

VALIDATION REPORT

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



Document Prepared By RINA Services Spa

Contact Information Rita VALOROSO (Scheme Manager) – rita.valoroso@rina.org

Project Title	NATURAL HIGH FOREST REHABILITATION PROJECT ON DEGRADED LAND OF KIBALE NATIONAL PARK, UGANDA
Version	1.2. Aa
Report ID	2015DG16MD

Report Title	Final validation report
Client	Face the Future B.V.
Pages	55
Date of Issue	26/11/2015
Prepared By	RINA Services Spa
Contact	Via Corsica 12 – 26124 GENOVA (Italy) +39 0106020711 rita.valoroso@rina.org www.rina.org
Approved By	Laura SEVERINO 

**Work Carried
Out By**

Rita VALOROSO – Team Leader/Validator
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 scope of validation is to have an independent evaluation of a project activity by a designated operational entity against the requirements of the CCB Standards, on the basis of the project design document and related project documents in order to confirm that the project designed as documented is sound, reasonable and meets the identified criteria.
- 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 validation report and certification.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. VALIDATION PROCESS.....	5
3. VALIDATION FINDINGS	11
4. DESIGN.....	15
5. LEGAL STATUS.....	27
6. CLIMATE SECTION	30
7. COMMUNITY SECTION	31
8. BIODIVERSITY SECTION.....	35
9. MONITORING.....	41
11.VALIDATION CONCLUSION.....	44
 APPENDIX A - VALIDATION PROTOCOL	
 APPENDIX B - ABBREVIATIONS	

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

Face the Future B.V. has commissioned RINA to carry out the validation Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda. This report summarizes the findings of the validation of the project, performed on the basis of CCB criteria as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The validation scope consisted of the project, its activities, and its geographic extent, as described within the PDD. The assessment was conducted against the criteria set out within the following guidance documents:

- Climate, Community and Biodiversity project design standards, Third Edition, December 2013 (CCB Standards);
- Rules for the use of the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, version December 2013 (CCB Standards Rules).

The project was assessed against all required criteria of the CCB Standards in order to determine whether the project could be validated at the “Approval” level.

Validation 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 project design.

1.3 Level of assurance

RINA performed this assessment 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 /10/41/38/44/. 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

2.1 Method and Criteria

Validation was conducted using RINA procedures in line with the requirements specified in the Rules for the Use of the CCB Standards and applying standard auditing techniques. The validation consisted of the following three phases:

- Document review;
- Follow-up actions (field visit)
- The resolution of outstanding and the issuance of the final validation report.

The following sections outline each step in more detail.

The sampling plan has been devised in order to verify climate, community and biodiversity situation. Samples of data and information to be validated have been selected to provide reasonable assurance level.

The sampling criteria of the climate aspect have been identified to fully understand and verify the outcomes of the monitoring campaign 2014 (the results have been discussed in the VCS verification report). The sample size is of 79 clusters established or re-measured in the corresponding compartments. Of this number, 8 were newly established clusters. To this regard, four clusters (5% of the sample size), randomly selected, have been re-measured giving priority to the 8 new established compartments. Two out of 8 new clusters (25% of the total new areas) have been verified (re-measured). Two other clusters were also 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 through the main criteria of verifying and appreciating the project claimed (CCB - PDD B1.2) 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 8 compartments (10% of the total):

- a) remaining grassland (mainly Pennisetum sp.) areas (two areas not yet planted),
- 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 above sample selection has proven to be effective in giving a good appreciation of the vegetation succession from degraded elephant-grass areas to forests types close to climax. The outcomes of the verification are generally according to the project observation and claims. (see the PIR Chapter 7.6: 'Ecological succession of the planted compartments and natural regenerated areas')

The animal component of the biodiversity aspect has been monitored by verification of the existing tools for animal identification and observation.(basically Census 2005 - 2010 and MIST)

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. The validation could confirm the claimed community improvements as stated in CCB - PDD CM2.1).

Besides communities, have been visited several project work of prevention of fire (2 fire lines sites) and elephant raiding (2 trenches sites). The site visit could verify the effectiveness of the mitigation measures as stated in the CCB PMP and PIR.

2.2 Document Review

The PDD version 3.2 of 10/07/2015 /10/, the CCB Monitoring Plan version 2.1 of 03/07/2015 /02/, Appendix 3 Monitoring Results 2014 of the VCS Monitoring Report version 1.1 of 24/11/2015 /01/ were assessed as part of the validation. And the Face the Future B.V.: CCB Project Implementation Report (PRI) of Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda, version V 2.2 of 23/11/2015

The CCB PDD version 2.1 of 28/04/2015 /10/ was made publicly available for the public comments period on the CCB website from 30/04/2015 to 30/05/2015 /79/.

The following table list the documentation that was reviewed during the validation:

/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), 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 Project Monitoring Plan (PMP) for Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda – version V 2.1 of 03/07/2015
/03/	Face the Future B.V.: Social And Biodiversity Impact Assessment (SBIA) report of KNP - Author Tasila Banda - 15/05/2015
/04/	CCBA 2011 Social And Biodiversity Impact Assessment (SBIA) methodology PART 1, 2 and 3
/05/	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.
/06/	CCB The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance: CCB Standard third edition of December 2013.
/07/	CCB The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance: Tool & Resource to assist with use of CCB Standards, of 2013
/08/	CCB The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance: Guidance for the use of the CCB Standards, of May 2014

/09/	CCB The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance: Rules for the use of the CCB Standards, of December 2013
/10/	Face the Future B.V: CCB - PDD - Project Design Document Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda – version 3.2 of 10/07/2015
/11/	FtF 2015 - VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Assessment.
/12/	UWA Monthly reports of activities: November 2012 of 25/11/2012, May 2013 of 03/06/2013, December 2014 of 15/01/2015.
/13/	Patrick A. Omeja 2011. Intensive tree planting facilitates tropical forest biodiversity and biomass accumulation in Kibale National Park, Uganda
/14/	MIST 2004-2014 observations by park rangers during the daily activities.
/15/	UWA: Kibale National Park General Management Plan 2014-2024
/16/	UWA: Kibale National Park Census data project area - KNP Census data_project area.xlsx of 16/03/2015 (Biodiversity monitoring data).
/17/	Face the Future B.V.: Project Community presentation of 15/07/2012
/18/	Face the Future B.V.: Second SBIA community presentation of 16/07/2012
/19/	Face the Future B.V: CCB Monitoring Report community presentation of April 2015
/20/	Community presentation feedback of 17/04/2015
/21/	Colin A. Chapman & Lauren J. Chapman: Exotic plantations and the regeneration of natural forests in Kibale National Park, Uganda, of December 1994.
/22/	International Journal of Primatology: Thirty years of research in Kibale National Park, Uganda, reveals a complex picture for conservation, of June 2005
/23/	Biological Conservation 134: Burning biodiversity, woody biomass use by commercial and subsistence groups in western Uganda's forests, of 2007
/24/	Colin A. Chapman & Lauren J. Chapman: Forest restoration in abandoned agricultural land, a case study from East Africa, of December 1999
/25/	UWA: Grievance Redress Procedure UWA-Face Project, Kibale National Park, Uganda, version 1.0 of 12/03/2015
/26/	UWA: Ground census of mammals in Kibale National Park, Uganda, of December 2005
/27/	UWA: Kibale National Park Census Results 2010, of 16/03/2015
/28/	American Journal of Primatology: Primate Population Dynamics Over 32.9 Years at Ngogo, Kibale National Park, Uganda, of 2011
/29/	Obua, J., Agea, J. G., & Ogwal, J. J. (2010). Status of forests in Uganda. African Journal of Ecology, 48(4), 853-859.
/30/	Forest Ecology and Management: Intensive tree planting facilities tropical forest biodiversity and biomass accumulation in Kibale National Park, Uganda, of 2011
/31/	Omeja, P. A., Jacob, A. L., Lawes, M. J., Lwanga, J. S., Rothman, J. M., Tumwesigye, C., & Chapman, C. A. (2014). Changes in Elephant Abundance Affect Forest Composition or Regeneration?. Biotropica, 46(6), 704-711.
/32/	Albertine Rift Technical Reports: The status of chimpanzees in Uganda, of 2003
/33/	UWA and Face the Future B.V.: Training Report on Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment of Carbon Projects carried out on 10-19/07/2012
/34/	Thomas T. Struhsaker 1996 - Cambridge University Press: Elephants, selective logging and forest regeneration in the Kibale Forest, Uganda.
/35/	African Journal of Ecology: Censusing large mammals in Kibale National Park evaluation of the intensity of sampling required to determine change, of 2009
/36/	UWA: Cluster 109, 806, 805, 107,906
/37/	UWA: Cluster locations Map related to the carbon monitoring campaign Kibale National Park 2014
/38/	SCS - Scientific Certification Systems: VCS - Validation and Verification Report Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda – of 06/09/2011.
/39/	Cooperation Agreement between Face the Future B.V. and Uganda Wildlife Authority, June 2015
/40/	SCS Scientific Certification Systems: VCS - Verification Report Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda – of 11/09/2011
/41/	Face the Future B.V.: VCS PDD of Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda, version 1.2 of 05/09/2011

/42/	Face the Future B.V.: CCB Project Implementation Report (PRI) of Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on degraded land of Kibale National Park, Uganda, version V 2.1 of 03/07/2015, 2.2 of 23/11/2015
/43/	Thomas T. Struhsaker 2003: Evaluation of the UWA-FACE Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project in Kibale National Park, Uganda. A Report Prepared for the Center for Applied Biodiversity Science of Conservation International and for the FACE Foundation.
/44/	P.R. Meijer 1999: Base Line study of Carbon Sequestration by UWA-Face in Kibale National Park, Uganda
/45/	The Uganda wildlife statute 1996
/46/	UWA - Face 2015. Report on trench digging and water projects in KNP.
/47/	UWA-Face Plan of Activities 2015 – 2024.
/48/	FtF 2011 - VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Assessment.
/49/	UWA agreements with community about the <i>collection of non-timber forest products (NTFP)</i>
/50/	Revenue sharing agreement between Face the Future and UWA.
/51/	Mackenzie, C.A. (2012). Accruing benefit or loss from a protected area: Location matters. Ecological Economics 76, 119-129.
/52/	WCS. 2015. Uganda's Elephants Increasing in Number. WCS News Releases. http://press.wcs.org/NewsReleases/tabid/13614/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/6761/Ugandas-Elephants-Increasing-in-Number.aspx
/53/	Spinage C.A. 1994. Elephants. London:T & A D Poyser.
/54/	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.
/55/	Plumptre, A.J., Mugume, S., Cox, D., & Montgomery, C. 2001. Chimpanzee and large mammal survey of Budongo Forest Reserve and Kibale National Park. Report to WCS on surveys in Western Uganda.
/56/	Southworth, J., Hartter, H., Binford, M. W., Goldman, A., Chapman, C. A., Chapman, L. J., Omeja, P. and Binford, E. 2010. Parks, people and pixels: evaluating landscape effects of an East African national park on its surroundings. Tropical Conservation Science Vol. 3 (2):122-142
/57/	UWA's Human Resource Manual
/58/	UWA - FACE Grievance Redress Procedure (2015)
/59/	MoU between Face and the Government of Uganda (1994).
/60/	GoU- FtF Contract and General conditions of Contract (1992).
/61/	KNP Tourism Annual Report 2014
/62/	UWA-Face KIBALE NATIONAL PARK - financial data and sources of project inputs
/63/	UWA-Face KIBALE NATIONAL PARK - Terms of Condition of Service
/64/	UWA-Face KIBALE NATIONAL PARK - wildlife conflict data
/65/	UWA-Face KIBALE NATIONAL PARK - ecological succession data
/66/	Forest Department. 1996. Kibale National Park Biodiversity Report. Edited by: Peter Howard, Tim Davenport and Roger Matthews.
/67/	Wanyama, F., Muhabwe, R., Plumptre, A. J., Chapman, C. A., & Rothman, J. M. 2010. Censusing large mammals in Kibale National Park: evaluation of the intensity of sampling required to determine change. African Journal of Ecology, 48(4), 953-961.
/68/	Chapman, C.A., Lambert, J.E., 2000. Habitat alteration and the conservation of African primates: case study of Kibale National Park, Uganda. American Journal of Primatology 50, 169–185.
/69/	Chapman, C.A., Chapman, L.J., 1999. Forest restoration in abandoned agricultural land: a case study from East Africa. Conservation Biology 13, 1301–1311.
/70/	Common Guidance for the Identification of High Conservation Values, developed by the HCV Resource Network (https://www.hcvnetwork.org/resources/cg-identification-sep-2014-english)
/71/	UWA-Face PROJECT PLAN OF OPERATION JANUARY 2008 – DECEMBER 2008
/72/	Kibale National Park Biodiversity Report, 1996
/73/	UWA MONITORING AND RESEARCH PLAN 2003 – 2008

/74/	Biomonitoring data from Wildlife censuses - Biomonitoring data collected opportunistically by park rangers during their daily activities. MIST 2004 - 2014, observations are georeferenced
/75/	ILO documents 87, 98 and ILO Code of Practice
/76/	The National Environmental Act of 1996,
/77/	The National Forestry and Tree Planting Act
/78/	The Uganda Wildlife Act, Cap. 2002.
/79/	CCB Website – Project view page http://www.climate-standards.org/2015/04/20/natural-high-forest-rehabilitation-project-on-degraded-land-of-kibale-national-park-uganda/ English language – retrieved on 30/07/2015
/80/	Face The Future B.V. : VCS PD version 1.2 of 05/09/2011
/81/	VCS website – Project view page http://www.vcsprojectdatabase.org/#/project_details/673 English language – retrieved on 30/07/2015

2.3 Interviews

From 17/6/2015 to 20/06/2015, RINA visited the project area of the Kibale National Park, Uganda to resolve questions and issues identified during the document review and to perform interviews with the relevant stakeholders. The key personnel interviewed and the main topics of the interviews are summarized in the table below:

	Date	Name - Role	Organization	Topic
/a/	17-20/06/2015	Martijn Snoep - FtF project manager	Face the Future B.V	Project goals, design and long-term viability
/c/		Kars Riemer FtF quality control review		
/d/		James K. Soita - UWA - FACE monitoring staff	Uganda Wildlife Authority	Land use scenario and additionality Stakeholder engagement Legal status and property rights Climate Biodiversity Community
/e/		Patrick Kamara UWA - FACE monitoring staff		
/f/		Francis Ainomugisha UWA - FACE monitoring staff		
/g/		Wilfred Chemutai - UWA - FACE 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 Village (Isunga Parish) – 18/07/2015
- Kanyante Village (Nyabweya Parish) – 19/07/2015

2.4 Site Inspections

The audit team performed an on-site inspection of the project area on the dates 17-20/06/2015. The main activities undertaken by the audit team were as follows:

- Interview with project personnel (see Section 2.3 above) to gather information regarding the project design;
- Interviews with members of the communities and other stakeholder groups (see Section 2.3 above) to confirm the appropriate involvement of these groups;
- Review of records (see Section 2.2 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.

2.5 PDD Public Comments

The CCB PDD version 3.2 of 10/07/2015 /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.

2.6 Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy

The objective of this phase of the validation 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.

The validation protocol consists of two tables and it is enclosed in Appendix A to this report.

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 validation protocol in Appendix A of this report Validation Findings.

Internal quality control: All the revisions of the validation report before being submitted to the client were subjected to an independent internal technical review to confirm that all validation activities had been completed according to the pertinent RINA instructions. The technical review was performed by a technical reviewer(s) qualified in accordance with RINA's qualification scheme.

Validation team and the technical reviewer(s): the validation team members and the technical reviewers consist of the following personnel (refer to the relevant attachments to see the pertinent qualification certificates):

Role	Last Name	First Name	Site Visit (Yes/No)	Country
Team Leader, Validator	VALOROSO	Rita	Yes	Italy
Technical Expert SS 14	CANOSSA	Massimo	Yes	Italy
Technical Reviewer	MENON	Rekha	No	India

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Summary Description of the Project

According to PDD /10/ 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 (KNP) 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.

The overall conclusions of this validation report are that the project fully complies with the climate, community and biodiversity requirement indicated in the CCB standards.

3.2 Project Location

CCB indicator: G1.3. Provide the location (country, sub-national jurisdictions(s) and a brief overview of the basic physical and social parameters of the project.	The PDD explains that the project is located in Kibale National Park western Uganda near the base of the Rwenzori Mountains and it falls into Kabarole district. <i>Physical features.</i> Kibale National Park has a wide altitudinal range from 1590 m in the extreme North to 1,110 m in the South.. <i>Climate.</i> It is tropical with two rainy periods, March to May and September to November. The annual mean temperature range rises from 14° - 15°C, - minimum to 26° - 27°C maximum. The annual rainfall is 1,100 - 1,600 mm. About 90% of the Park is overlain by red ferrallitic soils of which 70% are sandy clay loams in the North and 30% are clay loams in the South. These soils are deeply weathered, show little differentiation in horizon and are of very low to moderate fertility. The remaining 10% is where fertile eutrophic soil occurs on a base of volcanic ash limited to Mpokya and Isunga areas on the western edge of the park. <i>Types of vegetation</i> The forest cover in Kibale National Park is broadly classified into three. It is mid-altitude, moist evergreen in the north, gradually decreasing in elevation to moist semi-deciduous in the south and a mixture of deciduous and evergreens in the central parts. The UWA-Face project area, lies in the southern part of the park and its natural vegetation cover can therefore be classified as moist semi-deciduous forest. <i>Social-economic aspects</i> Kibale is surrounded by densely populated areas. The people include the native Batoro and the immigrant Bakiga in the 27 parishes surrounding KNP. The people are primarily subsistence agriculturists, growing mainly banana,
--	---

	groundnuts, sweet potatoes, beans and maize. Land pressure is high.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/ 41/44/43/site visit
Findings	The PDD sufficiently describes the social and physical parameters of the project area and zone. The site visit confirmed the descriptions.
CCB indicator: G1.4. Define the boundaries of the Project Area where project activities aim to generate net climate benefits and the Project Zone where project activities are implemented.	The PDD states that the 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. The project area is 10,000 ha within which close to 4,000 hectares have been replanted and almost 2,600 hectares have naturally regenerated (CCB - PDD G1.3)
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/ /41 (table 1.5)/
Findings	The location of the project area and zone is defined. The CCB - PDD indicator G1.7 also defines project area and zone.

3.3 Conditions Prior to Project Initiation

As per the VCS validation report of the registered project /38/ 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 encroachers for agriculture.

CCB indicator: G1.3. Provide the location (country, sub-national jurisdictions(s) and a brief overview of the basic physical and social parameters of the project.	<i>The PDD in the indicator G1.3 also describes the conditions prior the project initiation:</i> <u>Types of vegetation</u> The project area is situated in the south western part of Kibale National Park, which was heavily encroached between the 1960s and 1992. This encroachment led to large scale forest destruction and grassland clearing. In the early 1990s the Ugandan government decided to regain control over the Forest Reserves, which led to the eviction and relocation of settlers in 1992 (see also section G5.3). After the eviction, most of the grassland areas became dominated by elephant grass (<i>Pennisetum purpureum</i>) due to recurring fires that were set by poachers or that spread into the park from neighbouring areas, preventing natural forest regeneration (Struhsaker, 2003; in Omeja <i>et al.</i>, 2011). It is estimated that at least 15,000 hectares in the restoration zone have been affected by the encroachment. The degraded areas can be distinguished into seven main vegetation types. 1. Open spaces in the forest (about 850 ha). 2. Encroached areas with shrubs (about 4800 ha). 3. Elephant grass dominated areas (about
---	--

	6340 ha). - Grasslands with <i>Combretum spp.</i> (about 530 ha). - Non-forested riverine lands (about 2,810 ha). - Quartzite ridges and inselbergs (about 1,250 ha). - Forest (about 15,200 ha). See also the indicator G2.1 (base line - land use scenario)
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/21/43/44/38/13//G2.1 comments of this validation report/ site visit interviews and permanent plot verifications
Findings	The project area and zone condition prior action implementation have been very well documented and supported by scientific and base line studies.

3.4 Project Proponent

CCB indicator: G1.1. Identify the primary Project Proponent which is responsible for the project's design and implementation and provide contact details.	The project proponents are FACE the Future (FtF) B.V. from the Netherlands 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 .
Evidence used to assess conformance	/39/10/15/
Findings	The FtF is the primary project proponent
CCB indicator: G4.1. Describe the project's governance structures, and roles and responsibilities of all the entities involved in project design and implementation. For projects using a programmatic approach, identify any new entities included in the project since the last validation or verification against the CCB Standards.	The project is implemented by Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) and FtF. The roles and responsibilities for FtF and UWA are twofold: The project proponent, FtF, holds responsibility for the carbon development of the project and is entitled to the carbon sequestration rights of the project and for the following activities: Project funding, validation and verification procedures, project management. The field project is implemented by UWA according to a strategy and monitoring guidelines within the Forest Management Plan. The carbon monitoring is performed every 3 years by UWA and FtF staff who are well trained and have GIS inventory capacity.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/15/01/ site visit
Findings	The PDD lists the project proponents and their responsibilities which went through a precise and positive screening during the site visit.
CCB indicator: G4.2. Document key technical skills required to implement the project successfully, including community	The PDD states that the project started in 1995 and has led to the successful establishment of forest. The project works with experienced

engagement, biodiversity assessment and carbon measurement and monitoring skills. Document the management team's expertise and prior experience implementing land management and carbon projects at the scale of this project. If relevant experience is lacking, the proponents must either demonstrate how other organizations are partnered with to support the project or have a recruitment strategy to fill the gaps.	staff. The capacities of the staff are described in the document Management Capacity150319, as part of the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Assessment (/01/). This takes into account the skills related to community engagement, biodiversity assessment and carbon monitoring.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/11/10/01/12/ site visit interview
Findings	FtF and UWA-FACE implementing units team have the skills necessary to successfully carry out the project.

3.5 Other Entities Involved in the Project

No other entities are involved in the Project as per the cooperation agreement /38/. 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.

3.6 Project Start Date

CCB indicator: G1.9. Define the project start date and lifetime, and GHG accounting period and biodiversity and community benefits assessment period if relevant, and explain and justify any differences between them. Define an implementation schedule, indicating key dates and milestones in the project's development.	Project start date: 15 May 1994. Project Lifetime: 74 years. Project GHG Accounting Period: 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2068. The project was initiated on May 15, 1994. The execution of contracts and MOUs for the reforestation of lands within KNP constitute the initiation of the project. The project was initially registered, validated, and verified, under the Carbon Offset Verification Standard of SGS. Under this standard, the project was issued credits until 2006. Therefore, the GHG accounting period is shorter than the project lifetime, because the project switched to using another carbon crediting standard as per 1 January 2009 (VCS).
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/38/47/
Findings	The reported data have been duly verified. The UWA-Face activity plan outlines the main past and future development phases. The last planting campaign were implemented in 2010. There are 700 ha of new planting foreseen provided that new financing will be granted (CCB - PDD B1.2).

3.7 Project Crediting Period

As per the VCS validation and verification reports /38/ /40/ 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. The validation report /38/ states that the VCSA clarified that the emission reductions are temporally distinct in each program and thus there is not a risk of a double counting.

As per the validation report /38/ the project was initiated on 15/05/1994, the execution of contracts and MoUs for the reforestation of lands within Kibale National Park constitute the initiation of the project and according to these contracts the project end date is 31/12/2068. 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.

4 DESIGN

4.1 Sectoral Scope and Project Type

The proposed project falls under the SS 14 Agriculture Forestry and Other Land use category (AFOLU) and is specifically a Reforestation (R) project type of the ARR category of VCS standard.

4.2 Description of the Project Activity

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 /10/41/. Of the total project area 3,996 hectares have already been planted and an additional 2,593 hectares have been naturally regenerated.

CCB indicator: G1.2. Define the project's climate, community and biodiversity objectives.	<i>The PDD defines the project objectives as follow:</i> <u>General</u> - 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. <u>Climate</u> - The project contributes to climate change mitigation by sequestering GHGs in sinks through forest plantation and assisted natural regeneration activities (as per VCS AFOLU standards - see VCS project description /41/) that aim to promote regeneration of natural vegetation in the forest interior areas. <u>Community</u> - Transfer forestry knowledge and skills to the local communities, provide employment and income generating opportunities. <u>Biodiversity</u> - Restore the integrity of the degraded forest ecosystems in the KNP and thereby enhance biodiversity conservation and control of soil erosion.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/41/38/
Findings	The project's objectives are clearly defined, This indicator is adequately addressed.

CCB indicator: G1.8. Briefly describe each project activity and the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts of the activities identifying the causal relationships that explain how the activities will achieve the project's predicted climate, community and biodiversity benefits.	The project's theory of change has been reported as well as all relevant activities. See for more detail the UWA-Face Plan of Activities 2015 – 2024 for the project and for the relationships between the activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts, see the SBIA report.
--	---

Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/47/03/
Findings	The project activities and expected outputs are consistent with the stated objectives (see indicator G1.2) and purposes as well as with the SBIA outcomes (reflecting the community priorities). Each activity is adequately described in terms of outputs and indicates which outcomes and impacts is contributing to.

4.3 Management of Risks to Project Benefits

CCB indicator: G1.10. Identify likely natural and human-induced risks to the expected climate, community and biodiversity benefits during the project lifetime and outline measures needed and <i>taken</i> to mitigate these risks.	The project assessed risks through the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Assessment report 2011 and 2015. In general terms, risks to biodiversity benefits run parallel to the risks for climate benefits, which is covered in the VCS risk analysis. An additional risk to the biodiversity benefits is poaching. This risk is addressed by the project proponent by creating support among the community members for the park and by organising awareness meeting. At the same time UWA rangers carry out patrolling inside the park. A major risk to the community benefits is the elephants affecting the farmer's crops. Although the project implementer demonstrated that increase in elephant population in the park is caused by other factors than only the project activity (see section B2.1), the project is taking seriously this issue and started a consistent plan of mitigation measures such as elephant trenches around the park, unpalatable crops planting, community training. A risk to employment is envisaged if the project is not achieving its planting targets and in case of scaling down. The future activities that can generate employment are mainly the planting of the remaining 700 ha of land, the digging and maintenance of the elephant trenches. The risk for the collection of non-timber forest products is overexploitation. UWA monitors the extraction of the NTFP's by specific agreement (formal and also informal) with the communities.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/03/11/48/49/44/51/
Findings	The project analysis of the CCB related risks is comprehensive as well are the mitigation measures. Risks factors and related indicators have been duly included in the project activities, notably, in the PMP and PIR

CCB indicator: G1.11. Describe the measures needed and taken to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.	After the project completion, the restored area of the KNP will continue to stay under the jurisdiction of UWA. At project completion, in 2068, the forest will have been matured and management efforts will be limited. The same will be true for the biodiversity benefits which follow the development of the natural (climax) forest. The community benefits will be part of UWA general management activities and tourism development (temporary employment and tourism related economy) as well as the development of Income Generating Activities (IGA) promoted by the project and the UWA sharing fund. The management of the FtF and UWA sharing fund for IGA development is part of the PMP and UWA-Face plan of activities.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/15/30/47/02/11/
Findings	The project activities have been conceived also in order to ensure that CCB benefits conditions will be reasonably maintained beyond project completion (in 2068).

4.4 Project Financing

CCB indicator G4.3: Document the financial health of the implementing organization(s). Provide assurance that the Project Proponent and any of the other entities involved in project design and implementation are not involved in or are not complicit in any form of corruption⁴⁸ such as bribery, embezzlement, fraud, favoritism, cronyism, nepotism, extortion, and collusion, and describe any measures needed <i>and taken</i> to be able to provide this assurance.	The FtF claims that funding for the restoration of about 85% of the area for planting has been already secured (700 ha remaining for future planting / natural regeneration management). The administration and accounts of FtF are regularly audited. UWA-Face project staff submits monthly and quarterly financial returns to UWA Headquarters. UWA is also audited by external independent auditors.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/41/47/
Findings	FtF and UWA are financially accountable and have transparent and audited financial management. The site visit could verify the existence of the internal and external financial audits.

CCB indicator: G1.12. Demonstrate that financial mechanisms adopted, including actual and projected revenues from GHG emissions reductions or removals and other sources, provide an adequate actual and projected flow of funds for project implementation and to achieve the project's climate, community and biodiversity benefits.	The PDD states that the main costs of the project are for planting and tending in the first three to five years after planting. After that the trees can survive on their own and the planted compartments fall under general management of the park. The major part of the forest in the project area has already been established and the required funds have been spent for this establishment. New planting areas (planned
--	---

	700 ha) are only established when funding for the first 5 years of the new area is secured. For general management purposes there is a revenue sharing agreement between FtF and UWA/60/. As per the registered VCS PD /80/ the main source of income for the Kibale National Park is derived from tourism activities while that of neighbouring communities comes from subsistence agriculture, with poor access to improved agricultural implements and limited marked access. The costs of nursery establishment and tending of planted seedlings are beyond what UWA and or the local communities can afford.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/41/47/50/
Findings	Financial mechanisms are reasonably sustainable for securing further investments. Carbon revenues are partially devoted to project area local management by UWA (climate and biodiversity benefits) and community development.

4.5 Employment Opportunities and Worker Safety

CCB indicator: G3.9. Describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to provide orientation and training for the project's workers and relevant people from the Communities with an objective of building locally useful skills and knowledge to increase local participation in project implementation. These capacity building efforts should target a wide range of people in the Communities, with special attention to women and vulnerable and/or marginalized people. Identify how training is passed on to new workers when there is staff turnover, so that local capacity will not be lost.	According to the PDD, the project provided and is providing skills to local workers and community dwellers mainly related to nursery management, forest restoration skills, fire fighting, safety precautions, road maintenance, elephant trenches management, exotic species elimination. Women mostly do nursery management work and spot hoeing and pitting. Sharing funds allocation (the existing UWA fund and the forthcoming UWA-FACE) will provide new opportunities for increasing capacities in IGA initiatives.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/02/03/46/42/47/site visit
Findings	Site visit to communities and forest could verify that the mentioned activities have been implemented through the use of community trained personnel. Women are engaged in nursery activities running on family basis so that skills acquired thanks to the project will not be lost. The statements on the number of seedlings purchased from the nursery are kept in the project office (existing data verified). SBIA report confirms that UWA sharing fund needs to be better managed and the foreseen FACE sharing fund will be managed according to the mentioned lessons learned.

CCB indicator: G3.10. <i>Demonstrate</i> that people from the Communities are given an equal opportunity to fill all work positions (including management) if the job requirements are met. Explain how workers are selected for positions and where relevant, describe the measures needed and <i>taken</i> to ensure Community members, including women and vulnerable and/or marginalized people, are given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained.	The project PDD clearly describes the community recruitment policy. Casual workers positions require physical strength and fitness. Higher level staff, such as accountants, is appointed qualifications and experience form the basis for selection. With regards to equal opportunities, as described under section G 3.9, both women and men are offered job opportunities as well as people with different levels of status and income. Workers are mostly employed for planting, tending and maintenance activities. Most of the park rangers (75 %) also come from local communities. The age limit is from 18 years and above. When it is time for the project to recruit workers, a written notice, informing the public employment opportunities by the project, is hanged in busy public places like churches and trading centers. The number of workers recruited by the project between 2011 and 2014 is specified per parish in table 1 in CM1.1. of the CCB PDD. A copy of the UWA-Face “Terms and Conditions of Services” is also included in the attached documents describing the project’s procedures for recruitment and employment.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/57/51/
Findings	Project relevant documents and policy have been revised which are compliant with PDD. Community on site visit confirmed high satisfaction of community members about employment opportunities and recruitment mechanisms. Mackenzie 2012 (/51/) impact assessment on community benefits confirms that local communities are benefitting from project employment opportunities
CCB indicator: G3.11. Submit a list of all relevant laws and regulations covering worker’s rights in the host country. Describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to inform workers about their rights. Provide assurance that the project meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering worker rights and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.	As reported in the PDD, the following laws and regulations are applicable: • The National Social Security Fund Act 1985 • The Employment Act 1977 • The Employment Decree 1975 • The Employment regulations 1977 • The Workers Compensation Act 2000 • UWA Human Resource and

	Administration Policy Manual Revised Version 2008 UWA KNP has recognised the Uganda Hotels and Allied Workers Union. Minutes of all union meetings are available. There is a Medical and Health Safety Policy regarding health and safety of its staff and employees and there is separate policy available on HIV/AIDS. Section G 3.12 describes how occupational risks are dealt with.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/58/75/
Findings	The existing law and internal regulations have been verified as well as all related documentation.

CCB indicator: G3.12. Comprehensively assess situations and occupations that might arise through the implementation of the project and pose a substantial risk to worker safety. Describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to inform workers of risks and to explain how to minimize such risks. Where worker safety cannot be guaranteed, project proponents must show how the risks are minimized using best work practices in line with the culture and customary practices of the communities	Workers are sensitized about safety issues and are required to use personal protective equipments provided by the project. KNP has an arrangement with selected clinics to which serious medical cases can be taken in the event of occupational injuries. First aid kits are provided to work teams. Risks are minimized and mitigated through training, awareness information and supervision.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/ Copies of various acts such as Workers Compensation Act, Traffic and road safety Act, The Employment Decree 1975, and the Pocket Guide to your Rights are available in the park's office.
Findings	Site visit could verify that project claims on workers safety are consistent.

4.6 Stakeholders

CCB indicator: G1.5. Explain the process of stakeholder identification and analysis used to identify Communities, Community Groups and Other Stakeholders.	A SBIA has been carried out where the first step of the assessment was to identify the stakeholders. According to the SBIA, the following criteria to identify key stakeholders to be consulted during the SBIA process: • Representation by gender • Representation by location • Representation by administrative authority The parishes (communities) have been selected because they are adjacent to the boundary of
--	---

	the project area. For the SBIA process meetings were held at the village, parish and sub-county level. All community members were invited. The participants at the parish level were selected from the villages of each parish. In section 6 of the VCS Project Document a further description is provided of which stakeholders have been identified.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/03/10/38/40/41/
Findings	Community visit could confirm the described stakeholder engagement process. Minutes of the community meetings have been verified.

CCB indicator: G1.6. List all Communities, Community Groups and Other Stakeholders identified using the process explained in G 1.5.	<i>Parish communities' stakeholders:</i> Isunga Nyabweya Kakooga Kadindimo Bigodi Bujongobe Rugonjo Kiziba Nyabitusi Kyabandara Rwimi Rwenkuba In section 6 of the VCS Project Document see the community stakeholder.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/03/10/38/40/41/
Findings	The description of stakeholders is provided. The list of stakeholders seems reasonable. Community stakeholders have been verified have been visited and community location has been identified in local maps. See also indicator G1.7

CCB indicator: G3.1. Describe how full project documentation has been made accessible to Communities and Other Stakeholders, how summary project documentation (including how to access full documentation) has been actively disseminated to Communities in relevant local or regional languages, and how widely publicized information meetings have been held with Communities and Other Stakeholders.	The PDD (in English) and other project documents are available in the office at Mainaro, and on the head office at Isunga. Additionally, UWA Kibale gives out a magazine (on yearly basis) about activities being done where project activities and issues are included as they are a significant part of the KNP management. The PDD explains that the programme for revenue sharing with the communities of tourism income is kept transparent. The same
---	---

	document says that UWA and UWA/Face are frequently on the local radio in talk shows. For the project there are 3 official languages that need to be used when sharing information or giving out publications meant for local stakeholders. That is English and the 2 local languages Lutoro and Lukiga. During the SBIA process meetings have been organized at the parish level and a workshop with key stakeholders was organized. During the meetings on the parish level, a presentation about the project was provided.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/03/42/17/18/19/20/
Findings	Documents exist and were made available. Community presentation on project activities and SBIA outcomes presentations have been performed.

CCB indicator: G3.2. Explain how relevant and adequate information about potential costs, risks and benefits to Communities has been provided to them in a form they understand and in a timely manner prior to any decision they may be asked to make with respect to participation in the project.	The SBIA process includes an assessment of the risks and positive / negative impacts of the results of the project, based on a selection of main focal issues by the participating community members. The PDD claims that temporarily workers are informed about the benefits that the job brings on top of the wages (free medical service during work, pension fund, learning forest skills and getting protective ware). Similarly, risks are explained.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/03/42/18/
Findings	Relevant information was provided to communities and the project activities and community concerns were properly addressed and discussed. Training records have been verified in the UWA - FACE office.

CCB indicator: G3.3. Describe the measures taken, and communications methods used, to explain to Communities and Other Stakeholders the process for validation and/or verification against the CCB Standards by an independent Auditor, providing them with timely information about the Auditor's site visit before the site visit occurs and facilitating direct and independent communication between them or their representatives and the Auditor.	The PDD explains how communities have been informed in a presentation about the VCS+CCB validation and verification process. The audit dates have been communicated with the stakeholders.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/19/20/
Findings	The communities were informed in advance of the Validation + verification process and site visit.

CCB indicator: G3.4. Describe how Communities including all the Community Groups and Other Stakeholders have influenced project design and <i>implementation</i> through Effective Consultation, particularly with a view to optimizing Community and Other Stakeholder benefits, respecting local customs, values and institutions and maintaining high conservation values. Project proponents must document consultations and indicate if and how the project design and implementation has been revised based on such input.⁴² A plan must be developed and <i>implemented</i> to continue communication and consultation between the project proponents and Communities, including all the Community Groups, and Other Stakeholders about the project and its impacts to facilitate adaptive	The project design and PMP have been carried out also through consultation of the local communities by the SBIA exercise. The SBIA outcomes formed and confirmed the project design. Through the SBIA process the stakeholders have been consulted and have participated in the formulation of the project design by defining focal issues and vision statements. The continued communication is achieved through having regular meetings organized by the Community Conservation Unit.
--	---

management throughout the life of the project	
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/03/02/17/18/19/20/minutes of community attendance in meetings are available at the Mainaro project office
Findings	Local stakeholders were clearly consulted, and changes to the project activities were instituted based on their inputs. The CCB PMP set the implementation plan also based on the monitoring priorities identified by communities. Indicators and regular information about project performances is ensured to communities
CCB indicator: G3.5. Demonstrate that all consultations and participatory processes have been undertaken directly with Communities and Other Stakeholders or through their legitimate representatives, ensuring adequate levels of information sharing with the members of the groups.	
Evidence used to assess conformance	According to the PDD, there are minutes and attendance lists available for the meetings organized at the village and parish level. There is also a list of the legitimate representatives in the SBIA report.
Findings	/10/03/ The project proponent consulted with local stakeholders, and engage them in the project. On site visit could verify the minutes of the meeting with the stakeholders at the Mainaro FtF office.
CCB indicator: G3.6. Describe the measures needed and <i>taken</i> to enable effective participation, as appropriate, of all Communities, including all the Community Groups that want and need to be involved in project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation throughout the project lifetime, and describe how they have been implemented in a culturally appropriate and gender sensitive manner.	
Evidence used to assess conformance	The PDD states that the UWA - CCT organizes regular meetings with communities (awareness, problem solving, etc.) where people have the opportunity to express opinions and give feedback to Park management. The implementation relies on community engagement and employment. Workers are participating in decision-making through the Workers Committee. Decisions on the selection of focal issues in the SBIA process have been made by the local community representatives.
Findings	/10/03/02/41/42/minutes of workers committees at project office/ site visit interviews This indicator was adequately addressed
CCB indicator: G3.7. Describe the measures needed and <i>taken</i> to ensure that the project proponent and all other entities involved in project design and implementation are not involved in or complicit in any form of discrimination or sexual harassment with respect to the project.	
Evidence used to assess conformance	According the UWA's Human Resource Manual anti-discrimination measures are issued including actions related to discrimination and sexual harassment.
Findings	/57/58/ UWA FACE has strong anti-discrimination

	policy and procedure. No grievances regarding discrimination or harassment have been reported.
CCB indicator: G3.8. Demonstrate that a clear grievance redress procedure has been formalized to address disputes with Communities and Other Stakeholders that may arise during project planning, implementation and evaluation with respect but not limited to, Free, Prior and Informed Consent, rights to lands, territories and resources, benefit sharing, and participation. The project shall include a process for receiving, hearing, responding to and attempting to resolve Grievances within a reasonable time period. The Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure shall take into account traditional methods that Communities and Other Stakeholders use to resolve conflicts. The Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure shall have three stages with reasonable time limits for each of the following stages. First, the Project Proponent shall attempt to amicably resolve all Grievances, and provide a written response to the Grievances in a manner that is culturally appropriate. Second, any Grievances that are not resolved by amicable negotiations shall be referred to mediation by a neutral third party. Third, any Grievances that are not resolved through mediation shall be referred either to a) arbitration, to the extent allowed by the laws of the relevant jurisdiction or b) competent courts in the relevant jurisdiction, without prejudice to a party's ability to submit the Grievance to a competent supranational adjudicatory body, if any. The Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure must be publicized and accessible to Communities and Other Stakeholders. Grievances and project responses, including any redress, must be documented and made publicly available.	There is a Grievance Redress Procedure applicable. The implementation of the grievance mechanism started on the 16th of April 2015 with a presentation to the representatives of the local communities in which the Grievance Redress Procedure was being introduced and explained by the project staff. A copy of the presentation and the attendance list is included in the attached documents. There is a conflict resolution mechanism available for the resource use agreements (NTFP). Disputes about e.g. crop raiding and damage from baboons, monkeys and elephants, are recorded in the file with the Warden of Community Conservation.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/58/49/CAR 3 of this report/ Minute of assistance to grievance procedure presentation to community at Mainaro project office the Park response to grievances related to wildlife conflicts are included in minutes available on request at the UWA head office.
Findings	The implementation of the grievance mechanism started on the in April 2015 with a presentation to the representatives of the local communities in which the Grievance Redress Procedure was being introduced and explained by the project staff.

4.7 Project Boundary

CCB indicator: G1.7. Provide a map identifying the location of Communities and the boundaries of the Project Area(s), of the Project Zone, including any High Conservation Value areas (identified in CM1 and B1), and of additional areas that are predicted to be impacted by project activities identified in CL3, CM3 and B3.	The PDD includes a map of the project area and zone, as well as an HCV area within both zones. The HCV area is the area where communities primarily collect food, water and wood. Figure 2 of PDD for a map of the location of the communities, the Project Area and the Project Zone. The communities are divided in parishes, which are indicated on this map. The identified areas with HCVs are described in section B.1.2. The entire project area is considered to be HCV 1 and HCV 2 area, while only the planted and naturally regenerated project areas (excluding the future planting areas) are considered HCV3 and HCV4 areas.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/ see also G1.4, G1.6 and B.1.2 /41 table 1.5/
Findings	The indicator was properly addressed.

4.8 Baseline Scenario

CCB indicator: G2.1. Describe the most likely land-use scenario within the Project Zone in the absence of the project, describing the range of potential land-use scenarios and the associated drivers of land use changes and justifying why the land-use scenario selected is most likely. It is allowable for different locations within the Project Zone to have different without-project land use scenarios.	As described in the VCS PD 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 (grass, shrubs and bananas). The PDD analysis points out that 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. 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.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/38/41/43/44/
Findings	It very reasonable to assume that the most likely land use scenario would be land and soil degradation, poor access to resources for communities and low biodiversity.

4.9 Additionality

CCB indicator: G2.2. Document that project benefits including climate, community and biodiversity benefits would not have occurred in the absence of the project, explaining how existing laws, regulations and governance arrangements, or lack of laws and regulations and their enforcement, would likely affect land use and justifying that the benefits being claimed by the project are truly 'additional' and would not have occurred without the project. Identify any distinct climate, community and biodiversity benefits intended for use as offsets and specify how additionality is established for each of these benefits.	The additionality of climate benefits is demonstrated in VCS PD section 2.5. 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.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/38/41/43/44/13/21/22/30/
Findings	It is reasonable to assess that the project benefits would not have occurred in the absence of the project.

5 LEGAL STATUS

5.1 Compliance with Laws, Statutes, Property Rights and Other Regulatory Frameworks

CCB indicator: G5.6. Submit a list of all national and local laws and regulations in the host country that are relevant to the project activities. Provide assurance that the project is complying with these and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.	The PDD provides an extensive list of international agreements, national and local laws relevant to the project. Generally speaking, current laws and/or regulations such as the constitution of the Republic of Uganda (1995) and the National Environmental Act (1996) allow the reforestation on the degraded lands. Below are a list of laws and regulations that are in favour of the project activities: The constitution of the Republic of Uganda of 1995, The National Environmental Act of 1996, The National Forestry and Tree Planting Act, 8/2003, The Uganda Wildlife Act, Cap. 2002.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10 - section 5/76/ 77/ 78/
Findings	This indicator is well addressed.

CCB indicator: G5.7. Document that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, including the established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the Communities.	As stated by the PDD, the project takes place in the KNP, owned by the government and managed by UWA. It is a joint project by UWA and FtF. At the start of the project a MOU was signed between the Government of Uganda and Face. There are no established traditional authorities over the area of the National Park (see section G5.1).
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/15/17/47/site visit
Findings	All relevant authorities approved the project.

5.2 Evidence of Right of Use

CCB indicator: G5.8. Demonstrate that the Project Proponent(s) has the unconditional, undisputed and unencumbered ability to claim that the project will or did generate or cause the project's climate, community and biodiversity benefits.	The Ugandan Government owns the land of the KNP. According the agreements between FtF and the national government all resources, below or above the surface belong to the government, except for the carbon ownership by FtF. The biodiversity and community benefits are the results of the forest restoration activities carried out by the project, based on funding for the project.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/15/17/47/59 Art. 2.e/60 Art. 33/
Findings	The project proponents have the undisputed right to implement the project as well as have the right to the credits derived.

CCB indicator: G5.9. Identify the tradable climate, community and biodiversity benefits of the project and specify how double counting is avoided, particularly for offsets sold on the voluntary market and generated in a country participating in a compliance mechanism.	There are no offsets sold from the project area based on climate, community or biodiversity benefits, outside of VCS and CCBS offsets. Uganda does not participate in any compliance mechanisms for carbon or biodiversity / community schemes.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/ The project is registered under VCS and the verification activity is carried out in conjunction with the validation/verification CCB.
Findings	This indicator has been properly addressed

5.3 Respect for Rights and No Involuntary Relocation

CCB indicator: G5.1. Describe and map statutory and customary tenure / use / access / management rights to lands, territories and resources in the Project Zone including individual and collective rights and including overlapping or conflicting rights. If applicable, describe measures needed and taken by the project to help to secure statutory rights. <i>Demonstrate</i> that all Property Rights are recognized, respected, and supported.	The PDD describes that the KNP was first reserved in 1932. In 1968 it became a Central Forest Reserve up to 1993 when it was elevated from Forest Park to National Park status. Its boundaries are marked with boundary pillars GPS-positioned. The project area is situated within the boundaries of KNP and is part of its management plan. In the zone surrounding and outside the KNP and then the project area that the local communities have customary land rights. Local people have traditionally extracted a variety of resources, including firewood, wild coffee, water, medicinal plants, fish, honey and rattan cane. Local people will be permitted to use these resources through resource use agreements signed between UWA and community Resource users.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10//15/17/47/59 Art. 2.e/60 Art. 33/62/49/
Findings	The project respects the community land rights and customary rights to forest resources use. This indicator is well addressed.

CCB indicator: G5.2. <i>Demonstrate</i> with documented consultations and agreements that a. the project will not encroach uninvited on private property, community property, or government property, b. the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent <i>has been obtained</i> of those whose property rights are affected by the project through a transparent, agreed process.	The project does not encroach on private property or community property. The project area is located on land owned by the Government of Uganda. The project is mutual undertaking by Uganda Wildlife Authority, the institution responsible for managing the National Park, and Face the Future. In 1994 government invited Face Foundation to carry out restoration work. In 1994 a MOU was signed between Face and the Government of Uganda.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/15/47/59/60/62
Findings	This indicator is well addressed.

CCB indicator: G5.3. <i>Demonstrate</i> that project activities do not lead to involuntary removal or relocation of Property Rights Holders from their lands or territories, and does not force them to relocate	The PDD states that the project has not led to the removal or relocation of Property Right Holders. Encroachers and settlers had been evicted in the years before the project was
---	---

activities important to their culture or livelihood. If any relocation of habitation or activities is undertaken within the terms of an agreement, the project proponents must <i>demonstrate</i> that the agreement was made with the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent of those concerned and includes provisions for just and fair compensation.	established. However, the evictions were not caused by this particular project activity, but had to do with decisions by the Government of Uganda to regain control over its Forest Reserves. The government of Uganda decided to regain control of the Forest Reserves, which led to the eviction of the settlers from the Kibale Forest Reserve in 1992 and relocation had taken place. Currently there are no court cases related to the evictions and relocation of 1992.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/
Findings	The project activities did not lead to involuntary resettlement of people. This indicator is well addressed.

CCB indicator: G5.5. Identify any ongoing or unresolved conflicts or disputes over rights to lands, territories and resources and also any disputes that were resolved during the last twenty years where such records exist, or at least during the last ten years. If applicable, describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to resolve conflicts or disputes. <i>Demonstrate</i> that no activity is undertaken by the project that could prejudice the outcome of an unresolved dispute relevant to the project over lands, territories and resources in the Project Zone.	There are no unresolved tenure or use right disputes. See also PDD - indicator G5.3 for previous court cases. With regards to resolved conflicts related to human-wildlife interactions: data sheets and minutes are held by UWA. The same is true for the agreement for the use of FTNP
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/49/03/58/63/02/42/
Findings	Conflicts and grievances are well managed by the project implementers. No disputes are pending.

5.4 Illegal Activities and Project Benefits

CCB indicator: G5.4. Identify any illegal activities that could affect the project's climate, community or biodiversity impacts (e.g. illegal logging) taking place in the Project Zone and describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to reduce these activities so that project benefits are not derived from illegal activities.	The PDD explains that potential illegal activities cited in the PDD include poaching of wildlife, illegal firewood collection, over-extraction of resources beyond the carrying capacity of the forest. Illegal timber cutting and grazing are not significant. The illegal activities are controlled by UWA park rangers. Resource extraction is being monitored to make sure there is no over-extraction.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/49/03/58/63/42/
Findings	Illegal activities within KNP are resolved with an effective combination of law enforcement and community education strategies.

6 CLIMATE SECTION

As per the *Rules for the Use of the CCB Standards* (December 2013), a Climate Section Waiver is applicable for projects using the *Third Edition*. " The Climate section of the CCB Standards Third Edition is used to demonstrate a project's net positive climate benefits and not for claiming greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions and removals units for use as offsets. CL1-4 is not required for projects that have met the requirements of a Recognized GHG Program.

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 /81/.

7 COMMUNITY SECTION

7.1 Without-Project Community Scenario

CCB indicator: CM.1. Describe the Communities at the start of the project and significant community changes in the past, including well-being information, and any community characteristics. Describe the social, economic and cultural diversity within the Communities and the differences and interactions between the Community Groups.	The PDD give a description of the communities surrounding the KNP. The park is surrounded by densely populated areas, mainly due to immigration from southern Uganda and a high birth rate. Land pressure varies, in the north of the park around the tea estates only about 2 acres per family is available, to the east and south the pressure reduces. The standards of living are low. Tourism is an important source of income for the region, with several locally based groups facilitating access to the forest and wetlands. An overview of the 12 parishes is included in the SBIA and PDD.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/03/
Findings	The PDD describes well the communities living around the project zone. This indicator was adequately addressed.

CCB indicator: CM1.2. Evaluate whether the Project Zone includes any of the following High Conservation Values (HCVs) related to community well-being and describe the qualifying attributes for any identified HCVs: a. Areas that provide critical ecosystem services; b. Areas that are fundamental for the livelihoods of Communities; and c. Areas that are critical for the traditional cultural identity of Communities. Identify the areas that need to be managed to maintain or enhance the identified HCVs.	According to the PDD and KNP management plan there is a resource use zone along the park boundaries where communities have access to Park resources. Access and extraction are subject to agreement with the management of the Park. No areas are critical to the traditional cultural identity of communities. Additionally, the project area provides ecosystem services by filtering water from the rivers that enter the park and flow in Southern direction, draining into Lake George.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/49/15/51/
Findings	The project zone appears to have some benefit to community livelihood and partially to ecosystem services but no HCV has been clearly identified.

CCB indicator: CM1.3. Describe the expected changes in the well-being conditions and other characteristics of Communities under the without-project land use scenario, including the impact of likely changes on all ecosystem services in the Project Zone identified as important to Communities.	According the PDD, without the project the situation of the people in the communities would not have differed much from the situation before the start of the project. Without the project, there would not be the employment as provided by the project. The project area is less attractive for tourism in the without-project scenario compared to the restored ecosystem in the project scenario, and therefore revenues from tourism in the areas adjacent to the project area don't increase.
---	---

	NTFP illegal extraction will likely continue to happen, although limited by law enforcement by UWA. It is also likely that the human wildlife conflict would be smaller in absence of the project activity.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/51/44/41/
Findings	The description of the base line scenario for communities is accurate. This indicator was adequately addressed.

7.2 Net Positive Community Impacts

CCB indicator: CM2.1. Use appropriate methodologies to assess the impacts, including predicted and actual, direct and indirect benefits, costs and risks, on each of the identified Community Groups (identified in G1.5) resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario. The assessment of impacts must include changes in well-being due to project activities and an evaluation of the impacts by the affected Community Groups. This assessment must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about changes in well-being of the Community Groups under the with-project scenario, including potential impacts of changes in all ecosystem services identified as important for the Communities (including water and soil resources), over the project lifetime.	<u>Positive impacts</u> The PDD reports precisely project impact on communities. Employment is the largest positive impact of the project. Local skills (to date, nurseries and planting) and IGA (also thank to revenue sharing funds) also relevantly impact on people wellbeing. By converting the area covered with elephant grass to forest, the availability of NTFP is increased for the future. 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. The access roads and project local purchases (goods). <u>Negative impacts</u> Along the boundary of the park, the communities suffer from crop raiding by mainly elephants, and also baboons and other species. During the participatory assessment of the SBIA process, the human wildlife conflict is selected as one of the focal issues. Although it is expected that the elephant population increase can be positively affected by the project, the problem of crop-raiding by elephants is primarily caused by the existence of the Kibale National Park, which provides a sanctuary for the elephants within its borders. If the project was absent, the area would still exist within the boundaries of the national park. In relation to the overall observed increase in elephant population in KNP over the past decades, it seems that more strict conservation and anti-poaching policies and regulations as well as more intensive surveillance have proven effective, as this trend can be observed in the whole of Uganda. A WCS study argues that periods of conflict in neighbouring countries such as DRC have caused elephants to migrate to
---	---

	Uganda. For other species like primates and bushpigs the population increase can be linked to the project.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/02/03/42/51/64/43/52/56/52/
Findings	Negative and positive impacts have been reasonably addressed.

CCB indicator: CM2.2. Describe measures needed and taken to mitigate any negative well-being impacts on Community Groups and for maintenance or enhancement of the High Conservation Value attributes (identified in CM1.2) consistent with the precautionary principle.	According to project documentation, the negative project impact for local communities identified under CM2.1 in the SBIA process is the possible increase in the human wildlife conflict, for as far as the population increase of especially elephants can be partially attributed to the project. Mitigation activities to deal with the human-wildlife conflict have been identified in consultation with the local communities. The main activity is creating elephant trenches along the park boundary in places of high risk for elephants crossing the boundary and affecting the crops. This has already been implemented for a large part and this will continue in the future.
Evidence used to assess conformance	10/02/03/42/51/64/15/46/47/
Findings	The project demonstrated that corrective measures are in place and planned to mitigate its negative impacts.

CCB indicator: CM2.3. Demonstrate that the net well-being impacts of the project are positive for all identified Community Groups compared with their anticipated well-being conditions under the without project land use scenario (described in CM1).	The PDD states that the project results in several positive impacts (CM2.1). The negative impacts are limited and are mitigated as described in CM2.2.
Evidence used to assess conformance	10/02/03/42/51/64/15/46/47/
Findings	The project extensively supported and documented the positive net impact of the activities. The overall net impact is reasonably positive.

CCB indicator: CM2.4. Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values (identified in CM1.2) are negatively affected by the project.	In section CM1.2 no HCV's have been identified
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/02/03/42/51/64/43/52/56/52/
Findings	Not applicable.

7.3 Other Stakeholder impacts

CCB indicator: CM3.1. Identify any potential positive and negative impacts that the project activities are likely to cause on the well-being of Other Stakeholders.	According to the PDD, the stakeholders presented in section G1.6 are not negatively impacted by the project.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/site visit
Findings	No negative impact on Other Stakeholders is

	reported.
CCB indicator: CM3.2. Describe the measures needed <i>and taken</i> to mitigate the negative well-being impacts on Other Stakeholders.	Not applicable.
Evidence used to assess conformance	Not applicable.
Findings	Not applicable.
CCB indicator: CM3.3. Demonstrate that the project activities do not result in net negative impacts on the well-being of Other Stakeholders.	Only positive impacts have been identified in the PDD.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/
Findings	It is credible that only positive impacts result from the project.

8 BIODIVERSITY SECTION

8.1 Biodiversity Without-Project Scenario

CCB indicator: B1.1. Describe biodiversity within the Project Zone at the start of the project and threats to that biodiversity, using appropriate methodologies.	The PDD carries a comprehensive analysis of the biodiversity situation in the original baseline vegetation of the project concluding that it was quite limited. The areas consisted of elephant grass, spear grass and Hyperphenia. UWA monitors (animal) species biodiversity in KNP in two ways: Transects and MIST. There are various studies, related to biodiversity in KNP have been executed, either by UWA or (independent) researchers. Some studies are specifically focussed on the effects of the forest rehabilitation program. Some of these studies are:
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/31/14/54/53/43/31/34/26/35/21/66/67/68/69/
Findings	The project provides an extensive and well documented information supporting the biodiversity situation previous the project start. This indicator was adequately addressed.

CCB indicator: B1.2. Evaluate whether the Project Zone includes any of the following High Conservation Values (HCVs) related to biodiversity and describe the qualifying attributes for any identified HCVs: HCV 1 - a. Globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values; i. protected areas ii. threatened species iii. endemic species iv. areas that support significant concentrations of a species during any time in their lifecycle. HCV2 - b. Globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape-level areas where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance; HCV3 - c. Threatened or rare ecosystems. Identify the areas that need to be managed to maintain or enhance the identified HCVs.	According to the PDD, the conservation values of KNP are numerous. A basic assessment of HCV areas was made based on available existing data (see evidence section). For this assessment the project area is considered to consist out of two distinct areas: the planted and naturally regenerating areas (3992 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. In relation to the above project implementer thinks that 'the planted and naturally regenerating areas' will develop High Conservation Values similar to the forest ecosystems of KNP. <i>The PDD assesses that the following HCV can be applied to the project area: HCV 1, HCV 2 and HVC 3.</i>
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/15/70/71/72/73/74/03/
Findings	The project zone has the HCVs 1, 2 and 3. The project also intends to monitor the development of biodiversity in order to demonstrate the succession of the vegetation towards a climax forest type (part of the HCV 1).

CCB indicator: B1.3. Describe how the without-project land use scenario would affect biodiversity conditions in the Project Zone.	The PPD accounts that before the project start date the project area is dominated by grasslands with scattered trees. The selected baseline scenario is that the park management would lack the funds to reforest the area and has limited funds to control the fires that come in from outside the project area. In the dry seasons the grasslands are highly susceptible to fire risk. The frequent fires on the lands outside the park will enter the park and maintain a fire climax ecosystem. The elephant grass will stay there due to the fire regime favouring elephant grass and thwarting the natural regeneration of trees. Different types of vegetation will converge into fire-prone grassland, comprising mostly long and some short grasses and few fire tolerant bushes or trees, like the fire resistant <i>Combretum</i> trees. The dominant presence of grassland in the baseline scenario means the biodiversity conditions in terms of habitats and species in the project area will stay the same, and there will be no increase of forest habitat.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/43/44/23/
Findings	It is very likely that the without-project land use scenario would not have been conducive to significant biodiversity.

8.2 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts

CCB indicator: B2.1. Use appropriate methodologies to estimate changes in biodiversity, including assessment of predicted and actual, positive and negative, direct and indirect impacts, resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario in the Project Zone and over the project lifetime. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions.	Positive impacts on biodiversity As described in the section B 1.3 on the without-project scenario, the biodiversity in the fire-climax grasslands is relatively low. Studies demonstrate that intensive replanting can accelerate the natural accumulation of biomass and biodiversity. Therefore, the improvement of habitats for vulnerable and threatened species is expected to be significant. The observations of animals in parts of the project area that have been established since the project start date in 1995 clearly show significant presence of many species that prefer forest habitat. The MIST observations within the planting compartments and regeneration areas show a predominantly positive trend in number of elephant, chimpanzee, red colobus, black- and white colobus and red-tailed monkey sightings between 2004 and 2014. Potential negative impacts on biodiversity - following the most relevant: - Since grassland and shrubland communities will convert into forests the effects of the project will have a negative impact on the biodiversity of these systems. This suggests that forest restoration could potentially have a negative influence on elephant
---	--

	abundance. However, the elephant population seems to have increased considerably. Similar increase in elephant population can be observed in the neighbouring Queen Elizabeth NP, where the population seems to have (more than) doubled between 2000 and 2010 (Plumptre <i>et al.</i>, 2010). No forest restoration activities have taken place in this park in the last 20 – 30 years, which seems further substantiate that the increase in elephant population cannot be attributed to forest restoration activities in KNP. - The populations of bird species that mainly occur in <i>P. purpureum</i> vegetation are likely to decline. However, these species are commonly found throughout Uganda and the negative impact on biodiversity can therefore be considered low. - For the newly planted areas, the removal of wildlings can on the long term negatively affect natural regeneration of the forest.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/44/51/30/28/34/14/26/52/31/
Findings	The positive and negative impacts are duly described and documented.

CCB indicator: B2.2. <i>Demonstrate</i> that the project's net impacts on biodiversity in the Project Zone are positive, compared with the biodiversity conditions under the without-project land use scenario (described in B1).	The PDD demonstrates through available literature as well as the census, MIST and vegetation data the considerable positive impact of the project on biodiversity
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/
Findings	Given that this project favours the conversion from grassland to forest promoting high increase of biodiversity the net positive impact of the project compared to the without-project scenario is clear.

CCB indicator: B2.3. Describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to mitigate negative impacts on biodiversity and any measures needed and <i>taken</i> for maintenance or enhancement of the High Conservation Value attributes (identified in B1.2) consistent with the precautionary principle.	The main identified potential negative impacts that the project aims to mitigate are: Removal of wildlings, mitigating measure: The removal is planned in such a way that sufficient wildlings remain in the areas where they are collected. Removal of topsoil to provide soil for the nurseries mitigating measure: soil is only extracted at a small scale with as less as possible disturbance of the surrounding vegetation so that vegetation can quickly cover the spot where soil has been extracted in order to prevent soil erosion.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/03/02/42/Site visit
Findings	Mitigation measures have been identified and implemented

CCB indicator: B2.4. <i>Demonstrate</i> that no High Conservation Values (identified in B1.2) are negatively affected by the project.	The project aims to establish native forests, of which already parts have been realised in varying stages of regeneration, and is expected to further increase the HCV 1, 2 and 3 considerably.
---	--

Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/
Findings	This indicator is clearly addressed.

CCB indicator: B2.5. Identify all species used by the project and <i>show</i> that no known invasive species are introduced into any area affected by the project and that the population of any invasive species does not increase as a result of the project.	The project only uses native species for reforestation. The project does not introduce the species, but aims to remove them from the project area by debarking of the exotic trees and by slashing and uprooting the <i>L. camara</i>. Furthermore, the establishment of forest, in the long term, will prevent <i>L. camara</i> to establish.
Evidence used to assess conformance	01/41/10/03/site visit
Findings	No invasive species will be used in the project activities planned at this time. The project also promote the elimination of existing invasive and exotic species.

CCB indicator: B2.6. Describe possible adverse effects of non-native species ¹¹⁸ used by the project on the region's environment, including impacts on native species and disease introduction or facilitation. Justify any use of non-native species over native species.	Not applicable. The project does not make use of non-native species.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/
Findings	Not applicable.

CCB indicator: B2.7. <i>Guarantee</i> that no GMOs are used to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals.	The project only plants native species that are raised in the nursery from seeds collected from natural trees and that are not genetically modified.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/ site visit
Findings	This indicator is properly addressed.

CCB indicator: B2.8. Describe the possible adverse effects of, and justify the use of, fertilizers, chemical pesticides, biological control agents and other inputs used for the project.	The project does not use fertilizers, chemicals, pesticides and biological control agents.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/ site visit
Findings	This indicator is properly addressed.

CCB indicator: B2.9. Describe the process for identifying, classifying and managing all waste products resulting from project activities.	According to the PDD, the following rules are observed for waste management: - Bins and waste pits at all sites are available and are marked either bio-degradable or non-biodegradable. - Organic waste is placed in deep pits covered with planks so that the primates cannot access these areas. - Non-organic waste is taken to demarcated areas. - The communities collect the tins and plastic bottles for re-use so there is very little general waste. - The remaining part of non-biodegradable waste goes to the incinerator at the park headquarters.
--	---

Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/ site visit
Findings	This indicator is properly addressed.

8.3 Offsite Biodiversity Impacts

CCB indicator: B3.1. Identify potential negative impacts on biodiversity that the project activities are likely to cause outside the Project Zone.	No negative offsite biodiversity impacts as a result of the project activity have been identified.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/ on site visit
Findings	

CCB indicator: B3.2. Describe the measures needed and <i>taken</i> to mitigate these negative impacts on biodiversity outside the Project Zone.	Not applicable, see B 3.1.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/
Findings	Not applicable

CCB indicator: B3.3. Evaluate unmitigated negative impacts on biodiversity outside the Project Zone and compare them with the project's biodiversity benefits within the Project Zone. Justify and demonstrate that the net effect of the project on biodiversity is positive.	Not applicable, see B 3.1.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/
Findings	Not applicable, see B 3.1.

GL3 Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits

CCB indicator: GL3.1. Demonstrate that the Project Zone includes a site of high biodiversity conservation priority by meeting either the vulnerability or irreplaceability criteria defined below, identifying the ‘Trigger’ species that cause(s) the site to meet any of the following qualifying conditions and providing evidence that the qualifying conditions are met: 1.1 Vulnerability Regular occurrence of a globally threatened species (according to the IUCN Red List) at the site: a. Critically Endangered (CR) and Endangered (EN) species - presence of at least a single individual; or b. Vulnerable species (VU) - presence of at least 30 individuals or 10 pairs. OR 1.2 Irreplaceability A minimum proportion of a species’ global population present at the site at any stage of the species’ lifecycle according to the following thresholds: a. Restricted-range species - species with a global range less than 50,000 km² and 5% of global population at the site; or b. Species with large but clumped distributions - 5% of the global population at the site; or c. Globally significant congregations - 1% of the global population seasonally at the site; or d. Globally significant source populations - 1% of the global population at the site.	The PDD states that the project area being part of the KNP 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 <i>et al.</i> (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. There are no management actions taken.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/02/42/
Findings	This indicator is properly addressed.

CCB indicator: GL3.2. Describe recent population trends of each of the Trigger species in the Project Zone at the start of the project and describe the most likely changes under the without-project land use scenario.	See B1 and B2 sections and PMP and PIR. 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.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/02/42/

Findings	This indicator is properly addressed.
CCB indicator: GL3.3. Describe measures needed and <i>taken</i> to maintain or enhance the population status of each Trigger species in the Project Zone, and to reduce the threats to them based on the causal model that identifies threats to Trigger species and activities to address them.	See B1 and B2 sections. The management of the KNP is focused on maintaining trigger species. There are no specific actions identified to maintain or enhance elephant population in the project area, other than those discussed in the KNP general management (e.g. prevention of poaching). There are no management actions possible and taken for enhance the population of Red colobus in areas colonized by chimpanzees .
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/02/42/15/
Findings	This indicator is properly addressed.
CCB indicator: GL3.4. Include indicators of the population trend of each Trigger species and/or the threats to them in the monitoring plan and demonstrate the effectiveness of measures needed and taken to maintain or enhance the population status of Trigger species.	The PMP foresee sound measures for monitoring trigger species See also indicator GL3.3.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/02/42/
Findings	This indicator is properly addressed.

9 MONITORING

9.1 Description of the Monitoring Plan

The Monitoring Plan presents how community and biodiversity impacts and benefits are monitored by the project. The monitoring of the climate impact is covered in the VCS Project Document and, therefore, has not been included in the CCB reports. The indicators selected for monitoring have been identified on the basis of the relevant factors identified in the PDD and on the participatory SBIA report /03/.

According the SBIA, five focal issues have been identified with the communities:

1. Human Wildlife Conflict
2. Misuse of revenue sharing funds
3. Illegal extraction of resources inside the national park
4. Wildfires
5. Exotic/Invasive Species

Apart from the objectives linked to the focal issues, the SBIA set other objectives and indicators related to:

1. Restoration of the natural forest
2. Creating forest habitats for wildlife and increase wildlife populations
3. Generate employment for local communities

Tools and methods are also clearly mentioned and indicated in order to carry out the biodiversity and community monitoring of relevant indicators.

9.2 Climate Impact Monitoring

The VCS monitoring report /01/ and VCS PDD /41/ give a comprehensive information about the CL component of the project.

9.3 Community Impact Monitoring

CCB indicator: CM4.1. Develop and implement a monitoring plan that identifies community variables to be monitored, Communities, Community Groups and Other Stakeholders to be monitored, the types of measurements, the sampling methods, and the frequency of monitoring and reporting. Monitoring variables must be directly linked to the project's objectives for Communities and Community Groups and to predicted outputs, outcomes and impacts identified in the project's causal model related to the well-being of Communities (described in G1.8). Monitoring must assess differentiated impacts, including and benefits, costs and risks, for each of the Community Groups and must include an evaluation by the affected Community Groups.	See the separate CCB PMP for the UWA-Face project.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/02/03/
Findings	The PMP includes all relevant indicators linked to

	communities previously identified by the SBIA and the PDD .
CCB indicator: CM4.2. Develop and implement a monitoring plan to assess the effectiveness of measures taken to maintain or enhance all identified High Conservation Values related to community well-being.	Not applicable.
Evidence used to assess conformance	
Findings	Not applicable.
CCB indicator: CM4.3. Disseminate the monitoring plan, and any results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means.	A summary of the PMP has been presented to all stakeholders engaged by the project.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/02/19/site visit
Findings	Stakeholders are aware of the monitoring plan.

9.4 Biodiversity Impact Monitoring

CCB indicator: B4.1. Develop and implement a monitoring plan that identifies biodiversity variables ¹²⁰ to be monitored, the areas to be monitored, the sampling methods, and the frequency of monitoring and reporting. Monitoring variables must be directly linked to the project's biodiversity objectives and to predicted activities, outcomes and impacts identified in the project's causal model related to biodiversity (described in G1.8).	See the CCB Monitoring Plan for the UWA-Face project.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/02/
Findings	The monitoring plan is comprehensive of all relevant project indicators
CCB indicator: B4.2. Develop and implement a monitoring plan to assess the effectiveness of measures taken to maintain or enhance all identified High Conservation Values related to globally, regionally or nationally significant Biodiversity (identified in B1.2) present in the Project Zone.	Maintenance and enhancement of the High Conservation Values present in the project area are an integral part of the management of KNP. The General Management Plan (GMP, 2014 - 2024) of UWA describes which management activities are foreseen and which measures are taken. Within the restoration zone the following main activities take place: • Planting of trees • Removal of exotic species • Prevention of fire The GMP of KNP details specific management activities to ensure the protection of High Conservation Values within KNP.

	The biodiversity indicators and measurements as defined in the CCB Monitoring Plan for the UWA-Face project, also partially cover the monitoring activities related to High Conservation Values in the project area.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/02/15/47/03/01/42/
Findings	This indicator is properly addressed.

CCB indicator: B4.3. Disseminate the monitoring plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means.	A summary of the Monitoring Plan has been presented to the stakeholders.
Evidence used to assess conformance	/10/19/ site visit
Findings	This indicator is properly addressed.

10 VALIDATION CONCLUSION

Following completion of the validation process, it is RINA's opinion that the project conforms to CCB Standards (Third Edition).

CCB STANDARDS CRITERIA CHECKLIST:

GENERAL SECTION

CONFORMANCE

G1. Original Conditions in the Project Area (Required)	YES X	NO __
G2. Baseline Projections (Required)	YES X	NO __
G3. Project Design and Goals (Required)	YES X	NO __
G4. Management Capacity and Best Practices (Required)	YES X	NO __
G5. Legal Status and Property Rights (Required)	YES X	NO __

CLIMATE SECTION

CL1. Net Positive Climate Impacts (Required)	YES X	NO __
CL2. Offsite Climate Impacts ("Leakage") (Required)	YES X	NO __
CL3. Climate Impact Monitoring (Required)	YES X	NO __

COMMUNITY SECTION

CM1. Net Positive Community Impacts (Required)	YES X	NO __
CM2. Offsite Community Impacts (Required)	YES X	NO __
CM3. Community Impact Monitoring (Required)	YES X	NO __

BIODIVERSITY SECTION

B1. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts (Required)	YES X	NO __
B2. Offsite Biodiversity Impacts (Required)	YES X	NO __
B3. Biodiversity Impact Monitoring (Required)	YES X	NO __

GOLD SECTION

GL1. Climate Change Adaptation Benefits (Optional)	YES __	NO X (NA)
GL2. Exceptional Community Benefits (Optional)	YES __	NO X (NA)
GL3. Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits (Optional)	YES X	NO __

APPENDIX A

VALIDATION 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	Validation Conclusion
CAR 1 The theory of change analysis is only related to SBIA report outcomes while in the CCB - PDD (page 9) the expected outputs, outcome and impacts of the activities are not clearly and completely defined and do not encompass all the project aspects related to community and biodiversity.	G.1.8	The section G.1.8 of the PDD has been modified. The new chart is expanded to cover all the activities, outputs, outcomes and impact of the project, and the relationship between them has also been revised. As a consequence the Project Monitoring Plan (PMP) and the Project Implementation report have been expanded with indicators that reflect all of the project impacts, which were not yet part of the theory of change. In the PMP the heading 'Other Project Impacts' has been added in section 6. In the Project Implementation Report (PIR) the corresponding data of have been added in section 9.	The CCB - PDD has been modified in order to encompass a comprehensive and updated theory of change. The new logical framework is now complete and reflects the actual situation of project implementation The PMP and corresponding PIR have been integrated with new indicators consistent with the new PDD theory of change. CAR 1 is closed.
CAR 2 NTFP (and poaching) have been identified as a risk factors to biodiversity benefits, but they have not been included as indicators in the CCB Monitoring Plan	G.1.10	The Monitoring Plan has been revised in order to also capture these risk factors and corresponding indicators. It is now included in the monitoring table of the focal issue 'illegal extraction of resources inside the national park'. The Project Implementation Report has been expanded to include the monitoring data for the new indicators: see section 4.	The PMP and corresponding PIR have been integrated with new indicators consistent with the NTFP and poaching as crucial risk factors. CAR 2 is closed
CAR 3 The grievance mechanism was designed 2 months ago and not yet implemented.	G.3.8	The implementation of the grievance mechanism started on the 16 th of April 2015 with a presentation to the representatives of the local communities in which the Grievance Redress Procedure was being introduced and explained by the project staff. A copy of the presentation and the attendance list is included in the attached documents.	Project implementer provided evidence attesting that the implementation of the grievance mechanism effectively started the 16th April 2015. CAR 3 is closed.
CAR 4 It is not demonstrated that formal and transparent mechanism are in place to assure equal opportunity to fill	G.3.10	G3.10 of the CCB PDD is elaborated with a description on the UWA-Face recruitment process: "The project recruits workers from the communities adjacent to the project area, coming from within a distance of 7km from the actual working site to minimize travelling time. Any person	PDD G.3.10 has been modified with clear indications concerning project recruitment policy compliant with CCB criteria.

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Reference Section in VR	Response by project participants	Validation Conclusion
work position for community. Moreover there is no evidence that women and vulnerable or marginalized people have chance to fill positions within the project.		coming from a distance of more than 7km is only considered when he or she is to rent accommodation from the nearby area. The age limit is from 18 years and above. When it is time for the project to recruit workers, a written notice, informing the public employment opportunities by the project, is hanged in busy public places like churches and trading centers, specifying the number and types of jobs available. Workers already engaged on work are also informed during a meeting to inform the public about the recruitment opportunities in the project. Most casual workers in the project are men since the main activities for project implementation requires physical strength. Men are hired for ground preparation, tree planting, tending and fire protection. Female workers are mainly recruited for nursery operations, pitting and spot hoeing." The number of workers recruited by the project between 2011 and 2014 is specified per parish in table 1 in CM1.1. of the CCB PDD. As you can see most workers were recruited from Isunga, Nyabweya, Kadindimo and Kakooga, since these parishes are located close to the area which have been replanted between 2011 and 2014. A copy of the UWA-Face "Terms and Conditions of Services" is also included in the attached documents describing the project's procedures for recruitment and employment.	CAR 4 is closed
CAR 5 The negative project impact for local communities are not included in the theory of change analysis and the related indicators are not fully included in the Monitoring Plan. According to sociological studies (Mackenzie 2012) and community interview it seems that for communities located to	CM.2.1 CM.4.1	Added description in section CM 2.1 of the PDD, which puts the observed growth in elephant population and expected increase in human-wildlife conflicts into perspective. KNP provides a sanctuary for the elephants within its borders. If the project was absent, the area would still provide a suitable habitat and safe place for elephants. Even though the crop raiding map provided by McKenzie (2012) indicates crop raiding loss due to elephants along the boundary of KNP near the project area, it also shows that there is a lot of variation in crop raiding pressure that does not seem to be directly related to forest cover or an increase in forest cover.	PDD CM.2.1 and CM2.4.1 have been modified with clear indications concerning project relative impact on elephant increase and consequent wildlife conflicts. To this regard, considering the relative low responsibility of project over elephant population number and

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Reference Section in VR	Response by project participants	Validation Conclusion
the KNP borders, employment benefits does not offset damages to the crops caused by wildlife.		Moreover, when considering the distribution of human population around the park, crop raiding loss seems to be more strongly correlated with human population density. In relation to the overall observed increase in elephant population in Kibale National Park over the past decades, it seems that more strict conservation and anti-poaching policies and regulations as well as more intensive surveillance have proven effective, as this trend can be observed in the whole of Uganda, whereas in most neighbouring countries a decrease in elephant population is observed (WCS, 2015). WCS also argues that periods of conflict in neighbouring countries such as DRC have caused elephants to migrate to Uganda. This is considered to play a role in the increasing in human-wildlife conflicts as well. See the response to CAR 6 for further monitoring of human wildlife conflicts and the effectiveness of mitigation measures.	behaviours, it is acceptable that employment revenues cannot completely compensate for crop losses. CAR 5 is closed
CAR 6 It is not available a control system for assuring the effectiveness of trenches, moreover during the field visit it was noticed that the trenches in some cases are not effective where natural conditions are not suitable. The project has identified some mitigation measures which are not fully applied and assessed.	CM.2.2	A detailed description was added in PMP section 5 of current monitoring issues and additional planned base data collection to effectively monitor the mitigating effects of established trenches and unpalatable crops, i.e. by collecting more detailed data on: - the location of established trenches, - the location of planted upalatable crops, - the weak spots in the trenches, - location of surrounding villages and, - associated estimates of human population size In the PDD, see sections CM 2.1, CM 2.2 and CM 2.3. In the Monitoring Plan, see section 5 Methods, the heading 'Database for crop raiding and monitoring of trench and unpalatable cropping effectivity', and section 6 the table for the focal issue Human Wildlife Conflict. In the Project Implementation Report, see section 2 'Addressing the Human Wildlife Conflict'.	The PMP and PIR have sufficient provisions for the monitoring and reporting the effectiveness of trenches and unpalatable crops. CAR 6 is closed
CAR 7 The assumption that planted and regenerated areas already have high conservation area	B.1.2	The relevant section has been rephrased, and reads as follows. "In relation to the above we think that 'the planted and naturally regenerating areas' will develop High Conservation Values	The PDD B.1.2 has been reframed and is consistent with the biodiversity situation as observed during the site

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Reference Section in VR	Response by project participants	Validation Conclusion
similar to the forest ecosystem of KNP is not supported by enough scientific documentation and project monitoring data.		similar to the forest ecosystems of KNP. The project intends to monitor the development of biodiversity in order to demonstrate the succession of the vegetation towards a climax forest type.” See also the response to CAR 8 on how the ecological succession and corresponding High Conservation Values are monitored.	validation visit. CAR7 is closed
CAR 8 The monitoring plan for animals is well established however vegetation biodiversity indicators are insufficient for assessing the improvement of biodiversity into the planted and regenerated areas.	B.4.1	4 new indicators have are added to monitor the ecological succession in the planted and regenerated areas. The biodiversity monitoring table in the CCB Monitoring Plan is updated with these 4 new indicators and a new paragraph (§7.6) on ecological succession is added to the Project Implementation Report.	\$ new vegetation SMART indicators have been effectively added to the PMP and PIR. CAR 8 is closed
CL 1 It is not clearly explained and supported the project direct responsibility for the claimed negative impacts on communities.		See response to CAR 5.	See comment for CAR 5. CL1 is closed.
CL 2 The CCB PDD does not provide sufficient information about the community description involved in the project area.	CM.1.1	Section CM 1.1. has been elaborated with a table giving a detailed overview of the 12 parishes which are included in the SBIA process.	PDD CM.1.1 has been modified with detailed community data. CL 2 is closed.

TABLE 2 FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS.

Forward action request	Reference Section in VR	Response by project participants	Verification Conclusion

APPENDIX B

Abbreviations

CCB	Climate Community & Biodiversity Standard
CCBA	Climate Community & Biodiversity Alliance
CCT	UWA Community Conservation Team
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
FtF	Face the Future
HCV	High Conservation Values
GoU	Government of Uganda
IGA	Income Generating Activities
KNP	Kibale National Park
MIST	Management Information System
NTFP	Non-Timber Forest Products
PDD	Project Design Document
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PMP	Project Monitoring Plan
SBIA	<i>Social And Biodiversity Impact Assessment</i>
SCS	<i>Scientific Certification Systems</i>
UWA	Uganda Wildlife Authority
VCS	Verified Carbon Standards
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society



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
VER: Verifier
TEC: Technical Expert
TL: Team Leader
FIN-EXP: Financial Expert
DET: Determiner

CDM: Clean Development Mechanism
VCS : Verified Carbon Standard:
GS: Gold Standard
SCS: SocialCarbon Standard
JI: Joint Implementation

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 come¹:
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
VER: Verifier
TEC: Technical Expert
TL: Team Leader
FIN-EXP: Financial Expert
DET: Determiner

CDM: Clean Development Mechanism
VCS : Verified Carbon Standard:
GS: Gold Standard
SCS: SocialCarbon Standard
JI: Joint Implementation

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