}$ = Change in project emissions;

$E_{L\Delta}^{[m]}$ = Change in emissions due to leakage; and

$E_U^{[m]}$ = Cumulative confidence deduction at the end of the current monitoring period.

Determining Deductions for Uncertainty

The confidence deduction $E_U^{[m]}$ was determined following the equation [F.57], which is a linear combination of weighted standard errors of estimates from baseline emissions models and carbon stock measurements.

$$E_U^{[m]} = E_{B\Delta}^{[m]} \left[\frac{1.64}{E_{B\Delta}^{[m]} + A_{PAA}C_p^{[m]} + A_{PXC}C_B^{[m]}} \sqrt{(U_{EM}^{[m]})^2 + (U_p^{[m]})^2 (U_B^{[m]})^2} - 0.15 \right] \text{ [F.57]}$$

After using equation [F.57] the Cumulative confidence deduction at the end of the current monitoring period value obtained was 0. The equation has a strong dependence of the total project area, which is used to divide the 1.64 factor (from the Z value of 90% confidence), considering that the project has a big project accounting area the value obtained is really low, later that value has a 0.15 deduction which turn it into a negative value. Thus, no uncertainty deduction is applied.

Determining Reversals

There have been no reversals in the PAA during this monitoring period.

Quantifying Net Emissions Reductions for a PAA

The total net ERs (NERs) for each of the PAA during the first monitoring period [m=1] were calculated using equation [F.55], which calculates GERs minus the buffer account allocation.

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

Determining Buffer Account Allocation

The allocation of GERs to the buffer account was determined following the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0.

After applying the tool, the total value obtained was 6.5% (2% in the internal risks, 0% in the external risks and 4.5% in the natural risks), however, according to the requirements of the tool, the minimum risk rating shall be 10, regardless of the risk rating calculated. Therefore, a 10% was used to determine the buffer account allocation. As a result of the process, the percentage of GERs allocated in the buffer account is 10%

Quantifying Net Emissions Reductions across PAAs

The NERs were calculated separately for each PAA and then summed to determine the total NERs in this monitoring period. The following table summarizes the baseline validated, project and leakage ex post emissions and the net GHG emission reductions.

Year	Estimated baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Estimated project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Estimated leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Estimated NERs or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Buffer (tCO ₂ e)	VCUs
Sep 2016 –	97,680	7,387	8,933	81,358	8,136	73,222

Year	Estimated baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Estimated project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Estimated leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Estimated NERs or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Buffer (tCO ₂ e)	VCUs
Dec 2016						
2017	352,384	17,640	144,923	189,819	18,982	170,837
2018	374,724	5,040	8,017	361,666	36,168	325,498
2019	398,538	2,520	24,224	371,793	37,180	334,613
2020	452,672	4,850	13,989	433,832	43,384	390,448
Total	1,675,998	37,438	200,086	1,438,468	143,850	1,294,618

As requested per the methodology, the PP carried out a project performance evaluation, comparing the NERs presented for verification (ex post) relative to NERs presented for validation (ex ante): values are the same, since validation and verification were done at the same time.

In conclusion, the project achieved a net GHG emission reductions of 1,438,468 tCO₂e during the current monitoring period. Finally, VCUs are calculated by removing the buffer credits. The non-permanence risk rating for this project is 10%. Therefore, during this monitoring period (15-September-2016 to 31-December-2020), the project generated 1,294,618 VCUs for issuance and 143,850 buffer credits.

AENOR reproduced the calculations to achieve the same results and deems they are depicted clearly and correctly in the provided sheets. AENOR verification team was able to trace them directly from the data sources. Formulae used are in compliance with monitoring plan, PDD, and methodology, as well as the default values used to determine the parameters. Thus, the net amount of VCUs to be issued is accurate and realistic. Assumptions used by PP at verification were appropriately cross-checked and assessed with requested evidence.

In order to calculate the above terms, the MR details the data and parameters used during the verification process. For each of them, AENOR checked its accuracy, consistency, and reliability by reproducing the spreadsheets calculations, verifying the correctness of formulae and methods used and crosschecking the data values with sources (section 2.3 in this report).

AENOR carried out a deep review of the technical annex and the calculations and others provided by the PP that feed data values shown in the spreadsheets /86-92/, complemented with GIS database and shape files /153-172/ and interviews to the technical team (30/07/2021, 15/12/2022 and other communications along the process).

AENOR verified the consistency and accuracy of each parameter detailed in sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 of the MR by crosschecking the information with the information of the PDD as well as checking values and reproducing the calculations in the calculation spreadsheets (section 2.3 in this report) and did not find inconsistencies between them after the closing of CARs and CLs requested. Therefore, AENOR deems that values reported for the parameters are accurate and consistent. Information was deemed accurate and consistent taking into account sources used. Other default values used are from sources well accredited and validated at validation stage.

AENOR verified the list of parameters available at validation reported in the MR and values applied (if applicable) or the references to the documents. The list is complete and in compliance with the methodology and the validated PDD.

After a deep and thorough review and reproduction of calculation sheets and sample inventory plots, AENOR deems the parameters monitored and available at validation are correct, reliable and consistent. Information in the MR is in compliance with the PDD, the calculations provided and the applicable methodology. Then, the results showed in the MR are reliable, consistent and accurate. Procedures for quantifying the baseline emissions were conducted in accordance with the methodology.

4.4.2 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

The data and parameters used to determine GHG emission reductions are listed in sections 3.1.1 (for validation) and 3.1.2 (for verification) of the MR. The parameters were checked by AENOR and deemed complete and consistent with calculations and assumptions considered.

The following table summarizes the data/parameters available at validation:

Data/Parameter available at validation	Value	Assessment procedure and result
β Effect of time on the cumulative proportion of conversion over time (Unitless)	RA1 (PAA1) : 2.48800E-04 RA2 (PAA2, PAA3): 1.18000E-04	Reference area and historic reference period. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$\hat{\sigma}_{EM}$ Estimated standard deviation of the state observations used to fit the logistic function for the BEM (unitless)	RA1 (PAA1): 0.09938 RA2 (PAA2, PAA3): 0.08182	Remote sensing image interpretation. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
A_{PAA} Area of Project Accounting Areas (ha)	PAA1: 148,395.64 PAA2: 713,408.61 PAA3: 363,225.39	GIS analysis prior to sampling.
A_{PX} Area of proxy area for the Project Accounting Areas (ha)	Proxy1 (PAA1): 79.2 Proxy2 (PAA2, PAA3): 404.4	GIS analysis prior to sampling. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
f_{LSi} Emission factor for the defined livestock population, I (kg CH ₄ head ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹)	48	IPCC default values. Correctly selected and estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
n_d Number of spatial points in the reference area (no unit)	RA1 (PAA1): 1,654 (1,146 sites that were forest at the beginning of the reference period) RA2 (PAA2, PAA3): 2,566 (out of which 1,802 were forest at the beginning of the reference period)	Remote sensing image interpretation. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
q Lag between start of degradation and conversion (days)	0	Default value. Correctly selected and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
r_{RS} Expansion factor for above-ground biomass to below-ground biomass (root/shoot ratio) (Unitless)	0.232	IPCC 2019 Refinement, Chapter 4, Table 4.4. Correctly selected and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.

Data/Parameter available at validation	Value	Assessment procedure and result
r_U Onset proportion of conversion immediately adjacent to project area (Unitless)	PAA1: 3.1242 PAA2: 5.5914 PAA3: 1.8925	GIS analysis and image interpretation. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
t Time since project start date (Days)	PAA1, PAA2, PAA3: 1,568	Monitoring records. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
t_i The point in time of the observation made at point i (Days)	Various	Remote sensing image interpretation. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
t_{PL} Length of project crediting period (Days)	10,438	Public Private Agreements. Correctly selected and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
t_{PAI} Number of days after the project start date for the start of a project activity instance in a grouped project (Days)	PAA1: 0 PAA2: 0 PAA3: 1,308	Public Private Agreements. Correctly selected and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
w_i Weight applied to the i^{th} sample point in the Project Accounting Areas reference area (Unitless)	Various	Remote sensing image interpretation. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
x_i, y_i Latitude and longitude of the i^{th} sample point in the Project Accounting Areas reference area (Geographic coordinates)	Various	Remote sensing image interpretation. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.

The list of parameters to be monitored is the following:

Data/Parameter available at verification	Value	Assessment procedure and result
$A_{P1}^{[m=0]}$ Area of Project Accounting Areas stratum 1 prior to first verification event (ha)	PAA1: 148,395.64 PAA2: 713,408.61 PAA3: 363,225.39	GIS analysis prior to sampling. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets. Note that in PAA1, Stratum 1 is CCF. In PAA2 and PAA3, Stratum 1 is OWS. There is no second stratum in PAAs.
$A_{P2}^{[m=0]}$ Area of Project Accounting Areas stratum 2 prior to first verification event (ha)	NA	There is no second stratum in PAAs.
$C_B^{[m]}$ Baseline carbon stocks at the end of the current monitoring period (tCO ₂ e/ha)	PAA1: 195.55 PAA2, PAA3: 42.83	Proxy area sampling. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$C_{B\ BGB}^{[m]}$ Carbon not decayed in BGB at the end of the current monitoring period for the Project Accounting Areas (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 161,890.3 PAA2: 176,387.4 PAA3: 34,759.4	Proxy area sampling. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$C_{B\ b}^{[m]}$ Baseline scenario average carbon stock in selected carbon pools (tCO ₂ e/ha)	PAA1: 195.55 PAA2, PAA3: 42.83	Proxy area sampling. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$C_{B\ BM}^{[m]}$	PAA1: 195.55	Proxy area sampling.

Data/Parameter available at verification	Value	Assessment procedure and result
Baseline carbon stocks in biomass at the end of the current monitoring period for the Project Accounting Areas (tCO ₂ e/ha)	PAA2, PAA3: 42.83	Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$c_p^{[m]}$ Project carbon stocks at the end of the current monitoring period for the Project Accounting Areas (tCO ₂ e/ha)	PAA1: 652.70 PAA2: 179.98 PAA3: 179.98	Project accounting area sampling. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets. Note that the value for PAA1 is based on the stock of CCF cover, while the value for PAA2 and 3 is based on the stock of OWS cover
$c_p^{[m-1]}$ Project carbon stocks at the beginning of the current monitoring period for the Project Accounting Areas (tCO ₂ e/ha)	-	Project accounting area sampling. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$c_p^{[m=0]}$ Project carbon stocks prior to first verification event for the Project Accounting Areas (tCO ₂ e/ha)	PAA1: 652.70 PAA2: 179.98 PAA3: 179.98	Project accounting area sampling. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets. Note that the value for PAA1 is based on the stock of CCF cover, while the value for PAA2 and 3 is based on the stock of OWS cover
$c_{p\ 1\ BM}^{[m=0]}$ Project carbon stocks in biomass in stratum 1 prior to first verification event for the Project Accounting Areas (tCO ₂ e/ha)	PAA1: 652.7 PAA2, PAA3: 179.98	Project accounting area sampling. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$c_{p\ 2\ BM}^{[m=0]}$ Project carbon stocks in biomass in stratum 2 prior to first verification event for the Project Accounting Areas (tCO ₂ e/ha)	NA	There is no second stratum in PAAs.
$c_{p\ BM}^{[m=0]}$ Project carbon stocks in biomass prior to first verification event for the Project Accounting Areas (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 96,858,220 PAA2: 128,399,813 PAA3: 65,373,577	Project accounting area sampling. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$c_{p\ b}^{[m]}$ Average carbon in biomass in the Project Accounting Areas (tCO ₂ e/ha)	PAA1: 652.70 PAA2: 179.98 PAA3: 179.98	Project accounting area sampling. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets. Note that the value for PAA1 is based on the stock of CCF cover, while the value for PAA2 and 3 is based on the stock of OWS cover
$c_{p\ 1\ b}^{[m]}$ Average carbon in biomass for Project Accounting Areas, stratum 1 (tCO ₂ e/ha)	PAA1: 652.7 PAA2, PAA3: 179.98	Project accounting area sampling. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets. Note that in PAA1, Stratum 1 is CCF. In PAA2 and PAA3, Stratum 1 is OWS. There is no second stratum in PAAs.
$c_{p\ 2\ b}^{[m]}$ Average carbon in biomass for Project Accounting Areas, stratum 2 (tCO ₂ e/ha)	NA	There is no second stratum in PAAs.
$E_{\Delta GER}^{[m]}$	PAA1: 608,902 PAA2: 805,618	Area measurements. Correctly estimated and inputted in the

Data/Parameter available at verification	Value	Assessment procedure and result
GERs for the current monitoring period (tCO ₂ e)	PAA3: 23,948	calculation spreadsheets.
$E_{\Delta GER}^{[i]}$ GERs for monitoring period i (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 608,902 PAA2: 805,618 PAA3: 23,948	Area measurements. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$E_{\Delta NER}^{[i]}$ NERs for monitoring period i (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 548,010 PAA2: 725,055 PAA3: 21,553	Area measurements. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$E_B^{[m]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions at the end of the current monitoring period (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 789,131.2 PAA2: 859,327.7 PAA3: 152,202.7	Proxy area measurements. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$E_B^{[m-1]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions at the beginning of the current monitoring period (tCO ₂ e)	0	Proxy area measurements. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$E_{B \Delta}^{[m]}$ Change in baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 789,131.2 PAA2: 859,327.7 PAA3: 152,202.7	Proxy area measurements. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$E_{B \Delta BGB}^{[i]}$ Change in baseline emissions from below-ground biomass during monitoring period i (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 47,829.7 PAA2: 48,558.9 PAA3: 6,285.2	Monitoring the proxy area. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$E_{B BGB}^{[m]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions from below-ground biomass at the end of the current monitoring period (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 179,088.5 PAA2: 195,037.3 PAA3: 35,207.1	Measurements in the proxy area. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$E_{B BGB}^{[m-1]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions from below-ground biomass at the beginning of the current monitoring period (tCO ₂ e)	0	Measurements in the proxy area. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$E_{B BM}^{[m]}$ Cumulative baseline emissions from biomass at the end of the current monitoring period (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 951,021.5 PAA2: 1,035,715.1 PAA3: 186,962.1	Measurements in the proxy area. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$E_{BA}^{[m]}$ Cumulative emissions allocated to the buffer account at the end of the current monitoring period (tCO ₂ e)	143,850	Per VCS Methodology VM0009, section 8.4.4. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$E_L^{[m]}$ Cumulative emissions from leakage at the end of the current monitoring period (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 180,226.6 PAA2: 19,859.7 PAA3: 0	Measurement obtained in the two leakage areas for the monitoring period. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$E_L^{[m-1]}$ Cumulative emissions from leakage at the beginning of the current monitoring period	0	Measurements in the leakage areas. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.

Data/Parameter available at verification	Value	Assessment procedure and result
(tCO ₂ e)		
$E_{L \Delta}^{[m]}$ Change in emissions due to leakage (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 180,226.6 PAA2: 19,859.7 PAA3: 0	Measurement obtained in the two leakage areas for the monitoring period. Correctly appointed.
$E_{L ASF}^{[m]}$ Cumulative emissions from activity-shifting leakage in forested strata at the end of the current monitoring period (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 180,226.6 PAA2: 19,859.7 PAA3: 0	Measurement obtained in the two leakage areas for the monitoring period. Correctly appointed.
$E_{p \Delta}^{[m]}$ Change in project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	-	Not applicable in this monitoring period.
$E_{p \Delta BRN}^{[m]}$ Cumulative project emissions due to burning at the end of the current monitoring period (tCO ₂ e)	-	Not applicable in this monitoring period.
$E_{p \Delta LS}^{[m]}$ Cumulative project emissions due to livestock grazing within the project area (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 0 PAA2: 33,847.4 PAA3: 3,590.1	Monitoring in the project area. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$E_U^{[m]}$ Cumulative confidence deduction at the end of the current monitoring period (tCO ₂ e)	0	Equations according VCS Methodology VM0009, section 8.4.1.1. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
n_{LSi} The number of head of livestock species / category i in the project area (Count)	Multiple values per PAA and year	Monitoring in the project area. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$P_{L DEG}^{[m]}$ Portion of leakage due to degradation in forest at the end of the current monitoring period (unitless)	0.18	Monitoring in the leakage area. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$P_{L DEG}^{[m=0]}$ Portion of leakage due to degradation prior to first verification event (unitless)	0.18	Monitoring in the leakage area. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$P_{L CON G}^{[m=0]}$ Portion of leakage due to native grasslands prior to the first verification event (unitless)	-	Not applicable, since native grasslands are not present in the current PA.
$P_{L CON G}^{[m]}$ Portion of leakage due to native grasslands conversion at the beginning of the current monitoring period (unitless)	-	Not applicable, since native grasslands are not present in the current PA.
$P_{L CON G}^{[m-1]}$ Portion of leakage due to native grasslands conversion at the end of the current monitoring period (unitless)	-	Not applicable, since native grasslands are not present in the current PA.
$t^{[i-1]}$	NA	Current is the first monitoring period.

Data/Parameter available at verification	Value	Assessment procedure and result
Time from project start date to beginning of monitoring period i (Days)		
$t^{[m]}$ Time from project start date to end of current monitoring period (Days)	Multiple values	Monitoring records. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$t^{[m-1]}$ Time from project start date to beginning of current monitoring period (Days)	NA	Current is the first monitoring period.
$U_B^{[m]}$ Total uncertainty in proxy area carbon stock estimate (tCO ₂ e)	32.45	Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$U_{EM}^{[m]}$ Total uncertainty in Baseline Emissions Models for the Project Accounting Areas (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 0.09938 PAA2: 0.08182 PAA3: 0.08182	Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$U_P^{[m]}$ Total uncertainty in Project Accounting Areas carbon stock estimate (tCO ₂ e)	33.81	Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets.
$wC_{Pi}^{[m=0]}$ Weighted average carbon stocks for biomass or SOC in the project for the set of selected strata for the Project Accounting Areas (tCO ₂ e)	PAA1: 652.70 PAA2: 179.98 PAA3: 179.98	Inventory. Correctly estimated and inputted in the calculation spreadsheets. Note that the value for PAA1 is based on the stock of CCF cover, while the value for PAA2 and 3 is based on the stock of OWS cover

As mentioned in the PDD, the monitoring plan consists of a sampling inventory for carbon stocks following the guidelines described in Appendix B of the methodology VM0009. Prior to the field sampling the selection of the carbon sites was done considering a stratification of the land cover in the area as well as some other conditions such as distance between plots and minimum areas of the land cover, according to Annex 3 of the PDD.

The sampling for the first monitoring process was carried out by a team of Chinko employees together with a team of expert foresters from the region, the experts trained the employees from Chinko and together the first monitoring plots were established.

The monitoring process started in November 2020 and continued during the following months. During this period, a total of 168 plots were sampled in the project area: 119 for the closed canopy forest (CCF), 19 for the open woodland savannah (OWS), 17 for the dry edaphic grassland (DEG) and 13 for the wet edaphic grassland (WEG). For the proxy areas, a total of 13 plots were carried out in the forested land covers (CCF and OWS) and for the leakage areas, a total of 10 plots were carried out. Coordinates of all the plots was provided and a sample was confirmed during the remote crosscheck regarding to the land use of its location.

The monitoring process follow the methodology requirements and therefore, the plots will be remeasured at least every five years and as expressed in this report, there is a small deviation in which rather than having all plots measured in the first verification, future plots will be added once the project accounting area is expanded in the northern part of the project area.

Once the information was collected from the site, the biomass was calculated using the allometric equations. After that, the information was processed, the results of the 138 plots in forest areas show that the carbon stock in the CCF stratum is 652.7 tCO₂e/ha, and in the OWS, is 179.98 tCO₂e/ha. The calculated standard error is 9.3.

The QA/QC procedures of biomass data and carbon stocks changes were managed internally by a forestry and land use expert. The procedure for the calculation of biomass and carbon stock changes included:

- cross-checking the information from the original form and the database;
- confirming there are no non-realistic values measured;
- reviewing with the monitoring crew leader in case there are non-realistic values;
- cross-checking descriptions of validation and verification parameters;
- confirming that bibliographical data references are properly cited in internal documentation;
- checking that units are correctly carried through from the beginning to end of the calculations;
- checking that the conversion factors are correct;
- checking that temporal and spatial adjustment factors are used correctly;
- checking that there is detailed internal documentation to support the estimates and to enable reproduction of the emission reduction estimates;
- confirming that estimates are reported for all years;
- checking that known data gaps that may result in incomplete emissions estimates are documented and treated conservatively; and
- comparing current estimates to previous ones, if available. If there are significant changes or departures from expected trends, the estimates should be re-checked, and the differences explained.

During the processing of the raw data and following the QA/QC procedure minor mistakes were identified while reviewing the inventory data, this was informed to African Parks manager and was later solved after comparing the data with the original forms and discussing with the crew leader. In addition, the post-processing analysis also included a comparison of the results in the area with the values obtained in other regions of African, Asia and South America. This comparison was useful to validate that the values are aligned with what should be expected from the literature.

In conclusion, the PP demonstrated to have applied the standardized data collection and processing procedures. Several QA/QC (Quality assurance and quality control) procedures are in place, including regular training of quantifiers, staff internal revisions, multiple quantifications, etc.

AENOR has verified that the monitoring plan is being implemented as the described in the PDD. AENOR checked that key workers are fully involved in monitoring events (training, measuring, archiving, reporting, quality control, etc.). QA/QC procedures are considered strict at identifying, reviewing, and handling inconsistencies found in order to improve the management of the project. AENOR carried out a cross check of the information of a sample of plots, amongst the data collected onsite and the captured information for inventory calculations and no inconsistencies were found.

Roles and responsibilities along with data management and archival system are also detailed in the MR and other supported documents.

Interviews with the project staff and inspection of data and results demonstrated that the PP possesses competencies required for reporting of GHG emissions removals accurately.

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

4.4.3 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

The project utilized the non-permanence risk analysis tool (AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool 4.0) to assess risk according to internal risk, external risk, natural risk, and mitigation measures for minimizing risk. The audit team reviewed the Non-Permanence Risk Report following VCS Standard v4.1 and confirmed that the project adheres to the requirements set out in the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool.

At all levels, the audit team evaluated the rationale, appropriateness, and justifications of risk ratings chosen by the PP. Each risk factor was thoroughly assessed for conformance. A brief review of each factor is shown in the table below.

Risk factor	Risk Rating	Assessment
Internal Risks		
Project Management: (assessed using table 1 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool)-	-2 (total may be less than zero) In AENOR's opinion, total project management risk rating (-2) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool: VCS V4.0.	a) Not applicable. GHG credits are not based on planted species. Moreover, no GHG credits have previously been issued. Not applicable = 0 b) Ongoing enforcement to prevent encroachment by outside actors is required to protect more than 50% of stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued. No credits have been issued. Not applicable = 0 c) The management team does include individuals with significant experience in all skills necessary to successfully undertake all project activities. The management team includes more than 20-year experience, different departments have wide experience in their respective sectors, such as financial, administrative, management or HR. AENOR has reviewed the CV /179-186/ of the personnel involved in the CCA project Risk rating = 0 is justified d) The management team does maintain a presence in the country, they are based either on the capital of the country or in the project headquarters, moving continuously around the project area and the reference area. AENOR has visited the AP headquarters in Bangui, 2 hours from Kocho. Risk rating = 0 is justified e) Management team includes individuals with significant experience in AFOLU project design and implementation, carbon accounting and reporting under the VCS Program.

Risk factor	Risk Rating	Assessment
		AENOR has reviewed SP webpage and deems that the information is correct Risk rating= -2 is justified. f) No adaptive management plan in place. Not applicable = 0
Financial viability (assessed using table 2 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool).	5 (total may not be less than zero) In AENOR's opinion, total financial viability risk rating (5) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool: VCS v4.0.	a) Project cash flow breakeven point is greater than 10 years from the current risk assessment. AENOR has reviewed the cashflow /175/ and deems that the information is correct. Risk rating = 3 is justified b) – d) See above. Not applicable = 0 e) Project has secured less than 15% of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven. Not applicable = 0 f) The project has secured 27% of funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven. AENOR has reviewed the cashflow /175/ and deems that the information is correct. Risk rating = 2 is justified g) - h) See above. Not applicable = 0 j) Project has available as callable financial resources at least 50% of total cash out before project reaches breakeven. Not applicable = 0
Opportunity Cost (assessed using table 3 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool).	-4 (total may be less than zero) Then, in AENOR's opinion, total opportunity cost risk rating (-4) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.0.	a) – c) See below. Not applicable = 0 d), Baseline activities are subsistence-driven, and the project generates net positive impacts in the well-being of the communities. AENOR has reviewed section 4.2.3 of the PDD and crosschecked with information from the onsite visit. Risk rating = 0 is justified e) – f) See above. Not applicable = 0 g) African Parks, the project proponent, is a non-profit conservation organization. Risk rating = -2 is justified h) The project is protected by legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period. The project is protected by legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect the credited

Risk factor	Risk Rating	Assessment
		carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period. On 15 April 2020 African Parks signed a 25-years partnership agreement with the government of Central African Republic for the management and financing of the conservation area. This agreement superseded a previous agreement signed in 2014 to protect the area. The crediting period covers the full length of the current agreement. AENOR has reviewed the agreements with the Government and deems that the information is reliable. Risk rating= -2 is justified i) Project is not protected by legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over at least 100 years. Not applicable = 0
Project Longevity (assessed using table 4 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool).	3 (total may not be less than zero) 3 (total may not be less than zero) In AENOR's opinion, Total Project Longevity (54 years) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.0.	a) See below. Not applicable = 0 b) The project longevity is assumed to be 54 years, beginning from the project start date in 2016 and up to 2070 Risk rating = 3 is justified. According to section 2.2.4 of the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, the longevity is defined as "the number of years beginning from the project start date that project activities will be maintained, which may be longer than the crediting period, where projects can demonstrate that activities that maintain carbon stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued will continue beyond the project crediting period". Paragraph 2 of the section states "Evidence shall be provided that project ownership can be maintained for the entire longevity (e.g., where control is secured through a concession that is shorter than the project longevity, such concession is renewable for the full longevity period being claimed)." In the case of Chinko project, the project proponent used 54 years as longevity, beginning from the project start date in 2016 and up to 2070. The start date of the longevity was demonstrated with the agreement signed between African Parks and the Central African Republic government in 2014, whose translation into English was also provided. On the other hand, the end date of the longevity was demonstrated by Art 71 and 72 of chapter XII (duration and revision) and Art 73 of chapter XIII (termination) of the agreement signed by both parties in 2020 for a 25-year period /176-177/. Article in the chapters are as follows: Art 71 of the agreement "<i>Le présent Accord est conclu pour une durée de vingt-cinq (25) ans à compter de la date de sa signature. Il est renouvelable par tacite reconduction par notification d'une des Parties manifesté par une notification écrite, après un préavis de six (6) mois à compter de la date de notification.</i>" (This Agreement is concluded for a period of twenty-five (25) years from the date of its signature. It shall be renewable by tacit agreement upon written notification by one of the

Risk factor	Risk Rating	Assessment
		Parties, after six (6) months' notice from the date of notification). AENOR confirmed that the agreement is renewable with the intention of one of the parties and the longevity period described by the project proponent complies with the requirement set in the tool. Art 72 states <i>"Le présent Accord peut, à l'initiative de l'une des Parties, faire l'objet de modification ou de révision par un avenant signé par les deux (2) Parties. Les avenants dûment signés font partie intégrante du présent Accord. Aucune autre modification, aucun rajout ni aucune autre révision du présent Accord ne sont valables s'ils ne sont pas consignés par écrit et signés par les parties au présent Accord. « ("This Agreement may, at the initiative of one of the Parties, be amended or revised by an amendment signed by both Parties. Duly executed addenda shall form an integral part of this Agreement. No other amendment, addition or revision to this Agreement shall be valid unless in writing and signed by the parties to this Agreement")</i> From the Art above, AENOR confirmed that in the case of any change to the agreement both parties must agree and sign, therefore, no changes of conditions that are relevant for the longevity are expected without the revision and approval from African Parks. Art 73 states <i>"Nonobstant l'épuisement du processus de résolution de différends en Articles 78-82 ci-dessus, et toute autre disposition contraire, il peut être terminé de manière anticipée à l'Accord dans les cas suivants:</i> <i>• En cas de manquement grave aux dispositions de cet Accord, la Partie qui n'est pas en défaut peut exiger de l'autre Partie, par notification écrite, qu'elle remédie au manquement reproché. Dans ce cas un plan d'action est établi de commun accord. Si, après six (6) mois de la mise en œuvre du plan d'action, le manquement persiste, la Partie qui n'est pas en défaut peut notifier à la Partie sa décision de mettre fin à l'Accord six (6) mois après notification ;</i> <i>• Par APN, suite à un préavis écrit de trente (30) jours, si : (i) elle n'est pas en mesure de mobiliser les fonds nécessaires pour assurer le fonctionnement de l'ACC-PF ; ou (ii) en cas de suspension des financements ; ou (iii) si, selon l'avis de APN il n'est pas possible d'atteindre les objectifs de l'Accord sur le long terme à cause de contraintes excessives.</i> <i>• Par consentement mutuel des Parties ».</i> (Art 73 states "Notwithstanding the exhaustion of the dispute resolution process in Articles 78-82 above, and any other provision to the contrary, the Agreement may be terminated early in the following cases: - In the event of a serious breach of the provisions of this Agreement, the Party not in default may require the other Party, by written notice, to remedy the alleged breach. In this case, a plan

Risk factor	Risk Rating	Assessment
		of action shall be established by mutual agreement. If, after six (6) months of the implementation of the action plan, the defaulting Party persists, the Party not in default may notify the Party of its decision to terminate the Agreement six (6) months after notification. • By APN, following thirty (30) days written notice, if: (i) it is unable to raise the funds necessary to operate the CCA-FP; or (ii) in the event of a suspension of funding; or (iii) in the opinion of the AFN it is not possible to achieve the objectives of the Agreement over the long term due to undue hardship. • By mutual consent of the Parties.) Regarding the points mentioned above, AENOR confirmed that the possibility of the renewal of the agreement will always be in the hands of African Parks, since it is not the sole and exclusive competence of the national government. To conclude, as per the conditions expressed in the articles described above, AENOR verified that the project longevity complies with what is stated in paragraph 2 of the section 2.2.4 of the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, and, in any case that African Parks is complying with the agreement and has the intentions to continue the agreement, there will be guarantees to renew it. AENOR reviewed the legal analysis provided by South Pole and African Parks and confirms that it is consistent and demonstrates compliance with the project longevity and tenure requirements. Likewise, AENOR reviewed the publication of the land tenure agreement in the CAR official gazette /178/, which is archived at the Secrétariat Général du Gouvernement (SGG), and it can be obtained by direct request. Last, AENOR reviewed the Legal Opinion issued by an independent professional, whose credentials were provided and support the credibility of the opinion. Finally, paragraph 3 of the section states “For all AFOLU project types, the entire project longevity shall be covered by management and financial plans as submitted to local government or financial institutions, or otherwise made public, in which the intention to continue management practices is stated and planned for and may include external evidence such as municipal land-use plans, institutional structures, or tools such as ecological-economic zoning”. In the case of Chinko project, African Parks elaborates a 5-year business plan that is renewed each year, this plan sets short to medium objectives, targets and actions using the latest available financial data to project the development of management activities. In addition, African Parks has already finalized a Long-Term Sustainability Strategy (LTSS) for Chinko, this strategy provides the integrated long-term strategy for ensuring overall sustainability of the Conservation Area and taking into consideration the intention to continuing the management practices beyond the current agreement dates. The vision for Chinko is being the largest functional tropical wilderness in Africa with recognition of its value by all its stakeholders. The LTSS is underpinned by two key

Risk factor	Risk Rating	Assessment
		aspirations for the future of the project area. The first is an overall vision for the desired state of the park, a picture of the future that reflects the restoration and maintenance of all that makes the park unique and conservation-worthy in perpetuity (a clear intention to continue management practices beyond the years covered by the current agreement). The second is the articulation of a set of three component impacts (ecological, socio-political and financial) that are prerequisites for achieving overall sustainability for the park. In addition, African Parks has been working for more than 3 years in establishing a Land Use Plan in the region, the intention of this plan is to define, together with the stakeholders involved, activities that allow continuing protecting the forest and maintaining carbon stocks stored beyond the project crediting period. The Government and African Parks, after multiple workshops and understandings of the project, signed an agreement for the management of the carbon credits issued due to the project /187-200/. Considering the different plans and strategies developed by African Parks and the information provided and discussed during the audit process, it was clear for AENOR that African Parks has guarantees to renew the agreement and has intentions to do so and continue the management practices beyond the years covered by the current agreement. With all the details into consideration, AENOR was able to conclude that 54 years is an appropriate longevity and the score of 3 complies with the Tool requirements, and that the agreement constitutes sufficient evidence that project ownership will be maintained for the entire project longevity period stated and that no precondition or exception for renewal exists.
Total internal risk = 2 (total may not be less than zero)		
External Risks		
Land Tenure and resources access/impact (assessed using table 6 of the Risk Tool).	0 (total may not be less than zero) 0 (total may not be less than zero) in AENOR's opinion, total land tenure (0) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.0	a) See below. Not applicable = 0. b) the land is government owned and is managed by African Parks through a renewable 25-years management agreement. AENOR has reviewed the agreements with the government /72-73/ Risk rating = 2 is justified c) - d) There are no disputes over land tenure or ownership of the project area in more than 5% of the project area nor disputes over access/use rights (or overlapping rights). Risk rating=0 is justified e) This not a WRC project. Not applicable = 0 f) The project area is protected by legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect

Risk factor	Risk Rating	Assessment
		the credited carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period. AENOR has reviewed the agreements with the government and complementary performed interviews with the Representatives of the Ministry of Environment. Risk rating= -2 is justified g) No disputes over land tenure, ownership or access/use rights exist. Not applicable = 0
Community engagement (assessed using table 7 of the Risk Tool).	-5 (total may be less than zero) -5 (total may be less than zero) in AENOR's opinion, total community engagement (-5) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.0.	a) The project area is uninhabited, there are no households living within the project area. Not applicable = 0. b) The PP had multiples meetings covering all permanent settlements in the west, south and east of the area. AENOR has reviewed the attendance lists and further evidence to support the stakeholder engagement information as well as crosschecking this information with questions during the onsite audit. Risk rating=0 is justified. c) The project generates net positive impacts on the well-being of the communities. Risk rating= -5 is justified.
Political Risks (assessed using table 8 of the Risk Tool).	4 (total may not be less than zero) 4 (total may not be less than zero) in AENOR's opinion, total community engagement (4) is properly justified and in accordance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v4.0.	a) The average governance score in Central African Republic across the six indicators of the World Bank for the 2015-2019 period is -1.55. AENOR has reviewed the World Bank indicator /201/ and deems that it is correct. Risk rating= 6 is justified. b)-e) See above. Not applicable = 0 f) The Central African Republic is a member of the Forest Carbon Partnership in the Readiness Fund. Risk rating = -2 is justified.
Total external risks = 0 (Total may not be less than zero)		
Natural risks		
Fire Risk (assessed using table 10 of the Risk Tool).	LS*M=2.5	Less than every 10 years. Fires are common during the dry season in the savannah ecosystem in Africa. Chinko project implements an early burning strategy in order to prevent uncontrolled fires later in the season. AENOR has reviewed the fire analysis /203-204/ and have visited the activities related to preventive burning fires during the onsite visit in November 2022 to confirm that the information stated in this section of the NPRR is truth.

Risk factor	Risk Rating	Assessment
		Thus $L*S = 5$ is reasonable. Mitigation (M) measures = 0.5
Pest and disease outbreaks (assessed using table 10 of the Risk tool).	$LS*M=0$	Several studies have shown a negative correlation between the biodiversity of ecosystems and the emergence of outbreaks of pests and diseases that affect these ecosystems. It is assumed that no loss of the carbon stocks will be produced. AENOR has reviewed the evidence about pest and diseases /210-212/ and was compared with the NPRR and PDD information as well as with interviewing several people during the onsite visit. Thus $L*S = 0$ Mitigation (M) measures = 0
Extreme weather (assessed using table 10 of the Risk tool).	$LS*M=2$	Floods and droughts are events that can occur surprisingly in many savannas. AENOR has reviewed the risk of floods /205/ and deems that information is reasonable. Thus $L*S = 2$ is reasonable. No mitigation measures. Mitigation (M) measures: 1
Geological risks (assessed using table 10 of the Risk Tool).	$LS*M=0$	The project area is not within volcanoes activity area, earthquakes risk zone nor landslide risk area. Thus $L*S = 0$ is reasonable. Mitigation (M) measures: Not applicable.
Total natural risks = 4.5		
OVERALL RISK RATING = $2+0+4.5 = 6.5\%$. Then an overall risk rating of 10% is considered.		

The allocation of GERs to the buffer account was determined following the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, version 4.0. After applying the tool, the total value obtained was 6.5% (2% in the internal risks, 0% in the external risks and 4.5% in the natural risks). However, according to the requirements of the tool, the minimum risk rating shall be 10%, regardless of the risk rating calculated. Therefore, a 10% was used to determine the buffer account allocation.

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

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

AENOR confirmed during the on-site visit by interviewing local stakeholders the level of awareness about the results of the projects, its implementation and monitoring. Through different interviews, the audit team was able to compare and confirm the information provided in the MR according to the dissemination of the monitoring plan and results. The PP explains that the dissemination has been differed according to the stakeholder's group. For employees, hard copies were made available at the park headquarters (HQ) and the country office (assessed by the verification of the copies in the Kocho offices as well as contrasted with testimonies.). For local communities the dissemination depended on the level of illiteracy. AENOR carried out interviews with communities and pastoralists, and all of them recognized to have received documentation in relation to the CCA project.

For other stakeholders with more technical background, such as governmental institutions and private and philanthropic financial donors, African Parks is providing them access to project documentation and delivering frequent reports of the project activities either by sharing the files using USBs or by mail. AENOR verified this information by interviews with representatives of the Government.

AENOR confirms through visual observations during the visit that the PP properly records all the data, and they have the skills to provide clear documentation for the monitoring plan dissemination among stakeholders. During the interviews, AENOR asked if they received any type of material and all the interviewees recognized that information about the project, PDD and MP were shared with them, and explained in depth when needed.

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

Therefore, AENOR considers that the dissemination of the monitoring plan and the results have been carried out properly and correctly under the CCB standards and the PDD.

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

All the activities implemented by the PP to assist communities and/or biodiversity to adapt to the probable impacts of climate change were assessed by AENOR during the onsite visit. For example, for the pastoralism corridors, the VVB asked directly to the pastoralists about these zones and compared the information with the information gathered from the CAPEP and Bangassou interviews in which the land-use plan was being discussed. For the sensitization of pastoralists, AENOR was able to verify the information by interviewing ECHO teams and transhumant pastoralists. Therefore, with the data of the MR and the information obtained from the visit, AENOR deems that the measures to mitigate climate change and improve adaptation measures are implemented properly and match with the PDD.

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

AENOR deems that the benefits and the results of the actions to mitigate climate change, and deems that the activities mentioned above, and those described in the MR will assist the communities and positively will influence the project development and the livelihoods of the communities. By the onsite visit, and specifically with the activities mentioned above, the VVB was able to verify this section.

4.5 Community

4.5.1 Community Impacts (CM2.1)

Within this verification event, all the communities have been benefitted from the activities of the project.

Impacts have been described according to the type of stakeholder or community group as per section 4.1.1 of the MR.

- Employees: improvement of capacities such as trainings and enhancement of employment opportunities.
- Local communities: improvement of security, improvement of management of different areas while reducing conflicts, attendance to trainings and enhancement of capacities.
- Internally displaced people: humanitarian assistance

- Transhumant pastoralists: better management of their activities, reduction of conflicts and sensitization.
- Government: better knowledge about Chinko, improvement of the management capacities of the area

The project proponent has provided different evidence to demonstrate the community benefits mentioned above. The evidence provided has been the different trainings and stakeholder engagement activities /45-52/. Additionally, the audit team has verified these benefits through the onsite visit, where different interviews have been carried out and other documentation such as contracts has been shown to the verification team. About the employees, AENOR asked about the trainings they performed, and the information gathered was crosschecked with the records of trainings provided by AP. The results of employment opportunities also were asked, and all the employees recognized to be very grateful of the opportunity to be employed by Chinko. The rest of communities also noticed the benefits to have AP close to them, having the opportunity to be employed. The communities mentioned the problem they normally had with pastoralists, destroying their crops, stealing the sedentary cattle and robbing the families. With implementation of CCA they feel safer. AENOR also asked about the trainings carried out specifically for these communities and crosschecked with the PP evidence of the records. Complementary the PP showed the way in which AP helps different people by providing food, water and other basic necessities. This was verified onsite by reviewing records of the supports and pictures. The pastoralists, who also were interviewed by AENOR, recognized the creation of corridors and those areas will serve as grazing places avoiding conflicts with people and encounters with rangers' teams. Finally, from the interview with the Government, the Representatives of the Ministry of Environment recognized the great job of AP managing the area, trying to implement measures to manage properly the area in a equal way according to the needs and resources.

Therefore, AENOR's Verification team confirms that the information reported in the CCB-VCS-MR are properly addressed.

4.5.2 Negative Community Impact Mitigation (CM2.2)

AP has been sensitising hunters, fishermen, miners, loggers and local communities and authorities to promote the sustainable use of natural resources and communicating the future vision for Chinko, its legal status, the park boundaries, and the development of a comprehensive and participative land-use plan. With the arrival of a Community Development Manager in May 2017, first steps were taken to start up the community program. A work plan was drawn up to implement income-generating activities such as poultry breeding, saponification, farming etc. The plan was to roll out several community development initiatives in 2017 and 2018, however these projects were dependent on security in the communities. Regarding sustainable agriculture, in 2019 a consultancy firm called Oversee Advising Group was selected to carry out an in-depth socio-economic study of Chinko and its surroundings. The aim of the study was to enable the economic and social components to be better integrated into the Land-Use Plan and to be able to address the specific socio-economic concerns of the communities. The project started with a soil study, carried out by an agronomist. The soil analysis highlighted the following type of soil: loamy, clayey and sandy, which determined the type of crop recommended for production. Support was provided to the different market groups by supplying farming equipment and several types of vegetable seeds (especially those that are easily consumable and commercial at a local level). Also, the members received capacity building sessions in order to strength their skills in gardening. Further activities were developed also in 2020 such as the multiplication of crops and the continuation with vegetable gardening in Bangassou, Bakouma and Rafaï. Some strengthened areas were the preparation of market gardening land, the preparation of seedbed, some techniques of transplanting and the different types of phytosanitary inputs.

AENOR asked about the agriculture courses during the visit and considers that the information of the MR is reliable and correct. AENOR has also reviewed the final study report of such company.

The activities carried out in the monitoring period have been explained in section 4.1.2 of the MR. AENOR has reviewed the stakeholder engagement records /45-52/ to confirm the evidence provided in the MR by pictures. Also, by interviewing different groups, AENOR considers that the sensitization activities and the avoiding of conflicts by implementing different measures such as the land-use plan, are correct and do not have any evidence to demonstrate that the information is wrong. Testimonies from interviewed declared affirmatively the existence of sensitization activities, and AENOR interviewed people from the teams in charge of such sensitization activities, considering that the information is correct. PDD assessment by the audit team through the desk review and further onsite analysis concluded that the likelihood of net negative impacts on the well-being of the community is adequately addressed in the monitoring report and in accordance with the validated project description.

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

The PP provided in section 4.1.3 of the MR an in-depth explanation of the situation prior and during the CCA implementation. According to this information and the evidence provided about community activities or physical observations during the visit, AENOR considers that the information as correct.

About the impacts of the project, those stated by the PP are mainly: improvement of security conditions; improvement of natural and biodiversity conditions and knowledge about the value of the area; enhancement of employment opportunities and therefore improvement of livelihoods of communities.

AENOR's verification team confirms that net well-being impacts of the project are positive for all identified community groups compared with their anticipated well-being conditions under the without-project. This was assessed during the onsite visit through interviews with local stakeholders such as communities or pastoralists. The interviewees recognized that due to the project activities, among others, the possibilities to live without negative encounters, the chance to have better conditions related to health and food as well as a good salary and the opportunity to enjoy the animals present in the area. Hence, AENOR deems that the impacts in the community have turned positive in comparison with the situation prior to intervention.

4.5.4 Protection of High Conservation Values (CM2.4)

According to the MR there are two HCVs. To ensure the protection of these HCVs, the PP is carrying out monitoring, the annual reports /16-22/ and the location was also verified by the GIS files /153-172/. AENOR deems that the information about their protection matches with the testimonies gathered from the interviews, when AENOR asked about the protection of these places and the importance for the groups, such as the Rivers or the buffer zone, designed through meetings and good land use management.

Therefore, the verification team was able to confirm high conservation values have not been negatively affected by the project, but rather promoting their conservation.

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

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. The project activities have not created

negative impacts on other stakeholders. The transhumant pastoralists that enter the CAR from the Darfur region of Sudan may have been temporality impacted by the project activities because grazing is illegal in the project area but now with the proposal of the corridors they have clarities on where to take their cattle. Therefore, no net negative impacts on other stakeholders have been identified; on the contrary, the project has generated positive impacts for these stakeholders.

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

Community monitoring plan are detailed in section 4.3.1. of the monitoring report. The specific variables measured are:

- Training of rangers, ECHO, TANGO and other operators
- Development of land use planning
- Establishment of liaisons
- Identification of potential income generation activities
- Identification of tourism opportunities
- Support regional education

All these impacts were positive, and there were no negative impacts. Hence, the net impact of the project on all the above has been assessed to be positive. The frequency of monitoring is detailed in section 4.3.1 of the MR as well as the results of these observations.

Verification team assessed the evidence provided such as the stakeholder engagement and the annual reports /16-22/. Complementary, through the onsite visit, the audit team assessed through interviews the implementation of the monitoring activities with the different stakeholders and activities. AENOR confirms that community monitoring plan is implemented as per validated CCB-VCS-PDD.

4.5.7 Community Monitoring Plan Dissemination (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 evidence provided by the PP such as the stakeholder engagement activities /45-52/ and on the website of AP. AENOR team has also reviewed the links where the information has been uploaded for the stakeholders, and additionally, the audit team, through the onsite visit and the interviews performed confirms that the dissemination of the documents stated by the PP has been done correctly. In opinion of AENOR the results of community monitoring were disseminated in accordance with the validated CCB-VCS-PDD.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

4.6 Biodiversity**4.6.1 Biodiversity Changes (B2.1)**

Section 5.1.1 describes the biodiversity changes and different project interventions to produce the benefits which includes: increase landscape connectivity and enhancement of fauna populations.

The verification team reviewed the evidence provided by the PP, such as the *Aebischer* documentation about the previous and current conditions of the area. The onsite visit was a very important way to verify and assess these changes.

About the connectivity, AENOR, by the different flights carried out in November 2022, had the chance to identify the mosaic of habitats and ecosystems of Chinko. The open savannas of the north were contrasted with the woodland's areas mixed with bush vegetation and River vegetation in the center of the area and the dense tropical forest of the south, where for example Bangassou was located. AENOR considers that thanks to CCA, the connectivity of the vegetation is intact, and the different types of ecosystems are connected creating a mosaic of habitats. The without project scenario and the illegal activities that are unsustainable and incompatible with biodiversity conservation will imply a disconnect in the landscape, by deforestation, fire creation or degradation by other activities such as mines.

The fauna has clearly benefitted from the CCA project. The Conservation Manager showed the deep studies about fauna in Chinko, comparing numbers in the project, previous the pastoralists entered in the region, and currently. The data showed increase in numbers of key species through the conservation. Also, AENOR asked about fauna to all the interviewees. All of them recognized that that prior to the transhumant pastoralist's activities, was very easy to observe leopards, elephants, lions, or elands, but now, due to the pastoralist's presence, these populations were almost wiped out.

AENOR has reviewed the Chinko large mammal surveys for the different years and has confirmed that the population dynamics have suffered fluctuations regarding the year in which the fauna inventory was done. In that sense, the VVB has observed that the population densities before the project start were very elevated, but once the pastoralists started to go down into CCA, the populations drastically decreased. Some years later, once the CCA is established and the project staff is performing biodiversity conservation activities, the populations have risen again. AENOR has reviewed such evidence and has

confirmed onsite through explanations with the Conservation Manager and testimonies from other stakeholders.

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

4.6.2 Mitigation Actions (B2.3)

Section 5.1.2 of the monitoring report details the measures taken specifically designed, planned and implemented to create positive impacts for biodiversity through reducing direct or indirect threats to biodiversity and HCVs; a reduction in poaching; effective fire management; the effective management of transhumant pastoralism in the CCA; and sustainable natural resource management.

AENOR verified all of these activities on the following way:

- Reduction of poaching: interviewing rangers and asking about: the procedure of work, the poaching encounters during the MP, the typical animals poached and the reasons. AENOR attended the daily briefing meetings, in which all the AP staff met to discuss the sightings of each day in relation to poaching, sensitization, pastoralists or animal encounters. The conservation Manager also showed some evidence to demonstrate the work of the rangers and images about poaching.
- Effective fire management: AENOR reviewed the fire management plan and observed some of the prevention fires while the aerial flights were carried out to move around communities. Aenor auditor also accompanied the ECHO team and the conservation manager to review the creation of some of the prevention fires, avoiding additional fires during dry seasons.
- Transhumance sensitization: AENOR interviewed the TANGO team in charge of the sensitization and deems that the information stated on the MR and PDD is correct. AENOR also interviewed pastoralists, and they confirmed to be sensitized by staff from AP. Also, AENOR was able to verify this by attending the daily briefing meetings.
- Sustainable resource management: AENOR attended CAPEP, where the land use plan was being discussed. Also, the community members interviewed recognized to be part of the creation of the buffer zones according to their requirements.

The audit team during the onsite visit was able to confirm that the information stated in section 5.1.2 and along the whole biodiversity section is correct. Therefore, verification team concludes that the mitigation actions taken are appropriate and in accordance with validated project description. The VVB has asked to the managers and some people related to these activities about their performance in the cases any negative effect would occur in the project area. The people adjacent to the biodiversity conservancy are fully informed and are aware about these values of conservation and all of them have been sensitized on these mitigation activities to avoid negative effects.

4.6.3 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts (B2.2)

The CCA is also home to megafauna that could be affected by the disrupted ecosystem dynamics and human encroachment that climate change will cause. The climate impacts in the region could shrink the physical extent of habitats that currently have protected status or shift the distribution of specific plant species on which endangered species depend to areas outside of protection. By protecting the project area, the aim is to establish a self-regulating natural system that can adapt dynamically to changing

conditions over time and maintain a high level of biodiversity and resilient ecosystem functions to support both wildlife and provide critical services to local communities.

The net impact on biodiversity has been positive because of the protection of the ecosystems in the project area, as well as the conservation of vulnerable species that have their habitats in the park. Moreover, the management and sensitisation of transhumant pastoralism practice has and will continue to improve conditions in the park, with specific corridors for the movement of herds that reduce the impact on fauna from poaching and habitat degradation associated with the pastoralists and helping biodiversity adapt to the probable impacts of climate change.

Through direct interviews with stakeholders, review of evidence such as the *Climate change and adaptation in Central Africa* or the *Trophic rewilding as a climate change mitigation strategy* and other information stated in sections above, the audit team confirmed that the information stated on the MR is true, and the project activities have only positive incomes for biodiversity as well as for social sectors. Therefore, verification team considers that the net impact of the project's activities on biodiversity are positive.

4.6.4 High Conservation Values Protected (B2.4)

The HCVs in biodiversity are two: the Chinko Conservation Area and Chinko and Mbari Rivers. During the current monitoring period, none of them have been negatively affected by the project. Conversely, the improved protection of the CCA as a result of project activities has preserved the biodiversity present in the ecotone of the savanna and rainforest areas.

The conservation of Chinko, as CCA, provides better conditions for biodiversity in terms of refuge and the provision of ecosystem services such as food and shelter. With regard to the Rivers as HCVs, eco-monitors sensitized fishermen, miners and local communities to promote the sustainable use of natural resources in line with the land-use plan operating in the far south at the periphery of the reserve. AENOR asked to the communities about their opinion of Chinko conservation as well as the Rivers, and all of them recognized to be part of the conservancy and described the benefits of the project.

During the onsite visit, the VVB has reviewed several information, such as the plan to control and eliminate exotic species, and it was explicitly explained by the PP.

Therefore, AENOR deems that the information provided by the PP is reliable and correct.

4.6.5 Invasive Species (B2.5)

No invasive species were used in the project.

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

No invasive species were used in the project.

4.6.7 GMO Exclusion (B2.7)

No genetically modified organisms are used to generate GHG ERs or removals.

4.6.8 Inputs Justification (B2.8)

No fertilizers, chemical pesticides, biological control agents and other inputs are used for the project.

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

AENOR considers that the information stated in the MR is reliable and no negative impacts on biodiversity have been observed outside of the project due to the project activities. The activities that are forbidden within the project area are illegal activities under the laws of the country. Therefore, no offsite impacts related to the project activities will be expected.

4.6.10 Net Offsite Biodiversity Benefits (B3.3)

According to the MR, no explicit evaluation of biodiversity outside of the project area is available. However, project activities have likely had positive impacts on biodiversity inside and outside the project area and the net effect of the project in biodiversity is positive. Thanks to the project activities, vulnerable and endangered species are positively impacted, as their habitats are better protected and the occurrence of poaching has been dramatically reduced, this is reflected by the increase on the number of individuals identified per species. By introducing mitigation measures, such as sensitisation meetings with local communities who live in the periphery of CCA and transhumant pastoralists and creating sustainable opportunities aligned with the conservation approach of African Parks, the negative impacts on biodiversity both inside and outside the project area have been reduced.

This information has been assessed at the same time than the rest of biodiversity impacts and benefits, performed with onsite interviews with stakeholders and crosschecking the information with the statements of the MR. AENOR deems that the information provided on the MR is correct. AENOR considers that the information is correct, since the sensitization activities will help to reduce illegal activities such as poaching also out of the project, and the species will disperse their populations from Chinko to outside.

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

According to the MR, and the descriptions of the PDD, the main objectives of the monitoring of the biodiversity are:

- Monitor wildlife and human activities
- Monitor vulnerable and endangered species
- Review and amend zoning in relation to key species and habitats for a good management

AENOR reviewed records of the camera traps during the onsite visit. Also, AENOR followed the ECHO team in the process of trap cameras collection, when the methodology of setting up was explained. Also the ECHO team showed the way in which they do some inventory transects and explained the method of track counter. The team explained the origin of some tracks in a waterhole. The animals of these tracks were: waterbuck, eland, baboon and buffalo among others. During biodiversity monitoring, AENOR together with the ECHO team went to a remote waterhole in which they normally wait to look for animals. The VVB observed a giant forest hog in the hole. Complementary, the PP showed to the VVB the positions of several animals which were collared, and also the other techniques they have to monitor animals such as the aerial sightings. Complementary to the onsite verification, AENOR reviewed the images of the MR, the papers about biodiversity of Thierry Aebischer, the annual reports and other records of the camera trap images. The monitoring of biodiversity was also carried out for those species vulnerable or endangered as explained above, and table 11 of the MR provides an in depth summary of the results and the way of monitoring. About the monitoring of the management of the area was also assessed by interviewing the ECHO team officers, attending the briefing meetings and reviewing the results of the plan.

Therefore, the monitoring plan is compliant with the CCB-VCS-PDD. According to AENOR, the monitoring plan reflects the situation on the ground accurately. Measures scheduled and designed by the project

proponent to maintain or enhance the biodiversity are correct and results confirm their effectiveness. AENOR considers that the date of frequency and the results of the monitoring are correct according to the information reviewed.

4.6.12 Biodiversity Monitoring Plan Dissemination (B4.3)

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 asked to the stakeholders about the way documents were received and considers that the information stated in the MR is correct. AENOR has also reviewed the website where the PP has uploaded the information to share with the stakeholders and finally it has assessed with the community members to verify if the information has been shared properly with them.

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

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

The trigger species are Eastern Chimpanzee, African wild Dog and African Forest Elephant. AENOR has reviewed the annual reports /16-22/ and crosschecked with the species inventory and population trends during the MP. AENOR reviewed the records of trap cameras and saw examples of those species within the park. Together with the rest of activities of patrolling, sensitization or management, AENOR considers that the species are having an increase in their population with reducing threats. Therefore, AENOR considers that the project is implementing correct measures to ensure and improve the life of those species.

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

By reviewing the results of inventories as well as the opinion of communities and AP employees, together with the comparison between different annual reports, AENOR considers that the actions used to maintain or enhance the population of trigger species are correct and valuable.

4.7 Additional Project Implementation Information

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

4.8 Additional Project Impact Information

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

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

AENOR has verified that Chinko Conservation Area REDD+ Project, Central African Republic is in compliance with the Verified Carbon Standard version 4.1 without qualifications or limitations. The project has been implemented in accordance with the validated Project Description.

Verified GHG emission reductions provided by the project proponent and verified by AENOR has resulted in a total net GHG Emissions Reduction of 1,438,468 tCO₂e by the project during the monitoring period (15 September 2016 – 31 December 2020). Considering 10% of buffer withholding based on the VCS Non-Permanence Risk Assessment Tool v4.0, which means a buffer allocation of 143,850 tCO₂e, the Verified Carbon Units (VCU) to be issued are 1,294,618 tCO₂e.

Verification/monitoring period: 15 September 2016 – 31 December 2020.

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

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Buffer pool allocation	VCUs eligible for issuance
Sep 2016 – Dec 2016	97,680	7,387	8,933	81,358	8,136	73,222
2017	352,384	17,640	144,923	189,819	18,982	170,837
2018	374,724	5,040	8,017	361,666	36,168	325,498
2019	398,538	2,520	24,224	371,793	37,180	334,613
2020	452,672	4,850	13,989	433,832	43,384	390,448
Total	1,675,998	37,438	200,086	1,438,468	143,850	1,294,618

Overall non-permanence risk rating: 10%

VCUs buffer to be deposited: 143,850 tCO₂e.

Total VCUs to be issued: 1,294,618 tCO₂e.

Date: 20 November 2023

Lead Auditor
Javier Cócera



6 APPENDIX 1: VERIFICATION FINDINGS

Corrective action requests (CARs)

CAR ID:	01	Date: 16/01/2023
Description of CAR		
In section 2.2.1, some of the dates of milestones are incomplete since only the year is reported.		
Country participant response		Date: 18/01/2023
In section 2.2.1, the date of some milestones of the implementation schedule was updated to include the day, however, not all of them have a specific day but are activities done for multiple months or an extended period of time, so a footnote was added to provide clarity on this matter.		
Documentation provided by the Country Participant		
Updated MR		
VVB Assessment		Date: 23/01/2023
The section 2.2.1 on the date of some milestones has been updated with inclusion of a footnote to clarify that. Therefore, CAR 01 is closed.		

CAR ID:	02	Date: 16/01/2023
Description of CAR		
According to the VCS and CCB Monitoring Report Template the next sections require the following: 1. In the initial table, the contact's name for the PP must be provided. However, this requirement is not met. 2. In section 2.1.7, indicate the project location and geographic boundaries. Also include geodetic coordinates. However, the requirement is not met 3. In section 2.2.2, include evidence to demonstrate the deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG ER and do not relate any other part of the methodology. However, this requirement is not met. 4. In section 4.1.1, according to the template, describe also if it's a benefit, cost or risk. However, this requirement is not met. 5. In section 5.1.4, Demonstrate that no HCVs related to biodiversity in the project zone have been negatively affected by the project. However, the requirement is not met.		
Country participant response		Date: 18/01/2023

To comply with the requirements of the VCS and CCB Monitoring Report Template the following updates were done in the document:

1. In the initial table, the contact's name for the PP was added.
2. New details in section 2.1.7 were added, location folder with KML files added as supporting documentation.
3. Evidence of fire activity prior and during the project implementation was added section 2.2.2, to demonstrate the deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG ER.
4. Section 4.1.1 has been updated to describe if it's a benefit, cost or risk.
5. Section 5.1.4 has been updated to include details of the HCVs related to biodiversity and why they have not been negatively affected by the project.

Documentation provided by the Country Participant

CAR 02 folder with information relevant for item 2, including KML data required in the location requirement.

Updated MR

VVB Assessment

Date: 23/01/2023

1. Name and contacts for the project proponent have been added to the initial table.
2. In section 2.1.7, the project location, geographic boundaries with geodetic coordinates have been included to comply with this finding.
3. Section 2.2.2 has been updated to include evidence of fire activities before and during project implementation, demonstrating that the deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG ER.
4. Section 4.1.1 has been updated to describe the impact type as a benefit.
5. Section 5.1.4 has been updated to include details of the HCVs (such as CCA, Chinko and Mbari Rivers) and how they have been protected by the project.

Therefore, CAR 02 is closed

CAR ID:

03

Date: 16/01/2023

Description of CAR

The following errors have been found in the section "data and parameters":

1. For the value $f_{LS}i$, there are incongruences with the value and the evidence. Same for PDD.
2. $E_{\Delta GER}^{[i]} \rightarrow$ in the excel provided as evidence, this parameter does not match with GERs.

Country participant response

Date: 18/01/2023

The following updated have been made in the section "data and parameters":

1. For the value $f_{LS}i$, more details were added in sections 3.2.2 and 3.3.1 of the PDD and sections 3.1.1 and 3.2.2 of the MR to describe how the parameter is applied in the ER calculations.
2. $E_{\Delta GER}^{[i]}$ value corrected in section 3.1.2.

Documentation provided by the Country Participant

Updated MR and update excel spreadsheet with calculations

VVB Assessment

Date: 23/01/2023

1. Details have been added comments table of section of 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 of the MR to describe how the parameter is applied in the ER calculations.
2. Equation [F.54] values have been corrected in the MR.

Therefore, CAR 03 is closed

Clarification requests (CLs)

CL ID

01

Date: 16/01/2023

Description of CL

Please, provide further explanations or clarification about the following issues:

1. In section 1.2, many times it is stated that the number of employees is around 400 (all employees) while in education and other rows, the total amount is 400. Please clarify if the number is 400 or around 400. Also, in table 1 is stated that there are approximately 400 employees.
2. In the table of SDGs, please clarify the figure of SDG 13 and explain why is used estimated emissions instead of ex-post values as this is MR.
3. In section 2.3.1, please explain if the documentation has been provided in paper, online, by hand, etc.
4. In section 2.3.5, provide further information about the general process of CCB, not only about the visit of the auditor.
5. In section 2.3.8, provide further information about the input and influence of the project
6. In section 2.3.9, provide examples as demonstration is requested by template
7. In section 2.3.13, explain why other employments such as welder, tailor or carpenter are not reported in the MP.
8. In section 2.5.4, please explain why other illegal activities such as mining or illegal grazing are not reported
9. In section 3.1.4, please explain how is the distribution of the MP and results.
10. In section 4.3.2, please provide further information about the distribution process.
11. In section 5.3.1, due to this project is looking for gold level, and according to the template, include data to demonstrate the information. Therefore, provide some of the inventories to demonstrate the statements.
12. In section 5.3.2. please provide further information about the distribution and understanding of communities.
13. In section 5.4 it is stated in some species that during the last MP. Please, explain if the last MP is referred to the Current MP.
14. Please, provide evidence of section 4.1.4.

Country participant response

Date: 18/01/2023

Please, provide further explanations or clarification about the following issues:

1. Total number of employees in Section 1.2 were updated so all metrics have the same value described.

2. SDG 13 data in section 2.1.10 was updated to include the Gross Emission Reductions values.
3. Section 2.3.1 has been updated to include details of the way the information is shared.
4. Section 2.3.5 has been updated to provide further information about the information to stakeholders on the verification process.
5. Section 2.3.8 has been updated to provide further information about the stakeholders' input and influence of the project design.
6. Section 2.3.9 has been updated to provide examples and a footnote with the details of the supporting documentation available to demonstrate the consultation channels.
7. Section 2.3.13, has been updated to include information of workers in tasks related to logistics and operations, however, it is important to note that most of the supporting information described is regarding employees doing activities on the ground.
8. Section 2.5.4 was updated to include information of other illegal activities such as mining and more details of pastoralism.
9. Section 3.1.4 has been updated to include details of how the results were shared with the stakeholders.
10. Section 4.3.2 has been updated to include details of how the results were shared with the stakeholders.
11. Details of section 5.3.1 have been updated to include more details of the supporting documentation available, in addition, as part of the reply to the finding a folder with more supporting documentation of the biodiversity monitoring results was added to support the statements.
12. Section 5.3.2 has been updated to include details of how the results were shared with the stakeholders.
13. Language in Section 5.4 has been corrected, we are referring to the current monitoring period.
14. Section 4.1.4 has been updated to demonstrate that activities done during the monitoring period had no negative effects in the HCVs related to community

Documentation provided by the Country Participant

CL01 folder with information relevant for item 11, including results of biodiversity monitoring processes as well as reports to donors funding biodiversity activities. Updated MR

VVB assessment

Date: 24/01/2023

1. The total number of employees in Section 1.2 was updated so all metrics have the same value described.
2. In SDG 13 data in section 2.1.10 value has been corrected
3. Section 2.3.1 has been updated and includes details of information sharing modalities.
4. Section 2.3.5 has been updated to provide information to stakeholders on the verification process.
5. Information about the stakeholders' input and influence of the project design has been provided.
6. Section 2.3.9 has been updated to provide examples of consultation channels with stakeholders
7. Updated properly
8. The other illegal activities such as mining and more details of pastoralism have been included in section 2.5.4 of the MR
9. The distribution of the MP and results have been well captured in section 3.1.4.
10. Updated properly
11. section 5.3.1 has been updated to include more details of the supporting documentation available.
12. Section 5.3.2 has additional on distribution of information and community understanding
13. Section 5.4 language has been corrected.

14. Section 4.14 has been updated with evidential notes and maps.
Therefore, CL 01 is closed

7 APPENDIX 2: ATTENDANCE LISTS OF THE ONSITE AUDIT

AENOR
Cofina

PROJECT: Chinko Conservation Area
MEETING TOPIC: Social meeting - 10/11/22
LOCATION: Kacho
DATE: 16/11/22

ATTENDANCE LIST

No	NAME & SURNAME	ROLE/PROFESSION/STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMUNITY	SIGNATURE
1	Javier Caceres	AENOR		
2	Daniel Muehlen	AENOR		
3	Simon Bala	South Pole Manager		
4	Diego Arango	South Pole Manager		
5	Colleen A. Jones	SD Executive Assistant		
6	Elisavinda	CHILCO - Wildlife Policy Forum		
7	Chris Blythe	CHILCO Manager		
8	Antonia de la Cruz	UNEP, Chinko Conservation Area		
9	Theresa Rodriguez	Conservation Manager - AENOR		

PAGE 01 OF 01

AENOR
Cofina

PROJECT: Chinko Conservation Area
MEETING TOPIC: Women
LOCATION: Sam - Aubryda
DATE: 17/11

ATTENDANCE LIST

No	NAME & SURNAME	ROLE/PROFESSION/STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMUNITY	SIGNATURE
1	Javier Caceres	AENOR		
2	Daniel Muehlen	AENOR		
3	Adara Bala		Taka Dmone	
4	Emma Bala		Taka Hana	
5	Alisa Bala		Dmone	
6	Anna Chomom		Hana, Chada	
7	Thomas Bala		Taka Bala, Dmone	
8	Theresa Rodriguez	Transhumance		

PAGE 01 OF 01

AENOR
Cofina

PROJECT: Chinko Conservation Area
MEETING TOPIC: Social Meeting
LOCATION: Sam Aubryda
DATE: 17/11/22

ATTENDANCE LIST

No	NAME & SURNAME	ROLE/PROFESSION/STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMUNITY	SIGNATURE
1	Javier Caceres	AENOR		
2	Daniel Muehlen	AENOR		
3	Adam Bala	Responsable de la FSC		
4	Adara Bala		Taka Hana	
5	Theresa Rodriguez	Transhumance		
6	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
7	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
8	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
9	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
10	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
11	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
12	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
13	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
14	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
15	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
16	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
17	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
18	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
19	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
20	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
21	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
22	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
23	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
24	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
25	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
26	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
27	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
28	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
29	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
30	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
31	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
32	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
33	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
34	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
35	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
36	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
37	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
38	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
39	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
40	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
41	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
42	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
43	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
44	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
45	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
46	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
47	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
48	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
49	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
50	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
51	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
52	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
53	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
54	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
55	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
56	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
57	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
58	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
59	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
60	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
61	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
62	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
63	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
64	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
65	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
66	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
67	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
68	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
69	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
70	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
71	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
72	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
73	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
74	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
75	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
76	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
77	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
78	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
79	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
80	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
81	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
82	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
83	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
84	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
85	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
86	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
87	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
88	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
89	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
90	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
91	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
92	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
93	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
94	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
95	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
96	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
97	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
98	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
99	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	
100	Theresa Rodriguez		Chada	

PAGE 01 OF 01

AENOR
Cofina

PROJECT: Chinko Conservation Area
MEETING TOPIC: Transhumance - pastoralist
LOCATION: Sam - de Banya
DATE: 17

ATTENDANCE LIST

No	NAME & SURNAME	ROLE/PROFESSION/STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMUNITY	SIGNATURE
1	Javier Caceres	AENOR		
2	Daniel Muehlen	AENOR		
3	Adara Bala		Taka Dmone	
4	Emma Bala		Taka Hana	
5	Alisa Bala		Taka Bala	
6	Anna Chomom		Taka Bala	
7	Thomas Bala		Taka Bala	
8	Theresa Rodriguez	Transhumance		

PAGE 01 OF 01

AENOR
Cofina

PROJECT: Chinko Conservation Area
MEETING TOPIC: Workers of Chinko
LOCATION: Kacho
DATE: 18/11/22

ATTENDANCE LIST

No	NAME & SURNAME	ROLE/PROFESSION/STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMUNITY	SIGNATURE
1	THOMAS Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
2	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
3	BALLOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
4	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
5	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
6	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
7	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
8	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
9	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
10	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
11	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
12	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
13	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
14	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
15	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	

PAGE 01 OF 01

AENOR
Cofina

PROJECT: Chinko Conservation Area
MEETING TOPIC: Community meeting
LOCATION: Kacho
DATE: 18/11/22

ATTENDANCE LIST

No	NAME & SURNAME	ROLE/PROFESSION/STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMUNITY	SIGNATURE
1	Community N°1			
2	Community N°2			
3	Community N°3			
4	Community N°4			
5	Community N°5			
6	Community N°6			
7	Community N°7			
8	Community N°8			
9	Community N°9			
10	Community N°10			
11	Community N°11			
12	Community N°12			
13	Community N°13			
14	Community N°14			
15	Community N°15			
16	Community N°16			
17	Community N°17			
18	Community N°18			
19	Community N°19			
20	Community N°20			
21	Community N°21			
22	Community N°22			
23	Community N°23			
24	Community N°24			
25	Community N°25			
26	Community N°26			
27	Community N°27			
28	Community N°28			
29	Community N°29			
30	Community N°30			
31	Community N°31			
32	Community N°32			
33	Community N°33			
34	Community N°34			
35	Community N°35			
36	Community N°36			
37	Community N°37			
38	Community N°38			
39	Community N°39			
40	Community N°40			
41	Community N°41			
42	Community N°42			
43	Community N°43			
44	Community N°44			
45	Community N°45			
46	Community N°46			
47	Community N°47			
48	Community N°48			
49	Community N°49			
50	Community N°50			
51	Community N°51			
52	Community N°52			
53	Community N°53			
54	Community N°54			
55	Community N°55			
56	Community N°56			
57	Community N°57			
58	Community N°58			
59	Community N°59			
60	Community N°60			
61	Community N°61			
62	Community N°62			
63	Community N°63			
64	Community N°64			
65	Community N°65			
66	Community N°66			
67	Community N°67			
68	Community N°68			
69	Community N°69			
70	Community N°70			
71	Community N°71			
72	Community N°72			
73	Community N°73			
74	Community N°74			
75	Community N°75			
76	Community N°76			
77	Community N°77			
78	Community N°78			
79	Community N°79			
80	Community N°80			
81	Community N°81			
82	Community N°82			
83	Community N°83			
84	Community N°84			
85	Community N°85			
86	Community N°86			
87	Community N°87			
88	Community N°88			
89	Community N°89			
90	Community N°90			
91	Community N°91			
92	Community N°92			
93	Community N°93			
94	Community N°94			
95	Community N°95			
96	Community N°96			
97	Community N°97			
98	Community N°98			
99	Community N°99			
100	Community N°100			

PAGE 01 OF 01

AENOR
Cofina

PROJECT: Chinko Conservation Area
MEETING TOPIC: CAPED meeting
LOCATION: Bangassou
DATE: 19/11/22

ATTENDANCE LIST

No	NAME & SURNAME	ROLE/PROFESSION/STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMUNITY	SIGNATURE
1	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
2	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
3	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
4	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
5	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
6	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
7	MAMADOU Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	

PAGE 01 OF 01

AENOR
Cofina

PROJECT: Chinko Conservation Area
MEETING TOPIC: Stakeholder meetings
LOCATION: Bangassou CAPED
DATE: 19/11/2022

ATTENDANCE LIST

No	NAME & SURNAME	ROLE/PROFESSION/STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMUNITY	SIGNATURE
1	Adara Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
2	Adara Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	
3	Adara Bala	Worker - worker	Chinko / Kacho	

AENOR

PROJECT: Chino Conservation Area
MEETING TOPIC: Discussion

LOCATION: *Kecio*
DATE: *20/11/22*

ATTENDACE LIST

[illegible]

PAGE OF

AENOR

PROJECT: _____

MEETING TOPIC: _____

LOCATION: Rafai
DATE: 28/11/8

ATTENDANCE LIST

No	NAME & SURNAME	ROLE/PROFESSION/STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMUNITY	SIGNATURE
1	PINZA, DEGOUS, SIMPE	Ministre, Responsable du Secteur	RAFAT	
2	AKOUNGOU, SIKHE	Coordinateur du Soutien et appui technique	RAFAT	
3	DEFOU, MAHAGU	Responsable des Ressources	RAFAT	
4	NGAMA, GOMOU	Responsable Appui technique chef de group	RAFAT	
5	MIRAKOUMBA, CHRISTOPH	Responsable de l'éducation	RAFAT	
6	KITIPON, JUMOU	Professeur, ancien Rafati	RAFAT	
7	ABORAKAMBA, NINJAIG	chef de group eleveurs	RAFAT	
8	SALIE, BAMY	eleveur	RAFAT	
9	ABADJI, AWANGOU-DINGI	Eleveur	RAFAT	
10	ABADJI, FUMAROU	Eleveur	RAFAT	
11	MANOUA, AMAROU	TELEVEUR	RAFAT	
12	DEUPAIKOU, AMAROU	Eleveur	RAFAT	
13	SAHIL - ISSA	chef de village (Arde)	RAFAT	
14	ADOMBA-SALIE	President jeunesse	RAFAT (Cité Madoug)	
15	SEMI, PHENTOU	Eleveur	RAFAT	
16	KOU, AVOU - LAPIS	Eleveur	RAFAT	
17	EGBOU, ABIA BISSOU	Eleveur	RAFAT	
18	BOUAKOU, JARI	Eleveur	RAFAT	

PAGE OF

AENOR

PROJECT: LOCATION: RAISI
MEETING TOPIC: DATE: 20/November/2022

ATTENDACE LIST

No	NAME & SURNAME	ROLE/PROFESSION/TAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMUNITY	SIGNATURE
19	ISMAEL KUMARU	Chairman	RAFIA	
20	MAMUDU- ISSA	community leader	RAFIA	
21	ADAMU- KARY	community-leader	RAFIA	
22	KARANGO- Kumbi	Ecce crocodile AP dwingo	RAFIA	
23	MOLINARARU Bulbat	Ecce crocodile AP dwingo	RAFIA	
24	SUKO YODIN	Ecce crocodile	RAFIA	
25	WAGYU- RAYU	Ecce crocodile	RAFIA	
26	PAIRU- WILFUDU	Ecce crocodile	RAFIA	
27	BARATA- MALISSA	Ecce crocodile	RAFIA	
28	YUSUF-ALLEN	Chairman	RAFIA	
29	KARANGU- ISSA	Chairman	RAFIA	
30	MULIRU- WIRIN	Chairman	RAFIA	
31	HATHA- SALLI	Chairman	RAFIA	
32	HATHA-ADATH	Chairman	RAFIA	
33	HATHA- KANATHAN	Chairman	RAFIA	
34	HATHA- KATAYAN	Chairman	RAFIA	
35	ADATH- WIRIKALAI	Chairman	RAFIA	
36		Chairman	RAFIA	

PAGE 15

AENOR

PROJECT: Chiriko Conservation Area
MEETING TOPIC: Meeting of Environment (CLO)

ATTENDANCE LIST

[illegible]

PAGE 75