

CORAZÓN VERDE DEL CHACO PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT



Document Prepared By: Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc.

Project Title	Corazón Verde del Chaco Project
Version	2.0
Report ID	21045.00

Report Title	Corazón Verde del Chaco Project Verification Report
Client	Organization Name: Quadriz Paraguay S.A. Contact Name: Marcel van Heesewijk Email: Marcel.van.Heesewijk@Quadriz.com Phone: +33 6 48 58 12 88 Contact Name: Gabriela Vinales Email: Gabriela.vinales@quadriz.com
Pages	111
Date of Issue	01 June 2023
Prepared By	Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc.
Contact	Corporate Office: 3800 Clermont St. NW, North Lawrence, Ohio 55666; Phone: 330-294-1242; www.AsterGlobal.com
Approved By	Janice McMahon (President)
Work Carried Out By	Lead Verifier: Shawn McMahon; Verification Team Members: Mansfield Fisher, Taek Joo Kim, Kevin Markham, Matthew Perkowski, Richard Scharf, Matthew Campbell, Sandesh Shrestha, Caris Lyons, Ashley Laux; Translator: Rebecca Irala Melgarejo; Senior Internal Reviewer: Caitlin Sellers; QA/QC: Janice McMahon

Summary

Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc., (herein referred to as Aster Global or the Verification Team) was contracted by Quadriz Paraguay S.A. on 24 March 2021 to conduct the first monitoring period (01 July 2020 – 31 December 2021) verification of the Corazón Verde del Chaco Project (herein referred to as the Project). The Project falls under the VCS sectoral scope 14: – Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Uses (AFOLU), under the category Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD). Specifically, the project falls under the REDD+ category of Avoided Planned Deforestation (APD). This is a grouped project.

The grouped project area encompasses the Department of Presidente Hayes, Alto Paraguay, and Boquerón, with the initial project instance of approximately 31,858.6 hectares located in the Department of Presidente Hayes, Paraguay. However, due to Paraguayan law, the GHG accounting area for the initial project instance was determined to be approximately 20,515.0 hectares of forested land, and the Initial Project Zone was determined to be the 20-kilometer buffer around the initial instance. The intention of the grouped project is to scale up to over 300,000 hectares of privately owned land in the Departments of Presidente Hayes, Alto Paraguay, and Boquerón, Paraguay. Through adherence to VM0007 REDD Methodology Framework and Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Standards (Third Edition, June 2017), the Project will “mitigate deforestation pressures and the associated greenhouse gas emissions in the region, which is the main climate objective of the Project. The main community objective of the Project is to provide social programs to improve the livelihoods of community members living in the vicinity of the Project. The main biodiversity objective of the Project is the preservation of biodiversity, particularly medium-to-large mammals in the project areas” as stated in the CCB & VCS Project Description (PD).

The VCS verification assessed compliance with the VCS Version 4 Program Guide, Standard, the VM0007 Methodology, all associated updates, the validated Project Document, and the likelihood that implementation of the planned GHG project has resulted in the GHG emission removal enhancements as stated by the Project Proponent (ISO 14064-3:2006).

The CCB verification assessed that implementation of the planned GHG project has occurred, resulting in the GHG emission removal enhancements (climate), community, and biodiversity benefits as stated by the Project Proponent (ISO 14064-3:2006). The verification objective is to ensure the validated project design documentation has been implemented in compliance with CCB Standards (Third Edition).

The scope of the verification followed Section 4.3.4 of ISO 14064-3:2006, and methods included assessment of the GHG project implementation; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHGs; and time periods covered. This project follows the framework of project activities listed above.

The criteria followed the verification guidance documents provided by Verra located at <https://verra.org>. Unless otherwise indicated, the assessment was performed against the most recent version of the relevant VCS guidance documentation.

Verification to the VCS Program and CCB Program resulted in 1 VCS finding and 26 CCB findings. VCS findings are included in Appendix B, and CCB findings are included in Appendix C.

A risk-based approach was used to guide the verification and reach a *reasonable* level of assurance that no errors, omissions, nor misrepresentations resulting in a material misstatement have occurred. The

materiality threshold dictated by the project size was 1%. All findings were satisfied to a *reasonable* level of assurance.

After completion of a site inspection and review of all project information, procedures, calculations, and supporting documentation, Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc., confirms the Project is accurate, consistent, and complies with all VCS Version 4 criteria, CCB Third Edition criteria, the selected methodology (VM0007), and the validated Project Design Documentation (PD/PDD). Aster Global confirms Corazón Verde del Chaco Project Monitoring Report (Version 1.7, dated 31 May 2023) has been implemented in accordance with VCS Version 4 and CCB Third Edition criteria.

Aster Global confirms all verification activities – including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance, and Project Description implementation adhere to VCS Version 4 (and all associated updates) and CCB Standards Third Edition (and all associated updates) as documented in this report – are complete. Aster Global concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions the Corazón Verde del Chaco Project as described in the Monitoring Report (Version 1.7, dated 31 May 2023) meets the requirements of VCS Version 4 (and all associated updates), and CCB Standards Third Edition (and all associated updates). In addition, Aster Global asserts the project complies with the criteria for projects set out in the Third Edition of the CCB Standards to achieve Gold Level distinction for Biodiversity.

The GHG assertion provided by the project and verified by Aster Global has resulted in net baseline emission reductions of 996,844 tCO₂ equivalents (tCO₂e) by the project during the verification period/reporting period (VCS and CCB: 01 July 2020 – 31 December 2021; 1.5 years). This value is gross of the 13.5% (134,566 tCO₂e) buffer withholding, based on the non-permanence risk assessment tool, and associated leakage allocation. This results in 862,222 tCO₂e of credits eligible for issuance as VCUs.

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..... 7
2.3	Document Review 8
2.4	Interviews 9
2.5	Site Inspections 10
2.6	Resolution of Findings..... 10
2.7	Eligibility for Validation Activities 12
3	Validation Findings 12
3.1	Participation under Other GHG Programs 12
3.2	Methodology Deviations 12
3.3	Project Description Deviations (<i>Rules 3.5.7 – 3.5.10</i>) 12
3.4	Minor Changes to Project Description (<i>Rules 3.5.6</i>)..... 12
3.5	Grouped Project (G1.13 – G1.15, G4.1)..... 12
4	Verification Findings 12
4.1	Public Comments (<i>Rules 4.6</i>) 12
4.2	Summary of Project Benefits..... 13
4.3	General..... 21
4.4	Climate 30
4.5	Community 36
4.6	Biodiversity 39
4.7	Additional Project Implementation Information 44
4.8	Additional Project Impact Information 44
5	Verification Conclusion 44
Appendix A: Documents List 46	
Appendix B: VCS List of Findings 50	
Appendix C: CCB List of Findings..... 53	

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The objective of this verification was to ensure implementation of project activities and project compliance with the VCS Program Guide, VCS Standard, CCB Standards, selected methodology, and the validated VCS and CCB Project Description (PD). Aster Global assessed the GHG emission removals for the AFOLU project, specifically REDD+.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of a verification generally includes the GHG project and baseline scenarios; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHGs; time periods covered; conformance with the validated PD; evaluation of the sustainable development; and evaluation of the project's net climate, community, and biodiversity benefits. The geographic verification scope is defined by the project boundary, which includes aggregated parcels (grouped); the carbon reservoir types; management activities; growth and yield models; inventory program; and contract periods. The scope of the project was outlined within the Project Description (PD) and is redefined as follows for the GHG project:

Baseline Scenario	Conversion of native forest to pasture
Activities/Technologies/Processes	REDD+ activities utilizing VCS VM0007 and CCB Standards for Climate, Community & Biodiversity (Third Edition)
Sources/Sinks/Reservoirs	Aboveground biomass – Included Belowground biomass – Included Litter – Included Dead-wood – Included Soil organic carbon – Excluded Burning of woody biomass – Included Harvested wood products – Included
GHG Type	CO ₂ , N ₂ O, CH ₄
Time Period (start date, monitoring period, and crediting period)	Project State Date: 01 July 2020 Monitoring Period: 01 July 2020 – 31 December 2021 Crediting Period: 01 July 2020 – 30 June 2050 (30 years)
Project Boundary	The validated grouped project boundary covers the entirety of the three Departments of Alto Paraguay, Boquerón, and Presidente Hayes in Paraguay. The project plans to scale up to approximately 300,000 hectares within those departments throughout the life of the project. The initial project instance geographically encompasses 31,858.6 hectares. However, the GHG accounting boundary, due to Paraguayan law, is approximately 20,515.0 hectares.

The criteria followed the verification guidance documents provided by VCS located at <https://verra.org/project/vcs-program/>. These documents include the following:

- VCS Program Guide (v4.3, 17 January 2023)

- VCS Standard (v4.4, 17 January 2023)
- VCS Program Definitions (v4.3, 21 December 2022)
- AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (v4, 19 September 2019)
- VM0007 – REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD+MF), (v1.6, 08 September 2020)
- Validated PD (VCS and CCB)
- CCB Program Definitions (v3.0, June 2017)
- CCB Standards (Third Edition, v3.1, June 2017)
- CCB Program Rules (v 3.1 June 2017)
- Guidance for the Use of the CCB Standards (May 2014)

1.3 Level of Assurance

The level of assurance determines the depth of detail the Verification Team placed in the Verification and Sampling Plan to determine if there are any errors, omissions, or misrepresentations (ISO 14064-3:2006). Aster Global assessed the project's implementation of general principles, data collection and processing, sampling descriptions, documentation, *ex post* calculations, etc., to provide *reasonable* assurance to meet the Project Level requirements of the VCS Program. Based on the verification findings, a final evaluation statement reasonably assures the project's GHG representations are materially accurate. The evidence used to achieve a *reasonable* level of assurance is specified in subsequent sections of this report.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The Corazón Verde del Chaco Project falls under the VCS sectoral scope 14: – Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Uses (AFOLU), under the category Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD). Specifically, the project falls under the REDD+ category Avoided Planned Deforestation (APD). This is a grouped project.

The project instance geographically encompasses approximately 31,858.6 hectares in the Department of Presidente Hayes, Paraguay. The initial instance contains an allowable crediting area of approximately 20,515.0 hectares of forested land within the overall project area and instance, and the initial project zone was determined to be the 20-kilometer buffer around the initial instance. The intention of the grouped project is to scale up to over 300,000 hectares of privately owned land in the Departments of Presidente Hayes, Alto Paraguay, and Boquerón, Paraguay.

Through adherence to VM0007 REDD+ Methodology Framework and Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Standards (Third Edition, June 2017), the Project will “mitigate deforestation pressures and the associated greenhouse gas emissions in the region, which is the main climate objective of the Project. The main community objective of the Project is to provide social programs to improve the livelihoods of community members living in the vicinity of the Project. The main biodiversity objective of the Project is the preservation of biodiversity, particularly medium-to-large mammals in the project areas” as stated in the CCB & VCS Project Description Document.

Over the Project Lifetime, the Corazón Verde del Chaco Project identifies the following project activities for implementation:

- Forego Selling of Property, then Clearing and Conversion of the Project Areas;
- Provide Healthcare Services;
- Raise Project Awareness;

- Patrol and Monitor Deforestation;
- Establish a Project Headquarters; and
- Monitor Medium-to-Large Mammals in the Project Areas.

The conditions under which grouped project eligibility is being established are defined in the PD as: the baseline agent of deforestation will be similar large agribusinesses implement industrial scale cattle ranch; each additional project instance will meet the applicability conditions of each VM0007 module used to develop this initial project Instance; and quantification of baseline, with-project, and leakage will follow the equations outlined in the PD.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Audit Team Composition (*Rules 4.3.1*)

For VCS/CCB verifications, Aster Global maintains an experienced internal staff of Lead Verifiers, in addition to Certified Foresters, Registered Professional Foresters, The Wildlife Society Biologists, Forest Biometricians, Remote Sensing/GIS Specialists, and VCS-approved AFOLU Experts in IFM, REDD, and WRC categories. Shawn McMahon served as Lead Verifier for this project.

The site visit was undertaken by Mansfield Fisher. Direct employees of Aster Global conducted all desktop verification activities; however, the Aster Global team was supported during the site visits by a local translator and environmental engineer, Rebeca Irala Melgarejo. Ms. Irala provided the site visit team with the ability to conduct site visit interviews in either Spanish or Guarani – the two official languages of Paraguay. As an environmental engineer with prior REDD project experience, she also provided the team with social, cultural, ecological, and biodiversity experience specific to Paraguay. Aster Global completed all calculation/modeling review in-house with our team of foresters, forest biometricians, GIS/remote sensing specialists, and a soil scientist. Aster Global has been involved in over 68 VCS verifications and 36 CCB verifications, including 27 methodology assessments, and has experience with successful validation and/or verification of several projects in South America. Aster Global has a specialist on staff with more than ten years of CCB experience who oversees project review for CCB components. Aster Global staff and team involved in the verification have the necessary ecological, biodiversity, natural resources, forestry, social, and cultural expertise to fulfill these requirements.

2.2 Method and Criteria

The Verification Team assessed the Project's compliance with VCS Standard Version 4.4, CCB Third Edition, and all associated updates, the selected methodology (VM0007), and the validated PD. The Verification Team assessed the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emission removals for the monitoring period/verification period (01 July 2020- 31 December 2021) through AFOLU criteria under the REDD+ category. Specifically, the Project falls under the REDD+ category Avoided Planned Deforestation (APD). The Verification Team assessed whether the project adequately addressed project emissions, unplanned reductions in carbon stocks, and any possible leakage outside of the project boundary.

The non-permanence risk analysis was completed for this verification. Further, following Section 2.1.2 of the VCS Validation & Verification Manual, V3.2, the objectives of the verification exercise were to evaluate the monitoring report and assess:

- The extent to which methods and procedures, including monitoring procedures, have been implemented in accordance with the validated project description. This includes ensuring conformance with the monitoring plan (MP).
- The extent to which GHG Emission Reductions or Removals reported in the monitoring report (MR) are materially accurate.

The criteria followed the verification guidance documents provided by VCS and CCB. Unless otherwise indicated, the assessment was performed against the most recent version of the relevant VCS or CCB guidance document. Please also see Section 1.2 of this report.

In the verification process, there is a risk that potential errors, omissions, and misrepresentations will be found; therefore, a risk-based approach was used to guide the collection of appropriate and sufficient evidence to support a *reasonable* level of assurance. A risk-based approach means that the Verification Team focused on items that might result in a material misstatement of the reported GHG assertion.

A project-specific Validation/Verification and Sampling Plan (VSP) was developed to guide the verification auditing process to ensure efficiency and effectiveness. The purpose of the VSP was to present a risk assessment for determining the nature and extent of verification procedures necessary to ensure the risk of auditing error was reduced to a reasonable level. The VSP methodology was derived from all items in our verification process stated above. Specifically, the VSP utilized the VCS and CCB guidance documents and ISO 14064-3. Any modifications applied to the VSP were made based upon the conditions observed for monitoring to detect the processes with highest risk of material discrepancy.

At a high-level, the sampling plan consisted of a desktop review and in-country site visit. During the desktop review, the Verification Team completed a full review of all project quantifications, including the creation of a full set of independent data checks. Similarly, the Verification Team completed a full review of all remote sensing analyses conducted by the project which resulted in a full set of independent data checks. The qualitative review consisted of reviewing verifiable evidence provided by the project, reviewing collected field data (interview notes), and conducted independent research as needed.

A detailed field plan was developed to guide the verification site visit and is embedded within the VSP for the field sampling effort, direct measurement, observation, interviews, and review of the monitoring period emission reductions in the key areas determined to be the greatest risk, followed by ground-truthing and review of project activities. Field sampling and techniques were based on the project parameters/scope and best professional judgment of the Verification Team to meet a *reasonable* level of assurance as directed by the professional judgment of the Lead Verifier.

2.3 Document Review

A detailed review of all project documentation was conducted as part of the desktop verification component to ensure consistency with, and identify any deviation from, VCS Program requirements, CCB program requirements, the methodology (VM0007), and the validated PD. Initial review focused on the validated PD and MR relative to the field conditions observed and interviews with project management staff. Project details, implementation status, data and parameters, and quantification of GHG emission reductions and removals were thoroughly examined. Key supporting documents were also reviewed. These included monitoring data (i.e., remote sensing/GIS data), Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), financial

analyses, boundaries, maps and aerial images, fire-specific monitoring data, biomass, and carbon calculation spreadsheets, CCB interview/survey results, and responses to Clarification Requests (CLs).

The VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool was used by the Project Proponent to assess overall project risk. The Verification Team reviewed the Non-Permanence Risk Report provided with the verification supporting documentation and confirmed that the project adheres to the requirements set out in the risk tool. Each risk factor was thoroughly assessed for conformance. Any identified nonconformance reports (NCR) and/or CL findings related to the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool/Report are in Appendix B. The final score was calculated to be 13.5%.

For a listing of all documents received from the Project Proponent for this verification, please see Appendix A.

2.4 Interviews

Interviews were performed during the verification site inspection and as part of the overall verification process. The Verification Team met with individuals in various roles in the project. This included a series of interviews with on-site and in-country staff who support the mission of the project and other conservation objectives and some interviews/meetings conducted remotely. On-site interviews and informal discussions were conducted during the site visit (02-05 May 2022) with representatives from Quadriz Paraguay S.A., ATENIL S.A., Ostrya Conservation Inc., and members of the indigenous community of Maria Auxiliadora. Additional discussions regarding the project were held with key project personnel prior to and following the site visit(s). Interviews were conducted in English, Spanish, or Guarani, based on the interviewee's preference.

The interviews were conducted as part of verification efforts to substantiate key project assertions, including: project staff and technical team have necessary experience and skills; participating indigenous community members in the project zone are aware and consent to participation in the project; and conservation goals of the project would be expected to be achieved with project implementation. The following is a list of key interviewees and people with whom the Verification Team spoke about the project and/or provided information additional to that provided in the MR, PD, and any supporting documents:

Individual	Affiliation	Role
Marcel van Heesewijk	Quadriz Paraguay S.A	Founder and CEO
Gabriela Viñales	Quadriz Paraguay S.A	REDD+ Country Manager
Federico ("Fredy") Montoya	Quadriz Paraguay S.A	Field Operations Manager
Yolanda Ramos	Quadriz Paraguay S.A	Technical Assistant - Biodiversity Monitoring
Javier Rodas	Quadriz Paraguay S.A	Forestry Manager
Feliciano Cabañas	Quadriz Paraguay S.A	Forest Guard
James Eaton	Ostrya Conservation Inc.	Director
Hermenegildo Vera	Maria Auxiliadora (Community)	Community Leader
Patricia Villalba	Maria Auxiliadora (Community)	Community Member
Crispina Caballero	Maria Auxiliadora (Community)	Community Member
Eleuteria Elias	Maria Auxiliadora (Community)	Community Member
Samuel Torales	Maria Auxiliadora (Community)	Community Member

Patricia Vera	Maria Auxiliadora (Community) / Student – Puerto Casado	Community Member
---------------	--	------------------

2.5 Site Inspections

The verification site visit occurred from 02 – 05 May 2022. The site visit activities can be generally segmented into two different groups. The first focused on sampling to gather on-the-ground information to assess forestry and remote sensing components of the project. The second centered around stakeholder, community member, project management, and project staff interviews to substantiate implementation of project activities leading to community and biodiversity benefits. The verification of project activities also relied on observations and interviews conducted during the validation site visit that occurred from 04 November – 09 November 2021.

During the verification site visit, the Verification Team re-sampled plots in the strata with the highest stocking and the strata that were not re-sampled during the validation site visit. Across both the validation and verification site visits, 10 forest inventory plots were re-sampled, representing an approximately 7.5% sample size. During the course of the verification site visit, the Verification Team observed the general condition of the landscape, noting land use and landscape condition/context, viewed baseline case lands, assessed the accuracy of project mapping exercises such as boundary demarcation and stratification, and collected data that would be used to inform the assessment of the project's risk analysis. The Verification Team used on-site reviews to substantiate representative biodiversity-based activity implementation and monitoring, which included observation of representative camera traps used for biodiversity monitoring and review of biodiversity data collected through these cameras, noting signage delineating project boundaries, and observations of wildlife in and around the project area. Interviews were conducted with numerous stakeholders as described in Section 2.4 of this report to assess the relevant criteria and to review supporting documentation for aspects of the conformance to program requirements. To ensure the VVB conducted the site visit interviews in a manner demonstrating that the stakeholder interviews are free from bias or influence from the Project Proponent, the VVB utilized internal processes throughout the site visit, which includes contracting an independent translator, so the Verification Team did not rely on the project staff for translation. Additionally, the Verification Team conducted interviews without members of the project team present, where there was the potential for bias and to ensure an open dialogue with stakeholders. The PD and MR identifies a single participating community located within the project zone of the initial instance, Maria Auxiliadora. The Verification Team visited the community of Maria Auxiliadora on 03 May 2022 to conduct interviews with leaders and community members to assess their participation in the project during the monitoring period and to substantiate community-related benefits from project activity implementation during the monitoring period.

Greater detail on the outcomes from the forest inventory subplot re-sampling and the interviews conducted during the two site visits can be found in the VCS findings (Appendix B) and CCB findings (Appendix C), respectively.

2.6 Resolution of Findings

During the verification process, there was a risk that potential errors, omissions, and misrepresentations would be found. The actions taken when errors, omissions, and misrepresentations were found included: notifying the client of the issue(s) identified and expanding our review to the extent that satisfied the Lead Verifier's professional judgment.

The process of resolution of findings involved formal rounds of assessment by the Verification Team. Findings were resolved during the verification by the Project Proponent implementing corrective actions, such as amending the MR and calculations, as well as providing written responses and supporting documentation. This resulted in project documentation that was in conformance with the requirements of the VCS Standard and CCB Third Edition for GHG projects.

Non-Conformity Reports (NCRs) were issued as a response to material discrepancies in a part of the project and generally fell into one category:

- Non-conformity to a VCS or CCB guiding document listed in Sections 1.2 and 2.2 above
- Consistency among project documentation or calculations was lacking
- Mathematical formulae were incorrect
- Additional information was required by the Verification Team to confirm reasonable assurance for compliance

Clarifications (CL) were issued when language within a project document needed additional clarification to avoid ambiguity.

Opportunities for Improvement (OFI) were issued to the project when an opportunity for improvement was identified.

During the verification, one (1) VCS and twenty-six (26) CCB findings were identified, for a total of twenty-seven (27) findings. Details of the VCS finding, including the issue raised, responses, and final conclusions are provided in Appendix B: VCS NCR/CL/OFI. Please also see Appendix C: CCB NCR/CL/OFI for a summary of all findings raised during the CCB review. All NCRs/CLs were satisfactorily addressed and closed.

2.6.1 Forward Action Requests

The Verification Team reviewed the Validation report and noted there was one (1) FAR issued, which states “During the validation process, one (1) Forward Action Request (FAR) was identified pertaining to CCB Indicator G3.2. The Validation Team determined the Project Proponent documented reasonable efforts to seek permission from the San Isidro indigenous community to discuss participating in benefits from the project but was informed the community was not interested in discussing the project. The Verification Team is issuing a FAR requesting the auditors at verification to re-assess, as appropriate, continued efforts by the Project Proponent to try to engage with the San Isidro community as committed to in the PD. Specifically, the auditors at verification are requested to make appropriate efforts to meet with the indigenous community at San Isidro, if permission can be obtained from the community to do so, to confirm that potential costs, risks, and benefits from participation in the project, if they choose or chose to do so, were provided to them in a manner they understood.”

During this monitoring period the Verification Team conducted interviews with the project staff to ensure that the project has taken reasonable and appropriate efforts to try and engage with the San Isidro community. Specifically, the project staff informed the Verification Team that additional effort was made to reach out to the leaders of the San Isidro community, and the leaders indicated they are still not interested in discussing the project.

The Verification Team is issuing two (2) FARs based on the present verification assessment.

- 1) The Verification Team determined that because San Isidro is within the project zone defined for the initial project instance, the Verification Team is issuing a FAR requesting the auditors at the next verification to re-assess, as appropriate, continued efforts by the Project Proponent to try to engage with the San Isidro community as committed to in the PD, specifically related to CCB Indicator G3.2. Specifically, the auditors at verification are requested to make appropriate efforts to meet with the

indigenous community at San Isidro, if permission can be obtained from the community to do so, to confirm that potential costs, risks, and benefits from participation in the project, if they choose or chose to do so, were provided to them in a manner they understood.

- 2) The Verification Team determined that because no new hires were made during the monitoring period subsequent to PD validation, a FAR is warranted for the next audit team to review the hiring process for workers hired during the next monitoring period to ensure that in conformance with the validated PD, specifically related to CCB Indicator G3.10, community members from the Maria Auxiliadora community have been given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained.

2.7 Eligibility for Validation Activities

Validation activities are not applicable.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

The Verification Team performed a search of other registries and confirmed the project has not been registered and is not seeking registration under any other GHG programs, nor are they involved in other forms of environmental credits from its activities. The project currently only seeks carbon credits with the CCB label under the VCS program. This was confirmed through a risk-based internet review and interview with project. Therefore, the Verification Team deems the project eligible to participate under the VCS Program.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

No new methodology deviations were proposed during this monitoring period.

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

No project description deviations have been applied during this monitoring period.

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

No minor changes to the project description have been applied during this monitoring period.

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

No new project instances have been added during this monitoring period.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Public Comments (*Rules 4.6*)

The Verification Team was provided with an email from Verra stating:

“This email is to confirm that project ID 2611, CORAZÓN VERDE DEL CHACO PROJECT - CCB has been approved for CCB Verification public comment period. The project is now available on the Verra Registry for its 30-day public comment period, which will run from 25th April- 24th May. The dates of the public comment period will be posted on the Verra website under CCB Projects.”

The Verification Team noted the project is still listed as “Under Validation” on the Verra registry project page, with the public comment period identified as 06 October 2021 through 05 November 2021, which represents the public comment period posted for the Project Description. There were no comments received on the Verra website for the Monitoring Report.

4.2 Summary of Project Benefits

Through the implementation of a large-scale VCS-CCB avoided planned deforestation REDD+ project the project aims to alleviate pressure on natural forest habitat in the Chaco Region of Paraguay. Aster Global is reasonably assured that the project has appropriately identified and justified all achievements that are reported in Section 1 of the MR, and these benefits/achievements are appropriately substantiated these with information provided throughout the MR.

Section 1.1 of the MR identifies several additional expected benefits of the Project not captured by the standardized benefit metrics in Section 1.2 of the MR.

Achievements during the Monitoring Period	MR Section Reference	Verification Team Assessment
1) Chaco Med Flights: The MR states “During the 2020-2021 monitoring period, Quadriz: began the initial design of Chaco Med; reviewed potential plane models; assessed landing sites and locations of hospitals; reviewed relevant laws and regulations; designed a Chaco Med survey; spoke to pilots; and contacted two medical professionals about their interest in participating.”	4	While this is an expected project activity resulting in community benefits as identified in the PD, Aster Global verified that the achievements during the monitoring period are accurate and substantiated with information provided in the MR. The stated reference section is correct.
2) Visitors to the Visitor Center: “During the 2020-2021 monitoring period, Quadriz: began the initial design of a visitor center; reviewed potential locations for the visitor center; discussed the content to be included in the visitor center; reviewed relevant laws and regulations; designed a visitor center survey.”	4	While this is an expected project activity resulting in community benefits as identified in the PD, Aster Global verified that the achievements during the monitoring period are accurate and substantiated with information provided in the MR. The stated reference section is correct.
3) Wildlife Cameras Deployed: “During the 2020-2021 monitoring period, Quadriz: reviewed wildlife camera	5	The project has already conducted the initial deployment of wildlife cameras, and Aster Global verified that the achievements during

models; purchased the wildlife cameras; hired a wildlife biologist to oversee the wildlife camera study; installed the wildlife cameras in the Project Zone; and recorded vulnerable and threatened species.”		the monitoring period are accurate and substantiated with information provided in the MR. The stated reference section is correct.
---	--	--

Section 1.2 of the PD describes the Standardized Benefits of the Project as follows:

Category	Metric	Achievements during Monitoring Period	MR Section Reference	Verification Team Assessment
GHG emission reductions or removals	Net estimated emission removals in the project area, measured against the without-project scenario	Not Applicable.	N/A	The Verification Team determined this metric is appropriately marked Not Applicable, as Project activities do not generate emissions removals. The stated reference section is correctly identified as N/A.
	Net estimated emission reductions in the project area, measured against the without-project scenario	862,222 tCO ₂ e	3	The Verification Team confirmed through review of quantification methods in line with the chosen methodology the net estimated emission reductions (<i>ex post</i>) in the project measured against the without-project scenario. The stated reference section is correct.
Forest ¹ cover	For REDD ² projects: Estimated number of hectares of reduced forest	6,821 ha	3	The Verification Team confirmed through a review of quantification

¹ Land with woody vegetation that meets an internationally accepted definition (e.g., UNFCCC, FAO or IPCC) of what constitutes a forest, which includes threshold parameters, such as minimum forest area, tree height and level of crown cover, and may include mature, secondary, degraded and wetland forests (*VCS Program Definitions*)

² Reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) - Activities that reduce GHG emissions by slowing or stopping conversion of forests to non-forest land and/or reduce the degradation of forest land where forest biomass is lost (*VCS Program Definitions*)

	loss in the project area measured against the without-project scenario			methods, remote sensing analyses, and site visit observations this value is appropriate. The stated reference section is correct.
	For ARR ³ projects: Estimated number of hectares of forest cover increased in the project area measured against the without-project scenario	Not Applicable.	N/A	The Verification Team determined this project benefit is appropriately marked Not Applicable, as no afforestation/reforestation activities are implemented. That stated reference section is correctly identified as N/A.
Improved land management	Number of hectares of existing production forest land in which IFM ⁴ practices are expected to occur as a result of project activities, measured against the without-project scenario	Not Applicable.	N/A	The Verification Team determined this project benefit is appropriately marked Not Applicable as IFM practices are not implemented. That stated reference section is correctly identified as N/A.
	Number of hectares of non-forest land in which improved land management practices are expected to occur as a result of project activities, measured against the without-project scenario	Not Applicable.	N/A	The Verification Team determined this project benefit is appropriately marked Not Applicable as improved land management practices are not implemented. That stated reference section is correctly identified as N/A.
Training	Total number of community members who have improved skills and/or knowledge resulting from training provided as part of project activities.	5-10 community members	4	The Verification Team confirmed through site visit observations and interviews with project staff and community members and review of

³ Afforestation, reforestation and revegetation (ARR) - Activities that increase carbon stocks in woody biomass (and in some cases soils) by establishing, increasing and/or restoring vegetative cover through the planting, sowing and/or human-assisted natural regeneration of woody vegetation (*VCS Program Definitions*)

⁴ Improved forest management (IFM) - Activities that change forest management practices and increase carbon stock on forest lands managed for wood products such as saw timber, pulpwood and fuelwood (*VCS Program Definitions*)

				project documentation the achievements during the monitoring period are appropriately reported. The stated reference section is correct.
	Number of female community members who have improved skills and/or knowledge resulting from training provided as part of project activities of project activities	2-5 community members	4	The Verification Team confirmed through site visit observations and interviews with project staff and community members and review of project documentation the achievements during the monitoring period are appropriately reported. The stated reference section is correct.
Employment	Total number of people employed in of project activities, ⁵ expressed as number of full time employees ⁶	5-10 people	4	The Verification Team confirmed the achievements during the monitoring period are appropriately reported through site visit observations and interviews with project staff and community members and review of project documentation. The stated reference section is correct.
	Number of women employed in project activities, expressed as number of full-time employees	2	4	The Verification Team confirmed through site visit observations and interviews with project staff and community members and review of project documentation the achievements during the

⁵ Employed in project activities means people directly working on project activities in return for compensation (financial or otherwise), including employees, contracted workers, sub-contracted workers and community members that are paid to carry out project-related work.

⁶ Full time equivalency is calculated as the total number of hours worked (by full-time, part-time, temporary and/or seasonal staff) divided by the average number of hours worked in full-time jobs within the country, region or economic territory (adapted from UN System of National Accounts (1993) paragraphs 17.14[15.102];[17.28])

				monitoring period are appropriately reported. The stated reference section is correct.
Livelihoods	Total number of people with improved livelihoods ⁷ or income generated as a result of project activities	25-50 people	4	The Verification Team confirmed through site visit observations and interviews with project staff and community members and review of project documentation the achievements during the monitoring period are appropriately reported. The stated reference section is correct.
	Number of women with improved livelihoods or income generated as a result of project activities	10-25 people	4	The Verification Team confirmed through site visit observations and interviews with project staff and community members and review of project documentation the achievements during the monitoring period are appropriately reported. The stated reference section is correct.
Health	Total number of people for whom health services were improved as a result of project activities, measured against the without-project scenario	Chaco Med is a future activity and during the 2020-2021 monitoring period, there are no, women who benefitted from the Project's health services.	4	The Verification Team confirmed through site visit observations and interviews with project staff and community members and review of project documentation the achievements during the monitoring period are appropriately reported. The stated reference section is correct.

⁷ Livelihoods are the capabilities, assets (including material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living (Krantz, Lasse, 2001. *The Sustainable Livelihood Approach to Poverty Reduction*. SIDA). Livelihood benefits may include benefits reported in the Employment metrics of this table.

	Number of women for whom health services were improved as a result of project activities, measured against the without-project scenario	Chaco Med is a future activity and during the 2020-2021 monitoring period, there were little, to no, people who benefitted from the Project's health services.	4	The Verification Team confirmed through site visit observations and interviews with project staff and community members and review of project documentation the achievements during the monitoring period are appropriately reported. The stated reference section is correct.
Education	Total number of people for whom access to, or quality of, education was improved as a result of project activities, measured against the without-project scenario	The visitor center is a future activity and during the 2020-2021 monitoring period, there were little, to no, people who benefitted from the Project's educational services.	4	The Verification Team confirmed through site visit observations and interviews with project staff and community members and review of project documentation the achievements during the monitoring period are appropriately reported. The stated reference section is correct.
	Number of women and girls for whom access to, or quality of, education was improved as a result of project activities, measured against the without-project scenario	The visitor center is a future activity and during the 2020-2021 monitoring period, there were little, to no, women who benefitted from the Project's educational services.	4	The Verification Team confirmed through site visit observations and interviews with project staff and community members and review of project documentation the achievements during the monitoring period are appropriately reported. The stated reference section is correct.
Water	Total number of people who experienced increased water quality and/or improved access to drinking water as a result of project activities, measured against the without-project scenario	Not Applicable	N/A	The Verification Team confirmed the achievements during the monitoring period are appropriately reported marked Not Applicable, as no people directly rely

				on drinking water from the project area. That stated reference section is correctly identified as N/A.
	Number of women who experienced increased water quality and/or improved access to drinking water as a result of project activities, measured against the without-project scenario	Not Applicable.	N/A	The Verification Team determined this project benefit is appropriately marked Not Applicable, as no people directly rely on drinking water from the project area. That stated reference section is correctly identified as N/A.
Well-being	Total number of community members whose well-being ⁸ was improved as a result of project activities	25-50 community members	4	The Verification Team confirmed through site visit observations and interviews with project staff and community members, and review of project documentation the achievements during the monitoring period are appropriately reported. The stated reference section is correct.
	Number of women whose well-being was improved as a result of project activities	10-25 women	4	The Verification Team confirmed through site visit observations and interviews with project staff and community members, and review of project documentation the achievements during the monitoring period are appropriately reported. The stated reference section is correct.
Biodiversity	Change in the number of hectares significantly better managed by the project for	31,858.6 ha	3	The Verification Team confirmed through site visit observations and interviews with project

⁸ Well-being is people's experience of the quality of their lives. Well-being benefits may include benefits reported in other metrics of this table (e.g. Training, Employment, Health, Education, Water, etc.), but could also include other benefits such as empowerment of community groups, strengthened legal rights to resources, conservation of access to areas of cultural significance, etc.

conservation	biodiversity conservation, ⁹ measured against the without-project scenario			staff and community members, and review of project documentation the achievements during the monitoring period are appropriately reported. The stated reference section is correct.
	Number of globally Critically Endangered or Endangered species ¹⁰ benefiting from reduced threats as a result of project activities, ¹¹ measured against the without-project scenario	0 endangered or critically endangered species were identified at the Project Zone during the monitoring period.	5	The Verification Team confirmed through review of monitoring reports provided for the monitoring period and through interviews with project biodiversity monitoring staff that during the monitoring period no species categorized by IUCN as globally Critically Endangered or Endangered were documented as present within the project zone defined for the initial project instance. The Verification Team determined this is consistent with the PD not identifying the presence of these species within the project zone defined for the initial project instance.

⁹ Biodiversity conservation in this context means areas where specific management measures are being implemented as a part of project activities with an objective of enhancing biodiversity conservation.

¹⁰ Per IUCN's Red List of Threatened Species

¹¹ In the absence of direct population or occupancy measures, measurement of reduced threats may be used as evidence of benefit

4.3 General

4.3.1 Implementation Status (G1.9)

A comparison of the implementation schedules in the MR and PD shows the project has met key milestones identified in the PD for the period from the project start date through the monitoring period and has identified additional key dates and milestones for the monitoring periods, including continued operations. The Verification Team reviewed the PD and MR and determined there are no discrepancies between the project implementation and project description. The Verification Team determined the monitoring plan was implemented completely and appropriately.

The Verification Team requested to visit examples of all activities during the site visit and subsequently confirmed the implementation of items related to climate, community, and biodiversity. Climate objectives achieved included avoiding the net emissions of 862,222 tCO₂e.

The Verification Team witnessed examples of each activity and noted that understanding of the project and adherence to project requirements was strongly correlated to the degree to which project activities are implemented in any given area of the project zone. As revenues accrue, the project is extending activities to more parts of the project zone.

The GHG emission reductions generated by the project have not been included in an emissions trading program other than the VCS program and it has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit as confirmed through a risk-based review by the Verification Team (see Section 3.1).

Section 2.1.10 of the MR describes 17 SDGs to which the project contributes. Through site visit observations, interviews with community members, project staff, and technical consultants, and a review of supporting documentation the Verification Team is reasonably assured that the project has appropriately identified and justified the SDGs that the project is likely to contribute to.

The project has applied six (6) methodology deviations that have been previously validated, zero (0) project description deviations, and zero (0) minor changes to the project description. The Verification Team confirmed that the MR appropriately reports all previously validated methodology deviations which can be found in the table below.

Methodology Deviations Previously Reported
1) While sampling lying dead wood using the line intersect method: a. Two 100-meter transect lines were used rather than two 50-meter transect lines; b. The sampling lines did not bisect each sample plot, but rather ran from one plot center to the next; and c. The sampling lines were oriented to the north and east, and no randomization in the bearing of the first line was employed. This approach does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification and improves the accuracy of the lying dead wood sampling by enlarging the sampling unit.

2) Rather than using a root to shoot ratio to estimate belowground biomass as per the CP-AB module, belowground biomass was estimated using an allometric equation developed by Cairns et al.¹² This alternative method is more efficient for the project-specific circumstances as only one equation is needed for the project. Further, Cairns et al. is appropriate for determining belowground biomass as this equation is published in a peer-reviewed scientific journal and is cited in IPCC 2006 Annex 4A.2 (page 4.116). This source is appropriate as we are using a more recent version of IPCC guidance similar to the VCS Standard guidance "Where external documents are referenced, such as the IPCC 2006 Guidelines for National GHG Inventories, and such documents are updated, the most recent version of the document shall be used." This deviation is likely to yield the same level of accuracy (or better) given the wide range of root-to-shoot ratios found in the IPCC GL AFOLU guidance as found in the methodology. In fact, guidance for methodologies as found in VCS AFOLU Requirements version 3.4 specifically mentions the Cairns et al. equations in reference to established procedures for quantifying belowground biomass, thus further indicating the appropriateness of this source.
3) Rather than monitoring Cpost using modules CP-AB and CP-D as described in the M-REDD modules, C(post) can conservatively be assumed to be zero in the with-project case, not only for natural disturbance (CP,Dist,q,i , as stated in the M-REDD module) but also for deforestation (CP,post,u,i). This deviation is conservative because subtracting zero from the baseline stocks, leads to the conclusion that $\Delta C_{pools,Def,u,i,t}$ is equal to $C(BSL,i)$, which leads to the maximum emission in the with-project case, which is conservative. This deviation may be used for the first and each subsequent monitoring period.
4) The forest inventory has deviated from the criteria for selection (i.e., the equation is based on a datasets comprising at least 30 trees, with an r^2 that is ≥ 0.8) and validation of the allometric equation related to palm biomass, however the equation used is likely to result in a conservative estimate of palm biomass for the following reasons: - Volume is calculated as the volume of a paraboloid rather than the volume of a cylinder; and - Only stem biomass is estimated, thus conservatively excluding other aboveground biomass including palm fronds.
5) This project deviates from using the default value for the carbon fraction of dry litter matter as provided in the CP-L module (VMD0003, Version 1.0). Rather, a value of 0.47 t C t⁻¹ d.m was used for this project. This carbon fraction value is appropriate as it is in line with VCS guidance that where "external documents are referenced, such as the IPCC 2006 Guidelines for National GHG Inventories, and such documents are updated, the most recent version of the document shall be used." The default value provided in the CP-L module was sourced from IPCC 2003. The updated value of 0.47 t C t⁻¹ d.m is derived from page 4.48 of the IPCC 2006 Guidelines for National GHG Inventories. This value corresponds with the value for "all parts of the tree" and

¹² Cairns, M. A., S. Brown, E. H. Helmer, and G. A. Baumgardner. 1997. Root biomass allocation in the world's upland forests. *Oecologia* 111, 1-11.

was sourced from McGroddy¹³ et al., 2004. Finally, this value of 0.47 was also cited as the carbon fraction for foliage component in tropical and subtropical forest in the IPCC table on page 4.48, as sourced from Feldpausch et al., 2004. This represents a deviation to “data and parameters available at validation”. This methodology deviation is warranted as it increases the accuracy of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals.

- 6) This project deviated from the VM0007 MF,v1.6 requirement "The starting date of this [Historical Reference Period] must be between 9 and 12 years in the past and the end date must be within two years before project start date". This idea of a historical reference period only makes sense in terms of an unplanned REDD project where the rate of deforestation is defined over a distinct period of time, as opposed to the “number of years over which deforestation occurred in land parcel pn in proxy area” as defined in the BL-PL module. Notably, there is no mention of a historical reference period in the BL-PL module. One of criteria for identifying proxy areas, as stated in BL-PL module is "Deforestation in the proxy area must have occurred within the 10 years prior to the baseline period" thus clearly conflicting with the VM0007MF,v1.6 Historical Reference Period requirement. This requirement does not specify the starting year for the deforestation in the proxy years. Rather, one of the parameters used in determining "D%planned,i,t" (i.e., the projected annual proportion of land that will be deforested in stratum i during year t) is the parameter "Yrspn". This parameter is the number of years over which deforestation occurred in land parcel pn in proxy area. This change represents a deviation to “parameters available at validation.” This methodology deviation doesn't impact the project conservativeness or accuracy, since VMD0006-BL-PL requirements are met. Further, this deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals because it does not affect the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals.

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

Natural and human-induced risks to the expected project benefits are identified in Section 2.2.6 of the MR and are consistent with those identified in Section 2.1.18 of the PD. Three natural and human-induced risks to the Project's expected climate, community, and biodiversity benefits have been identified: encroachment into the Project Areas by local farmers; the presence of anthropogenic fire in this dry forest ecosystem; the potential for illegal logging, hunting, or other unapproved use of land. The MR identifies mitigation activities that have been implemented during the monitoring period which include: the hiring of guard; the placing of posters/signs at strategic point; and the design of a template for monitoring deforestation. To verify whether reasonable steps were taken to mitigate identified risks, the Verification Team assessed each identified risk through project and supplemental document review and site interviews and observations. Site visit interviews and observations substantiate that a guard has been hired and is actively patrolling the project area, signage has been placed at strategic points throughout the project area designating the project area

¹³ McGroddy, Megan E., Tanguy Daufresne, and Lars O. Hedin. "Scaling of C: N: P stoichiometry in forests worldwide: Implications of terrestrial redfield-type ratios." *Ecology* 85, no. 9 (2004): 2390-2401. McGroddy et al., 2004 investigated C, N, and P in forest foliage and litter and used a carbon value of 47% of reported biomass, based on the mean of reported data.

as an area of conservation and outlining the prohibited activities within the project area (e.g., no hunting, no harvesting of trees, etc.), and that a template for monitoring deforestation template was designed.

The risks described appear to be reasonable and complete, based on the Verification Team's knowledge of the region from the site visit. Through the review and substantiation of the mitigations of each identified risk, the verification team determined that the project has been successful in mitigating the risks to expected project benefits during this verification period. The verification team concludes the risks are adequately addressed through these activities designed to mitigate them.

4.3.3 Community and Biodiversity Benefit Permanence (G1.11)

The Verification Team reviewed the PD and the MR to ensure plans are being implemented to maintain and enhance CCB benefits beyond the project lifetime. The Verification Team reviewed supplemental materials provided by the project and collected information via site visit interviews to that supported that the project is continuing to engage with and support Quadriz, the landowner of the initial project instance, universities, the Paraguayan Government and local communities to ensure the necessary ongoing management and monitoring of the project. The Verification Team reviewed supplemental materials that confirmed the project has developed a pro forma to model the costs and revenues of the project, specifically as it relates to ensuring funding of project activities. Through site visit interviews with project staff and technical consultants, the Verification Team confirmed that the project is exploring options to ensure the ongoing conservation of the project area beyond the Project Lifetime. Through site visit interviews and a review of supplemental materials the Verification Team confirmed the Quadriz is continuing to engage with stakeholders to help other landowners and the Paraguayan Government undertake additional conservation projects such as REDD+. Through site visit observations and interviews and a review of supplemental materials, the Verification Team confirmed that necessary construction enhancements to the future visitor center building have occurred, and steps have been taken to gather the necessary information to better inform the design of the Chaco Med program. The Verification Team determined that reasonable measures have been taken to enhance project benefits beyond the project lifetime in accordance with the validated project description.

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

The Verification Team reviewed the PD for actions identified as needed for comparison to actions identified in the MR as having been taken for ensuring stakeholder access to information. The Verification Team interviewed community members to substantiate the access to information documented in the PD and the MR. Through site visit interviews and observations and collection of on-site reports submitted to the participating community, the Verification Team substantiated that full project documentation has been made accessible in appropriate local languages to communities and other stakeholders during this verification period.

The efforts made to provide relevant and adequate information about potential costs, risks, and benefits to community members and other stakeholders are consistent between the PD and MR and include discussions and meetings at different project stages. These actions were confirmed during both the validation site visit and verification site visit (which occurred as 2 separate site visits) and were conducted by Aster Global.

Additionally, through site visit interviews, the Verification Team found the participating community is aware of the verification process, the community was aware the Verification Team was performing a site visit, and the Verification Team would be visiting their community to conduct interviews. The Verification Team is reasonably assured the project has taken appropriate actions to explain the verification process to the participating community. Through site visit interviews conducted during the validation site visit, the Verification Team confirmed that the other stakeholders understand the verification process. The

Verification Team is reasonably assured that the project has taken appropriate actions to explain the verification process to other stakeholders.

In conclusion, after the review of supplemental documentation provided by the project and observations and information collected via interviews during the site visit(s) the Verification Team is reasonably assured that the project has carried out effective community consultation.

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

The Verification Team reviewed Section 2.3.7 of the MR against the validated PD, which describes numerous stakeholder consultations with communities and stakeholders identified in Appendix 1 and identifies where these meetings influenced project design. Interviews conducted by the Verification Team substantiated that the project consulted the identified stakeholders and that the project design considered input received from some of these meetings. Additional clarification provided by the project substantiated that all identified stakeholders were consulted and how these stakeholders influenced the project design, and that the Maria Auxiliadora community is being voluntarily included in project benefits and did not seek additional benefits. Based on information provided by the project, and substantiated through interviews with the stakeholders identified in the PD, the Verification Team determined that other stakeholders do not utilize or otherwise have rights or benefits from the project area property without the project, and because there are no stakeholders other than the land owner benefiting from or using the project area, the project has voluntarily chosen to modify or not modify the project design based on the input of these other stakeholders.

The Verification Team reviewed Section 2.3.8 of the MR against the PD, which describes the processes the Project will use throughout the Project lifetime to consider input and adaptive management. These processes include ongoing meetings with stakeholders either in person or at several identified locations, continuing to implement Degradation Surveys and the PRA to continuously identify and update risks, costs, and benefits to local community members, and using wildlife camera studies to identify rare, threatened, and endemic species, along with identified HCV species. As substantiated during the Verification Team interviews with the Maria Auxiliadora indigenous community, distance and lack of transportation was identified as a potential limitation in ongoing community participation, so the project committed to either meeting in person with this community or providing transportation to community members. Through interviews conducted during the site visit, the Verification Team is reasonably assured the project has effectively consulted the participating community and subsequently influenced the project design. Additionally, the Verification Team reviewed supporting documentation to demonstrate the project is effectively consulting with other stakeholders in line with the mechanisms described in the validated PD.

Site visit interviews with the community leader and members as well as other stakeholders, and review of supporting documentation, substantiate that the level of information sharing as described in Section 2.3.9 of the MR has occurred, and the project's plan for continued communication is being carried as described in the validated PD. Additional clarification provided by the project substantiated that project meetings were held with identified stakeholder's legal representatives. The Verification Team concludes that the stakeholder consultation channels and the plan for continued communication identified in the validated PD is being carried out. Overall, the Verification Team substantiated that the project has carried out effective community consultation.

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

The Verification Team reviewed Section 2.3.10 of the MR against the validated PD, which describes the measures identified by the Project as needed or taken to enable effective participation with local

communities as well as stakeholders based in Asunción. Site visit interviews with the Maria Auxiliadora community substantiated that community members are proficient in either Spanish or Guarani, the project has staff who are from Paraguay and able to communicate with communities in either Guarani or Spanish, and staff have the relevant experience and knowledge to allow them to communicate in a culturally sensitive manner. Site visit interviews with project staff further substantiated that consultations with local communities occurred with both a male and female staff representative present to ensure consultations were conducted in a gender sensitive manner.

Potential concerns in ensuring community members are able to meet with project staff identified during the validation site visit interviews with the Maria Auxiliadora community included distance and suitable transportation needed to meet with project staff at the project headquarters. To mitigate this concern, the project committed to meeting in person with community members within the community or providing necessary transportation to the headquarters. The verification site visit interviews with community members substantiated that consultations to date have occurred in person, and that they were conducted in a culturally and gender sensitive manner. The Verification Team determined the measures needed and taken by the Project Proponent to enable effective participation in a culturally appropriate and gender sensitive manner have occurred, and the project enabled community participation in project implementation.

4.3.7 Anti-discrimination (G3.7)

Company and human resource policies in place to prevent and define discrimination relating to gender, religion, and sex, as well as a grievance procedure are described in the MR. Through review of project documentation, additional clarification from the project, review of provided company policies and site visit interviews, the Verification Team substantiated that the actions taken during this verification period are consistent with those described in the validated PD and is reasonably assured that the Project Proponent and all other entities involved in project design and implementation are not involved in or complicit in any form of discrimination or sexual harassment with respect to the project.

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

A grievance redress procedure is outlined in the validated PD and consistent with the grievance procedure detailed in the MR. The MR states that no grievances were raised during this verification period. The Verification Team substantiated this claim through site visit interviews with community members, none of whom had filed a grievance or knew of anyone who had. The Verification Team is reasonably assured that no grievances arose during this monitoring period and is thus relying on the project's anticipated adherence to the grievance redress policy outlined in the PD should a grievance arise.

4.3.9 Worker Relations (G3.9 – G3.12)

The Verification Team reviewed information presented in the MR, supplemental materials provided by the project, and conducted site interviews with project representatives, employees, and the leader and representative community members of the Maria Auxiliadora indigenous community. The Verification Team determined that through the end of the first monitoring period, the project had not yet employed workers from Maria Auxiliadora, the sole participating community within the project zone for the initial project instance. The Verification Team determined the project's workers were Paraguayan nationals, including individuals originally from the three departments constituting the validated grouped project area. Interviews and site visit observations substantiate training as reported in the MR occurred and progress towards building capacity for project staff was achieved. Furthermore, the MR, in-line with the validated PD, identifies the need of "cross-training" and development of "written plans" to ensure capacity is not lost as a result of staff turnover. During the verification, the Verification Team confirmed via site visit interviews and

through the review of supporting documentation that cross-training is occurring and written plans are being developed. The Verification Team is reasonably assured the substantiated capacity built during this verification will not be lost.

The Verification Team reviewed the validated PD for the actions needed and the MR for the actions taken to ensure community members are given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained. The MR notes that during the monitoring period, there was only 1 position that was opened to be filled by the project and that this position was not filled by someone from the Maria Auxiliadora community. The Verification Team noted clarification was provided to the PD in response to findings issued during project validation, and this clarification identified measures designed to ensure community members, particularly indigenous community members within the project zone, will be provided with a fair opportunity to fill positions available in the future and for employment. During the site visit, the Verification Team confirmed via interviews with the leader and representative community members from Maria Auxiliadora that project staff have spoken to the Maria Auxiliadora community about potential future employment opportunities. The Verification Team determined that because no new hires were made during the monitoring period subsequent to the clarification provided as part of the PD validation, a Forward Action Request (FAR) is warranted for the next audit team to review the hiring process for workers hired during the next monitoring period to ensure that in conformance with the validated PD, community members from the Maria Auxiliadora community have been given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained.

The Verification Team confirmed relevant laws and regulations related to worker's rights are described in 2.3.15 of the MR are consistent with the laws and regulations described in Section 2.3.16 of the PD. The Verification Team reviewed the International Labour Organization (ILO) webpage for Paraguay and determined the ILO webpage did not identify any changes to these relevant laws and regulations during the monitoring period. The project provides the required assurance in the MR that the project meets applicable laws and/or regulations. The Project Proponent provided additional clarification and supporting documentation to substantiate this stated assurance. Through review of project documentation and additional clarification supported by site visit interviews and observations, the Verification Team substantiated that the project is adhering to all relevant laws and regulations covering worker's rights. Site visit interviews with current project staff substantiated they had been informed of their rights and the measures designed to inform workers of their rights in the future were substantiated as appropriate.

The Verification Team reviewed Section 2.3.16 of the MR against Section 2.3.17 of the PD, which identifies substantial risks to worker safety and the necessary measures needed to mitigate these risks. The Verification Team substantiated through review of project documentation and site visit interviews with project workers that the risks identified are appropriate, and that workers are informed of the identified risks and future identified risks, as well as the measures needed and designed to minimize each risk.

The Verification Team determined reasonable assurance was provided in the MR regarding worker relations. Through results of interviews with project staff and interviews with members of the participating community in the initial project instance and project zone and review of clarification and supporting documentation provided, the relationship between workers and the project during the monitoring period upholds the intent and design presented in the validated PD.

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

The Verification Team reviewed Sections 2.4.2, 2.4.3, and 2.4.4 of the PD, which identify the required technical skills to successfully implement the project and include stakeholder identification and community engagement, legal analysis of landownership documentation, government policy, biodiversity assessment and monitoring, carbon stock measurement and monitoring, regional deforestation and land-use modeling, project management, local knowledge and fluency in Spanish and Guarani, and sale of carbon offset credits. Through site visit interviews with project management staff, support staff, and technical consultants, the Verification Team determined the project team has the required technical and management skills required to continue to implement the project successfully and has appropriately reported these requirements in the MR.

The project provided supplemental financial information to document the financial health of Quadriz, including a letter of support from Quadriz's CFO attesting that Quadriz has sufficient financial resources to fund the project and identifying specific, internal, non-restricted funds made available to develop the project. Based on the evidence provided, including the pro forma documented in Section 4.3.3 of the MR, the Verification Team determined the financial health of the implementing organization would be adequate to support the project over its lifetime.

Section 2.4.5 of the MR provides the required attestation. Interviews and discussions with the Project Proponent, project management staff, technical consultants, and community members did not identify any concerns the project or project staff are complicit in any form of corruption.

4.3.11 Commercially Sensitive Information (Rules 3.5.13 – 3.5.14)

The MR states that no commercially sensitive information is included in the MR. The Verification Team substantiates the project's assessment that the MR does not deliberately exclude commercially sensitive information.

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

Statutory and Customary Property Rights are identified in Section 2.5.1, and the project's recognition of property rights are described in Section 2.5.2 of the PD and are consistent with the description in Section 2.5.1 of the MR. The project area has not changed since validation, and no additional project instances have been added. The Verification Team assessed provided ownership documents, further substantiated by validation site visit interviews with the landowner and Project Proponent, and confirmed the land of the Initial Project Instance is privately owned. As the land is privately owned, the land use and access rights are owned by the landowner. The Verification Team substantiated that the landowner has provided consent to the Project Proponent for use of property in developing a REDD+ project through review of the contract between the landowner and the Project Proponent. A map of the land tenure within and surrounding the Initial Project Zone is provided in Section 2.5.1 of the MR. Review of provided geospatial files, landownership documents, and the agreement between the landowner and Project Proponent substantiated the accuracy of the map of tenure, use, access and management rights to lands, territories, and resources in the project zone.

The Verification Team substantiated the land of the Initial Project Instance is privately owned by the landowner, with the consent to accessing and developing a REDD+ project provided to the Project

Proponent. As such, the Verification Team determined all property rights are recognized, respected, and supported.

The Verification Team reviewed Section 2.5.3 of the PD that states the project will occur on private property and thus not encroach on other private property, community property, or government lands and found this to be consistent with Section 2.5.2 of the MR. The Verification Team substantiated Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) was established with the landowner of the project through the presentation, discussion, and eventual signing of a contract between the landowner and Project Proponent. Site visit interviews with the Maria Auxiliadora community leader and members substantiated that the community had no claims to the first instance project property, and none of their property rights would be affected by the project. Through review of the FPIC process, review of ownership documents and the contract between the landowner and Project Proponent, and supported by site interviews with community members during the verification site visit and the landowner during the validation site visit, the Verification Team substantiated the project is respecting the property rights of both the landowner and the identified community.

Section 2.5.3 of the MR states the project activities do not lead to any involuntary removal or relocation of property rights holders from their lands or territories and does not force rights holders to relocate activities important to their culture or livelihood. Site visit interviews substantiate this statement, and site visit interviews with community leader and community members of the Maria Auxiliadora substantiated the community had no claims to the first instance project property, and none of their property rights would be affected by the project.

Section 2.5.5 of the PD identifies three main potential illegal activities, including encroachment, fire, and poaching. No perceived positive benefits are anticipated from these illegal activities. Measures designed and undertaken to reduce encroachment and fire include on-the-ground monitors, periodic aerial surveillance, and satellite imagery analysis. Measures designed and undertaken to reduce poaching include installation of guard houses and periodic biodiversity monitoring. Site visit interviews and observations substantiate that the identified measures have been undertaken so that project benefits are not derived from illegal activities and have been appropriately reported on in the MR.

The MR states there are no known ongoing disputes or conflicts within the project area. Site visit interviews did not identify any known ongoing disputes or conflicts. Through substantiation of all claims made in the MR pertaining to protecting rights of Indigenous Peoples, communities and other stakeholders, the Verification Team determined the project was in accordance with the CCB Standards and PD throughout this verification period.

4.3.13 Legal Status (G5.6)

A list of laws and regulations considered relevant to the project are provided in Section 2.5.6 of the MR and are the same laws identified in the PD. Through site visit interviews conducted with the project team, interviews with project staff, confirmation via review of supporting documentation of the ongoing communication with MADES and INFONA, and a review of satellite imagery, the Verification Team is reasonably assured that the project complies with relevant laws and regulations.

4.4 Climate

4.4.1 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

Aster Global conducted an intensive review of all input data, parameters, formulae, calculations, conversions, statistics and resulting uncertainties, and output data to ensure consistency with the VCS Standard, the validated PD, and VM0007. Data with associated conversion factors, formulae, and calculations were provided by the project in spreadsheet format to ensure all formulae were accessible for review. The Verification Team recalculated subsets of the analyses to confirm correctness and assess if data transposition errors occurred to achieve a *reasonable* level of assurance and to meet the materiality requirements of the project, as required by the VCS Standard. The project also provided answers to questions on calculations to ensure the Verification Team understood the approach and could confirm its consistency with VM0007 and the PD.

An overview of the data and parameters monitored, along with Verification Team findings, are included in the table below. This is not an exhaustive list of all monitored parameters that are available for verification, but all were data checked as part of the comprehensive desktop review:

Data Unit / Parameter	Accuracy of GHG emission reductions and removals	Whether methods and formulae set out in the PD have been followed	Appropriateness of default values
$\Delta\text{CBSL,PA,planned}$	The Verification Team confirmed that the validated parameter value was applied during this monitoring period and that the baseline period has not expired. The validated value of this parameter for the monitoring period is approximately 996,844 tCO ₂ e.	This parameter was derived from the validated baseline as described in the PDD.	Not applicable.
$\Delta\text{CP,Def,i,t(t CO}_2\text{-e)}$	The Verification Team confirmed that this parameter was appropriately calculated in-line with the VM0007 methodology and procedures described in the PDD. The calculated value of this parameter for the monitoring period is approximately 52.4 tCO ₂ e.	This parameter was calculated in-line with the validated PDD and VM0007 methodology.	Not applicable.
$\text{GHGP-E,i,t(t CO}_2\text{-e)}$	The Verification Team confirmed that this parameter was appropriately calculated in-line with the VM0007 methodology and procedures described in the PDD. The calculated value of this parameter for the monitoring period is approximately 3.1 tCO ₂ e.	This parameter was calculated in-line with the validated PDD and VM0007 methodology.	Not applicable.

$\Delta CP, LB$	The Verification Team confirmed that this parameter was appropriately calculated in-line with the VM0007 methodology and procedures described in the PDD. The calculated value of this parameter for the monitoring period is 0 tCO ₂ e.	This parameter was calculated in-line with the validated PDD and VM0007 methodology.	Not applicable.
$\Delta CLK-AS, planned$ (t CO ₂ -e)	The Verification Team confirmed that this parameter was appropriately calculated in-line with the VM0007 methodology and procedures described in the PDD. The calculated value of this parameter for the monitoring period is approximately 0 tCO ₂ e	This parameter was calculated in-line with the validated PDD and VM0007 methodology.	Not applicable.
$NER_{REDDERROR,t}$	The Verification Team confirmed that the validated parameter value was applied during this monitoring period and that the baseline period has not expired. The validated value of this parameter for the 2-year monitoring period is approximately 3.7%.	This parameter was derived from the validated baseline as described in the PDD.	Not applicable.

For this monitoring period, the project relied on the network of forest inventory plots and resulting analysis that were confirmed at validation and as allowed by VCS Standard v4.4. To monitor deforestation in the project area and leakage belt, the project conducted a remote sensing analysis as described in Section 3.1.3 of the MR. The Verification Team acquired multispectral satellite imagery to review for disturbance or deforestation, in addition to ground-truthing efforts from the site visit. Sentinel 2 sensor data was downloaded for the beginning and end of the reporting period to monitor the project area and detect any land cover changes. The project conducted a Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) in 2021, which was used to determine if forest degradation was occurring within the project area and determine the level of immigration. The verification confirmed the results of the PRA through on-site interviews and a review of supporting documentation.

The Verification Team observed analysis methods during a calculation walkthrough meeting with the project where the features of VM0007 were discussed. It was confirmed that the project's on-going analysis methods for monitoring conform with the methodology. The Verification Team reviewed the monitoring period quantification results independently and conducted independent data checks to assess whether there were transpositional errors and confirmed that data sources are suitable and in compliance with VM0007 requirements.

Uncertainty calculations were reviewed in detail as prescribed by the methodology and confirmed. As uncertainty was below the allowable uncertainty threshold dictated by the methodology, the project appropriately did not apply an uncertainty deduction for this monitoring period.

The methods and formulae set out in the PD for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions, and leakage were confirmed. The total end of the monitoring period carbon stocks in all project activities for all relevant pools resulting from carbon stock changes were correctly quantified. Where ranges of parameters or other types of formulaic uncertainty existed, appropriately conservative values were used in data analysis.

In conclusion, the quantification methods for GHG emission reductions and removals have been performed correctly and in accordance with the validated PD and VM0007.

4.4.2 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

During this verification assessment, the evidence provided by the project was sufficient in both quantity and quality to support the determination of GHG emission removals reported by the project. Throughout the verification, the project demonstrated a commitment toward conservativeness and took all measures appropriate to ensure the reliability of evidence provided.

The threshold for materiality with respect to the aggregate of errors, omissions and misrepresentations relative to the total reported GHG emission reductions and/or removals was met for this project as defined in the Validation/Verification Sampling Plan. Materiality is a concept that errors, omissions and misrepresentations could affect the GHG reduction assertion and influence the intended users (ISO 14064-3:2006). As defined by VCS Version 4.4, the materiality will be 1% for this project.

The evidence provided to determine emission reductions reported in the MR included values, notations, units, and sources. This evidence has been cross-checked with supplied emission reduction calculation spreadsheets. The procedure for data recording, transfer and final storage was also verified and found to be in compliance with the monitoring plan outlined in the PD. The Verification Team confirmed through cross-checks that adequate monitoring mechanisms are in place where the required parameters need to be monitored.

The Verification Team was provided access to the project's series of monitoring worksheets where monitoring data is compiled for quantification and reporting. These tools ensure accurate information flow for monitoring efforts. Section 3.1.3 of the MR provides additional detail on project data management methods and structure.

The Verification Team confirmed the project has provide a comparison of the ex-ante ERRs and ex-post ERRs in Table 3.19 of the Monitoring Report. The VVB confirmed that the information provided is correct.

Year	Ex-ante emissions reductions/removals	Achieved emissions reductions/removals	Percent difference	Justification for the difference
2020	247,504	247,488	-0.01%	There was a small number of emissions in the project scenario during the monitoring period.

2021	614,766	614,734	-0.01%	There was a small number of emissions in the project scenario during the monitoring period.
Total	862,270	862,222	-0.01%	There was a small number of emissions in the project scenario during the monitoring period.

In conclusion, the evidence provided by the project was sufficient in both quantity and quality to support the determination of GHG emission removals reported by the project.

4.4.3 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

The project appropriately utilized the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool to assess internal, external, and natural risk and mitigation measures for minimizing risk. The Verification Team reviewed the Non-Permanence Risk Report following VCS AFOLU Requirements Section 3.7.3 and confirmed the project adheres to the requirements. The Verification Team evaluated the rationale, appropriateness, and justifications of risk ratings chosen by the project. Each risk factor was thoroughly assessed for conformance. Any identified NCR and/or CL findings related to the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool/Report are presented in Appendix B.

Risk Factor	Rationale & Quality	Conclusion
Internal Risks		
Project Management	The management team includes individuals that have the necessary skills and experience to implement all project activities. The local management team includes relevant personnel from the region with extensive experience managing rural lands in the Chaco. During the site visit, the Verification Team confirmed that the Project Proponent has an office in at Estancia Santa Rosanna Carmelo Peralta, Paraguay and is able to travel to the project site in less than a day of travel.	A risk rating of -2 is appropriate given the rationale provided and all statements made are substantiated.

	The Validation Team confirmed the management team includes individuals with significant experience in AFOLU project design and implementation, carbon accounting and reporting under the VCS Program.	
Financial Viability	Financial documents provided demonstrate cash flow breakeven is 4 years or less from the current risk assessment and that the project has 100% of financial resources available before the project reaches break even.	A risk rating of 0 is appropriate given the rationale provided and supporting documentation reviewed by the Verification Team.
Opportunity Cost	The Validation Team was provided an economic additionality analysis and NPV analysis substantiating the NPV from project activities is expected to be 20% and up to 50% more profitable than the most probably alternative land use scenario. A letter of agreement provided to the Validation Team substantiates that the project is protected by a legally binding commitment to continue management practices.	A risk rating of -2 is appropriate given the rationale provided and supporting documentation reviewed by the Verification Team.
Project Longevity	There is a legal agreement in place that continues the management practice for 30 years.	A risk rating of 15 is appropriate given the rationale provided.
Total Internal Risks		The project has a total Internal Risk score of 11 .
External Risks		
Land Tenure	Ownership and resource access/use rights are held by different entities. A contract provided to the Verification Team substantiates that the project is protected by a legally binding commitment to continue management practices.	A risk rating of 0 is appropriate given the rationale provided and supporting documentation reviewed by the Verification Team.
Community Engagement	No people live on the Initial Project Area or are reliant on the Initial Project Area. To their knowledge the Project Proponent has contacted all communities which may be reliant on the Initial Project Area.	A risk rating of 0 is appropriate given the rationale provided.
Political Risk	The Governance Score is -0.37.	A risk rating of 2 is appropriate given the rationale provided.

	The Validation Team performed a web search and confirmed that Paraguay has an established DNA under the CDM.	
Total External Risks		The project has a total External Risk score of 2 .
Natural Risks		
Natural Risk	All natural risks were appropriately identified and justified. Where necessary the verification reviewed supporting evidence, including on-site interviews and observations. Fire was the most significant natural risk, with a significance of insignificant or transient and a likelihood of less than every 10 years. A mitigation of 0.25 is appropriately applied based on incorporation of fire breaks and project staff's proven history of effectively eliminating fire from the area.	A risk rating of 0.5 is appropriate given the rationale provided.
Total Natural Risks		The project has a total Natural Risk score of 0.5 .

In summary, the project has accounted for risk factors in a reasonable manner and has reached an overall risk rating that encompasses all risks of non-permanence. The project has applied the Non-Permanence Risk Rating of 13.5%. As required, risk will be reassessed and given risk scores at each verification period.

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

The Verification Team reviewed actions taken to disseminate the monitoring plan and actions identified in PD Section 3.3.4 to be taken. The Verification Team confirmed the monitoring plan, as identified within the PD, is included in the MR. The Verification Team confirmed monitoring results for the monitoring period are included in the MR. The Verification Team confirmed that the MR has been submitted to Verra to be posted on the Verra Registry and links to the reports were available through Quadriz's website. The Verification Team confirmed through site visit interviews that the monitoring plan and results of monitoring for this monitoring period were provided to the Maria Auxiliadora community. The Verification Team determined through observations confirming the postings and weblinks and through the results of interviews that the results of climate monitoring were disseminated in accordance with the validated PD.

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

Not applicable - The Project does not seek to be validated nor verified to the Gold Level for climate change adaptation benefits.

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

Not applicable - The Project does not seek to be validated nor verified to the Gold Level for climate change adaptation benefits.

4.5 Community

4.5.1 Community Impacts (CM2.1)

The Verification Team reviewed the community impacts identified in the PD and methods identified in the PD for assessing these impacts as the basis for review of community impacts presented in the MR. The Verification Team determined the methodology presented in the MR for measuring and monitoring impacts of the project on the identified community, Maria Auxiliadora, is based on theory of change presented in the validated PD. The Verification Team reviewed information provided in the MR, supplemental materials provided by the project, interviews with project representatives, community leaders, and community members to assess the general quality and accuracy of the impact assessment.

The Verification Team determined the project uses appropriate methodologies to estimate impacts on communities resulting from planned project activities. Section 4.1.1 of the MR appropriately identifies the impacts, type of benefits/cost/risk, and associated change in well-being for all community groups. Through review of the MR, clarification provided, and supporting documentation, and through results of interviews with project staff and community members of Maria Auxiliadora, the Verification Team determined the three expected community impacts identified in the PD are still predicted for this initial monitoring period based on Chaco med program and Visitor Center not yet implemented and no community members from Maria Auxiliadora yet employed by the project. The Verification Team determined through results of interviews with project staff and review of supporting documentation that progress was made during the monitoring plan on planning for implementation of these three identified community benefits. The Verification Team determined the additional impact included in the MR not specifically identified in the PD, generally related to benefits to the Maria Auxiliadora community through prevention of deforestation of the project area, is appropriately described as an indirect benefit. The Verification Team determined through results of interviews with community members of Maria Auxiliadora that the community recognized the negative impacts on peccary populations – species relied on for subsistence hunting by the community – when forest habitats contiguous to their communal lands are cleared and converted to other use. Through interviews with the project biodiversity consultant and project monitoring staff and through review of supporting documentation, the Verification Team substantiated that preventing deforestation of the project area would be expected to result in positive, indirect impacts to the Maria Auxiliadora community through maintaining suitable habitat for species the community relies on for subsistence hunting.

The Verification Team determined that site visit interviews and observations, paired with additional clarification and supplemental documentation from the project, provided reasonable assurance that the changes in well-being presented for the impacts identified were generally aligned with documentable or community-acknowledged progress being made for the participating and identified community. Site visit observations and interviews did not identify any additional unplanned impacts not identified in the MR and PD. Overall, the Verification Team determined through review of project and supplemental documentation, additional clarification from the project, and site visit interviews and observations that the assessment of impacts during this monitoring period is accurate.

4.5.2 Negative Community Impact Mitigation (CM2.2)

The Verification Team reviewed Section 4.2.2 of the PD, which states that there are no expected negative community impacts, as there are no communities living with the project area nor reliant on the project area. Additionally, the PD does not identify any necessary mitigation actions because there are no expected

negative impacts. Through interviews with the Maria Auxiliadora, the Verification Team did not identify any negative community impacts affecting their community. As there are no identified negative impacts, the Verification Team determined that the mitigation actions were implemented in accordance with the PD.

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

Section 4.1.3 of the MR states that all community groups identified received net-positive impacts from implementation of project activities during this verification period. During the site visit, the Verification Team met with and interviewed community leaders and community members of the Maria Auxiliadora community to assess the positive and negative benefits that the project has had on the community during this monitoring period. As the Verification Team has already determined that the Maria Auxiliadora community, including the identified community groups within this community, has experienced positive indirect benefits during the monitoring period in Section 4.5.1 of this report and there are no identified negative impacts, the Verification Team determined that overall, the net impact on community groups is positive.

4.5.4 Protection of High Conservation Values (CM2.4)

The Verification Team reviewed Section 4.2.4 of the PD in comparison to HCVs identified in Section 4.1.3 of the PD and to impacts identified under the without-project scenario in Section 4.1.4 of the PD against the reported impacts in Section 4.1.4 of the MR and found them to be consistent. The PD identifies a single community-related HCV, which is the Chaco forest habitat on the roughly 30,000 hectares of indigenous community lands shared by the Maria Auxiliadora community. Through site visit interviews with Maria Auxiliadora community leaders and community members, the Verification Team found no evidence that this identified community-related HCV was negatively affected by the project. Additionally, the Verification Team noted that the project area does not overlap with this community-related HCV, but this HCV is within the initial project zone defined for the initial project instance. The Verification Team determined, as described in Section 4.5.3 of this Verification Report, that project activities associated with preventing conversion of the Chaco forest habitats to pasture on the project area helps protect the HCV attributes for contiguous Chaco forest habitats on the Maria Auxiliadora community. Overall, the Verification Team is reasonably assured that no HCVs have been negatively affected by the project.

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

The Verification Team reviewed Section 4.3.1 and Appendix 1 of the PD that identify potential positive and negative impacts the project activities are likely to cause on the well-being of other stakeholders and the mitigation measures for implementation. The PD identifies one general potential negative impact on other stakeholders, which is that land values could go up or down as a result of this conservation project. The PD identifies potential negative impacts for other stakeholders that are specifically named. During the site visit, review of supporting documentation, and independent reviews of third-party data, the Verification Team found no evidence of a negative impact on other stakeholders resulting from project implementation. Through site visit interviews with project staff, interviews with representatives of selected other stakeholders, and a review of supporting documentation, the Verification Team is reasonably assured that the project engaged with other stakeholders during the monitoring period, which is the primary mitigation action described in the PD for offsetting potential, though unlikely, negative impacts resulting from project implementation. The Verification Team is reasonably assured that the project activities are not resulting in negative impacts on other stakeholders.

The Verification Team reached an overall conclusion that based on the absence of negative impacts to other stakeholders during the monitoring period and the generally defined positive impacts protection of the project area's Chaco forest had on other stakeholders, the net impacts of project activities on the well-being are positive.

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

The Verification Team reviewed the community monitoring plan provided in Section 4.4.1 of the PD against Section 4.3.1 of the MR and supporting documents. The PD describes four community surveys that will be implemented and used as the community monitoring plan. The PD identifies that two of the community monitoring surveys – the Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) and degradation survey – have already been developed and implemented. The additional two community surveys have not been developed, as they related to specific project activities still in the development phase. The validated PD states that the PRA and degradation surveys will be administered every 2 years. MR Section 4.4.1 states that the degradation survey was administered in March of 2021, and the PRA was administered in August of 2021. These were the first surveys administered, and the 2-year period for reassessment did not occur during the verification period. Through interviews with the participating community, review of monitoring results and supporting documentation, interviews with project staff, and additional clarification from the project, the Verification Team is reasonably assured that the community monitoring plan, specifically the dates, frequency, and sampling methods, has been implemented as described in the validated PD.

The Verification Team reviewed the validated PD, which identified that in order to monitor the community HCV (the Chaco Forest), the project will monitor forest canopy cover using satellite imagery. The Verification Team reviewed the deforestation analysis conducted by the project and determined the analysis to be accurate. The results of this analysis are elaborated on and described in Section 4.4.1 of this report. Additionally, the project has developed a biodiversity monitoring plan to specifically monitor medium-to-large mammals in the project area. Through a review of monitoring results, supporting documentation, and interviews with project staff charged with implementing the biodiversity monitoring plan, further described in Section 4.6.11 of this report, the Verification Team is reasonably assured that the project has implemented the monitoring plan for community HCVs in line with the validated PD.

As the Project does not intend to meet the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits, the additional requirements pertaining to Gold Level did not need to be assessed by the Verification Team.

The Verification Team determined through review of the validated monitoring plan, additional clarification from the Project Proponent, and results of the monitoring plan supported by site visit interviews with project staff, that with the reasonable exception for monitoring of two community benefits not yet implemented during the monitoring period, the community monitoring plan was carried out in accordance with the validated PD.

4.5.7 Community Monitoring Plan Dissemination (CM4.3)

The Verification Team reviewed Section 4.4.2 of the PD that describes how the current community monitoring plan and results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan will be disseminated. The Verification Team substantiated via an email sent by Verra (refer to Section 4.1 of this report) that the MR has been submitted to Verra to be posted on the Verra Registry. During the site visit via interviews with the Maria Auxiliadora community, the Verification Team substantiated that the community had been provided access to monitoring results via access to the MR. Overall, the Verification Team is

reasonably assured that the results of community monitoring were disseminated in accordance with the validated PD.

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

Not applicable - The Project does not seek to be validated nor verified to the Gold Level for community.

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

Not applicable - The Project does not seek to be validated nor verified to the Gold Level for community.

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

Not applicable - The Project does not seek to be validated nor verified to the Gold Level for community.

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

Not applicable - The Project does not seek to be validated nor verified to the Gold Level for community.

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

Not applicable - The Project does not seek to be validated nor verified to the Gold Level for community.

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

Not applicable - The Project does not seek to be validated nor verified to the Gold Level for community.

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

Not applicable - The Project does not seek to be validated nor verified to the Gold Level for community.

4.6 Biodiversity

4.6.1 Biodiversity Changes (B2.1)

The Verification Team reviewed Section 5.1.1 of the MR against Section 5.2.1 of the PD that provides a description of expected changes to biodiversity under the with-project scenario. Additionally, Section 5.2.1 of the PD identifies 2 biodiversity elements that are expected to change because of the project activity. The first change identified is tree canopy cover and availability of Chaco Forest habitat. The MR states that the conservation of tree canopy cover and availability of Chaco Forest is an actual, positive, and direct change in biodiversity as a result of project activities. The second change identified is the population of endemic, threatened and endangered species and that under the project scenario, the population of these species will be greater as a result of forest conservation in the project area. The MR states that this is an actual, positive, and direct change that occurred as a result of project activities, forest conservation.

The project uses remote sensing analyses to determine the amount of avoided deforestation (against the baseline) that has occurred in the project area for the current monitoring period. The Verification Team reviewed these analyses through a set of independent data checks and found no discrepancies in the projects reported results and the Verification Team's independent analysis. Through site visit interviews

with project staff and observations of made by the Verification Team as the Verification Team moved throughout the project area, the Verification Team found no evidence to contradict the results of the monitored data related to deforestation. In addition to the monitoring of canopy cover in the project area via remote sensing analyses, the project has initiated a first study of to monitor the presence of endemic, threatened and endangered species using wildlife cameras. During the site visit, the Verification Team observed wildlife cameras throughout the project area, and project staff collected data from these cameras. Furthermore, the Verification Team reviewed the photos collected with the project staff and viewed photos of jaguar, giant armadillo, and ocelot.

In conclusion, the Verification Team confirmed the accuracy and appropriateness of the monitored data that supports the reported changes in biodiversity in the project area and project zone. The Verification Team confirmed the project has adequately justified the changes in biodiversity as a result of project activities. Overall, the Verification Team is reasonably assured the project's assessment of changes in biodiversity resulting from project activities in the project zone during the monitoring period is accurate.

4.6.2 Mitigation Actions (B2.3)

The Verification Team reviewed Section 5.2.2 of the PD that states that the project is unlikely to have any negative impacts on biodiversity because the project is a conservation and avoided deforestation project, and therefore no mitigation actions are necessary.

The Verification Team reviewed Section 5.2.2 of the PD, which described four measures needed to maintain biodiversity HCV attributes. During verification, the Verification Team conducted site visit interviews, reviewed monitoring results, requested additional clarification from the project, and reviewed supporting documentation to substantiate claims made in the MR. Through site visit interviews and review of supporting documentation, the Verification Team is reasonably assured the project still maintains a legal contract with the landowner that prevents the selling and ultimate deforestation of the project area. Furthermore, the Verification Team confirmed that deforestation did not occur during this monitoring period as discussed in other sections of this report. Through site visit interviews with project staff, the Verification Team is reasonably assured that although no project instances have been added during this monitoring period, the project has begun to reach out to other landowners in the validated grouped project area with the intention of adding additional project instances over time. As discussed in Section 4.6.1 of this report, the Verification Team is reasonably assured the project has implemented the monitoring of medium-to-large mammals using wildlife cameras. Through site visit interviews with project staff, specifically the newly hired forest guard, observations of signage placed at strategic points throughout the project area (primarily at the main entrance points), and a review of supporting documentation, the Verification Team is reasonably assured the project is appropriately monitoring forest canopy cover and illegal hunting. Overall, the Verification Team concludes that the project has taken the appropriate measures needed to maintain biodiversity HCV attributes in accordance with the project's validated PD.

4.6.3 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts (B2.2)

During the verification, the Verification Team conducted interviews with project staff and technical experts, reviewed supporting documentation, including remote sensing analyses designed to quantify the amount of avoided deforestation that occurred during the monitoring period, and collected observational data during the site visit. The Verification Team provides additional information on the evidence collected through these evidence-gathering activities in Sections 4.6.1, 4.6.2, 4.4.1, and Appendix A of this report. After a review of

the evidence collected during the verification and Section 5.2.3 of the PD against section 5.1.3 of the MR, the Verification Team is reasonably assured the project activities result in a net positive impact on biodiversity.

4.6.4 High Conservation Values Protected (B2.4)

As described in the validated PD, the core project activity is forest conservation through the avoidance of planned deforestation for livestock ranching. Section 5.2.4 of the PD identifies additional activities that are needed to ensure the protection of the HCVs identified in Section 5.1.2 of the PD. These specific activities include monitoring of deforestation via remote sensing analyses and via on-the-ground guards, to not allow hunting in the project area, monitor illegal hunting, and monitor the abundance and diversity of medium-to-large mammals. As previously discussed and elaborated on in earlier sections of this report, the Verification Team confirmed the project is actively monitoring deforestation in the project area via remote sensing analyses. Through site visit interviews with project staff, including the newly hired forest guard, a review of supporting documentation, and observational evidence collected during the site visit (signage posted at different entrance points to the project area stating that no hunting is allowed within the project area, and a review of photos captured via game cameras located throughout the project area), the Verification Team is reasonably assured that the project continues to implement the necessary activities outlined in the validated PD to protect HCVs. Section 5.1.2 of the PD identifies two HCVs: Tree canopy cover and availability of Chaco Forest Habitat; and populations of endemic, threatened and endangered species. As the project continues to protect the forest of the project area and has implemented additional project activities as described in the validated PD to protect HCVs, the Verification Team is reasonably assured that no high conservation values were negatively affected by the project during the monitoring period.

4.6.5 Invasive Species (B2.5)

The Verification Team reviewed the MR and determined the statements in the MR are consistent with assertions made in the PD that the project does not use non-native species in the Project Area or Project Zone and that the project will not result in introduction of known invasive species. During the site visit, the Verification Team conducted interviews with project staff, collected observational evidence and found no evidence that the project has introduced invasive species into any area affected by the project. Furthermore, during the review of the remote sensing analyses conducted by the project to monitor and quantify deforestation in the project scenario, the Verification Team found no evidence of afforestation, which could potentially use invasive species. In conclusion, the Verification Team is reasonably assured that the project has not introduced invasive species into the project area.

Section 5.1.5 of the MR states that a single invasive species, feral pig, was documented at the initial project instance during the monitoring period. The Verification Team noted the MR identifies measures implemented for planning how to address the presence of this invasive species at the initial project instance. The Verification Team determined through review of monitoring data and interviews with project staff that the feral pig population has not demonstrated an increase during the monitoring period due to implemented project activities. The Verification Team further determined with control measures being considered for feral pig, reasonable expectations would be provided that the population of this invasive species would not be expected to increase as a result of project activities.

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

The Verification Team reviewed Section 5.1.6 of the MR and Section 5.2.7 of the PD. The PD states that the project will not use any non-native species in the project area or project zone, which agrees with Section 5.1.6 MR that states the project has not used non-native species in the project area or project zone. During the site visit, the Verification Team conducted interviews with project staff, collected observational evidence and found no evidence that the project is using non-native species in the project area or in its project activities. In conclusion, the Verification Team is reasonably assured the project is not using non-native species, and thus there is no potential to harm the region's environment.

4.6.7 GMO Exclusion (B2.7)

PD Section 5.2.8 states the project will not use any GMOs to generate ERs (Emission Reductions) or removals, and this statement agrees with Section 5.1.7 of the MR. During the site visit, the Verification Team found no evidence that GMOs were used to generate GHG ERs or removals, and thus the Verification Team is reasonably assured that no GMOs have been used to generate GHG ERs or removals.

4.6.8 Inputs Justification (B2.8)

PD Section 5.2.9 states the project does not anticipate using any inputs, and this statement agrees with Section 5.1.8 of the MR. During the site visit, the Verification Team found no evidence that the project used inputs during the monitoring period, and thus the Verification Team is reasonably assured that no inputs have been used.

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

Section 5.2.1 of the MR states there are no negative offsite biodiversity impacts, consistent with Section 5.3.1 of the PD. Site visit observations and interviews did not identify any negative offsite biodiversity impacts. As no negative impacts were anticipated or observed, no mitigation measures were identified as warranted.

4.6.10 Net Offsite Biodiversity Benefits (B3.3)

Section 5.2.2 of the MR describes several offsite biodiversity benefits, consistent with those identified in Section 5.3.2 of the PD. As documented in Section 4.6.9 of this report, no negative impacts were observed or anticipated. The positive benefits identified and absence of negative impacts result in net-positive biodiversity impacts.

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

The biodiversity monitoring plan (BMP) is outlined in Section 5.4.1 of the PD. The Verification Team reviewed the summary results of the biodiversity monitoring presented in Section 5.3.1 of the MR and compared the dates, frequencies and sampling methods reported to those identified in the PD. The Verification Team substantiated through review of project and supplemental documents, additional clarification and supplemental documents provided by the project, and site visit interviews and observations, that the biodiversity monitoring conducted during this verification period was in accordance with the PD. The Verification Team reviewed the monitoring conducted for identified HCVs and compared the results to the HCV monitoring measures documented in the PD. Additional clarification and supplemental

documentation were provided by the project. The Verification Team substantiated that HCV monitoring was conducted in line with the validated project design and that these measures were effective in maintaining and enhancing all identified HCVs related to community well-being.

The project has been validated to Gold Level for exceptional biodiversity benefits. As such, the monitoring results must include additional identified indicators. The Verification Team reviewed the monitoring results, and with additional clarification and supplemental documentation provided by the project, determined the population trends and threats to identified trigger species were carried out in accordance with the validated project description, meeting the criteria for Gold Level exceptional biodiversity benefits. Gold Level exceptional biodiversity benefits are assessed in greater detail in Sections 4.6.12 – 4.6.13 of this report. Through review of project and supplemental documentation, additional clarification, and evidence provided in site visit interviews and observations, the Verification Team determined the biodiversity monitoring plan was carried out in accordance with the validated PD.

4.6.12 Biodiversity Monitoring Plan Dissemination (B4.3)

The Verification Team reviewed the MR and PD to evaluate the actions taken to disseminate the results of biodiversity monitoring during this verification period against the actions described in the PD. The Verification Team confirmed that the biodiversity monitoring results have been incorporated into the MR, and the MR has been submitted to Verra to be posted on the Verra Registry.. Site visit interviews with the participating community, Maria Auxiliadora, confirmed the community has been provided copies of the project documents. Review of supplemental support documents, along with site visit interviews and observations, substantiate the results of the biodiversity monitoring for this verification were disseminated in accordance with the validated PD.

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

The Verification Team reviewed actions identified in the MR taken by the project to maintain or enhance the populations of the identified trigger species and to reduce threats against these trigger species against the actions identified in the PD, as needed. The Verification Team determined through site visit observations and interviews with the project biodiversity consultant and project biodiversity monitoring staff, and through additional clarification and supplemental documentation provided by the Project Proponent, that the actions identified in the PD were implemented during the monitoring period. Site visit observations and interviews and additional clarification and supplemental documentation provided by the project substantiated that the project maintained the legal contract with the landowner of the project area, the project prevented deforestation of the project area, and the project hired a forest guard to prevent illegal timber harvesting and hunting. Documentation that each of the five trigger species was present during the monitoring period is assessed by the Verification Team in Section 4.6.14 of this verification report. The Verification Team determined reasonable evidence was provided to substantiate actions taken during the monitoring period resulted in reduced threats to the identified trigger species and that the project activities associated with preventing deforestation and preventing hunting in the initial project instance are measures that maintained populations of the trigger species during the monitoring period.

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

The Verification Team verified the measures taken by the project during the monitoring period to maintain or enhance the populations of trigger species, as described in Section 4.6.13 of this verification report. The Verification Team reviewed the results of monitoring for the trigger species for the monitoring period. The

Verification Team determined through review of the periodic and final biodiversity monitoring reports for the monitoring period, review of photographic documentation, and through interviews with project staff monitoring biodiversity, that reasonable evidence has been provided to substantiate each of the trigger species was documented in the project area for the initial project instance during the monitoring period. The Verification Team determined the population trends presented are reasonably substantiated by the monitoring data and population analyses provided. The Verification Team determined the documented occurrences and population estimates derived for the trigger species for the monitoring period provide assurance that measures implemented during the monitoring period were effective at maintaining the population status of each trigger species in the project zone.

4.7 Additional Project Implementation Information

The project has not presented additional project implementation information. This section is not applicable.

4.8 Additional Project Impact Information

The project has not presented additional project implementation information. This section is not applicable.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

Subject to verification, after site inspections and review of all project information, procedures, calculations, and supporting documentation, Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc., confirms this day of 30 January 2023 that the Corazón Verde del Chaco Project is accurate, consistent, and complies with all VCS Version 4 criteria, CCB Third Edition criteria, the selected methodology (VM0007), and the validated Project Design Documentation (PD). Aster Global confirms 2020-2021 Corazón Verde del Chaco Grouped REDD+ Project Monitoring Report Project (Version 1.7, dated 31 May 2023) has been implemented in accordance with VCS Version 4 and CCB Third Edition criteria. The objectives, scope, and criteria used to compile and assess the GHG statement have been described in Section 1 of this report.

Aster Global confirms all verification activities – including objectives, scope and criteria, reasonable level of assurance, and PD implementation adherence to VCS Version 4 (and all associated updates) and CCB Project Design Standards (Third Edition), as documented in this report – are complete. Aster Global concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions 2020-2021 Corazón Verde del Chaco Grouped REDD+ Project Monitoring Report Project (Version 1.7, dated 31 May 2023) meets the requirements of VCS Version 4 (and all associated updates), CCB Project Design Standards (Third Edition), and the validated PD. In addition, Aster Global asserts the project complies with the criteria for projects set out in the Third Edition of the CCB Standards to achieve Gold Level distinction for Biodiversity. Aster Global's conclusion on the GHG statement is a positive opinion.

The GHG assertion provided by the project and verified by Aster Global has resulted in baseline emission reductions or removals of 996,844 tCO₂ equivalents (tCO₂e) by the project during the verification period/reporting period (VCS and CCB: 01 July 2020 – 31 December 2021; 1.5 years). This value is gross of the 13.5% (134,566 tCO₂e) buffer withholding based on the non-permanence risk assessment tool, and associated leakage allocation. This results in 862,222 tCO₂e of credits eligible for issuance as VCUs.

The GHG statement is the responsibility of the Project Proponent. The data and information supporting Aster Global's GHG opinion are projected and historical in nature. Aster Global declares this opinion was

conducted in accordance with ISO 14064-3; 2006). This opinion is based on VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report (v4, 19 September 2019).

Monitoring period: From 01 July 2020 to 31 December 2021

Verified GHG emission reductions and removals in the above verification period¹:

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)
2020	286,132	18	0	247,488
2021	710,712	37	0	614,734
Total	996,844	55	0	862,222

¹Please note that the values in the table above are rounded for readability, for exact values please reference the project's provided quantification workbook. The final VCU value is correctly reported in this table.

APPENDIX A: DOCUMENTS LIST

Document Name	Date Received
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Calcs 2022.03.17.xlsx	3/21/2022
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2022.03.17.docx	3/21/2022
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 NPRR 2022.03.17.docx	3/21/2022
Corazón Verde del Chaco Summary Document 2022.03.17 (English).pdf	3/21/2022
Corazón Verde del Chaco Summary Document 2022.03.17 (Spanish).pdf	3/21/2022
Atenil - 2022 Clasificacion de cobertura 2022.03.07.docx	3/21/2022
Atenil S.A. Forest-nofo MAP.png	3/21/2022
Atenil S.A. IPCC MAP.png	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2021-12-02_mmu4900.CPG	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2021-12-02_mmu4900.dbf	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2021-12-02_mmu4900.prj	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2021-12-02_mmu4900.sbn	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2021-12-02_mmu4900.sbx	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2021-12-02_mmu4900.shp	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2021-12-02_mmu4900.shp.xml	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2021-12-02_mmu4900.shx	3/21/2022
Stratified_random_sampling_dec2021_v2.cpg	3/21/2022
Stratified_random_sampling_dec2021_v2.dbf	3/21/2022
Stratified_random_sampling_dec2021_v2.prj	3/21/2022
Stratified_random_sampling_dec2021_v2.qmd	3/21/2022
Stratified_random_sampling_dec2021_v2.shp	3/21/2022
Stratified_random_sampling_dec2021_v2.shx	3/21/2022
Atenil - Clasificacion de cobertura - Joel Mercado - V2.docx	3/21/2022
Atenil - Clasificacion de cobertura - Joel Mercado - V2.pdf	3/21/2022
PastDeFor_Corazon_Verde_2020.cpg	3/21/2022
PastDeFor_Corazon_Verde_2020.dbf	3/21/2022
PastDeFor_Corazon_Verde_2020.prj	3/21/2022
PastDeFor_Corazon_Verde_2020.sbn	3/21/2022
PastDeFor_Corazon_Verde_2020.sbx	3/21/2022
PastDeFor_Corazon_Verde_2020.shp	3/21/2022
PastDeFor_Corazon_Verde_2020.shp.xml	3/21/2022
PastDeFor_Corazon_Verde_2020.shx	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2020_mmu4900v4.cpg	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2020_mmu4900v4.dbf	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2020_mmu4900v4.prj	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2020_mmu4900v4.sbn	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2020_mmu4900v4.sbx	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2020_mmu4900v4.shp	3/21/2022
Clasificacion_2020_mmu4900v4.shp.xml	3/21/2022

Clasificacion_2020_mmu4900v4.shx	3/21/2022
Current_classification_clipped_by_PA.cpg	3/21/2022
Current_classification_clipped_by_PA.dbf	3/21/2022
Current_classification_clipped_by_PA.prj	3/21/2022
Current_classification_clipped_by_PA.sbn	3/21/2022
Current_classification_clipped_by_PA.sbx	3/21/2022
Current_classification_clipped_by_PA.shp	3/21/2022
Current_classification_clipped_by_PA.shp.xml	3/21/2022
Current_classification_clipped_by_PA.shx	3/21/2022
Union_pastDeform_w_CurrentDeform.cpg	3/21/2022
Union_pastDeform_w_CurrentDeform.dbf	3/21/2022
Union_pastDeform_w_CurrentDeform.prj	3/21/2022
Union_pastDeform_w_CurrentDeform.sbn	3/21/2022
Union_pastDeform_w_CurrentDeform.sbx	3/21/2022
Union_pastDeform_w_CurrentDeform.shp	3/21/2022
Union_pastDeform_w_CurrentDeform.shp.xml	3/21/2022
Union_pastDeform_w_CurrentDeform.shx	3/21/2022
Step4_Intersected_w_Strata.cpg	3/21/2022
Step4_Intersected_w_Strata.dbf	3/21/2022
Step4_Intersected_w_Strata.prj	3/21/2022
Step4_Intersected_w_Strata.sbn	3/21/2022
Step4_Intersected_w_Strata.sbx	3/21/2022
Step4_Intersected_w_Strata.shp	3/21/2022
Step4_Intersected_w_Strata.shp.xml	3/21/2022
Step4_Intersected_w_Strata.shx	3/21/2022
Deforestation_2020_to_2021.cpg	3/21/2022
Deforestation_2020_to_2021.dbf	3/21/2022
Deforestation_2020_to_2021.prj	3/21/2022
Deforestation_2020_to_2021.sbn	3/21/2022
Deforestation_2020_to_2021.sbx	3/21/2022
Deforestation_2020_to_2021.shp	3/21/2022
Deforestation_2020_to_2021.shp.xml	3/21/2022
Deforestation_2020_to_2021.shx	3/21/2022
Atenil1Boundary_2021.01.20.cpg	3/21/2022
Atenil1Boundary_2021.01.20.dbf	3/21/2022
Atenil1Boundary_2021.01.20.prj	3/21/2022
Atenil1Boundary_2021.01.20.sbn	3/21/2022
Atenil1Boundary_2021.01.20.sbx	3/21/2022
Atenil1Boundary_2021.01.20.shp	3/21/2022
Atenil1Boundary_2021.01.20.shp.xml	3/21/2022
Atenil1Boundary_2021.01.20.shx	3/21/2022

CorazonVerde_PA_Strata_2022.02.16.cpg	3/21/2022
CorazonVerde_PA_Strata_2022.02.16.dbf	3/21/2022
CorazonVerde_PA_Strata_2022.02.16.prj	3/21/2022
CorazonVerde_PA_Strata_2022.02.16.sbn	3/21/2022
CorazonVerde_PA_Strata_2022.02.16.sbx	3/21/2022
CorazonVerde_PA_Strata_2022.02.16.shp	3/21/2022
CorazonVerde_PA_Strata_2022.02.16.shp.xml	3/21/2022
CorazonVerde_PA_Strata_2022.02.16.shx	3/21/2022
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Calcs 2022.08.19.xlsx	8/22/2022
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2022.08.19.docx	8/22/2022
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 NPRR 2022.08.19.docx	8/22/2022
21045.00_Corazon Verde del Chaco_CCB_Ver_Round 1_20221021 (Responses).docx	10/31/2022
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2022.10.29 (TRACKED).docx	10/31/2022
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2022.10.29.docx	10/31/2022
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2022.10.29.pdf	10/31/2022
Announcements on Local Radio.pdf	10/31/2022
Auditors and MADES Email.pdf	10/31/2022
Code of conduct Quadriz v20210317.pdf	10/31/2022
Consolidated PRAs.xlsx	10/31/2022
ContractGuardServices_Los Guardianes.pdf	10/31/2022
Environmental-Sustainability-Policy-Investigancia_Quadriz.pdf	10/31/2022
Informe_final_QUADRIZ_Rev.NIB.pdf	10/31/2022
Investancia_Quadriz_HSE_Manual_2022 (Revised).pdf	10/31/2022
Meeting between auditors and INFONA.pdf	10/31/2022
Monitoreo de Campo (Template).pdf	10/31/2022
Nota DNCC Nº 206_MADES.pdf	10/31/2022
Nota Firmada - Donación a la Comunidad Indígena.pdf	10/31/2022
Payments for advice_ChacoMed.pdf	10/31/2022
Plan de prevención y control de incendios_Proyecto Corazon Verde del Chaco_17032022.pdf	10/31/2022
Programa Chaco Alert.pdf	10/31/2022
Quadriz's April 2022 Annoucement of Public Comment Period.pdf	10/31/2022
Quadriz's October 2021 Annoucement of Public Comment Period.pdf	10/31/2022
Signs placed at CVdC.pdf	10/31/2022
Surveys_Maria Auxiliadora_2_March 2021.pdf	10/31/2022
Surveys_Maria Auxiliadora_March2021.pdf	10/31/2022
Surveys_MariaAuxiliadora_Agost2021_1.pdf	10/31/2022
Surveys_MariaAuxiliadora_Agost2021_2.pdf	10/31/2022
Surveys_MariaAuxiliadora_Agost2021_3.pdf	10/31/2022
Surveys_SanIsidro_March2021.pdf	10/31/2022
Visitor Book_Maria AuxiliadoraCommunity.jpeg	10/31/2022

Visits to Maria Auxiliadora community_2021.pdf	10/31/2022
WWF and Quadriz Fire Plan.pdf	10/31/2022
WWF and Quadriz Meeting.pdf	10/31/2022
WWF Invitation to Quadriz.pdf	10/31/2022
21045.00_Corazon Verde del Chaco_CCB_Ver_Round 2_20221213 (Responses).docx	12/21/2022
Contrato Laboral - MIGUEL RICARDO BUENO CANTERO.pdf	12/21/2022
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2022.12.19 (clean).docx	12/21/2022
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2022.12.19 (clean).pdf	12/21/2022
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2022.12.19 (Tracked).docx	12/21/2022
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2023.01.06.docx	1/6/2023
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Calcs 2023.01.17.xlsx	1/17/2023
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2023.01.17 (tracked).docx	1/17/2023
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2023.01.17.docx	1/17/2023
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2023.01.17.pdf	1/17/2023
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2023.01.19 (cleaned).docx	1/19/2023
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2023.01.19 (cleaned).pdf	1/19/2023
Corazon Verde 2020-2021 MR Report 2023.01.19 (tracked).docx	1/19/2023

APPENDIX B: VCS LIST OF FINDINGS

Findings Number	1
Approved VCS Module VMD0015,Version 2.2 (08 September 2020), Methods for monitoring GHG emissions and removals in REDD and CIW projects, Sectoral Scope 14 (Section)	5.1 STEP 1: Selection and analyses of sources of land-use and land-cover (LU/LC) change data
Approved VCS Module VMD0015,Version 2.2 (08 September 2020), Methods for monitoring GHG emissions and removals in REDD and CIW projects, Sectoral Scope 14 (Description)	In general, the same source of remotely sensed data and data analysis techniques must be used within the period for which the baseline is fixed.
Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)	Y
Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)	MR, PDD
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	The VVB noted monitoring plan section in PD and MR describes about classification methodology based on Landsat imagery. However, in section 3.2.2 of MR (Project Emissions) the VVB noted Sentinel 2 (10m) imagery is used to monitor land cover change for this monitoring period. The VVB noted a change of the source of imagery in this monitoring period. However, the VVB noted that the MR provides no explanation for such a change.
Aster Global Round 1 NCR/CL/OFI	CL: Please address in line with the findings.

Round 1 Response from Project Proponent (DD MonthYYYY)	"VMD0015,Version 2. states ""STEP 1. Selection and analyses of sources of land-use and land-cover (LU/LC) change data Medium resolution remotely sensed spatial data shall be used (30m x 30m resolution or less, such as Landsat, Resourcesat-1 or Spot sensor data). In general, the same source of remotely sensed data and data analysis techniques must be used within the period for which the baseline is fixed. If remotely sensed data have become available from new and higher resolution sources (e.g., from a different sensor system) during this period then it is possible to change the source of the remotely sensed data. Equally if the same source is no longer available (e.g. due to satellites or sensors going out of service) an alternate source may be used. A change in source data may only occur if the images based on interpretation of the new data overlap the images based on interpretation of the old data by at least 1 year and they cross calibrate to acceptable levels based on commonly used methods in the remote sensing community."" The statement cited by the VVB ""In general, the same source of remotely sensed data and data analysis techniques must be used within the period for which the baseline is fixed."" is followed by ""If remotely sensed data have become available from new and higher resolution sources (e.g., from a different sensor system) during this period then it is possible to change the source of the remotely sensed data."" Sentinel Imagery has become more widely available for the initial project area and as it is a ""higher resolution source"", the project has ""change[d] the source of the remotely sensed data"" to use Sentinel Imagery during this monitoring period. Further the following statement has been added to the MR Sentinel 2 imagery was used to monitor deforestation, as opposed to LandSat imagery, as allowed by the methodology because "it is possible to change the source of the remotely sensed data" where "remotely sensed data [has] become available from new and higher resolution sources" during the monitoring period. "
--	--

Aster Global Round 2 Findings	The VVB acknowledges the clarification provided here, as well as the additional information included in the monitoring report. The VVB would like to clarify that the statement was not cited, but rather used to park the findings related to the change in imagery source. The VVB is also aware that if it is available, higher resolution imagery may be used. However, the VVB was looking for some text that indicates the change of imagery in the monitoring plan. The VVB confirms that the findings have been addressed and that this item has been closed.
---	--

APPENDIX C: CCB LIST OF FINDINGS

VCS/CCB Template Instructions	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	The VVB reviewed the submitted MR and noted that throughout the document many sections are identical to the PD, which has led to a general lack of conformance with the template instructions. Furthermore, there are cases throughout the document where the MR template requires a description of actions/results/etc. that have occurred during the monitoring period, and it is generally unclear on which actions occurred during the monitoring period or are planned to occur in the future.
Findings:	Please update the MR and ensure adherence to the VCS/CCB MR Template instructions. Similarly, please ensure that the MR is clear so planned actions vs. actions that have already occurred can be differentiated.
Date Closed:	October 21, 2022

Indicator G1.1 – Identify the primary Project Proponent which is responsible for the project’s design and implementation and provide contact details.	Project Description (PD) title page block and PD section 2.1.3 identify Quadriz Paraguay S.A. as the Project Proponent with Marcel van Heesewijk as the primary contact. Contact information is provided in the PD title page block.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Project Description v1.0 (22 October 2021) title block information and PD section 2.1.3, site visit interviews with project management staff and project consultant.
Findings:	This indicator was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator G1.2 – Define the project’s climate, community and biodiversity objectives.	PD Section 2.1.1 describes the project’s climate, community, and biodiversity objectives.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 2.1.1, CCB Standards v3.1, CCB & VCS Project Description template instructions; interview with project proponent and project management staff
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator G1.3 – Provide the location (country, sub-national	PD Section 2.1.5 provides information and mapping for the specific project area identified as the first
---	---

jurisdictions(s)) and a brief overview of the basic physical and social parameters of the project.	project instance covered by the planned grouped project. Digital files were provided for the boundaries of the project area for this first project instance. PD Section 2.1.6 provides information for social parameters within the general Chaco region.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Sections 2.1.5 and 2.1.6, digital files of project area, CCB & VCS Project Description template instructions
Findings:	This indicator was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator G1.4 - Define the boundaries of the Project Area where project activities aim to generate net climate benefits and the Project Zone where project activities are implemented.	PD Section 2.1.7 provides maps identifying initial project area and project zone for initial project area, and grouped project boundary.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 2.1.7, digital files of project area, CCB & VCS Project Description template instructions, site visit interviews with project management staff and project consultant
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator G1.5 - Explain the process of stakeholder identification and analysis used to identify Communities, Community Groups and Other Stakeholders.	PD Section 2.1.8 provides a summary of the stakeholder identification process utilized for this project, referencing the Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment (SBIA) Manual for REDD+ Projects: Part 2 – Social Impact Assessment Toolbox.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 2.1.8, PD Appendix 2, SBIA Manual for REDD+ Projects: Part 2, site visit interviews with project management staff and project consultant
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator G1.6 -List all Communities, Community Groups and Other Stakeholders identified using the process explained in G 1.5.	PD Section 2.1.9 refers to PD Appendix 2 for the list of stakeholders identified for the project.
---	---

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 2.1.9 and Appendix 2, CCB & VCS Project Description template instructions
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator G1.7 - Provide a map identifying the location of Communities and the boundaries of the Project Area(s), of the Project Zone, including any High Conservation Value areas (identified in CM1 and B1), and of additional areas that are predicted to be impacted by project activities identified in CL3, CM3 and B3.	PD Section 2.1.7 presents maps identifying the location of Communities in relation to the initial project instance property and project zone for the initial project instance property (Figure 2.2), boundaries of the project area for the initial project instance property (Figure 2.6), and project zone for the grouped project boundary (Figure 2.3).
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 2.1.7, PD Section 4.1.3 (for CM1.2), PD Sections 4.3.1 through 4.3.3 (for CM3.1 through CM3.3), PD Section 5.1.2 (for B1.2), PD Sections 5.3.1 through 5.3.2 (for B3.1 through B3.3), PD Figure 3.3 (for CL3 – Leakage), site visit interviews with project management staff, site visit interviews with community leader and community members in Maria Auxiliadora indigenous community
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator G1.8 - Briefly describe each project activity and the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts of the activities identifying the causal relationships that explain how the activities will achieve the project's predicted climate, community and biodiversity benefits.	PD Section 2.1.11 describes six main project activities. A Project Activities and Theory of Change Table is presented for each of the six project activities.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 2.1.11, interviews with project management staff and project consultant
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator G1.9 - Define the project start date and lifetime, and GHG accounting period and biodiversity and community benefits assessment	Section 2.2.1 of the MR outlines the implementation schedule for the current monitoring period, including current accomplishments and anticipated milestones.
--	---

period if relevant, and explain and justify any differences between them. Define an implementation schedule, indicating key dates and milestones in the project's development.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 2.2.1
Findings:	The table in MR section 2.2.1 outlines the key dates and milestones in the Project's development and implementation, including current accomplishments during the 2020-2021 monitoring period. The table also includes anticipated milestones including subsequent monitoring and verifications and baseline revision, which are line with the PD. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	20 October 2022

Indicator G1.10 - Identify likely natural and human-induced risks to the expected climate, community and biodiversity benefits during the project lifetime and outline measures needed and <i>taken</i> to mitigate these risks.	Section 2.2.6 of the MR outlines the risks to the project. Identified risks include: encroachment into the Project Area by local farmers, the presence of anthropogenic fire in the dry forest ecosystem, and the potential for illegal logging, hunting or other unapproved use of the land. Mitigation measures in place include onsite forest guard patrols, camera traps, occasional satellite imagery to monitor for deforestation. Guard houses were established to deter individuals from illegal logging hunting, or unapproved use of the land.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 2.2.6
Findings:	The MR identifies the likely natural and human-induced risks to the project and plans for how to mitigate these risks. It is unclear to the audit team measures taken during the monitoring period to mitigate these risks.
Clarification Request (CL):	Please clarify what actions were taken to mitigate the identified risks during the monitoring period and provide supporting evidence to demonstrate the activities occurred.
Date Issued:	15 September 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section 2.2.6 has now been revised in the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report. Supplementary document include a deforestation monitoring template, pictures of the signs present at the project, and a guard services contract.

	(31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Section 2.2.6 of the MR has been updated to clarify what mitigation actions were taken during the monitoring period, which included hiring a guard, posters and signs placed throughout the project area, and a development of a deforestation monitoring template. The MR also describes additional mitigation measures that occurred outside the monitoring period. The contract for the guard services, photos of signs/posters, and field monitoring plans. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	5 December 2022
Indicator G1.11 - Describe the measures needed and <i>taken</i> to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.	Section 2.2.7 describes the measures needed and designed in order to ensure the climate, community, and biodiversity objectives are maintained beyond the project lifetime. These include the continuing involvement and support of entities involved in the project, ongoing funding, purchasing the land, helping to set up additional conservation projects, and the visitor center, Chaco Med, and educational facilities.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 2.1.19
Findings:	The MR states what is needed in order to ensure project benefits are maintained beyond the project lifetime, however it is unclear what measures were taken during the monitoring period to ensure benefits and maintained.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please clarify what actions were taken during the monitoring period to maintain and enhance benefits beyond the project lifetime and provide supporting evidence.
Date Issued:	15 September 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section 2.2.7 has been updated in the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report. Supplementary documentation include: Quadriz's website (https://quadriz.com/), which demonstrates the continuing involvement and support of Quadriz's local experts; emails between Quadriz and WWF as an example of ongoing stakeholder engagement; the Chaco Med formal document; and the invoice for the fees paid to the pilot for his professional advice. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Section 2.2.7 of the MR has been updated to clarify what actions were taken during the monitoring period, including ongoing stakeholder engagement, a pro

	forma for Chaco Med, conversations with an expert pilot, and updates to the visitor center. The visitor center and Chaco Med will be implemented even if no other project instances are added to the grouped project. The verification team saw the visitor center under construction during the site visit. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2022

Indicator G1.12 - Demonstrate that financial mechanisms adopted, including actual and projected revenues from GHG emissions reductions or removals and other sources, provide an adequate actual and projected flow of funds for project implementation and to achieve the project's climate, community and biodiversity benefits.	PD Section 2.1.20 provides a general summary describing a detailed pro forma developed by the Project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 2.1.20, PD Section 2.1.11, review of supplemental financial information provided by Project Proponent, interview with project management staff, review of project benefits proposed by the Impact Reforestation in the Chaco Project (a separate VCS/CCB project under validation). Furthermore, the VVB confirmed as part of the review related to the VCS verification that the project has adequate cash flow and assets to cover the costs of the project. This was assessed as part of the review of the project related to the VCS NPRT.
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator G1.13 - Specify the Project Area(s) and Communities that may be included under the grouped project approach, and identify any new Project Area(s) and Communities that have been included in the project since the last CCB validation or verification.	MR section 2.2.5 states that no new project instances have been added or removed. The Project Area and Communities identified during validation are the same for the monitoring period.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 2.2.5; PD Section 2.1.7; 2.1.9

Findings:	Project areas and communities that may be included under the grouped project were identified during validation. There were no new project instances added during the monitoring period.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Insert NCR/CL (fill the cell with Red for NCR)
Date Closed:	15 September 2022

Indicator G1.14 - Specify the eligibility criteria and process for project expansion under the grouped project <i>and demonstrate that these have been met for any new Project Areas and Communities that have been included in the project since the last validation or verification against the CCB Standards.</i>	The eligibility criteria and process for project expansion under the grouped project were outlined in the PD and confirmed during validation. There were no new project instances added during the monitoring period.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 2.1.21; MR Section 2.2.5
Findings:	No new project instances or communities were added during the monitoring period, and therefore no demonstration of eligibility was required.
Date Closed:	15 September 2022

Indicator G1.15 - Establish scalability limits, if applicable, and describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to address any risks to climate, community and biodiversity benefits if the project expands beyond those limits.	The scalability limits for the project were identified in the PD and evaluated during validation. There are no serious scalability limits, and the project has a goal of 300,000 ha for the grouped project. There a mitigation measures planned if the project exceeds the 300,000 ha, but it has not yet reached this goal.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 2.1.21; MR section 2.2.5
Findings:	There were no scalability limits that required mitigation to address risks to the project during the monitoring period.
Date Closed:	15 September 2022

Indicator G2.1 - Describe the most likely land-use scenario within the Project Zone in the absence of the project, describing the range of potential land-use scenarios and the associated drivers of land use changes and justifying why the land-	PD Section 2.2.1 provides a description of land use scenarios without the project and provides a series of aerial images (Figures 2.8 through 2.13) depicting forest loss in the Chaco region for agricultural expansion between 1990 and 2020.
--	---

use scenario selected is most likely. It is allowable for different locations within the Project Zone to have different without-project land use scenarios.	PD Section 2.2.2 identifies the most likely baseline scenario as conversion of the “Project Area” to pasture. PD Section 2.2.2 refers to PD Sections 3.1.4 and 3.1.5 for more information on the identification and justification of the without-project land use scenario and additionality.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2, PD Sections 3.1.4 and 3.1.5, PD Figures 2.4 and 3.6, interviews with project management staff, interview with landowner, interviews with government agency staff from INFONA and MADES
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator G2.2 - Document that project benefits including climate, community and biodiversity benefits would not have occurred in the absence of the project, explaining how existing laws, regulations and governance arrangements, or lack of laws and regulations and their enforcement, would likely affect land use and justifying that the benefits being claimed by the project are truly ‘additional’ and would not have occurred without the project. Identify any distinct climate, community and biodiversity benefits intended for use as offsets and specify how additionality is established for each of these benefits.	PD Section 2.2.3 describes the additionality identified by the Project Proponent for the Project’s community and biodiversity benefits and refers to PD Sections 3.1.4 and 3.1.5 for more information. PD Section 2.2.4 states the community and biodiversity benefits are not intended to be used as offsets, and that the only offsets generated from the Project are verified emission reductions (VERs).
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Sections 2.2.3 and 2.2.4, PD Sections 3.1.4 and 3.1.5, interviews with project management staff, interview with landowner, interviews with government agency staff from INFONA and MADES, interview with wildlife monitoring consultant
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator G3.1 - Describe how full project documentation has been made accessible to Communities and Other Stakeholders, how summary project documentation (including how to access full documentation) has been actively disseminated to Communities in relevant local or regional languages, and how widely publicized information meetings have been held with Communities and Other Stakeholders.	Section 2.3.1 of the MR describes the ways in which project documentation will be made accessible to the communities and stakeholders, including posting online at the Verra website, physical copies at Quadriz's headquarters, distribution of documents to local communities, and announcements on Chaco TV and radio. PD Section 2.3.2 identifies how the Project Proponent proposed to disseminate summary project documentation, including information required for G1.1-9, will be actively disseminated to communities. PD Section 2.3.3 summarizes informational meetings identified by the Project Proponent as held with various stakeholders.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3; PD
Findings:	It is unclear from the MR what actions were taken during the monitoring period to provide communities and stakeholders with project information, including the results of monitoring and associated monitoring report. Additionally, there appear to be multiple instances in the MR that only uses future tenses making it unclear if these are actions that are yet to occur or occurred during the monitoring period.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please provide additional detail within the MR to describe the actions taken to provide communities and stakeholders relevant project information. Similarly, provide evidence to support these statements. Please ensure that all statements within the MR accurately reflect whether certain actions have yet to occur (will occur in the future) or have occurred during this monitoring period.
Date Issued:	20 October 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, and 2.3.3. have been updated in the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report. In addition, the entire 2020-2021 Monitoring Report has been reviewed for proper tenses. Supplementary documentation includes: the Participatory Rural Assessments (PRAs) that were originally submitted to the VVB; emails with stakeholders; official acknowledgment letter from MADES; and the Verra

	website showing the public comment period dates, along with Quadriz's website announcements. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	During site visit interviews it was confirmed that project documents had been distributed to the indigenous channels through the channels that were originally agreed upon. Project documents are sent to Patricia Villalba who then sends them along to the Maria Auxiliadora community. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2022

Indicator G3.2 - Explain how relevant and adequate information about potential costs, risks and benefits to Communities has been provided to them in a form they understand and in a timely manner prior to any decision they may be asked to make with respect to participation in the project.	Section 2.3.4 of the MR describes the costs, risks, and benefits to the communities in the Project Zone. There are no communities located within the project area, and two indigenous communities located in the project zone.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 2.3.4, MR section 2.3.4, site visit interviews
Findings:	During the verification site visit, the VVB spoke requested to meet with the community in San Isidro but was told this community still did not wish to participate in the project. The VVB will issue a FAR to ensure that this community continues to be appropriately engaged and monitored as to whether they would like to participate in this project. During the verification site visit the VVB met with community members from Maria Auxiliadora and found that the community is still aware of potential benefits and confirmed that they have received benefits from the project. Similarly, the community was aware of the costs and risk of the project.
Date Closed:	October 20, 2022

Indicator G3.3 - Describe the measures taken, and communications methods used, to explain to Communities and Other Stakeholders the process for validation and/or verification against the CCB Standards by an independent Auditor,	Sections 2.3.5 and 2.3.6 of the MR describe the process for the measures taken to communicate the verification against the CCB standard.
--	--

providing them with timely information about the Auditor's site visit before the site visit occurs and facilitating direct and independent communication between them or their representatives and the Auditor.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 2.3.5 and 2.3.6, site visit interviews
Findings:	The MR describes the steps that are in place to inform communities on the verification process. It is unclear from the MR or supporting evidence provided what steps were taken during the current monitoring period to inform stakeholders of the verification.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please clarify which steps were taken during the current monitoring period and provide supporting evidence demonstrating that the actions occurred.
Date Issued:	19 September 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Sections 2.3.5. and 2.3.6. have been updated in the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report. Supplementary documentation includes: the invoices for the radio announcements; pictures of visits to the Maria Auxiliadora community; and a logbook documenting each visit to the Maria Auxiliadora community. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The verification team reviewed the supporting evidence demonstrating that the communities were visited. During site visit interviews members of the community stated that Quadriz always gives advanced notice before visiting the communities, which shows respect. Sharing project documents and communication is done through Patricia Villalba, who is the agreed upon communication channel. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	12 December 2022
Indicator G3.4 - Describe how Communities including all the Community Groups and Other Stakeholders have influenced project design and <i>implementation</i> through Effective Consultation, particularly with a view to optimizing Community and Other Stakeholder benefits, respecting local customs, values and institutions and maintaining high conservation	Section 2.3.8 of the MR outlines the steps the Project Proponent will take to continue to communicate and consult with stakeholders about the project.

values. Project proponents must document consultations and indicate if and how the project design and implementation has been revised based on such input. A plan must be developed and <i>implemented</i> to continue communication and consultation between the project proponents and Communities, including all the Community Groups, and Other Stakeholders about the project and its impacts to facilitate adaptive management throughout the life of the project.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 2.3.8, site visit interviews
Findings:	While the MR describes the how the project proponent plans to continue to communicate and consult with local communities, it is unclear from the MR what actions were taken during the current monitoring period. Guidance for indicator G3.4 states that: "Project proponents must document consultations and indicate if and how the project design and implementation has been revised based on such input."
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please provide documentation of consultations that took place during the monitoring period and if and how the project design and implementation has been revised based on feedback from communities.
Date Issued:	19 September 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Sections 2.3.8 has been updated in the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report. Supplementary documentation includes: pictures of visits to the Maria Auxiliadora community; a logbook documenting each visit to the Maria Auxiliadora community; and the community surveys previously submitted to the VVB. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The VVB reviewed the supplementary documentation provided, including the logbook of visits to the Maria Auxiliadora community and community surveys. The MR states that from the surveys, the communities communicated that a concern was distance and lack of transportation to the project area. Because of this concern, Quadriz has ensured that all meetings take place at the Maria Auxiliadora community. This item is addressed.

Date Closed:	12 December 2022
Indicator G3.5 - Demonstrate that all consultations and participatory processes have been undertaken directly with Communities and Other Stakeholders or through their legitimate representatives, ensuring adequate levels of information sharing with the members of the groups.	Section 2.3.9 of the MR outlines the Stakeholder Consultation Channels set up by the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 2.3.9; PD section 2.3.9; site visit interviews and observations
Findings:	The MR describes several channels by which the Project Proponent has communicated with project stakeholders. Those channels include in person meetings, information sharing via WhatsApp, ongoing phone calls and videoconferences, newsletters, announcements via LinkedIn and Press releases, information videos, and announcements on tv and radio stations. Meetings were held with the Maria Auxiliadora indigenous community and included community leader Hermenegildo Vera. The VVB substantiated during site visit interviews that Mr. Vera was confirmed by community members as the legally elected leader of the community. The VVB substantiated during site visit interviews that government agencies identified by the Project Proponent as Other Stakeholders for the project were the appropriate legal entities to consult for this project. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	20 October 2022
Indicator G3.6 - Describe the measures needed and <i>taken</i> to enable effective participation, as appropriate, of all Communities, including all the Community Groups, that want and need to be involved in project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation throughout the project lifetime, and describe how they have been implemented in a culturally appropriate and gender sensitive manner.	Section 2.3.10 of the MR describes the stakeholder participation in decision-making and implementation for the project.

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 2.3.10; PD section 2.3.10; site visit interviews and observations
Findings:	The MR template instructions for indicator G3.6 state: “Describe the activities and/or processes implemented to enable the effective participation, as appropriate, of all communities. Demonstrate the culture- and gender-sensitivity of implementation of such actions.” While section 2.3.10 of the MR describes how the project plans to ensure stakeholder participation in decision-making and implementation, it is unclear from the MR which activities were implemented during the 2020-2021 monitoring period.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please clarify within the MR what actions were implemented during the monitoring period to enable effective participation of all communities.
Date Issued:	20 October 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section 2.3.10 of the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report has been updated. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The MR has been updated to detail how the project ensures that there is effective participation for communities. All meetings take place at the maria Auxiliadora community so that they do not have to travel, with a male and female Quadriz representative. Communication about the project is done through Patricia Villalba, who is the agreed upon communication channel. As this is the initial project instance, other project activities have not yet been implemented. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	12 December 2022

Indicator G3.7 - Describe the measures needed and <i>taken</i> to ensure that the project proponent and all other entities involved in project design and implementation are not involved in or complicit in any form of discrimination or sexual harassment with respect to the project.	Section 2.3.11 of the MR describes the policies in place to ensure Quadriz is an equal opportunity employer and promotes anti-discrimination protocols.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 2.3.11, site visit observations
Findings:	The MR describes the specific measures designed to ensure that no entities involved in the project design

	and implementation are involved in, or complicit in, and form of discrimination or sexual harassment. It is unclear from the MR if there were any instances of discrimination or sexual harassment during the monitoring period.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please update the MR to clarify actions taken during the monitoring period to ensure the project is not complicit in any form of discrimination or sexual harassment with respect to the project.
Date Issued:	20 October 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section 2.3.11 of the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report has been updated. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Section 2.3.11 of the MR now contains a sentence stating: "To date, and throughout the 2020-2021 monitoring period, Quadriz has not been complicit in any form of discrimination or sexual harassment." The verification team did not find evidence that contradicts this statement. Item closed.
Date Closed:	5 December 2022

Indicator G3.8 - Demonstrate that a clear grievance redress procedure has been formalized to address disputes with Communities and Other Stakeholders that may arise during project planning, implementation and evaluation with respect but not limited to, Free, Prior and Informed Consent, rights to lands, territories and resources, benefit sharing, and participation. The project shall include a process for receiving, hearing, responding to and attempting to resolve Grievances within a reasonable time period. The Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure shall take into account traditional methods that Communities and Other Stakeholders use to resolve conflicts. The Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure shall have three stages with reasonable time limits for each of the following stages.	Section 2.3.12 of the MR outlines the feedback and grievance redress procedure in place for the project which is in-line with the process described in the PD.
---	--

First, the Project Proponent shall attempt to amicably resolve all Grievances, and provide a written response to the Grievances in a manner that is culturally appropriate. Second, any Grievances that are not resolved by amicable negotiations shall be referred to mediation by a neutral third party. Third, any Grievances that are not resolved through mediation shall be referred either to a) arbitration, to the extent allowed by the laws of the relevant jurisdiction or b) competent courts in the relevant jurisdiction, without prejudice to a party's ability to submit the Grievance to a competent supranational adjudicatory body, if any. The Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure must be publicized and accessible to Communities and Other Stakeholders. Grievances and project responses, including any redress, must be documented and made publicly available.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 2.3.12, PD Section 2.3.12; site visit observations
Findings:	The MR describes the grievance and redress procedure that was put in place during project development and evaluated during validation. The project proposes the MADES process, which is currently under development. The MR states that there were no grievances received during the 2020 – 2021 monitoring period. During the site visit the VVB interviewed the participating community and confirmed that there have been no grievances filed by the community nor do they have any grievances to file.
Date Closed:	October 21, 2022

Indicator G3.9 - Describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to provide orientation and training for the project's workers and relevant people from the Communities with an objective of building locally useful skills and knowledge to increase local participation in project implementation. These capacity building efforts should target a wide range of people in the Communities, with special attention to women and vulnerable and/or marginalized people. Identify how training is passed on to new workers when there is staff turnover, so that local capacity will not be lost.	Section 2.3.13 of the MR describes the orientation and trainings conducted during the monitoring period and planned by the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 2.3.13; PD section 2.3.14; site visit interviews
Findings:	A summary of trainings identified as needed or held to date is included in the MR. Site visit interviews substantiate trainings identified in the MR. Orientation and training is provided for personnel involved in the project and there are measures in place to prevent loss of capacity during staff turnover.
Date Closed:	October 21, 2022
Indicator G3.10 - <i>Demonstrate</i> that people from the Communities are given an equal opportunity to fill all work positions (including management) if the job requirements are met. Explain how workers are selected for positions and where relevant, describe the measures needed and <i>taken</i> to ensure Community members, including women and vulnerable and/or marginalized people, are given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained.	Section 2.3.14 of the MR describes the measures in place to ensure communities are given an equal opportunity to fill work positions and ensure marginalized community members are given a fair chance to fill positions.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 2.3.15; PD section 2.3.15; site visit observations, site visit interviews
Findings:	The project plans to employ people from nearby villages, which includes indigenous communities in

	the area. To ensure equal opportunity for all community members, including marginalized communities, positions are announced on the local radio and spread by word of mouth. The project has actively reached out to indigenous community members in Maria Auxiliadora to inform them about the project and potential positions. The MR states that forest guards were hired during the 2020-2021 monitoring period. However, clarification is requested within the MR to state whether or not any community members from Maria Auxiliadora were employed in the project during the monitoring period under verification. Similarly, clarification is requested as to how many positions have been created and filled during this monitoring period.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please clarify how many community members from Maria Auxiliadora have been employed by the project in the most recent monitoring period. Furthermore, please clarify how many positions have been created and filled during this monitoring period.
Date Issued:	October 21, 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	To date, there are approximately 5-10 full-time Quadriz staff. As of December 31, 2021, there was one local guard was hired by the Project and this guard did not come from the Maria Auxiliadora community. Section 2.3.15 of the 2020-201 Monitoring Report has been updated to reflect this. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	MR section 2.3.14 has been updated to clarify that 1 individual was hired during the monitoring period, and they did not come from the local community. The MR states that there are not many positions to fill for the first project instance, however Quadriz is committed to informing the local communities about open positions in the future. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	5 December 2022
Indicator G3.11 - Submit a list of all relevant laws and regulations covering worker's rights in the host country. Describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to inform workers about	Section 2.3.15 of the MR identifies the relevant laws and regulations related to worker's rights.

their rights. Provide assurance that the project meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering worker rights and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 2.3.15; PD Section 2.3.16, International Labour Organization webpage for Paraguay (2019), site visit interview with project administrative staff and project management staff
Findings:	The MR identifies four relevant laws or regulations covering worker's rights in Paraguay. Review of the ILO webpage for Paraguay substantiates these are identified as the appropriate laws or regulations. The MR states that there were no additional laws or regulations passed during the 2020-2021 monitoring period. The MR also identifies measures needed and taken by the project team to inform workers about their rights, including providing orientation to new hires, providing a safety manual outlining worker's rights, and posting what is required by law on the wall at Estancia Santa Rosanna. A copy of the safety manual was provided to the audit team for review. Site visit observations and interviews support what is stated in the MR. Additional evidence demonstrating that orientations for new hires took place as planned and new hires received copies of the safety manual was not provided to the audit team.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please provide additional evidence such as attendance logs or meeting minutes demonstrating that orientation for new hires took place as planned. Also, please provide evidence (if available) that new hires received copies of the employee safety manual.
Date Issued:	21 September 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The HSE manual is currently being revised and will be completed in Q1 2023. At this time, the sole new hire (i.e., the forest guard) will sign the new HSE manual. The VVB has been provided with the latest HSE manual, which includes the risks to worker safety, along with the Code of Conduct and the Environmental Sustainability Policy. (31 October 2022)

Evidence Used to Close NCR:	A copy of the HSE manual was provided to the verification team for review. The verification team understands the manual will be signed once all updates are made in 2023. It is still unclear from the MR and supplemental documentation provided if orientation was provided for this new hire during the monitoring period.
Clarification Request (CL):	Please clarify if orientation was provided to the new hire during the monitoring period and provide supporting evidence.
Date Issued:	5 December 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Orientation was provided to the forest guard (i.e., the new hire). The forest guard was hired in October 2021 on an interim basis and then hired full time on December 1, 2021. A signed labor contract, which demonstrates orientation to the position (e.g., position, duty station, work days and hours, etc.) has been provided to the VVB. (21 December 2022)
Evidence Used to Close CL:	The VVB reviewed the signed labor contract and confirmed it identifies orientation provided to the employee (forest guard) hired during the monitoring period. Item closed.
Date Closed:	3 January 2023

Indicator G3.12 - Comprehensively assess situations and occupations that might arise through the implementation of the project and pose a substantial risk to worker safety. Describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to inform workers of risks and to explain how to minimize such risks. Where worker safety cannot be guaranteed, project proponents must show how the risks are minimized using best work practices in line with the culture and customary practices of the communities.	The risks to worker safety due to project implementation are outlined in Section 2.3.16 of the MR.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 2.3.16; PD section 2.3.17; site visit observations; site visit interviews
Findings:	The risks to worker safety outlined in the MR include: snake bites, other wildlife, tropical diseases, getting lost, driving around the Chaco, heat and dehydration related illnesses during fieldwork, and potential hostile confrontations with illegal hunters or illegal

	loggers. These risks are not included in the version of the HSE Policy and Procedure provided to the audit team. The MR states that the risks and any future risks identified will be added to the HSE policy. It is unclear to the audit team what actions were taken during the monitoring period to inform workers of their rights. Pending finding above on new hires receiving copies of the HSE manual.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please ensure that the HSE policy is document is updated with the current risks related to worker safety and ensure an updated copy is provided to workers with supporting documentation provided to the VVB.
Date Issued:	October 21, 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The HSE manual is currently being revised (i.e., in part to include the newly identified risks) and will be completed in Q1 2023. At this time, the sole new hire (i.e., the forest guard) will sign the new HSE manual. The VVB has been provided with the latest HSE manual, which includes the risks to worker safety, along with the Code of Conduct and the Environmental Sustainability Policy. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	A copy of the HSE manual was provided to the verification team for review, and includes an appendix including the risks mentioned in the MR. The verification team understands the manual will be signed once all updates are made in 2023. Item closed.
Date Closed:	5 December 2022

Indicator G4.1 - Describe the project's governance structures, and roles and responsibilities of all the entities involved in project design and implementation. For grouped projects, identify any new entities included in the project since the last validation or verification against the CCB Standards.	The governance structures and roles and responsibilities of the entities involved in the project were evaluated and confirmed during validation. Section 2.2.5 of the MR states that there were no changes to the management structure, roles, and/or responsibilities that resulted from new entities joining the project during the 2020-2021 monitoring period.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 2.2.5; PD section 2.4.1
Findings:	The project's governance structure including roles and responsibilities for the entities involved in project

	design and implementation are included in the PD and were confirmed during validation. There were no new entities added during the monitoring period. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	21 September 2022
Indicator G4.2 - Document key technical skills required to implement the project successfully, including community engagement, biodiversity assessment and carbon measurement and monitoring skills. Document the management team's expertise and prior experience implementing land management and carbon projects at the scale of this project. If relevant experience is lacking, the proponents must either demonstrate how other organizations are partnered with to support the project or have a recruitment strategy to fill the gaps.	Sections 2.4.1, 2.4.2, and 2.4.3 of the MR outline the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR sections 2.4.1-2.4.3 and PD sections 2.4.2-2.4.4; site visit interviews and observations.
Findings:	The MR outlines the steps taken by the project proponent to ensure that the capacity exists to implement the project over the project lifetime. The technical skills required and the management team still that have the expertise and experience to fulfill the necessary skills are identified in the MR. The skills required include: stakeholder identification and community engagement, legal analysis of landownership documentation, government policy, biodiversity assessment and monitoring, regional deforestation and land-use modeling, project management, local knowledge and fluency in Spanish and Guarani, and sales of carbon offset credits to raise climate finance. The management team contains staff members with the expertise and prior experience with financing, designing, and implementing carbon projects to fulfill all necessary rolls. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	21 September 2022
Indicator G4.3 - Document the financial health of the implementing organization(s). Provide assurance	Section 2.4.4 and 2.3.5 of the MR contain the information outlined by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.

that the Project Proponent and any of the other entities involved in project design and implementation are not involved in or are not complicit in any form of corruption such as bribery, embezzlement, fraud, favoritism, cronyism, nepotism, extortion, and collusion, and describe any measures needed <i>and taken</i> to be able to provide this assurance.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 2.4.4 and 2.3.5 of the MR
Findings:	The Project Proponent provided supplemental financial information to document the financial health for Quadriz, including a letter of support from Quadriz's CFO attesting that Quadriz has sufficient financial resources to fund the project, and identifying specific, internal, non-restricted funds made available to develop the project. MR Section 2.4.5 provides the assurance that the Project Proponent is not involved in, or complicit in, any form of corruption such as bribery, embezzlement, fraud, favoritism, cronyism, nepotism, extortion, and collusion. The MR identifies B corporation certification and independent audits as measures needed and to be taken to provide this assurance. Additional financial risk items are being verified as part of the VCS verification. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	22 September 2022

Indicator G5.1 - Describe and map statutory and customary tenure/use/access/management rights to lands, territories and resources in the Project Zone including individual and collective rights and including overlapping or conflicting rights. If applicable, describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> by the project to help to secure statutory rights. <i>Demonstrate</i>	Section 2.5.1 of the MR describes the recognition of the property rights in the project area.
---	---

that all Property Rights are recognized, respected, and supported.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 2.5.1; PD sections 2.5.1 and 2.5.2; interviews with landowner; interviews with indigenous communities
Findings:	The initial project instance is owned by Atenil S.A. The signed contract between Atenil S.A. and Quadriz was provided to the audit team, which outlines the terms and conditions of the agreement between the landowner and the project proponent. There were no new project area instances added during the monitoring period, and ownership of the initial project instance was confirmed during validation. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	22 September 2022

Indicator G5.2 - Demonstrate with documented consultations and agreements that a. the project will not encroach uninvited on private property, community property, or government property, b. the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent⁵ has been obtained of those whose property rights are affected by the project through a transparent, agreed process. Free, Prior and Informed Consent is defined as: - ‘Free’ means no coercion, intimidation, manipulation, threat and bribery; - ‘Prior’ means sufficiently in advance of any authorization or commencement of activities and respecting the time requirements of their decision-making processes; - ‘Informed’ means that information is provided that covers (at least) the following aspects a. the nature, size, pace, reversibility and scope of any proposed project or activity; b. the reason/s or purpose of the project and/or activity;	Section 2.5.3 of the MR outlines how FPIC was received for the initial project instance.
---	---

c. the duration of the above; d. the locality of areas that will be affected; e. a preliminary assessment of the likely economic, social, cultural and environmental impact, including potential risks and fair and equitable benefit sharing in a context that respects the precautionary principle; f. personnel likely to be involved in the execution of the proposed project (including Indigenous Peoples, private sector staff, research institutions, government employees, and others); and g. procedures that the project may entail; and - ‘Consent’ means that there is the option of withholding consent and that the parties have reasonably understood it. - Collective rights holders must be able to participate through their own freely chosen representatives and customary or other institutions following a transparent process for obtaining their Free, Prior and Informed Consent that they have defined. c. appropriate restitution or compensation has been allocated to any parties whose lands have been or will be affected by the project.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 2.5.2; PD section 2.5.3; site visit interviews, site visit observations
Findings:	The initial project instance takes place on private land and the MR states that it will not encroach on other private land, community lands, or government lands. Quadriz met with the private landowner and presented a contract to them to ensure FPIC was received from the landowner. The signed agreement was shown to the audit team. Interviews with the Maria Auxiliadora indigenous community leader and members substantiated that the community had no claims to the first instance project property and none of their property rights would be affected by the project. There were no additional project instances added during the monitoring period. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	22 September 2022

Indicator G5.3 - <i>Demonstrate</i> that project activities do not lead to involuntary removal or relocation of Property Rights Holders from their lands or territories, and does not force them to relocate activities important to their culture or livelihood. If any relocation of habitation or activities is undertaken within the terms of an agreement, the project proponents must <i>demonstrate</i> that the agreement was made with the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent of those concerned and includes provisions for just and fair compensation.	Section 2.5.3 of the MR outlines property rights protection for the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 2.5.3; PD Section 2.5.3; site interviews with indigenous communities, interview with landowner, interviews with project management staff,
Findings:	MR Section 2.5.3 clearly states that the project activities do not lead to any involuntary removal or relocation of property rights holders from their lands or territories and does not force rights holders to relocate activities important to their culture or livelihood. Interviews with the landowner substantiate that project activities do not lead to any involuntary removal or relocation of property rights holders from their lands or territories and does not force rights holders to relocate activities important to their culture or livelihood. Interviews with the Maria Auxiliadora indigenous community leader and members substantiated that the community had no claims to the first instance project property and none of their property rights would be affected by the project. There were no project instances added and no involuntary removals or relocations that took place during the monitoring period. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	22 September 2022
Indicator G5.4 - Identify any illegal activities that could affect the project's climate, community or biodiversity impacts (e.g. illegal logging) taking place in the Project Zone and describe measures needed	Section 2.5.4 of the MR identifies the potential illegal activities that could negatively affect the project.

and <i>taken</i> to reduce these activities so that project benefits are not derived from illegal activities.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 2.5.4, PD section 2.5.5, site visit interview, site visit observations
Findings:	MR Section 2.5.4 identifies three main illegal activities that could negatively affect the Project's CCB impacts: encroachment, fire, and poaching. MR Section 2.5.5 identifies appropriate measures designed and undertaken or planned to be undertaken to reduce these activities. Site visit interviews and site visit observations substantiate the activities already undertaken and substantiate activities to be undertaken are appropriate to reduce these activities. No project benefits would be derived from illegal activities. The MR states that no illegal activities were identified during the monitoring period. According to information collected during the site visit, the audit team found evidence of fire that came from the easterly direction and evidence that there have been instances of poaching occurring off the main road. Clarification is requested as to why these items are not reported in the MR.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please ensure that all illegal activities that have been reported/found during the monitoring period are described in the MR and if necessary provide substantiating information to the VVB.
Date Issued:	October 21, 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section 2.5.4 of the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report has been updated. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Additional detail has been added to section 2.5.4 of the MR related to illegal activity in the project area. Several activities occurred outside the monitoring period to help mitigate any potential illegal activities. The MR states that since the hiring of a guard, there have been no other signs of poaching. A Fire Prevention and Control Plan was developed and provided to the monitoring team for review. Item Closed.
Date Closed:	5 December 2022
Indicator G5.5 -Identify any ongoing or unresolved conflicts or disputes over rights to lands,	Section 2.5.5 of the MR identifies any ongoing disputes in the project area.

territories and resources and also any disputes that were resolved during the last twenty years where such records exist, or at least during the last ten years. If applicable, describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to resolve conflicts or disputes. <i>Demonstrate</i> that no activity is undertaken by the project that could prejudice the outcome of an unresolved dispute relevant to the project over lands, territories and resources in the Project Zone.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 2.5.5; supporting documents; site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	MR Section 2.5.5 states that there are no ongoing or unresolved conflicts or disputes over the rights to the Project Area's lands and resources to the best of the Project Proponent's and landowner's knowledge. Site visit interviews substantiate that neither party is aware of known ongoing or unresolved conflicts or disputes or any that have been resolved during the past 20 years. Support documents provided to the VVB support the landowner's title to the property for the first project instance and support the claim by the Project Proponent for the carbon rights for the project. There have been no additional project area instances added during the monitoring period that could result in disputes over lands or territories. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	30 September 2022

Indicator G5.6 - Submit a list of all national and local laws and regulations in the host country that are relevant to the project activities. Provide assurance that the project is complying with these and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.	Section 2.5.6 of the MR lists the relevant National and Local Laws for the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 2.5.6; PD section 2.5.7, review of IUCN publication (2019) on forest protection laws in Paraguay, site visit interviews, site visit observations
Findings:	The MR outlines the national, regional, and local laws and regulations in Paraguay that are relevant to the project activities. The MR also states how the project achieves compliance, which includes satellite imagery analysis, observations, and contact with INFONA and MADES.

	During the site visit the VVB found no evidence that the project is not complying with National And Local laws.
Date Closed:	October 21, 2022

Indicator G5.7 - Document that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, including the established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the Communities.	PD Section 2.5.8 presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 2.5.8, interviews with government staff at MADES and INFONA, interview with Maria Auxiliadora indigenous community leader
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be reevaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	23 September 2022

Indicator G5.8 - Demonstrate that the Project Proponent(s) has the unconditional, undisputed and unencumbered ability to claim that the project will or did generate or cause the project's climate, community and biodiversity benefits.	PD Section 2.5.9 presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 2.5.9, interviews with landowner and project proponent, review of supplemental documents provided by project proponent including Letter of Agreement for Verified Carbon Unit Credits, and legal review memo (Propiedad del Carbono en Tierras Privadas)
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator G5.9 - Identify the tradable climate, community and biodiversity benefits of the project and specify how double counting is avoided, particularly for offsets sold on the voluntary market and generated in a	PD Section 2.5.10 presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
--	---

country participating in a compliance mechanism.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 2.5.10, CCB Program Rules v3.1, interview with government agency staff with MADES
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Climate Section

CL1 Without-Project Climate Scenario

A Climate Section Waiver is applicable to Indicators CL1 – CL4 as these elements are addressed via the VCS portion of the verification.

Indicator GL1.1 - Identify likely regional or sub-national climate change and climate variability scenarios and impacts, using available studies, and identify potential changes in the local land use scenario due to these climate change scenarios in the absence of the project.	PD Section 3.4 states the Project does not seek to be validated to the Gold Level for climate change adaptation benefits.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for climate change adaptation benefits.
Date Closed:	29 September 2022

Indicator GL1.2 - Demonstrate that current or anticipated climate changes are having or are likely to have an impact on the well-being of Communities and/or the conservation status of biodiversity in the Project Zone and surrounding regions.	PD Section 3.4 states the Project does not seek to be validated to the Gold Level for climate change adaptation benefits.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for climate change adaptation benefits.
Date Closed:	29 September 2022

Indicator GL1.3 - Describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to assist Communities and/or biodiversity to adapt to the probable impacts of climate change based on the causal model that explains how the project activities will achieve the project's predicted adaptation benefits.	PD Section 3.4 states the Project does not seek to be validated to the Gold Level for climate change adaptation benefits.
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for climate change adaptation benefits.
Date Closed:	29 September 2022

Indicator GL1.4 - Include indicators for adaptation benefits for Communities and/or biodiversity in the monitoring plan. <i>Demonstrate</i> that the project activities assist Communities and/or biodiversity to adapt to the probable impacts of climate change. Assessment of impacts of project activities on Communities must include an evaluation of the impacts by the affected Communities.	PD Section 3.4 states the Project does not seek to be validated to the Gold Level for climate change adaptation benefits.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for climate change adaptation benefits.
Date Closed:	29 September 2022

Indicator CM1.1 - Describe the Communities at the start of the project and significant community changes in the past, including well-being information, and any community characteristics. Describe the social, economic and cultural diversity within the Communities and the differences and interactions between the Community Groups.	PD Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 present the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2, site visit interviews with Maria Auxiliadora community leader and members, interviews with project management staff and landowner

Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated here. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator CM1.2 - Evaluate whether the Project Zone includes any of the following High Conservation Values (HCVs) related to community well-being and describe the qualifying attributes for any identified HCVs: a. Areas that provide critical ecosystem services; b. Areas that are fundamental for the livelihoods of Communities; and c. Areas that are critical for the traditional cultural identity of Communities. Identify the areas that need to be managed to maintain or enhance the identified HCVs.	PD Section 4.1.3 presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 4.1.3, PD Section 2.1.7 and Figure 2.2, site visit interviews with Maria Auxiliadora indigenous community leader and members
Findings:	This indicator was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator CM1.3 - Describe the expected changes in the well-being conditions and other characteristics of Communities under the without-project land use scenario, including the impact of likely changes on all ecosystem services in the Project Zone identified as important to Communities.	PD Section 4.1.3 presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 4.1.4, interviews with Maria Auxiliadora indigenous community leader and members
Findings:	This indicator was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator CM2.1 - Use appropriate methodologies to assess the impacts, including predicted and actual, direct and indirect benefits, costs and risks, on each of the identified Community Groups (identified in G1.5) resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario. The assessment of impacts must include changes in well-being due to project activities and an evaluation of the impacts by the affected Community Groups. This assessment must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about changes in well-being of the Community Groups under the with-project scenario, including potential impacts of changes in all ecosystem services identified as important for the Communities (including water and soil resources), over the project lifetime.	Section 4.1.1 of the MR outlines the Community Impacts for the Monitoring Period.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 4.1.1, PD Section 4.2.1, 2.1.8; site visit interviews
Findings:	Section 4.1.1 of the MR identifies the community groups, impacts, type of benefit/cost/risk, and change in well-being. However, the table in the MR describes expected impacts and change in well-being. The MR template instructions state: "Complete the table below to describe all the impacts on each community group resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario. Impacts must include all those identified in the project description and any other unplanned impacts." It is unclear from the MR what impacts were experienced as a result of project activities during the monitoring period. Similarly, it is unclear how the Maria Auxiliadora community has a net benefit as a result of the project as all impacts are identified as predicted.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please clarify what the impacts on each community group were as a result of project activities during the monitoring period and provide all relevant references.

	Please clarify how the Maria Auxiliadora community has a net benefit from the project as all benefits are identified as predicted.
Date Issued:	18 October 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section 4.1.1. has been updated in the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The MR has been updated to describe how the project has impacted the community so far, which includes providing school supplies, assistance with national IDs, and food deliveries. These activities were observed during the site visit. Other impacts reported are still predicted since other project activities have not yet been implemented. The VVB notes that an additional impact was added to the MR, which is increased tree canopy and availability of Chaco Forest habitat. The VVB agrees that protecting the forest provides a net benefit to the Maria Auxiliadora community by preserving habitat for the animals they depend on. However, the MR states that protecting the forest is a direct benefit. The VVB does not agree that the forest is a direct benefit to the community since they do not use or depend on the project area directly.
Clarification Request (CL):	Please provide additional evidence showing the increased tree canopy cover and availability of Chaco Forest is a direct benefit to the community or update the MR to state it is an indirect benefit.
Date Issued:	12 December 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section of 4.1.1. of the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report has been updated to clarify the increased tree canopy cover and availability of Chaco Forest is an indirect benefit, as opposed to the incorrectly classified direct benefit, to the Maria Auxiliadora community. (21 December 2022)
Evidence Used to Close CL:	The VVB noted MR Section 4.1.1 has been updated to identify increased tree canopy cover and availability of Chaco Forest habitat as an indirect benefit to the community at Maria Auxiliadora. Item closed.
Date Closed:	3 January 2023
Indicator CM2.2 - Describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to mitigate any negative well-being impacts on Community Groups and	Section 4.1.2 of the MR describes any Community Impact Mitigation that occurred during the monitoring period.

for maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes (identified in CM1.2) consistent with the precautionary principle.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 4.1.2 of the MR, PD section 4.2.2, site visit interviews, site visit observations
Findings:	The MR states that there are no community groups living within the initial project area and no groups that are reliant on the project area. There were no negative community impacts during the 2020-2021 monitoring period. During the site visit the VVB confirmed that the community does not anticipate or has been negatively impacted as a result of the project implementation.
Date Closed:	October 21, 2022

Indicator CM2.3 - Demonstrate that the 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 land use scenario (described in CM1).	Section 4.1.3 of the MR outlines how the project ensures net positive community well-being.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 4.1.3; PD section 4.2.3; site visit interviews, site visit observations
Findings:	The MR describes how the project is likely to have net positive well-being impacts and states that the project had net positive impacts during the 2020-2021 monitoring period by reducing deforestation. The audit team was unable to locate in the MR how the project demonstrates that net well-being impacts are positive for all community groups.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please clarify in the MR and with supporting evidence how the project has demonstrated that reducing deforestation has had net positive community well-being impacts during the monitoring period.
Date Issued:	30 September 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	All three interviewees from the Maria Auxiliadora community stated the forests are important to them for wildlife consumption. These community surveys, and the aggregated results, were provided to the VVB. Further, an estimated 6,821 hectares were not deforested over the 2020-2021 monitoring period.

	Section 4.1.3 has been slightly updated in the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	As there are no negative impacts on communities, the verification team agrees that protecting the forest provides an indirect net-positive benefit by protecting habitat for species they depend on for subsistence hunting. This item is closed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2022

Indicator CM2.4 - <i>Demonstrate</i> that no High Conservation Values (identified in CM1.4) are negatively affected by the project.	Section 4.1.4 of the MR describes the protection of HCVs in the project area.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 4.1.4; PD section 4.2.4; site visit interviews
Findings:	MR section 4.1.4 states that because the project is an avoided deforestation, forest conservation project, the community's High Conservation Values will not be negatively impacted. There were no negative impacts on HCVs identified during the 2020-2021 monitoring period. Site visit interviews with the Maria Auxiliadora indigenous community leader and members substantiated that protecting natural vegetation cover on the project area property would not negatively affect HCVs for the community, rather the community sees this as benefitting them. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	18 October 2022

Indicator CM3.1 - Identify any potential positive and negative impacts that the project activities are likely to cause on the well-being of Other Stakeholders.	PD Section 4.3.1 presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 4.3.1, PD Section 2.1.9 and Appendix 2
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator CM3.2 - Describe the measures needed <i>and taken</i> to	Section 4.2.1 of the MR outlines the mitigation of negative impacts on other stakeholders.
---	--

mitigate the negative well-being impacts on Other Stakeholders.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 4.2.1; PD section 4.3.2; site visit interviews, site visit observations
Findings:	The MR states that no major negative impacts on other stakeholders were identified during the monitoring period, and therefore no mitigation measures were needed. Potential negative impacts will be monitored by Quadriz, and if needed there are specific mitigation measures in place. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	30 September 2022

Indicator CM3.3 - Demonstrate that the project activities do not result in net negative impacts on the well-being of Other Stakeholders.	Section 4.2.2 of the MR outlines the net impacts on other stakeholders.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 4.2.2; PD section 4.3.3
Findings:	The MR states that due to the Project's reduction in deforestation, reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, along with the preservation of the Chaco's biodiversity and cultural heritage, the impacts on other stakeholders are positive. There are no major negative impacts envisioned for other stakeholders, and therefore the net impact on Other Stakeholders during the 2020-2021 monitoring period is positive. During the site visit the VVB found no evidence to suggest that Other Stakeholders were experiencing or could possibly be experiencing negative impacts.
Date Closed:	October 21, 2022

Indicator CM4.1 - Develop and implement a monitoring plan that identifies community variables to be monitored, Communities, Community Groups and Other Stakeholders to be monitored, the types of measurements, the sampling methods, and the frequency of monitoring and reporting. Monitoring variables must be directly linked to the project's objectives for Communities and Community Groups and to predicted outputs,	Details on the community monitoring plan are included in Section 4.3.1 of the MR.
---	---

outcomes and impacts identified in the project's causal model related to the well-being of Communities (described in G1.8). Monitoring must assess differentiated impacts, including and benefits, costs and risks, for each of the Community Groups and must include an evaluation by the affected Community Groups.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 4.3.1; PD section 2.1.1, 2.1.11, 4.4.1; site visit interviews
Findings:	After a review of Section 4.3.1 the VVB identified that the project has not appropriately followed the requirements of the VCS/CCB MR template as the results of the community impact monitoring have not been presented.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	The VVB has identified an NCR as the template MR template instructions have not been followed. Please update the MR to include all information required by the template.
Date Issued:	October 21, 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section 4.3.1 has been clarified and further updated to present the results of the community impact monitoring plan. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Section 4.3.1 of the MR has clarified what community monitoring activities have taken place during the monitoring period, which includes the initial Participatory Rural Assessment. Some results from the PRAs are included in the MR, including information about how the communities prefer to meet, priorities, languages spoken, and others. Other monitoring activities have not yet taken place as activities have not yet been implemented during this initial monitoring period. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2022
Indicator CM4.2 - Develop and implement a monitoring plan to assess the effectiveness of measures taken to maintain or enhance all identified High Conservation Values related to community well-being.	Section 4.3.1 of the MR describes the monitoring plan to assess the effectiveness of measure taken to maintain or enhance HCVs.

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 4.3.1; PD Section 4.4.1, 4.1.3; site visit interviews
Findings:	The MR describes the actions that are needed and have been taken in order to monitor the effectiveness of measures taken to maintain identified HCVs related to community well-being. The MR describes actions such as the legally binding agreement between Quadriz and the landowner, as well as forest canopy monitoring and monitoring for illegal hunting. It is unclear what monitoring actions occurred during the 2020-2021 monitoring period and what the results from the monitoring were.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please clarify what measure were taken during the monitoring period to maintain or enhance all identified HCVs related to community well-being and if those measures were effective. Similarly, please provide the results of the community and biodiversity monitoring for this monitoring period.
Date Issued:	19 October 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section 4.3.1 of the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report, particularly the HCVs section, has been updated. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The MR has been updated to clarify how HCVs related to community well-being were maintained during the monitoring period. Actions taken included a legally binding agreement, satellite monitoring for deforestation, hiring a guard, and installing camera traps. Community members state that the forest is essential for their livelihood. This item is closed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2022
Indicator CM4.3 - Disseminate the monitoring plan, and any results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means.	Section 4.3.2 of the MR describes how the monitoring plan and its results will be disseminated.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 4.3.2

Findings:	The MR describes the plans for disseminating the community monitoring plan and its results, including creating Spanish and English Summary documents and having summaries available in project offices and online. However, it is unclear from the MR if the monitoring plan and results were disseminated as described during the 2020-2021 monitoring period.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please clarify in the MR what actions were taken during the monitoring period to disseminate the monitoring plan and results.
Date Issued:	19 October 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section 4.3.2 of the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report has been updated. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The MR states that summary documents including monitoring results were disseminated to communities by Fredy Montoya and Gabriela Vinales. There were also radio announcements made about the project. During site visit interviews individuals stated that they had been provided with project documents through the channels originally agreed upon. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2022

Indicator GL2.1 - a. Demonstrate that Smallholders/Community Members or Communities either own or have management rights, statutory or customary, individually or collectively, to land in the Project Area. The Smallholders/Community Members or Communities have rights to claim that their activities will or did generate or cause the project's climate, community and biodiversity benefits. OR b. Demonstrate that the Project Zone is in a low human development country OR in an administrative area of a medium or high human development country in which at least 50% of the households within the Communities are below the national poverty line.	PD Section 4.5 states the Project does not seek to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
---	---

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator GL2.2 - <i>Demonstrate</i> that the project generates short-term and long-term net positive well-being benefits for Smallholders/Community Members. Include indicators of well-being impacts on Smallholder/Community Members in the monitoring plan. The assessment of impacts must include changes in well-being due to project activities and an evaluation of the impacts by the affected mallholders/Community Members.	PD Section 4.5 states the Project does not seek to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator GL2.3 - Identify, through a participatory process, risks for the Smallholders/Community Members to participate in the project, including those related to tradeoffs with food security, land loss, loss of yields and short-term and long-term climate change adaptation. Explain how the project is designed to avoid such tradeoffs and the measures taken to manage the identified risks. Include indicators of risks for Smallholders/Community Members in the monitoring plan.	PD Section 4.5 states the Project does not seek to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.

Date Closed:	14 September 2022
--------------	-------------------

Indicator GL2.4 - Identify Community Groups that are marginalized and/or vulnerable. <i>Demonstrate</i> that the project generates net positive impacts on the well-being of all identified marginalized and/or vulnerable Community Groups. <i>Demonstrate</i> that any barriers or risks that might prevent benefits going to marginalized and/or vulnerable Smallholder/Community Members have been identified and addressed. <i>Demonstrate</i> that measures are taken to identify any marginalized and/or vulnerable Smallholders/Community Members, whose well-being may be negatively affected by the project, and that measures are taken to avoid, or when unavoidable to mitigate, any such impacts.	PD Section 4.5 states the Project does not seek to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator GL2.5 - Demonstrate that the project generates net positive impacts on the well-being of women and that women participate in or influence decision-making and include indicators of impacts on women in the monitoring plan.	PD Section 4.5 states the Project does not seek to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator GL2.6 - Describe the design and implementation of a benefit sharing mechanism, demonstrating that Smallholders/Community Members have fully and effectively participated in defining the decision-making process and the distribution mechanism for benefit sharing; and demonstrating transparency, including on project funding and costs as well as on benefit distribution.	PD Section 4.5 states the Project does not seek to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator GL2.7 - Explain how relevant and adequate information about predicted and actual benefits, costs and risks has been communicated to Smallholders/Community Members and provide evidence that the information is understood.	PD Section 4.5 states the Project does not seek to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator GL2.8 - Describe the project's governance and implementation structures, and any relevant self-governance or other structures used for aggregation of Smallholders/Community members, and demonstrate that they enable full and effective participation of Smallholders/Community Members in project decision-making and implementation.	PD Section 4.5 states the Project does not seek to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
---	---

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator GL2.9 - Demonstrate how the project is developing the capacity of Smallholders/Community Members, and relevant local organizations or institutions, to participate effectively and actively in project design, implementation and management.	PD Section 4.5 states the Project does not seek to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator B1.1 - Describe biodiversity within the Project Zone at the start of the project and threats to that biodiversity, using appropriate methodologies.	PD Section 5.1.1 presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.1.1, supplemental reports for camera trapping data (June through September 2021), site observations, interviews with biodiversity monitoring consultant and project staff
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator B1.2 - Evaluate whether the Project Zone includes any of the following High Conservation Values (HCVs) related to biodiversity and describe the qualifying attributes for any identified HCVs: a. Globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values;	PD Section 5.1.2 presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
---	--

i. protected areas108 ii. threatened species109 iii. endemic species110 iv. areas that support significant concentrations of a species during any time in their lifecycle. b. Globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape-level areas where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance; c. Threatened or rare ecosystems.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.1.2, literature review including IUCN website/data, site observations, supplemental reports for camera trapping data (June through September 2021), interviews with biodiversity monitoring consultant and project staff
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator B1.3 - Identify the areas that need to be managed to maintain or enhance the identified HCVs.	PD Section 5.1.2 presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator. The CCB & VCS Project Description template incorrectly attributes this indicator number to PD Section 5.1.3, but this indicator represents the Focal Area section required within PD Section 5.1.2 table(s).
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.1.2, literature review including IUCN website/data, site observations, interviews with biodiversity monitoring consultant and project staff
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator B1.4 - Describe how the without-project land use scenario would affect biodiversity conditions in the Project Zone.	PD Section 5.1.3 presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
--	--

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.1.3, literature review including IUCN website/data, site observations, interviews with biodiversity monitoring consultant and project staff
Findings:	This item was addressed during verification and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator B2.1 - Use appropriate methodologies to estimate changes in biodiversity, including assessment of predicted and actual, positive and negative, direct and indirect impacts, resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario in the Project Zone and over the project lifetime. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions.	MR section 5.1.1 describes the biodiversity changes during the monitoring period.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 5.1.1; site visit interviews and observations
Findings:	The MR states that during the 2020-2021 monitoring period it was monitored and demonstrated that tree canopy and the availability of Chaco Forest habitat was greater in the with-project scenario than in the without-project scenario. It is unclear from the MR how the project proponent has demonstrated that tree canopy and availability of Chaco Forest habitat was greater than the without-project scenario during the monitoring period. The MR template instructions state: "Identify predicted and actual, positive and negative, direct or indirect changes that have occurred as the result of project activities that have resulted in quantitative or qualitative changes."
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please provided additional detail and evidence used to identify the biodiversity changes that occurred during the monitoring period.
Date Issued:	19 October 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	It is estimated that 6,821 hectares would have been deforested over the 2020-2021 monitoring period, which would have emitted 800,000+ tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions. In contrast, an actual, positive and direct change occurred with respect tree canopy and availability of Chaco Forest habitat as the result of Project activities. This can be demonstrated

	via the GIS files and carbon accounting workbook provided to the VVB. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Through review of satellite imagery, the project has demonstrated that 6,821 hectares of forest were protected compared to the baseline scenario. Projecting tree canopy cover and Chaco forest habitat is essential for the endemic, threatened, and endangered species found in the project area. GIS files and satellite imagery are reviewed in more detail throughout the VCS review. This item is closed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2022

Indicator B2.2 - <i>Demonstrate</i> that the project's net impacts on biodiversity in the Project Zone are positive, compared with the biodiversity conditions under the without-project land use scenario (described in B1).	Section 5.1.3 of the MR outlines the Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts for the project
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 5.1.3; site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	Section 5.1.3 of the MR outlines how the project's net impact on biodiversity is expected to be positive compared to the without-project scenario. The project had positive biodiversity impacts during the 2020-2021 monitoring period due to the Project reducing deforestation. The VVB reviewed the remote sensing analyses to monitoring deforestation in the project scenario and confirmed that these analyses were correct and that deforestation in the project scenario was lower than in the baseline scenario. However, the VVB identified an NCR that the project has not followed the requirements of the MR template which state "Demonstrate that the project's net impacts on biodiversity in the project zone are positive compared with conditions under the without-project land use scenario.:"
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please update the MR to specifically follow the requirements of the template.
Date Issued:	October 21, 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section 5.1.3. of the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report has been updated.

	(31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Section 5.1.3 of the MR has been updated to state that the project has had net positive biodiversity impacts through reducing deforestation of approximately 6,800 hectares compared to the baseline scenario. GIS files and satellite imagery are reviewed in more detail throughout the VCS review. This item is closed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2022

Indicator B2.3 - Describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to mitigate negative impacts on biodiversity and any measures needed and <i>taken</i> for maintenance or enhancement of the High Conservation Value attributes (identified in B1.2) consistent with the precautionary principle.	Section 5.1.2 of the MR describes the mitigation actions for the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 5.1.2; site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	There are no expected negative impacts on biodiversity as a result of the project, and no negative impacts were identified during the 2020-2021 monitoring period. There are no mitigation actions required. The measures needed to maintain the biodiversity HCV attributes as well as actions taken during the monitoring period are outlined in MR section 5.1.2. However, the MR does not describe the mitigation actions taken.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	The VVB identified an NCR related to this indicator as the project does not describe the mitigation measures taken during the monitoring period.
Date Issued:	October 21, 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section 5.1.2. of the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report has now been updated. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The MR has been updated to describe the mitigation measures that occurred during the monitoring period, including satellite monitoring of avoided deforestation, community meetings, wildlife camera traps, forest monitoring by a guard, and installation of posters and signs throughout the project area. Site visit interviews with the forest guard confirm monitoring is occurring as planned. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2022

Indicator B2.4 - Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values (identified in B1.2) are negatively affected by the project.	Section 5.1.4 of the MR outlines how HCVs are protected by the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 5.1.4; site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	The MR states that no HCVs are negatively affected by the project since the project is a conservation project. There was no evidence that HCVs related to biodiversity were negatively affected during the 2020-2021 monitoring period. Actions taken by the project to ensure no HCVs are negatively affected include: legally binding agreement with the landowner, monitoring of forest canopy cover, protection and monitoring of vulnerable, threatened, and endangered species, and monitoring for illegal hunting. The VVB notes that monitoring results of illegal hunting have not been provided. Similar to other clarifications noted; please provide the monitoring results for illegal hunting.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Similar to other clarifications noted; please provide the monitoring results for illegal hunting.
Date Issued:	October 21, 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section 5.1.4. of the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report has been updated. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The MR has been updated, stating that there have been no signs of additional hunting since the guard was hired in 2021. Interviews with the forest guard confirm that monitoring is occurring, and no hunting instances were observed. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2022
Indicator B2.5 - Identify all species used by the project and <i>show</i> that no known invasive species are introduced into any area affected by the project and that the population of any invasive species does not increase as a result of the project.	Section 5.1.5 of the MR presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 5.1.1; PD sections 5.2.5, 5.2.6, site visit observations

Findings:	The PD states that no species are used during the course of the REDD+ project. The invasive species that have been identified in the project area are listed in section 5.1.5 of the MR. The MR states that the project will not introduce any of these known invasive species. Site observations and interviews with project management staff substantiate no introduction of invasive species is proposed and based on the current condition of the project area property, project activities are not anticipated to facilitate the spread of invasive species into the project area or project area property. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	19 October 2022

Indicator B2.6 - Describe possible adverse effects of non-native species used by the project on the region's environment, including impacts on native species and disease introduction or facilitation. Justify any use of non-native species over native species.	Section 5.1.6 of the MR presents the information provided by the project proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 5.1.6 of the MR; PD Sections 5.2.6, 5.2.7; site visit observations and interviews.
Findings:	This indicator is not applicable for Project since it is not using any non-native species in the Project Zone. Site observations and interviews with project management staff substantiate no non-native species are used or planned for use by the Project. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	19 October 2022

Indicator B2.7- <i>Guarantee</i> that no GMOs are used to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals.	Section 5.1.7 of the MR presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 5.1.7; PD section 5.2.8; site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	MR Section 5.1.7 clearly states that "Quadriz guarantees that no genetically modified organisms (GMOs) will be used in the Project to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals. No GMOs were used during the 2020-2021 monitoring period." Site observations and interviews with project management staff substantiate the current condition of the project

	area property and no reforestation or introduction of species is proposed. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	19 October 2022

Indicator B2.8 - Describe the possible adverse effects of, and justify the use of, fertilizers, chemical pesticides, biological control agents and other inputs used for the project.	Section 5.1.8 of the MR presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 5.1.8; PD Section 5.2.9; site visit interviews and observations
Findings:	The MR states that “The Project does not anticipate using any inputs, including fertilizers, chemical pesticides, or biological control agents, during the Project Lifetime. Likewise, the Project did not use any such products during the 2020-2021 monitoring period.” Site observations and interviews with project management staff substantiate the current condition of the project area property and substantiate inputs are not needed or anticipated to be used for the project. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	19 October 2022

Indicator B2.9 - Describe the process for identifying, classifying and managing all waste products resulting from project activities.	PD Section 5.2.10 presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.2.10, PD Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.11, site visit observations, interviews with project management staff
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022
Indicator B3.1 - Identify potential negative impacts on biodiversity that the project activities are likely to cause outside the Project Zone.	Section 5.2.1 of the MR presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 5.2.1; PD section 5.3.1; site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	MR section 5.2.1 states there are no negative offsite impacts on biodiversity outside the Project Zone resulting from project activities. Site visit observations and interviews with project management staff, landowner, and government agency staff did not identify any potential negative impacts on biodiversity

	outside the Project Zone likely to result from project activities. Item closed.
Date Closed:	19 October 2022

Indicator B3.2 - Describe the measures needed and <i>taken</i> to mitigate these negative impacts on biodiversity outside the Project Zone.	Section 5.2.1 of the MR presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 5.2.1; PD section 5.3.1; site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	Based on no negative impacts identified as likely on biodiversity outside the Project Zone, no mitigation measures would be warranted. Item closed.
Date Closed:	19 October 2022

Indicator B3.3 - Evaluate unmitigated negative impacts on biodiversity outside the Project Zone and compare them with the project's biodiversity benefits within the Project Zone. Justify and demonstrate that the net effect of the project on biodiversity is positive.	Section 5.2.2 of the MR presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 5.2.2; PD sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2, site visit interviews and observations
Findings:	MR Section 5.2.2 states the net effect of the Project on biodiversity is positive. Based on site visit observations and interviews with project management staff, landowner, and government agency staff, there are no unmitigated negative impacts identified as likely on biodiversity outside the Project Zone. The VVB concurs the net effect of the project on biodiversity is positive. Item closed.
Date Closed:	19 October 2022

Indicator B4.1 - Develop and implement a monitoring plan that identifies biodiversity variables to be monitored, the areas to be monitored, the sampling methods, and the frequency of monitoring and reporting. Monitoring variables must be directly linked to the project's biodiversity objectives and to	Section 5.3.1 of the MR outlines the Biodiversity Monitoring Plan set up by the project.
--	--

predicted activities, outcomes and impacts identified in the project's causal model related to biodiversity (described in G1.8).	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 5.3.1; PD section 5.4.1; site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	The MR template instructions state:” Present the results of the biodiversity impact monitoring, which should include: • All biodiversity variables identified in the monitoring plan. • Dates, frequency, locations, sampling methods used, and other information concerning the monitoring process. • Results and evaluation of monitoring. For projects validated to the Gold Level for exceptional biodiversity benefits, include all additional monitored data to demonstrate the project meets all required criteria.” While the MR outlines the biodiversity monitoring plan that identifies all the required elements for monitoring, the MR does not present the results of the biodiversity impact monitoring that took place.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please update the MR to include the results of the biodiversity impact monitoring in line with the template instructions.
Date Issued:	19 October 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	he monitoring results and evaluation of the June 2021-May 2022 wildlife camera study (i.e., the biodiversity impact monitoring plan) have been added to section 5.3.1 of the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report. In addition, the final biodiversity report has been provided to the VVB. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Section 5.3.1 of the MR has been updated with results from the biodiversity monitoring that occurred during the monitoring period. Additionally, a detailed biodiversity report was provided to the verification team, detailing the results from the camera traps placed throughout the project area. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2022
Indicator B4.2 - Develop and implement a monitoring plan to	Section 5.3.1 of the MR outlines the Biodiversity Monitoring Plan set up by the project.

assess the effectiveness of measures taken to maintain or enhance all identified High Conservation Values related to globally, regionally or nationally significant Biodiversity (identified in B1.2) present in the Project Zone.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 5.3.1; PD section 5.4.1; site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	The MR template instructions state:” Present the results of the biodiversity impact monitoring, which should include: • All biodiversity variables identified in the monitoring plan. • Dates, frequency, locations, sampling methods used, and other information concerning the monitoring process. • Results and evaluation of monitoring. For projects validated to the Gold Level for exceptional biodiversity benefits, include all additional monitored data to demonstrate the project meets all required criteria.” While the MR outlines the biodiversity monitoring plan for HCVs that identifies all the required elements for monitoring, the MR does not present the results of the biodiversity HCV impact monitoring that took place.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please update the MR to include the results of the biodiversity impact monitoring in line with the template instructions.
Date Issued:	19 October 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The results of the biodiversity HCV impact monitoring have been added to section 5.3.1 of the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report. In addition, the final biodiversity report has been provided to the VVB which includes monitoring results for the vulnerable, threatened, and endangered species found in the project area. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	Section 5.3.1 of the MR has been updated with results from the biodiversity monitoring that occurred during the monitoring period. Additionally, a detailed biodiversity report was provided to the verification team, detailing the results from the camera traps placed throughout the project area.

	This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2022

Indicator B4.3 - Disseminate the monitoring plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means.	MR section 5.3.2 outlines how the Biodiversity monitoring plan was disseminated.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 5.3.2. PD section 5.4.2; site visit interviews and observations
Findings:	The biodiversity monitoring plan and its results were incorporated into the Monitoring Reports and Spanish and English Summary Documents were made. The summary documents were shared with stakeholders and local communities and made available at project offices. Project documents are also available online at the Verra Registry and on Quadriz's website. This is marked pending the provision of biodiversity monitoring results.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Insert NCR/CL (fill the cell with Red for NCR)
Date Issued:	
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Section 5.3.2. has been updated. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The MR states that summary documents including results from biodiversity monitoring will be provided to stakeholders. Site visit interviews confirmed that documents were disseminated to communities through agreed upon channels. This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2021

Indicator GL3.1 - Demonstrate that the Project Zone includes a site of high biodiversity conservation priority by meeting either the vulnerability <i>or</i> irreplaceability criteria defined below, identifying the 'Trigger' species that cause(s) the site to meet any of the following qualifying conditions and	PD Section 5.5.1 presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
--	--

providing evidence that the qualifying conditions are met: 1.1 Vulnerability Regular occurrence of a globally threatened species (according to the IUCN Red List) at the site: a. Critically Endangered (CR) and Endangered (EN) species - presence of at least a single individual; or b. Vulnerable species (VU) - presence of at least 30 individuals or 10 pairs. OR 1.2 Irreplaceability A minimum proportion of a species' global population present at the site at any stage of the species' lifecycle according to the following thresholds: a. Restricted-range species - species with a global range less than 50,000 km² and 5% of global population at the site; or b. Species with large but clumped distributions - 5% of the global population at the site; or c. Globally significant congregations - 1% of the global population seasonally at the site; or d. Globally significant source populations - 1% of the global population at the site.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.5.1, site observations, supplemental reports for camera trapping data (June through September 2021), review of IUCN citations provided in PD, literature review, interviews with biodiversity monitoring consultant and project staff
Date Closed:	14 September 2022
Indicator GL3.2 - Describe recent population trends of each of the Trigger species in the Project Zone at the start of the project and describe	PD Section 5.5.2 presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.

the most likely changes under the without-project land use scenario.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.5.2, PD Section 5.5.1 and findings for Indicator GL3.1, interviews with biodiversity monitoring consultant and project staff
Findings:	This item was addressed during validation and does not need to be re-evaluated during verification. Item closed.
Date Closed:	14 September 2022

Indicator GL3.3 - Describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to maintain or enhance the population status of each Trigger species in the Project Zone, and to reduce the threats to them based on the causal model that identifies threats to Trigger species and activities to address them.	Section 5.4.1 of the MR presents the information identified by the Project Proponent to address this indicator.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 5.4.1; PD section 5.5.2; interviews with project staff and biodiversity consultant
Findings:	There are 5 trigger species that have been identified in the project zone. From June to November 2021, at least 1 individual of all species were photographed in the project zone. MR section 5.4.1 outlines the measures needed to maintain these populations as well as the actions taken during the monitoring period, which includes an agreement with the landowner, avoided deforestation, preserved habitat, installed wildlife cameras, and hiring a wildlife biologist. The main threats to these species continue to be deforestation and hunting, which project activities are mitigating. Supporting documentation/evidence in the form of documentation or camera trap photos have not been supplied to the VVB to substantiate the sightings related to Trigger species.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please provide supporting evidence for the VVB to evaluate the text within section 5.4.1 of the MR.
Date Issued:	October 21, 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The final biodiversity report, which includes time-stamped photographs of the trigger species photographed at the Project, has been provided to the VVB. (31 October 2022)

Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The verification team reviewed the final biodiversity report provided and confirms that it contains camera trap photos of the trigger species taken during the monitoring period. This item is closed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2022
Indicator GL3.4 - Include indicators of the population trend of each Trigger species and/or the threats to them in the monitoring plan and demonstrate the effectiveness of measures needed and taken to maintain or enhance the population status of Trigger species.	Section 5.3.1 of the MR outlines the Biodiversity Monitoring Plan set up by the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 5.3.1; PD section 5.4.1; site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	The MR template instructions for this indicator state: ” For projects validated to the Gold Level for exceptional biodiversity benefits, include all additional monitored data to demonstrate the project meets all required criteria.” Section 5.3.1 of the MR does not include results of the biodiversity monitoring and does not include additional monitored data to demonstrate this requirement is met.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please update section 5.3.1 of the MR to include the additional monitored data to demonstrate the project meets all required criteria.
Date Issued:	20 October 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The monitoring results and evaluation of the June 2021-May 2022 wildlife camera study (i.e., the biodiversity impact monitoring plan) have been added to section 5.3.1 of the 2020-2021 Monitoring Report. In addition, the final biodiversity report has been provided to the VVB. (31 October 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The verification team reviewed the final biodiversity report provided and confirms that it contains camera trap photos of the trigger species taken during the monitoring period. The biodiversity report also contains detailed analysis of wildlife behavior and presence. MR section 5.3.1 has been updated with additional detail about the estimated population trend and species ranges for the 5 trigger species.

	This item is addressed.
Date Closed:	9 December 2022