VERIFICATION REPORT

NATURAL HIGH FOREST REHABILITATION PROJECT ON DEGRADED LAND OF KIBALE NATIONAL PARK, UGANDA

Document Prepared By RINA Services Spa

Contact Information Rita VALOROSO

Project Title	NATURAL HIGH FOREST REHABILITATION PROJECT ON DEGRADED LAND OF KIBALE NATIONAL PARK, UGANDA
Version	1.1 Aa
Report ID	2015DG16MD

Report Title	Final verification report
Client	Face the Future B.V.
Pages	35
Date of Issue	26/11/2015
Prepared By	RINA SERVICES SPA
Contact	Via Corsica 12 – 26124 GENOVA (Italy) , +39 0106021711 rita.valoroso@rina.org www.rina.org
Approved By	Laura Severino
Work Carried Out By	Rita VALOROSO – Team Leader/Verifier Massimo CANOSSA – Technical Expert SS 14

Summary:

- The project aims to restore natural high forest in Kibale National Park in Uganda; it contributes to climate change mitigation by sequestering GHGs in sinks through planting indigenous tree species and assisted natural regeneration activities. The purpose of the project activity is to realize multiple socio-economic and environmental benefits (climate change mitigation, biodiversity conservation, local community development and soil erosion control) through restoring forest vegetation on degraded lands.
- The purpose of this verification was to verify and certify emission reductions and the land management reported for the Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, project in Uganda for the period 02/01/2011 to 01/03/2014. The scope of verification is to verify that the project activity has been implemented and operated in accordance with the registered PDD, the monitoring plan complied with the monitoring methodology and the actual monitoring complies with the monitoring plan, the data and calculation of GHG emission reductions have been assessed to correctly supported the emission reductions being claimed.
- The verification consisted of the following three phases: (i) document review, (ii) on-site assessment, (iii) the resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and certification.
- In conclusion, it is RINA's opinion that the project activity "Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda", as described in the Monitoring Report version 1.1 of 24/11/2015 and the CCB Project Implementation Report version 2.2 of 23/11/2015, meets all relevant requirements for VCS and CCB activities and correctly applied the baseline and monitoring methodology AR-ACM0001 Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land version 05.0.0. Hence RINA is able to certify that the emission reductions from the project during the monitoring period 02/01/2011 to 01/03/2014 amount to 199,083 tCO_2e.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

Face the Future B.V. has commissioned RINA to carry out the verification and certification of emission reductions and land management for the registered Natural High Forest Rehabilitation on degraded land of Kibale National Park, project in Uganda, VCS Project ID 673 for the period 02/01/2011 to 01/03/2014. The objective of the verification is to have an independent review ex post determination by a DOE (Designated Operational Entity) of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred as a result of the registered project during a define monitoring period. Certification is the written assurance by the DOE that, during a specific time period the project activity achieved the reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs as verified.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The verification scope is:

- To verify whether the project has been implemented in accordance with its validate design and successfully delivered net climate, community and biodiversity benefits for each CCB criteria and indicators.
- To verify that actual monitoring systems and procedures are in compliance with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan;
- To evaluate the GHG emission reductions data and express a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emission reduction data is free form material misstatement;
- To verify the reported GHG emission data is sufficiently supported by evidence. .

Verification shall ensure that reported emission reductions are complete and accurate in accordance with the applicable VCS and CCB criteria in order to be certified. Verification is not meant to provide any consultancy towards the project participants. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may have provided input for improvement of the monitoring.

The report summarizes the findings of the verification of the project, performed on the basis of VCS and CCB criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

1.3 Level of assurance

RINA maintains a reasonable level of assurance that the emission reduction emission reduction calculation according to section 7.3.1 of the VCS standard /which states the level of assurance is reasonable for validation and verification, as well as based on the guidance described by the Rules for the Use of the CCB Standards to determine whether there is a reasonable level of assurance that the project design addresses each requirement of the CCB Standards.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The project activity is developed in Kibale National Park (KNP) and is located in the western part of Uganda near the base of Rwenzori Mountain and is implemented by Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) in cooperation with Face the Future B.V. Due to high precipitation, complex landform and undulating valleys, as well as continual human disturbances (fire, grazing, charcoal production and cultivation) and poor land management, the area has been subjected to severe degradation of the vegetation and soil erosion. The purpose of the project activity is to realize multiple socio-economic and environmental benefits (local community development, climate change mitigation, biodiversity conservation and soil erosion control) through restoring forest vegetation on degraded lands. The project contributes to climate change mitigation by sequestering GHGs sinks through assisted natural regeneration activities that aim to promote regeneration of natural vegetation in the forest interior areas by creating a forested zone around the edge of the park which acts as a buffer to relieve the interior areas of pressure from agents of deforestation and degradation.

2 VALIDATION PROCESS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

2.1 Validation Process

The project was validated by Scientific Certification Systems (Validation Report of 06/09/2011) and it was registered under the VCS registration reference N°673.

2.2 Validation Findings

2.2.1 Gap Validation

According the Validation Report issued by Scientific Certification Systems /06/ and the Monitoring Report /01/ and the CCB Implementation Report /03/ there is not any gap validation.

2.2.2 Methodology Deviations

There is not any deviation in the applied methodology to the project activity.

2.2.3 Project Description Deviations

There is not any deviation in the project description.

2.3 Validation Conclusion

According the Validation Report /06/ the project activity as described in the project description document version 1.2 of 05/09/2011 /14/ and in the CCB Project Design Document version 3.1 of 03/07/2015 /20/meets all relevant VCS Standard 2007.1 requirements as well as the CCB Standard requirements third edition.

3 VERIFICATION PROCESS

3.1 Method and Criteria

Verification is conducted using RINA procedures in line with the requirements specified in the latest version of CDM VVS, VCS Standard requirements and CCB Standard requirements and applying standard auditing techniques. The verification consisted three phases as described in the following sections.

3.2 Document Review

The VCS monitoring report, version 1.1 of 24/11/2015 and previous version /01/, the emission reductions provided in a spreadsheet Monitoring Results 2014 20150415_VCS_MR_Appendix3.xlsx /01/, the CCB Monitoring Plan version 1.0 of 10/04/2015 /02/, the CCB Project Implementation Report version 2.2 of 23/11/2015 and previous versions /03/, were assessed as part of the verification. In addition the VCS PD /14/ in particular the baseline estimations and the monitoring plant, the previous VCS verification report /07/ and the VCS validation report /06/ for the project were reviewed.

The CCB Project Implementation Report version 1.0 of 21/05/2015 /02/ was made publicly available on the CCB website on 20/04/2015.

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

/01/	Face the Future B.V.: VCS Monitoring Report for Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda – version 1 of 15/04/2015 (monitoring period 01/02/2011 to 01/03/2014), and version 1.1 of 24/11/2015 (monitoring period 02/01/2011 to 01/03/2014). Appendix 1: DBH-height model parameters 20150415_VCS_MR_Appendix1.xlsx Appendix 2: Fresh weight to air-dry weight conversion coefficients 20150415_VCS_MR_Appendix2.xls Appendix 3: Monitoring Results 2014 20150415_VCS_MR_Appendix3.xlsx Appendix 4: QC results 2014 20150415_VCS_MR_Appendix4.xls
/02/	Face the Future B.V.: CCB Monitoring Plan for Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda – version 1.0 of 10/04/2015, version 2.1 of 03/07/2015.
/03/	Face the Future B.V.; CCB Project Implementation Report for for Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda – version 1.0 of 21/04/2015, version 2.1 of 03/07/2015 (monitoring period February 2011 to March 2014), version 2.2 of 23/11/2015 (monitoring period 02/01/2011 to 01/03/2014).
/04/	Face the Future B.V: Kibale Baseline Recalculation_082711.xlxs spreadsheet of 27/08/2011
/05/	Face the Future B.V: Non-Permanence Risk Report for Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda – version 1.0 of 22/04/2015 (monitoring period 01/02/2011 to 01/03/2014), version 1.1 of 24/11/2015 (monitoring period 02/01/2011 to 01/03/2014).
/06/	Scientific Certification Systems: Validation Report Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda – of 06/09/2011
/07/	Scientific Certification Systems: Verification Report Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project

	on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda – of 06/09/2011
/08/	Voluntary Carbon Standard: VCS Standard 2007.1 of 18/11/2008
/09/	Voluntary Carbon Standard: VCS Program guidelines of 18/11/2008
/10/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Guidance Validation and Verification Manual version 3.1 of 08/10/2013
/11/	Verified Carbon Standard: AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, version 3.2 of 04/10/2012
/12/	Verified Carbon Standard: Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Requirements, version 3.4 of 08/10/2013
/13/	CDM Executive Board: Approved consolidated afforestation and reforestation baseline and monitoring methodology AR-ACM0001 Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land, version 05.0.0 of 17/09/2010.
/14/	Face the Future B.V.: VCS PD version 1.2 of 05/09/2011
/15/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS+CCB Guidance Project Development Process, version 3.0 of 26/11/2012
/16/	CCB The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance: CCB Standard third edition of December 2013.
/17/	CCB The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance: Tool & Resource to assist with use of CCB Standards, of 2013
/18/	CCB The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance: Guidance for the use of the CCB Standards, of May 2014
/19/	CCB The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance: Rules for the use of the CCB Standards, of December 2013
/20/	Face the Future B.V: CCB Project Design Document Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda – version 2.1 of 28/04/2015, version 3.1 of 03/07/2015
/21/	Cooperation Agreement between Face the Future B.V. and Uganda Wildlife Authority, June 2015
/22/	UWA Monthly reports: November 2012 of 25/11/2012, May 2013 of 03/06/2013, December 2014 of 15/01/2015.
/23/	Non-permanence risk assessment – - Agreement between UWA and Kiziba Community - MoU between UWA and Bigodi Parish - Agreement between UWA and Nyabweya Community - Agreement between UWA and Rwenkuba Community - The Uganda Wildlife Statute 1996 - Report on Trench digging and water projects in Kibale National Park - UWA-Face Project Social Impact analysis - Addendum to Agreement for CO_2 offset 2009 - IC on Banana & Plantain in Africa (banana prices) - IC on Banana & Plantain in Africa (banana yields) - ERPA between Face the Future and J.P. Morgan Ventures Energy Corporation - Agreement between UWA and Rwenkuba Community - Planting agreement J.P. Morgan - Planting agreement Greenchoice - UWA Fire risk and strategies for mitigating fire risk - UWA General Management Plan 2015-2024

	-
/24/	Tasila Banda: Social and biodiversity Impact Assessment Report of 20/03/2015
/25/	MIST 2004-2014 observations by park rangers during the daily activities.
/26/	UWA: Kibale National Park General Management Plan 2014-2024
/27/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Program Guide version 3.5 of 08/10/2013
/28/	Verified Carbon Standard: VCS Standard version 3.5 of 25/03/2015
/29/	RINA Services SPA – CCB Validation Report ID 2015DG16MD of 03/08/2015
/30/	UWA: Kibale National Park Census data project area - KNP Census data_project area.xlsx of 16/03/2015 (Biodiversity monitoring data).
/31/	P.R. Meijer 1999: Base Line study of Carbon Sequestration by UWA-Face in Kibale National Park, Uganda
/32/	UWA agreements with community about the collection of non-timber forest products
/33/	Mackenzie, C.A. (2012) Accruing benefit or loss from a protected area: Location matters. Ecological Economics 76. 110-129
/34/	Chapman, C.A., Chapman, L.J., Kaufman, L., Zanne, A.E., 1999. Potential causes of arrested succession in Kibale National Park, Uganda: growth and mortality of seedlings. African Journal Of Ecology 37, 81–92

3.3 Interviews

From 17/06/2015 to 20/06/2015, RINA visited the Kibali National Park within the Kabarole district. During the on-site assessment of the project RINA assessed the implementation and operation of the proposed project activity, reviewed the information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters, interviewed key personnel involved in the project activity to confirm the operational and data collection procedures, cross-checked between information provided in the monitoring report and project data, reviewed calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions, checked the quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters.

The key personnel interviewed and the main topics of the interviews are summarized in the table below:

	Date	Name and Role	Organization	Topic
/a/	17-20/06/2015	Martjin Snoep Project Manager	Face the Future B.V	Project implementation Monitoring plan Data/Parameters monitored Emission reductions calculation Biodiversity Community
/c/		Kars Riemer Quality Control Review		
/d/		James K. Soita Monitoring Staff	Uganda Wildlife Authority	
/e/		Patrick Kamara Monitoring Staff		
/f/		Francis Ainomuglsha Monitoring Staff		

/g/		Wilfred Chemutai Project Manager		

Residents of villages located within the project boundary were also interviewed. Local residents of the following villages were interviewed during the dates listed:

- Isunga in Isunga Parish – 18/07/2015
- Kanyante in Nyabweya Parish – 19/07/2015

3.4 Site Inspections

The audit team performed an on-site inspection of the project area on the dates 17-20/07/2015. The main activities undertaken by the audit team were as follows:

- Interview with project personnel (see Section 3.3 above) to gather information regarding the project design;
- Interviews with members of the communities and other stakeholder groups (see Section 3.3 above) to confirm the appropriate involvement of these groups;
- Review of records (see Section 3.2 above) to ensure the appropriate design of the project;
- Conduct of a visit to the project area to confirm the accuracy of the claims made in the PDD.

The sampling plan has been devised in order to verify climate, community and biodiversuty situation. The sampling criteria of the climate aspect have been identified to fully understand and verify the outcomes of the monitoring campaign 2014. To this regard, four clusters have been re-measured giving priority to the 8 new established compartments. Two out of 8 new clusters (25%) have been verified. Two other cluster were controlled belonging to old compartment plantations (n. 107 and n 109) both of them 15 years old.

Regarding the biodiversity aspect, the sampling plan of the vegetation component have been verified in order to appreciate the claimed improvement of biodiversity as a result of project plantation and natural regeneration protection (from the fire). To this end, the sampling plan has been designed to follow the plant community succession from the base line scenario (Pennisetum plus fire resistant trees) to mature planted compartments. Therefore, the field visit included: (a) remaining Pennisetum areas; (b) 5/6 years old planted clusters (in the new established compartments, two cluster: n.905 and n. 906); (c) 15 years old planted clusters (cluster n. 107 and n.109); (d) natural regenerating area (cluster n. 906); (e) 20 years old planted area (compartment n. 8).

The animal component of the biodiversity aspect has been monitored by verification of the existing tools for animal identification and observation.

The community aspect have been approached by site visit (focus groups were performed) of two communities located on the mere border of the KNP in order to appreciate the issues related to

human wildlife conflict. Besides community, have been visited several project work of prevention of fire (2 fire lines sites) and elephant raiding (2 trenches sites).

3.5 Public Comments

The CCB PDD version 2.1 of 28/04/2015 /10/ was made publicly available on the CCB website (http://www.climate-standards.org/2015/04/20/natural-high-forest-rehabilitation-project-on-degraded-land-of-kibale-national-park-uganda/). Stakeholders invited to provide comments during a 30 days period from 30/04/2015 to 30/05/2015 . No public comments were received during that period.

3.6 Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy

The objective of this phase of the verification is to resolve any outstanding issues which need to be clarified for RINA's positive conclusion on the monitoring report and emission reductions.

To guarantee transparency a verification protocol has been customized for the project. The protocol shows in a transparent manner the requirements, means of verification and the results from verifying the identified criteria.

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

Non-conformities with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in monitoring and reporting, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;

- Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions that will impair the estimate of emission reductions;
- Issues identified in a FAR during validation to be verified during verification have not been resolved by the project participants.

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

A forward action request (FAR) is raised during verification for actions if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next monitoring period.

CARs, CLs and FARs identified are included in the verification protocol in Appendix A of this reporVerification Findings

4 GENERAL

4.1 Summary Description of the Project

According to PDD /14/ /20/ the purpose of the project activity is to realize multiple-socio economic and environmental benefits (climate change mitigation, biodiversity conservation, local community development and soil erosion control) through restoring forest vegetation on degraded lands. The project aims to restore natural high forest in Kibale National Park by planting indigenous tree species and encouraging natural forest regeneration by protection against fires as well as to mitigate negative impacts of the presence of the park on surrounding communities, by addressing human-wildlife conflicts among others.

4.2 Project Location

The project is located in Kibale National Park western Uganda near the base of the Rwenzori Mountains and it falls into Kabarole district. Kibale project area is located south east of Fort Portal

Town with bearings 0°12" - 0° 40" North and 30° 20" - 30° 35" East in the counties of Burahya, Kibale and Mwenge /14/.

4.3 Conditions Prior to Project Initiation

As per the validation report /06/ a land evaluation map was checked which indicates that the project did not contain forest at project initiation. As the land at the project start consisted of grassland and cropland, the land did not meet the definition of forest in Uganda. Prior to project initiation the project land was cleared by encroaches for agriculture.

4.4 Project Proponent

The project proponents are FACE the Future B.V from Netherland and Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA). The project land is owned by the Government of Uganda and there are no overlapping claims to the land and transfers the rights of carbon credits to Face the Future /21/,

4.5 Other Entities Involved in the Project

No other entities are involved in the Project as per the cooperation agreement /21/. IFER – Institute of Forest Ecosystem Research is an independent research institute contracted by Face the Future to conduct and support the implementation of carbon monitoring campaigns.

4.6 Project Start Date

The project was initiated on 15/05/1994 and the project end date is 31/12/2068 as per the validation and previous verification report /06/ /07/.

4.7 Project Crediting Period

As per the validation and previous verification report /06/ /07/ the project was initially registered, validated and verified under the Carbon Offset Verification Standard of SGS and under this standard the project was issued credits until 2006. A fixed crediting period of 60 years is applied and the crediting period start date under VCS is 01/01/2009 and ending on 31/12/2068.

5 IMPLEMENTATION OF DESIGN

- *Implementation status of the project activity(s), including any material discrepancies between the project and the project description.*
  The project area is 10,000 hectares located within a larger area of 15,973 set aside for project activities within Kibale National Park; of the greater 15,973 hectares area only 10,000 hectares will be included in the project. Of the total project area 3,996 hectares have already been planted and an additional 2,593 hectares have been naturally regenerated. Since the trees in the compartments which have been replanted after 2010 are too small to qualify, the actual monitoring period includes 3,623 ha of replanted area and 2,593 ha of regeneration area. UWA usually issue a monthly report for reporting the activities carried out along the park including the new planted areas /22/. For the emission reductions calculation data are from Field-Map Inventory Analyst (data collection and mapping technology). Any material discrepancies between the project and the project description is noted.

- *Implementation status of the monitoring plan and the completeness of monitoring, including any material discrepancies between the project and the project description.*
  The monitoring plan in the registered VCS PD /14/ is in accordance with the approved methodology /13/ applied by the project activity. The parameters have been monitored in accordance with the monitoring plan in the registered VCS PD /13/ and the monitoring report /01/. The CCB project implementation report /03/ includes the indicators that have been monitored for the monitoring period 02/01/2011 to 01/03/2014.

- *Any remaining issues from previous validation or verification.*
  As per the previous verification activity /07/ the following Opportunity for Improvement was issued:

  It was noted during the audit that the field teams were highly reliant on Field Map for locating plots and conducting the forest inventory. While it was observed that the inventory was of high quality and found to be accurate, it would be good practice for the Project Proponent to develop an alternative method of locating plot centers and inventorying plot data that did not rely exclusively on Field Map. The project proponent replied that where already planning to carry out research on other alternative monitoring methodologies after the project successfully goes through verification.
  During the actual verification the plot centers have been sampled as described in para 3.4 of this report and a field visit is conducted.

5.1 Description of the Project Activity

As per the assessment provided in Section 5there have been no deviations to the implementation status of the project activity according the registered VCS PD /14/ and the CCB PDD /20/.

5.2 Management of Risks to Project Benefits

Non-permanence risk assessment /05/ is carried out in accordance with the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence risk tool /11/. According to the assessment the project falls into an overall risk rating of 4,50 % buffer requirements. Internal risk, external risk and natural risk have been evaluated. The information provided in the Non-permanence risk assessment have been cross-checked with the documents provided by the PP /23/.In general terms, risks to biodiversity benefits run parallel to the risks for climate benefits, which is covered in the VCS risk assessment /05/. An additional risk to the biodiversity benefits is poaching, The risk is addressed by the project proponent by creating support among the community members for the park and by organising awareness meeting. The risk to community benefits is the elephants affecting the farmer's crops. A risk to employment is envisages if the project is not achieving its planting targets and in case of scaling down. The risk for the collection of non-timber forest product is over exploration /31/ /32/ /33/ /34/.

5.3 Measures to Maintain High Conservation Values

According the CCB PDD /20/ six types of HCV areas were distinguished and the entire project is considered to be HCV1 area (the forest areas contain regionally and nationally significant concentration of biodiversity values), and HCV2 area (The Kibale National Park system encompasses 25 protected areas, contains a remarkable variety of ecosystems ranging from high-altitude afro-montane habitats to low and medium altitude tropical forests, savannahs and lake systems), while the planted and naturally regenerated project areas are considered HCV3 (the forest constitute a threatened and endangered ecosystem) and HVC4 areas (the park represents and important water catchment area, as it protects and filters the waters of the Dura and Mpanga rivers from pollution). The HCV areas assessment is based on data available /24/ /25/ /26/.

5.4 Project Financing

The largest part of the project has already implemented. As per the validation report /06/ the projects has already broken even in terms of cash flow by previously selling GHG credits verified under another standard and by obtaining funds for specific planting campaign. Face the Future claims that funding for restoration of about 85% of the area for planting has been already secured (700 ha remaining for future/planting natural regeneration management) /26/.

5.5 Employment Opportunities and Worker Safety

The employment is the positive impact of the project implementation; labour for fieldwork creates the employment and in the period 2002-2013 on average about 300 local people were employed for fieldwork activities which was confirmed by the villagers during the field visit. /26/

5.6 Stakeholders

The stakeholder identification was done at the Social and biodiversity Impact Assessment level. The communities are divided in parishes. The parishes have been selected because they are adjacent to the boundary of the project area. The parish communities that could be affected by the project activity are: Isunga, Nyabweya, Kakooga, Kadindimo, Bigodi, Bujongobe, Rugonjo, Kiziba, Nyabitusi, Kyabandara, Rwimi, Rwenkuba,

6 LEGAL STATUS

6.1 Compliance with Laws, Statues, Property Rights and Other Regulatory Frameworks

The project does not encroach on private property or community property, the project areas is located on land owned by the Government of Uganda. The Kibale National Park is managed by the Uganda Wildlife Authority a governmental organization. In the zone surrounding the project area the local communities have customary land rights. The natural resources from the Park as firewood, wild coffee, medicinal plants, fish, honey and rattan cane are extracted by the local community since the Government permits communities to access resources from the Park with permission from the Executive Director.

As per the validation report /06/ the current laws and/or regulations that allow the reforestation on degrade lands are: (i) The constitution of the Republic of Uganda; (ii) the National Environmental Act of 1996; (iii) the National Forestry and Tree Planting Act 8/2003; (iv) the Uganda wildlife Act Cap 200.

6.2 Evidence of Right of Use

The project proponents are FACE the Future B.V from Netherland and Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA). The project land is owned by the Government of Uganda and there are no overlapping claims to the land and transfers the rights of carbon credits to Face the Future /21/,

6.3 Emissions Trading Programs and Other Binding Limits

NA

As per the information available in the validation report /06/ and previous verification report /07/ the project has participated in another emission trading program. The project was issued credit under the SGS Climate Change Program for vintage years 1995 to 2006. No double counting of emission reductions has occurred because all the emission reductions reported in the monitoring report associated with this verification report occurred after the project start date in 2009.

6.4 Participation under Other GHG Programs

Please refer to section 6.3 of this report.

6.5 Other Forms of Environmental Credit

Please refer to section 6.3 of this report.

6.6 Projects Rejected by Other GHG Programs

Please refer to section 6.3 of this report.

6.7 Respect for Rights and No Involuntary Relocation

The project has not led the removal or relocation of Property Right Holder and this is also confirmed through the interaction with the local community during the on-site visit.

6.8 Illegal Activities and Project Benefits

Illegal activities are in place but they are irrelevant such timber cutting and grazing. Even if the extraction of resources from local community is allowed by the Government, that is monitored to make sure that there is no over-extraction. The biodiversity benefits are the results of the forest restoration activities carried out by the project, based on funding for the project; the community benefits in terms of employment, skills, NTFP's are a result of the same funding for restoring the forest by the project /32/

7 APPLICATION OF METHODOLOGY

7.1 Project Description Deviations

The project uses the approved baseline methodology AR-ACM0001 /13/ Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land and it was validated on 06/09/2011 by Scientific Certification Systems /06/. There have been no deviations in the methodology to the monitoring plan.

7.2 Baseline Scenario

The most likely and conservative baseline scenario is "continued but less intensive encroachment" assuming that UWA would have limited success in keeping encroachers at bay. This would mean that fires continue to roam the formerly encroached land and the carbon stock would be the result of a mix between agricultural activities, fire and partial regeneration of pioneer vegetation. The social implications without the restoration of the project area are linked to poor access to natural resources and employment linked to project activities and tourism. Regarding the Biodiversity implications, the vegetation is dominated by grasses and shrubs. The succession towards forest is prevented by the periodic occurrence of fire keeping the areas in relatively low biodiversity /20/ /06/ /14/ /29/.

7.3 Additionality

As per the VCS and CCB validation report /06/ /29/ and related project documents /14/ /20/ the additionality assessment of climate benefits demonstrates that when compared against potential alternative land uses the projects activity faces investment barriers, institutional barriers, technological barriers, first of its king project barrier that makes its implementation in the absence of carbon finance unlikely. The biodiversity benefits of the restored native forest are directly linked to the climate benefits. Additionally, the employment created by the project (planting and maintenance), the skills established and the contribution to the tourism business, are the most relevant and verifiable community benefits to date.

8 QUANTIFICATON OF GHG EMISSION REDUCTIONS AND REMOVALS

8.1 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations

The formulas used to estimate project GHG emissions are taken directly from the approved CDM methodology /13/. The emission reduction calculation provided in the spreadsheet /01/ have been verified to be corrected in line with the validated VCS PD /14/. According the applied methodology AR-ACM0001 Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land /13/ the emission reductions are calculated as following:

$$C_{AR-CDM} = \Delta C_{ACTUAL} - \Delta C_{BSL} - LK$$

Where:

C_{AR-CDM} Net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks (t CO_2-e)

ΔC_{ACTUAL} Actual net GHG removals by sinks (t CO_2-e)

ΔC_{BSL} Baseline net GHG removals by sinks (t CO_2-e)

LK Total GHG emissions due to leakage (t CO_2-e) (leakage is not applicable to the project)

Baseline emissions.
The baseline GHG removals by sinks is the sum of the changes in carbon stocks in the selected carbon pools within the project boundary that would have occurred in the absence of the AR project activity. As per the registered VCS PD /14/ the initial baseline carbon stock in three biomass is conservatively determined to be 5.2 tC/ha or 19.1 tCO_2/ha and the value is used as the initial carbon stock value in the project area before the implementation or the AR project activity.

Project emissions.
As per the applied methodology /13/ there is no quantification of project emissions for this monitoring period as per the following: (a) transportation of workers is not needed since the labour force needed for the AR project is activity is from local villages as confirmed through the interview during the on site visit; (b) emissions from burning of woody biomass is not accounted since the burning does not take place in the project area; (c) As described in the registered VCS PD /14/, only the above-ground and below-ground biomass of tree vegetation is selected as carbon pool for the project activity. Dead wood, litter and soil organic carbon are conservatively

excluded as carbon sink. Furthermore, changes in carbon stock of above-ground and below-ground biomass of non-tree vegetation is conservatively set to be zero for all strata in the project scenario.

Emission reductions achieved.
The data presented in the monitoring report /01/ were assessed by reviewing in detail project documentation, collection of monitored data, observation of established monitoring and reporting practices. Sufficient evidences were presented and verified by RINA for the reported emission reductions. The emission reductions calculation reported in the Monitoring Report version 1.1 and related appendixes have been verified to be correct. The net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks per stratum in 2014 account to 1,011,194 tCO_2e. The calculated VCUs per stratum for monitoring period 2011-2014 account to 221,203. As per the Non-Permanence Risk Report /05/ the AFOLU buffer account to 10%= 22,120, thus the net VCUs after buffer subtraction are 199,083.

Parameters Available at Validation and Data Fixed Ex-ante

DATA/PARAMETER	Source of data	Reported value for the project period	Assessment/Observation

T = years	/	3	Validated VCS PD /14/
t_2 = date of verification 2011	Carbon monitoring campaign 2011	February 2011	
t_3 = date of verification 2014	Carbon monitoring campaign 2014	March 2014	
i = dimensionless stratum	/	Planting year, natural regeneration area	
A_i = ha Total area monitored for GHG sinks	GPS coordinates	3,624 ha compartment area 2,593 ha natural regeneration area	
$a_{i,p}$ = m^2 Area of permanent sampling plot p	IFER	Plot size to measure trees with DBH 50mm - 150mm: 201.06 m^2 Plot size to measure trees with DBH 150mm - 300mm: 500 m^2 Plot size to measure trees with DBH > 300mm: 2,000 m^2	
$A_{i,p}$ = ha Total area of all sample plots in stratum *i*	Calculated based on the strata and the applied sampling scheme	Depending on sampling scheme	
Plot position	GPS coordinated	GPS coordinates	
a,b,c,d = Dimensionless	National Biomass Study (NBS) Uganda	Different values	
CF_a =Dimensionless Conversion factor for the conversion of fresh weight to air dry weight of woody biomass	National Biomass Study (NBS) Uganda	Different values If a factor for particular species is unknown, a default value of 0.54 is applied	
CF_b =Dimensionless Conversion factor for the conversion of air dry weight to oven-dry weight of woody biomass	National Biomass Study (NBS) Uganda	0.853	
CF_a =Dimensionless	IPCC 1995	0.5	

Conversion factor for the conversion of oven-dry weight to carbon stock in above-ground tree biomass			
CF_r =Dimensionless Conversion factor for calculating root biomass	CO2 fix model	0.16	
44/12 = Dimensionless Ratio of molecular weights of CO_2 and carbon	IPCC	44/12	
ΔC_{BSL} = t CO_2-e Baseline net GHG removals by sinks	VCS PD	0	
C_{TREE_BSL} = t CO_2-e Baseline net GHG removals by sinks	VCS PD	19.1	
GHG_E = t CO_2-e Increase in non-CO_2 emissions within the project boundary as a result of the implementation of the AR project activity	VCS PD	0	
LK = t CO_2-e Total GHG emissions due to leakage	VCS PD	0	

Parameters and Data Monitored

DATA/PARAMETER	**DBH**
Data Unit	Mm
Description	Diameter at breast height of tree – measured at 1.3 m heigh
Source of data to be used	Field measurements in inventory sample plots
Value data for the monitoring period	Tree DBH vary per tree age and tree species
Measuring and reporting frequency; recording procedure	It is measured in the inventory sample plots during the monitoring campaigns every three years
Type of monitoring equipment and its accuracy	The DBH was measured in the field using a calliper. Data was stored in Field-Map
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked?	The Field-Map data base was checked during the site visit as well as a sample of measurement has been carried out as described in section 3.4 of this report
If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	To qualify for sampling and carbon stock calculation, only trees with dimensions greater or equal to 5 cm in diameter at breast height were considered.

DATA/PARAMETER	**H**
Data Unit	M
Description	Tree height
Source of data to be used	Field measurements in inventory sample plots
Value data for the monitoring period	Tree heights vary per tree age and tree species
Measuring and reporting frequency; recording procedure	It is measured in the inventory sample plots during the monitoring campaigns every three years
Type of monitoring equipment and its accuracy	Triangulation using Fiel-Map Technology
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked?	The Field-Map data base was checked during the site visit as well as a sample of measurement has been carried out as described in section 3.4 of this report
If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has	/

the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	

DATA/PARAMETER	**CW**
Data Unit	m
Description	Tree crown width
Source of data to be used	Field measurements in inventory sample plots
Value data for the monitoring period	Tree crown width vary per tree age and tree species
Measuring and reporting frequency; recording procedure	It is measured in the inventory sample plots during the monitoring campaigns every three years
Type of monitoring equipment and its accuracy	The Tree crown width was measured in the field using Field Map technology
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked?	The Field-Map data base was checked during the site visit as well as a sample of measurement has been carried out as described in section 3.4 of this report
If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	/

DATA/PARAMETER	**Tree species**
Data Unit	Dimensionless
Description	The name of the tree species, identified at both genus and species level
Source of data to be used	Field measurements in inventory sample plots
Value data for the monitoring period	Tree species
Measuring and reporting frequency; recording procedure	It is measured in the inventory sample plots during the monitoring campaigns every three years
Type of monitoring equipment and its accuracy	It was measured in the field using Field Map technology
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked?	The Field-Map data base was checked during the site visit as well as a sample of measurement has been carried out as described in section 3.4 of this report

If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	/

DATA/PARAMETER	**W_{wet}**
Data Unit	t
Description	Fresh weight of above ground tree biomass
Source of data to be used	Field measurements in inventory sample plots
Value data for the monitoring period	Depends on tree species and tree size
Measuring and reporting frequency; recording procedure	It is measured in the inventory sample plots during the monitoring campaigns every three years
Type of monitoring equipment and its accuracy	It was measured in the field using Field Map technology
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked?	The Field-Map data base was checked during the site visit as well as a sample of measurement has been carried out as described in section 3.4 of this report
If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	/

DATA/PARAMETER	**W_{airdry}**
Data Unit	t
Description	Air-dry weight of above ground tree biomass
Source of data to be used	Field measurements in inventory sample plots
Value data for the monitoring period	Depends on tree species and tree size
Measuring and reporting frequency; recording procedure	It is measured in the inventory sample plots during the monitoring campaigns every three years

Type of monitoring equipment and its accuracy	It was measured in the field using Field Map technology
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked?	The Field-Map data base was checked during the site visit as well as a sample of measurement has been carried out as described in section 3.4 of this report
If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	/

DATA/PARAMETER	**$W_{ovendry}$**
Data Unit	t
Description	oven-dry weight of above ground tree biomass
Source of data to be used	Field measurements in inventory sample plots
Value data for the monitoring period	Depends on tree species and tree size
Measuring and reporting frequency; recording procedure	It is measured in the inventory sample plots during the monitoring campaigns every three years
Type of monitoring equipment and its accuracy	It was measured in the field using Field Map technology
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked?	The Field-Map data base was checked during the site visit as well as a sample of measurement has been carried out as described in section 3.4 of this report
If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	/

DATA/PARAMETER	**CS_{TAG}**
Data Unit	tC
Description	Carbon stock in above-ground tree biomass
Source of data to be used	Tree data; IPCC

Value data for the monitoring period	Depends on tree species and tree size
Measuring and reporting frequency; recording procedure	It is measured in the inventory sample plots during the monitoring campaigns every three years
Type of monitoring equipment and its accuracy	It was measured in the field using Field Map technology
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked?	The Field-Map data base was checked during the site visit as well as a sample of measurement has been carried out as described in section 3.4 of this report
If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	/

DATA/PARAMETER	**CS_{TBG}**
Data Unit	tC
Description	Carbon stock in above-ground tree biomass
Source of data to be used	Tree data; CO2 fix model
Value data for the monitoring period	Depends on tree species and tree size
Measuring and reporting frequency; recording procedure	It is measured in the inventory sample plots during the monitoring campaigns every three years
Type of monitoring equipment and its accuracy	It was measured in the field using Field Map technology
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked?	The Field-Map data base was checked during the site visit as well as a sample of measurement has been carried out as described in section 3.4 of this report
If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	/

DATA/PARAMETER	**C_{TREE}**
Data Unit	t CO_2-e
Description	GHG sinks in above- and below-ground tree biomass
Source of data to be used	Tree data; IPCC
Value data for the monitoring period	Depends on tree species and tree size
Measuring and reporting frequency; recording procedure	It is measured in the inventory sample plots during the monitoring campaigns every three years
Type of monitoring equipment and its accuracy	It was measured in the field using Field Map technology
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked?	The Field-Map data base was checked during the site visit as well as a sample of measurement has been carried out as described in section 3.4 of this report
If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	/

DATA/PARAMETER	ΔC_P
Data Unit	t CO_2-e
Description	Sum of the changes the carbon stock in the selected carbon pools within the project boundary since the start of the AR project activity.
Source of data to be used	Field measurements in inventory sample plots
Value data for the monitoring period	Depends on tree species and tree size
Measuring and reporting frequency; recording procedure	It is measured in the inventory sample plots during the monitoring campaigns every three years
Type of monitoring equipment and its accuracy	It was measured in the field using Field Map technology
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked?	The Field-Map data base was checked during the site visit as well as a sample of measurement has been carried out as described in section 3.4 of this report
If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption	/

theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	

DATA/PARAMETER	ΔC_{ACTUAL}
Data Unit	t CO_2-e
Description	Actual net GHG removals by sinks since the start of the AR project activity
Source of data to be used	Field measurements in inventory sample plots
Value data for the monitoring period	Depends on tree species and tree size
Measuring and reporting frequency; recording procedure	It is measured in the inventory sample plots during the monitoring campaigns every three years
Type of monitoring equipment and its accuracy	It was measured in the field using Field Map technology
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked?	The Field-Map data base was checked during the site visit as well as a sample of measurement has been carried out as described in section 3.4 of this report
If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	/

DATA/PARAMETER	C_{AR_VCS}
Data Unit	t CO_2-e
Description	Net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks
Source of data to be used	Field measurements in inventory sample plots
Value data for the monitoring period	
Measuring and reporting frequency; recording procedure	It is measured in the inventory sample plots during the monitoring campaigns every three years
Type of monitoring equipment and its accuracy	It was measured in the field using Field Map technology
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked?	The Field-Map data base was checked during the site visit as well as a sample of measurement has been carried out as described in section 3.4 of this report
If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-	/

activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	

DATA/PARAMETER	VC□□s
Data Unit	credits
Description	Number of Verified Certified Carbon Units
Source of data to be used	Field measurements in inventory sample plots
Value data for the monitoring period	
Measuring and reporting frequency; recording procedure	It is measured in the inventory sample plots during the monitoring campaigns every three years
Type of monitoring equipment and its accuracy	It was measured in the field using Field Map technology
How were the values in the monitoring report verified and cross-checked?	The Field-Map data base was checked during the site visit as well as a sample of measurement has been carried out as described in section 3.4 of this report
If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	/

8.2 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals

The project accounts for carbon in the above-ground tree biomass and below ground tree biomass. Dead wood is conservatively ignored. Non-tree biomass, litter, and soil organic carbon are conservatively excluded from the project, in accordance with the methodology. The sources, sinks and reservoirs selected are consistent with VCS guidelines and the requirements of the selected methodology. Every three years a monitoring campaign is carried out, the latest one in 2014 has included only compartments with planting year of 2010 or older. The carbon monitoring campaign uses plot design and a regular sampling grid is applied to all the compartment areas using clusters of four permanent sampling plots at a spacing of 500x500 meters. In total there were 316 plots in 79 clusters established or re-measured in compartment areas. Of this number, 8 were newly established clusters with 32 inventory plots. The naturally regenerated areas comprised of 66 plots within 22 clusters. The practices were checked during the on-site visit for the sample assessment measurement as described in Section 3.4 of this report.

8.3 Management and Operational System

The Field-Map technology is used for data collection and mapping during the monitoring campaign. The technology is composed by an advanced computer aided field data collection, an efficient field navigation, support for concentric sample plot circles, continuous georeferencing, remote diameter measurement allowing measuring trees with buttresses, several height measurement modes. /01/

8.4 Climate Change Adaptation Benefits

The project is VCS registered. Please refer to § 8.3 where the climate change adaptation benefits is described and assessed.

9 COMMUNITY

9.1 Net Positive Community Impacts

Employment is the largest positive impact of the project. The established forest makes the area more attractive for tourism, resulting into more employment and revenues related to tourism. There are some other positive side effects of the project such as the access roads and project local purchases (goods). From 2002 to 2013 the average monthly employment is 262 jobs /22/. As part of the project activity the local people acquire skills for the planting and maintenance of local tree species, which they can replicate in their own farms.
The above information are confirmed also through interview with the local villagers during the on-site visit.

9.2 Offsite Stakeholder impacts

Community is not negatively impacted by the project. Mitigation activities are in place to deal with the human wildlife conflict like the creation of elephant trenches along the park boundary in places of high risk for elephants crossing the boundary and affecting the crops. As demonstrated during the on site visit this has already been implemented for a large part and this will continue in the future.

9.3 Exceptional Community Benefits

Other project positive impacts on the community are monitored as:

- Enhance tourism opportunities by establishing native forest
- Local sourcing of project inputs to benefit the local economy
- Provide skills to workers and employees in order to increase local business development and employment opportunities

The number of people trained on nursery management, planting, maintenance and fire management is zero within this monitoring period. All the workers that were employed during this monitoring period, received their training in the period before. The last training session was held in 2010, when 16 persons were trained.

10 BIODIVERSITY

10.1 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts

The biodiversity situation in the original baseline vegetation was quite limited, the areas consisted of elephant grass, spear grass and Hyperrhenia. the project area is considered to consist out of two distinct areas: the planted area is about 3,993 ha and naturally regenerating areas 2,593 ha, and the future planting areas (700 ha): These areas will be planted in the (near) future, in predominantly degraded open landscapes dominated by elephant grass. The areas is developing into a High Conservative Value Forest providing habitat for forest biodiversity. For the first Implementation period the objectives monitored are:

- To conduct animal census in Kibale National Park for establishing trends by 2024
- To have all the degraded areas in KNP restored by 2024.
- To eliminate and control the exotics/ invasive species in KNP by 2024
- To monitor the change of tree species composition in the restoration area
- To monitor the ecological succession of the planted and natural regenerated area.

The data are monitored through the daily observation by park rangers and through the census data project area /30/ /25/.

10.2 Offsite Biodiversity Impacts

No negative offsite biodiversity impacts as a result of the project activity have been identified /29/ /14/.

10.3 Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits

The project area holds exceptional biodiversity benefits. With regards to vulnerability, the project area contains chimpanzees (endangered), red colobus (endangered), elephants (vulnerable). The wildlife census data that covers the planting compartments shows the following observed numbers of these mammals. With regards to irreplaceability, the KNP is considered to hold the only viable red colobus population for Uganda. Furthermore, within KNP endemic bird species have been observed that can be considered of irreplaceable value, such as the Kibale Prigogine's ground thrush. As described in earlier sections, the elephant population has been growing over the past 20-30 years in KNP. Also in the project area elephant abundance seem to have increased, regardless of the possibility that forest restoration does not seem to benefit elephants. The apparent impact of predation by chimpanzees on the red colobus in KNP, as described by Lwanga *et al*. (2011), represents an unusual situation involving two species of conservation concern in which one is negatively impacting the other. As both species are expected to benefit from forest restoration, their population is expected to (relatively) increase. It is however difficult to determine how both populations will respond over time. However, the reduction in the population of the red colobus is only observed in Ngogo. In other parts of the park the concentration of the red colobus has increased. The apparent impact of predation by chimpanzees on the red colobus in KNP, represents an unusual situation involving two species of conservation concern in which one is negatively impacting the other. As both species are expected to benefit from forest restoration, their population is expected to (relatively) increase. The reduction in the population of the red colobus is only observed in Ngogo. In other parts of the park the concentration of the red colobus has increased. The management of the KNP is focused on maintaining trigger species.
The data are monitored through the daily observation by park rangers and through the census data project area /30/ /25/ and the monitoring and reporting processes are sufficient

11 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

RINA Services Spa (RINA) has performed verification of the emission reductions reported for the project activity "NATURAL HIGH FOREST REHABILITATION PROJECT ON DEGRADED LAND OF KIBALE NATIONAL PARK, UGANDA" in Uganda, for the 02/01/2011 to 01/03/2014, with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM and VCS activities.

It is RINA's opinion that the GHG emission reductions stated in the Monitoring Report version 1.1 of 24/11/2015 are fairly stated. The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly, on the basis of the approved monitoring methodology AR-ACM0001 Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land, version 05.0.0 of 17/09/2010.and the monitoring plan contained in the validated VCS PD version 1.2 of 05/09/2011.

As per the Non-Permanence Risk Report /05/ the AFOLU buffer account to 10%= 22,120, thus the net VCUs after buffer subtraction are 199,083 over the current monitoring period.

CCB STANDARDS CRITERIA CHECKLIST:

GENERAL SECTION	CONFORMANCE	
G1. Project Goals, Design and Long-term Viability	YES **X**	NO __
G2. Without-project Land Use Scenario and Additionality	YES **X**	NO __
G3. Stakeholder Engagement	YES **X**	NO __
G4. Management Capacity	YES **X**	NO __
G5. Legal Status and Property Rights	YES **X**	NO __
CLIMATE SECTION		
CL1. Without-project Climate Scenario	YES **X**	NO __
CL2. Net Positive Climate Impacts	YES **X**	NO __
CL3. Offsite Climate Impacts	YES **X**	NO __
CL4. Climate Impact Monitoring	YES **X**	NO __
COMMUNITY SECTION		
CM1. Without-project scenario for communities	YES **X**	NO __
CM2.Net Positive Community Impacts	YES **X**	NO __
CM3.Offsite Community Impacts	YES **X**	NO __
CM4.Community Impact Monitoring	YES **X**	NO __
BIODIVERSITY SECTION		
B1. Without-project Biodiversity Scenario	YES **X**	NO __
B2. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts (Required)	YES **X**	NO __
B3. Offsite Biodiversity Impacts (Required)	YES **X**	NO __
B.4 Biodiversity Impact Monitoring (Required)	YES **X**	NO __
GOLD LEVEL SECTION		
GL1. Climate Change Adaption Benefits	YES__	NO _ **(NA)**
GL2. Exceptional Community Benefits	YES__	NO _ **(NA)**
GL3. Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits	YES **X**	NO __

APPENDIX A

VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

TABLE 1 RESOLUTION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS AND CLARIFICATION REQUESTS.

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Reference Section in VR	Response by project participants	Verification Conclusion
CAR 1 The CCB project implementation report does not clarify why the indicators related to community and biodiversity have been not monitored or have not result for the monitoring period 02/01/2011 to 01/03/2014**.**	*CCB*	*The CCB project implementation report is updated accordingly.*	*CCB Project Implementation report version 2.2 of 23/11/2015 is provided and it is updated accordingly.* *CAR1 is closed.*

TABLE 2 FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS.

Forward action request	Reference Section in VR	Response by project participants	Verification Conclusion
FAR 1 During the monitoring campaing of the regeneration area local geographical coordinates have been used but this does not facilitate to find the areas within the GPS coordinates**.**	VCS	To be taken into consideration for the next verification.	To be verified during the next verification.

RINA

CERTIFICATO DI QUALIFICA
QUALIFICATION CERTIFICATE

Si attesta che il sig./sig.ra: *We declare that Mr/Mrs/Ms:*	**Rita Valoroso**
è qualificato come1: *is qualified as:*	**CDM -TEC, -VAL, -VER, -TL** **TECHNICAL REVIEWER**
per le seguenti aree tecniche: for the following technical areas:	**1.2, 13.1**

AREE TECNICHE **TECHNICAL AREAS**	**DESCRIZIONE DELL'AREA TECNICA** ***TECHNICAL AREA DESCRIPTION***	**SCOPO SETTORIALE** ***SECTORAL SCOPE***
1.2	Renewables	1
13.1	Solid Waste and waste water	13

in accordo alle istruzioni della Divisione Certificazione.
in accordance with the instructions of the Certification Division.

REVISIONE ***REVISION***	**DATA** ***DATE***	**MOTIVAZIONI PER LA REVISIONE** ***REASON FOR THE REVISION***
0	18-01-10	-
9	22-12-2014	Update qualification according to AS ver.6.0

Il Resp. QPT
Head of QPT

[1] Legend:

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

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

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

RINA

CERTIFICATO DI QUALIFICA
QUALIFICATION CERTIFICATE

Si attesta che il sig./sig.ra: *We declare that Mr/Mrs/Ms:*	**Massimo Canossa**
è qualificato come[1]: *is qualified as:*	**CDM-TEC**
per le seguenti aree tecniche: for the following technical areas:	**14.1, 15.1**

AREE TECNICHE **TECHNICAL AREAS**	**DESCRIZIONE DELL'AREA TECNICA** ***TECHNICAL AREA DESCRIPTION***	**SCOPO SETTORIALE** ***SECTORAL SCOPE***
14.1	Afforestation and reforestation	14
15.1	Agriculture	15

in accordo alle istruzioni della Divisione Certificazione.
in accordance with the instructions of the Certification Division.

REVISIONE ***REVISION***	**DATA** ***DATE***	**MOTIVAZIONI PER LA REVISIONE** ***REASON FOR THE REVISION***
0	05-08-2014	First issue
1	22-12-2014	Update qualification according to AS ver.6.0

Il Resp. QPT
Head of QPT

[1] Legend:

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

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

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