



**Verified Carbon
Standard**

EVERGREEN REDD+ PROJECT



Document Prepared by RINA Services S.p.A.

Project Title	<i>Evergreen REDD+ Project</i>
Version	<i>2.0Aa</i>
Report ID	<i>2021 BQ MD 35</i>

Report Title	<i>Evergreen REDD+ Project</i>
Client	<i>ITUXI ADMINISTRAÇÃO E PARTICIPAÇÃO LTDA</i>
Pages	<i>52</i>
Date of Issue	<i>17-March-2022</i>
Prepared By	<i>RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA)</i>
Contact	<i>Via Corsica 12, 16128 Genova, Italy</i> <i>+39 01053851</i>

	laura.severino@rina.org www.rina.org
Approved By	Laura Severino (Authorized officer signing for the DOE) Head of Sustainability Compliance & New Scheme Development Coordination Unit 
Work Carried Out By	<i>Team Leader and Technical Expert: Rekha Menon</i> <i>Validator, Local Expert and Technical Expert: Gustavo Góes</i> <i>Independent Technical Reviewer: Vinay Singh</i>

Summary:

RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA), commissioned by Ituxi Administração e Participação Ltda, verified the greenhouse gas emission reductions reported for the project activity “Evergreen REDD+ Project” in Brazil, with regards to relevant requirements for VCS rules. The objective of the grouped project activity is to avoid unplanned and planned deforestation. The first project activity instance has a total protected area of 130,554.8 ha within 5 private properties in the municipality of Apuí, Amazon state.

The objective of the verification is to have an independent review ex post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emission reductions, verification was conducted using RINA procedures in line with the requirements specified in the VCS version 4 requirements and applying standard auditing techniques. The verification consisted of desk review, remote site assessment and the resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and certification.

The verification shall ensure that reported emission reductions are complete and accurate in accordance with applicable VCS requirements in order to be certified.

This is the first verification assessment of “Evergreen REDD+ Project” for the monitoring period of 25 November 2020 to 31 July 2021.

The GHG emission reductions were calculated on the basis of the approved methodology VM0007 “REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD+ MF)” Version 1.6, 08 September 2020, and the monitoring plan included in the validated VCS PD version 1.0 of 29 December 2021.

In conclusion, it is RINA’s opinion that the project activity “Evergreen REDD+ Project” in Brazil, meets all relevant requirements for VCS standard and guidelines and correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology VCS VM0007 “REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD+ MF)” Version 1.6, 08 September 2020. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatement. Hence, RINA is able to certify that the emission reductions from the project during the monitoring period 25 November 2020 to 31 July 2021 amount to 853,085 tCO₂e and that tradable VCUs are 766,356 tCO₂e.

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Objective	4
1.2	Scope and Criteria	4
1.3	Level of Assurance.....	4
1.4	Summary Description of the Project	5
2	Verification Process.....	6
2.1	Method and Criteria.....	6
2.2	Document Review	6
2.3	Interviews	11
2.4	Site Inspections.....	11
2.5	Resolution of Findings	13
2.6	Eligibility for Validation Activities	14
3	Validation Findings.....	15
3.1	Participation under Other GHG Programs	15
3.2	Methodology Deviations.....	15
3.3	Project Description Deviations.....	15
3.4	Grouped Project	15
4	Verification Findings.....	15
4.1	Project Implementation Status	15
4.2	Safeguards	17
4.3	AFOLU-Specific Safeguards	18
4.4	Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations	19
4.5	Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals	33
4.6	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis.....	33
5	Verification conclusion	40
	APPENDIX 1: ABBREVIATIONS	41
	APPENDIX 2: LIST OF FINDINGS.....	412

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

Ituxi Administração e Participação Ltda has contracted RINA Services S.p.A. (hereinafter referred to as RINA) to verify the project titled “Evergreen REDD+ Project” (hereinafter referred to as the project) in the state of Amazonas, Brazil.

Verification is the periodic independent review and ex-post determination by an accredited verification body of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred as a result of the registered VCS project activity during a defined verification period.

A verification statement is the written assurance by a verification body that, during a specific period in time, a project activity achieved the emission reductions as verified.

The objective of this verification was to verify and provide a verification statement of emission reductions reported for the “Evergreen REDD+ Project” for the period 25 November 2020 to 31 July 2021.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of verification is:

- To verify that actual monitoring systems and procedures are in compliance with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan.
- To evaluate the GHG emission reduction data and express a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emissions reduction data is free from material misstatement.
- To verify that reported GHG emissions data is sufficiently supported by evidence.
- To verify that the stakeholder consultation carried out is relevant and there are mechanisms for on-going communication.

The VCS MR is reviewed against the criteria stated in the VCS Version 4.0, and the relevant documents and policy announcements made by the VCSA, and the criteria stated in the VCS methodology VM0007 “REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD+ MF)”, Version 1.6, 08 September 2020.

The verification shall ensure that reported emission reductions are complete and accurate in order to be verified.

1.3 Level of Assurance

RINA provides reasonable assurance that the “Evergreen REDD+ Project” meets VCS criteria. To ensure complete transparency, any clarification or corrective actions raised have been included in the Appendix 2. The verification expresses a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emission reduction data is free from material misstatement.

In addition, RINA applies materiality threshold of 5 per cent with respect to omission or misstatement concerning reported quantities as per VCS Standard.

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 RINA instructions, with reasonable level of assurance.

The technical review was performed by a technical reviewer(s) qualified in accordance with RINA's qualification scheme for VCS and CDM validation and verification.

The verification team and the technical reviewers consist of the following personnel.

Role	Last Name	First Name	Country
Team Leader and Technical Expert	Menon	Rekha	<i>External Auditor - Rina Brazil</i>
Validator, Local Expert and Technical Expert	Góes	Gustavo	<i>External Auditor - Rina Brazil</i>
<i>Technical Reviewer</i>	Singh	Vinay	<i>Internal Technical Reviewer</i>
<i>Technical Reviewer (Expert)</i>	Singh	Vinay	Internal – Rina India

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

Project Proponents	Ituxi Administração e Participação Ltda, Milenio Empreendimentos and Carbonext Consultoria Ltda.
Title of the project activity	Evergreen REDD+ Project.
Baseline and monitoring methodology	VM0007 “REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD+ MF)”, Version 1.6
Location of the project activity	The Evergreen REDD+ Project (hereafter “the project”) is situated in the Apuí municipality in the State of Amazonas.
Brief description of the project	The project is a grouped project that avoid unplanned deforestation (AUD) and planned deforestation (APD) of a region within the municipality of Apuí, Amazon. The first project activity instance has 130,554.8 ha of project area which is within 5 private properties. The present REDD project is expected to avoid a predicted 58,073.54 ha AUD and 26,470.88 ha APD resulting in 55,503,537 tCO₂e emissions reductions over the 30 -years project lifetime (25 November 2020 to 24 November 2050), including buffer (RF) and leakage (DLF). On the first verification, RINA is able to certify that the emission reductions from the project during the monitoring period amount to 853,085 tCO₂e and that tradable VCUs are 766,356 tCO₂e.
Monitoring period	25 November 2020 to 31 July 2021

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Method and Criteria

The verification consisted of the following three phases in accordance with the approved methodology, the VCS Standard version 4.1 and other relevant VCS requirements:

- A desk review of the project documents.
- Follow-up interviews with project stakeholders and remote site inspection.
- The resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the verification report and opinion.

The following sections outline each step in more detail.

2.2 Document Review

The VCS MR submitted by Carbonext and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e., VCS Monitoring Report Template, Approved VCS methodology, Validation and Verification Requirements, scientific literature and country law were reviewed.

The following tables list the documentation that was reviewed during the verification.

Documents provided by the project participant related directly to the VCS.

/1/	Carbonext Consultoria Ltda: VCS Monitoring Report for project activity “Evergreen REDD+ Project”, version 1.1 dated 14 March 2022
/2/	Carbonext Consultoria Ltda: Emission reductions calculation spreadsheet. MR1_SPREADSHEET_11_01_2022
/3/	Carbonext Consultoria Ltda: Non-Permanence risk report. VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Template-v4.0_Evergreen_MR1, version 1.0 dated 12 November 2021.docx Evergreen_FINANCIAL_VIABILITY_v10_NPRR.xlsx
/4/	Carbonext Consultoria Ltda: Project Description for the project activity “Evergreen REDD+ Project”, VCS-PD, version 01 of 29/12/2021
/5/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Standard version 4.1 dated 21 April 2021.
/6/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Validation and Verification Manual, version 4.0 dated 19 September 2019.
/7/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Program Definitions version 4.0 dated 19 September 2019.
/8/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Guidance for Standardized Methods version 3.3 dated 08 October 2013.
/9/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Program Guide version 4.0 dated 19 September 2019.
/10/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Verification Report Template, VCS version 4 dated 19 September 2019.
/11/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Monitoring Report Template, VCS version 4 dated 19 September 2019.
/12/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS AFOLU Non-Permanent Risk Tool version 4.0 dated 19 September 2019.
/13/	Verified Carbon Standard: VM0007 “REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD+ MF)”, version 1.6, 08 September 2020
/14/	RINA Accreditation: https://verra.org/project/rina-services-s-p-a/
/15/	RINA: Recording of remote site audit, 2021.
/16/	Evergreen_FINANCIAL_VIABILITY_v10_NPRR.xlsx
/17/	Contrato_REDD_Evergreen_agosto2020 -vp.pdf

/18/	Land titles and ownership documents: Alvorada
/19/	Land titles and ownership documents: Aroeira
/20/	Land titles and ownership documents: Boa Lembrança
/21/	Land titles and ownership documents: Buiúçu
/22/	Land titles and ownership documents: Damião
/23/	Mapbiomas: Historical LandUse shapefiles – from 2012 to 2021.
/24/	IPCC: Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Volume 4 AFOLU. 2006
/25/	Registered Florestal Santa Maria Project: https://registry.terra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/875
/26/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Program Guide version 4.0 dated 19 September 2019.
/27/	Verified Carbon Standard: VMD0001 Estimation of carbon stocks in the above- and belowground biomass in live tree and non-tree pools (CP-AB), v1.1, 11 October 2013
/28/	Verified Carbon Standard: VMD0005 Estimation of carbon stocks in the long-term wood products pool (CP-W), v1.1, 20 November 2012
/29/	Verified Carbon Standard: VMD0015 “Methods for monitoring of GHG emissions and removals in REDD and CIW projects (M-REDD)” Version 2.2, 08 September 2020
/30/	Fearnside et al.: Greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and forest fires in Roraima: sources and sinks, 2013
/31/	Barni et al: Spatial distribution of forest biomass in Brazil's state of Roraima, northern Amazonia, 2016.
/32/	Brown, S., A. J. R. Gillespie, and A. E. Lugo, 1989. Biomass estimation methods for tropical forests with applications to forest inventory data. Forest Science, 35:881-902.
/33/	Verified Carbon Standard: VMD0011 Estimation of emissions from market-effects (LK-ME), v1.1,
/34/	Saatchi, R.A. et al. Distribution of aboveground live biomass in the Amazon basin, 2007
/35/	Janaina Dallan CV: CV_Janaina_Dallan_eng2020.pdf.
/36/	Luiz Fernando de Moura CV: Luiz_Fernando_de_Moura-CV_en.pdf.
/37/	David John Morris Swallow CV: 21.03_David Swallow CV_EN.pdf.

/38/	<i>World Bank Institute's Worldwide Governance Indicators.</i> Available at: http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/Home/Reports.
/39/	ALLEN et al. Immediate damage by an earthquake to a temperate montane forest. <i>Ecology</i>, 1999, vol. 80, no. 2, pp. 708-714.
/40/	TOMINAGA et al. Desastres Naturais: conhecer para prevenir. Instituto Geológico, Governo do Estado de São Paulo, 3rd Edition, 2009.
/41/	REN et al. Mudslide-caused ecosystem degradation following Wenchuan earthquake 2008. <i>Geophysical Research Letters</i>, 2009, vol. 36, L 05401.
/42/	Instituto Socioambiental (ISA) (2019). O arco do desmatamento e suas flechas. https://www.socioambiental.org/sites/blog.socioambiental.org/files/nsa/arquivos/nova_geografia_do_arco_do_desmatamento_isa.pdf#overlay-context=pt-br/noticias-socioambientais/discurso-oficial-contra-fiscalizacao-impulsiona-destruicao-da-floresta-amazonica-mostra-isa
/43/	Secretaria de Estado do Meio Ambiente – SEMA. ESTADO DO AMAZONAS.. Altera a Resolução CEMAAM n° 17 de 20 de agosto de 2013, na forma deliberada na 47° Reunião Ordinária do CEMAAM. Resolução/CEMAAM N. 30 de 31 de outubro de 2018. WWF (Brasil) Protected Areas Program of the Amazon - ARPA (Brasil) (Org.). Arpa Biodiversidade. Amazonas:, 2010. 34 p.
/44/	IBGE: Population Estimates Tabnet Platform.
/45/	Embrapa: Ageitec: Embrapa Technological Information Agency. Available at : <https://www.agencia.cnptia.embrapa.br/gestor/solos_tropicais/arvore/CONT000fzyjaywi02wx5ok0q43a0r58asu5l.html>. Last accessed on: 01/12/2021.
/46/	IBAMA: Sustainable management authorized by Ibama in 2019 totaled 39 thousand hectares, 2020.
/47/	Training Procedures: Proced_Forest Management Training_Evergreen.pdf Proced_Sustainable Cattle Management Training_Evergreen.pdf Proced_Wild-Harvesting Training_Evergreen.pdf
/48/	Carbonext: Property Control and Fire Prevention Procedure, 2020.
/49/	RINA: Remote Audit Attendance List, 23-September-2021.
/50/	Public consultation: Video, 17-July-2021.
/51/	Public consultation: Records of interview questionnaires, 15-July-2021.

/52/	Public consultation: Photos, 15-July-2021.
/53/	Police report, 01/04/2021.
/54/	Airplane purchase: Airplane's photos,
/55/	Airplane purchase: Airplane's receipt, 29 June 2021.
/56/	Airplane purchase: Certificate of Registration, 17 September 2021.
/57/	Ferry installation: Material purchase receipts, 13 to 27 July 2021.
/58/	Ferry installation: Photos and videos.
/59/	Boa Lembrança Base repairs: Material purchase receipts, 12 July 2021 to 16 July 2021.
/60/	Boa Lembrança Base repairs: Photos and vídeos, 15 July 2021.
/61/	First Aid Training: Attendance list, 17 July 2021.
/62/	Air, river and land monitoring records, 2021.
/63/	Gold Standard: https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects?q=&page=1 , last accessed on 29 December 2021.
/64/	CDM: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/projsearch.html , last accessed on 29 December 2021.
/65/	Carbonext Consultoria Ltda: Coordinates KML file.

2.3 Interviews

On 23 September 2021, the verification team from RINA conducted the remote audit to the “Evergreen REDD+ Project” based on videoconference and performed interviews with project proponents’ staff. The remote audit video and an attendance list signed by the project participants is available with Audit team /49/.

	Date	Name	Organization	Role	Topic
/a/	23 September 2021	Janaína Dallan	Carbonext Consultoria Ltda	CEO Carbonext	Project presentation.
/b/	23 September 2021	Luis Fernando de Moura	Carbonext Consultoria Ltda	REDD+ technical coordinator	ER calculations, comparison between recorded data and calculation spreadsheets, monitoring plan.
/c/	23 September 2021	David John Morris Swallow	Carbonext Consultoria Ltda	Technical director	Verification of actual implementation as per VCS PD, non-permanence risk report.
/d/	23 September 2021	Jéssica Lima Guin	Carbonext Consultoria Ltda	REDD+ project analyst	Verification of actual implementation as per VCS PD, non-permanence risk report.
/e/	23 September 2021	Alice Dias da Cruz	Carbonext Consultoria Ltda	GHG protocol inventory analyst	Records and storage of data.
/f/	23 September 2021	Renan Vitoriano Bohem	Milenio Empreendimentos	Project Proponent (Landowner)	Ownership, verification of actual implementation. Monitoring plan.
/g/	23 September 2021	Ricardo Stoppe Junior	Ituxi Administração e Participação Ltda	Project Proponent (Landowner)	
/h/	23 September 2021	Rafael H. Ruas Martins	Carbonext Consultoria Ltda	SIG coordinator	Satellite data acquisition and processing, calibration data
/i/	23 September 2021	Gilson Macena do Rosario	Fazenda Boa Lembrança	Project's staff	Stakeholder consultation,

/j/	23 September 2021	Jaqueline da Silva Oliveira	Neighboring community	-	Grievance mechanism, Benefits from the project, employment generation, trainings, patrolling from forest officers, trend in deforestation, livelihood, and socio-economic.
/k/	23 September 2021	Edson Marques	Neighboring community	-	
/l/	23 September 2021	Reury Silverman Domaneschi	Neighboring community	-	

2.4 Site Inspections

The auditing team could not visit the site due to COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent travel restrictions. The VVB could not postpone the site visit due the prevailing uncertainty in travel restrictions and the deadline for completion of the project as per the VCS standard requirements and signed contract between the VVB and the PP. Additionally, it is noted that there is no mandatory VCS Program requirement that mentions that a site visit must be conducted (even for forestry projects). However, to make sure that the VVB complies with the clause 4.1.2 of VCS Standard Version 4.1, all the information provided in the MR and ER spread sheets was verified during the desk-review phase. In addition, the VVB also checked the documents against credible sources and interviews with concerned stakeholders. The VVB carried out the audit by other means of standard auditing techniques, which included video conference calls, videos of the site, videos of the project site, remote sensing imagery, publicly available documents and interviews via MS team. The recording of remote site audit is available with audit team/15/. The same is as per the VCS- COVID travel guidance(<https://verra.org/covid-19-travel-guidance/>).

During the desk assessment of the project, the auditing team assessed the implementation and operation of the proposed project activity, project area, reference region area and the leakage belt area, baseline, additionality. The same was crosschecked by interviewing the stakeholders. Independent check of baseline deforestation was carried out by the authorized sites from the Brazilian Government.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

The objective of this phase of the verification was to resolve any outstanding issues that needed be clarified prior to RINA's positive conclusion on the monitoring report.

A corrective action request (CAR) is issued if one of the following occurs:

The project participants have made mistakes that will influence the ability of the project activity to achieve real, measurable additional emission reductions.

The VCS requirements have not been met.

There is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated.

A clarification request (CL) is raised if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable VCS requirements have been met.

7 CARs and 2 CLs were raised and have been adequately addressed by the project participant (refer to Appendix 2).

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

A forward action request (FAR) is raised during validation to highlight issues related to project implementation that require review during the first verification of the project activity.

A forward action request (FAR) should be issued, where:

1. the actual project monitoring and reporting practices requires attention and /or adjustment for the next consecutive verification period, or
2. an adjustment of the MP is recommended.

No forward action requests (FAR) were identified.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

As of the contractual service date with the client, RINA holds accreditation for validation and verification activities under sectoral scope 14 as set out by the eligibility guidelines set forth in the VCS Program Guide /26/ and as recognized by the VCSA.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

Use this section to provide details of all validation activities that took place during the verification, such as gap validation, validation of methodology deviations and project description deviations, and the inclusion of new project activity instances into grouped projects.

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

The project has not participated or been rejected under any other GHG programs since validation. moreover, there is no evidence of the project's rejection from any other GHG programs as per the GS and CDM project data base /63/ /64/.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

The Evergreen REDD+ Project has no methodology deviations during this monitoring period.

3.3 Project Description Deviations

The Evergreen REDD+ Project has no project deviations during this monitoring period.

3.4 Grouped Project

The project activity is a grouped project; however, no new project activity instance was included.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

During the remote audit, through observations of project activities and interviews with project personnel (see /a/ - /j/) RINA confirmed that the project has been implemented throughout this monitoring period as it was described in the monitoring report /1/.

The monitoring report was cross-checked against the monitoring plan submitted in the VCS PD /4/ to ensure compliance in terms of GHG emission reduction calculations as well as monitoring occurrences. RINA also conducted interviews (see /a/ - /j/) to confirm that monitoring plans were implemented as described in the VCS PD /4/.

The verification team has determined whether the monitoring plan has been properly implemented and followed by PP that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the registered monitoring plan; and determined whether all parameters including project emission parameters, baseline emission parameters and leakage emission parameters used for emission reduction calculation stated in the registered monitoring plan are monitored or used appropriately as per the VCS PD /4/.

During the verification all monitoring parameters listed in Section 4 of MR /1/ were compared with monitoring parameters and the monitoring plan of the VCS PD /4/ and have been verified with regard to appropriateness of the applied measurement / determination method, the correctness of the values applied for ER calculation /2/, the accuracy and applied QA/QC measures.

The verification team confirmed that the project proponents have implemented surveillance activities /62//i/. The audit team has verified the project implementation activity during the remote audit through videos /50/, interview with specific stakeholders /i - l/ and also through document analysis /51/. As described in the MR and verified during the remote audit, a hybrid model aircraft was purchased to carry out aerial monitoring /54//55//56/, the owner carried out repairs to the structure and painting to revitalize the Boa Lembrança monitoring base /59//60/ and it was verified the training on fire brigades /61/ carried out during the first monitoring period.

In line with Guidelines for Application of materiality in verifications /6/ a reasonable level of assurance is defined for the verification of the project by complete verification of all the values indicated in the emission reduction spreadsheet at the document review stage and remote site. There are no material errors, omissions or misstatements.

There are no material discrepancies between the actual monitoring system, and the monitoring plan set out in the project description and the applied methodology.

The GHG emission reductions or removals generated by the project have not become included in an emissions trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading.

The project has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit, or has not become eligible to do so since validation or previous verification.

The project has not participated or been rejected under any other GHG programs since validation or previous verification.

The project sustainable development contribution was assessed and confirmed by the VVB through remote assessments and interviews (see /a/ - /j/) with project management team and with supporting documents provided by PP. The project contributes to several nationally stated sustainable development priorities, such as the following objectives and targets from the Brazilian Government related to the Sustainable Development Goals:

- SDG 1: No poverty;
- SDG 3: Healthy lives;
- SDG 8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all;
- SDG 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts;
- SDG 15: To protect, restore and promote the sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, to manage forests sustainably, to combat desertification, to halt and reverse land degradation, and to halt the loss of biodiversity.

Reducing deforestation and promoting sustainable development in the Amazon is also a key component to Brazil's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) under the Paris Agreement. According to the Brazilian Government Ministry for the Environment (in Portuguese, Ministério do Meio Ambiente), the implementation of REDD+ activities are an important component to meet the Country's contribution under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change while preserving natural forest resources.

The Evergreen REDD+ Project has no methodology deviations and no project deviations during this monitoring period.

Thus, it's RINA's conclusion that the project has been implemented as described in the project description.

4.2 Safeguards

4.2.1 No Net Harm

As mentioned in the VCS MR /1/, the project does not cause any potential negative environmental and socio-economic impacts since this project is a conservation project implemented in private properties. The positive impacts identified by PP are described in section 2.1 of the VCS MR /1/ and were verified /10/ /11/ /51/ by the VVB team.

4.2.2 Local Stakeholder Consultation

As stated in the MR /1/, during the validation of project activity, a physical stakeholder consultation was carried out at the community level and due to COVID pandemic feedbacks were also invited from various

organizations via email. Noted that the project did not receive any negative comments either in presential meeting or via e-mail.

A communication channel (Carbonext phone and email) has been established with stakeholders to better explain the project activities and to respond to stakeholders' doubts and concerns related to the project. During the remote audit, the verification team checked the online permanent communication channel with local stakeholders that was created to receive any comments or suggestions regarding the present REDD project. The local communication channel was created to establish an effective interaction with the residents of the region.

During the remote audit, the verification team interviewed some stakeholders and all of them were of positive opinion. The stakeholders interviewed confirmed that Evergreen Redd+ Project has processes to communicate and consult the local stakeholders /i - l/.

4.3 AFOLU-Specific Safeguards

The processes used to identify local stakeholders likely impacted by the project was a survey in the project region. As described in the MR /1/ and VCS PD /4/, the activities implemented by PP to mitigate risks to local stakeholders due to project implementation were evaluated as part of the public consultation.

As explained by project participants, any updates to the property and land use rights of the local stakeholders and the evidence provided that the project has not negatively impacted such rights without first obtaining the free, prior and informed consent of the affected parties, and provided just and fair compensation if done so: given that the project is carried out in a private territory, there are no conflicts over title with the surrounding communities. In addition, during the public consultation, the participants signed the document "Declaration of Consent with the Project" /51/, where they give their free consent and acceptance with the project objectives and its development.

RINA was informed about the processes used by PP to communicate and consult with local stakeholders during the validation and checked the communication channel created and used during the monitoring period. Grievance redress and conflict management procedures, as well as benefit sharing mechanisms have been discussed in communication meetings with neighbours and communities. In case of any grievances, this will be resolved in a suitable timeframe whenever possible, taking into account culturally-appropriate conflict resolution methods.

4.4 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

According to VCS: VM0007 REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD+ MF) v1.6, The total net greenhouse gas emissions reductions of the REDD project activity are calculated as follows:

$$NER_{REDD} = (\Delta C_{BSL-REDD} - \Delta C_{WPS-REDD} - \Delta C_{LK-REDD})$$

Where:

NER_{REDD}	Total net GHG emission reductions of the REDD project activity up to year t* (t CO2e)
$\Delta C_{BSL-REDD}$	Net GHG emissions in the REDD baseline scenario up to year t* (t CO2e)
$\Delta C_{WPS-REDD}$	Net GHG emissions in the REDD project scenario up to year t* – from Module MREDD (t CO2e)
$\Delta C_{LK-REDD}$	Net GHG emissions due to leakage from the REDD project activity up to year t* (t CO2e)

Baseline emissions ($\Delta C_{BSL-REDD}$)

According to the VM0007 REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD+MF) /58/ the baseline of the REDD project activity is estimated ex ante as follows:

$$\Delta C_{BSL-REDD} = (\Delta C_{BSL,planned} + \Delta C_{BSL,unplanned} + \Delta C_{BSL,deg rad - FW/C})$$

$\Delta C_{BSL-REDD}$	Net GHG emissions in the REDD baseline scenario up to year t* (t CO2e)
$\Delta C_{BSL,planned}$	Net GHG emissions in the baseline scenario from planned deforestation up to year t* – from Module BL-PL (t CO2e)
$\Delta C_{BSL,unplanned}$	Net GHG emissions in the baseline scenario from unplanned deforestation up to year t* – from Module BL-UP (t CO2e)
$\Delta C_{BSL,deg rad - FW/C}$	Net GHG emissions in the baseline scenario from degradation caused by fuelwood collection and charcoal making up to year t* – from Module BL-DFW (tCO2e)

Avoided Unplanned Deforestation ($\Delta C_{BSL,planned}$)

In accordance with the VCS VMD0007-BL-UP_v3.3 methodological module, the full calculation to obtain the projected baseline deforestation for the MR period was therefore:

AUD proportion of PA area x deforestation rate x partial year factor

Satellite images from Mapbiomas /23/ of the historical reference period between 2012 and 2020, it was used to estimate the rate of annual deforestation. The resulting average annual rate in the submontane dense stratum is 1.86%.

Avoided Planned Deforestation ($\Delta C_{BSL,unplanned}$)

Regarding Avoided Planned Deforestation (APD), as described in PD section 3.4 (Baseline Scenario), the schedule regarding Avoided Planned Deforestation (APD) is from June 2022 to June 2027, involving 26,407 hectares, therefore it is outside the monitoring period of the present Monitoring Report.

Project emissions ($\Delta C_{WPS-REDD}$)

Project emissions are determined as the sum of emissions arising from logging gap in project area and emissions from constructing logging infrastructure for removal of timber in project area minus the wood products carbon pool in project area.

Over the monitoring period (25/11/2020 – 31/12/2020), no deforestation was detected in the Project Area /23/.

Leakage ($\Delta C_{LK-REDD}$)

According to the methodology VM0007 /13/ Net GHG emissions due to leakage from the REDD project activity is estimated as follows:

$$\Delta C_{LK-REDD} = (\Delta C_{LK-AS,planned} + \Delta C_{LK-AS,unplanned} + \Delta C_{LK-AS,deg\ rad - FW/C} + \Delta C_{LK-ME,})$$

Where:

$\Delta C_{LK-REDD}$	Net GHG emissions due to leakage from the REDD project activity up to year t^* , (t CO ₂ e)
$\Delta C_{LK-AS,planned}$	Net GHG emissions due to activity shifting leakage for projects preventing planned deforestation up to year t^* – from Module LK-ASP (t CO ₂ e)
$\Delta C_{LK-AS,unplanned}$	Net GHG emissions due to activity shifting leakage for projects preventing unplanned deforestation up to year t^* – from Module LK-ASU (t CO ₂ e)
$\Delta C_{LK-AS,deg rad - FW/C}$	Net GHG emissions due to activity shifting leakage for degradation caused by extraction of wood for fuel up to year t^* – from Module LK-DFW (t CO ₂ e)
$\Delta C_{LK-ME,}$	Net GHG emissions due to market-effects leakage up to year t^* – from Module LK-ME (t CO ₂ e)

Market Leakage ($\Delta C_{LK-ME,}$)

Total GHG emissions due to market-effects leakage through decreased timber harvest is equal to the summed emissions from timber harvest in the baseline case potentially displaced plus a leakage factor:

$$LK_{MarketEffects,Timber} = \sum_{i=1}^M (LF_{Me} * AL_{T,i})$$

Where:

$LK_{MarketEffects,Timber}$	Total GHG emissions due to market- effects leakage through decreased timber harvest; t CO ₂ -e
LF_{Me}	Leakage factor for market-effects calculations; dimensionless
$AL_{T,i}$	Summed emissions from timber harvest in stratum i in the baseline case potentially displaced through implementation of carbon project; t CO ₂ -e
i	1,2,3,...M strata

The deduction factor (LF_{Me}) was adopted as 0.2, given that the biomass of total aboveground tree is considered to be 32,65% greater in the Amazon Biome than in the Project Area. According to the module

VMD0011 (LK-ME) /33/, when the mean biomass is more than 15% greater than the biomass within the project boundaries, the LF_{Me} shall be considered 0.2.

The total volume that would have been logged in the baseline in the Project Area, across strata and time periods, is estimated as follows:

$$AL_{T,i} = \sum_{t=1}^t (C_{BSL,XBT,i,t})$$

Where:

$AL_{T,i}$	Summed emissions from timber harvest in stratum i in the baseline case potentially displaced through implementation of carbon project; t CO2-e
$C_{BSL,XBT,i,t}$	Carbon emission due to displaced timber harvests in the baseline scenario in stratum i in time t; t CO2-e
i	1,2,3,...M strata
t	1, 2, 3, ... t years elapsed since the projected start of the REDD project activity

The carbon emission due to the displaced logging has two components: the biomass carbon of the extracted timber and the biomass carbon in the forest damaged in the process of timber extraction:

$$C_{BSL,XBT,I,T} = ([V_{BSL,XE,I,t} * D_{mn} * CF] + [V_{BSL,XE,I,t} * LDF] + [V_{BSL,XE,I,t} * LIF]) * \frac{44}{12}$$

Where:

$C_{BSL,XBT,i,t}$	Carbon emission due to displaced timber harvests in the baseline scenario in stratum i in time t; t CO ₂ -e
$V_{BSL,XE,I,t}$	Volume of timber projected to be extracted from within the project boundary during the baseline in stratum i at time t; m ³
D_{mn}	Mean wood density of commercially harvested species; t d.m.m-3
CF	Carbon fraction of biomass for commercially harvested species j; t C td.m.-1
LDF	Logging damage factor; t C m-3 (default 0.53 t C m-3 for broadleaf and mixed forests)
LIF	Logging infrastructure factor; t C m-3 (default 0.29 t C m-3)
i	1,2,3,...M strata
t	1, 2, 3, ... t years elapsed since the projected start of the REDD project activity

The table below summarizes the calculation steps and results of market leakage estimates for the Evergreen REDD+ Project.

D_{mn}	0.59 t/m ³	/32/
CF	0.47	/24/
LDF	0.53 tC/m ³	/33/
LIF	0.29 tC/m ³	/33/

Leakage outside ($\Delta C_{LK-AS,unplanned}$)

According to the applied module LK-ASU the proportion migrating to the Leakage Belt is calculated as the area of the Leakage Belt as a proportion of the total available forest area nationally (AVFOR). AVFOR was estimated as follows:

$$AVFOR = TOTFOR - PROTFOR - MANFOR$$

Where

AVFOR	Total available national forest area for unplanned deforestation; ha
TOTFOR	Total available national forest area; ha
PROTFOR	Total area of fully protected forests nationally; ha
MANFOR	Total area of forests under active management nationally; ha

TOTFOR consisted of multiplying size of the Brazilian Amazon by 97%, which represents its preserved area, according to SEMA /43/. As a result, TOTFOR represents 486,461,572 ha. According to the Embrapa /45/, PROTFOR is equivalent to 10.4% of the Brazilian territory, calculated as 88,566,400 ha. MANFOR is estimated in 1,400,000, according to IBAMA /46/. In this context, AVFOR is estimated as 396,495,172 ha.

The proportion of Leakage Belt area related to the total available national forest area (PROPLB) is calculated by dividing Leakage Belt area by AVFOR. This procedure results in PROPLB equal to 0.000306171 (dimensionless).

The proportional leakage for areas with immigrating populations (LK_{PROP}) was then equal to the immigrating proportion multiplied by the proportion of available national forest area outside the Leakage Belt multiplied by the proportional difference in stocks between forests inside and outside the Leakage Belt

$$LK_{PROP} = PROP_{IMM} * (1 - PROP_{LB}) * PROP_{CS}$$

Where:

LK_{PROP}	Proportional leakage for areas with immigrating populations; proportion
$PROP_{IMM}$	Estimated proportion of baseline deforestation caused by immigrating population; proportion
$PROP_{LB}$	Area of forest available for unplanned deforestation as a proportion of the total national forest area available for unplanned deforestation; proportion
$PROP_{CS}$	Proportional difference in stocks between areas of forest available for unplanned deforestation both inside and outside the Leakage Belt; proportion

LK_{PROP} was estimated in 0.018.

Leakage due to the proportion of the baseline deforestation actors who are displaced to areas outside the Leakage Belt was therefore equal to the change in stocks in the baseline scenario minus the change in stocks in the project scenario multiplied by the proportional leakage factor for areas with immigrating populations:

$$\Delta C_{LK-ASU,OLB} = (\Delta C_{BSL,LK,unplanned} - \Delta C_{P,LB,}) * LK_{PROP}$$

Where:

$\Delta C_{LK-ASU,OLB}$	Net CO2 emissions due to unplanned deforestation displaced outside the Leakage Belt ; t CO2-e
$\Delta C_{BSL,LK,unplanned}$	Net CO2 equivalent emissions in the baseline from unplanned deforestation in the leakage belt; t CO2-e
$\Delta C_{P,LB,}$	Net CO2 equivalent emissions within the leakage belt in the project case; t CO2-e
LK_{PROP}	Proportional leakage for areas with immigrating populations; proportion

For the difference in emissions from unplanned deforestation within the Leakage Belt in the baseline and in the project case, a 10% factor was considered (i.e. $\Delta C_{P,LB,}$ was considered to be 10% higher than $\Delta C_{BSL,LK,unplanned}$). It is assumed that this factor is valid for the Evergreen REDD+ Project, given that the project proponent will adopt a series of activities for leakage mitigation, as previously mentioned in this VCS-PD.

Leakage Outside ($\Delta C_{LK-AS,planned}$)

According to the module VMD0009 (LK-ASP): “Where the specific deforestation agent can be identified, leakage does not need to be considered where it can be demonstrated that the management plans and/or land-use designations of the deforestation agent’s other lands (which must be identified by location) have not materially changed as a result of the project¹ (e.g., the deforestation agent has not designated new lands as timber concessions, increased harvest rates in lands already managed for timber, cleared intact forests for agricultural production or increased fertilizer use to enhance agricultural yields).”

The Alvorada property is currently under the ownership of Ituxi Administração e Participação Ltda , and Milenio Empreendimentos is the other project area owner involved in the Evergreen REDD project. No

forest clearing or sustainable forest management plans have been requested by either company since project start date 25th November 2020.

Based on the values obtained for Market Leakage, Leakage Outside the Leakage Belt, and Activity Shifting Leakage, the Total Leakage was as follows:

Leakage			
Market leakage (tCO2)	Leakage outside (tCO2)	Shifting leakage (tCO2)	Total (tCO2)
5,539.9	726.04	0.0	6,265.99
31,742.4	4,160.04	0.0	35,902.44

VVB conducted a rigorous review of all input data, parameters, formulas, calculations and output data and verified that the GHG emission reductions and/or removals have been quantified in accordance with the project description (with the exception of the methodology deviation discussed in section 3.3 of this report) and applied methodology /13/.

The total GHG emissions reductions and removals for the monitoring period from 25 November 2020 to 31 July 2021 is 853,085 tCO₂e /2/.

Parameters Available at Validation and Data Fixed Ex-ante

Data/parameter	Unit	Value applied	Assessment
CF	tCt/td.m-1	0.47	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Volume 4 AFOLU /24/.
44/12	Dimensionless	44/12	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Volume 4 AFOLU /24/.
R	t root d.m.t-1 shoot d.m	0.37	VMD0001 Estimation of carbon stocks in the above- and belowground biomass in live tree and non-tree pools (CP-AB), v1.1- page 17; “Tropical rainforest”; “>125 t.ha ⁻¹ ” /27/.
WW _{ty}	Dimensionless	0.24	Default value for developing countries: VCS Module VMD0005 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of Carbon Stocks in The Long-Term Wood Products Pool (CP-W). - page 14 /28/.
SLF _{ty}	Dimensionless	0.20	VCS Module VMD0005 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of Carbon Stocks in The Long-Term Wood Products Pool (CP-W): Sawnwood, page 13 /28/.
OFT _{ty}	Dimensionless	0.80	VCS Module VMD0005 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of Carbon Stocks in The Long-Term Wood Products Pool (CP-W) /28/.

P_{COMi}	Dimensionless	Submontane dense: 0.08235 Submontane open: 0.08155	For calculation of this parameter, the volume of merchantable wood in exploitation (in m^3/ha) has been based on "Florestal Santa Maria Project" /25/ ($35.08 m^3/ha$), whose Project Area is located about 120 km South of this Project Area and has the same two forest classes represented within it.
$C_{WP,i}$	$t CO_2e ha^{-1}$	2.61	VCS Module VMD0005 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of Carbon Stocks in The Long-Term Wood Products Pool (CP-W) /28/.
Cab_tree	$t CO_2e ha^{-1}$	433.3 for Submontane dense 437.6 for Submontane open	The value is the result of the division of the total aboveground carbon pool per stratum by the area. Based on the study from Fearnside et al. 2013 /30/ and Barni et al. 2016 /31/).
Cbb_tree	$t CO_2-e ha^{-1}$	254.5 for Submontane dense 257.0 for Submontane open	The value is the result of the division of the total aboveground carbon pool per stratum by the area.
C_{XB}	$t CO_2-e ha^{-1}$	27.03	Mean stock of extracted biomass carbon from stratum i. Calculated as in Table 36 of the project VCS-PD /4/
BCEF	Dimensionless	1.32	According to VMD0001 Estimation of carbon stocks in the above- and belowground biomass in live tree and non-tree pools (CP-AB) - page 14, being the average of the three proposed factors /27/.

COMF	Dimensionless	0.50	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 4 Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use, Chapter 2, "Primary tropical moist forest /24/.
G _{gi}	g kg ⁻¹ dry matter burnt	GCH ₄ = 4.8 GN ₂₀ = 0.2	Volume 4, Chapter 2, of the IPCC 2006 Inventory Guidelines in table 2.5 (see Annex 2: emission factors for various types of burning for CH ₄ and N ₂₀) /24/.
Deforestation	ha	Yearly variable	Mapbiomas: Historical LandUse maps /23/
Dmm	t d.m.m ⁻³	0.59	Brown, S., A. J. R. Gillespie, and A. E. Lugo, 1989 /32/.
LDF	t C m ⁻³	0.53	VMD0011 Estimation of emissions from market-effects (LK-ME) /33/
LIF	t C m ⁻³	0.29	VMD0011 Estimation of emissions from market-effects (LK-ME) /33/
LFme	Dimensionless	0.2	VMD0011 Estimation of emissions from market-effects (LK-ME) /33/
C _{LB}	t CO _{2e} ha ⁻¹	435.8	Based on similarity analysis, data from the Project Area was applied to Leakage Belt area. It was taken a weighted average of aboveground biomass inside the Project Area.
C _{OLB}	t CO _{2e} ha ⁻¹	578.1	Saatchi, R.A. Houghton, R.C. dos Santos Alvalá, J.V. Soares, and Yifan Yu /34/.
DLF	%	10	PP conservatively allowed a 10% leeway as leakage due to displaced deforestation based on the various measures/activities' implementation by the REDD project.

Parameters and Data Monitored

Data/parameter	Frequency and measurement method
Aburn,i,t	The measuring instrument used is remote sensing and GIS /23/.
ADistPA	The measuring instrument used is remote sensing and GIS /23/.
ABSLPA _t	The measuring instrument used is remote sensing and GIS /23/.
V _{EXT z i t}	The parameter was not measured in this monitoring period because there was no forest management.
C _{EXT z i t}	The parameter was not measured in this monitoring period because there was no forest management.
C _{LG i t}	The parameter was not measured in this monitoring period because there was no forest management.
ADECKS,i,t	The parameter was not measured in this monitoring period because there was no forest management.
AROAD,i,t	The parameter was not measured in this monitoring period because there was no forest management.
L _{sk}	The parameter was not measured in this monitoring period because there was no forest management.
C _{AB_tree, dest}	The parameter was not measured in this monitoring period because there was no forest management.
C _{BB_tree,dest}	The parameter was not measured in this monitoring period because there was no forest management.

$C_{S/U,ig}$	The parameter was not measured in this monitoring period because there was no forest management.
$C_{B,ig}$	The parameter was not measured in this monitoring period because there was no forest management.
W_{skid}	The parameter was not measured in this monitoring period because there was no forest management.
Leakage outside	The measuring instrument used is remote sensing and GIS /23/.
MANFOR	Official country-specific data from IBAMA /46/.
PROTFOR	Official country-specific data from ISA /42/.
TOTFOR	Official country-specific data from SEMA /43/.
$\Delta C_{P,LB}$	Procedure as per Module M-REDD /29/.
$PROP_{IMM}$	Official country-specific (government) data from IBGE /44/
$A_{DefLB,i,t}$	The measuring instrument used is remote sensing and GIS /23/.
$A_{DefPA,l,u,t}$	The measuring instrument used is remote sensing and GIS /23/.
RFt	All data sources from the VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report were used to measure the various risk factors./3/
Project Forest Cover Monitoring Map	The measuring instrument used is remote sensing and GIS /23/.
Leakage Belt Forest Cover Monitoring Map	The measuring instrument used is remote sensing and GIS /23/.
$A_{DefLB,i,u,t}$	The measuring instrument used is remote sensing and GIS /23/.

RINA confirmed that the monitoring methods were followed as stated in section 5.2 of the registered VCS PD /4/.

4.5 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

The evidences used to determine the GHG emission reductions and removals were sufficient in quantity and has appropriate quality. It was verified during the remote audit that data used for calculations and to determine GHG emissions reductions and removals is consistent with those from the validation /4/ and thus calculations can be verified as accurate. The maps used to quantify emission reductions and removals meet the necessary requirements, in addition, the project location and geographic boundaries, including geodetic coordinates, were sent separately in a KML file.

PP has established management systems, monitoring procedures, outlines of roles and responsibilities and QA/QC procedures which ensure consistent data collection, recordation and storage /1/.

Implementation of these systems has been observed during the remote audit and actions are confirmed to be in accordance with the documented descriptions.

4.6 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

The proposed project “Evergreen REDD+ Project” in Brazil utilized the “AFOLU Non-permanence risk tool” to assess the risk according to internal risk, external risk, natural risk, and mitigation measures for minimizing risk. At all levels, the audit team evaluated the rationale, appropriateness, and justifications of risk ratings chosen by project proponent. The findings and conclusion regarding the non-permanence risk analysis undertaken for the project are summarized below for each risk category and factor. Unless noted otherwise, the audit team agrees with the conclusion stated in the non-permanence risk report.

The findings of the audit team regarding the risk scores applied for each factor are as follows.

1. Internal Risk

Risk Factor	Validation Findings	Risk Rating
1. Project Management (PM)		
a)	Risk factor does not apply as the project area’s vegetation is 100% native with no planting occurring as seen during the remote audit in the satellite images and classification /23/. Not applicable correctly applied.	0
b)	The project did not generate carbon credits previously.	0

c)	The validation team checked all the evidence cited in the VCS non-permanence risk report and also interviewed personnel working in the project and confirms any area of required experience is covered by at least one individual with at least 5 years' experience in the area /35//36//37/.	0
d)	The validation team checked during remote audit that management team is located less than a day of travel from the project site. It is checked from the google map that the travel time to the project site is less than a day. The same was confirmed during the site visit and interviews with them	0
e)	Management team includes individuals with significant experience in AFOLU project design and implementation, carbon accounting and reporting (eg, individuals who have successfully managed projects through validation, verification and issuance of GHG credits) under the VCS Program or other approved GHG programs /35//36//37/. This evidence is listed in item c) of the non-permanence risk report and has been checked by the validation team.	-2
f)	PP has developed an adaptative management plan that includes activities such as fire prevention and surveillance protocols /48/ to ensure well-functioning and maintenance of the project.	-2
	<i>Total Project Management (PM)</i> Total may be less than zero.	-4

Risk Factor	Validation Findings	Risk Rating
2. Financial Viability (FV)		
a)	Not applicable.	0
b)	Not applicable.	0
c)	Not applicable.	0
d)	The project cash flow breakeven point, where the annual income consistently exceeds annual outgoing occurs in year 4. The audit team discussed key details with the PP regarding the	0

	cash in and cash out used to create the cash flow in which it is demonstrated where the breakeven point is reached /16/	
e)	Not applicable.	0
f)	Not applicable.	0
g)	Not applicable.	0
h)	It is checked that the PP has secured 80% or more of the funds before reaching the breakeven point, is secured. The calculations are explicit in the spreadsheet /16/.	0
i)	Project has available callable financial resources to cover at least 50% of total cash out before project reaches breakeven /16/	-2
	<i>Total Financial Viability (FV)</i> Total may not be less than zero.	0

Risk Factor	Validation Findings	Risk Rating
3. Opportunity Cost (OC)		
a)	Not applicable.	0
b)	Not applicable.	0
c)	Not applicable.	0
d)	Not applicable.	0
e)	Not applicable.	0
f)	PP considered NPV from project activity at least 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity as checked in the "Financial viability" spreadsheet /16/	-4
g)	The PP is not a non-profit organization.	0
h)	The project is protected by a legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect credit carbon stocks over the length of the crediting period /17/	-2
i)	Not applicable.	0
	<i>Total Opportunity Cost (OC)</i>	-6

	Total may not be less than zero.	
--	----------------------------------	--

Risk Factor	Validation Findings	Risk Rating
4. Project Longevity (PL)		
a)	Not applicable.	0
b)	As mentioned in item h) above, the project has a legal agreement or requirement to continue management practice over the length of the crediting period /17/. PP defined the maximum project longevity is 30 years.	15
	<i>Total Project Longevity (PL)</i> Total may not be less than zero.	15

2. External Risk

Risk Factor	Validation Findings	Risk Rating
1. Land Tenure and Resource Access/Impacts (LT)		
a)	The Audit team has checked the ownership and right of use documents. The ownership of each land has the user right, which was checked and confirmed from the land titles /18/ to /22/.	0
b)	Not applicable.	0
c)	It was verified that there are 50 community members living within and surrounding the project area /50/ to /52. However, there are no disputes over land tenure or ownership.	0
d)	As assessed above, there are no disputes over access/use rights in the project area.	0
e)	Not applicable.	0
f)	As discussed above the project area is protected by a legally binding commitment to continue management practices /17/.	-2

g)	It was verified that there is documented evidence that measures have been taken to restore justice of the overlap of a private property with the project property Aroeira /53/.	-2
	<i>Total Land Tenure (LT)</i> Total may not be less than zero.	0

Risk Factor	Validation Findings	Risk Rating
2. Community engagement (CE)		
a)	It is checked that no residents within the Evergreen REDD+ Project Area /50/ to /52/.	0
b)	It is been checked that there are around 20.2% inhabitants living within 20 km of the project boundary outside the project area, who have been consulted /50/ to /52/.	0
c)	As assessed above through the evidence the audit team confirmed that the project generates net positive impacts on the social and economic well-being of the local communities who derive livelihoods from the project area /47/ /j/ /k/ /l/	-5
	<i>Total Financial Viability (FV)</i> Total may not be less than zero.	-5

Risk Factor	Validation Findings	Risk Rating
3. Political Risk (PC)		
a)	Not applicable.	0
b)	Not applicable.	0
c)	The audit team confirmed that the 5 year (2015- 2019) mean governance score for Brazil across the six governance indicators of World Bank Institute's Worldwide Governance Indicators is -0.177 /38/. Therefore, agrees that the political risk is 2.	2
d)	Not applicable.	0

e)	Not applicable.	0
f)	The audit team checked the following a) The country is receiving REDD+ Readiness funding from the FCPF, UN-REDD or other bilateral or multilateral donors b) The country is participating in the CCBA/CARE REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards Initiative c) The jurisdiction in which the project is located is participating in the Governors' Climate and Forest Taskforce d) The country has an established national FSC or PEFC standards body e) The country has an established DNA under the CDM and has at least one registered CDM A/R project.	-2
	<i>Total Political Risk (PC)</i> Total may not be less than zero.	0

3. Natural Risk

Risk Factor	Validation Findings	Risk Rating
3. Political Risk (PC)		
F	The fire risk in the project location is considered to be insignificant during the period from 2012 to 2020 as evidenced by INPE sources report /95/. Evergreen's Adaptative Management Plan is in place, having the aim of reducing risks of fire and related trespassing /3/. Mitigation: 0.25	0
PD	It was communicated to the audit team and confirmed based on professional experience that there was no record of any pest and disease outbreak in the project area since the area is covered by 100% Amazon Rainforest, i.e., "natural forests". Mitigation: 1	0
W	The VVB team has confirmed through a review of the reference indicated in the risk report, that the risk of carbon stocks loss	2

	due to extreme weather was considered due to droughts caused in the amazon forest because Pacific and Atlantic Sea Surface Temperatures effect. Mitigation: 1	
G	The VVB team has confirmed through a review of the reference indicated in the risk report /39/-/41/, that there are no geological events damaging the project site.	N/A
ON	No other sources of natural risk were identified.	N/A
f)	Total Natural Risk (as applicable, F + PD + W + G + ON)	2.00

The overall non-permanence risk rating that was determined for the project, using below Table is 7.00.

<i>Risk Category</i>	<i>Rating</i>
a) Internal Risk	5.00
b) External Risk	0.00
c) Natural Risk	2.00
Overall Risk Rating (a + b + c)	7.00

In summary, the overall risk rating that was determined for the project, in accordance with the VCS Non-Permanence Risk Tool, is 7.00%. The audit team has concluded that the above risk rating is in conformance with the VCS rules.

However, in accordance with the VCS Non-Permanence Risk Tool, the overall score shall be rounded up to the nearest whole percentage, and the minimum risk rating shall be 10, regardless of the risk rating calculated. Therefore, 10% is the overall risk rating for this project.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA) has performed verification of the emission reductions reported for the project activity “Evergreen REDD+ Project” in Brazil, for the VCS monitoring period from 25 November 2020 to 31 July 2021, with regard to the relevant requirements for VCS rules.

It is the responsibility of RINA to express an independent verification opinion about the project’s conformity with the VCS requirements and procedures and on the reported greenhouse gas emission reductions from the project.

Based on documented evidence and corroborated by a remote site assessment RINA can confirm that:

- The project has been implemented and operated as per the registered VCS PD;
- The monitoring plan in the registered VCS-PD is as per the applied baseline and monitoring methodology.
- The monitoring report and other supporting documents provided are complete and verifiable and in accordance with the applicable VCS requirements.

It is RINA’s opinion that the GHG emission reduction stated in the VCS monitoring report version 01 of 18 January 2022 for the “Evergreen REDD+ Project” in Brazil for the period 25 November 2020 to 31 July 2021 are fairly stated. The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly on the basis of the baseline and monitoring methodology VM0007 “REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD+ MF)”, Version 1.6, 08 September 2020.

RINA is able to certify that the emission reductions from the “Evergreen REDD+ Project” during the period 25 November 2020 to 31 July 2021 amount to 853,085 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent, detailed as below.

Verification period: From 25-November-2020 to 31-July-2021.

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
2020	134,967	0	6,266	126,764	12,888	113,876
2021	773,325	0	35,902	726,322	73,842	652,480
Total	908,293	0	42,168	853,085	86,730	766,356

APPENDIX 1: ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations	Full texts
AFLOU	Agriculture Forestry and Other Land Use
AUD	Avoided Unplanned Deforestation
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER(s)	Certified Emission Reduction(s)
CL	Clarification Request
CR	Clarification Request
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
FAR	Forward Action Request
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
GHG(s)	Greenhouse gas(es)
LU/LC	Land-Use/Land-Cover
MR	Monitoring Report
PD	Project Description
PP(s)	Project Proponent(s)
REDD	Reducing Emissions Deforestation and Degradation
Ref.	Document Reference
RINA	RINA Services Spa
SEMA	Environmental Secretary of Mato Grosso State
SS(s)	Sectoral Scope(s)
TA(s)	Technical Area(s)
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
VCU	Verified Carbon Unit
VER	Voluntary Emission Reductions
VVB	Validation and Validation Board
VVS	Validation and Validation Standard

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF FINDINGS

CAR ID	01	Section no.	1.0	Date: 26/10/2021
Description of CAR				
<i>1. Identified inconsistency in the monitoring period between the Monitoring Report and VCS PD. A valid justification needs be provided to explain the disregard for the initial months of the project.</i>				
Project participant response				Date: 03/11/2021
The period of the MR was adjusted according to period cited in the PD.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment				Date: 05/12/2021
The period of the MR was updated. All sections affected by this update have been checked. CAR 01 is closed.				

CAR ID	02	Section no.	1.4	Date: 26/10/2021
Description of CAR				
Summary Description of the Implementation Status of the Project <i>1. Section 1.1 of the MR is not transparent on the relevant implementation dates.</i>				
Project participant response				Date: 03/11/2021
Relevant dates have been included in section 1.1.				
Documentation provided by project participant				

DOE assessment	Date: 05/12/2021
Start dates of activities implemented during the monitoring period were included and checked against evidence. CAR 02 is closed.	

CAR ID	03	Section no.	3.4	Date: 26/10/2021
Description of CAR				
Grouped Projects 1. As per VCS Monitoring Report template, section 3.3 should provide relevant information about new instances of the project activity(s)				
Project participant response				Date: 17/11/2021
It was informed in the section 3.3 that no new instances were added to the project within this monitoring period.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment				Date: 05/12/2021
Section 3.3 of the revised MR has been updated. The same was checked and accepted. CAR 03 is closed.				

CAR ID	04	Section no.	1.3	Date: 26/10/2021
Description of CAR				
Project Proponent 1. During the audit it was identified that the company Carbonext is one of the Project Proponents. However, the company Carbonext is presented in the Monitoring Report as Other Entity Involved in the Project and Project Proponent at the same time.				
Project participant response				Date: 03/11/2021

Documentation provided by project participant	
Carbonext is now only cited as a project proponent	
DOE assessment	Date: 05/12/2021
The participation of the company Carbonext was reviewed in the MR and confirmed from evidence and interviews. CAR 04 is closed.	

CAR ID	05	Section no.	4.2	Date: 26/10/2021
Description of CAR				

Monitoring Plan

1. According to VM0007, for monitoring changes in forest cover and carbon stock changes in REDD projects, the monitoring plan must use the methods given in Module M-REDD. All relevant parameters from the modules are to be included in the monitoring plan.

2. There are few points, which are not discussed as per the requirements of M-REDD. Kindly make the same transparent as per the below:

a) Monitoring areas undergoing carbon stock enhancement

b) Monitoring areas undergoing natural disturbance

c) Degradation through extraction of trees for illegal timber or fuelwood and charcoal

d) Monitoring forest degradation.

3. The task "Monitoring of project implementation" is not mentioned as in the first paragraph. Fix for 4 tasks.

Data and Parameters Monitored

3. According to the M-REDD, the following parameters must be part of the monitoring:

a) Project Forest Cover Monitoring Map,

b) Leakage Belt Forest Cover Monitoring Map

c) A_{DefPA}

d) A_{DefLB}

e) A_{DECKS}

f) A_{ROAD}

g) A_{DistPA}

h) CAB_tree

i) CBB_tree_dest,

j) W_{SKID}

4. The value of deforestation in the leakage belt presented in section 4.2 is inconsistent with the ER sheet.

5. Data "Deforestation": The parameter must be replaced by the parameters indicated by M-REDD, respecting the minimum accuracy percentage.

6. According to M-REDD, the minimum map accuracy must be 90% for the classification of forest/non-forest in the remote sensing imagery. However, QA/QC procedures to be applied follow a minimum of 60%.

Project participant response	Date: 11/11/2021
Monitoring Plan 1. According to VM0007, for monitoring changes in forest cover and carbon stock changes in REDD projects, the monitoring plan must use the methods given in Module M-REDD. All relevant parameters from the modules are to be included in the monitoring plan. <i>All the relevant parameters for monitoring changes in forest cover and carbon stock changes were added to the monitoring plan.</i> 2. There are few points, which are not discussed as per the requirements of M-REDD. Kindly make the same transparent as per the below: <i>The points listed were added to the Monitoring Plan.</i> 3. The task "Monitoring of project implementation" is not mentioned as in the first paragraph. Fix for 4 tasks: this issue has been fixed and now "monitoring of project implementation" is mentioned. Data and Parameters Monitored 3. According to the M-REDD, the following parameters must be part of the monitoring: All the parameters mentioned have been included in the monitoring section as per M-REDD requirements. The parameter CAB_tree is mentioned in Section 4.1, since it is a parameter available at validation and that does not change. The parameter CAB_tree_dest , was added in section 4.2. 4. The value of deforestation in the leakage belt presented in section 4.2 is inconsistent with the ER sheet. The value of deforestation in the leakage belt was updated and is now consistent with the ER sheet. 5. Data "Deforestation": The parameter must be replaced by the parameters indicated by M-REDD, respecting the minimum accuracy percentage. The parameter "Deforestation" was deleted and replaced by the parameters indicated by M-REDD. 6. According to M-REDD, the minimum map accuracy must be 90% for the classification of forest/non-forest in the remote sensing imagery. However, QA/QC procedures to be applied follow a minimum of 60%. <i>The error matrix and kappa coefficient have become a standard means of assessment of image classification accuracy. So, according to Kappa Index references, kappa value greater than 60% means substantial agreement. For that reason, it mentioned 60% as the minimum. However, all the land use classification process reaches over than 90% of accuracy. The results are presented in table 11 and 12.</i>	
Documentation provided by project participant	

DOE assessment	Date: 05/12/2021
1. All parameters relevant to monitoring changes in forest cover and changes in carbon stock have been updated. The same was checked and accepted. 2. All M-REDD requirements and Monitoring Plan framework have been revised per module. 3. Monitoring Plan tasks have been updated and accepted. 3. All the parameters mentioned have been included in the monitoring section as per M-REDD requirements and accepted. 4. The value of deforestation in the leakage belt was updated. The same was checked and accepted. 5. All the parameters mentioned have been included in the monitoring section as per M-REDD requirements and accepted. 6. The justification provided by the PP is accepted. CAR 05 is closed.	

CAR ID	06	Section no.	5	Date: 26/10/2021
Description of CAR				
1. The emissions values in section 5 of the Monitoring Report are not up to date with the latest version of the ER sheet. Project Emissions 2. The period analyzed in project emissions does not consider the beginning of project period. PP is requested to include the calculation and provide evidences from the start date. Net GHG Emission Reductions and Removals 3. Summary values need to be updated.				
Project participant response				Date: 17/11/2021

1. The emissions values in section 5 of the Monitoring Report are not up to date with the latest version of the ER sheet.

The emission values in section 5 were updated to the latest version of the ER sheet.

Project Emissions

2. The period analyzed in project emissions does not consider the beginning of project period. PP is requested to include the calculation and provide evidences from the start date.

The period of 25/11/2020 to 31/12/2020 are now being considered in the project emissions analysis.

Net GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

3. Summary values need to be updated.

The values are now updated with the latest version of the ER sheet.

Documentation provided by project participant

DOE assessment

Date: 05/12/2021

1. The emission values in section 5 were updated to the latest version of the ER sheet. The same was checked and accepted.

2. The period from 11/25/2020 to 12/31/2020 is now being considered in the project emissions analysis. All calculations followed the methodology and procedures established in the PD.

3. The values are now updated with the latest version of the ER sheet. The same was checked and accepted.

CAR 06 is closed.

CAR ID	07	Section no.		Date: 26/10/2021
Description of CAR				
1. At the moment the validation report contains open CAR and CLs that directly influence the monitoring report. All validation report findings must be closed, and any changes must be reviewed in the MR.				
Project participant response				Date: 17/11/2021

1. At the moment the validation report contains open CAR and CLs that directly influence the monitoring report. All validation report findings must be closed, and any changes must be reviewed in the MR. The relevant changes made in the PD were reviewed in the MR.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
DOE assessment	Date: 05/12/2021
1. All changes made to the PD that interfered with the MR were reviewed and corrected CAR 07 is closed.	

CL ID	01	Section no.	2	Date: 26/10/2021
Description of CL				
AFOLU-Specific Safeguards 1. The activities implemented to mitigate risks local stakeholders due to project implementation during the monitoring period is not transparent Implementation Status of the Project Activity 2. Provide more details on air monitoring operations performed during the monitoring period with evidences. 3. It is not transparent in the MR what was carried out in the monitoring base of Boa Lembança farm. PP is requested to discuss the implementations made during the monitoring period. Summary Description of the Implementation Status of the Project 4. As per section 1.1, two planes were purchased to carry out the aerial monitoring of the properties. However, according to the section 3.1 and evidence provided, only one plane was purchased during the monitoring period. PP is requested to clarify.				
Project participant response				Date: 17/11/2021

AFOLU-Specific Safeguards

1. During the public consultation held on July 17,2021, no risk to the communities was detected. They also did not express any perception of risks and conflicts with them.

Implementation Status of the Project Activity

2. Evidence of the air monitoring has been included in this folder: [Air Monitoring](#)
3. The activities carried out in Boa Lembrança were included: structural repairs and painting.

Summary Description of the Implementation Status of the Project.

4. Information on the period of acquisition of the aircraft was corrected.

Documentation provided by project participant

DOE assessment

Date: 05/12/2021

1. The justification provided by the PP is accepted. This item is closed.
 2. Evidence of the air monitoring has been checked and accepted.
 3. Now it is transparent in the MR what was done in the monitoring base of the Boa Lembrança farm. The evidence of the implementations was checked.
 4. The purchase of the plane was explained in detail in the revised MR.
- CL 01 is closed.

CL ID	02	Section no.	5.3	Date: 26/10/2021
Description of CL				

Leakage Emissions	
The PP made a correction to the Leakage value justifying the following: "not all of the gross shifting leakage described above is considered as due to project activities, but instead is due to an explosion of deforestation was observed in 2020 and 2021 compared to historical average levels." However, the updated LB values of ex-ante (1311.35) and ex-post (1348.95) are very close. PP is requested to justify why the increase would be due to an explosion between 2020 and 2021 in RR if the estimated value is close to the real one.	
Project participant response	Date: 17/11/2021
The shifting leakage value was updated according to the correction of the MR period. The new value is lower than the estimated ex-ante. Therefore, no correction was applied. The value previously considered (1348.95 ha) is for the period of august 2020 to July 2021. The corrected value considered the period of 25/11/2020 to 31/07/2021 is 1002,66 ha.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
DOE assessment	Date: 05/12/2021
The shifting leakage value was updated according to the correction of the MR period. The same and the PP justification was accepted. CL 02 is closed.	



CERTIFICATO DI QUALIFICA PER GLI SCHEMI VOLONTARI*
QUALIFICATION CERTIFICATE FOR VOLUNTARY SCHEMES*

Si attesta che il sig./sig.ra:
 We declare that Mr/Mrs/Ms:

Rekha Menon

è qualificato come:
 is qualified as:

TEC, VAL, VER, TL, ITRP

per le seguenti aree tecniche:
 for the following technical areas:

AREE TECNICHE TECHNICAL AREAS	DESCRIZIONE DELL'AREA TECNICA TECHNICAL AREA DESCRIPTION	SCOPO SETTORIALE SECTORAL SCOPE
1.2	Renewables	1
2.1	Electricity distribution	2
13.1	Solid waste and wastewater	13
13.2	Manure	13
14.1	Afforestation and reforestation	14

REVISIONE REVISION	DATA DATE	MOTIVAZIONI PER LA REVISIONE REASON FOR THE REVISION
0	19/07/2016	First issue with new template (this certificate is linked to CDM qualification)

Responsabile di schema
 Scheme Leader
 Rita Valoroso



*SCHEMI VOLONTARI/ VOLUNTARY SCHEMES: ACR American Carbon Registry, CCB The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance, GS Gold Standard, JI Joint Implementation, SCS Social Carbon Standard, VCS Verified Carbon Standard.

TEC: Technical expert; VAL: Validator; VER: Verifier; TL: Team leader; FIN EXP: Financial Expert; ITRP: Independent technical reviewer

RINA Services S.p.A. è accreditato/recognized da

RINA Services S.p.A. is accredited /recognized by

UNFCCC	quali Entità Operativa Designata (DOE), per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti CDM as Designated Operational Entity (DOE), to carry out Validation and Verification of CDM Projects
VCSA	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti VCS to carry out Validation and Verification of VCS Projects
GS Foundation	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti GS to carry out Validation and Verification of GS Projects
Ecologica Institute	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di rapporti SCS to carry out Validation and Verification of SCS Reports
American Carbon Registry ACR	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti ACR to carry out Validation and Verification of ACR projects
The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance CCB	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti co-benefici CCB to carry out Validation and Verification of co-benefits CCB projects



CERTIFICATO DI QUALIFICA PER GLI SCHEMI VOLONTARI*
QUALIFICATION CERTIFICATE FOR VOLUNTARY SCHEMES*

Si attesta che il sig./sig.ra:
 We declare that Mr/Mrs/Ms:

Vinay SINGH

è qualificato come:
 is qualified as:

TEC, VAL, VER

per le seguenti aree tecniche:
 for the following technical areas:

1.2, 14.1

AREE TECNICHE TECHNICAL AREAS	DESCRIZIONE DELL'AREA TECNICA TECHNICAL AREA DESCRIPTION	SCOPO SETTORIALE SECTORAL SCOPE
1.2	Renewables	1
14.1	Forestry	14

REVISIONE REVISION	DATA DATE	MOTIVAZIONI PER LA REVISIONE REASON FOR THE REVISION
0	09/09/2020	First issue

Il Resp. CEINS
 Head of CEINS



*SCHEMI VOLONTARI/VOLUNTARY SCHEMES: ACR American Carbon Registry, CCB The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance, GG Gold Standard, JI Joint Implementation, SGS Social Carbon Standard, VCS Verified Carbon Standard.

TEC: Technical expert; VAL: Validator; VER: Verifier; TL: Team leader; FIN EXP: Financial Expert; ITRP: Independent technical reviewer

RINA Services S.p.A. è accreditato/riconosciuto da
 RINA Services S.p.A. is accredited/recognized by

UNFCCC	Quali Entità Operativa Designata (DOE), per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti CDM as Designated Operational Entity (DOE), to carry out Validation and Verification of CDM Projects
VCSA	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti VCS to carry out Validation and Verification of VCS Projects
GG Foundation	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti GG to carry out Validation and Verification of GG Projects
Ecologica Institute	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di rapporti SGS to carry out Validation and Verification of SGS Reports
American Carbon Registry ACR	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti ACR to carry out Validation and Verification of ACR projects
The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance CCB	per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti co-benefici CCB to carry out Validation and Verification of co-benefits CCB projects

GHG_QUAL_CERT_EN_07_16 Voluntary(Certificate)

Page 1 of 1



CERTIFICATO DI QUALIFICA
QUALIFICATION CERTIFICATE

Si attesta che il sig./sig.ra:
We declare that Mr/Mrs/Ms: Gustavo Goes Lima

è qualificato come:¹
is qualified as: CDM, VCS, SCS - TEC

per le seguenti aree tecniche:
for the following technical areas: 14.1

AREE TECNICHE TECHNICAL AREAS	DESCRIZIONE DELL'AREA TECNICA TECHNICAL AREA DESCRIPTION	SCOPO SETTORIALE SECTORAL SCOPE
14.1	Afforestation and reforestation	14

in accordo alle istruzioni dell'unità Sustainability Compliance & New Scheme Development Coordination.
in accordance with the instructions of the Sustainability Compliance & New Scheme Development Coordination Unit.

REVISIONE REVISION	DATA DATE	MOTIVAZIONI PER LA REVISIONE REASON FOR THE REVISION
0	26/05/2021	First Issue

Il Resp. CEINS
Head of CEINS



¹ Legend:

VAL:	Validator	CDM: Clean Development Mechanism
VER:	Verifier	VCS: Verified Carbon Standard
TEC:	Technical Expert	GS4GG: Gold Standard For Global Goals
TL:	Team Leader	SCS: SocialCarbon Standard
FIN-EXP:	Financial Expert	J: Joint Implementation
DET:	Determiner	

RINA Services S.p.A. è accreditato da UNFCCC, quale Entità Operativa Designata (DOE), per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti CDM, da VCSA per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti VCS, da GS Foundation, per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti GS, da Ecologica Institute per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di rapporti SCS

RINA Services S.p.A. is accredited by the UNFCCC, as Designated Operational Entity (DOE), to carry out Validation and Verification of CDM Projects, by the VCSA, to carry out Validation and Verification of VCS Projects, by the GS Foundation, to carry out Validation and Verification of GS4GG Projects and by the Ecologica Institute, to carry out Validation and Verification of SCS Reports