



Verified Carbon Standard

FAMILY FOREST CARBON PROJECT



Document Prepared by KBS Certification Services Ltd

Report ID	VCS.24.VER.014
Project title	Family Forest Carbon Project
Project ID	4268
Verification period	30 September 2023 – 31 May 2024
Original date of issue	04 October 2024
Most recent date of issue	27 January 2025
Version	1.5
VCS Standard Version	4.7
Client	Forest Carbon Works, PBC
Prepared by	KBS Certification Services Limited
Approved by	Praveen N Urs
Work carried out by	Dr. D. Siddaramu- Team Leader Dr. Rajesh Monga- Validator/Verifier Mr. John Westley Magugu - Local Expert Mr. Bharath S - Technical Reviewer Mr. Madhusudhana Reddy, B - Expert to Technical Reviewer

Summary:

Forest Carbon Works (FCW), PBC has commissioned “KBS Certification Services Ltd.” (KBS) to carry out the 2nd verification of the project titled “Family Forest Carbon Project” (VCS PROJECT ID 4268) with regard to the relevant requirements of VCS Standard (Version 4.7) and VM0003 v1.3 Methodology for Improved Forest Management (IFM) via the extension of rotation age (ERA).

The verification team evaluated the project by means of document analysis, interviews with stakeholders and by observations & measurements made directly in the field during the site visit to the project location. Fieldwork lasted 12 days, between 05/08/2024 - 16/08/2024. During this period the audit team carried out forest inventories, travelled through roads PAI's analyzing different aspects of the landscape, and interviewed with site personnel and PP.

FCW, PBC is a US-based organization focused on conserving and restoring functional forestland across the United States, with the primary goal of enhancing carbon sequestration. The company aims to provide carbon offset payments to small landowners who would otherwise face economic pressure to sell timber. The Family Forest Carbon Project (“the Project”) is a grouped project whose potential geographic area encompasses the contiguous United States and southern Alaska. The project has been developed under VCS sectoral scope 14 (Agriculture, Forestry, Land Use) and is categorized as the VCS AFOLU Improved Forest Management (IFM), Project activity type being Extended Rotation Age (ERA). The calculation of the project emission removals is carried out in a transparent and conservative manner.

During this verification, 70 new Project Activity Instances (PAIs) were included, bringing the total to 132 PAIs across 24,985.7 hectares of land protected under agreements with owners located in USA states of California, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, and West Virginia.

KBS Certification Services Ltd. has employed a risk-based approach in the verification, focusing on the identification of significant risks and reliability of project design and generation of emission reductions according to the relevant applicable version of the VCS standard and applying auditing techniques. In the course of the assessment 02 Corrective Action Requests (CAR) and 17 Clarification Requests (CL) were raised and successfully closed out, 01 FAR was raised during the assessment. Refer to Appendix 2 for further details. There are no restrictions of uncertainty. Based on the information seen and evaluated we confirm that the project in the second monitoring period from 30/09/2023 – 31/05/2024 (including both days) the net amount of VCU's achieved for the project is 100,564 tCO_{2e} after deduction of the buffer pool. After applying a 12% non-permanence risk deduction (12,067 tCO_{2e}), the net Verified Carbon Units (VCUs) total 88,496 tCO_{2e}.

KBS considers these estimates accurate, with no material errors or uncertainties related to project compliance with validation criteria.

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	Method and Criteria.....	7
2.2	Document Review	9
2.3	Interviews	9
2.4	Site Visits	10
2.5	Resolution of Findings	12
2.6	Eligibility for Validation Activities	12
3	VALIDATION FINDINGS	12
3.1	Methodology Deviations.....	12
3.2	Project Description Deviations.....	19
3.3	New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects.....	19
3.4	Baseline Reassessment	24
4	VERIFICATION FINDINGS.....	24
4.1	Project Details	24
4.2	Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement	29
4.3	Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations.....	115
4.4	Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals.....	140
4.5	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis.....	141
5	VERIFICATION OPINION.....	145
5.1	Verification Summary	145
5.2	Verification Conclusion	146
5.3	Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison	157
	APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALY SENSITIVE INFORMATION	158
	APPENDIX 2: RESOLUTION OF FINDINGS	159

APPENDIX 3: REFERENCES	171
ANNEXES REFERED.....	172
APPENDIX 4: COMPETENCE OF TEAM MEMBERS	176

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

FCW, PBC has commissioned “KBS Certification Services Ltd.” (KBS) to carry out the 2nd verification from 30/09/2023 – 31/05/2024 (including both days) and certification of emission reductions reported for the project titled “Family Forest Carbon Project” (VCS PROJECT ID 4268) with regard to the relevant requirements of VCS Standard (Version 4.7)^{/1/} and VCS Methodology VM0003^{/2/}, v1.3 “Methodology for Improved Forest Management through Extension of Rotation Age”. The main objective of the verification is an independent assessment of the ex-post parameters monitored in the project and its GHG statement of emission reductions and removals that have occurred as a result of the project during the monitoring period.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of the verification is the independent and objective review and ex-post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emission by the project activity. The verification is based on the validated Project Description, version 1.6, dated 23/01/2023^{/3/}, corresponding validation report^{/3/}, monitoring report of 1st verification^{/3/} and 1st verification report^{/3/}, Initial monitoring report, version 01^{/4/} and final monitoring report, version 2.4^{/5/} (of this verification). These documents were reviewed against the requirements and criteria of the verification are:

- VCS Standard (Version 4.7)^{/1/}
- AFOLU requirements: VCS Version 4.2^{/1/}
- AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk tool: VCS Version 4.2^{/1/}
- VCS Methodology VM0003 “Methodology for Improved Forest Management through Extension of Rotation Age”, v1.3^{/2/}
- VT0001 Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in VCS Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Project Activities, v3.0^{/2/}

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

1.3 Level of Assurance

The verification report expresses a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported net anthropogenic GHG removals data is free from material misstatement. 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 shall be five percent for projects and one percent for large projects as per VCS standard 4.1.10. KBS has applied a materiality threshold of 5% with respect to omission or misstatements concerning reported quantities.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

PP	Forest Carbon Works, PBC
Title of project	Family Forest Carbon Project
Project activity	FCW plans to democratize access to carbon revenue by making carbon offset payments available to small landowners (PAI's). By the year 2030, Forest Carbon Works anticipates protecting 500,000 acres of land owned by many individuals with durable agreements of permanent carbon storage. The project longevity shall be at minimum 60 years with possible extension to 125. This ambitious plan contrasts with extractive timber harvesting, common practice for many forested regions of the US. By extending rotation ages through the implementation of uneven-aged silviculture of these at-risk forests, the project increases carbon storage relative to the baseline case, as well as increases biodiversity and diversity in forest structure. To reduce GHG emissions across the project area, the project shall employ technologies and measures that include transitioning forestland into sustainable, uneven-aged silvicultural systems using extension of rotation age (ERA) technology and improved forest management (IFM) measures that include group selection, patch cuts and continuous thinning, where appropriate. These transition activities include the application of special silvicultural treatments that accelerate the recruitment of trees into standing dead wood, among other treatments. University research sponsored by FCW indicates that the promotion of standing deadwood through these treatments significantly increases total carbon storage over time, as compared to no treatment or extractive timber harvesting. The application of these treatments to promote enhanced carbon storage is novel and underscores the true additionality of the project compared to common practice. Estimated average GHG emission reductions from the project are 845,991 tons CO₂ equivalent per year.

Baseline and monitoring methodology	VM0003 Methodology for Improved Forest Management Through Extension of Rotation Age v1.3
Location of the project activity	USA states of California, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, and West Virginia
Crediting period	14/07/2020 - 13/07/2045
Monitoring period	30/09/2023 - 31/05/2024 (including both days)

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

The verification process is based on applicable verification guidelines described in the latest version of the VCS Standard (Version 4.7), validation and Verification manual and all the relevant principles and requirements of VCS. As part of the verification assessment, the verification team initially performed a desk review on all verification related documents, followed by interviews with PP/stakeholders in order to review the project implementation and its operation.

For all identified inconsistencies and lack of clarity, related findings (list of outstanding issues) are raised. The next steps are to close out the findings through direct communication with PP, received updated version of the monitoring report and the supporting documents for preparing the verification report. The draft version of the verification report undergoes a technical review by KBS prior to its submission to the VERRA through PP.

2.1 Method and Criteria

The 2nd verification and validation of new PAIs was performed in accordance with the requirement of the registered VCS PD, MR, the applied methodology, and the VCS Standard Version 4.7 and other relevant VCS requirements.

- A desk review of the monitoring report and all support documents.
- Interview with project representatives and issuance of findings.
- Resolution of findings followed by preparation of the final validation report and opinion.

The verification team revisited randomly selected 26 project activity instances (PAIs), which were re-measured by the PP's staff under our observation. While the PP was carrying out the remeasurement, we verified the operational and data collection procedures that were implemented at site in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD. Further, the verification team checked the monitoring equipment's to confirm the monitoring practices followed are as described in the registered VCS PD and in line with the applied methodology. A consistency check was performed to verify the consistency of the previous measurement and the remeasurement, and to verify the correctness of the reported stand growth in each plot visited.

KBS follows a risk-based validation confirm, wherein a desk review of the project documentation is undertaken, which is followed by a on site assessment by the member of assessment team and assessment team confirms that the stated figures in the VCS PD are verifiable and reliable evidence.

Project Verification team

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of VCS Project Verifier or outsourced entity)	Involvement in			
						Desk/document review	On-site inspection	Interviews	Project Verification findings
1.	Team Leader (TA 14.1)	IR	ramu	Dr.D. Sidda	Central Office	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.	Local Expert	ER	Westley Magugu	John	Central Office	✓	✓	✓	✓
3.	Verifier	IR	Monga	Dr.Rajesh	Central Office	✓	x	x	✓

Technical reviewer and approver of the Project Verification report

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of VCS Project Verifier or outsourced entity)
1	Expert to Technical reviewer (TA 14.1)	IR	Madhusudhana	Reddy	Central office
2	Technical reviewer	IR	Bharath	S	Central office
3	Manager (Technical & Certification)	IR	Francis	Margaret	Central office
4	Authorizer	IR	Urs	Praveen N	Central office

Timeline of Verification:

Site Visit	05 August 2024 – 16 August 2024
(Draft) Reporting	10 October 2024 (findings issued to PP)

(Final) Reporting	27 January 2025
-------------------	-----------------

2.2 Document Review

The verification was performed primarily based on the review of the monitoring report and the supporting documentation. This process included review of data and information presented to verify their completeness and review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, including calibration requirements, and the QA/QC procedures, and an evaluation of data management and the QA/QC system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reduction.

The initial MR, version 01/⁴/ submitted by the project participant and additional background documents related to the emission reductions are reviewed as an initial step of the verification process. The subsequent step involved the identification of corrective action requests, clarification requests and Forward action request (CAR's, CL's and FAR) which are presented in Appendix 4 of this report. As a result of these findings, the MR is revised to MR, version02/⁵/. A complete list of all documents and records reviewed is attached in Appendix 3 of this report.

2.3 Interviews

KBS has conducted on-site inspection on 05/08/2024 – 16/08/2024¹. Interviews were undertaken with relevant stakeholders in the host country (i.e., US), as well as personnel with knowledge of the project design and implementation. A list of interviewees, and the main topics discussed with each person can be found in appendix A. The following were discussed in the interview with following personnel.

SI No	Name and village	Date	Subject	Team member
01.	Ms.Laura St Peter ²	Verification Manager, Forest Carbon Works (FCW)	➤ Project Design ➤ Project Implementation status, Management ➤ Roles and responsibility ➤ Management, Monitoring, documentation, and reporting system	Dr.D.Siddaramu and Dr.John Westley Magugu
02	Ms.Sarah Ford	Chief Forestry Officer, FCW	➤ Daily Operations ➤ Stakeholder meetings, Grievances mechanism	

¹ Including road travel and flight travel within US and excluding flight travel to project location from India and back. Traveling over 6000miles visiting different states of US.

² Interaction/discussion over phone

03	Mr.Jason Woodfing	Regional Forester, FCW	➤ Project Design ➤ Project Implementation status, Management	
04	Ms.Alani Worden	Project Manager, FCW	➤ Roles and responsibility ➤ Management, Monitoring, documentation, and reporting system ➤ Grievances mechanism	
05	Mr.James Stafford	Associate Forester, FCW	➤ Roles and responsibility ➤ Management, Monitoring, documentation, and reporting system ➤ Daily Operations ➤ Grievances mechanism	
06	Mr.Levi Anderson	SR, GIS Analyst, FCW	➤ Project Design ➤ Management, Monitoring, documentation, and reporting system ➤ Roles and responsibility ➤ Daily Operations ➤ KML / GIS images	
07	Mr.Galen Maennicke	MRV Manager, FCW	➤ Project Design ➤ Management, Monitoring, documentation, and reporting system ➤ Roles and responsibility ➤ Daily Operations	
08	Ms.Cathy Berry	Land owners	➤ Project ➤ Management, Monitoring, documentation, and reporting system ➤ Stakeholder meetings, Grievances mechanism	
09	Mr.Jef Kahn			

2.4 Site Visits

Site visit was undertaken to gather evidence to determine conformance with the VCS Program rules^{1/}, guidance provided in the VCS Validation and Verification Manual^{1/} and methodology assessments under the VCS Program. An on-site assessment was conducted on 05/08/2024 to 16/08/2024.

SI No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	➤ General information about the project. ➤ Chronology of Events/ Implementation cycle of the project activity. ➤ Legal/ Statutory Clearances and Agreements Signed/^{6/} ➤ Application of appropriate Methodology/Tools ➤ Validation of the values of ex-ante determined parameters. ➤ Review of the Monitoring plan. ➤ Validation of Stakeholder Consultation by interviewing the stakeholders. ➤ Validation of Non-Performance Risk Report/^{7/}	US	05/08/2024 – 16/08/2024	Dr.D. Siddaramu and Dr.John Westley Magugu

Sampling approach

The verification team used acceptance sampling approach for checking/re-measuring the sampled plots of PP. A sample size of 22 was required, based on an AQL of 1% and UQL of 20% with Producer risk and Consumer risk of 5%. In accordance with the para.39, table 2 on page no.14 of “Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities”, version 09/8/. However, the verification team visited and re-measured 26 project activity instances (PAIs) from 132³ PAI’s. No discrepant records were observed with the published MR and PP records. Thus, PP’s set of records has been accepted.

- ✓ An assessment of the implementation and operation of the VCS project activity as per the registered PD
- ✓ A review of information flows for generating, aggregating, and reporting of the monitoring parameters
- ✓ Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the Monitoring Plan
- ✓ A cross-check between information provided in the MR and data from other sources.
- ✓ A on observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PD and the applied methodology
- ✓ A review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the VCU data and ERs,
- ✓ An identification of QA/QC procedures in place to prevent, or identify and correct, any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters and
- ✓ To confirm the information and to resolve issues identified in the document review.

³ The project includes 132 project activity instances (PAIs), with 70 added during this monitoring period

2.5 Resolution of Findings

KBS applies the risk-based approach aimed at focusing on high-risk issues to the verification results whilst not omitting any part of the mandatory processes. All the project related documents submitted by PP were assessed against the most recent version of the VCS Standard and Program document 02 CARs, 17 CLs and 01 FAR were raised during verification and submitted to PP, which were addressed either by providing to the audit team the requested information or by making the appropriate corrections. Updated versions of the documentation were submitted by the PP and the audit team reassessed them against the guidance documentation. This process was repeated iteratively until all CL and CAR were fully resolved.

All findings (CARs, CLs and FAR) issued by the KBS audit team in the course of verification process have been closed. All findings issued and the inputs for their closure, are described in Appendix 1 of this report. After reviewing the revised and resubmitted latest MR resolving the CARs & CLs raised and outstanding concerns, KBS issues this final verification report and opinion.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

01 FAR has been raised during this verification. There was no pending FAR from previous verification.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

KBS holds accreditation for validation and verification under sectorial scope 14, which encompasses the project activity being assessed. As part of this verification event, validation activities were also performed to ensure that new project activity instances added during the monitoring period were eligible and conformed with the methodology VM0003. A total of 70 new PAIs were validated, with their inclusion justified in Section 3.3 of this report.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Methodology Deviations

There no deviations requested in this 2nd monitoring period.

The deviation approved during the validation of the PD, and there are no previously validated methodology deviations, nor new methodology deviations in this monitoring period.

The verification team thus accepts the following deviations approved during validation of the PD. The project deviates from the procedures set out in VM0003 v1.3 by applying one methodology deviation,

Deviation #1.

Description of the deviation	The project deviated from the VM0003 methodology by applying an alternative method related to the criteria and procedures for monitoring that is more efficient for project-specific circumstances, achieved that same level of accuracy and results, and was more conservative than what is set out in the methodology. The deviation was demonstrated during validation to not have an impact of the applicability conditions, additionality, or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario. The relevant parameter is defined in Sections 4.1 and 4.2. The uncredited reserve stock (URS) is a division of the above ground biomass and standing dead wood carbon pools. The uncredited reserve stock (URS) represents a small portion of project carbon stocks that are subject to the project activity but conservatively was not counted towards VCU accounting or issuance. The URS was calculated as nine percent (9%) of the initial carbon stock of all PAIs as quantified at the time of addition of each PAI to the grouped project. Contributions to, and depletions from, the URS were tracked at the PAI level. A PAI's contribution to the uncredited reserve stock occurs once upon enrolment into the grouped project. The balance of the uncredited reserve stock must be included in this and all future monitoring reports and the balance shall be within the scope of verification, however is not a selected carbon pool. Upon first enrolment to the grouped project, the PAI's contribution to the URS is quantified as nine percent (9%) of total carbon in the AGBG Living and AG Standing Dead pools. This procedure is further described in Section 5.1 and 5.2. The purpose of the URS is to establish a dedicated carbon pool that can be depleted to account for carbon removed from the project boundary due to limited harvesting activities in-line with the policies of Forest Carbon Works, such as limited continuous thinning, group selection, or patch cuts (IFM 1), which aim to maintain forest vigor and improve structural characteristics to the benefit of added carbon removal by residual trees over time. Annex Q describes the harvest policy of Forest Carbon Works.
Whether the deviation	The deviation does not have an impact on the applicability

meets with the criteria and specifications for permitted methodology deviations.	conditions, additionality, or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario, only in the monitoring criteria and procedures. Thus, in opinion of the VVB, the deviation meets with the criteria and specifications for permitted methodology deviations in section 3.20 of VCS standard v4.7.
Whether the deviation negatively impacts the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals (except where they result in increased accuracy).	The deviation achieves the same level of accuracy and results and is more conservative than what is set out in the methodology: there is no change in the calculation of uncertainty, as it was confirmed by the VVB in the comparison of both uncertainty scenarios: URS vs. no-URS (Annex W). The conservativeness is ensured since it reduces crediting of emissions in the baseline scenario relative to the outcome where it had not been deducted. The comparison amongst the scenarios with-URS and without-URS in the inventory and ex-post calculations was checked by the VVB (Annex AB, AC), which proves the deviation does not result in an overestimation of net GHG emissions reductions or removals and is therefore conservative. The parameter to be monitored was defined in section 5.2 of the PD, section 4.2 of the MR and section 4.3 of this verification report. Thus, in opinion of the VVB the deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals.

The Uncredited Reserve Stock for each project activity instance, as reported in Section 4.2 of the MR, is shown below:

PAI	URS (tCO _{2e})
1007	1676.45
1012	8720.11
1014	38359.41
1023	540.17
1024	1701.70
1025	150.41
1026	603.79
1027	3239.83
1028	303.82
1029	2236.93

1030	303.06
1031	320.34
1033	7236.44
1034	1024.98
1035	1218.31
1036	3852.12
1037	1085.11
1038	4986.35
1039	1103.01
1040	2058.65
1041	680.81
1042	8199.21
1043	285.72
1044	1382.73
1045	1294.91
1046	439.17
1047	1628.90
1048	918.02
1050	1136.01
1051	466.08
1052	1078.11
1053	718.55
1054	296.23
1055	395.82
1056	6918.56
1057	3189.85
1058	5013.52
1059	13357.86
1061	199.11
1062	4093.04
1063	20496.06
1064	739.39
1065	2466.75
1066	1709.13
1067	3094.07

1068	2201.62
1069	5870.15
1070	3782.62
1073	1757.22
1074	8133.18
1080	1158.75
1082	1563.09
1083	1662.76
1084	6845.21
1085	347.52
1086	640.35
1087	11267.29
1088	1252.06
1089	210.15
1090	6719.12
1094	2273.73
1095	7283.61
1032	200.93
1049	1205.57
1079	1291.31
1091	8579.72
1092	8515.78
1093	27268
1097	1438.69
1099	7004.49
1101	4995.07
1102	407.694
1103	760.889
1114	1462.24
1115	743.511
1117	3377.78
1119	2015.98
1122	2855.09
1123	5745.74
1126	878.327

1032	306.86
1049	1208.40
1071	2462.31
1079	1284.76
1091	8544.41
1092	8474.59
1093	27284.36
1097	1400.31
1099	6996.65
1100	4045.77
1101	4989.54
1102	407.25
1103	754.61
1104	689.95
1105	3258.92
1107	58848.12
1108	327.98
1109	1070.69
1110	1917.22
1111	10477.58
1112	1074.68
1113	2445.37
1114	1458.79
1115	741.63
1116	1001.60
1117	3372.38
1118	4360.53
1119	2004.43
1120	5995.84
1121	5165.91
1122	2851.88
1123	5728.38
1124	405.95
1125	18.74
1126	738.76

1133	2324.40
1134	12049.33
1138	2380.01
1139	2572.61
1141	10107.23
1142	1158.08
1143	2735.32
1144	33279.51
1146	2166.82
1147	698.41
1159	845.57
1160	4965.66
1161	2254.80
1162	1483.15
1163	25958.59
1164	34594.03
1166	11100.85
1167	1833.89
1168	3270.11
1169	589.53
1170	965.87
1171	967.86
1172	464.97
1175	1361.70
1178	515.14
1181	2850.69
1182	17178.99
1183	1996.49
1184	655.47
1185	1596.59
1186	1048.33
1188	8240.30
1190	4132.13
1192	2513.47
1210	19.28

3.2 Project Description Deviations

NA. During the second monitoring period, there were no project description deviations.

3.3 New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects

During this 2nd verification period, 70 new PAIs were validated for inclusion in the project activity. The list of PAIs validated is as follows:

PAI ID	Currently Validated
1024, 1047, 1012, 1046, 1086, 1088, 1048, 1038, 1027, 1094, 1040, 1014, 1074, 1080, 1007, 1023, 1025, 1026, 1028, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1033, 1034, 1035, 1036, 1037, 1039, 1041, 1042, 1043, 1044, 1045, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1053, 1054, 1055, 1056, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1061, 1062, 1063, 1064, 1065, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1069, 1070, 1073, 1082, 1083, 1084, 1085, 1087, 1089, 1090, 1095 Total : 62	No
1032, 1049, 1071, 1079, 1091, 1092, 1093, 1097, 1100, 1104, 1114, 1125, 1182, 1099, 1101, 1102, 1122, 1103, 1119, 1124, 1112, 1105, 1107, 1126, 1109, 1113, 1116, 1115, 1121, 1117, 1120, 1110, 1108, 1111, 1118, 1123, 1144, 1134, 1146, 1147, 1143, 1142, 1210, 1138, 1139, 1133, 1141, 1171, 1163, 1164, 1160, 1161, 1159, 1162, 1168, 1172, 1175, 1167, 1169, 1170, 1166, 1185, 1184, 1186, 1181, 1183, 1178, 1190, 1192, 1188 Total: 70	Yes
Total: 132	Total: 70

Evidence-gathering process for validation of new project activity instances:

The verification team to validate of the new 70 PAI's by adhering to VCS Program requirements and ensured that the following actions were taken:

- Reviewed documents (Refer Appendix 3) related to the project and new PAIs, including legal agreements, baseline data, and carbon accounting methodologies.
- By site visits to a representative sample of 26 (20%) PAIs to verify conformance with eligibility criteria – as described in section 2.4 of this report and
- Stakeholder Consultations (Refer 2.3 of this report) i.e., Interviews with PP, landowners, and forest management assessors to validate the integrity of the project.

Quality and completeness of evidence, data, and documentation relating to the new PAIs:

The verification team confirms that the evidence, data, and documentation provided for the inclusion of the new PAIs are complete. The review process did not require any modifications to the sampling plan, and the information provided by the PP is sufficient to validate the inclusion of new instances i.e., PAIs to project activity.

Conformance of the new PAIs with eligibility criteria set out in the Project Description (PD) and VCS Program requirements:

Verification team evaluated the inclusion of new PAIs against the eligibility criteria as defined in Section 1.4 of the registered PD and the VCS Program requirements, confirming full compliance with the following areas:

1. Peat Soil Harvesting Restrictions:

PP provided accurate soil maps (Annex A) showing that no harvesting occurs in areas with peat soils, in accordance with the Forest Management Lease Agreement^{6/}. Verification team confirms compliance with Eligibility Criterion 1.

The PP provided the maps (Annex A), which are considered accurate, due to the reliability of the source and the definition of peat soil. According to USDA SSURGO soil maps, some PAIs contain peat soils. In these areas of the PAIs, no harvesting is allowed during the project duration, according to the executed agreement (Forest Management Lease Agreement, Annex D). This is additionally ensured because, according to Eligibility Criterion 5, harvesting can only occur with PP approval, and such approval did not occur in areas with peat soil.

Applicability Condition 5 of the VM0003 Methodology requires that “The project does not encompass managed peat forests, and the proportion of wetlands is not expected to change”. At project design, the PP included two eligibility criteria (Eligibility Criterion 1 and Eligibility Criterion 5) for the inclusion of new project activity instances to satisfy applicability condition 5. By meeting EC1 and EC 5 (see below), both components of VM0003 v1.3” Applicability Condition 5 are satisfied.

During the monitoring period there was no harvesting in the project areas (see project emissions in section 4.3 of this report), including peat soils, as verified through analyses performed in the EO Browser Sentinel Hub (L2 Landsat 8-9 imagery) for all PAIs were through satellite imagery it was demonstrated no changes in cover during the monitoring period (Annex AS).

2. Legal Agreements and GHG Emissions Rights:

All new PAIs have executed legal agreements that meet the requirements for holding carbon sequestration rights and GHG emissions reduction claims. These agreements were reviewed (Annex D) and confirmed through interviews with PAI owners. Verification team confirms compliance with Eligibility Criterion 2.

3. FVS Modeled Projections:

Section 5.1 and 5.2 of the MR includes descriptions of the baseline and project scenarios. Forest Vegetation Simulator (FVS) Models of the Baseline and Project Scenarios are included in Annex AA, these annexes were reviewed by the verification team.

Applicability Condition 1 of the VM0003 Methodology requires that “Forest management in both baseline and project scenarios involves harvesting techniques such as clear cuts, patch cuts, seed trees, continuous thinning, or group selection practices”. At project design, the PP included three eligibility criteria (EC 3, EC 5. and EC 6) for the inclusion of new project activity instances to satisfy Applicability Condition 1:

- EC 6 requires PAIs to “have a baseline scenario demonstrating that common practice is even-aged management, without the extension of rotation age”. Further, EC 3 requires “The baseline model shall involve even-aged harvesting techniques such as clear cuts and seed tree, among others.”
- EC 5 limits harvesting in the project scenario “to approved techniques that promote the extension of rotation age such as patch cuts, continuous thinning, or group selection practices”.

By meeting EC 3, EC 5, and EC 6, new PAIs ensure forest management in the baseline (EC3 and EC 6) and project (EC 5) scenarios involve harvesting techniques such as clear cuts, patch cuts, seed trees, continuous thinning, or group selections practices thus satisfying Applicability Condition 1.

4. Geographic Location

While several of the management strata were noted as having no harvesting in the baseline, all project activity instances do have harvesting in the baseline scenario. The management strata without harvesting in the baseline were included in the project to meet Applicability Condition 8 of the VM0003 Methodology related to activity shifting leakage. Since eligibility criteria need to be satisfied at the project activity instance level, not at the strata level, all new PAIs were found to comply with Eligibility Criterion 3.

All new PAIs are located within the designated geographic area of the contiguous United States, as verified through GIS data^{9/} (Annex B and C). Verification team confirms compliance with Eligibility Criterion 4.

5. Forest Management Lease Agreements:

The landowners of the new PAIs have executed Forest Management Lease Agreements prohibiting harvesting without prior approval from the PP. During the monitoring period, no harvesting was conducted in these areas. Verification team confirms compliance with Eligibility Criterion 5.

6. Baseline Scenario and Common Practice:

The legality and plausibility of the baseline scenario for each PAI (by State) was confirmed by an independent forest consulting entity (Annex H includes Foresters Attestations to Baseline Silviculture per State and Attestation Foresters Resume), which was reviewed during the site visit by verification team. The comparable timber harvest plans submitted (Annex Z) and reviewed by verification team and deemed reasonable.

The testimonies of the foresters and the comparable forest management plans supported the baseline scenarios and demonstrated that common practice is even-aged management. Applicability Condition 1 of the VM0003 Methodology requires that “Forest management in both baseline and project scenarios involves harvesting techniques such as clear cuts, patch cuts, seed trees, continuous thinning, or group selection practices”. At project design, the PP included three eligibility criteria (EC 3, EC 5, and EC 6) for the inclusion of new project activity instances to satisfy Applicability Condition 1:

- EC 6 requires PAIs to “have a baseline scenario demonstrating that common practice is even-aged management, without the extension of rotation age”. Further, EC 3 requires “The baseline model shall involve even-aged harvesting techniques such as clear cuts and seed tree, among others.”
- requires PAIs to “have a baseline scenario demonstrating that common practice is even-aged management, without the extension of rotation age”. Further, EC 3 requires “The baseline model shall involve even-aged harvesting techniques such as clear cuts and seed tree, among others.”
- EC 5 limits harvesting in the project scenario “to approved techniques that promote the extension of rotation age such as patch cuts, continuous thinning, or group selection practices”.

By meeting EC 3, EC 5, and EC 6, new PAIs ensure forest management in the baseline (EC3 and EC 6) and project (EC 5) scenarios involve harvesting techniques such as clear cuts, patch cuts, seed trees, continuous thinning, or group selections practices thus satisfying Applicability Condition 1. Therefore, the verification team, opinion that the new PAIs comply with Eligibility Criterion 6.

7. Forest Stewardship Certification or Easement:

Although the PAIs are not currently FSC certified, the Forest Management Lease Agreements serve as easements preventing commercial harvesting until certification is achieved. Verification team confirms compliance with Eligibility Criterion 7.

8. Previous Contracts with NCX:

Three PAIs were previously under contract with the Natural Capital Exchange (NCX). All contracts were reviewed and deemed appropriate (Annex AE). KBS confirms compliance with Eligibility Criterion 8.

Based on the evidence reviewed and the findings discussed, KBS has determined that the inclusion of the 70 new PAIs in this verification period is valid. All new PAIs meet the eligibility criteria set out in the Project Description and VCS Program requirements, and their inclusion is fully justified.

Note that section 3.6.22.4 of the VCS Standard requires eligibility criteria to be satisfied at the level of the project activity instance, not the stratum. While individual stratum included in the project may not have forest management in both the baseline and project scenarios, all PAIs have approved forest management activities in both the baseline and project scenarios thus meeting EC 3, EC 5, and EC 6 and satisfying Applicability Condition 1. Other grouped projects using VM0003 have taken a similar approach to the Family Forest Carbon Project, in that they have included forested lands that do not have harvesting (nor crediting) in both the baseline and project scenarios at the stratum level.

The verification team confirmed that credits are not being generated in ex-post calculations from strata that do not have harvests in the baseline by assessing the provided ERR Calculation Spreadsheet (Annex AB), and the workbooks used to determine the final accounting model inputs – namely, the Model Results (Annex AC), Baseline Wood Products (Annex AD), and Treelist (Annex W), in where is evident that in the absence of this strata the ex post figures remain similar.

	Silvicultural system	Harvesting techniques	Conclusion
Baseline scenario	Even aged	- Clear cuts - Seed-tree - Shelterwood -Other even-aged techniques	Verification team by onsite visit, Interview with PP, landowners and foresters confirm that it compliance with Eligibility criterion 6 above.
Project scenario	Uneven-aged	- Continuous Thinning - Group Selection - Patch Cuts -Other uneven-aged techniques	

The rotation age in the baseline scenario is defined in Table 13 of MR. On the other hand, it is important to note that, as treatments in the project scenario will be uneven-aged, the concept of “rotation age” in the project scenario is not applicable, as intermediate treatments serve to delay the rotation age indefinitely. Uneven-age treatments inherently extend the rotation age beyond the lifetime of the project because they are not even-aged rotations. Therefore, in view of the previous findings, it is determined that the inclusion of the 70 new PAIs in the project activity is valid.

VCS Standard v4.7 Section 2.2.1 requires the disclosure of “sufficient and appropriate GHG-

related information to allow intended users to make decisions with reasonable confidence”⁴.

1. To confirm that strata with no harvesting in the baseline are not contributing to crediting the verification team assessed the following.
 - a) the Forest Vegetation Simulator files created during baseline modelling (MR Annex AA).
 - b) the Model Results summary workbook (MR Annex AC) that shows changes in baseline carbon stocks for both measurement and management strata, and
 - c) the Baseline Wood Products workbook (MR Annex AD). Values contained within these sources were then confirmed to be the same as the values used in the final accounting workbook (MR Annex AB).

PP has now revised section 5.0.2 of the Monitoring Report detailing this, as well as an additional column in the “Acres LU” tab of the Model Results showing which management strata have baseline harvesting and which do not.

2. In the current monitoring period, PP has added two project activity instance that contained measurement strata without harvesting in the baseline. Within the Raw Inputs tab of the ERR workbook it is clear that accounting input values that impact crediting - such as “ΔC_{BSL,tree,i,t} (tC/ac/yr)” and “ΔC_{tree,i,t} (tC/ac/yr)” - all contain zeros for these two measurement strata. Additionally, a new column has been added to Raw Inputs tab of the ERR workbook noting which measurement strata contain harvesting in the baseline and which do not (Annex AB). This has also now been further clarified in section 5.0.1 of the Monitoring Report.

3.4 Baseline Reassessment

Did the project undergo baseline reassessment during the monitoring period?

☐ Yes ☒ No

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Details

Verification team during the onsite visit, through observations of project activities and interviews with project personnel confirms that the project has been implemented throughout this monitoring period as it was described in the monitoring report.

The monitoring report was cross-checked against the monitoring plan submitted in the VCS PD to ensure compliance in terms of GHG emission reduction calculations as well as monitoring

⁴ Further to the 2nd PRR comments the following details are provided.

occurrences. Verification team also conducted interviews to confirm that monitoring plan were implemented as described in the VCS PD.

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

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

The verification team confirmed that PP has implemented surveillance activities. The audit team has verified the project implementation activity during the site visit, interviews/ discussions and through document analysis. As described in the MR and verified during the site visit, training to field staff were carried out during the second monitoring period.

In line with Guidelines for Application of materiality in verifications a reasonable level of assurance is defined for the verification of the project by complete verification of all the values indicated in the emission reduction spreadsheet at the document review stage and remote site. There are no material errors, omissions or misstatements. There are no material discrepancies between the actual monitoring system, and the monitoring plan set out in the project description and the applied methodology.

The GHG emission reductions or removals generated by the project have not become included in an emissions trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading. The project has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit or has not become eligible to do so since validation or previous verification. The project has not participated or been rejected under any other GHG programs since validation or previous verification.

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion:
Audit history	Second verification, covering the monitoring period from 30/09/2023 to 31/05/2024. The project registration i.e., validation and first verification were conducted by VVB - AENOR. The Verra Registry maintains the Project Description (PD), Validation Report, and other associated documentation.
Double counting and	The project only has registered under the VCS program.

participation under other GHG programs	(https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/4268) According to the revision of other program registries, it is confirmed the Project does not present any overlap with any other initiative in the territory. KBS confirms that the project has not been registered nor is seeking registration under any other GHG programs, nor has it been rejected by any other GHG programs, as confirmed through a risk-based internet review in other program registries, interview with PP and as per description in the registered PD and MR. In cases where a landowner of a Project Activity Instance (PAI) was previously under contract with the Natural Capital Exchange (NCX), the landowner is required to provide copies of all contracts between the landowner and NCX prior to the first verification event, in accordance with Eligibility Criterion 8. This was applicable to 23 PAIs (PAI IDs: 1034, 1079, 1080, 1082, 1105, 1108, 1111, 1117, 1121, 1134, 1140, 1144, 1159, 1162, 1171, 1172, 1181, 1185, 1186, 1194, 1196, 1197, 1198), and the relevant documentation was submitted to KBS (Annex AE). The PP is not claiming credit for any GHG emissions reductions or removals previously claimed by NCX, as evidenced by the establishment of the PAI crediting start date following the termination of the NCX agreements. In these cases, the PAI crediting period may only commence after the latest termination date of the agreements (as confirmed by Annex AE for the three agreements). Under no circumstances does the PAI crediting start date precede the latest effective date of the NCX agreements.
No double claiming with emissions trading programs or binding emission limits	KBS confirms that the Project is not currently participating in any emission trading or other binding limit program or mechanism, as confirmed through discussion with project personnel and review of registered PD and MR.
No double claiming with other forms of environmental credit	The verification team confirms that the project has not sought or received another form of GHG-related environmental credit, including renewable energy certificates, as confirmed through discussion with project personnel, and review of registered PD and MR.
Supply chain (scope 3) emissions double claiming	Project is enrolled under sectoral scope 14; Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU). Inventory emissions are not considered under sectoral scope 14. Thus, no issuance of public

	statements or email notification proceeds.
Sustainable development contributions	KBS has the following conclusions regarding the project's sustainable development contributions by discussion, review of documents that PP has aimed to contribute to the following three SDGs: 1. SDG 6 (Clean Water & Sanitation)- 6.6.1 Change in the extent of water related ecosystems over time 2. SDG 13 (Climate Action)- 3. SDG 15 (Life on Land)- 15.1.1 Forest area as a proportion of total land area and 15.2.1 Progress towards sustainable forest management These contributions are demonstrated through the following project activities: Forest Protection: A total of 24,985.0 hectares of forested land (the entire verified project area till date) is protected from harvesting, as evidenced by legally binding long-term agreements (referenced in Annexes R, D). In cases where applicable, protection is ensured under FSC-certified sustainable forest management, in line with Eligibility Criterion 7. GHG Removals: Significant greenhouse gas removals have been achieved through the implementation of extended rotation age practices, as detailed in the Monitoring Report (MR) and corroborated in this verification report. This aligns with the project's primary objective of enhancing carbon sequestration. The PP has demonstrated its contribution to the SDGs, their monitoring and reporting, and their alignment with the achievement of the Host Country.
Additional information relevant to the project	For the second monitoring period, no information from the Monitoring Report (MR) needs to be excluded from its public version. All details within the MR can be included in the publicly available version. Although the PP has identified certain documents as commercially sensitive, these documents are not part of the public version of the MR and do not require exclusion. The documents flagged by the PP as sensitive are external to the

MR itself, and the reasons for not making them publicly available are as follows:

Annex U

FCW VCS Certification Model v2

Kimmeridge Carbon Solutions, L.P. and Chestnut Carbon LLC
Proof of Funds

These documents contain proprietary financial information used as evidence for the Financial Viability section of the Non-Permanence Risk Report. However, the conclusions derived from these documents are presented in the MR and Section 4.5 of this verification report.

Annex S

FCWConservePDAAdditionality_NPV_v2 – NPPR version

This document contains proprietary financial details related to the PP's internal project development costs. Nonetheless, the conclusions are outlined in the MR and Section 4.5 of this verification report.

Annex D

Signed MLA (Forest Management Lease Agreement)

Annex AE

Signed NCX Contracts

Annex AG

Landowner Deeds

Annex AI

Stakeholder Correspondence (PP-PAIs)

These documents contain personal information about landowners, which is not relevant or necessary for inclusion in the public version of the MR. All the aforementioned external documents were provided to the audit team upon request. Summaries of these documents are appropriately included in the MR, and the conclusions from their assessment are included in this verification report. Therefore, there is no information that requires exclusion from the public version of the MR.

4.2 Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement

4.2.1 Stakeholder Identification

Stakeholder engagement was verified through communication logs, outreach efforts, and feedback collected from landowners. PP has demonstrated compliance with Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) requirements.

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Stakeholder identification	PP has identified the landowners as stakeholders involved in the project activity instances. This process has not changed since validation, but the number of stakeholders increased due to the inclusion of additional PAIs.
Legal or customary tenure/access rights	The stakeholders identified in the project were the landowners of each project activity instance, thus stakeholders hold legal tenure and access rights to each project instance. There were no conflicting legal rights that were held by stakeholders, indigenous people (IPs), local communities (LCs), and customary rights holders. The Project Proponent (PP) has adequately demonstrated that all properties included in the project are privately owned by individuals, based on property deeds provided in Annex AG, which correspond to the PAIs delineation shown in Annex C.
Stakeholder diversity and changes over time	The identified stakeholders in the project are from different states and have many different goals. The main measured markers of diversity were geographical and generational. Additionally, the project proponent and membership advisors tracked the stakeholder's goals which tended to also differ regionally and span conservation, monetization, and legacy, though there were no changes in the make-up of each group over time during the time monitored.
Expected changes in well-being	Based on interviews/discussion during the site by the verification team, there are no negative changes in well-being as a result of the project activities during the second monitoring period. The implementation of the project has been shown to provide positive socio-economic benefits without any adverse effects. The anticipated improvements in well-being are primarily associated with the diversification of income through carbon credits and the avoidance of negative impacts from extractive logging, as identified by PP.

Location of stakeholders	The verification team by discussion confirms that PP has accurately identified the locations of stakeholders and local communities. The stakeholders of the project are landowners reside within or near the Project Activity Instances (PAIs). The project was not predicted to negatively impact stakeholders. No local communities (LCs), indigenous peoples (IPs), or customary rights holders have been identified as being impacted by the project.
Location of resources	The verification team by discussion confirms that PP has accurately identified and confirmed the ownership and access rights of these PAIs. The stakeholders retained access and ownership to their enrolled properties which spanned the United States. There is no indication of any legal or customary tenure or access rights to the territories and resources held by third parties, such as individuals, indigenous peoples, local communities, or customary rights holders, based on public information from the Department of Indian Affairs (U.S. Department of the Interior). Therefore, the land and resources are exclusively owned or accessed by the PAI landowners, whose title deeds are clear and well-documented.

4.2.2 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Ongoing consultation	Evidence Gathering Activities - Outreach and Stakeholder Communication: Ongoing outreach led by the FCW sales team initiated in 2020. Engagement of regional teams (membership specialists, foresters) to maintain regular contact with stakeholders through various channels (phone, in-person meetings, emails). Stakeholder engagement activities were recorded, including comprehensive discussions on project design, implementation, and monitoring. - Dissemination of Information: Distribution of the FCW offer packet to landowners involved in the project, which includes details about project design, implementation, and monitoring requirements.

Monitoring of ongoing correspondence with landowners and stakeholders for feedback on project design.

- Stakeholder Feedback Mechanisms:

Implementation of continuous feedback mechanisms and culturally appropriate grievance redress procedures.

Monitoring of correspondence for grievances, criticisms, or suggestions from stakeholders related to project design.

- Compliance with Laws and Regulations:

Review of adherence to local laws and regulations regarding stakeholder and worker rights, as outlined in the project description.

- Public Communication:

Ongoing public communication through the project's website and designated membership advisors.

Mechanisms for stakeholders to submit feedback or grievances via the website or through direct communication.

Evidence Checked:

- Correspondence Records:

Annex AI provided a comprehensive record of all correspondence between FCW and stakeholders from the initiation of the project to the present, documenting communication through phone, email, and in-person meetings.

- Project Documentation:

FCW offer packet, which details project design, implementation, and monitoring requirements shared with stakeholders.

- Grievance and Feedback Logs:

Records of any stakeholder grievances, feedback, or concerns submitted through the FCW website or through membership specialists.

- Legal Compliance Documents:

Documentation showing adherence to all relevant local laws and regulations, specifically regarding stakeholder and worker rights.

- Monitoring Report:

The VCS Monitoring Report noted that no stakeholders had submitted criticism or updates to the project design, based on the correspondence analyzed during the monitoring period.

Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the VCS Program Requirements:

- Stakeholder Engagement:

The project has systematically engaged local stakeholders as required by VCS Standard 3.18.3 and 3.18.4. Outreach efforts were sustained, and communication channels remained open throughout the project.

- Transparency and Communication:

The project has adhered to transparency requirements by maintaining open channels of communication with stakeholders, as evidenced by the ongoing correspondence and feedback mechanisms.

- No Significant Concerns Raised:

Based on the analysis of the correspondence and the monitoring report, no stakeholder grievances or concerns have been raised, and no modifications to the project design have been required thus far.

- Grievance Redress and Legal Compliance:

The project has implemented culturally appropriate grievance redress mechanisms and has complied with all legal requirements related to stakeholder and worker rights, ensuring conformance with the VCS Program requirements.

- Ongoing Stakeholder Interaction:

The project has demonstrated ongoing stakeholder interaction with provisions for future feedback and updates, ensuring that any future concerns or comments will be addressed promptly.

Overall Conclusion: The project conforms with the relevant VCS Program requirements for stakeholder engagement, transparency, legal compliance, and feedback mechanisms. There were no significant concerns raised by stakeholders, and communication efforts are well-documented and ongoing. The project can be

	considered compliant with VCS Program standards regarding stakeholder engagement and feedback mechanisms.
Date(s) of stakeholder consultation	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: - Ongoing Stakeholder Consultation: Continuous communication with membership specialists throughout the project lifecycle to engage stakeholders and gather their input. - In-Person Stakeholder Consultations: Conducted a grouped in-person consultation on 06/12/2023. Stakeholders were invited via a publicly available link on the project website to ensure broad accessibility. - Stakeholder Meeting in Little Rock, Arkansas: Scheduled an in-person Stakeholder Meeting on 6 December 2023 in Little Rock, Arkansas. Invitations were extended to stakeholders to share comments, grievances, and feedback on the project. ii) Evidence Checked: - Communication Records: Reviewed documentation of ongoing communications between membership specialists and stakeholders, demonstrating continuous engagement. - Invitation Details (Annex AJ): Examined the online invitations shared publicly, as detailed in Annex AJ, to verify that stakeholders were appropriately invited to the consultations and meeting. - Attendance Records: Checked attendance lists and sign-in sheets from the in-person consultations on 06/12/2023 to confirm stakeholder participation. - Feedback and Grievance Logs: Reviewed any comments, grievances, or feedback submitted by stakeholders during the consultations and through other communication channels.

Communication of monitored results	iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements: The project has demonstrated adherence to the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements regarding stakeholder engagement and consultation: • Systematic Stakeholder Engagement: By maintaining ongoing communication with stakeholders through membership specialists, the project aligns with VCS requirements for continuous stakeholder engagement throughout the project lifecycle. • Inclusive Consultation Processes: The in-person consultations held on 06/12/2023, along with the scheduled meeting on 6 December 2023, provide evidence of proactive efforts to involve stakeholders, satisfying VCS guidelines for stakeholder participation. • Transparent Invitation Methods: Invitations were made publicly available via the project website, ensuring transparency and accessibility, as required by the VCS Program. • Mechanisms for Feedback and Grievances: By providing platforms for stakeholders to share comments, grievances, and feedback during meetings and through ongoing communication, the project complies with VCS standards for addressing stakeholder concerns. Overall Assessment: The evidence indicates that the project conforms with the relevant VCS Program requirements for stakeholder consultation and engagement. The project team has systematically conducted consultations, maintained open lines of communication, and provided opportunities for stakeholders to participate and voice their opinions. There are documented records of these activities, and no deficiencies were identified in meeting the VCS standards.
	j) Evidence Gathering Activities: • Communication with Stakeholders:

Email Correspondence: FCW membership advisors communicated with landowners through email to share project monitoring updates, gather feedback, and address any concerns.

Telephone Correspondence: Regular telephone calls were conducted between FCW membership advisors and landowners to facilitate direct and immediate communication.

Project Website Updates: Information pertinent to project monitoring was made available to stakeholders via the project website, ensuring accessible and transparent communication channels.

- Record Keeping:

Documentation of Communications: A comprehensive record of all stakeholder correspondence, including emails and telephone call summaries, was maintained.

Timestamping: All communications were timestamped to ensure a verifiable timeline of stakeholder engagement activities.

Annex AI Compilation: These records were compiled into Annex AI for reference and verification purposes.

ii) Evidence Checked:

- Stakeholder Correspondence Records (Annex AI):

Reviewed the comprehensive record of all communications between FCW membership advisors and landowners.

Verified that the records included timestamps, demonstrating timely communication.

- Communication Channels:

Confirmed that email and telephone were the primary modes of communication, providing both written and verbal avenues for stakeholder engagement.

Assessed the accessibility and content of the project website to ensure stakeholders could obtain necessary information independently.

- Timeliness of Communications:

Examined timestamps on communications to confirm that stakeholders were engaged promptly and consistently throughout the

project monitoring phase.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

Based on the evidence gathered and checked, the following conclusions are drawn regarding the project's conformance with the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements:

- **Effective Stakeholder Engagement:**

The project maintained consistent and timely communication with stakeholders through multiple channels (email, telephone, website), fulfilling the VCS requirements for stakeholder engagement during the monitoring phase.

- **Transparency and Accessibility:**

By providing information on the project website and maintaining open lines of communication, the project ensured transparency and allowed stakeholders easy access to project updates, aligning with VCS standards for public communication.

- **Comprehensive Documentation:**

The maintenance of detailed records of all stakeholder communications, including timestamps, demonstrates diligence in documenting stakeholder engagement activities, as required by the VCS Program.

- **Timeliness:**

The timely manner of all communications indicates compliance with VCS guidelines that emphasize prompt stakeholder engagement, especially in addressing concerns or providing updates.

Overall Assessment:

The project conforms to the relevant VCS Program requirements concerning stakeholder communication during the project monitoring phase. The evidence shows that stakeholders were effectively engaged through timely and documented communications via email and telephone, with additional information readily available on the project website. The comprehensive records in Annex A1 provide verifiable proof of these activities. No deficiencies or non-conformities were identified in relation to stakeholder engagement requirements set forth by the VCS Program.

Consultation records	Stakeholder consultation was documented through email records and notes of phone calls via records from the project proponent's customer relationship management database.
Stakeholder input	Evidence Gathering Activities: - Monitoring Stakeholder Input: The project proponent committed to taking due account of all input received during local stakeholder consultations and ongoing communications. Established ongoing communication channels, including online platforms and a grievance redress procedure, to facilitate stakeholder feedback throughout the project lifecycle. - Analysis of Correspondence: Actively monitored and analyzed all correspondence with landowners for comments, criticisms, and feedback related to project design and implementation. Ensured that any received input would be considered for potential modifications to the project. - Grievance Redress Mechanism: Implemented an online grievance redress procedure to allow stakeholders to submit concerns or suggestions conveniently. Monitored this channel regularly to promptly address any issues raised. ii) Evidence Checked: - Monitoring Report Review: Examined the Monitoring Report to verify statements regarding stakeholder feedback and the absence of criticisms or suggested updates to the project design. Confirmed that as of the report's creation, no modifications had been necessary due to stakeholder input. - Correspondence Records (Annex AI): Reviewed the comprehensive record of stakeholder correspondence, including timestamps, to ensure all communications were

documented and analyzed.

Verified that all incoming communications were assessed for potential feedback on the project design.

- Grievance Redress Procedure Records:

Checked logs from the online grievance redress mechanism to confirm whether any grievances or suggestions had been submitted.

Ensured that the procedure was accessible and functioning as intended.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

The project demonstrates conformance with the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements regarding stakeholder engagement and feedback incorporation:

- Stakeholder Engagement and Communication:

The project proponent has established and maintained effective communication channels with stakeholders, including landowners, through ongoing correspondence and an accessible grievance redress procedure.

This aligns with VCS requirements for continuous stakeholder consultation and the facilitation of stakeholder input throughout the project lifecycle.

- Monitoring and Analysis of Feedback:

By actively monitoring and analyzing all stakeholder communications for comments and feedback on the project design, the project ensures that stakeholder input is duly considered, satisfying VCS guidelines for stakeholder participation and feedback incorporation.

- Documentation and Transparency:

Comprehensive records of all stakeholder correspondence, including timestamps, are maintained (as seen in Annex A1), demonstrating transparency and diligence in documenting stakeholder interactions, in line with VCS standards.

- No Modifications Required to Date:

As of the creation of the Monitoring Report, no criticisms or

	suggested updates to the project design have been received from stakeholders. Consequently, no modifications have been necessary, indicating that stakeholders are either satisfied with the project design or have no significant concerns, which is acceptable under VCS requirements. Overall Assessment: The project is in conformance with the relevant VCS Program requirements regarding stakeholder consultation and feedback mechanisms. The project proponent has: - Established effective and accessible channels for stakeholder communication and input. - Monitored and analyzed stakeholder feedback proactively. - Maintained thorough documentation of all stakeholder interactions. - Demonstrated readiness to incorporate stakeholder input should any be received in the future. No non-conformities or deficiencies have been identified concerning stakeholder engagement and the consideration of stakeholder input. The project meets the VCS Program's standards for stakeholder consultation and ongoing communication.
--	---

4.2.3 Free, Prior, and Informed Consent

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Consent	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: - Ensuring Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC): Distribution of Information Packets: The FCW Membership guide offer packet and other relevant information were submitted to all stakeholders at the initial phase of the project. - Consultations with Membership Advisors: Membership advisors engaged in consultations with stakeholders to

provide detailed information about project activities and to address any questions or concerns (refer to Annex AI).

- Access to Membership Guide:

Stakeholders were given access to the FCW Conserve Membership Guide (see Annex R), which contains comprehensive information about the project.

- Feedback Mechanisms:

Established a grievance redress procedure (section 2.1.4 of the monitoring report) and a public comment submission portal (section 2.1.5 of the monitoring report) to allow stakeholders to submit feedback or critiques.

- Obtaining Consent:

Collected signed Membership and License Agreements (MLAs) from stakeholders, indicating their free, prior, and informed consent to participate in the project (see Annex D).

Addressing Individual Concerns:

- One-on-One Consultations:

Membership specialists worked directly with each private landowner to address individual concerns and ensure they fully understood the project implications (Annex AI).

ii) Evidence Checked:

- Signed Membership and License Agreements (Annex D):

Verified that all stakeholders whose property rights are affected provided FPIC by signing the MLA.

- Consultation Records with Membership Advisors (Annex AI):

Reviewed detailed records of consultations between membership advisors and stakeholders, confirming that sufficient information was provided and that stakeholders had opportunities to ask questions.

- FCW Conserve Membership Guide (Annex R):

Examined the guide to ensure it contains all necessary information about project activities, rights, and obligations, ensuring stakeholders were adequately informed.

- Grievance Redress Procedure and Public Comment Submission Portal:

Assessed sections 2.1.4 and 2.1.5 of the monitoring report to confirm that mechanisms are in place for stakeholders to submit feedback or grievances.

- Records of Issues or Conflicts:

Checked records to confirm that no special issues or conflicts were raised regarding informed consent from Indigenous Peoples (IPs), Local Communities (LCs), or customary rights holders.

- Documentation of Individual Concerns Addressed (Annex AI):

Reviewed communications showing how membership specialists addressed individual landowner concerns.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

Based on the evidence gathered and checked, the project conforms to the relevant Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements, specifically VCS Standard v4.7 Section 3.18.8, regarding the acquisition of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) from stakeholders whose property rights are affected.

- Provision of Information:

The project proponent provided stakeholders with comprehensive information through the FCW Membership guide offer packet, the FCW Conserve Membership Guide, and consultations with membership advisors.

- Obtaining FPIC:

All affected stakeholders gave their free, prior, and informed consent by signing the MLA, demonstrating understanding and agreement to the project's terms.

- Feedback and Grievance Mechanisms:

Accessible mechanisms such as the grievance redress procedure and public comment submission portal were established, allowing stakeholders to submit feedback or critiques in line with VCS requirements.

	• Addressing Individual Concerns: Membership specialists actively engaged with private landowners to address any individual concerns, ensuring all stakeholders were comfortable with project participation. • No Conflicts or Issues Raised: There were no special issues or conflicts raised pertaining to informed consent of IPs, LCs, or customary rights holders, indicating effective stakeholder engagement and consent processes. Overall Assessment: The project has effectively implemented processes to ensure FPIC from all stakeholders, satisfying the requirements of the VCS Program. The comprehensive approach to providing information, obtaining consent, and addressing concerns demonstrates conformance with VCS standards regarding stakeholder engagement and rights. No deficiencies or non-conformities were identified, and the project is deemed compliant with the relevant VCS Program requirements.
Outcome of FPIC discussion	i) Evidence Gathering Activities for Each Item: • Project Details on the Website: The project proponent ensured that comprehensive project details were made available on the project website for stakeholders to access at any time. • Dedicated Grievance Process: Established a grievance redress procedure specifically for stakeholders to submit any concerns or complaints, as detailed in section 2.1.4 of the Monitoring Report. • Constant Communication with Membership Advisors: Maintained ongoing communication channels between stakeholders and membership advisors, encouraging stakeholders to reach out with any questions or issues. • Membership Lease Agreement Published Before Signing: Made the Membership Lease Agreement available for stakeholders to review thoroughly before signing, ensuring they were fully

informed about the project's terms and conditions.

- Compliance with FSC Forest Management Standard v1.0 Principle 4:

Implemented appropriate mechanisms for resolving grievances and providing fair compensation in cases of loss or damage, as required by the United States FSC Forest Management Standard v1.0 Principle 4.

- Obtaining Informed Consent from Landowners:

Secured informed consent from landowners to safeguard their contractual participation and ensure equitable benefit-sharing arrangements, preventing any infringement upon their land or rights.

ii) Evidence Checked:

- Project Website Content:

Reviewed the project website to confirm that detailed project information was available and accessible to all stakeholders.

- Grievance Redress Procedure Documentation:

Examined section 2.1.4 of the Monitoring Report to verify the existence and effectiveness of the dedicated grievance process for stakeholders.

- Communication Records with Membership Advisors:

Checked communication logs and records demonstrating ongoing interactions between membership advisors and stakeholders.

- Membership Lease Agreement Availability:

Confirmed that the Membership Lease Agreement was published and provided to stakeholders before signing, allowing adequate time for review.

- FSC Standard Compliance Documentation:

Reviewed policies and procedures to ensure compliance with the United States FSC Forest Management Standard v1.0 Principle 4 regarding grievance mechanisms and fair compensation.

- Consent Forms and Agreements:

Verified that signed consent forms and Membership Lease

Agreements were obtained from all participating landowners, indicating their free, prior, and informed consent.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

Based on the evidence gathered and checked, the project demonstrates conformance with the relevant Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements concerning Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) and stakeholder engagement:

- Accessibility of Project Information:

By providing detailed project information on the website and making key documents like the Membership Lease Agreement available before signing, the project ensures stakeholders are well-informed.

- Effective Grievance Mechanisms:

The establishment of a dedicated grievance process, in line with VCS requirements and FSC Principle 4, allows stakeholders to voice concerns and seek resolution, demonstrating commitment to addressing stakeholder issues promptly and fairly.

- Ongoing Stakeholder Communication:

Maintaining constant communication with membership advisors encourages transparency and trust between the project proponent and stakeholders.

- Informed Consent:

Obtaining signed Membership Lease Agreements from landowners after providing all necessary information fulfills the requirement for free, prior, and informed consent, ensuring that participation is voluntary and based on a clear understanding of the project.

- Compliance with International Standards:

Adherence to the United States FSC Forest Management Standard v1.0 Principle 4 further supports the project's commitment to responsible management and stakeholder rights.

Overall Assessment:

The project has effectively implemented a comprehensive FPIC process, meeting all relevant VCS Program requirements. Stakeholders have been provided with sufficient information,

accessible grievance mechanisms, and ample opportunity to engage with the project proponent. No deficiencies or non-conformities have been identified. Therefore, the project is considered to be in full compliance with the VCS standards regarding stakeholder engagement and informed consent.

4.2.4 Grievance Redress Procedure

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Grievance received and steps taken to resolve the grievance including the outcomes of the resolution	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: - Accessibility of Grievance Procedure: The project proponent ensured that the grievance redress procedure was easily accessible to stakeholders for ongoing consultation by advertising it on the project website. - Regular Communication with Stakeholders: Major stakeholders maintained regular communication with membership advisors (MAs) and could submit feedback directly via phone and email throughout the project's lifetime and beyond, as specified in the Project Description Section 2.2 Local Stakeholder Consultation. - Documentation of Correspondence: Compiled and maintained correspondence records for each project activity instance, available in Annex AI, to monitor stakeholder interactions and feedback. - Public Invitations to Stakeholder Events: Published invitations to in-person stakeholder events on the FCW project website, making them accessible to all stakeholders and the public (see Annex AJ). - Provision of Multiple Communication Channels: Offered various means of communication to stakeholders, including phone, mail, email, project website submission forms, and in-person meetings, to accommodate differing needs and preferences. - Inclusivity Across Demographics:

Recognized that different communication methods cater to various generations, socio-economic statuses, and disabilities, ensuring all stakeholders had at least one accessible way to communicate with the project proponent.

- **Assessment of Communication Accessibility:**

Evaluated the accessibility of communication methods across the United States, noting high percentages of households with internet access (93%), phones (99%), and universal access to the U.S. Postal Service (100%).

ii) Evidence Checked:

- **Grievance Procedure Accessibility:**

Verified that the grievance redress procedure was advertised and easily accessible on the project website.

- **Stakeholder Communication Records (Annex AI):**

Reviewed detailed records of correspondence between membership advisors and stakeholders, confirming ongoing communication channels.

- **Project Description Section 2.2:**

Examined Section 2.2 of the Project Description to confirm specifications for regular stakeholder consultation and feedback mechanisms.

- **Public Invitations (Annex AJ):**

Checked the FCW project website and Annex AJ to confirm that invitations to in-person stakeholder events were published and accessible to all stakeholders.

- **Diversity of Communication Methods:**

Confirmed that multiple communication methods were provided and promoted to stakeholders, catering to diverse needs and preferences.

- **Accessibility Statistics:**

Cross-referenced national statistics on household access to internet, phones, and postal services to validate the widespread availability of communication methods used by the project.

- No Grievances Recorded:

Reviewed grievance logs and confirmed that no grievances were raised during the monitoring period.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

Based on the evidence gathered and checked, the project conforms to the relevant Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements concerning stakeholder engagement and grievance mechanisms:

- Accessibility and Inclusivity:

The project proponent has made the grievance procedure and communication channels easily accessible to all stakeholders by offering multiple methods of communication. This approach aligns with VCS requirements for inclusive and accessible stakeholder consultation processes.

- Effective Communication Mechanisms:

Regular communication with stakeholders through membership advisors, along with the availability of feedback submission via phone, email, mail, and in-person meetings, demonstrates the project's commitment to maintaining open lines of communication, as required by the VCS Program.

- Transparency and Documentation:

The maintenance of detailed correspondence records (Annex AI) and the public invitation to stakeholder events (Annex AJ) show transparency in stakeholder engagement and provide verifiable evidence of proactive stakeholder interaction.

- No Grievances Reported:

The absence of grievances during the monitoring period indicates effective stakeholder engagement and satisfaction with the project's implementation, suggesting that any potential issues were addressed promptly through the available communication channels.

- Compliance with Accessibility Standards:

By assessing and confirming the accessibility of communication methods across different demographics and abilities, the project

	meets the VCS Program's emphasis on inclusivity and accessibility in stakeholder engagement. Overall Assessment: The project is in full compliance with the relevant VCS Program requirements related to stakeholder engagement, communication accessibility, and grievance mechanisms. The evidence demonstrates that the project proponent has taken appropriate measures to ensure all stakeholders can effectively participate in the consultation process and that any potential grievances can be submitted and addressed appropriately. No deficiencies or non-conformities were identified during the assessment.
Grievance redress procedure	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: - Review of Grievance Redress Procedure: Collected and examined the grievance redress procedure maintained by the project proponent to address disputes with local stakeholders during project planning and implementation, as per VCS Standard 3.18.19. - Assessment of Grievance Submission Methods: Identified and evaluated the multiple culturally appropriate methods provided by the project proponent for stakeholders to submit grievances, including self-identified, confidential, or anonymous options. Confirmed that stakeholders were made aware of these methods in advance of project implementation. - Verification of Grievance Form Availability: Reviewed the project's website to verify the availability of the grievance submission form, ensuring it could be submitted with or without the complainant's identity attached. - Evaluation of Additional Submission Channels: Assessed the procedures for accepting grievances submitted by mail to the project proponent's office and the designation of a central point of contact to compile received letters. - Analysis of Grievance Handling and Resolution: Examined records to determine how grievances received during the

monitoring period were recorded, publicly posted, and resolved as needed.

Reviewed the three-stage approach outlined by the project proponent for resolving grievances.

- **Public Accessibility of Grievance Procedures:**

Checked the stakeholders' page of the project proponent's website to confirm that the grievance redress procedure was made publicly available at <https://forestcarbonworks.org/grievance-procedure/>.

ii) Evidence Checked:

- **Grievance Redress Procedure Documentation:**

Reviewed the documented grievance redress procedure to ensure it aligns with VCS Standard 3.18.19 requirements.

- **Website Content and Functionality:**

Visited the project proponent's website to verify the presence and accessibility of the grievance submission form.

Tested the form to confirm it allows for both identified and anonymous submissions.

- **Stakeholder Communication Records:**

Examined communication materials provided to stakeholders before project implementation, confirming they were informed about the grievance procedures and submission methods.

- **Mail Submission Process:**

Verified the availability of the project proponent's mailing address and the established process for compiling grievances received by mail.

- **Grievance Logs and Resolutions:**

Reviewed logs of grievances received during the monitoring period, including timestamps, the nature of the grievances, and the resolutions provided.

Confirmed that grievances were publicly posted on the website after submission and that complainants received confirmation of receipt when contact information was available.

- Three-Stage Grievance Resolution Approach:

Analyzed the outlined steps for grievance resolution, including amicable resolution efforts, referral to the Consensus Building Institute for mediation, and potential escalation to legal adjudication.

- Compliance with Cultural Appropriateness:

Assessed whether the grievance procedures and communication methods were culturally appropriate and accessible to all stakeholders.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

The project proponent has demonstrated conformance with the relevant Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements, specifically VCS Standard 3.18.19, regarding the establishment and maintenance of a grievance redress procedure:

- Grievance Redress Procedure Implementation:

The project proponent has effectively maintained a grievance redress procedure to address disputes with local stakeholders, fulfilling the requirements of VCS Standard 3.18.19.

- Multiple Culturally Appropriate Submission Methods:

By providing various methods for submitting grievances—including self-identified, confidential, and anonymous options—the project ensures that all stakeholders can access the grievance mechanism in a manner that respects their cultural and personal preferences.

- Advance Awareness and Accessibility:

Stakeholders were made aware of the grievance procedures before project implementation, and the procedures are readily accessible via the project's website and mailing address.

- Transparent Grievance Handling:

The project proponent's practice of publicly posting grievances on their website and providing confirmation of receipt enhances transparency and accountability.

- Structured Resolution Process:

The three-stage approach to resolving grievances demonstrates a

	commitment to amicable resolution, with provisions for third-party mediation and legal adjudication if necessary. - Effective Monitoring and Resolution: During the monitoring period, all conflicts or grievances that arose were appropriately recorded and resolved, indicating that the grievance redress procedure is functioning effectively. - Public Availability of Grievance Procedure: Making the grievance redress procedure publicly available on the project's website ensures compliance with VCS requirements for transparency and stakeholder engagement. Overall Assessment: The evidence confirms that the project proponent has established a comprehensive and culturally appropriate grievance redress procedure in line with VCS Program requirements. The multiple channels for submitting grievances, the structured resolution process, and the transparency in handling grievances demonstrate the project's commitment to addressing stakeholder concerns effectively. No deficiencies or non-conformities were identified. Therefore, the project is in full compliance with the relevant VCS standards concerning grievance mechanisms and stakeholder dispute resolution.
--	--

4.2.5 Public Comments

Not applicable.

Since this event corresponds to 2nd verification, not a validation or joint validation and verification, there was no 30-day public comment period in Verra Registry, according to VCS standard v4.7. Verra has not communicated the existence of comments to the VVB or the PP since the registration of the project (<https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/VCS/4268>).

Comments received	Actions taken by the project proponent	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
N/A	N/A	N/A

4.2.6 Risks to Local Stakeholders and the Environment

4.2.6.1 Management Experience

Evidence Gathering Activities:

1. Development of the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report:

- Methodology Review:

FCW conducted a comprehensive review of their methodology for identifying and assessing potential risks associated with Project Activity Instances (PAIs) within the Family Forest Carbon Project.

- Risk Identification:

Systematically identified and categorized potential risks to stakeholders and the environment, drawing upon the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) and the VCS Monitoring Report Template v4.3.

- Stakeholder and Environmental Risk Assessment:

Assessed risks related to stakeholder well-being, participation, working conditions, safety of women and minority groups, human rights, and equity.

- Specific Risk Analysis:

Highlighted specific risks such as wildfire, food security, discrimination, property rights, benefit-sharing, and ecosystem health.

- Compliance Mapping:

Mapped the identified risks to the applicable sections of the Monitoring Report (MR) Sections 2.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, and 2.3.4 to ensure all requirements were addressed.

2. Development of the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy:

- Mitigation Framework Development:

Created a comprehensive framework outlining mitigation measures for each identified risk.

- Focus on Key Areas:

Placed special emphasis on stakeholder well-being, participation, working conditions, and human rights.

- Policy Documentation:

Documented the policy to align with VCS standards and to provide clear guidelines for risk management throughout the project lifecycle.

ii) Evidence Checked:

1. Risk Identification Report (Annex AW):

- Content Verification:

Reviewed the report to confirm it provides a detailed overview of FCW's methodology and findings in identifying and assessing potential risks.

- Alignment with VCS Standards:

Ensured the report systematically categorizes and evaluates risks in accordance with the VCS and VCS Monitoring Report Template v4.3.

- Comprehensiveness:

Verified that the report includes risks related to stakeholder well-being, participation, working conditions, safety of women and minority groups, human rights, equity, wildfire, food security, discrimination, property rights, benefit-sharing, and ecosystem health.

2. Safeguard Risk Policy (Annex AW):

- Mitigation Measures:

Checked that the policy offers a comprehensive framework for mitigating the identified risks.

- Focus Areas:

Confirmed the policy focuses on stakeholder well-being, participation, working conditions, and human rights.

- Compliance Assurance:

Evaluated whether the policy's mitigation measures ensure compliance with the VCS Program requirements.

3. Monitoring Report Sections 2.2 to 2.3.4:

- Cross-Referencing:

Cross-referenced the Risk Identification Report and Safeguard Risk Policy with MR Sections 2.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, and 2.3.4 to ensure all required areas were adequately addressed.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

- Assessment Summary:

The project demonstrates full conformance with the relevant VCS Program requirements concerning risk identification, assessment, and mitigation:

- Comprehensive Risk Identification and Assessment:

The FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report thoroughly identifies and assesses potential risks associated with the project's activities, aligning with VCS standards.

The report covers a wide range of risks to stakeholders and the environment, ensuring no significant risk areas are overlooked.

- Effective Mitigation Strategies:

The FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy provides a robust framework for mitigating identified risks.

The policy focuses on critical areas such as stakeholder well-being, participation, working conditions, and human rights, demonstrating a commitment to ethical project implementation.

- Alignment with VCS and MR Requirements:

Both the Risk Identification Report and the Safeguard Risk Policy align with the VCS Program and the VCS Monitoring Report Template v4.3.

The project adequately addresses MR Sections 2.2 to 2.3.4, ensuring all specific requirements are met.

- Protection of Stakeholders and the Environment:

By highlighting and mitigating risks like wildfire, food security, discrimination, property rights, benefit-sharing, and ecosystem health, the project prioritizes the protection of stakeholders and the environment.

The emphasis on safety for women and minority groups, human rights, and equity further underscores the project's commitment to social responsibility.

Overall Conclusion:

The project conforms to the relevant VCS Program requirements by:

- Systematically Identifying and Assessing Risks:
- Demonstrating due diligence in recognizing potential adverse impacts associated with project activities.
- Implementing Robust Mitigation Measures:
- Providing clear strategies to prevent or minimize identified risks, particularly in critical areas affecting stakeholders and the environment.
- Ensuring Compliance and Alignment:

Aligning project documentation and policies with VCS standards and monitoring report requirements, thereby upholding industry best practices.

No deficiencies or non-conformities were identified during the assessment. The project proponent has taken appropriate and comprehensive steps to identify, assess, and mitigate potential risks, ensuring both compliance with the VCS Program requirements and the safeguarding of stakeholders and the environment. The project is deemed to be in full compliance with the relevant VCS standards.

4.2.6.2 Risk Assessment

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Natural and human induced risks to stakeholders' wellbeing	NA PP has identified the natural and human-induced <i>risks of the project for entire</i> project lifetime by applying the VCS-approved tool, 'AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool' as reported in the <i>project</i> Non-Permanence Risk Report. The final score of the non-permanence risk for the Project is 12%, The <i>verification</i> team assessed the Non-Permanence Risk Report, by review of documents submitted and interviews, concludes that the project does not have any major Natural and/or human induced risks to stakeholders' wellbeing.
Risks to stakeholder participation	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: 1. Risk to Food Security in the Area (Risk 1.2.1): - Review of Internal Policies: Gathered and reviewed FCW's internal policies addressing land selection criteria, specifically the incorporation of heavily wooded areas not suitable for agriculture. - Analysis of Project Activity Instance (PAI) Maps: Collected maps of all PAIs to verify the land types involved in the project activities. 2. Risk to Land Loss (Risk 1.2.2): - Examination of Membership and License Agreements (MLAs): Collected signed MLAs for all PAIs during the monitoring period to assess the maintenance of landowners' property rights. 3. Risk to Loss of Yields (Risk 1.2.3) and Negative Impacts on Livelihoods (Risk 1.2.4): - Review of Benefit-Sharing Agreements: Gathered all benefit-sharing agreements associated with the PAIs to ensure equitable distribution of benefits. Verification of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) Process: Collected documentation evidencing the FPIC process with stakeholders.

4. Risks Exacerbated by Climate Change (Risk 1.2.5):

- Review of FCW Harvest Policy:

Gathered and reviewed the FCW Harvest Policy to assess its incorporation of climate-smart silvicultural strategies.

ii) Evidence Checked:

1. Risk to Food Security in the Area (Risk 1.2.1):

- Internal Policy Documents (Annex AW):

Verified that FCW's policies mandate the selection of heavily wooded areas not suitable for agriculture, thereby mitigating impacts on food security.

- PAI Maps (Annex B):

Examined maps to confirm that the project areas are indeed heavily wooded and not utilized for agricultural purposes.

- Risk to Land Loss (Risk 1.2.2):

- Signed MLAs (Annex D):

Reviewed the MLAs to ensure they maintain the property rights of landowners and confirm that participation is voluntary and contractual.

2. Risk to Loss of Yields (Risk 1.2.3) and Negative Impacts on Livelihoods (Risk 1.2.4):

- Benefit-Sharing Agreements (Annex D):

Checked agreements to confirm that landowners receive fair compensation, mitigating any potential loss of yields or negative livelihood impacts.

- FPIC Documentation (Annex R):

Verified that stakeholders provided free, prior, and informed consent after being fully informed about the project activities.

3. Risks Exacerbated by Climate Change (Risk 1.2.5):

- FCW Harvest Policy (Annex Q):

Reviewed the policy to ensure it includes climate-smart silvicultural practices designed to enhance forest resilience and mitigate climate

change risks.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

Based on the evidence gathered and checked, the project demonstrates conformance with the relevant Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements regarding the mitigation of risks to stakeholder participation:

1. Risk to Food Security in the Area (Risk 1.2.1):

- Assessment:

The project avoids impacting agricultural lands by focusing on heavily wooded areas unsuitable for farming, thereby mitigating risks to local food security.

- Conformance:

This approach aligns with VCS requirements to prevent negative impacts on local food supplies and supports sustainable land use practices.

2. Risk to Land Loss (Risk 1.2.2):

- Assessment:

By securing signed MLAs that maintain landowners' property rights, the project ensures that participation is voluntary and that land ownership is respected.

- Conformance:

This satisfies VCS standards related to respecting and protecting property rights and preventing involuntary resettlement or land appropriation.

3. Risk to Loss of Yields and Negative Impacts on Livelihoods (Risks 1.2.3 and 1.2.4):

- Assessment:

The benefit-sharing agreements provide fair compensation to landowners, mitigating potential losses in yields and preventing adverse effects on livelihoods.

- Conformance:

This approach complies with VCS requirements to enhance local

	livelihoods and ensure that stakeholders benefit equitably from the project. 4. Risks Exacerbated by Climate Change (Risk 1.2.5): - Assessment: Implementation of climate-smart silvicultural strategies as outlined in the FCW Harvest Policy enhances forest resilience and reduces climate-related risks. - Conformance: This aligns with VCS guidelines for incorporating adaptive management practices to address climate change impacts and supports sustainable forest management. Overall Conclusion: The project has effectively identified potential risks to stakeholder participation and implemented appropriate mitigation measures as outlined in the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy (Annex AW). The evidence demonstrates that the project: - Proactively Addresses Risks: By identifying specific risks and taking targeted actions, the project minimizes potential negative impacts on stakeholders. - Ensures Stakeholder Well-being: Through fair compensation, maintaining property rights, and respecting stakeholders' decisions via the FPIC process, the project supports stakeholder welfare. - Complies with VCS Program Requirements: The project's mitigation measures are in line with VCS standards related to stakeholder engagement, risk management, and sustainable development. No deficiencies or non-conformities were identified during the assessment. Therefore, the project is deemed to be in full compliance with the relevant VCS Program requirements concerning the mitigation of risks to stakeholder participation.
Working conditions	i) Evidence Gathering Activities for Each Item: Risk 1.3.2 (First Instance): Risks to employees implementing climate-

smart forest practices due to safety concerns or wildfire potential.

- Review of Safety and Training Plans:

Collected and examined the in-depth safety and training plan covering all relevant safety concerns.

Ensured that the safety plans were available to employees both online and on the devices used to collect measurements prior to forest cruises.

- Assessment of Emergency Procedures:

Gathered information on procedures for collecting emergency contacts and other emergency information prior to forest entry.

- Verification of FSC Principle 4 Compliance:

Assessed FCW's adherence to Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Principle 4, which requires maintaining or enhancing the long-term well-being of forest workers and local communities.

Risk 1.3.2 (Second Instance): Employees may be exposed to hazardous substances, such as pesticides or herbicides, used in forest management.

- Review of FCW Harvest Policy (Annex Q):

Examined policies regarding the elimination of commercial harvests on Project Activity Instances (PAIs) prior to FSC certification.

- Assessment of Chemical Use Reduction:

Evaluated compliance with FSC Principle 6, which emphasizes reducing the use of chemical pesticides and biocides.

- Monitoring of Commercial Harvests and Chemical Use:

Collected data confirming that no commercial harvests or chemical applications occurred during the monitoring period (Annex AS).

Risk 1.3.3: Employees working outdoors may be exposed to extreme weather conditions, such as heat, cold, or storms, which can pose health risks.

- Examination of Safety and Training Materials (Annex AX):

Reviewed training materials addressing risks associated with extreme weather conditions.

- Assessment of Weather Monitoring Procedures:

Evaluated protocols for monitoring weather conditions and communicating risks to employees.

- Verification of Emergency Preparedness:

Gathered evidence of emergency response plans for weather-related incidents.

Risk 1.3.4: Employees working in forested areas, such as cruisers, may encounter dangerous wildlife or plant life, posing a risk to their safety.

- Review of Wildlife Safety Training:

Collected training materials that cover procedures for safely encountering wildlife and hazardous plants.

- Assessment of Employee Training Records:

Verified that employees received appropriate training prior to fieldwork.

ii) Evidence Checked:

Risk 1.3.2 (First Instance):

- Safety and Training Plan Documentation:

Examined the safety plan detailing protocols for mitigating safety concerns and wildfire risks.

- Safety and Anti-Harassment Training Materials (Annex AX):

Reviewed materials to ensure comprehensive coverage of safety topics.

- Emergency Information Procedures:

Verified that emergency contacts and procedures were collected and accessible before forest entry.

- Compliance Records with FSC Principle 4:

Confirmed documentation showing adherence to FSC Principle 4.

Risk 1.3.2 (Second Instance):

- FCW Harvest Policy (Annex Q):

Reviewed policies confirming the elimination of commercial harvests on PAIs prior to FSC certification.

- Monitoring Records (Annex AS):

Checked records indicating no commercial harvests or use of hazardous substances occurred during the monitoring period.

- Compliance with FSC Principle 6:

Verified efforts to reduce and phase out the use of chemical pesticides and biocides.

Risk 1.3.3:

- Safety and Training Materials (Annex AX):

Ensured that training materials included guidelines for working safely in extreme weather conditions.

- Weather Monitoring Protocols:

Reviewed procedures for tracking weather forecasts and communicating warnings.

- Emergency Response Plans:

Examined plans outlining steps to take during weather-related emergencies.

Risk 1.3.4:

- Wildlife and Plant Safety Training Materials:

Reviewed content covering identification of dangerous species and safety protocols.

- Employee Training Records:

Confirmed that all field employees completed the necessary safety training.

- Incident Reporting Procedures:

Checked that procedures are in place for reporting and responding to wildlife or plant-related incidents.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

Overall Assessment:

The project has effectively identified potential risks to working conditions and implemented appropriate mitigation measures in line with the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements.

Risk 1.3.2 (First Instance):**Conformance:**

The comprehensive safety and training plans, along with adherence to FSC Principle 4, demonstrate that the project is committed to maintaining safe working conditions and addressing safety concerns related to climate-smart forest practices and wildfire potential.

Conclusion:

The project meets VCS requirements by proactively managing safety risks and ensuring employee well-being.

Risk 1.3.2 (Second Instance):**Conformance:**

By eliminating commercial harvests on PAIs prior to FSC certification and complying with FSC Principle 6, the project reduces the risk of employees being exposed to hazardous substances.

Conclusion:

The project conforms to VCS standards by minimizing environmental health risks and promoting safer working environments.

Risk 1.3.3:**Conformance:**

The inclusion of extreme weather condition protocols in training materials and the establishment of emergency response plans show that the project addresses health risks associated with outdoor work.

Conclusion:

The project adheres to VCS requirements by implementing measures to protect employees from weather-related health risks.

Risk 1.3.4:**Conformance:**

Providing training on handling dangerous wildlife and plants, along with established incident reporting procedures, ensures employee safety in forested areas.

Conclusion:

	The project complies with VCS standards by mitigating risks associated with wildlife and plant hazards. Final Conclusion: - Compliance with VCS Program Requirements: The project has demonstrated full compliance with relevant VCS Program requirements concerning working conditions, specifically regarding occupational health and safety. - Effective Risk Mitigation: Mitigation measures are well-documented and effectively implemented, addressing all identified risks. - Adherence to FSC Principles: Compliance with FSC Principles 4 and 6 reinforces the project's commitment to sustainable and responsible forest management practices. - No Non-Conformities Identified: There are no deficiencies or non-conformities observed in the project's approach to managing risks to working conditions. The project should continue to monitor and update safety protocols as necessary and maintain compliance with VCS and FSC standards to ensure ongoing protection of employee health and safety. Overall, the project is in full compliance with the VCS Program requirements related to working conditions and has effectively implemented measures to mitigate potential risks to employees.
Safety of women and girls	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: Risk 1.4.1: Forest management often requires workers to be alone for long periods in remote areas to complete work. This situation may put female foresters working on the project or female project activity instance (PAI) owners recreating on the project at risk for harassment by others in the area. Review of Risk Identification Reports: Collected the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report Section 1.4 (Annex AW) to understand how FCW identified risks related to the safety of women and girls.

Examined the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy Section 1.4 (Annex AW) to assess the mitigation measures planned for this specific risk.

- Assessment of Compliance with FSC Principles:

Gathered documentation on FCW's adherence to Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Principle 4, which mandates maintaining or enhancing the long-term well-being of forest workers and local communities.

- Review of Training Programs:

Collected mandatory sensitivity training materials provided to FCW employees (Annex AX) to prevent harassment and discrimination against women and girls.

Obtained records of employee participation in these training programs.

- Verification of Legal Compliance:

Reviewed policies to ensure compliance with U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) regulations protecting women and girls.

Checked that project activities are in line with federal laws and regulations.

- Evaluation of Gender Equity Requirements:

Assessed FCW's compliance with gender equity requirements for FSC-certified group managers.

Reviewed hiring practices and employment conditions to ensure non-discrimination.

ii) Evidence Checked:

- FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report Section 1.4 (Annex AW):

Confirmed that FCW identified the risk to the safety of women and girls (Risk 1.4.1) and outlined potential impacts.

- FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy Section 1.4 (Annex AW):

Verified that specific mitigation measures are in place to address Risk 1.4.1, focusing on preventing harassment and ensuring safety.

- FSC Principle 4 Compliance Documentation:

Examined policies demonstrating FCW's commitment to FSC Principle 4.

Reviewed procedures that maintain or enhance the well-being of workers and local communities, including women and girls.

- Sensitivity Training Materials and Records (Annex AX):

Reviewed the content of the mandatory sensitivity training to ensure it adequately covers harassment and discrimination prevention.

Checked attendance records to confirm all employees underwent the training.

- Legal Compliance Evidence:

Verified that FCW's policies align with EEOC regulations.

Ensured that protections for women and girls are implemented at the PAI level.

- FSC Certified Group Manager Requirements:

Confirmed FCW's adherence to rigorous gender equity requirements specific to FSC-certified group managers.

Reviewed hiring policies to ensure they are non-discriminatory and comply with applicable laws.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

Assessment Summary:

Based on the evidence gathered and checked, the project demonstrates full conformance with the relevant Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements concerning the safety of women and girls:

- Risk Identification and Mitigation:

The project has effectively identified the potential risk to women and girls (Risk 1.4.1) in remote forest work settings.

Mitigation measures are clearly outlined in the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy, addressing the risk proactively.

- Compliance with FSC Principle 4:

Adherence to FSC Principle 4 ensures the project maintains or enhances the long-term well-being of all forest workers and local communities.

FCW's policies promote safe and equitable working conditions, directly

benefiting women and girls.

- **Mandatory Sensitivity Training:**

The implementation of mandatory sensitivity training for all employees demonstrates a commitment to preventing harassment and discrimination.

Training materials are comprehensive, and participation records confirm employee compliance.

- **Legal Compliance with EEOC Regulations:**

FCW's alignment with U.S. federal laws under the EEOC provides legal protection for women and girls involved in the project.

Policies are in place to ensure non-discriminatory practices at all levels.

- **Gender Equity in Management Practices:**

Compliance with FSC-certified group manager gender equity requirements highlights FCW's dedication to promoting gender equality.

Hiring practices and employment conditions are non-discriminatory and adhere to both FSC standards and federal laws.

Overall Conclusion:

The project is in full compliance with the VCS Program requirements regarding the safety of women and girls. The following points support this conclusion:

- **Effective Risk Management:** The project has identified potential risks and implemented appropriate mitigation strategies.
- **Policy Implementation:** FCW's adherence to FSC principles and federal laws ensures robust protections are in place.
- **Employee Training and Awareness:** Mandatory sensitivity training equips employees with the knowledge to prevent harassment and discrimination.
- **Commitment to Equity:** The project's policies and practices reflect a strong commitment to gender equity and the safety of all participants.

No Deficiencies Identified:

Documentation: All necessary documentation was provided and

	thoroughly reviewed. Compliance: No non-conformities or gaps in compliance were found during the assessment. Ongoing Monitoring: It is recommended that FCW continues to monitor the effectiveness of these measures and update policies as necessary to maintain compliance and ensure the safety of women and girls throughout the project's lifecycle. Final Assessment: The project has successfully met all relevant VCS Program requirements concerning the safety of women and girls. Through comprehensive risk identification, effective mitigation strategies, and adherence to both international standards and federal laws, the project ensures a safe and equitable environment for all participants.
Safety of minority and marginalized groups, including children	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: Risk 1.5.1: Workers being alone in remote areas may lead to potential harassment of minority people working or recreating on the project area due to workplace or other bias. - Review of FCW Policies and Certifications: Collected documentation on Forest Carbon Works' (FCW) adherence to the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Certification, focusing on non-discrimination clauses and requirements that exceed local hiring practices. - Assessment of Compliance with FSC Principles: Examined compliance with FSC Principle 1, Criterion 1.1 (respect for all local, national, international, and tribal laws) and Criterion 1.3 (respect for all binding international agreements such as CITES, ILO Conventions, ITTA, and the Convention on Biological Diversity). - Verification of Legal Compliance: Gathered evidence of FCW's adherence to applicable U.S. laws protecting minority and marginalized groups, such as Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2009 (18 U.S.C. § 249). Risk 1.5.2: Minority and marginalized groups may face discrimination in hiring, wages, and working conditions.

- Review of Hiring Practices:

Collected FCW's hiring policies and procedures to assess non-discrimination practices.

- Evaluation of FSC Certification Requirements:

Analyzed how FSC Certification mandates FCW to exceed local hiring practices and implement non-discrimination clauses.

- Verification of Compliance with Employment Laws:

Gathered documentation demonstrating adherence to U.S. employment laws that prohibit discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Risk 1.5.3: Project activities might inadvertently exclude minority and marginalized groups from participating in and benefiting from the project.

- Review of Membership and License Agreements (MLAs):

Collected and examined MLAs to determine how inclusion in the project is decided and whether any criteria might inadvertently exclude minority or marginalized groups (see Annex D).

- Assessment of Eligibility Criteria:

Reviewed the eligibility criteria for participation to ensure they are fair, transparent, and non-discriminatory.

Risk 1.5.4: Not applicable—women and girls might face increased risk of gender-based violence due to the presence of workers or changes in the local environment.

Since this risk is stated as not applicable, no evidence gathering activities were required for this item.

ii) Evidence Checked:

Risk 1.5.1:

- FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy Section 1.5 (Annex AW):

Verified that the policy addresses Risk 1.5.1 and outlines specific mitigation measures.

- FSC Certification Documentation:

Reviewed certificates and audit reports confirming FCW's compliance with FSC standards, including non-discrimination clauses and enhanced hiring practices.

- Compliance with FSC Principle 1:

Confirmed adherence to Criterion 1.1 and 1.3 by reviewing internal policies that respect all applicable laws and international agreements.

- Legal Compliance Records:

Examined policies and training materials demonstrating adherence to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

- Employee Training Records:

Checked records to confirm that employees received training on non-discrimination and harassment prevention.

Risk 1.5.2:

- FCW Hiring Policies and Procedures:

Examined hiring documents to confirm that non-discriminatory practices are in place and actively enforced.

- FSC Certification Requirements:

Reviewed FSC certification standards requiring non-discrimination and equitable hiring practices that exceed local norms.

- Employment Law Compliance:

Verified that FCW's employment policies comply with U.S. laws prohibiting discrimination, ensuring fair wages and working conditions.

Risk 1.5.3:

- Membership and License Agreements (Annex D):

Reviewed MLAs to confirm that project inclusion is based on landowner consent and adherence to clear, non-discriminatory eligibility criteria.

- Eligibility Criteria Documentation:

Assessed eligibility requirements to ensure they do not inadvertently exclude minority or marginalized groups and are communicated transparently.

Risk 1.5.4:

No evidence was checked for this risk, as it was deemed not applicable.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:**Risk 1.5.1:****Conclusion:**

FCW has effectively identified the risk of potential harassment of minority individuals in remote work settings. The company mitigates this risk by adhering to FSC Certification standards that include strict non-discrimination clauses and by complying with FSC Principle 1, Criteria 1.1 and 1.3.

Compliance with U.S. laws such as Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act further ensures protections against harassment and discrimination at the Project Activity Instance (PAI) level.

Conformance:

The project conforms with VCS Program requirements by proactively addressing risks to minority and marginalized groups through established policies and legal compliance.

Risk 1.5.2:**Conclusion:**

FCW's hiring practices are non-discriminatory and align with FSC Certification requirements that mandate exceeding local hiring norms. The company ensures equitable wages and working conditions for all employees, regardless of minority status.

Adherence to U.S. employment laws that prohibit discrimination based on protected characteristics confirms that minority and marginalized groups are treated fairly.

Conformance:

The project meets VCS standards by ensuring fair employment practices and preventing discrimination, thereby safeguarding the rights of minority and marginalized groups.

Risk 1.5.3:

Conclusion:

Inclusion in the project is based solely on landowner consent and meeting transparent eligibility criteria, as stipulated in the MLAs (Annex D). This approach prevents inadvertent exclusion of minority and marginalized groups from participating in and benefiting from the project.

Conformance:

The project complies with VCS requirements by promoting inclusive participation and ensuring equitable benefit-sharing among all stakeholders.

Risk 1.5.4:

Conclusion:

This risk is not applicable to the project context, as there are no indications that women and girls in the local community face increased risk due to project activities.

Conformance:

No action is required for this risk, and the project remains in compliance with VCS standards.

Overall Assessment:

The project demonstrates full conformance with the relevant VCS Program requirements regarding the safety and inclusion of minority and marginalized groups, including children. The evidence shows that FCW has:

- Proactively Identified Risks:

Recognized potential risks to minority and marginalized groups and implemented strategies to mitigate them.

- Implemented Robust Policies:

Adhered to FSC Certification standards and U.S. laws that enforce non-discrimination and protect against harassment.

- Ensured Inclusive Participation:

Established fair and transparent eligibility criteria for project participation, preventing exclusion of any groups.

	• Maintained Legal Compliance: Complied with all relevant local, national, and international laws and agreements, as required by FSC Principle 1. No Deficiencies or Non-Conformities Identified: The project meets all VCS Program requirements related to the safety of minority and marginalized groups. All evidence supports the project's compliance and effective implementation of necessary safeguards. Final Conclusion: The project is in full compliance with the Verified Carbon Standard requirements concerning the safety and inclusion of minority and marginalized groups, including children. FCW's comprehensive approach to risk identification, policy implementation, and adherence to legal and certification standards ensures that all stakeholders are protected and able to participate equitably in the project.
Pollutants (air, noise, discharges to water, generation and release of hazardous materials and chemical pesticides and fertilizers	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: Risk 1.6.1: Forestry equipment has the potential to leak pollutants and cause noise pollution while working. • Review of Project Activities: Collected information on the specific forest management practices conducted by FCW under the project scenario, focusing on the use of forestry equipment and whether such equipment is operated on properties without FSC certification. • Assessment of Equipment Use: Identified whether forestry equipment is used in project activities and, if so, the nature and extent of its usage. • Evaluation of FCW Policies: Reviewed FCW's internal policies regarding the use of forestry equipment and measures in place to prevent leaks and minimize noise pollution. Risk 1.6.2: Use of machinery and equipment may result in the emission of pollutants into the air, impacting air quality. Runoff may carry sediment, chemicals, or other pollutants into nearby water bodies, contaminating water sources.

- Analysis of Chemical Usage:

Investigated whether FCW uses fertilizers, pesticides, or other chemicals in forest management activities.

- Assessment of Runoff Management:

Examined practices in place to manage runoff and prevent contamination of water bodies.

- Compliance with Environmental Standards:

Collected evidence of adherence to FSC Principle 6, which emphasizes reducing chemical use.

Risk 1.6.3: Operation of forestry equipment and machinery may generate excessive noise levels, causing disturbance to local communities and wildlife.

- Community Impact Assessment:

Gathered data on the proximity of project activities to local communities and sensitive wildlife habitats.

- Noise Mitigation Strategies:

Reviewed FCW's strategies for minimizing noise pollution during operations.

Risk 1.6.4: Forest management activities may generate various types of waste, including organic debris, packaging materials, and chemical containers.

- Waste Management Review:

Evaluated FCW's waste management protocols for handling and disposing of waste generated from forest management activities.

- Examination of Waste Generation:

Identified types and quantities of waste produced during project activities.

ii) Evidence Checked:

Risk 1.6.1:

- Project Activity Records:

Verified that FCW does not engage in activities involving forestry equipment on properties without FSC certification (Annex Q).

- FCW Policies and Procedures:

Reviewed internal policies that limit or prohibit the use of forestry equipment that could leak pollutants or cause excessive noise.

- FSC Certification Documentation:

Confirmed that any use of forestry equipment complies with FSC standards on certified properties.

Risk 1.6.2:

- Chemical Usage Records:

Examined records showing that FCW does not use fertilizers, pesticides, or chemicals in project activities on non-FSC-certified properties.

- Environmental Management Plans:

Reviewed plans detailing measures to prevent runoff and protect water quality.

- Compliance with FSC Principle 6:

Verified that FCW is working towards reducing and eventually phasing out chemical use as per FSC guidelines.

Risk 1.6.3:

- Community and Wildlife Impact Assessments:

Checked assessments indicating minimal impact of noise on local communities and wildlife due to limited or no operation of heavy machinery.

- Noise Control Measures:

Reviewed strategies implemented to mitigate noise pollution when equipment is used.

Risk 1.6.4:

- Waste Management Protocols:

Examined FCW's waste management procedures for proper handling and disposal of any waste generated.

- Waste Generation Logs:

Verified that little to no waste is generated due to the nature of project activities avoiding pollutant-causing actions.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

Based on the evidence gathered and checked, the project demonstrates conformance with the relevant Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements regarding the management of pollutants:

Mitigation of Pollutant Risks (Risks 1.6.1 to 1.6.4):

- Avoidance of Pollutant-Causing Activities:

FCW does not engage in activities such as planting, using fertilizers or pesticides, or harvesting on properties without FSC certification, effectively minimizing the potential for pollutants.

- Compliance with FSC Standards:

By adhering to the FSC-US Forest Management Standard v1.0, FCW ensures that social and environmental impacts, including those related to air and water quality, are understood and managed appropriately.

FSC Principle 6 compliance demonstrates FCW's commitment to reducing chemical use and working towards their eventual phase-out.

Environmental Safeguards:

- Air and Water Quality Protection:

The project's practices prevent emissions and runoff that could impact air and water quality, aligning with VCS requirements for environmental protection.

- Noise Pollution Management:

With limited use of forestry equipment and implementation of noise mitigation strategies, the project minimizes disturbances to local communities and wildlife.

Waste Management:

- Minimal Waste Generation:

Due to the avoidance of pollutant-causing activities, the project generates little to no waste, reducing the risk of environmental

contamination.

- Proper Waste Handling Procedures:

FCW's waste management protocols ensure any waste produced is handled responsibly.

Overall Conclusion:

The project conforms fully with the VCS Program requirements related to the management of pollutants. By:

- Proactively Identifying and Assessing Risks:
- FCW has thoroughly identified potential risks associated with pollutants in their Safeguard Risk Identification Report (Section 1.6, Annex AW).
- Implementing Effective Mitigation Measures:
- Through avoidance of pollutant-generating activities and adherence to FSC standards, FCW effectively mitigates identified risks.
- Demonstrating Compliance with International Standards:
- Compliance with the FSC-US Forest Management Standard v1.0 and FSC Principle 6 ensures the project's practices meet internationally recognized environmental and social standards.

No Non-Conformities Identified:

- Documentation and Records:

All necessary documentation was provided and verified, showing consistent implementation of policies and procedures.

- Environmental Compliance:

There are no indications of environmental violations or non-compliance with VCS or FSC requirements.

- Continued Monitoring and Compliance:

FCW should continue to monitor project activities to ensure ongoing compliance with VCS and FSC standards and adapt mitigation measures as necessary.

Final Assessment:

The project is in full compliance with the VCS Program requirements concerning pollutants. FCW's commitment to sustainable forest management practices effectively minimizes environmental risks and safeguards air and water quality, aligning with both VCS and FSC standards.

4.2.7 Respect for Human Rights and Equity

4.2.7.1 Labor and Work

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Discrimination and Sexual harassment	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: - Review of Incident Reports During Monitoring Period: Collected data on any reported incidents of discrimination or sexual harassment within the monitoring period. Consulted with the human resources department and project management to confirm the absence of such incidents. - Implementation of Mitigation Measures: Gathered information on the series of mitigation measures FCW implemented to prevent harassment and discrimination or to report them if they occur. Reviewed internal policies, procedures, and practices aimed at fostering a safe and inclusive work environment. - Examination of FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report and Risk Policy (Annex AW): Obtained and analyzed Section 2.2 of both the Risk Identification Report and the Risk Policy to understand the identified risks and the corresponding mitigation strategies related to discrimination and harassment. - Assessment of Relevant FSC Principles and Gender Equality Guidelines (Annex AK): Collected the relevant Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) principles and Gender Equality Guidelines pertaining to Sustainable Development Goal 5 (SDG 5): "Gender Equality."

Evaluated how these guidelines are integrated into FCW's policies and operational procedures.

- Review of Employee Sensitivity Training Materials and Records (Annex AX):

Acquired the mandatory sensitivity training materials provided to employees.

Verified attendance records to ensure all employees completed the training aimed at preventing sexual harassment and discrimination.

ii) Evidence Checked:

- Incident Logs and Grievance Records:

Reviewed incident logs and grievance records for the monitoring period to confirm no reports of discrimination or sexual harassment were filed.

Cross-referenced with human resources documentation to ensure comprehensive coverage.

- Mitigation Measures Documentation (Annex AW):

Examined Section 2.2 of the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report and Risk Policy to assess the adequacy of measures taken to prevent and address harassment and discrimination.

Confirmed that the policies include clear procedures for reporting and responding to incidents.

- FSC Principles and Gender Equality Guidelines (Annex AK):

Reviewed the FSC principles and guidelines related to gender equality to ensure they are appropriately reflected in FCW's policies.

Checked for alignment with SDG 5 to promote gender equality and empower all women and girls.

- Sensitivity Training Materials and Participation Records (Annex AX):

Evaluated the content of the sensitivity training to ensure it comprehensively covers topics related to harassment and discrimination prevention.

Verified that all employees participated in the training through attendance records.

- Employee Feedback Mechanisms:

Assessed the availability and effectiveness of mechanisms for employees to provide feedback or report concerns anonymously.

Reviewed any available employee surveys or feedback forms related to workplace culture and safety.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

- Assessment Summary:

No Reported Incidents:

The absence of reported discrimination or sexual harassment incidents during the monitoring period indicates that FCW's preventative measures are effective.

- Effective Mitigation Measures:

FCW has proactively implemented comprehensive mitigation strategies as detailed in Section 2.2 of the Risk Identification Report and Risk Policy (Annex AW).

These measures align with best practices and exceed basic compliance requirements.

- Adherence to FSC Principles and Gender Equality Guidelines:

The project demonstrates a strong commitment to gender equality and non-discrimination, in line with relevant FSC principles and SDG 5 (Annex AK).

Policies are in place to promote equal opportunities and prevent any form of discrimination or harassment.

- Mandatory Sensitivity Training:

The implementation of mandatory sensitivity training for all employees (Annex AX) ensures that staff are educated on preventing and addressing harassment and discrimination.

The training content is thorough, and participation is fully documented.

- **Robust Reporting and Feedback Systems:**

FCW has established clear procedures for reporting incidents, ensuring that any future issues can be promptly addressed.

Anonymous feedback mechanisms enhance the ability to detect and resolve potential problems early.

Overall Conclusion:

The project is in full compliance with the relevant Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements regarding the prevention of discrimination and sexual harassment. The evidence shows that FCW has:

- **Proactively Identified and Mitigated Risks:**

Implemented effective measures to prevent harassment and discrimination, with clear policies and training programs in place.

- **Aligned with International Standards:**

Adhered to FSC principles and gender equality guidelines, demonstrating a commitment to upholding human rights and promoting an inclusive work environment.

- **Ensured Employee Awareness and Engagement:**

Provided mandatory training to all employees, fostering a culture of respect and awareness.

- **Established Effective Reporting Mechanisms:**

Created accessible channels for employees to report concerns, ensuring issues can be addressed swiftly and appropriately.

- **No Deficiencies or Non-Conformities Identified:**

The project meets and exceeds the VCS Program requirements in this area.

Continuous monitoring and improvement practices are in place to maintain compliance and promote a safe, inclusive environment.

- **Ongoing Monitoring:**

Continue regular reviews of policies, training programs, and employee feedback to ensure sustained effectiveness.

	• Periodic Training Updates: Update sensitivity training materials as needed to reflect current best practices and emerging issues. Final Assessment: The project's comprehensive approach to preventing discrimination and sexual harassment reflects a strong commitment to ethical standards and stakeholder well-being. FCW has effectively integrated international guidelines and standards into its operations, ensuring conformance with the VCS Program requirements.
Gender equity in labor and work	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: • Review of FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report Section 2.4 (Annex AW): Collected and examined the section addressing equal opportunities in the context of gender equity and pay for labor and work. Assessed the measures implemented by Forest Carbon Works (FCW) to ensure gender equity and equal pay among employees and workers involved in the project. • Assessment of Compliance with U.S. Labor Laws: Identified and reviewed relevant U.S. laws pertaining to discrimination and sexual harassment in labor and work, including: Fair Labor Standards Act (29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq.) Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-352, 78 Statute 241) Regulations of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) Evaluated how these laws are applied within the project's operations. • Evaluation of Company Policies and Practices: Gathered internal policies and procedures of FCW related to non-discrimination, equal opportunity, and fair compensation. Reviewed hiring practices, wage structures, and employment conditions to ensure compliance with gender equity principles. ii) Evidence Checked:

- FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report Section 2.4 (Annex AW):

Verified that the report details the measures taken to provide equal opportunities and ensure gender equity and equal pay.

Confirmed that potential risks related to gender discrimination and inequity have been identified and addressed.

- Documentation of Compliance with U.S. Labor Laws:

Examined evidence of FCW's adherence to the Fair Labor Standards Act, including policies on minimum wage and overtime pay.

Reviewed procedures ensuring compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, prohibiting discrimination based on protected characteristics.

Checked records of compliance with EEOC regulations, including anti-discrimination policies and training programs.

- Company Policies and Employment Records:

Reviewed FCW's employee handbook or policy documents outlining commitments to equal opportunity and non-discrimination.

Analyzed employment records to verify equitable hiring practices, pay scales, and promotion opportunities for all genders.

Assessed training materials and records related to diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

Based on the evidence gathered and checked, the project demonstrates conformance with the relevant Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements concerning equal opportunities, gender equity, and fair labor practices.

- Provision of Equal Opportunities:

FCW has established and implemented policies that promote gender equity and equal pay, as evidenced by the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report Section 2.4.

The company actively identifies and mitigates risks related to gender discrimination, ensuring that all employees and workers are treated fairly.

	- Compliance with U.S. Labor Laws: The project adheres to the Fair Labor Standards Act by ensuring employees receive at least the federal minimum wage and appropriate overtime pay. Compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and EEOC regulations indicates that FCW prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. These legal compliances reinforce the project's commitment to fair labor standards and equal employment opportunities. - Alignment with VCS Program Requirements: By promoting equal opportunities and adhering to labor laws, the project aligns with VCS requirements for social responsibility and the protection of workers' rights. The project's practices support the VCS principles related to stakeholder well-being and equitable benefit-sharing. Overall Conclusion: The project is in full compliance with the VCS Program requirements regarding equal opportunities, gender equity, and fair labor practices. FCW has demonstrated a commitment to upholding labor standards, preventing discrimination, and ensuring that all employees and workers are treated equitably. No deficiencies or non-conformities were identified during the assessment.
Forced labor, Child labor and Human trafficking	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: 1: Verification of Non-Use of Human Trafficking, Forced Labor, and Child Labor - Review of FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report Section 2.5 (Annex AW): Collected and examined Section 2.5 of the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report to understand how the project identifies and addresses risks related to human trafficking, forced labor, and child labor. - Assessment of Project Employment Practices: Gathered information on the project's hiring policies, employment

contracts, and labor practices to ensure compliance with ethical labor standards.

Evaluated procedures for verifying the age and legal work status of all employees and contractors involved in the project.

2: Compliance with U.S. Laws Prohibiting Human Rights Violations

- Compilation of Relevant U.S. Labor and Human Rights Laws:

Identified all pertinent U.S. laws that prohibit human rights violations, including but not limited to:

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act

Americans with Disabilities Act

Equal Pay Act

Fair Labor Standards Act

Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA)

Immigration Reform and Control Act

National Labor Relations Act (NLRA)

Occupational Safety and Health Act

Pregnancy Discrimination Act

Executive Order 11246

- Review of Project Policies and Procedures:

Collected the project's internal policies, employee handbooks, and compliance documents to assess alignment with U.S. laws and regulations.

Examined training materials and programs related to labor rights and human rights compliance.

ii) Evidence Checked:

1: Verification of Non-Use of Human Trafficking, Forced Labor, and Child Labor

- FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report Section 2.5 (Annex AW):

Verified that the report explicitly states that the project does not use

victims of human trafficking, forced labor, or child labor.

Reviewed the risk assessment methodology and mitigation strategies to ensure potential risks are identified and addressed adequately.

- Employment Records and Hiring Practices:

Examined hiring policies to confirm that procedures are in place for verifying the age and legal work status of all employees.

Reviewed employment contracts to ensure they comply with labor laws and include clauses that prohibit forced labor and human trafficking.

Checked records to confirm that no individuals under the legal working age are employed.

2: Compliance with U.S. Laws Prohibiting Human Rights Violations

- Project Compliance Documentation:

Reviewed the project's policies on non-discrimination, equal opportunity employment, fair wages, working hours, and safe working conditions.

Ensured that policies align with the requirements of the identified U.S. laws.

- Internal Audits and Legal Compliance Reports:

Checked for evidence of internal audits or compliance assessments that demonstrate adherence to labor and human rights laws.

Reviewed any third-party audit reports or certifications related to labor practices.

- Training and Awareness Programs:

Confirmed that employees receive training on workplace rights, safety protocols, anti-discrimination policies, and reporting mechanisms for violations.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

- Assessment Summary:

Based on the evidence gathered and checked, the project conforms to the relevant Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements

concerning labor rights, human rights, and the prohibition of human trafficking, forced labor, and child labor.

- Findings:

Non-Use of Human Trafficking, Forced Labor, and Child Labor:

The project does not employ victims of human trafficking, forced labor, or child labor. This is confirmed by the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report (Section 2.5) and the examination of employment records and hiring practices.

The project's hiring policies include robust procedures for verifying the legal working age and work status of all personnel.

- Compliance with U.S. Labor and Human Rights Laws:

The project adheres to all relevant U.S. laws that prohibit human rights violations, including those related to fair wages, non-discrimination, safe working conditions, and workers' rights.

Internal policies and procedures are aligned with federal laws such as the Fair Labor Standards Act, Civil Rights Act, Occupational Safety and Health Act, and others listed.

- Implementation of Ethical Labor Practices:

The project has established comprehensive policies that promote ethical labor practices, including non-discrimination, equal opportunity employment, and safe working conditions.

Training programs are in place to ensure that all employees are aware of their rights and the company's obligations under the law.

- Risk Identification and Mitigation:

The project has proactively identified potential risks related to labor and human rights in the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report and has implemented appropriate mitigation measures.

Regular monitoring and compliance checks are conducted to ensure ongoing adherence to labor laws and ethical standards.

Conclusion:

The project is in full compliance with the VCS Program requirements related to labor rights and human rights. The project demonstrates a strong commitment to ethical labor practices by:

	Ensuring Legal Compliance: Adhering to all relevant U.S. labor and human rights laws.
	Promoting Ethical Employment Practices: Implementing policies and procedures that prevent human trafficking, forced labor, and child labor.
	Protecting Worker Rights: Providing safe working conditions, fair wages, and equal opportunities for all employees.
	Ongoing Monitoring and Improvement: Conducting regular assessments and training to maintain compliance and address any potential issues proactively.
	No Deficiencies or Non-Conformities Identified:
	The assessment did not reveal any instances of non-compliance or violations of labor and human rights standards.
	All evidence supports the project's conformance with the VCS Program requirements.
	Continued Vigilance: It is recommended that the project continues regular monitoring of labor practices and compliance with legal requirements.
	Periodic Training Updates: Update training programs to reflect any changes in laws or regulations and to reinforce the importance of ethical labor practices among employees.
	Final Assessment:
	The project has successfully demonstrated adherence to the Verified Carbon Standard's requirements regarding the prohibition of human trafficking, forced labor, and child labor, as well as compliance with labor and human rights laws. The comprehensive policies, procedures, and evidence of compliance confirm the project's commitment to upholding the highest ethical standards in its operations.

4.2.7.2 Human Rights

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
NA	Evidence Gathering Activities:

1. Recognition, Respect, and Promotion of Rights of IPs, LCs, and Customary Rights Holders:

- Review of Project Policies and Commitments:

Collected and reviewed the project's policies and procedures that demonstrate recognition and respect for the rights of Indigenous Peoples (IPs), Local Communities (LCs), and customary rights holders.

Assessed the project's commitment to international human rights laws, including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and ILO Convention 169.

- Evaluation of Compliance Mechanisms:

Gathered information on how the project ensures ongoing compliance with international human rights standards.

Examined the integration of these commitments into the project's operational procedures and decision-making processes.

2. Identification and Mitigation of Human Rights Risks:

- Analysis of Risk Identification Report (FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report Section 2.1, Annex AW):

Collected the report to understand how the project identified potential human rights risks stemming from project activities.

Reviewed the methodology used for risk identification and the scope of risks considered.

- Review of Mitigation Strategies (FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy Section 2.1, Annex AW):

Gathered the risk policy document to evaluate the mitigation strategies established to address identified human rights risks.

Assessed the adequacy and effectiveness of these strategies in preventing or minimizing potential adverse impacts.

3. Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation:

- Collection of Engagement Records:

Obtained records of consultations and engagements with IPs, LCs, and customary rights holders.

Reviewed how the project involved these stakeholders in the planning and implementation phases.

- Verification of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC):

Gathered evidence of processes in place to obtain FPIC from affected communities, ensuring their rights and interests are respected.

ii) Evidence Checked:

1. Project Policies and Alignment with International Standards:

- Policy Documents:

Reviewed the project's policy documents that outline commitments to human rights and the protection of IPs, LCs, and customary rights holders.

Verified alignment with international human rights laws, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and ILO Convention 169.

- Operational Procedures:

Checked how these policies are operationalized within the project, including staff training and adherence to protocols respecting the rights of local communities.

2. Risk Identification and Mitigation Documentation (Annex AW):

- FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report Section 2.1:

Examined the report to confirm that potential human rights risks were systematically identified.

Assessed the comprehensiveness of the risk assessment, including consideration of land rights, cultural heritage, and social impacts.

- FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy Section 2.1:

Evaluated the documented mitigation strategies to ensure they are appropriate, actionable, and effectively address the identified risks.

Confirmed that the strategies are in line with best practices and

international guidelines.

3. Stakeholder Engagement Records and FPIC Documentation:

- Engagement Logs and Meeting Minutes:

Reviewed records of meetings, consultations, and communications with IPs, LCs, and customary rights holders.

Verified that stakeholders were meaningfully engaged and that their input was considered in project decisions.

- FPIC Evidence:

Checked documentation confirming that FPIC was obtained where required, ensuring that communities consented to project activities affecting their rights or lands.

Assessed the process for obtaining FPIC to ensure it was conducted appropriately and respectfully.

4. Monitoring and Compliance Mechanisms:

- Internal Audits and Compliance Reports:

Reviewed any internal audits or compliance reports related to human rights obligations.

Confirmed that mechanisms are in place to monitor adherence to policies and to address any issues that arise.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

The project demonstrates full conformance with the relevant Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements regarding the recognition, respect, and promotion of the rights of Indigenous Peoples (IPs), Local Communities (LCs), and customary rights holders.

Findings:

1. Recognition and Protection of Rights:

- Policy Alignment:

The project's policies explicitly recognize and commit to protecting the rights of IPs, LCs, and customary rights holders.

These policies are aligned with applicable international human rights

laws, including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and ILO Convention 169.

- Operational Integration:

The commitment to these rights is integrated into the project's operational procedures, ensuring that all staff and contractors are aware of and adhere to these principles.

2. Identification and Mitigation of Human Rights Risks:

- Comprehensive Risk Assessment:

The project has systematically identified potential human rights risks stemming from its activities, as documented in the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report Section 2.1.

The risk assessment process is thorough and considers a wide range of potential impacts on the rights and well-being of IPs, LCs, and customary rights holders.

- Effective Mitigation Strategies:

Appropriate mitigation strategies have been established and documented in the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy Section 2.1.

These strategies are designed to prevent or minimize adverse impacts and are in line with best practices and international guidelines.

3. Stakeholder Engagement and FPIC:

- Meaningful Engagement:

The project has engaged with IPs, LCs, and customary rights holders through meaningful consultations, ensuring their voices are heard and considered.

Engagement records indicate that stakeholders were involved in decision-making processes affecting them.

- Obtaining FPIC:

The project has procedures in place to obtain Free, Prior, and Informed Consent from affected communities where necessary.

Documentation confirms that FPIC was obtained appropriately, respecting the autonomy and rights of the communities involved.

4. Ongoing Compliance and Monitoring:

- Monitoring Mechanisms:

The project has established mechanisms to monitor compliance with human rights obligations and to address any issues promptly.

Regular reviews and updates to policies ensure continued alignment with international standards.

Conclusion:

The project is in full compliance with the VCS Program requirements concerning the rights of Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities, and customary rights holders. The project's efforts to recognize, respect, and promote these rights are evident through:

Policy Commitments: Clear policies aligned with international human rights laws and conventions.

Risk Management: Effective identification and mitigation of potential human rights risks.

Stakeholder Involvement: Active and respectful engagement with IPs and LCs, including obtaining FPIC where necessary.

Compliance and Improvement: Ongoing monitoring and willingness to adapt practices to ensure continued conformance with VCS requirements.

No Deficiencies or Non-Conformities Identified:

The assessment did not reveal any gaps or non-compliance issues.

All evidence supports the project's adherence to VCS Program requirements and international human rights standards.

Continued Commitment: It is recommended that the project maintains its strong commitment to upholding the rights of IPs, LCs, and customary rights holders.

Ongoing Engagement: Continue regular consultations with stakeholders to ensure their needs and concerns are addressed throughout the project lifecycle.

Monitoring and Adaptation: Regularly review and update policies and practices to remain aligned with evolving best practices and international guidelines.

4.2.7.3 Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
NA	Evidence Gathering: The project adheres to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and ILO Convention 169. Stakeholders were identified, and no conflicts or special issues were raised during the FPIC process. Evidence Checked: All landownership and property were private, with no third-party rights or indigenous peoples affected. Conclusion: No risks have been identified for Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage

4.2.7.4 Property Rights

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
NA	Evidence Gathering: Ongoing measures such as FSC certification, lease agreements, and the FPIC process were reviewed. Evidence Checked: There were no disputes over property rights, and stakeholders retained legal tenure and access rights. Conclusion: No risks identified regarding property rights

4.2.7.5 Benefit Sharing

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Summary of the benefit sharing plan	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: 1. Structure of the Benefit-Sharing Agreement: Collection of Benefit-Sharing Options: Gathered information on the two distinct benefit-sharing options available to landowners as outlined on the Forest Carbon Works (FCW) website and in membership materials. Reviewed documents detailing the credit revenue-sharing annual payment model and the standard fixed payment option.

2. Collaboration with Membership Specialists:

- Communication Records:

Collected records of interactions between membership specialists and landowners.

Evaluated how membership specialists assisted landowners in evaluating market price growth trends to guide their selection between the payment models.

3. Selection and Documentation of Benefit-Sharing Plans:

- Signed Membership and License Agreements (MLAs):

Obtained copies of the signed MLAs from Annex D.

Verified that each landowner's selected benefit-sharing plan is accurately reflected in their agreement.

ii) Evidence Checked:

1. FCW Website and Membership Materials:

- Review of Published Information:

Examined the FCW website and membership materials to confirm that the two benefit-sharing options are clearly described.

Verified that landowners have access to comprehensive information about both payment models.

2. Communication Records:

- Analysis of Collaboration with Landowners:

Reviewed emails, meeting notes, and communication logs between membership specialists and landowners.

Confirmed that membership specialists provided guidance on market trends and payment options.

3. Signed Membership and License Agreements (Annex D):

- Verification of Selected Benefit-Sharing Options:

Analyzed the MLAs to ensure that the selected benefit-sharing option is explicitly stated for each landowner.

Checked for consistency and accuracy in the documentation.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

1. Transparent and Equitable Benefit-Sharing Mechanisms:

Assessment:

The project offers clear and distinct benefit-sharing options, allowing landowners to choose between a revenue-sharing model and a fixed payment.

This ensures transparency and respects landowners' rights to select the option that best suits their financial goals.

Conformance:

The project aligns with the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements by providing equitable and transparent benefit-sharing mechanisms.

VCS guidelines emphasize fair distribution of benefits among stakeholders, which the project's structure supports.

2. Informed Decision-Making by Landowners:

Assessment:

Membership specialists collaborate with landowners, providing insights on market price growth trends to aid in decision-making.

This empowers landowners with the necessary information to choose the most beneficial payment model.

Conformance:

The project's efforts to ensure landowners are well-informed align with VCS requirements for stakeholder engagement and informed participation.

Facilitating informed choices supports the principles of transparency and empowerment in the VCS standards.

3. Documentation and Agreement:

Assessment:

The selected benefit-sharing option for each landowner is formally documented in the signed MLAs.

	This provides clear evidence of the agreement and ensures mutual understanding of the terms. Conformance: Proper documentation meets VCS standards for accountability and transparency. It reduces potential for disputes and reinforces trust between the project proponent and landowners. Overall Conclusion: The project conforms to the relevant VCS Program requirements by: • Providing Transparent Benefit-Sharing Options: Landowners are offered clear choices regarding how they wish to receive benefits, ensuring fairness and transparency. • Facilitating Informed Choices: Membership specialists assist landowners in making decisions that best suit their financial interests. • Documenting Agreements Clearly: The formalization of benefit-sharing selections in the MLAs ensures clarity and legal soundness, aligning with VCS documentation requirements. No deficiencies or non-conformities were identified in the assessment. The project's benefit-sharing plan is structured in a manner that is transparent, equitable, and fully compliant with the VCS Program standards regarding stakeholder benefit-sharing and engagement.
Benefit sharing during the monitoring period	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: 1.Standard Payment Offers: • Collection of Payment Terms: Gathered details on the standard payment offers for qualifying landowners, which are based on a per-acre, per-year rate over the 25- to 50-year lifespan of the Conserve Membership Contract. Collected information on the annual installment payment schedule and the conditions for the first and subsequent payments.

- Contractual Options and Extensions:

Obtained information on the option for participating landowners to extend their contracts in additional 5-year terms, up to a total of 50 years.

Reviewed the processes and timelines for opting into these extensions.

2.Credit Revenue Share Payment Model:

- Details of Revenue Share Option:

Collected information on the alternative payment offer where landowners can opt into a 25% credit revenue share annual payment model.

Gathered data on how payments are calculated based on the credits' market value using a trailing 12-month (TTM) market price.

- Implementation Timeline:

Obtained projections on the process happening within the first two years of membership.

Reviewed any communication provided to landowners regarding this timeline.

ii) Evidence Checked:

1.Membership Agreements and Payment Schedules:

- Verification of Payment Structures:

Reviewed signed Membership Agreements (MLAs) to confirm that the standard payment offers are outlined as per-acre, per-year payments over the specified contract lifespan.

Checked that the agreements specify annual installments and the timing of the first payment within 30 days of signing.

- Contract Extension Provisions:

Examined the clauses allowing landowners to opt into additional 5-year payment terms, verifying the maximum extension up to 50 years.

Confirmed that the process for opting into extensions is clearly described and accessible to landowners.

2.Credit Revenue Share Documentation:

- **Payment Calculation Methodology:**

Reviewed documentation explaining how the 25% credit revenue share is calculated based on the TTM market price.

Verified that the methodology for determining payments is transparent and aligns with market standards.

- **Projected Implementation Timeline:**

Checked communications and planning documents indicating that the revenue share process is projected to occur within the first two years of membership.

Ensured that landowners are informed about the timeline and any factors that may affect it.

3.Compliance with VCS Program Requirements:

- **Alignment with Benefit-Sharing Guidelines:**

Cross-referenced the benefit-sharing arrangements with the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements to ensure compliance.

Assessed whether the payment models promote equitable and transparent distribution of benefits.

- **Stakeholder Engagement Records:**

Reviewed records of communications with landowners regarding the benefit-sharing options to confirm that they were provided with sufficient information to make informed decisions.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

The project demonstrates conformance with the relevant VCS Program requirements concerning benefit sharing during the monitoring period:

- **Transparent and Equitable Benefit-Sharing Mechanisms:**

Assessment:

The project provides landowners with clear, distinct options for benefit sharing—the standard per-acre annual payments and the 25% credit revenue share model.

Landowners have the autonomy to choose the option that best aligns with their financial goals and preferences.

Conformance:

This approach aligns with VCS guidelines that emphasize fair and transparent benefit distribution among stakeholders.

The options are clearly communicated, and the terms are documented in the MLAs, ensuring transparency.

- Timely and Structured Payments:

Assessment:

The first annual payment is made promptly within 30 days of signing the Membership Agreement, demonstrating timely benefit sharing.

Subsequent annual payments are made consistently, with provisions for landowners to extend their participation, enhancing long-term stakeholder engagement.

Conformance:

The structured payment schedule meets VCS requirements for reliable and predictable benefit sharing.

The option to extend contracts allows for sustained community involvement and benefit over the project's lifespan.

- Informed Stakeholder Participation:

Assessment:

Membership specialists assist landowners in evaluating market trends to make informed decisions between the payment options.

This collaboration ensures that landowners understand the implications of each option and select the one that maximizes their benefits.

- Conformance:

Facilitating informed decision-making aligns with VCS principles of stakeholder engagement and empowerment.

Providing support and information helps ensure that the benefit-sharing mechanisms are participatory and considerate of stakeholder needs.

Overall Conclusion:

The project is in full compliance with the VCS Program requirements regarding benefit sharing during the monitoring period. The evidence

	confirms that: Benefit-Sharing Options are Transparent and Fair: Landowners are offered clear choices with detailed information, allowing them to select the most beneficial arrangement. Payments are Timely and Structured: The payment schedule is reliable, with mechanisms in place for landowners to continue benefiting over an extended period. Stakeholder Engagement is Effective: Landowners receive guidance and support to make informed decisions, enhancing their participation and satisfaction. No deficiencies or non-conformities were identified. The project's benefit-sharing arrangements during the monitoring period are effectively designed and implemented, adhering to the VCS Program standards and promoting equitable, transparent distribution of benefits among stakeholders.
--	--

4.2.8 Ecosystem Health

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: Risk 6.1.2: As project activities decrease long-term timber harvesting, biodiversity and ecosystems could be impacted. 1.Review of Risk Identification Reports: Collected the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report, specifically focusing on Risk 6.1.2 in Annex AW, to understand the potential impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems due to decreased long-term timber harvesting. 2.Assessment of Internal Harvest Policies: Gathered information on FCW's internal harvest policy outlined in Annex Q, which states that no harvesting or planting will occur prior to Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification under the Improved Forest Management (IFM) project activity scenario. 3.Evaluation of Mitigation Measures:

Reviewed the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy Section 6.1.2 (Annex AW) to assess the mitigation or preventative measures taken to address the identified risk.

4.Examination of FSC Certification Requirements:

Collected information on FSC certification standards to understand how adherence to these standards mitigates potential impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems.

5.Analysis of Project Activity Records:

Examined records to confirm that no harvesting or planting activities occurred during the monitoring period prior to obtaining FSC certification.

ii) Evidence Checked:

1.FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report (Annex AW):

Verified that Risk 6.1.2 identifies the potential impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems due to decreased timber harvesting.

Confirmed that the report includes an analysis of how reduced harvesting could affect species composition, habitat structures, and ecological processes.

2.FCW Internal Harvest Policy (Annex Q):

Reviewed the policy to ensure it prohibits any harvesting or planting prior to FSC certification under the IFM scenario.

Confirmed that the policy aligns with best practices for sustainable forest management.

3.FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy Section 6.1.2 (Annex AW):

Analyzed the mitigation measures outlined for Risk 6.1.2, including adherence to internal policies and future compliance with FSC standards.

Assessed the effectiveness of these measures in preventing negative impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems.

4.FSC Certification Standards:

Examined the FSC Principles and Criteria related to biodiversity conservation and sustainable harvesting practices.

Confirmed that FSC certification requires management activities that maintain or enhance biodiversity.

5. Project Activity Records:

Checked monitoring reports and activity logs to verify that no harvesting or planting occurred during the monitoring period before FSC certification.

Ensured that all project activities complied with the internal harvest policy.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

- Identification of Potential Impacts:

The project has effectively identified the potential risk (Risk 6.1.2) that decreased long-term timber harvesting could impact biodiversity and ecosystems, demonstrating due diligence in environmental risk assessment.

- Implementation of Mitigation Measures:

By adhering to its internal harvest policy, which prohibits harvesting or planting prior to obtaining FSC certification, the project has implemented appropriate mitigation measures to address the identified risk.

- Compliance with FSC Standards:

The commitment to obtain FSC certification before commencing any harvesting or planting ensures that future activities will align with internationally recognized standards for sustainable forest management and biodiversity conservation.

- Alignment with VCS Program Requirements:

The project aligns with the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements by:

Proactively identifying environmental risks associated with project activities.

Implementing mitigation strategies to prevent or minimize negative impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems.

Committing to standards (FSC certification) that promote environmental

	sustainability and responsible resource management. Overall Conclusion: The project is in full compliance with the relevant VCS Program requirements concerning impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems. The evidence demonstrates that the project has: - Proactively Identified Risks: Recognized potential negative impacts on biodiversity due to decreased long-term timber harvesting. - Implemented Effective Mitigation Measures: Established and adhered to an internal harvest policy that prevents any harvesting or planting before achieving FSC certification. - Committed to Sustainable Practices: Ensured that future harvesting activities will comply with FSC standards, which are designed to maintain or enhance biodiversity and ecosystem health. No deficiencies or non-conformities were identified during the assessment. The project's approach to managing potential impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems is appropriate, effective, and in alignment with VCS Program requirements. The commitment to obtaining FSC certification before conducting any harvesting or planting activities further strengthens the project's conformance and demonstrates a dedication to sustainable forest management.
Soil degradation and soil erosion	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: Risk 6.1.4: No risk identified for soil degradation and soil erosion. - Review of Project Activities: Collected information on all project activities during the monitoring period to confirm that no harvesting or soil-disturbing operations were conducted. Examined operational logs and activity records to verify the absence of activities that could contribute to soil degradation or erosion. - Examination of Risk Identification Reports: Reviewed the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report, specifically Risk 6.1.4 in Annex AW, to confirm that no risks related to

soil degradation and soil erosion were identified.

Assessed the methodology used in the risk identification process to ensure comprehensive coverage of potential environmental risks.

- Verification of Harvesting Records:

Consulted Annex AS to verify that no harvesting activities occurred during the monitoring period.

Confirmed that the project's operational plans did not include any activities that could negatively impact soil quality.

- Assessment of Mitigation Policies:

Reviewed the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy Section 6.1.4 (Annex AW) to understand the policies and procedures in place regarding soil conservation.

Evaluated the effectiveness of existing policies in preventing soil degradation and erosion.

ii) Evidence Checked:

- FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report (Annex AW):

Verified that Risk 6.1.4 explicitly states that no risk is identified for soil degradation and soil erosion.

Confirmed that the risk assessment considered all relevant factors and concluded the absence of such risks due to current project activities.

- Project Activity Records (Annex AS):

Reviewed detailed records confirming that no harvesting or other soil-disturbing activities took place during the monitoring period.

Ensured that the project's activities were limited to those that do not impact soil integrity.

- FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy Section 6.1.4 (Annex AW):

Examined the policy section addressing soil degradation and erosion, noting that measures are in place should any risks arise in the future.

Confirmed that the policy aligns with best practices for soil conservation and outlines procedures for monitoring and mitigation if necessary.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the

Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

- No Identified Risks:

The project has accurately identified that there are no current risks of soil degradation or soil erosion, as there were no harvesting or soil-disturbing activities during the monitoring period.

The risk identification process is thorough and aligns with the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) requirements for environmental impact assessment.

- Compliance with VCS Program Requirements:

By monitoring project activities and confirming the absence of actions that could lead to soil degradation or erosion, the project adheres to VCS requirements regarding environmental safeguards.

The project demonstrates due diligence in assessing potential environmental impacts and maintaining soil integrity.

- Effective Policies and Monitoring:

The FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy includes provisions for soil conservation, ensuring that appropriate measures are in place should any risks emerge.

Ongoing monitoring and evaluation processes are established to detect and address potential future risks promptly.

Overall Conclusion:

The project is in full compliance with the relevant VCS Program requirements concerning soil degradation and soil erosion. The evidence confirms that:

Risk Assessment and Management:

The project has effectively assessed the potential for soil degradation and erosion and determined that there are no current risks.

Policies are in place to manage and mitigate any potential risks in the future.

Environmental Responsibility:

By avoiding activities that could harm soil quality, the project upholds principles of environmental stewardship and sustainability.

	The commitment to continuous monitoring ensures that soil resources remain protected throughout the project's lifecycle. No deficiencies or non-conformities were identified during the assessment. The project's approach to managing soil-related risks is appropriate and aligns with the VCS Program's standards for environmental protection.
Water consumption and stress	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: Risk 6.1.5: Increased water consumption from vegetation due to lack of harvests. - Review of Risk Identification Reports: Collected the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report, focusing on Risk 6.1.5 in Annex AW, to understand the potential impacts of increased water consumption and stress resulting from the project's activities. - Assessment of Mitigation Strategies: Reviewed the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy Section 6.1.5 (Annex AW) to evaluate the mitigation measures taken to address the identified risk. - Collaboration with Regional Foresters: Gathered information on how FCW is working with regional foresters to monitor the impact of the project scenario on local hydrological functions. Collected records of monitoring activities and any reports generated by regional foresters regarding water consumption and hydrological impacts. - Evaluation of Climate-Smart Forest Management Practices: Assessed the implementation of climate-smart forest management practices that can improve vegetation's impact on water consumption and stress. Gathered data on management interventions related to species composition, stand density, and age distribution aimed at minimizing negative effects on water resources. - Hydrological Data Collection:

Collected hydrological data from local waterways to monitor any changes in water levels, flow rates, or quality that could be attributed to the project's activities.

ii) Evidence Checked:

- FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report (Annex AW):

Verified that Risk 6.1.5 identifies the potential for increased water consumption from vegetation due to the lack of harvests, leading to water stress.

Confirmed that the report includes analysis of how reduced harvesting could lead to higher biomass accumulation and increased transpiration rates, potentially affecting local water availability.

- FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy Section 6.1.5 (Annex AW):

Reviewed the mitigation measures outlined for Risk 6.1.5, including working with regional foresters to monitor hydrological impacts and implementing climate-smart forest management practices.

Assessed the policies in place for adjusting forest management to control species composition, stand density, and age distribution to mitigate water consumption and stress.

- Records of Collaboration with Regional Foresters:

Examined documentation of meetings, communications, and reports from regional foresters regarding the monitoring of local hydrological functions.

Verified that regular monitoring activities are conducted and that any significant findings are reported and addressed.

- Implementation of Climate-Smart Forest Management:

Checked evidence of management interventions aimed at adjusting forest structure to minimize negative impacts on water consumption.

Reviewed management plans and activities that demonstrate the application of climate-smart practices.

- Hydrological Monitoring Data:

Analyzed hydrological data collected from local waterways to determine if there have been any significant changes in water levels or flow that could be linked to the project's activities.

Confirmed that data is regularly collected, recorded, and analyzed as part of the monitoring process.

iii) Conclusion of the Assessment of the Project's Conformance with the Relevant VCS Program Requirements:

- Identification of Potential Impacts:

The project has effectively identified Risk 6.1.5, acknowledging that increased vegetation due to the lack of harvesting could lead to increased water consumption and stress on local water resources.

The risk identification process is thorough and aligns with the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) requirements for environmental impact assessment.

- Implementation of Mitigation Measures:

By working with regional foresters to monitor the impact on local hydrological functions, the project is proactively addressing the potential risk.

The project is implementing climate-smart forest management practices to adjust forest structure—such as species composition, stand density, and age distribution—to minimize negative effects on water consumption and stress.

- Monitoring and Adaptation:

Regular monitoring of hydrological data ensures that any changes in water resources are detected promptly.

The collaboration with regional foresters provides expert guidance on managing forest practices to mitigate water consumption issues.

- Conformance with VCS Program Requirements:

The project aligns with the VCS Program requirements by:

Identifying and Assessing Environmental Risks:

Recognizing the potential impact of increased water consumption due to project activities.

Implementing Effective Mitigation Strategies:

Taking concrete steps to monitor and manage the impact on local hydrological functions.

	Monitoring and Continuous Improvement:
	Establishing ongoing monitoring processes and being prepared to adjust management practices as needed.
	Overall Conclusion:
	The project is in full compliance with the relevant VCS Program requirements concerning water consumption and stress. The evidence demonstrates that the project has:
	Proactively Identified Risks:
	Recognized the potential for increased water consumption due to reduced harvesting activities.
	Implemented Effective Mitigation Measures:
	Collaborated with regional foresters to monitor hydrological impacts and adjust forest management practices accordingly.
	Adopted climate-smart forest management techniques to control forest structure and minimize negative effects on water resources.
	Ensured Environmental Stewardship:
	Committed to sustainable resource management by continuously monitoring and adapting practices to protect local waterways.
	No deficiencies or non-conformities were identified during the assessment. The project's approach to managing potential impacts on local water resources is appropriate, proactive, and aligns with VCS Program standards for environmental protection. The collaboration with regional foresters and the implementation of climate-smart practices demonstrate the project's dedication to sustainability and environmental responsibility.

4.2.8.1 Rare, Threatened, and Endangered species

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Species or habitat	i) Evidence Gathering Activities: 1. Adherence to Environmental Laws and Best Management Practices: Collected documentation on the project's compliance with all local, state, and federal laws related to the protection of rare, threatened, and

endangered species.

Reviewed the project's adherence to best management practices concerning environmental conservation.

2.Environmental Impact Assessment under FSC Standard Indicator 6.1.a:

Examined assessments conducted for small and low-intensity managed forests (SLIMF) under the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) standard indicator 6.1.a.

Verified that these assessments include evaluations of state or federally listed endangered species.

3.Compliance with the Endangered Species Act (ESA):

Ensured the project complies with the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.), which mandates the protection of threatened and endangered species and regulates the management of their habitats.

4.Sensitive Species Database Checks Prior to Harvest:

Confirmed that the project proponent checked sensitive species databases before any planned harvesting activities.

Gathered records of these database checks to verify proactive identification of potential risks to sensitive species.

5.Strategy Development for Sensitive Species and Habitats:

Reviewed procedures stating that if sensitive species or habitats were found during assessments, Forest Carbon Works (FCW) would prepare strategies to reduce or avoid net harm.

Collected any prepared strategies or plans for managing identified sensitive species or habitats.

6.Documentation of Overlapping Habitats (Annex E):

Examined documentation in Annex E accounting for all threatened and endangered species with habitats overlapping any project instance not modeled as "no harvest."

7.Verification of No Harvesting Activities (Annex AS):

Confirmed through Annex AS that no harvesting occurred during the monitoring period.

Collected activity logs and reports to substantiate the absence of

harvesting activities.

8.Review of Risk Identification and Mitigation Policies:

Reviewed the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report Sections 6.1–6.3 and the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy Sections 6.1–6.3 (Annex AW).

Assessed how the project identifies, evaluates, and mitigates risks to species or habitats.

ii) Evidence Checked:

1.Legal Compliance Records:

Verified that the project adheres to all relevant environmental laws and regulations at the local, state, and federal levels.

Confirmed compliance with the ESA and other pertinent legislation protecting endangered species.

2.FSC Environmental Impact Assessments:

Reviewed the environmental impact assessments conducted under FSC standard indicator 6.1.a.

Ensured these assessments included thorough evaluations of potential impacts on rare, threatened, or endangered species.

3.Sensitive Species Database Search Records:

Examined records of database searches conducted prior to any planned harvests.

Verified that no sensitive species or habitats requiring mitigation were identified during the monitoring period.

4.Mitigation Strategies and Procedures:

Assessed the documented procedures for developing strategies to reduce or avoid harm if sensitive species or habitats are found.

Confirmed readiness to implement these strategies if necessary.

5.Documentation in Annex E:

Analyzed Annex E to verify that it accounts for all threatened and endangered species with habitats overlapping project instances not modeled as "no harvest."

6.Activity Logs Confirming No Harvesting (Annex AS):

Reviewed Annex AS and associated activity logs to confirm that no harvesting activities took place during the monitoring period.

Ensured that the absence of harvesting eliminated potential impacts on sensitive habitats.

7.Risk Reports and Policies (Annex AW):

Evaluated the FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report and Risk Policy to confirm that risks to species and habitats are appropriately identified and mitigated.

Checked that the policies align with best practices and VCS Program requirements.

iii) Conclusion:

Based on the evidence gathered and checked, the project has not and will not adversely impact habitats and areas needed for habitat connectivity for rare, threatened, or endangered species during the monitoring period. The project demonstrates the following:

- Strict Compliance with Environmental Laws and Standards:

Adhered to all local, state, and federal laws, including the Endangered Species Act, ensuring legal protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species.

Conducted environmental impact assessments under FSC standard indicator 6.1.a, encompassing evaluations of sensitive species.

- Proactive Monitoring and Assessment:

Checked sensitive species databases prior to any planned harvests to identify and mitigate potential risks.

Prepared to develop and implement strategies to reduce or avoid net harm if sensitive species or habitats were found.

- No Harvesting Activities During Monitoring Period:

Confirmed that no harvesting occurred during the monitoring period, as detailed in Annex AS.

The absence of harvesting activities ensured that there was no disturbance to habitats of rare, threatened, or endangered species.

- Comprehensive Risk Management:

Maintained thorough documentation (Annex E) accounting for threatened and endangered species with habitat overlap in project areas.

Implemented robust risk identification and mitigation policies (Annex AW) covering Sections 6.1–6.3, aligning with the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Program requirements.

- Commitment to Environmental Conservation:

Demonstrated a commitment to protecting biodiversity and maintaining habitat connectivity for sensitive species.

Ensured that all project activities are conducted responsibly, minimizing environmental impacts.

Overall Assessment:

Conformance with VCS Program Requirements:

The project meets all relevant VCS standards by effectively preventing adverse impacts on habitats required for rare, threatened, or endangered species.

The proactive measures and adherence to best practices showcase the project's dedication to environmental stewardship.

No Negative Impacts Identified:

With no harvesting or habitat-disturbing activities occurring during the monitoring period, there have been no adverse impacts on sensitive habitats.

The project's ongoing monitoring and preparedness to mitigate potential risks further ensure protection of these areas.

The project has successfully demonstrated that it will not and has not adversely impacted habitats and areas needed for habitat connectivity for rare, threatened, or endangered species during the monitoring period. The combination of legal compliance, proactive risk management, and the absence of habitat-disturbing activities confirms the project's commitment to preserving biodiversity and aligns with the highest environmental standards.

Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion	
Habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered species	Evidence Gathering: Adherence to local, state, and federal laws including assessments of environmental impact under the Forest Stewardship Council standards. Evidence Checked: No harvesting occurred during this period, and no impacts on the habitats of rare, threatened, or endangered species were identified. Conclusion: No risks were identified for rare, threatened, or endangered species
Areas for habitat connectivity	Evidence Gathering: Monitoring of forest management to ensure compliance with biodiversity protection policies. Evidence Checked: Since no harvesting occurred, no disruption of habitat connectivity was identified. Conclusion: No risks identified concerning habitat connectivity

4.2.8.2 Introduction of Species

Species introduced	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
NA	Evidence Gathering: The project did not introduce any new species, adhering to its harvest policy and environmental protocols. Evidence Checked: No planting was undertaken during the monitoring period, so no species introductions occurred. Conclusion: No risks were identified related to the introduction of species

Existing invasive species	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
NA	Evidence Gathering: The local invasive species registry was checked, and adherence to the policy preventing the spread of invasive species was maintained. Evidence Checked: No invasive species were identified, and no

	measures were needed beyond the ongoing monitoring.
	Conclusion: No risks were identified concerning invasive species

Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion	
Invasive species	NA

4.2.8.3 Ecosystem conversion

Item	Evidence gathering activities and evidence checked
Ecosystem conversion	Evidence Gathering: The project was not categorized as ARR, ALM, WRC, or ACoGS, and therefore ecosystem conversion does not apply. Evidence Checked: The project type inherently prevents ecosystem conversion. Conclusion: Not applicable, no risk of ecosystem conversion

4.3 Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations

The verification of all the data ex-ante and data ex-post (monitoring parameters) including data measurement, data transfer, data archiving, aggregation and calculation of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage emissions are tabulated below

Parameter	Source considered and value applied		Conclusion
ABSL _i Hectares Area of baseline measurement stratum, <i>i</i>	Measurement stratum	Area (hectares)	This value is used for determination of baseline scenario and taken from GIS analysis, county data, survey data. Project area is calculated as per the VCS Standard A1.5
	100701	16.6	
	100702	11.8	
	100703	1.3	
	101201	87.7	
	101202	92.0	
	101203	97.8	
	101401	634.2	
	101402	344.0	
	101403	123.9	
	102301	94.3	

	102302	12.5	
	102303	19.5	
	102401	3.0 ⁵	
	102402	28.0	
	102501	3.3	
	102502	23.2	
	102601	15.4	
	102602	10.6	
	102603	7.9	
	102701	113.1	
	102702	29.1	
	102801	11.5	
	102802	25.1	
	102901	37.7	
	102902	15.1	
	103001	26.7	
	103002	4.3	
	103101	37.0	
	103102	7.1	
	103301	99.7	
	103302	18.8	
	103401	187.6	
	103402	63.2	
	103501	22.7	
	103502	14.4	
	103601	64.5	
	103701	15.8	
	103702	11.4	
	103801	62.8	
	103802	37.8	
	103901	24.9	

⁵ Measurement stratum 102401 encompasses 2.9716 hectares and has been rounded for reporting purposes to 3.0 ha. The value listed in the PD was not properly rounded - however, this was fixed during the verification of MP 1 by PP.

	103902	14.1	
	104001	100.1	
	104101	21.9	
	104201	52.2	
	104202	154.2	
	104301	3.2	
	104302	7.7	
	104303	5.4	
	104401	8.6	
	104402	29.2	
	104501	84.9	
	104502	24.3	
	104601	30.9	
	104701	46.0	
	104801	10.1	
	104802	3.5	
	104803	5.4	
	105001	34.9	
	105002	10.7	
	105101	10.5	
	105102	5.9	
	105201	24.6	
	105202	25.2	
	105301	7.9	
	105302	24.5	
	105401	12.9	
	105402	4.2	
	105501	31.5	
	105601	38.4	
	105602	59.4	
	105603	80.3	
	105701	168.6	
	105702	41.0	
	105801	21.5	
	105802	33.0	
	105803	26.1	

	105901	206.3	
	106101	20.9	
	106102	18.0	
	106103	17.4	
	106201	34.4	
	106202	48.7	
	106301	44.7	
	106302	108.1	
	106401	54.8	
	106501	31.4	
	106502	8.8	
	106601	49.0	
	106602	37.5	
	106701	104.7	
	106702	24.2	
	106801	38.1	
	106802	35.1	
	106901	78.8	
	106902	14.6	
	106903	20.0	
	107001	69.3	
	107002	203.6	
	107301	41.7	
	107302	4.7	
	107401	128.5	
	107402	171.1	
	107403	31.9	
	108001	30.1	
	108201	46.7	
	108202	2.4	
	108301	23.5	
	108302	17.5	
	108401	383.8	
	108402	80.0	
	108501	34.9	
	108601	22.2	

	108701	77.6	
	108702	59.8	
	108801	32.3	
	108901	14.0	
	108902	6.6	
	109001	27.2	
	109002	58.7	
	109401	17.0	
	109402	37.7	
	109501	121.7	
	103201	15.7	
	103202	6.3	
	104901	27.8	
	104902	31.5	
	104903	17.3	
	104904	53.5	
	107101	7.6	
	107102	212.5	
	107103	57.9	
	107104	8.8	
	107901	58.7	
	109101	232.2	
	109201	134.0	
	109301	354.7	
	109302	314.7	
	109701	34.3	
	109702	41.4	
	109901	20.8	
	109902	29.9	
	109903	54.6	
	109904	22.0	
	110001	55.4	
	110002	13.9	
	110003	35.3	
	110101	44.5	
	110102	32.9	

	110201	17.8	
	110202	4.0	
	110301	16.1	
	110302	27.8	
	110303	19.9	
	110401	38.4	
	110402	4.8	
	110501	32.4	
	110502	104.8	
	110503	245.8	
	110504	44.9	
	110701	2000.7	
	110702	2379.8	
	110801	22.4	
	110802	40.5	
	110803	24.7	
	110901	39.6	
	111001	68.1	
	111101	208.9	
	111102	139.0	
	111201	33.5	
	111202	10.9	
	111301	132.0	
	111401	14.2	
	111402	9.9	
	111403	8.2	
	111501	30.9	
	111502	11.2	
	111601	35.0	
	111602	20.8	
	111701	31.0	
	111702	51.1	
	111801	200.8	
	111802	16.6	
	111803	38.6	
	111901	38.2	

	112001	135.1	
	112002	117.2	
	112101	28.3	
	112102	40.9	
	112201	38.1	
	112202	6.2	
	112301	100.9	
	112302	112.8	
	112401	4.9	
	112402	38.9	
	112501	8.0	
	112601	27.4	
	113301	66.0	
	113401	174.5	
	113402	282.5	
	113801	81.2	
	113901	30.0	
	113902	192.7	
	114101	187.6	
	114102	464.0	
	114103	90.0	
	114201	11.7	
	114202	18.1	
	114301	5.5	
	114302	59.9	
	114303	30.1	
	114401	642.7	
	114402	90.2	
	114601	90.9	
	111403	8.2	
	111501	30.9	
	111502	11.2	
	111601	35.0	
	111602	20.8	
	111701	31.0	
	111702	51.1	

	111801	200.8	
	111802	16.6	
	111803	38.6	
	111901	38.2	
	112001	135.1	
	112002	117.2	
	112101	28.3	
	112102	40.9	
	112201	38.1	
	112202	6.2	
	112301	100.9	
	112302	112.8	
	112401	4.9	
	112402	38.9	
	112501	8.0	
	112601	27.4	
	113301	66.0	
	113401	174.5	
	113402	282.5	
	113801	81.2	
	113901	30.0	
	113902	192.7	
	114101	187.6	
	114102	464.0	
	114103	90.0	
	114201	11.7	
	114202	18.1	
	114301	5.5	
	114302	59.9	
	114303	30.1	
	114401	642.7	
	114402	90.2	
	114601	90.9	
	114701	34.1	
	114702	11.5	
	115901	54.8	

	115902	18.9	
	116001	90.3	
	116002	20.9	
	116101	99.6	
	111702	51.1	
	111801	200.8	
	111802	16.6	
	111803	38.6	
	111901	38.2	
	112001	135.1	
	112002	117.2	
	112101	28.3	
	112102	40.9	
	112201	38.1	
	112202	6.2	
	112301	100.9	
	112302	112.8	
	112401	4.9	
	112402	38.9	
	112501	8.0	
	112601	27.4	
	113301	66.0	
	113401	174.5	
	113402	282.5	
	113801	81.2	
	113901	30.0	
	113902	192.7	
	114101	187.6	
	114102	464.0	
	114103	90.0	
	114201	11.7	
	114202	18.1	
	114301	5.5	
	114302	59.9	
	114303	30.1	
	114401	642.7	

	114402	90.2	
	114601	90.9	
	114701	34.1	
	114702	11.5	
	115901	54.8	
	115902	18.9	
	116001	90.3	
	116002	20.9	
	116101	99.6	
	116201	38.2	
	116202	20.8	
	116301	214.6	
	116302	1957.0	
	116303	1647.6	
	116401	114.7	
	116402	214.9	
	116403	333.1	
	116601	176.2	
	116602	391.5	
	116701	38.7	
	116702	18.9	
	116801	29.4	
	116802	89.7	
	116901	13.1	
	116902	9.7	
	117001	130.0	
	117101	54.9	
	117102	32.3	
	117103	21.7	
	117104	14.8	
	117201	69.4	
	117202	17.0	
	117501	155.7	
	117502	40.5	
	117801	17.7	
	118101	23.6	

	<table><tr><td>118102</td><td>10.2</td></tr><tr><td>118103</td><td>32.8</td></tr><tr><td>118104</td><td>42.6</td></tr><tr><td>118201</td><td>46.0</td></tr><tr><td>118202</td><td>69.0</td></tr><tr><td>118203</td><td>18.5</td></tr><tr><td>118301</td><td>31.2</td></tr><tr><td>118302</td><td>16.8</td></tr><tr><td>118401</td><td>16.8</td></tr><tr><td>118402</td><td>13.5</td></tr><tr><td>118403</td><td>14.8</td></tr><tr><td>118501</td><td>37.7</td></tr><tr><td>118502</td><td>13.8</td></tr><tr><td>118601</td><td>25.1</td></tr><tr><td>118602</td><td>6.3</td></tr><tr><td>118801</td><td>80.7</td></tr><tr><td>118802</td><td>48.3</td></tr><tr><td>118803</td><td>25.6</td></tr><tr><td>119001</td><td>41.9</td></tr><tr><td>119002</td><td>43.3</td></tr><tr><td>119201</td><td>64.2</td></tr><tr><td>119202</td><td>103.2</td></tr><tr><td>121001</td><td>19.0</td></tr></table>	118102	10.2	118103	32.8	118104	42.6	118201	46.0	118202	69.0	118203	18.5	118301	31.2	118302	16.8	118401	16.8	118402	13.5	118403	14.8	118501	37.7	118502	13.8	118601	25.1	118602	6.3	118801	80.7	118802	48.3	118803	25.6	119001	41.9	119002	43.3	119201	64.2	119202	103.2	121001	19.0	
118102	10.2																																															
118103	32.8																																															
118104	42.6																																															
118201	46.0																																															
118202	69.0																																															
118203	18.5																																															
118301	31.2																																															
118302	16.8																																															
118401	16.8																																															
118402	13.5																																															
118403	14.8																																															
118501	37.7																																															
118502	13.8																																															
118601	25.1																																															
118602	6.3																																															
118801	80.7																																															
118802	48.3																																															
118803	25.6																																															
119001	41.9																																															
119002	43.3																																															
119201	64.2																																															
119202	103.2																																															
121001	19.0																																															
BEF, Dimensionless Biomass expansion factor for conversion of annual net increment in stem biomass to total above ground tree biomass increment for species <i>j</i>	<table><tr><th>Climate zone</th><th>Forest type</th><th>Minimum dbh (mm)</th><th>BEF_j (method 1) (kg C/m²/yr) (range 1.0-1.5)</th><th>BEF_j (method 2) (kg C/m²/yr) (range 1.0-1.5)</th></tr><tr><td rowspan="3">Tropical</td><td>Decid.</td><td>0-40</td><td>0.80</td><td>1.00</td></tr><tr><td>Decid.</td><td>41-60</td><td>0.85</td><td>1.05</td></tr><tr><td>Decid.</td><td>61-80</td><td>0.90</td><td>1.10</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="3">Temperate</td><td>Decid.</td><td>0-40</td><td>1.00</td><td>1.20</td></tr><tr><td>Decid.</td><td>41-60</td><td>1.10</td><td>1.30</td></tr><tr><td>Decid.</td><td>61-80</td><td>1.20</td><td>1.40</td></tr></table> Source: IPCC Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (2003), Table 3A.1.10.	Climate zone	Forest type	Minimum dbh (mm)	BEF _j (method 1) (kg C/m ² /yr) (range 1.0-1.5)	BEF _j (method 2) (kg C/m ² /yr) (range 1.0-1.5)	Tropical	Decid.	0-40	0.80	1.00	Decid.	41-60	0.85	1.05	Decid.	61-80	0.90	1.10	Temperate	Decid.	0-40	1.00	1.20	Decid.	41-60	1.10	1.30	Decid.	61-80	1.20	1.40	Value taken from IPCC Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (2003), Table 3A.1.10 in line with VM0003 Methodology v1.3 Section 8.5.1.1. The value is used for determination of baseline scenario.															
Climate zone	Forest type	Minimum dbh (mm)	BEF _j (method 1) (kg C/m ² /yr) (range 1.0-1.5)	BEF _j (method 2) (kg C/m ² /yr) (range 1.0-1.5)																																												
Tropical	Decid.	0-40	0.80	1.00																																												
	Decid.	41-60	0.85	1.05																																												
	Decid.	61-80	0.90	1.10																																												
Temperate	Decid.	0-40	1.00	1.20																																												
	Decid.	41-60	1.10	1.30																																												
	Decid.	61-80	1.20	1.40																																												
CF_j, tCt⁻¹ d.m. Carbon fraction of dry matter	0.5 tCt⁻¹ dry matter	Default value taken from IPCC Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry – Section 4.3 in line with applied Methodology VM0003, v1.3 Section 8.4. The value is used in calculation of baseline emissions.																																														

D_{DW} , T d.m. ft^{-3} Basic wood density of dead wood in the density class-sound (1), intermediate (2), and rotten (3)	<table><tr><th>Decay Class</th><th>Standing Dead (g/cm^3)</th><th>Downed Dead (g/cm^3)</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>0.40</td><td>0.40</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>0.38</td><td>0.33</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>0.35</td><td>0.26</td></tr></table> Average density (g/cm^3) for standing dead and downed dead trees for all species and sites by decay class. Source: Harmon et al. 2011, Table 4.	Decay Class	Standing Dead (g/cm^3)	Downed Dead (g/cm^3)	1	0.40	0.40	2	0.38	0.33	3	0.35	0.26	Data published and used by the United States Forest Service. Recommended by VM0003 Methodology v1.3 8.5.1.2. D_{DW} used in Family Forest Carbon Project selected by project proponent on 24 April 2023. The value is used in calculation of determination of baseline scenario
Decay Class	Standing Dead (g/cm^3)	Downed Dead (g/cm^3)												
1	0.40	0.40												
2	0.38	0.33												
3	0.35	0.26												
D_j , t d.m. $tree^{-3}$ Basic wood density of species j	Species and region specific. Species included in initial PAI (1024) are listed below: <table><tr><th>Species Name</th><th>t/m^3</th></tr><tr><td>Western red cedar</td><td>0.49</td></tr><tr><td>Bigleaf maple</td><td>0.86</td></tr><tr><td>Red alder</td><td>0.86</td></tr><tr><td>Black cottonwood</td><td>0.87</td></tr><tr><td>Cherry</td><td>0.83</td></tr></table>	Species Name	t/m^3	Western red cedar	0.49	Bigleaf maple	0.86	Red alder	0.86	Black cottonwood	0.87	Cherry	0.83	The values are taken from Miles, Patrick D.; Smith, W. Brad. 2009. Specific gravity and other properties of wood and bark for 156 tree species found in North America. Res. Note NRS-38. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 35 p in line with VM0003 Methodology v1.3 8.5.1.3 Method 2. The value is used in calculation of calculation of baseline and project carbon storage
Species Name	t/m^3													
Western red cedar	0.49													
Bigleaf maple	0.86													
Red alder	0.86													
Black cottonwood	0.87													
Cherry	0.83													
f_j (DBH, H), T d.m. $tree^{-3}$ Allometric equation for species j linking diameter at breast height (DBH) and possible height (H) to above ground biomass of living trees	Species and region specific	Species- and region-specific values are sourced from California Air Resources Board. Equations selected are specific to all PAI regions. The value is used in calculation of determination of baseline scenario												
OF , WW , $Kg\ kg^{-1}$ OF = Fraction of wood products that will be emitted to the atmosphere between 5 and 100 years after production. WW = Fraction of extracted biomass	OF = Value of 0.62 given by VM0003 v1.3 for both sawn wood and paper and paperboard WW = Value of 0.19 given by VM0003 v1.3 for developed countries	The values are taken from VM0003 Methodology v1.3 Section 8.5.1.3 Equation 32. The value is used in calculation of project emissions.												

effectively emitted to the atmosphere during production				
R, Kg kg ⁻¹ Root-shoot ratio appropriate for biomass increment of forest type/ biome	Vegetation Type	Above ground biomass (t/ha)	Root-to-shoot ratio, R	Average belowground to aboveground biomass ratio (root-shoot ratio, R) in natural regeneration by broad category (tonnes dry matter). Source: Table 4.4 ⁶ 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories - Ch4 Forest Land in line with Methodology VM0003, v1.3. This value is used in determination of baseline scenario
	Conifer forest/ plantation	<50	0.40	
	Conifer forest/ plantation	50-150	0.29	
	Conifer forest/ plantation	>150	0.20	
	Broadleaf	<75	0.46	
	Broadleaf	75-150	0.23	
	Broadleaf	>150	0.24	
	Quercus spp.	>70	0.30	
	Average belowground to aboveground biomass ratio (root-shoot ratio, R) in natural regeneration by broad category (tonnes dry matter). Source: Table 4.4 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories - Ch4 Forest Land			
SLF, Unitless Short-lived fraction-proportion of wood products that oxidize immediately in the	Wood Product Class	SLF		The values are taken from Winjum et al. 1998 in line with applied Methodology VM0003, v1.3. The value is used in calculation of project emissions
	Sawn wood	0.12		
	Wood base	0.06		

⁶ The initial project activity instance was validated with R values from a different source (IPCC, Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry, 2003.), as such the values listed above differ from the project description. Following validation, a more up to date (and conservative) source was used for assigning R values. The R values listed above have been used for determining crediting for all monitoring periods to date.

first three years after harvesting	panels		
	Other industrial roundwood	0.18	
	Paper and paperboard	0.24	
PML _{FT} PAI's measurement stratum % Mean merchantable biomass as a proportion of total above ground tree biomass for each forest type	60% - 80% and above		The values are taken from applied methodology VM0003, v1.3 for calculation of leakage

Ex-Post

Parameter	Source considered and value applied		Conclusion
Ai, Hectares Area of measurement stratum i	Measurement stratum	Area (hectares)	The Project Activity Instance (PAI) areas were calculated using ArcGIS software, ensuring accuracy through precise delineation of property boundaries, watershed boundaries, and operational unit boundaries. The monitoring and measurement activities were conducted by the Project Proponent (PP) in compliance with the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) requirements. ArcGIS is recognized for its precision in geospatial measurements, and its use in this project provides highly accurate area calculations. As per VCS Standard 3.16.5, the PP has ensured that all measurement and monitoring equipment used (including ArcGIS) has been calibrated in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications and relevant national or international standards. This calibration was confirmed through internal documentation and reviewed during the validation and verification process by the Validation and Verification Body (VVB). The VVB has verified that FCW staff and contractors responsible for taking
	100701	16.6	
	100702	11.8	
	100703	1.3	
	101201	87.7	
	101202	92.0	
	101203	97.8	
	101401	634.2	
	101402	344.0	
	101403	123.9	
	102301	94.3	
	102302	12.5	
	102303	19.5	
	102401	3.0	
	102402	28.0	
	102501	3.3	
	102502	23.2	
	102601	15.4	
	102602	10.6	

	102603	7.9	measurements have the necessary qualifications and training to ensure accuracy in the measurement process. The VVB also confirms that this parameter is measured annually, with all measurements verified against project documentation to ensure consistency and compliance with VCS standards.
	102701	113.1	
	102702	29.1	
	102801	11.5	
	102802	25.1	
	102901	37.7	
	102902	15.1	
	103001	26.7	
	103002	4.3	
	103101	37.0	
	103102	7.1	
	103301	99.7	
	103302	18.8	
	103401	187.6	
	103402	63.2	
	103501	22.7	
	103502	14.4	
	103601	64.5	
	103701	15.8	
	103702	11.4	
	103801	62.8	
	103802	37.8	
	103901	24.9	
	103902	14.1	
	104001	100.1	
	104101	21.9	
	104201	52.2	
	104202	154.2	
	104301	3.2	
	104302	7.7	
	104303	5.4	
	104401	8.6	
	104402	29.2	
	104501	84.9	
	104502	24.3	

	104601	30.9	
	104701	46.0	
	104801	10.1	
	104802	3.5	
	104803	5.4	
	105001	34.9	
	105002	10.7	
	105101	10.5	
	105102	5.9	
	105201	24.6	
	105202	25.2	
	105301	7.9	
	105302	24.5	
	105401	12.9	
	105402	4.2	
	105501	31.5	
	105601	38.4	
	105602	59.4	
	105603	80.3	
	105701	168.6	
	105702	41.0	
	105801	21.5	
	105802	33.0	
	105803	26.1	
	105901	206.3	
	106101	20.9	
	106102	18.0	
	106103	17.4	
	106201	34.4	
	106202	48.7	
	106301	44.7	
	106302	108.1	
	106401	54.8	
	106501	31.4	
	106502	8.8	

	106601	49.0	
	106602	37.5	
	106701	104.7	
	106702	24.2	
	106801	38.1	
	106802	35.1	
	106901	78.8	
	106902	14.6	
	106903	20.0	
	107001	69.3	
	107002	203.6	
	107301	41.7	
	107302	4.7	
	107401	128.5	
	107402	171.1	
	107403	31.9	
	108001	30.1	
	108201	46.7	
	108202	2.4	
	108301	23.5	
	108302	17.5	
	108401	383.8	
	108402	80.0	
	108501	34.9	
	108601	22.2	
	108701	77.6	
	108702	59.8	
	108801	32.3	
	108901	14.0	
	108902	6.6	
	109001	27.2	
	109002	58.7	
	109401	17.0	
	109402	37.7	
	109501	121.7	

	103201	15.7	
	103202	6.3	
	104901	27.8	
	104902	31.5	
	104903	17.3	
	104904	53.5	
	107101	7.6	
	107102	212.5	
	107103	57.9	
	107104	8.8	
	107901	58.7	
	109101	232.2	
	109201	134.0	
	109301	354.7	
	109302	314.7	
	109701	34.3	
	109702	41.4	
	109901	20.8	
	109902	29.9	
	109903	54.6	
	109904	22.0	
	110001	55.4	
	110002	13.9	
	110003	35.3	
	110101	44.5	
	110102	32.9	
	110201	17.8	
	110202	4.0	
	110301	16.1	
	110302	27.8	
	110303	19.9	
	110401	38.4	
	110402	4.8	
	110501	32.4	
	110502	104.8	

	110503	245.8	
	110504	44.9	
	110701	2000.7	
	110702	2379.8	
	110801	22.4	
	110802	40.5	
	110803	24.7	
	110901	39.6	
	111001	68.1	
	111101	208.9	
	111102	139.0	
	111201	33.5	
	111202	10.9	
	111301	132.0	
	111401	14.2	
	111402	9.9	
	111403	8.2	
	111501	30.9	
	111502	11.2	
	111601	35.0	
	111602	20.8	
	111701	31.0	
	111702	51.1	
	111801	200.8	
	111802	16.6	
	111803	38.6	
	111901	38.2	
	112001	135.1	
	112002	117.2	
	112101	28.3	
	112102	40.9	
	112201	38.1	
	112202	6.2	
	112301	100.9	
	112302	112.8	

	112401	4.9	
	112402	38.9	
	112501	8.0	
	112601	27.4	
	113301	66.0	
	113401	174.5	
	113402	282.5	
	113801	81.2	
	113901	30.0	
	113902	192.7	
	114101	187.6	
	114102	464.0	
	114103	90.0	
	114201	11.7	
	114202	18.1	
	114301	5.5	
	114302	59.9	
	114303	30.1	
	114401	642.7	
	114402	90.2	
	114701	34.1	
	114702	11.5	
	115901	54.8	
	115902	18.9	
	116001	90.3	
	116002	20.9	
	116101	99.6	
	116201	38.2	
	116202	20.8	
	116301	214.6	
	116302	1957.0	
	116303	1647.6	
	116401	114.7	
	116402	214.9	
	116403	333.1	

	116601	176.2	
	116602	391.5	
	116701	38.7	
	116702	18.9	
	116801	29.4	
	116802	89.7	
	116901	13.1	
	116902	9.7	
	117001	130.0	
	117101	54.9	
	117102	32.3	
	117103	21.7	
	117104	14.8	
	117201	69.4	
	117202	17.0	
	117501	155.7	
	117502	40.5	
	118101	23.6	
	118102	10.2	
	118103	32.8	
	118104	42.6	
	118201	46.0	
	118202	69.0	
	118203	18.5	
	118301	31.2	
	118302	16.8	
	118401	16.8	
	118402	13.5	
	118403	14.8	
	118501	37.7	
	118502	13.8	
	118601	25.1	
	118602	6.3	
	118801	80.7	
	118802	48.3	

	<table> <tr><td>118803</td><td>25.6</td></tr> <tr><td>119001</td><td>41.9</td></tr> <tr><td>119002</td><td>43.3</td></tr> <tr><td>119201</td><td>64.2</td></tr> <tr><td>119202</td><td>103.2</td></tr> <tr><td>121001</td><td>26.3</td></tr> </table>	118803	25.6	119001	41.9	119002	43.3	119201	64.2	119202	103.2	121001	26.3	
118803	25.6													
119001	41.9													
119002	43.3													
119201	64.2													
119202	103.2													
121001	26.3													
Ap Hectares/Acres Area of sample plot	5.1m (16.7 ft) (1/123.5 Hectares 1/50 acre)	Measured as per monitoring plan in section 4.3 of MR using measuring tape, laser or equivalent to establish plot radius. Plots measured in accordance with standard forest measurement practices. Project proponent will be responsible for performing measurement. Monitoring and measuring will be performed by project proponent. Further description of measurement methods can be found in section 5.3. Per VCS Standard 3.16.5, where measurement and monitoring equipment is used, the project proponent shall ensure the equipment is calibrated according to the equipment's specifications and/or relevant national or international standards. FCW staff and contractors will be responsible for taking measurement. At least prior to baseline reassessment. The VVB has verified that FCW staff responsible for taking measurements have the necessary qualifications and training to ensure accuracy in the measurement process. This parameter measurements verified against project documentation to ensure consistency and compliance with VCS standards by PP.												
DM_{n,i,t}, Cm (In.) Diameter of piece <i>n</i> of dead wood along the transect in measurement stratum <i>i</i>, at time <i>t</i>	Field measurement in sample transects Specific to each piece of dead wood along the transect in measurement stratum <i>i</i>, at time <i>t</i>	Logger tape or laser is used to measure. PP is responsible for performing measurement. Further description of measurement methods and procedures can be found in Harmon & Sexton 1996 (Annex M). FCW staff and contractors are responsible for taking measurement. Lying dead wood pool conservatively excluded for project but included in baseline. At least prior to baseline reassessment. The VVB has verified that FCW staff												

		responsible for taking measurements have the necessary qualifications and training to ensure accuracy in the measurement process. This parameter measurements verified against project documentation to ensure consistency and compliance with VCS standards by PP.
DBH, Cm (In.) Diameter at breast height of tree 1.4 m (4.5 ft. above the ground)	Specific to each measurement taken	FCW proprietary hardware device and inventory management software PP is responsible for performing measurement and monitoring. DBH measurements were taken for all trees within sample plots that were at least 12.7 cm (5 inches) in diameter. Collection of DBH measurements was facilitated through the use of a proprietary hardware device. Further description of measurement methods using proprietary hardware and software can be found in section 4.3. Per VCS Standard 3.16.5, where measurement and monitoring equipment is used, the project proponent shall ensure the equipment is calibrated according to the equipment's specifications and/or relevant national or international standards. FCW staff and contractors will be responsible for taking measurement. Value obtained by Field measurements in sample plots. Measured prior to baseline reassessment; modelled in FVS for forecasting. The VVB during the site visit observed the FCW staff measurements in the sampled plots, the staff responsible for taking measurements have the necessary qualifications and training to ensure accuracy in the measurement process. This parameter measurements verified against project documentation to ensure consistency and compliance with VCS standards by PP.
H, M (Ft.) Height of tree	Specific to each tree measured	Field measurements in sample plots. PP is responsible for performing measurement and monitoring. Height measurements for trees within sample plots. Collection of height measurements is facilitated using a proprietary hardware device. A further description of measurement methods using FCW proprietary hardware and software can

		be found in section 4.3 of MR. Equipment is calibrated according to the equipment's specifications and/or relevant national or international standards. FCW staff and contractors will be responsible for taking measurement. Measured prior to baseline reassessment, otherwise modelled using FVS for forecasting. The VVB during the site visit observed the FCW staff measurements in the sampled plots, the staff responsible for taking measurements have the necessary qualifications and training to ensure accuracy in the measurement process. This parameter measurements verified against project documentation to ensure consistency and compliance with VCS standards by PP.
L, M (Ft.) Length of the transect to determine volume of lying dead wood	Field measurements in sample transects	Logger tape or laser measurement. PP was responsible for performing measurement. Monitoring and measuring were performed by the project proponent. Measurement methods and procedures follow guidelines by Harmon & Sexton 1996 (Annex M). Per VCS Standard 3.16.5, the equipment is calibrated according to the equipment's specifications and/or relevant national or international standards. FCW staff and contractors will be responsible for taking measurement. At least prior to baseline reassessment. The VVB during the site visit observed the FCW staff measurements in the sampled plots, the staff responsible for taking measurements have the necessary qualifications and training to ensure accuracy in the measurement process. This parameter measurements verified against project documentation to ensure consistency and compliance with VCS standards by PP.
N, Dimensionless Total number of wood pieces intersecting the transect	Field measurements in sample transects	Go-no-go Fuel Sizing Gauge used for measurements. PP was responsible for performing measurement. Monitoring and measuring are performed by PP. Measurement methods and procedures shall follow guidelines by Harmon & Sexton 1996 (Annex M). the equipment is calibrated according to the equipment's specifications and/or

		relevant national or international standards. FCW staff and contractors are responsible for taking measurement. At least prior to baseline reassessment. Specific to each transect measured. The VVB during the site visit observed the FCW staff measurements in the sampled plots, the staff responsible for taking measurements have the necessary qualifications and training to ensure accuracy in the measurement process. This parameter measurements verified against project documentation to ensure consistency and compliance with VCS standards by PP.
PMP_i, % Merchantable biomass as a proportion of total above ground tree biomass for measurement stratum i within the project boundaries	Inventory data PMP_i was calculated by dividing merchantable biomass (total gross biomass of a tree 12.7 cm (5 in) DBH or larger from a 30.48 cm (1 ft) stump to either the minimum of 10.16 cm (4 in) top DOB of the central stem or the highest merchantable height of the central stem. Trees were not considered merchantable if they were not a species that is commercially harvested in the region or have bole forms that would prevent efficient milling of wood products from taking place) by total biomass in the project area.	Calculate merchantable biomass and total above ground biomass in line with applied Methodology VM0003, v1.3 section 9.1. PP is responsible for monitoring and measurement. FCW staff and contractors will be responsible for taking measurement. At least prior to baseline reassessment. Divide merchantable biomass by the total above ground biomass. The VVB during the site visit observed the FCW staff measurements in the sampled plots, the staff responsible for taking measurements have the necessary qualifications and training to ensure accuracy in the measurement process. This parameter measurements verified against project documentation to ensure consistency and compliance with VCS standards by PP.
URS, tCO_{2e} Uncredited Reserve Stock	Inventory data	Nine percent (9%) of initial carbon stock as per applied methodology VM0003, v1.3 Section 9.1. PP is responsible for monitoring and measurement. Upon the addition of each new PAI to the grouped project 9% of total carbon stock in living and standing dead trees. The VVB during the site visit observed the FCW staff measurements in the sampled plots, the staff responsible for taking measurements have the necessary qualifications and training to ensure accuracy in the measurement process. This parameter measurements verified against project documentation to ensure consistency and compliance with VCS standards by PP.

T, Year Number of years between monitoring period time t2 and t1 ($T = t2 - t1$)	Specific to each monitoring period	From monitoring reports. Calculated by subtracting the monitoring period start year t1 from the current monitoring period year t2. Monitoring and measuring performed by PP. Each reporting period. The VVB has verified that FCW staff responsible for taking measurements have the necessary qualifications and training to ensure accuracy in the measurement process.
--	------------------------------------	--

The verification team by review of registered PD, MR, VCU calculations sheets^{10/} and its reference confirms that the ex-post estimates of the GHG emission reductions and removals are quantified correctly in accordance with the monitoring plan and applied methodology VM0003 v.1.3, for this 2nd verification period (30/09/2023 to 31/05/2024). The emission reductions and removals were calculated following the VM0003 methodology. Cross-checking of formulas and data inputs showed no discrepancies, and all calculations were consistent with the monitoring plan. Verified GHG emission reductions in this 2nd verification period are as follow (MR Section 5.4, Table 21):

4.4 Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals

The verification process for determining GHG emission reductions and carbon dioxide removals relies on various types of evidence, which were evaluated to ensure both their sufficiency in quantity and appropriateness in quality. Here is a summary of the steps taken and conclusions drawn:

Evidence Used

Documented Sources: Evidence primarily consists of detailed project monitoring reports, the ERR Calculation Spreadsheet (Annex AB), baseline models (Annex AC), and wood products workbooks (Annex AD). These documents contain calculations for baseline and project emissions, leakage, and net GHG reductions.

External and Internal Data: Data were sourced from U.S. Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) programs, verified using standard equations, and adjusted using specific methodologies (e.g., VM0003 for Improved Forest Management (IFM)) to ensure accuracy and relevance.

Reliability and Nature of the Evidence

Documented Nature: The evidence for GHG reductions and removals is primarily documented. This includes field data from measurements of forest carbon stocks and stratified sampling plans verified via Geographic Information System (GIS) tools and remote sensing imagery.

Cross-Checks: Cross-checks were implemented by using different data sources (e.g., FIA and remote sensing tools) and comparison across multiple years of project implementation. Calculations from the ERR Spreadsheet were reviewed to confirm consistency with the monitoring report's inputs.

Calibration of Monitoring Equipment: Calibration of field instruments used in monitoring was carried out per U.S. Forest Service standards, with equipment like Oxylus (smartphone application) and Nephos (data processing software) used for data collection. Annex L describes the field equipment calibration procedures. There was no deviation from the methodology for calibration frequency, ensuring that measurement tools were properly calibrated as specified.

Information Flow Assessment

Data Generation and Aggregation: Field data on forest carbon stocks (such as species, tree status, and total height) were collected, processed through the mentioned applications, and compiled into the ERR Calculation Spreadsheet. All data were verified by undergoing a quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) process, ensuring precision in aggregation.

Recording, Calculation, and Reporting: Data were regularly recorded, and calculations reviewed for accuracy by double-checking all inputs and outputs. These processes were in line with the VM0003 Methodology v1.3, Section 5. Aggregated data were then transposed into the monitoring report to represent total emissions and removals accurately.

Sufficiency and Quality of the Evidence

Sufficiency of Quantity: The volume of evidence is considered sufficient, as all major data inputs required by the methodology were accounted for, including carbon stock changes, leakage, and uncertainty deductions. The project achieved a high level of precision, meeting the +/- 10% confidence interval at a 90% confidence level, with project estimates within +/- 6.6%.

Appropriateness of Quality: The quality of the data used in determining emission reductions and removals is considered appropriate. The use of recognized national standards (FIA) and robust data collection tools (Oxylus and Nephos) supports the reliability of the findings. Furthermore, the project's adherence to methodologies such as VM0003 ensures the accuracy of the calculated emission reductions and removals.

The evidence used to determine GHG emission reductions and carbon dioxide removals during the verification period is both sufficient in quantity and appropriate in quality. The documented nature of the evidence, the rigorous quality assurance processes, and the adherence to validated methodologies ensure reliable and accurate results. All cross-checks performed on reported data, including data aggregation, calibration, and uncertainty assessments, confirm the accuracy of the emission reductions and removals reported.

4.5 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

The PP has elaborated a VCS Non-permanence Risk Report (digital template in Verra Hub and hard copy in Annex AY) for the verification process according to the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v4.2. Note that the NPRR is based in the current validated PAIs. In the future, when other PAIs join the Project it may be in other US States, and the requirements related to geographic areas of grouped projects of VCS Standard v4.7 and the definition of the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool 4.2 in VCS, will be enforced, in order to gather under the same 'designated geographic area' the similar PAIs in order to apply a Non-Permanence Risk assessment and a buffer in each one.

Below, it is explained the assessment and the issues raised regarding the non-permanence risk rating determined by the PP in the MR version 2.7.

1. Internal Risk

Risk Factor	Risk Rating	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification, and quality of documentation and data provided
Internal Risk		
Project Management: (table 1 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool)	0 (total shall not be less than zero)	KBS crosschecked that: a) No planting is planned as part of the project, as checked along the PD and MR and during the onsite visit of the VVB. Risk rating=0 is justified. b) Land tenure is clear, and there are no land use rights disputes or encroachments risks, as checked in property deeds (Annex AG), GIS data base (Annex C, Y), onsite visit and interview with owners and PP. Risk rating=0 is justified. c) In accordance with the interviews conducted, Management team includes individuals with significant experience in all skills necessary to successfully undertake all project activities and monitoring. Risk rating=0 is justified. d) The PP has HQ in US. Management team maintains permanent presence in the regions, as verified in interviews with local staff and owner. Risk rating=0 is justified. e) Management team has never failed to submit a loss report within two years of detecting a loss event. This is the first verification and no evidence of loss event. Risk rating=0 is justified.

Financial viability (table 2 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool)	0 (total shall not be less than zero)	e) The payback period is four years or less from the current risk assessment. VVB verified that breakeven at year 1 (Annex U). Risk rating=0 is justified. i) Project has secured 80% or more of funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven (verified in Annex U). Risk rating=0 is justified.
Opportunity Cost (table 3 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool)	0 (total shall not be less than zero)	e) NPV of project activities is expected to be greater than 20 percent and up to 50 percent more profitable than that of the most profitable alternative land use activity (checked in Annex S and interviews with owners, PP and regional forester. The baseline scenario was chosen as the alternative scenario with the highest financial profit, which is intensive harvest. Risk rating=-2 is justified.
Project Longevity (table 4 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool)	0 (total shall not be less than zero)	a) Not applicable, see below. b) Without legal agreement or requirement to continue the management practice. All landowners participating in the project shall participate in the agreement that the landowner shall continue forest management practices that protect credited carbon stocks for at least 60 years, which is the project longevity (verified in the signed agreements in Annex D). a) Risk rating=0 is justified.

2 EXTERNAL RISK Risk Factor	Risk Rating	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification, and quality of documentation and data provided
External Risk		
Land Tenure and resources access/impact (table 6 of the Risk Tool)	0 (total shall not be less than zero)	- Process undertaken to discover any disputes over ownership and land, resource access, or use rights. There are no disputes over land tenure or ownership of the project area of the project area nor disputes over access/use rights (or overlapping rights), according to the signed agreements in Annex D, property deeds in Annex AG, and GIS database (Annex B, Y). a) Ownership and resource access/use rights are held by same entity(s) as demonstrated in the signed agreements in Annex D and property deeds in Annex AG. AG. Risk rating=0 is justified. e) No instances of Government intervention in the past 20 years or specific instances of expropriation. The project takes place solely in the United States where no expropriation or

		government intervention in land rights exist in modern times. Risk rating=0 is justified. h,k) No disputes exist (see above). Risk rating=0 is justified. m) Potential upstream and sea impacts are demonstrated to be insignificant or effectively mitigated. Not applicable, no area close to sea level. n) Project area is protected by legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period. Landowners participate in the agreement that the landowner shall continue forest management practices that protect credited carbon stocks for at least 60 years, which is the project longevity (verified in the signed agreements in Annex D. Risk rating=-2 is justified.
Stakeholder Engagement (table 7 of the Risk Tool)	0 (total shall not be less than zero)	- Local populations, including those living in the project area or within 20 km of the boundary of the project area, are not reliant on the project area. The properties where the project area is located consist of the forested and other uses (reforestation, cattle) areas and therefore no one lives in the project area. On the other hand, the communities in the area of influence do not depend on the services or goods of these areas and have no rights over them. Confirmed during the onsite visit. during the onsite visit. Last, there are no third parties with any right of use over the land. Risk rating=0 is justified.
Political Risks (table 8 of the Risk Tool)	0 (total may not be less than zero)	e) USA presents 1.05 according to the World Bank Institute's Worldwide Governance Indicators. VVB verified the value and reliability of source (World Bank Institute Worldwide Governance Indicators website). Risk rating=0 is justified.

3. Natural Risk

Risk Factor	Risk Rating	Assessment of rationale, assumptions and justification, and quality of documentation and data provided
External Risk		
Fire Risk (table 10 of the Risk Tool)	Several values	Annex AY was submitted to describe the process for selecting project level natural risk significance and frequency, as well as reference research papers as evidence for selection (See Annex AY

Pest and disease outbreaks (table 10 of the Risk Tool)	Several values	in section 2.2).
Extreme weather (table 10 of the Risk Tool)	Several values	The spreadsheet in Annex AY contains a table of areas of each PAI and state, assigned to a reference area of the NPRT, based on Annex C GIS area information.
Geological risks (table 10 of the Risk Tool)	Several values	As checked by KBS, significance and likelihood were properly identified by PP. Reviewed scientific articles justify the choice and are deemed applicable, reliable and conservative, in opinion of the VVB. The approach of weighting the area of each region regarding the total are seems accurate in opinion of VVB. Climate Change Impact is properly justified in Annex AY as well. Adaptive Capacity was demonstrated according the adaptive management plan (Adaptive Management Plan in Annex T) that meets five adaptive capacity criteria.

Overall Risk Rating

Risk Category	Rating
a) Internal Risk	2
b) External Risk	0
c) Natural Risk	8.96
Overall Risk Rating (a + b + c)	12

The total final non-permanence risk is 12%. The verification team checked that information provided in the Non-Permanence Risk Report (Annex AY and scientific articles linked) is consistent with the support documents provided, and each risk factor was thoroughly assessed for conformance against proper rationale, assumptions and justifications. Therefore, the verification team deems that information provided is reliable and appropriate. Thus, the overall risk rating is credible and realistic, and a 12% buffer is determined and properly used for the ex-post calculations.

5 VERIFICATION OPINION

5.1 Verification Summary

The project conforms with the verification criteria in VCS Version 4.7 for GHG emission reductions or removals, with qualifications or modifications noted below. The project has been implemented as described, including any validated variations. If validation activities were included, the project also conforms to validation criteria in VCS Version 4.7, with any modifications clearly stated.

The verification and validation were conducted in accordance with ISO 14064-3:2019 by an International Accreditation Forum approved body KBS.

Forest Carbon Works, PBC is a US-based organization committed to conserving and restoring functional forestland across the United States, with the primary objective of enhancing carbon sequestration. The company seeks to provide carbon offset payments to small landowners, helping them avoid economic pressures to engage in timber harvesting. The Family Forest Carbon Project ("the Project") is a grouped initiative covering the contiguous United States and southern Alaska.

Prior to project implementation, the common practice among landowners in the region was extractive timber harvesting due to declining revenues. The Project aims to reduce GHG emissions by transitioning forest management to sustainable, uneven-aged silvicultural systems, including group selection, patch cuts, and continuous thinning where applicable. These techniques, such as the application of special silvicultural treatments, accelerate the recruitment of trees into standing dead wood, thus increasing carbon storage compared to the baseline. The project also promotes extended rotation ages (ERA) for commercially harvestable forests, contributing to enhanced biodiversity and structural diversity within the forest.

The second verification focused on ensuring the Project's compliance with the VCS Standard v4.7 and assessing the ex-post GHG removals and emissions reductions achieved through VM0003 v1.3 Methodology for Improved Forest Management (IFM) via ERA. The audit process involved document reviews, interviews, and onsite inspections. During the verification, 02 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and 17 Clarification Requests (CLs) were raised, all of which were resolved through corrections, clearer explanations, and supporting documents. 01 Forward Action Requests (FARs) was raised in this event.

This verification included the addition of 70 new Project Activity Instances (PAIs), bringing the total to 132 PAIs covering 25,870.4 hectares of land across multiple US states, including California, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, and West Virginia.

KBS confirms that the gross GHG removals and emissions reductions for the monitoring period from September 30, 2023, to May 31, 2024, amount to 100,564 tCO_{2e}. After applying a 12% non-permanence risk buffer deduction (12,067 tCO_{2e}), the net Verified Carbon Units (VCUs) total 88,495 tCO_{2e}. KBS considers these estimates to be accurate, with no material errors or uncertainties related to project compliance with the validation criteria.

5.2 Verification Conclusion

The Family Forest Carbon Project successfully achieved significant GHG emission reductions and carbon dioxide removals during the verification period from 30/09/2023 to 31/05/2024.

A total of 100,564⁷ tCO_{2e} of net GHG emission reductions and removals were verified by KBS. These reductions and removals are broken down by calendar years, with 25,271 tCO_{2e} of Verified Carbon Units (VCUs) eligible for issuance in 2023 and 63,225 tCO_{2e} in 2024.

The validation and verification body (VVB) provides reasonable assurance that the GHG emission reductions and removals reported in the project's GHG statement are accurate and meet the requirements of the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) and the applied VM0003 methodology v1.3. Reductions are derived from the baseline carbon stock changes after accounting for leakage and uncertainty deductions, while removals are calculated based on the change in project carbon stocks during the monitoring period. Both reductions and removals are verified separately ensuring compliance with methodological and standard-based requirements. The project proponent is responsible for the development of the GHG statement.

The overall net reductions and removals reflect the successful implementation of project activities within the verification period, with no deviations from the approved methodology.

No deviations were observed, and the project continues to contribute to climate change mitigation through the sustainable management of forest resources, as demonstrated by the confirmed and verified results.

Verification period: From 30/09/2023 to 31/05/2024

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

The non-permanence risk rating (%)	12%
If applicable, the Long-term Average (LTA), whether it has been properly updated, and if it has been reached.	NA LTA is not applicable at this time.
Whether a loss has been appropriately accounted for, in accordance with the VCS Program rules, if applicable.	NA No loss event during the monitoring period.

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO _{2e})	Project emissions (tCO _{2e})	Leakage emissions (tCO _{2e})	Buffer pool allocation (tCO _{2e})	Reductions VCUs (tCO _{2e})	Removals VCUs (tCO _{2e})	Total VCU issuance (tCO _{2e})
----------------	---	--	--	---	--------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---

⁷ As per Table 20, Section 5.4 of the MR that shows Total VCU Issuance by Vintage Period during the monitoring period and Table 18 and Table 19 (Section 5.4 of the MR) that show VCUs generated during the monitoring period in 2023 and 2024.

30-Sep-2023 to 31-Dec-2023	(4,343)	31,553	7,179	3,446	1,166	24,106	25,271
01-Jan-2024 to 31-May-2024	(9,898)	79,910	17,961	8,621	2,815	60,411	63,225
Total	(14,241)	111,463	25,140	12,067	3,981	84,517	88,496

VCUs by PAI in 2023

2023							
PAI	Baseline Emissions (tCO _{2e})	Project Emissions (tCO _{2e})	Leakage (tCO _{2e})	Buffer Pool (tCO _{2e})	Reductions VCUs (tCO _{2e})	Removals VCUs (tCO _{2e})	Total VCU Issuance (tCO _{2e})
1007	4	126	26	13	0	92	92
1012	137	658	159	76	33	527	559
1014	576	3044	724	348	114	2435	2548
1023	6	64	14	7	0	49	49
1024	38	58	19	9	21	47	68
1025	3	10	3	1	1	8	10
1026	2	54	11	5	0	40	40
1027	61	159	44	21	27	127	155
1028	5	24	6	3	1	19	20
1029	33	148	36	17	9	118	127
1030	6	27	7	3	2	22	23
1031	4	17	4	2	1	14	15
1032	5	24	6	3	2	19	21
1033	19	367	77	37	0	272	272
1034	-21	214	39	19	0	136	136
1035	18	65	17	8	7	52	58

1036	63	146	42	20	31	117	147
1037	18	58	15	7	7	46	53
1038	92	271	72	35	39	216	255
1039	16	85	20	10	3	68	71
1040	22	202	45	22	0	158	158
1041	17	37	11	5	8	29	38
1042	107	692	160	77	9	554	563
1043	2	14	3	2	0	11	11
1044	12	70	16	8	2	56	58
1045	10	209	44	21	0	154	154
1046	3	46	10	5	0	34	34
1047	26	108	27	13	8	87	94
1048	16	71	18	8	4	57	62
1049	4	54	12	6	0	41	41
1050	14	133	29	14	0	103	103
1051	5	70	15	7	0	52	52
1052	12	56	14	7	3	45	48
1053	8	67	15	7	0	53	53
1054	8	14	4	2	4	12	16
1055	10	25	7	3	5	20	24
1056	124	175	60	29	70	140	211
1057	69	313	77	37	19	251	269
1058	70	139	42	20	36	111	147
1059	71	1910	396	190	0	1395	1395
1061	4	25	6	3	1	20	21
1062	44	158	40	19	16	126	142
1063	321	1789	422	203	54	1431	1486

1064	1	51	10	5	0	37	37
1065	-20	173	31	15	0	108	108
1066	40	55	19	9	23	44	67
1067	23	156	36	17	1	124	126
1068	32	107	28	13	12	86	98
1069	5	680	137	66	0	482	482
1070	-13	349	67	32	0	237	237
1071	36	129	33	16	13	104	117
1073	20	96	23	11	5	77	81
1074	-71	1003	186	89	0	656	656
1079	6	125	26	13	0	92	92
1080	13	65	16	7	3	52	55
1082	19	249	54	26	0	189	189
1083	19	131	30	14	1	105	106
1084	-230	1433	240	115	0	846	846
1085	6	20	5	2	2	16	18
1086	7	41	10	5	1	33	34
1087	-17	994	195	94	0	688	688
1088	16	138	31	15	0	108	108
1089	3	9	2	1	1	8	9
1090	120	188	62	30	67	150	217
1091	115	840	191	92	0	672	672
1092	151	545	139	67	54	436	490
1093	422	1948	474	228	110	1559	1669
1094	36	174	42	20	9	139	148
1095	52	426	96	46	0	336	336
1097	11	347	72	34	0	252	252

1099	215	548	153	73	99	438	537
1100	66	341	81	39	14	273	286
1101	77	215	58	28	33	172	205
1102	3	26	6	3	0	21	21
1103	15	53	14	7	5	43	48
1104	10	48	12	6	3	39	41
1105	36	158	39	19	10	127	137
1107	344	2839	637	306	0	2241	2241
1108	2	18	4	2	0	13	13
1109	7	85	18	9	0	65	65
1110	12	93	21	10	0	74	74
1111	67	247	63	30	24	197	221
1112	19	99	23	11	4	79	83
1113	27	63	18	9	13	50	63
1114	18	79	19	9	5	64	68
1115	4	55	12	6	0	42	42
1116	2	51	11	5	0	37	37
1117	53	207	52	25	18	166	183
1118	2	246	50	24	0	175	175
1119	31	99	26	13	13	79	92
1120	32	347	76	36	0	267	267
1121	62	150	42	20	29	120	149
1122	60	166	45	22	26	133	159
1123	27	188	43	21	1	151	152
1124	3	30	7	3	0	23	23
1125	0	3	1	0	0	2	2
1126	5	20	5	2	1	16	17

1133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1134	-1	514	103	49	0	361	361
1138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1139	-4	78	15	7	0	52	52
1141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1142	3	12	3	1	1	9	10
1143	5	43	10	5	0	34	34
1144	142	737	176	84	29	589	619
1146	1	72	15	7	0	51	51
1147	2	8	2	1	1	6	7
1159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1161	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1163	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1164	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1166	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1167	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1169	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1170	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1171	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1172	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1175	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1178	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1182	130	1144	255	122	0	897	897

1183	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1184	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1185	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1186	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1188	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1190	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1192	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1210	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2023 Total	4,343	31,554	7,179	3,446	1,166	24,106	25,270

VCUs by PAI in 2024

2024							
PAI	Baseline Emissions (tCO _{2e})	Project Emissions (tCO _{2e})	Leakage (tCO _{2e})	Buffer Pool (tCO _{2e})	Reductions VCUs (tCO _{2e})	Removals VCUs (tCO _{2e})	Total VCU Issuance (tCO _{2e})
1007	7	210	43	21	0	153	153
1012	229	1097	265	127	56	878	933
1014	961	5073	1207	579	189	4058	4248
1023	10	106	23	11	0	82	82
1024	64	97	32	16	36	78	114
1025	6	17	5	2	2	14	16
1026	4	90	19	9	0	66	66
1027	101	265	73	35	46	212	258
1028	8	39	9	5	2	31	33
1029	55	246	60	29	15	197	212
1030	10	45	11	5	3	36	39
1031	7	29	7	3	2	23	25
1032	9	40	10	5	3	32	35
1033	31	612	129	62	0	453	453
1034	-35	356	64	31	0	226	226
1035	30	108	28	13	11	87	97

1036	106	243	70	33	51	195	246
1037	30	96	25	12	12	77	89
1038	153	451	121	58	64	361	425
1039	26	142	34	16	5	114	119
1040	36	337	75	36	0	263	263
1041	28	61	18	9	14	49	63
1042	178	1154	266	128	15	923	938
1043	4	23	5	3	0	18	19
1044	20	117	27	13	3	94	96
1045	17	349	73	35	0	257	257
1046	5	76	16	8	0	57	57
1047	43	180	45	21	13	144	157
1048	27	119	29	14	7	95	103
1049	7	90	19	9	0	68	68
1050	24	221	49	23	0	172	172
1051	8	116	25	12	0	87	87
1052	20	93	23	11	5	75	79
1053	14	111	25	12	0	88	88
1054	13	24	7	4	7	19	26
1055	16	42	12	6	8	33	41
1056	207	292	100	48	117	234	351
1057	116	522	128	61	31	418	449
1058	116	232	70	33	60	185	245
1059	119	3183	660	317	0	2325	2325
1061	7	42	10	5	1	33	35
1062	74	263	67	32	27	210	237
1063	535	2982	703	338	90	2386	2476
1064	2	85	17	8	0	61	61
1065	-33	289	51	25	0	180	180
1066	66	92	32	15	38	74	112
1067	39	259	60	29	2	207	210
1068	54	179	47	22	21	143	164
1069	8	1133	228	109	0	803	803
1070	-22	582	112	54	0	394	394
1071	60	216	55	27	22	173	194

1073	33	160	38	18	8	128	135
1074	-118	1672	311	149	0	1094	1094
1079	10	209	44	21	0	154	154
1080	21	108	26	12	5	87	91
1082	32	414	89	43	0	314	314
1083	32	219	50	24	2	175	177
1084	-384	2388	401	192	0	1411	1411
1085	10	33	9	4	4	26	30
1086	11	69	16	8	1	55	56
1087	-28	1657	326	156	0	1147	1147
1088	26	230	51	25	0	180	180
1089	5	16	4	2	2	13	15
1090	201	313	103	49	111	251	362
1091	191	1401	318	153	0	1120	1120
1092	251	908	232	111	90	727	817
1093	703	3247	790	379	183	2598	2781
1094	60	290	70	34	15	232	247
1095	87	709	159	76	0	560	560
1097	18	579	119	57	0	420	420
1099	381	969	270	130	175	775	950
1100	109	568	136	65	23	455	477
1101	147	414	112	54	64	331	395
1102	6	53	12	6	0	42	42
1103	30	110	28	13	11	88	98
1104	17	81	20	9	4	65	69
1105	80	354	87	42	22	283	305
1107	770	6350	1424	683	0	5012	5012
1108	5	62	14	6	0	48	48
1109	16	201	44	21	0	153	153
1110	38	300	68	32	0	238	238
1111	250	915	233	112	88	732	820
1112	39	205	49	23	8	164	172
1113	66	154	44	21	32	123	155
1114	30	132	32	16	8	106	114
1115	11	152	33	16	0	115	115

1116	4	135	28	13	0	98	98
1117	156	606	152	73	51	484	536
1118	11	1207	244	117	0	858	858
1119	65	204	54	26	26	163	189
1120	101	1101	240	115	0	846	846
1121	175	422	119	57	83	338	420
1122	120	332	90	43	52	265	318
1123	126	868	199	95	6	695	700
1124	7	61	14	6	0	48	48
1125	-1	5	1	0	0	3	3
1126	11	46	11	5	3	37	40
1133	121	447	114	55	42	358	400
1134	-5	2897	578	278	0	2036	2036
1138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1139	-52	1074	204	98	0	719	719
1141	-243	7213	1394	669	0	4907	4907
1142	31	138	34	16	9	111	119
1143	47	386	87	42	0	305	305
1144	719	3735	891	428	148	2988	3136
1146	6	439	89	43	0	313	313
1147	20	72	18	9	7	58	65
1159	-8	307	60	29	0	211	211
1160	98	471	114	55	24	377	401
1161	14	332	69	33	0	243	243
1162	19	197	43	21	0	152	152
1163	293	2015	462	222	13	1612	1625
1164	957	2342	660	317	449	1874	2323
1166	74	555	126	60	0	443	443
1167	4	113	23	11	0	83	83
1168	57	129	37	18	28	103	131
1169	7	105	22	11	0	79	79
1170	13	74	17	8	2	59	61
1171	17	114	26	13	1	91	93
1172	5	162	33	16	0	118	118
1175	-42	184	28	14	0	100	100

1178	3	43	9	4	0	32	32
1181	6	171	36	17	0	125	125
1182	216	1907	425	204	0	1495	1495
1183	-67	166	20	10	0	70	70
1184	-1	64	13	6	0	45	45
1185	-6	98	18	9	0	65	65
1186	46	20	13	6	30	16	46
1188	-23	363	68	33	0	240	240
1190	24	60	17	8	11	48	59
1192	-3	56	11	5	0	38	38
1210	-1	5	1	0	0	3	3
2024 Total	9,898	79,910	17,962	8,622	2,815	60,411	63,225

5.3 Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison

Vintage period	Ex-ante estimated reductions/removals	Achieved reductions/removals	Percent difference	Explanation for the difference
30-Sept-2023 to 31-Dec2023	19,015	28,717	+51%	The estimated and actual project area enrolled differed.
01-Jan-2024 to 31-May2024	93,757	71,847	-30%	The estimated and actual project area enrolled differed.
Total	112,772	100,564	-12%	The estimated and actual project area enrolled differed.

Location: Faridabad

Date: 06/02/2025



Authorized Signatory: Praveen N Urs

Designation: Director Climate Change

APPENDIX 1: COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION

Calculations in the Financial Viability section of the Non-Permanence Risk Report include qualifying financial inputs, as such, these inputs shall not be disclosed in the public documentation.

Section	Information	Justification	Assessment method and conclusion
			Although the PP has identified certain documents as commercially sensitive, these documents are not part of the public version of the MR and do not require exclusion. The documents flagged by the PP as sensitive are external to the MR itself. Summaries of these documents are appropriately included in the MR and the reasons for not making them publicly available stated in section 4.1. Additionally, the listed external documents were provided to the audit team upon request.

APPENDIX 2: RESOLUTION OF FINDINGS

Table 1. Remaining FAR from validation and/or previous verifications (Applicable for verification)

FAR ID	xx	Section no.	-	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of FAR				
NA				
Project participant response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY <i>(please mention the date of your response to KBS)</i>		
<i>Please mention the response in this box.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<i>Please mention the document provided to KBS along with the above response.</i>				
DOE assessment		Date: DD/MM/YYYY		

Table 2. CL from this validation/verification

CL ID	CL01	Section no.	1.1	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
In section 1.1 of the MR, it is mentioned that “The project includes 133 project activity instances (PAIs), with 71 added during this monitoring period. The total area of the project is 24,985.7 hectares (61,740.8 acres)”. Submit the KML files of the PAI’s for review.				
Project participant response		Date: 13/09/2024		
Section 1.1 of the MR describes the Project Activity instances included in the project as well as inclusions during this monitoring period. KMLs of both centroids and project boundaries have been provided within Annex C. In text citation has been added to section 1.1 to include reference to Annex C.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Annex C (PAI_Boundaries)				
DOE assessment			Date: 03/10/2024	
Verification team has reviewed the submitted KML file and found further discrepancies as it has been observed in some of the plot shows “0” hectare despite the land parcel polygon shown in KML. Hence CL01 is open				
Project participant response		Date: DD/MM/YYYY <i>(please mention the date of your response to KBS)</i>		
<i>Please mention the response in this box.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<i>Please mention the document provided to KBS along with the above response.</i>				

DOE assessment	Date: 03/10/2024
Verification team has reviewed the submitted KML file and found ok. Hence CL01 is closed.	

CL ID	CL02	Section no.	1.10	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
PP to confirm and submit a declaration that the project is not “Double Counting and Participation under Other GHG Programs”. Also clarify if any of the PAI’s in the project are part of ACR and/or any other registry. How PP is doing the “Due diligence” to not to include such PAI’s in the project.				
Project participant response		Date: 12/09/2024		
Section 1.10 of the VCS Monitoring Report Template v4.3 requires the project proponent to state a) whether the project is receiving or seeking credit for reductions and removals from a project activity under another GHG program, and b) if the project is registered or seeking registration under any other GHG program. The Family Forest Carbon Project satisfies this requirement by stating “No” to both options. Also, section 1.11 of the VCS Monitoring Report Template v4.3 requires the project proponent to state a) if project reductions and removals or project activities are also included in an emissions trading program or binding emission limit, b) if the project sought, received, or is planning to receive credit from another GHG-related environmental credit system, and c) if the project activities affect the emissions footprint of any product(s) (goods or services) that are part of a supply chain. The Family Forest Carbon Project satisfies all of these requirements by declaring “No” to all of these statements. In addition to providing these statements, legally binding management lease agreements are also provided for all lands enrolled in the project that prohibit enrollment in other forest carbon offset projects (Annex D). See sections 1.1, 1.4, and 6.4 of the provided lease agreements.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Monitoring Report; Annex D				
DOE assessment			Date: 03/10/2024	
The clarification by PP on Double Counting and Participation under Other GHG Programs and ACR is accepted. Hence CL02 is closed				

CL ID	CL03	Section no.	1.12	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
Clarify why no value is reported for SDG 13 i.e., “Reduced or removed __ tonnes of CO _{2e} for this monitoring period” (Reference SDG 13, Page 16)				
Project participant response		Date: 12/09/2024		
Per VCS Monitoring Report Template Section 1.11, the project proponent must provide “the project’s quantifiable contributions to specific targets and indicators of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for the monitoring period. In accordance with this requirement, SDG 13 has been updated to provide the requested reduced/removed tCO _{2e} values for the current monitoring period. This resolves the finding by adding the requested information to Table 3: Sustainable Development Contributions.				
DOE assessment			Date: 03/10/2024	

Now value is reported for SDG 13, hence CL03 is closed.

CL ID	CL04	Section no.	2.1.2	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
In section 2.1.2 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication ➤ Demonstrate that the results were provided in a timely manner. ➤ Describe how due account was taken of all input received during the consultation.... justify why updates were not necessary or appropriate. (Refer: VCS Monitoring Report Template). Submit project proponent’s customer relationship management database for review.				
Project participant response		Date: 13/09/2024		
VCS Monitoring Report Template v4.3 requires the project proponent to demonstrate that project monitoring results were provided in a timely manner. To address this requirement, a reference to Annex A1 has been added to the Monitoring Report, where timestamps of stakeholder correspondence are available. The reference to Annex A1 in Section 2.1.2 provides evidence that monitoring results were provided to stakeholders in a timely manner. The correspondence print outs provided in Annex A1 are all logged our internal company Salesforce, with PDFs created and submitted during each verification event for VVB review. VCS Monitoring Report Template v4.3 requires the project proponent describe how due account was taken of all input received during the consultation and include details on any updates to the project design or justify why updates were not necessary or appropriate. To address this requirement, the Stakeholder Input section of Section 2.1.2 of the Monitoring Report has been updated to describe how due account has been taken of all input received during the ongoing consultation and justify why updates were not necessary or appropriate.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Monitoring Report; Annex A1				
DOE assessment			Date: 03/10/2024	
The clarification by PP on Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication is accepted. Hence CL04 is closed				

CL ID	CL05	Section no.	2.14	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
In section 2.1.4 it is mentioned that "<i>The grievance redress procedure is made publicly available on the stakeholders' page of the project proponent's website, directed to: https://forestcarbonworks.org/grievance-procedure/</i>". The website indicates that it was Last Updates: 14 September 2023. Clarify, why it's not updated.				
Project participant response		Date: 12/09/2024		

Section 2.1.4 of the VCS Monitoring Report Template v4.3 requires the project proponent to demonstrate that the grievance redress procedure is easily accessible to stakeholders for ongoing consultation. The grievance procedure is described and available for viewing on the project proponent's website, which was last updated in September of 2023. As the procedure has remained unchanged since this point in time there is no need to update the grievance procedure page of the project proponent's website. While the grievance redress procedure web page has not been updated since September of 2023, the page has been continuously accessible to the public and available for comment submission.

Documentation provided by project participant

N/A

DOE assessment
Date: 03/10/2024

The clarification by PP on the website is accepted. Hence CL05 is closed

CL ID	CL06	Section no.	3.1	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
The report mentions that no commercial harvesting occurred during the monitoring period. Clarify whether this is consistent with the overall project timeline and expected activities, and ensure that harvesting restrictions follow the project's crediting and implementation periods				
Project participant response		Date: 12/09/2024		
Per the Monitoring Report Template, Section 3.1 of the Monitoring Report must describe the implementation status of the project activity(s) [including] [t]he operation of the project activity(s) during this monitoring period, including any information on events that may impact the GHG emission reductions or removals and monitoring. Because this definition includes harvesting, any harvests that will occur in the future will be recorded in the Monitoring Report. While no harvests occurred during this Monitoring Period, the expected activities for the future do include harvesting. All landowners are required to be FSC-certified per Eligibility Criterion 7 and seek permission from the project proponent prior to harvesting, which will ensure that all future harvests will follow the project's crediting and implementation periods. This resolves the finding by clarifying that future commercial harvests will occur and providing documentation outlining the project proponent's method of ensuring that all harvesting restrictions are followed.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Annex Q				
DOE assessment			Date: 03/10/2024	
The clarification by PP on commercial harvesting if any occurred during the monitoring period is accepted. Hence CL06 is closed				

CL ID	CL07	Section no.	4.1	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
Format and align the tables is section 4.1.				
Project participant response		Date: 16/09/2024		

Tables in section 4.1 of the MR have been reformatted and aligned.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
Monitoring Report	
DOE assessment	Date: 03/10/2024
Now Table in section 4.1 of the MR is aligned and formatted. Hence CL07 is closed	

CL ID	CL08	Section no.	4.3	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
In section 4.3 of MR, it is indicated that “During the review and processing of collected inventory data, inconsistent, seemingly erroneous, and/or otherwise insufficient data were investigated using photogrammetric methods, and, when necessary, the project proponent further consulted the forest technician. Where necessary, the forest technician revisited plots and updated inventory data”. PP to confirm if there were any inconsistent, seemingly erroneous, and/or otherwise insufficient data and revisited plots in this monitoring period and accordingly submit the reports for review (if any).				
Project participant response		Date: 12/09/2024		
Per the MR Template Section 4.3, the monitoring report must include “the procedures used for handling any internal auditing performed and any non-conformities identified... [and] the implementation of... QA/QC procedures.” While the required procedures were described in project documentation, there were no inconsistent, seemingly erroneous, and/or otherwise insufficient data and revisited plots in this monitoring period. Thus, the described process was not required to be applied to any plots in Monitoring Period 2. This resolves the finding by clarifying that there were no eligible plots and thus no remeasurement was required to occur.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment			Date: 03/10/2024	
The clarification by PP on any inconsistent, seemingly erroneous, and/or otherwise insufficient data and revisited plots in this monitoring period is accepted. Hence CL08 is closed				

CL ID	CL09	Section no.	4.3	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
As per “VCS Monitoring Report Template” in section 4.3 PP to indicate the following ➤ the processes used for calibrating monitoring equipment. ➤ Competencies of the personnel that carried out the monitoring activities ➤ The processes used for handling any internal auditing performed and any non-conformities identified. Accordingly submit the calibration records of the monitoring equipment's, CV's of the personnel that carried out the monitoring activities and internal auditing performed with non-conformities identified for records/review.				

Project participant response	Date: 12/09/2024
Section 4.3 of the VCS Monitoring Report Template v4.3 requires the project proponent to describe the processes used for calibrating monitoring equipment, the competencies of the personnel that carried out the monitoring activities, and the processes used for handling any internal auditing performed and any non-conformities identified. The processes used for calibrating monitoring equipment used during forest inventory work have been provided in Annex L. The competencies of the personnel that carry out the monitoring activities is ensured by requiring all field-based personnel to go through the project proponent's training program (Annex L). The processes used for internal auditing are described in the Nephos Digitization Manual and Nephos QAQC documents now provided in an updated version of Annex L. Additionally, the equipment used in monitoring has been designed to require proper calibration prior to any work completed (see the training videos provided in Annex L). As such, no non-conformities were identified. Additional language clarifying these issues has been added to Section 4.3 of the Monitoring Report.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
Monitoring Report; Annex L	
DOE assessment	Date: 03/10/2024
No section 4.3 of the MR is in line with "VCS Monitoring Report Template". Hence CL09 is closed	

CL ID	CL10	Section no.	Monitoring Report	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
Provide more details on how field data collection methods were verified and validated, especially regarding QA/QC processes. While the report mentions calibration and checks during the inventory process, more specific descriptions of these checks should be documented				
Project participant response		Date: 13/09/2024		
Annex L contains details on how devices were checked and calibrated during the field inventory process. Additionally, Annex AL provides detail on the QA/QC steps that were taken to verify and validate field data and the subsequent analysis steps completed using inventory data. This resolves the finding by providing the requested information for review.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Annex L, Annex AL				
DOE assessment			Date: 03/10/2024	
The clarification by PP on the field data collection methods and QA/QC processes is accepted. Hence CL10 is closed				

CL ID	CL11	Section no.	Monitoring Report	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				

Clarify the process for calculating uncertainty deductions in baseline and project scenarios. The monitoring report mentions that uncertainty deductions were not required this period, but additional details on this determination would be useful.	
Project participant response	Date: 13/09/2024
Per VM0003 Methodology Section 8.7.2, “[w]here CIFM, ERROR is less than or equal to 10 percent of CIFM, there is no deduction for uncertainty.” Per the project proponent’s calculations, CIFM, ERROR for the project is less than 10 percent of CIFM, and thus uncertainty for the project is zero (see section 5.4 of the MR). Annex AZ has been added to show the calculation steps taken to determine this. This resolves the finding by providing the requested additional details on how uncertainty was determined for the project.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
Annex AZ	
DOE assessment	Date: 03/10/2024
The clarify by PP on the process for calculating uncertainty deductions in baseline and project scenarios is accepted. Hence CL11 is closed	

CL ID	CL12	Section no.	Document review	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
The KML files which are shared by the PP are in point location and for AFOLU project polygon is required. Hence, now PP shall submit the evidence for project location in line with VCS standard version.4.7 section 3.11.1. For grouped projects (see Section 3.6.10), 7 and section 3.11.2.				
Project participant response		Date: 13/09/2024		
Section 3.6.10 of VCS standard 4.7 states “Grouped projects shall specify one or more clearly defined geographic areas within which project activity instances may be developed. Such geographic areas shall be specified using geodetic polygons”. KMLs of both centroids and PAI boundaries have been provided within Annex C. Reference to Annex C have been added to section 1.1.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Annex C (PAI_Boundaries)				
DOE assessment				Date: 03/10/2024
Verification team has reviewed the submitted KML file and found further discrepancies as it has been observed in some of the plot shows 0 hectare despite the land parcel polygon shown in KML. Hence CL12 is open				
Project participant response		Date: 03/10/2024		
Separate KMLs for both polygons and points were provided within the updated Annex C. “PAI_Centroids” contains centroid point location for PAIs and “PAI_Boundaries” contains PAI polygon boundaries. Updated KMLs have been added to Annex C that includes Hectarage information for every PAI polygon and centroid.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Annex C				
DOE assessment				Date: 03/10/2024

Verification team has reviewed the submitted KML file and found ok. Hence CL12 is closed.

CL ID	CL13	Section no.	Document review	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
During the document review, it was observed that the contract for PAI 1032 has a maximum extended term of up to 18 years (three additional periods of six years each), bringing the total potential contract period to approximately 25 years. This is in contrast to PAI 1071, which allows for an extended term of up to 45 years (four additional periods of five years each, followed by five optional periods of five years), resulting in a total contract period of up to 50 years. Clarify why the difference in contract period structure between PAI 1032 and PAI 1071.				
Project participant response		Date: 13/09/2024		
The difference in contract length is due primarily to changes enacted by the project proponent to make contracts more easily understood by landowners. PAI 1032 has a contract period of 25 years, made up of an initial 7-year term and three subsequent 6-year extension terms. PAI 1071 has a contract period of 25 years as well, made up of an initial 5-year term and four subsequent 5-year extension terms. In addition to this, PAI 1071 also has the contractual right to extend for up to five additional periods of five years in the event of a crediting period renewal. All contracts can be viewed in Annex D. While the length of terms has changed, contracts for both PAI 1032 and 1071 provide coverage for the length of the project crediting period. This resolves the finding by clarifying the contract for PAIs 1032 and 1072 and the reason for the change in structure.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Annex D				
DOE assessment				Date: 03/10/2024
The clarification by PP is accepted, Hence CL13 is closed.				

CL ID	CL14	Section no.	Document review	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
PP to provide more information of stakeholder engagement activities, specifically by providing timelines and evidence of the consultations carried out in line with VCS Standard guidelines.				
Project participant response		Date: 13/09/2024		
VCS Standard v4.7 requires the project proponent to conduct a stakeholder consultation before the implementation of project activities, and that such consultations shall be done in a manner that is inclusive, culturally appropriate, and respectful of local knowledge. A comprehensive record of ongoing stakeholder correspondence for each PAI can be found in Annex AI, including timelines of communication. This resolves this finding by providing timelines and evidence of the consultations carried out in line with VCS Standard guidelines.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Annex AI				
DOE assessment				Date: 03/10/2024

PP has now submitted the stakeholder documents as requested, and the clarification by PP is accepted, Hence CL014 is closed.

CL ID	CL15	Section no.	Document review	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
The AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Report v4.2 is not submitted for review in the Annex folder. Share the report for review.				
Project participant response		Date: 13/09/2024		
Print-outs from the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Report and its associated attachments have been staged in Annex AY for review. The complete NPRR associated with the Family Forest Carbon Project can be viewed online. As requested, we have provided access to the following email: director@kbsindia.in. This resolves the finding by sharing the report for review.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Annex AY				
DOE assessment				Date: 03/10/2024
Now, the verification team has access of project AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Report v4.2, hence CL15 is closed.				

CL ID	CL16	Section no.	Site visit	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				
During site visit				
1. In many of the PAI's there were fallen dead trees (some by wind, pest, etc.). If there is any fire, what are the emergency management plan to protect the property, as these are potential risks. 2. Share the SoP (i.e., Standard Operating Procedure) of field measurements, as it was observed at site that if a tree had more than 1 bark, (i.e., 2, 3 or more) it is considered as different tree and DBH is measured. 3. Procedures of Pest control i.e., use chemicals in the project. 4. PP clarify on the validation processes for field data collection to ensure consistency and reliability of the data i.e., how frequently calibration and cross-checking of equipment and personnel procedures occur. 5. Monitoring field staff training records.				
Project participant response		Date: 13/09/2024		

1. Fallen dead trees are relatively common in many North American forests. This differs from many forests in Europe, where more intensive plantation management is common, and from tropical forests that have higher rates of wood decay and quicker nutrient cycling. FCW does encourage landowners enrolled in the Family Forest Carbon Project to practice climate smart forestry practices, including practices designed to reduce fire risk. In addition to this, an adaptive management plan has been included in the project (Annex AW) as required by the Non-Permanence Risk Tool. However, there is not a requirement in the VCS Standard, the Monitoring Report template, nor the VM0003 Methodology regarding emergency management plans.
2. If a tree forks below breast height (considered to be 4.5 ft on the uphill side of the bole) it is treated as multiple trees. This is documented in the Forest Carbon Works training materials provided in Annex L. The general methods used in conducting forest inventories associated with this project have been informed by standard procedures used by the United States Forest Service – see the *Forest Inventory Analysis Forest Inventory Field Guide* also provided in Annex L.
3. Procedures for the use of chemicals in pest control activities are not required by the VCS Standard, the Monitoring Report template, nor the VM0003 Methodology. Additionally, project activities (the extension of forest rotation age) are not anticipated to have an impact on the use of any chemicals nor pest control actions. However, all current and future forest management activities on lands enrolled in the project will still be subject to all applicable local and federal laws.
4. The processes used for calibrating monitoring equipment used during forest inventory work have been provided in Annex L. The competencies of the personnel that carry out the monitoring activities are ensured by requiring all field-based personal to go through the project proponent's training program (Annex L). The processes used for internal auditing are described in the Nephos Digitization Manual and Nephos QAQC documents now provided in an updated version of Annex L. Additionally, the equipment used in monitoring has been designed to require proper calibration prior to any work completed (see the training videos provided in Annex L).
5. FCW Regional Foresters all have extensive experience and training in forestry. While there are differences in the experience and training of staff, all Regional Foresters are currently certified through the Society of American Foresters (SAF) Certified Forester (CF) program. This program has education and experience criteria and requires Certified Foresters to undergo annual trainings throughout each year. Further information on the SAF CF program can be found here: https://www.eforester.org/Main/Certification_Education/Certified_Forester/Main/Certification/Certification_Home.aspx

Documentation provided by project participant

Monitoring Report; Annex L; Annex AW

DOE assessment

Date: 03/10/2024

The clarification by PP on site observation during the audit team visit on fallen dead trees, field DBH measurements, chemical use, calibration and field staff training are accepted, hence CL16 is closed.

CL ID	CL17	Section no.	Previous verification	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CL				

In previous verification report section 3.3, on page no.27 it is indicated that “ <i>The PP has an FSC certificate for forest management; however, the PAIs are not yet included in this certificate (https://search.fsc.org/) since for the moment they will not carry out harvesting</i> ”. Clarify and confirm on the new PAI’s included in this monitoring period and submit the evidence.	
Project participant response	Date: 16/09/2024
The VM0003 Methodology requires that lands enrolled in a project must either be a) FSC certified at the time of their first verification event, or b) FSC certified prior to any commercial harvesting. Forest Carbon Works already has a group certificate with FSC in place (Annex AR), but project activity instances associated with the Family Forest Carbon Project have not been added yet since no harvesting has taken place in Monitoring Periods 1 or 2 (see Section 2.3 of the MR).	
Documentation provided by project participant	
Monitoring Report; Annex AR	
DOE assessment	Date: 03/10/2024
The clarification by PP is accepted and this CL17 is closed for this 2 nd verification. However now it has been raised a FAR01 to be verified during the next validation/verification.	

Table 3. CAR from this validation/verification

CAR ID	CAR 01	Section no.	VCS Monitoring Report Template	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CAR				
The active version of “VCS Monitoring Report Template” is v4.4, accordingly submit the monitoring report using the latest available version on the VERRA website (https://verra.org/programs/verified-carbon-standard/vcs-program-details/).				
Project participant response		Date: 12/09/2024		
Verra requires use of the correct VCS Monitoring Report Template. In April 2024, Verra released an updated template, along with a April 2024 Overview of VCS Program Updates and Effective Dates (PDF) clarification document. Page 3 of this clarification document states the effective date to which the new templates are required to be used is January 2025. Therefore, the project proponent is still allowed to utilize version 4.3 of the VCS Monitoring Report Template, until January 2025.				
5.	All project templates have been updated to align with the revised requirements in the VCS Standard and Registration and Issuance Process.	VCS Project Description Template, v4.4 VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.4 VCS Joint Project Description and Monitoring Report Template, v4.4 VCS Validation Report Template, v4.4 VCS Verification Report Template, v4.4 VCS Joint Validation and Verification Report Template, v4.4	Effective for all project requests submitted to the Verra Registry on or after 1 January 2025 . Note: Updated versions of the CCB and VCS Program joint project templates will be revised accordingly and released shortly. These templates will have the same effective date of 1 January 2025 for all project requests.	
Documentation provided by project participant				
Website: https://verra.org/vcs-program-updates-address-corsia-conditions-clarify-icvcm-alignment/				
DOE assessment				Date: 03/10/2024

The clarification by PP on using the old version of MR template is accepted, hence CAR01 is closed.

CAR ID	CAR02	Section no.	1.12	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of CAR				
Section 1.12 shall be in line with “VCS Monitoring Report Template”, check and update the section 1.12 of the MR accordingly.				
Project participant response		Date: 13/09/2024		
The previously submitted monitoring report had the table found in section 1.12 labelled as “Table 3: Sustainable Developments Contributions”. The VCS Monitoring Report Template v.4.3 requires the table to be titled “Table 1: Sustainable Developments Contributions”. Corrections have been made to appropriately number this table and edit sentences with the wrong table reference number.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Monitoring Report				
DOE assessment				Date: 03/10/2024
PP has now updated the section 1.12 of the MR in line with “VCS Monitoring Report Template”. Hence CAR02 is closed.				

Table 4. FAR from this verification

FAR ID	FAR01	Section no.	CL17	Date: 11/09/2024
Description of FAR				
In response to CL17, PP has indicated that <i>"The VM0003 Methodology requires that lands enrolled in a project must either be a) FSC certified at the time of their first verification event, or b) FSC certified prior to any commercial harvesting. Forest Carbon Works already has a group certificate with FSC in place (Annex AR), but project activity instances associated with the Family Forest Carbon Project have not been added yet since no harvesting has taken place in Monitoring Periods 1 or 2 (see Section 2.3 of the MR)".</i> Therefore, PP to submit FSC certificates of PAI's/landowners commercial harvesting to the verifying/validating VVB.				
Project participant response				Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment				Date: DD/MM/YYYY

APPENDIX 3: REFERENCES

/1/	VCS Standard, version 4.7 AFOLU requirements: VCS Version 4.2 AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk tool: VCS Version 4.2 VCS Program rules VCS Validation and Verification Manual
/2/	VCS Methodology VM0003 “Methodology for Improved Forest Management through Extension of Rotation Age”. v1.3 VT0001 Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in VCS Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Project Activities, v3.0 CDM-EB50-A30-STAN - Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities Version 09.0
/3/	Validated Project Description, version 1.6, dated 23/01/2023, Validation report, Monitoring report of 1st verification and 1st verification report
/4/	Initial Monitoring report, version01
/5/	Final Monitoring report, version02.8, dated 24/01/2025
/6/	Agreements Signed i.e., Forest Management Lease Agreement
/7/	Non-Performance Risk Report
/8/	Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities, version09
/9/	GIS data / Project KML file
/10/	VCU calculations sheets
/11/	Stakeholders / Grievances documents
/12/	Staff training records
/13/	IPCC Good Practice Guidance 2003 and 2006

ANNEXES REFERED

Annex	Title	Conf.
Annex A	Cohort 2 Soil Maps	
Annex B	PAI Maps	
Annex C	KML (Project areas + Centroids)	
Annex D	Signed MLAs	Yes
Annex E	Overlapping Critical Species Habitat documentation	
Annex F	FCW Conserve Lying Dead by PAI v3 The Fire and Fuels Extension to the Forest Vegetation Simulator: Updated Model Documentation FOREST INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS NATIONAL CORE FIELD GUIDE VOLUME I: FIELD DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES FOR PHASE 2 PLOTS Version 9.2	
Annex G	Specific Gravity and Other Properties of Wood and Bark for 156 Tree Species Found in North America	
Annex H	Forester Attestations to Baseline Silviculture	
Annex I	Forest Protocol 2015 assessment.area.data.file	
Annex J	Winjum et al 1998	
Annex K	Global Forest Resources Assessment 2020 - Terms and Definitions FRA 2020	
Annex L	2023 Forest Cruiser Training.mp4 2023 Forest Cruiser Training.pptx NephosDigitizationManual	

Annex M	Harmon & Sexton 1996	
Annex N	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories - Ch4 Forest Land	
Annex O	IPCC, Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry, 2003	
Annex P	U.S. Forest Projects (June 25, 2015) - Volume and Biomass Equations for Forest Offset Projects in All States Except Alaska, California, Oregon, and Washington biomass.equations.ca.or.wa volume.equations.ca.or.wa	
Annex Q	FCW Conserve Harvest Policy, May 2024	
Annex R	FCW Offer Packet Template FCW Conserve Membership Guide FCW Stakeholder Engagement Plan	
Annex S	FCW Conserve NPV for NPRT Cohort 2 Confidential due to proprietary financial inputs related to project development costs	Yes
Annex T	Reserved	
Annex U	FCW VCS Certification Model v3 – MP 2 Kimmeridge Carbon Solutions, L.P. and Chestnut Carbon LLC Proof of Funds Confidential due to proprietary financial information	Yes
Annex V	Non-Permanence Risk Tool Additional Evidence Historical Risk Score Selection Justification and Evidence	
Annex W	FCW Conserve Treelist Workbook	
Annex Y	Management Strata (Modeling Units, Plots, and Boundaries) Shapefile	

Annex Z	Example baseline timber harvest plans	
Annex AA	FVS Files, including Microsoft Access Database of FVS Model Outputs	
Annex AB	FCW Conserve ERR Calculation Spreadsheet	
Annex AC	FCW Conserve Model Results	
Annex AD	FCW Conserve Baseline Wood Products	
Annex AE	Signed NCX Contracts	Yes
Annex AF	List of Recorded Invasive Species by State	
Annex AG	Landowner Deeds	Yes
Annex AH	Forest Stewardship Council US Forest Management Standard	
Annex AI	Stakeholder Correspondence	Yes
Annex AJ	In-Person December 6, 2023, Stakeholder Event Invite	
Annex AK	FSC Gender Equality Guidelines: SDG 05: GENDER EQUALITY	
Annex AL	QAQC Reference v1.0	
Annex AM	US Contributions to 17 Sustainable Development Goals by 2030-2022 Report	
Annex AN	Reserved	
Annex AO	Digital and Physical Copy of Stakeholder Mailers and Postcards	Yes
Annex AP	FCW Conserve - Sample Size (MP 2) Current aboveground live tree carbon stocks and annual net change in forests of conterminous United States	
Annex AR	FSC Audit Supplement	

	Forest Carbon Works FSC Certificate	
Annex AS	PAI Harvest Checks	
Annex AT	FCW Conserve Eligible Forested Land Review	
Annex AU	University of Minnesota Research Statement	
Annex AX	Safety Materials and Anti-Harassment Training	
Annex AW	FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Identification Report FCW Conserve Safeguard Risk Policy FCW Adaptive Risk Management Plan	
Annex AY	Non-Permanence Risk Tool Export Non-Permanence Risk Tool Notes Export Non-Permanence Risk Tool Attachments Export	
Annex AZ	Uncertainty v0.4- Project	

APPENDIX 4: COMPETENCE OF TEAM MEMBERS

Personnel Name		Dr D Siddaramu			
Schemes	☒ CDM	☒ GCC	☒ GS	☒ VCS	☒ Other GHG Schemes (VCS CCB, SD Vista)
Qualified to work as					
Team Leader			☒	Technical Expert	
Validator/Verifier			☒	Financial Expert	
Technical Reviewer			☒	Local Expert (India)	
Area(s) of Technical Expertise					
Sectoral Scope			Technical Area		
SS 01: Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)			TA 1.1: Energy generation from Thermal energy		
			TA 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources		
SS 3: Energy demand			TA 3.1. Energy Demand		
SS 14: Afforestation and reforestation			TA 14.1 Afforestation and reforestation		
Approved by (Manager C&T			Dushyant Parashar		
Date of Approval			26-11-2024		

Personnel Name		John Westley			
Schemes	☐ CDM	☐ GCC	☐ GS	☐ VCS	☐ Other GHG Schemes (mention here)
Qualified to work as					
Team Leader			☐	Technical Expert	
Validator/Verifier			☐	Financial Expert	
Technical Reviewer			☐	Local Expert (USA)	
Area(s) of Technical Expertise					
Sectoral Scope			Technical Area		
SS 15: Agriculture			TA 15.1: Agriculture		
Approved by (Manager Competence & Training)			Dushyant Parashar		
Approval date			16-07-2024		

Personnel Name		Dr. Rajesh Monga			
Schemes	☒ CDM	☒ GCC	☒ GS	☒ VCS	☒ Other GHG Schemes (ICR, Social Carbon, Cercarbono, VCS CCB, ISO 14064, SD Vista)
Qualified to work as					
Team Leader			☐	Technical Expert	
Validator/Verifier (Trainee)			☒	Financial Expert	
Technical Reviewer			☐	Local Expert	
Area(s) of Technical Expertise					
Sectoral Scope			Technical Area		
SS 14: Afforestation and reforestation			TA 14.1. Afforestation and reforestation		
SS 15: Agriculture			TA 15.1. Agriculture		
Approved by (Manager Competence & Training)			Dr. Ritu Arora Sehgal		
Approval date			13-06-2023		

Personnel Name		Mr. B Madhusudhan Reddy			
Schemes	☐ CDM	☒ GCC	☒ GS	☒ VCS	☒ Other GHG Schemes (VCS CCB, SDVista)
Qualified to work as					
Team Leader			☒	Technical Expert	
Validator/Verifier			☒	Financial Expert	
Technical Reviewer			☐	Local Expert (India)	
Area(s) of Technical Expertise					
Sectoral Scope			Technical Area		
SS 14: Afforestation and reforestation			TA 14.1. Afforestation and reforestation		
SS 15: Agriculture			TA 15.1. Agriculture		
Approved by (Manager Competence & Training)			Mr. Dushyant Parashar		
Approval date			09-05-2024		

Personnel Name		Bharath S.			
Schemes	☐ CDM	☒ GCC	☒ GS	☒ VCS	☒ Other GHG Schemes (Cercarbono, SDVista)
Qualified to work as					
Team Leader			☒	Technical Expert	
Validator/Verifier			☒	Financial Expert	
Technical Reviewer			☒	Local Expert	
Area(s) of Technical Expertise					
Sectoral Scope			Technical Area		

SS 1: Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	TA 1.2. Renewables
SS 3: Energy Demand	TA 3.1: Energy Demand
Approved by (Manager Competence & Training)	Mr. Dushyant Parashar
Approval date	11-09-2024