



VCS VERIFICATION REPORT

RIO BRAVO CLIMATE ACTION PROJECT

MONITORING PERIOD:
01 JAN. 2002 TO 31 DEC. 2010

REPORT N°2011- 9803
REVISION No. 1.0

Project Title	Rio Bravo Climate Action Project
Version	Version 1.0

Report Title	Verification Report for Rio Bravo Climate Action Project
DNV Ref:	PRJC-334574-2011-CCS-USA
Client	The Nature Conservancy
Pages	98
Date of Issue	02-Dec-2011
Prepared By	Det Norske Veritas USA Inc
Contact	One Bush Street, 12th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 Email: climatechange@dnv.com http://climatechange.dnv.com
Approved By	Miguel Rescalvo, VCS Approver
Work Carried Out By	Kyle Holland, VCS verifier & VCSA-Certified AFOLU Expert Ben Caldwell, VCS verifier Under Observation Kyle Silon, Project Manager
Technical review by:	Gordon Smith, VCS Technical Reviewer & VCSA-Certified AFOLU Expert

Summary:

Det Norske Veritas USA Inc(DNV) has performed the verification of the emission reductions reported for the “Rio Bravo Climate Action Project” for the monitoring period 01 Jan. 2002 to 31 Dec. 2010, to review and determine the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred as a result of the project activity.

The verification was performed on the basis of VCSA Programme Guidelines & Standard version 3.1 for the VCS projects and AFOLU Requirements version 3.1, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. The verification was conducted by means of document review, follow-up interviews and site inspection, and the resolution of outstanding issues.

In our opinion, the GHG emission reductions reported for the project in the monitoring report version 9 of 1 Dec. 2011 are fairly stated. The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly on the basis of approved methodology VM0007 version 1.1 and the monitoring plan contained in the VCS PD of 1 Dec 2011.

Hence, Det Norske Veritas U.S.A. Inc (DNV) is able to certify that the emission reductions from the “Rio Bravo Climate Action Project” during the period amount to 1,660,260 tonnes CO₂ equivalent.

DNV does not assume any responsibility towards the issuance and utilization of the VCUs hereby verified and certified. Request for issuance of VCUs shall be made by the project proponent to an approved VCS Program Registry based on the requirements set out under the most recent version of the VCS Program Guidelines clause on VCS Registration.

The verification of reported emission reductions is based on the information made available to DNV and the engagement conditions detailed in this report. DNV cannot be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on this report.

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	OBJECTIVE	1
1.2	SCOPE AND CRITERIA.....	1
1.3	LEVEL OF ASSURANCE	1
1.4	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT	2
2	VALIDATION PROCESS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION.....	2
2.1	VALIDATION PROCESS	2
2.1.1	DOCUMENT REVIEW	2
2.1.2	INTERVIEWS	2
2.1.3	SITE INSPECTIONS.....	2
2.1.4	RESOLUTION OF ANY MATERIAL DISCREPANCY	3
2.2	VALIDATION FINDINGS	3
2.2.1	GAP VALIDATION	3
2.2.2	METHODOLOGY DEVIATIONS	3
2.2.3	NEW PROJECT ACTIVITY INSTANCES	3
2.3	VALIDATION CONCLUSION.....	3
3	VERIFICATION PROCESS	3
3.1	METHOD AND CRITERIA	3
3.2	DOCUMENT REVIEW	5
3.3	INTERVIEWS.....	6
3.4	SITE INSPECTIONS	9
3.5	RESOLUTION OF ANY MATERIAL DISCREPANCY	12
4	VERIFICATION FINDINGS	12
4.1	PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS	12
4.2	ACCURACY OF GHG EMISSION REDUCTION OR REMOVAL CALCULATIONS	67
4.3	QUALITY OF EVIDENCE TO DETERMINE GHG EMISSION REDUCTIONS OR REMOVALS	73
4.4	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL SYSTEM	73
5	VERIFICATION CONCLUSION	74
6	REFERENCES	76
APPENDIX A CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS, CLARIFICATION REQUESTS AND FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS		

1 INTRODUCTION

The Nature Conservancy has commissioned Det Norske Veritas U.S.A Inc (DNV) to carry out the verification and certification of emission reductions reported for the “Rio Bravo Climate Action Project” (the project) in the period 01 Jan. 2002 to 31 Dec. 2010. This report contains the findings from the verification and includes a verification statement for the verified carbon units.

1.1 Objective

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

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

The objective of this verification was to verify and provide a verification statement of emission reductions reported for the “Rio Bravo Climate Action Project” for the period 01 Jan. 2002 to 31 Dec. 2010.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of the verification is:

- To verify that actual monitoring systems and procedures are in compliance with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan.
- To evaluate the GHG emission reduction data and express a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emissions reduction data is free from material misstatement.
- To verify that reported GHG emissions data is sufficiently supported by evidence.

The criteria of the verification are:

- VCS Program Guide version 3.1
- VCS Standard version 3.1 and other relevant requirements defined by VCSA.
- AFOLU Requirements version 3.1
- The approved methodology VM0007 (version 1.1).

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

1.3 Level of assurance

The verification report expresses a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emissions reduction data is free from material misstatement. DNV applied a materiality threshold of 5% with respect to omission or misstatements concerning reported quantities as per VCS standard 3.1.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The “Rio Bravo Climate Action Project” is an Avoided Planned Deforestation project. The project began in September 1994 and is located in north-west Belize and contains 6,296 hectares (ha). The area within the Project Boundary was purchased creating a clear land title held by the Program for Belize, the project proponent. The act of purchase removed the imminent threat of purchase by industrial scale agricultural farmers who would have proceeded to deforest the area.

The project proponent is selectively logging the project area under and FSC certificate which accounts for minimal project emissions. During the monitoring period, a hurricane impacted (natural disturbance) part of the project area and emissions from this event were conservatively estimated. Minor emissions occurred as a result of illegal logging and were conservatively estimated.

2 VALIDATION PROCESS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

This validation was completed concurrently with the current VCU verification.

2.1 Validation Process

The validation was performed through means of the following three phases in accordance with the requirement of the registered VCS PD, the applied methodology, and the VCS Standard version 3.1 and other relevant VCS requirements. The conclusions of the validation are stated in DNV’s validation report for the Rio Bravo Climate Action Project version 1.0 dated 2 Dec 2012.

The validation consisted of the following three phases:

- A desk review of the project documents
- Follow-up interviews with project stakeholders and site inspection where necessary
- The resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the validation report and opinion

2.1.1 Document Review

The documentation was reviewed in combination with the verification activity for the project. Refer to details in Section 2.2 of the validation report.

2.1.2 Interviews

The interviews were performed in combination with the verification activity for the project. Refer to details in Section 2.3 of the validation report.

2.1.3 Site Inspections

The site inspection was performed in combination with the verification activity for the project. Refer to details in Section 2.4 of the validation report.

2.1.4 Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy

This activity was performed in combination with the verification activity for the project. Refer to details in Section 2.5 of the validation report.

2.2 Validation Findings

The initial validation was conducted simultaneous to verification. A separate validation report has been submitted. The validation findings are described in section 3 of the validation report.

2.2.1 Gap Validation

No additional project description (PD) has been produced as this verification has been conducted simultaneous to validation.

2.2.2 Methodology Deviations

Four deviations were requested from the methodology during the validation of the project related to the monitoring plan, the procedures for monitoring and measuring the carbon pools, as stated in DNV's validation report version 1.0 dated 02 Dec 2011. These deviations were either immaterial or resulted in conservative estimates of carbon pools. The deviations are described in Section 3.3.7 of the validation report.

2.2.3 New Project Activity Instances

This is not a grouped project.

2.3 Validation Conclusion

DNV is able to confirm the project is in compliance with the VCS requirements for validation, as stated in DNV's validation report version 1.0, dated 2 Dec 2011.

3 VERIFICATION PROCESS

3.1 Method and Criteria

The verification was performed through means of the following three phases in accordance with the requirement of the registered VCS PD, the applied methodology, and the VCS Standard version 3.1 and other relevant VCS requirements.

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

The following sections outline each step in more detail.

The verification of the emission reductions has assessed all factors and issues that constitute the basis for emission reductions from the project. These include:

- The emission reduction calculations and the relevant data records.
- The calibration and maintenance records for the monitoring instruments.
- The management systems to support the project operation and monitoring.

The verification plan agenda is provided in section 3.4 of this report. The sampling plan is based on perceived risk of material misstatement and identified several areas of risk referenced in section 4.2 of this report. The sampling plan included verification of measurement plots, interviews, document review and recalculation.

Verification team

Role	Last Name	First Name	Country	Type of involvement					
				Desk review	Site visit	Reporting	Supervision of work	Technical review	TA 14.1 competence
Project Manager	Silon	Kyle	USA				✓		
Team leader VCS Verifier & VCS-Certified AFOLU Expert	Holland	Kyle	USA	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
VCS Verifier Under Observation	Caldwell	Ben	USA	✓	✓	✓			
VCS Technical Reviewer & VCS-Certified AFOLU Expert	Smith	Gordon	USA					✓	✓

Duration of verification

Preparations:	From 24 Aug 2011 to 15 Sept. 2011
On-site verification:	From 15 Sept. 2011 to 20 Sept. 2011
Reporting, calculation checks and QA/QC:	From 20 Sept. 2011 to 02-Dec-2011

3.2 Document Review

The following tables list the key documentation that was reviewed during the validation.

Documentation provided by the project participants

- /1/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: VCS PD for project activity “Rio Bravo Climate Action Project” in Belize, and associated Annexes, Version 9 dated 1 Dec 2011.
- /2/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: *Rio Bravo Climate Action Project Monitoring Report*, Version 9 dated 1 Dec 2011, and previous versions.
- /3/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: *Rio Bravo Climate Action Project Application of Baseline Report* dated 28 Nov 2011.
- /4/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: *Rio Bravo Climate Action Project Summary of Land Tenure Information Report* dated 9 Sept 2011.
- /5/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: *Rio Bravo Climate Action Project Agricultural Expansion and Management in Northern Belize Results of Survey* dated May 2011.
- /6/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: *Rio Bravo Climate Action Project Definition of Project Boundary Report* dated 8 Sept 2011.
- /7/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: *Rio Bravo Climate Action Project Analysis of the Potential of Natural Risks within the Rio Bravo Project Area* dated Sept 2011.
- /8/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: *Non-Permanence Risk Report, Rio Bravo Climate Action Project*, Version 1 dated 8 Sept 2011.

Standards, methodologies, and other guidance by the VCSA

- /9/ VCSA: VCS Standard, version 3.1.
- /10/ VCSA: Methodology ““REDD Methodology Modules (REDD_MF)”, version 1.1.
- /11/ VCSA: Guidance from Carolyn Ching, RE: AFOLU Risk Assessment Clarification dated 11 Oct 2011.
- /12/ VCSA: Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Requirements, version 3.1 dated 19

Oct 2011

- /13/ VCSA: AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, version 3.0 dated 8 March 2011
- /14/ VCSA: Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in VCS Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Project Activities, version 1.0 dated 23 Nov 2010

Documentation used by DNV to validate / cross-check the information provided by the project participants

- /15/ IPCC: *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*
- /16/ DNV: *VCS Methodology Element Report Revision of VMD00015 Methods for Monitoring of GHG Emissions and Removals*, Version 1 dated 22 Nov 2011.
- /17/ Government of Belize: Official Land Certificates for Block 14, Parcel 3 and Block 13, Parcel 6 dated 2 Jan 1996.
- /18/ Landfolio Registry: Certified True Copies of Clear Title for Block 14, Parcel 3 and Block 13, Parcel 6 dated 23 Sept. 2011.
- /19/ Programme for Belize: *Rio Bravo Conservation and Management Area Management Plan (Edition V) 2006 – 2010* dated July 2006.
- /20/ Chave et al.: *Tree allometry and improved estimation of carbon stocks and balance in tropical forests*, *Oecologia*, dated 22 June 2005.
- /21/ Programme for Belize: *Rio Bravo Conservation and Management Area Sustainable Timber Programme Forest Management Plan and Operational Guidelines 2006 – 2010* dated February 2006.

3.3 Interviews

On 12 Sept. 2011 DNV visited Belize, Belize City, Belopan and the project area to perform interviews with project stakeholders.

	Date	Name	Organization	Topic
/22/	12 Sept. 2011	Alex Quintero	The Nature Conservancy	Review project documentation and validation plan
/23/	12 Sept. 2011	Sarah Walker	Winrock International	
/24/	12 Sept. 2011	Ramon Pachero	Programme for Belize	
/25/	15 Sept. 2011	Alex Quintero	The Nature	Review project

			Conservancy	documentation
/26/	15 Sept. 2011	Sarah Walker	Winrock International	
/27/	15 Sept. 2011	Ramon Pachero	Programme for Belize	
/28/	15 Sept. 2011	Herbert Haylock	Programme for Belize	
/29/	15 Sept. 2011	Edilberto Romero	Programme for Belize	
/30/	15 Sept. 2011	Atemio Osono	Ministry of Finance	Government support, finance and applicable laws
/31/	15 Sept. 2011	Maria Cooper	Ministry of Finance	
/32/	15 Sept. 2011	Alejandro Martinez	The Nature Conservancy	
/33/	15 Sept. 2011	Beverly Castillo	Ministry of Natural Resources	Government support, finance, baseline scenario and applicable laws
/34/	15 Sept. 2011	Colin Young	Ministry of Natural Resources	
/35/	16 Sept. 2011	Joseph Boris Loskot	New River Enterprises	Baseline scenario
/36/	16 Sept. 2011	Miroslava Loskot Bardaza	New River Enterprises	
/37/	16 Sept. 2011	Susano Blanco	Local community member	Baseline scenario, socio-economic impacts
/38/	16 Sept. 2011	Armin Cansino	Ministry of Lands (former)	Baseline scenario
/39/	16 Sept. 2011	Daniel Cowo	Local community member	Baseline scenario, socio-economic impacts
/40/	16 Sept. 2011	Blanca Torres	August Pine Ridge RCS	Baseline scenario, socio-economic impacts
/41/	16 Sept. 2011	Ramino Peralta	St. Michael RCS	Baseline scenario, socio-economic impacts
/42/	16 Sept. 2011	Armando Peralta	St. Michael RCS	
/43/	16 Sept. 2011	Frank Krahm	Local community member	Baseline scenario, socio-economic impacts
/44/	16 Sept. 2011	Abe Rempel	Local community	Baseline scenario, socio-

			member	economic impacts
/45/	17 Sept. 2011	Ramon Pacheco	Programme for Belize	FSC selective logging, project emissions, plot measurement
/46/	17 Sept. 2011	Alex Quintero	The Nature Conservancy	Plot allocation, plot measurement
/47/	17 Sept. 2011	Sarah Walker	Winrock International	
/48/	17 Sept. 2011	Ramon Pacheco	Programme for Belize	
/49/	17 Sept. 2011	Alex Quintero	The Nature Conservancy	
/50/	17 Sept. 2011	Sarah Walker	Winrock International	Plot allocation, plot measurement
/51/	17 Sept. 2011	Unidentified fieldworker	Programme for Belize	
/52/	17 Sept. 2011	Unidentified fieldworker	Programme for Belize	
/53/	17 Sept. 2011	Unidentified fieldworker	Programme for Belize	
/54/	17 Sept. 2011	Unidentified fieldworker	Programme for Belize	Plot allocation, plot measurement
/55/	18 Sept. 2011	Ramon Pacheco	Programme for Belize	
/56/	18 Sept. 2011	Alex Quintero	The Nature Conservancy	
/57/	18 Sept. 2011	Sarah Walker	Winrock International	
/58/	18 Sept. 2011	Unidentified fieldworker	Programme for Belize	Leakage, baseline scenario, project emissions, risk buffer determination, plot allocation,
/59/	18 Sept. 2011	Unidentified fieldworker	Programme for Belize	
/60/	18 Sept. 2011	Unidentified fieldworker	Programme for Belize	
/61/	18 Sept. 2011	Unidentified fieldworker	Programme for Belize	
/62/	18 Sept. 2011	Ramon Pacheco	Programme for Belize	

				wood products
/63/	18 Sept. 2011	Alex Quintero	The Nature Conservancy	
/64/	18 Sept. 2011	Sarah Walker	Winrock International	
/65/	18 Sept. 2011	Edilberto Romero	Programme for Belize	
/66/	19 Sept. 2011	Unidentified mechanized farmer	Local community member	Baseline scenario, socio-economic impact
/67/	19 Sept. 2011	Unidentified mechanized farmer	Local community member	Baseline scenario, socio-economic impact
/68/	19 Sept. 2011	Unidentified mechanized farmer	Local community member	Baseline scenario, socio-economic impact
/69/	19 Sept. 2011	Unidentified mechanized farmer	Local community member	Baseline scenario, socio-economic impact
/70/	07 Nov. 2011	Alex Quintero	The Nature Conservancy	Review and discuss findings
/71/	07 Nov. 2011	Sarah Walker	Winrock International	
/72/	16 Nov. 2011	Alex Quintero	The Nature Conservancy	Review and discuss findings
/73/	23 Nov. 2011	Alex Quintero	The Nature Conservancy	Review calculations of baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage and uncertainties
/74/	23 Nov. 2011	Sarah Walker	Winrock International	

3.4 Site Inspections

A site visit was conducted 15 Sept 2011 to 20 Sept 2011 with the objective of acquiring evidence to support a positive validation opinion. During the site visit, interviews were conducted with project stakeholders, government officials and local community members to confirm statements by the project proponents and to identify potential misstatements. During the site visit, carbon inventory plots were also re-measured. These methods and results are provided in separate verification reports.

Evidence was collected at the Programme for Belize offices in Belize City, government offices in Belmopan, offices in Orange Walk, local mestizo communities near the project area, agriculturalist communities near the project area, the project area, and Programme for Belize offices near the project area.

The following table is the agenda for the validation/verification plan for the site visit which shows dates, times, involved parties and audit activities related. The verification plan was presented to the client and agreed upon prior to the site visit. The following agenda from the verification plan accurately reflects the audit activities conducted during the site visit. Additional validation notes are maintained by DNV and include confidential contact information for interviewees. The sampling plan is presented below:

Sampling Plan

The audit entailed a risk-based assessment to collect evidence in support of the verification opinion contained in this report. The verification opinion is based on a reasonable level of assurance, using the materiality thresholds specified in the VCS Standard Version 3.1.

Based on a preliminary review of the documents provided by the project proponent on the week of September 12th, the areas of highest risk were identified as follows:

- Soil organic carbon which comprises a significant portion of credit generation
- Aboveground biomass which is difficult to measure
- Emissions from natural disturbance (hurricane)
- Uncertainty calculations based on assumption and sampling design
- Leakage calculations
- Determination of VCUs (application of uncertainty deduction, leakage and buffer pool allocation to gross emissions reductions)

Plots were sorted by stocking levels as measured by the project proponent, and more heavily stocked plots were sampled first. No systemic or consistent errors were identified during the audit, and so the plan was not modified. Modelling assumptions were also reviewed by interviewing knowledgeable persons in the area, by comparison of direct observations of the project areas to the model inputs, review of model outputs and inspection of the model itself.

The field component of the audit was accompanied by a subsequent desk audit and review of materials provided and collected during the site visit. A desk procedure was used to verify calculations (estimates of carbon stocks) after the site visit.

Time	Involved Parties	Audit Activities	Comments
Day 1 (Belize City and Belmopan) Thursday, 15/09/2011			
9:00 AM	✓ All parties	✓ Introduction	Introductions and revisions to verification plan
9:30 AM	✓	✓ Overview of Project	Brief overview of project by Project Proponent(s)
10:30 AM	✓	✓ Project Activities	
11:00 AM	✓	✓ Non-Permanence Risk	
12:00 PM	✓	✓ Lunch	
2:00 PM 3:00 PM	✓ Ministry of Finance ✓ Ministry of Natural Resources ✓ Ministry of Land	✓ Verification of Carbon Rights	Government officials, offices in Belmopan 2pm-Finance 3pm Natural Resources
Day 2 (Belize City and Project Area) Friday, 16/09/2011			
7:30 AM	✓ DNV audit team	✓ Audit Team Meeting	
8:30 AM – 10:00 PM	✓ All parties	✓ Project Review	
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM	✓	✓ Stakeholder Interviews	Meetings with stakeholders en route to Project Area
12:00 PM	✓	✓ Lunch	In route
12:00 PM – 6:00 PM	✓	✓ Stakeholder Interviews	Meetings with stakeholders en route to Project Area
Day 3 (Project Area) Saturday, 17/09/2011			
8:30 AM	✓	✓ Field Tour of Project Area	Tour and introduction to the project area, verification of forest types
11:30 AM	✓	✓ Lunch	In field
12:00 PM – 6:00 PM	✓	✓ Field Verification	Verification of plot measurements
Day 4 (Project Area) Sunday, 18/09/2011			
8:00 AM	✓	✓ Field Verification	Continued verification of plot measurements
12:00 AM	✓	✓ Lunch	In field

12:30 PM	✓	✓ Field Verification	
Day 5 (Project Area and Belize City) Monday, 19/09/2011			
9:00 AM	✓	✓ Stakeholder Interviews	Meetings with local stakeholders, tour of local communities
1:00 PM	✓	✓ Lunch	
	✓	✓ Travel to Belize City	
2:00 PM – 4:00 PM	✓	✓ Stakeholder Interviews	
4:30 PM	✓ DNV audit team	✓ Audit Team Meeting	
6:30 PM	✓	✓ Closing Meeting	Review of audit and draft findings
7:30 PM	✓	✓ Dinner	Traditional Chinese dinner

3.5 Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy

A corrective action request (CAR) is issued, where:

- 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 which 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) shall be raised if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable VCS requirements have been met.

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

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

As part of the site visit DNV was able to confirm that the project implementation is in accordance with the project description contained in registered VCS PD of 1 Dec 2011, and that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS PD of 1 Dec 2011.

Current deviations to the monitoring plan are presented in section 2.2.2.

The following tables are assessments and observations of the data or parameters monitored and reported for the “Rio Bravo Climate Action Project” for the period 01 Jan. 2002 to 31 Dec. 2010. These data and parameters were verified by re-measurement, recalculation, interviews and observation during the desk review and the site visit.

Module Name	Module Number	DNV Assessment of Monitoring
Estimation of carbon stocks in the above- and belowground biomass in live tree and non-tree pools (CP-AB), v1.0	VM0001	Data and parameters in conformance with the module and the granted deviations.
Estimation of carbon stocks in the dead-wood pool (CP-D), v1.0	VM0002	Not applicable
Estimation of carbon stocks in the litter pool (CP-L), v1.0	VM0003	Not applicable
Estimation of stocks in the soil organic carbon pool (CP-S), v1.0	VM0004	Data and parameters in conformance with the module.
Estimation of carbon stocks in the long-term wood products pool (CP-W), v1.0	VM0005	Data and parameters in conformance with the module. Most data and parameters immaterial.
Estimation of baseline carbon stock changes and greenhouse gas emissions from planned deforestation (BL-PL), v1.0	VM0006	Data and parameters in conformance with the module and the granted deviations.
Estimation of baseline carbon stock changes and greenhouse gas emissions from unplanned deforestation (BL-UP), v2.0	VM0007	Not applicable
Estimation of baseline emissions from forest degradation caused by extraction of wood for fuel (BL-DFW), v1.0	VM0008	Not applicable
Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoided planned deforestation (LK-ASP), v1.0	VM0009	Data and parameters in conformance with the module.
Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoided unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU),	VM0010	Not applicable

v1.0		
Estimation of emissions from market-effects (LK-ME), v1.0	VM0011	Not applicable, no logging in the baseline scenario that would cause any market effect.
Estimation of emissions from displacement of fuelwood extraction (LK-DFW), v1.0	VM0012	Not applicable
Estimation of greenhouse gas emissions from biomass burning (E-BB), v1.0	VM0013	No biomass burning
Estimation of emissions from fossil fuel combustion (E-FFC), v1.0	VM0014	Optionally excluded
Methods for monitoring of greenhouse gas emissions and removals (M-MON), v2.0	VM0015	Data and parameters in conformance with the module and the granted deviations. Many data and parameters are immaterial.
Methods for stratification of the project area (X-STR), v1.0	VM0016	Data and parameters in conformance with the module.
Estimation of uncertainty for REDD project activities (X-UNC), v1.0	VM0017	Data and parameters in conformance with the module.

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>Area of sample plots in ha (VMD0001)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Monitoring must occur at least every ten years for baseline renewal. Where carbon stock enhancement is included monitoring shall occur at least every five years
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	No, measured initially in 2000 and therefore is due for remeasurement in 2010 (see FAR1). The area of sample plots is unlikely to change.
Type of monitoring equipment:	DME for plot radius

Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews with field works and observation of six plots in the field. The area of these plots was vefified to be correct.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>Number of sample points (VMD0001)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Monitoring must occur at least every ten years for baseline renewal. Where carbon stock enhancement is included monitoring shall occur at least every five years
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	No, measured initially in 2000 and therefore is due for remeasurement in 2010 (see FAR1). The number of sample plots is unlikely to change.
Type of monitoring equipment:	
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for	NA

the period that calibration was not valid.	
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Randomly re-located six plots to confirm they were installed.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>Diameter at breast height of a tree in cm (VMD0001)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Monitoring must occur at least every ten years for baseline renewal. Where carbon stock enhancement is included monitoring shall occur at least every five years
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	No, measured initially in 2000 and therefore is due for remeasurement in 2010 (see FAR1). All project emissions have been accounted so it is conservative to delay this remeasurement.
Type of monitoring equipment:	Diameter tape.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan?	Yes

If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews with field workers and remeasurement of all trees on six plots.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>Area of one sampling frame (VMD0001)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Monitoring must occur at least every ten years for baseline renewal. Where carbon stock enhancement is included monitoring shall occur at least every five years
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	NA, sampling frames were not used because non-tree biomass was conservatively excluded
Type of monitoring equipment:	NA
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	NA

How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	NA
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>Total area of all non-tree allometric method sample plots in stratum i (VMD0001)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Monitoring must occur at least every ten years for baseline renewal. Where carbon stock enhancement is included monitoring shall occur at least every five years
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	NA, allometry was used for sample plots.
Type of monitoring equipment:	NA
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA

Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	NA
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	NA
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>Total height of tree (VMD0001)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Monitoring must occur at least every ten years for baseline renewal.

	Where carbon stock enhancement is included monitoring shall occur at least every five years
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	No, measured initially in 2000 and therefore is due for remeasurement in 2010 (see FAR1). All project emissions have been accounted so it is conservative to delay this remeasurement.
Type of monitoring equipment:	Clinometer and measuring tape
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews with field workers and remeasurement of palm trees for height on six plots.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of	Yes

emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>Soil organic carbon of the sample in g C/100 g soil (VMD0004)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Where soil organic carbon is an included pool monitoring must occur at least every ten years for baseline renewal. Where carbon stock enhancement is included and soil organic carbon is an included pool monitoring shall occur at least every five years
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	No, measured initially in 1998 and therefore is due for remeasurement in 2008 (see FAR1). SOC is not expected to change over time.
Type of monitoring equipment:	Bulk density and SOC probes.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency	NA

represent good monitoring practise?	
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Yes, final calculation compared with IPCC defaults from chapter 4.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>Bulk density of fine (< 2 mm) fraction of mineral soil per unit volume of sample in g cm⁻³; bulk density equals the oven dry weight of the fine fraction (< 2 mm) of the soil core divided by the core volume (VMD0004)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Where soil organic carbon is an included pool monitoring must occur at least every ten years for baseline renewal.

	Where carbon stock enhancement is included and soil organic carbon is an included pool monitoring shall occur at least every five years
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	No, measured initially in 1998 and therefore is due for remeasurement in 2008 (see FAR1). Bulk density is not expected to change over time.
Type of monitoring equipment:	Bulk density and SOC probes.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Yes, final calculation compared with IPCC defaults from chapter 4.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of	Yes

emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>Total area of stratum i (VMD0005)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Every ten years at the time of baseline renewal
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	No, measured initially in 2000 and therefore is due for remeasurement in 2010 (see FAR1). Immaterial, the stratum areas are unlikely to change.
Type of monitoring equipment:	GIS
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of	NA

monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Definitions for stratum were verified in the field and using Google Earth.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>Commercial volume as a percent of total aboveground volume in stratum i (VMD0005)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Every ten years at the time of baseline renewal
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	No, measured initially in 2000 and therefore is due for remeasurement in 2010 (see FAR1). All project emissions have been accounted so it is conservative to delay this remeasurement. The commercial volume is expected to grow proportionally to total volume.

Type of monitoring equipment:	Estimated from the inventory data.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	No
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values were not verified because carbon in long-lived wood products is immaterial.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Not verified.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation	NA

been approved?	
----------------	--

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>The volume of timber in m3 extracted from within the stratum (does not include slash left onsite), reported by wood product class and preferably species. (VMD0005)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Every ten years at the time of baseline renewal
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, whenever logging occurred: 1999, 2004, 2005, 2008, 2009 and 2010.
Type of monitoring equipment:	100% cruise of all harvested trees, reports by wood products class form survey. Emissions form wood products are immaterial.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for	NA

the period that calibration was not valid.	
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews with project proponent and review of calculations in provided spreadsheets. Comparison of calculations to commercial inventory cruise data.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>Total area of planned deforestation over the entire project lifetime for stratum i (VMD0009)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Must be examined at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	No, established at baseline and renewal. The entire project area would have been deforested so this number does not change, immaterial.
Type of monitoring equipment:	GIS and remote sensing data.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does	Yes, this number comes from VMD0006 which was validated.

the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, with the validation report.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	By confirming the entire project area would have been deforested in the baseline form the validation report.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	NA
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

Assessment/ Observation

Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>The total area of deforestation by the baseline agent or class of agent of the planned deforestation in stratum i at time t (VMD0009)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Must be reexamined at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	No, established at baseline and renewal. The entire project area would have been deforested so this number does not change, immaterial.
Type of monitoring equipment:	GIS and remote sensing data.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes, this number comes from VMD0006 which was validated.
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, with the validation report.
How were the values in the monitoring report	By confirming the entire project area would have

verified?	been deforested in the baseline form the validation report.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	NA
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>Project Forest Cover Monitoring Map (VMD0015)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Measurements and reports were made 1994, 2000, 2004, 2010. No, but the difference is immaterial.
Type of monitoring equipment:	Cherrington, Emil a. et. al [2010] - forest cover & deforestation in belize 1980 – 2010
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good	Yes

monitoring practise?	
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews and observation
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter:	<i>Degradation PRA Results (VMD0015)</i>

(as in monitoring plan):	
Measuring frequency:	Every 2 years
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Measurements and reports were made in 2011. No, but the difference is immaterial and methodology was first available in 2010.
Type of monitoring equipment:	The results of the PRA summarized as a report: RioBravo_IllegalLoggingSurvey-RangerResponses.pdf
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews and observation

Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	Area of recorded deforestation in the project area in stratum <i>i</i> converted to land use <i>u</i> at time <i>t</i> (VMD0015)
Measuring frequency:	Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Monitored in 1994, 2000, 2004, 2010. No, but the difference is immaterial.
Type of monitoring equipment:	cherrington, emil a. et. al [2010] - forest cover & deforestation in belize 1980 - 2010
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the	NA

monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews and observation, no deforestation was observed during the site inspection or in Google Earth imagery.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	Area potentially impacted by degradation processes in stratum I (VMD0015)
Measuring frequency:	Must to be repeated each time the PRA indicates a potential for degradation

Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Monitored in 2011. No, but the difference is immaterial and the methodology was not available prior to 2010.
Type of monitoring equipment:	GIS delineation and ground truthing
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews and observation, the areas delineated for potential degradation were inspected during the site visit and no evidence was observed that any other areas could be impacted. Emissions from degradation are immaterial.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC	Yes

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

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	Area of logging decks in stratum <i>i</i> at time <i>t</i> (VMD0015)
Measuring frequency:	Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, monitored in 1999, 2004, 2005, 2008, 2009, 2010 (years when logging took place in project area)
Type of monitoring equipment:	Post Harvest Assessments (based on field measurements) Supplementary Documents\Annex O Monitoring\Selective Logging Data\Post-Harvest_Assessments, Supplementary Documents\Annex O Monitoring\Selective Logging Data\EmissionsLoggingInfrastructure.xlsx
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA

Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	No, emissions from logging decks are immaterial.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	Area impacted by natural disturbance in the project stratum <i>i</i> converted to natural disturbance stratum <i>q</i> at time <i>t</i> , ha (VMD0015)
Measuring frequency:	Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every

	5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, monitored in 1999, 2004, 2005, 2008, 2009, 2010 (years when logging took place in project area)
Type of monitoring equipment:	cherrington, emil a. et. al [2010] - forest cover & deforestation in belize 1980 - 2010
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews and observation, the area impacted by natural disturbance was observed during the site visit and is visible in Google Earth imagery.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation)	Yes

ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	Area of roads in stratum <i>i</i> at time <i>t</i> (VMD0015)
Measuring frequency:	Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, monitored in 1999, 2004, 2005, 2008, 2009, 2010 (years when logging took place in project area)
Type of monitoring equipment:	GIS dataset of roads based on field measurements and post-harvest assessment reports
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency	NA

represent good monitoring practise?	
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews and observation, one logging site from 2006 was observed and the length (area) of road reported appeared reasonable. Emissions from roads are immaterial.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	Biomass carbon of trees cut and removed through illegal logging and fuelwood and charcoal extraction degradation process from plots measured in stratum <i>i</i> at time <i>t</i> (VMD0015)
Measuring frequency:	Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any

	verification event
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	No, not monitored per the granted deviation. Instead forest inventory data were used to conservatively estimate emissions from illegal logging.
Type of monitoring equipment:	Forest inventory data, RioBravo_ForestInventory1999_2010.xlsx
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews, observation and recalculation. Cedar and mahogany trees were the only species observed as cut during the site visit. Six plots in the forest inventory were remeasured and the forest inventory was used per the deviation to estimate emissions.

Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	Carbon stock in aboveground tree biomass assumed to be killed per unit area resulting from the creation of the skid trail in stratum I (VMD0015)
Measuring frequency:	The maximum size tree assumed to be killed during skid trail creation must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Monitored in 2000 and 2011. No, but the difference is immaterial.
Type of monitoring equipment:	Field measurements and survey of logging operator: SurveyofLoggingActivities.JPG, rio_bravo_baseline_carbon_data.xlsx, tab: TREE_00 less 30 dbh
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes

Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews, observation and recalculation. One logging site from 2005 was observed and the length and width (area) of skid trails reported appeared reasonable. Six plots in the forest inventory were remeasured and the forest inventory was used per the deviation to estimate emissions. Emissions from skid trails are immaterial.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	Carbon stock in belowground tree biomass assumed to be killed per unit area resulting from the creation of the d trail in stratum I (VMD0015)
Measuring frequency:	Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Monitored in 2011. No, but the difference is immaterial.
Type of monitoring equipment:	Field measurements, root-to-shoot ratio: SurveyofLoggingActivities.JPG, rio_bravo_baseline_carbon_data.xlsx, tab: TREE_00 less 30 dbh
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for	NA

the period that calibration was not valid.	
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews, observation and recalculation. One logging site from 2005 was observed and the length and width (area) of skid trails reported appeared reasonable. Six plots in the forest inventory were remeasured and the forest inventory was used per the deviation to estimate emissions. Emissions from skid trails are immaterial.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	Land use factor before or after conversion (VMD0015)
Measuring frequency:	Not specified
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Type of monitoring equipment:	Stock Change Factors are provided in Tables 5.5, 5.10, and 6.2 of the IPCC 2006GL Volume 4
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan?	Yes

If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Reviewed Stock Change Factors in Tables 5.5, 5.10, and 6.2 of the IPCC 2006GL Volume 4
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	Management factor before or after conversion (VMD0015)
Measuring frequency:	Not specified
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Type of monitoring equipment:	Stock Change Factors are provided in Tables 5.5, 5.10, and 6.2 of the IPCC 2006GL Volume 4
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Reviewed Stock Change Factors in Tables 5.5, 5.10, and 6.2 of the IPCC 2006GL Volume 4

Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	Input factor before or after conversion (<i>VMD0015</i>)
Measuring frequency:	Not specified
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Type of monitoring equipment:	Stock Change Factors are provided in Tables 5.5, 5.10, and 6.2 of the IPCC 2006GL Volume 4
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA

Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Reviewed Stock Change Factors in Tables 5.5, 5.10, and 6.2 of the IPCC 2006GL Volume 4
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	Length of skid trail <i>sk</i> (VMD0015)
Measuring frequency:	Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and	Yes, monitored in 1999, 2004, 2005, 2008, 2009, 2010 (years when logging took place in project

monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	area).
Type of monitoring equipment:	Post-harvest assessment reports and maps of skid trails Supplementary Documents\Annex O Monitoring\Selective Logging Data\Post-Harvest_Assessments, Supplementary Documents\Annex O Monitoring\Selective Logging Data\SkidTrails, Supplementary Documents\Annex O Monitoring\Selective Logging Data\EmissionsLoggingInfrastructure.xlsx
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews, observation and recalculation. One logging site from 2005 was observed and the length and width (area) of skid trails reported appeared reasonable. Six plots in the forest inventory were

	remeasured and the forest inventory was used per the deviation to estimate emissions. Emissions from skid trails are immaterial.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	Volume extracted from logging stratum z in stratum i at time t (<i>VMD0015</i>)
Measuring frequency:	Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, monitored in 1999, 2004, 2005, 2008, 2009, 2010 (years when logging took place in project area)
Type of monitoring equipment:	Field Measurements \Supplementary Documents\Annex O Monitoring\Selective Logging Data\Harvest_data: TimberHarvest_Invoices, Forest Management Plan 2006-2010(completetext), RioBravo_Harvest_Summary.xlsx, 1999 Harvest Yield.XLS, WB6.xls, volumes per comp2005.xls, Sorted Waybills 2008.xls, RawWayBillDeliveryData2009.xls, 2010 Delivery

	24Mar-8Oct10.xls
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews and observation. Values in log scale reports from 2005 and 2008 were reviewed and compared to those used in calculations of emissions. Values were found to be correct. No field measurements were recorded because all harvested logs were subsequently removed from site for processing. An interview with a local logger /43/ confirmed log scales were reasonable and no evidence was discovered to the contrary.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes

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

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	The volume of timber extracted of species j for logging stratum z , in stratum i at time t ; (VMD0015)
Measuring frequency:	Must be monitored at least every 5 years or if verification occurs on a frequency of less than every 5 years examination must occur prior to any verification event
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, monitored in 1999, 2004, 2005, 2008, 2009, 2010 (years when logging took place in project area)
Type of monitoring equipment:	Field Measurements \Supplementary Documents\Annex O Monitoring\Selective Logging Data\Harvest_data: TimberHarvest_Invoices, Forest Management Plan 2006-2010(completetext), RioBravo_Harvest_Summary.xlsx, 1999 Harvest Yield.XLS, WB6.xls, volumes per comp2005.xls, Sorted Waybills 2008.xls, RawWayBillDeliveryData2009.xls, 2010 Delivery 24Mar-8Oct10.xls
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA

Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews and observation. Values in log scale reports from 2005 and 2008 were reviewed and compared to those used in calcuations of emissions. Values were found to be correct. No field measurements were recorded because all harvested logs were subsequently removed from site for processing. An interview with a local logger /43/ confirmed log scales were reasonable and no evidence was discovered to the contrary.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	Mean width of skid trails (VMD0015)
Measuring frequency:	The estimated mean width of skid trails shall be monitored and updated prior to each verification report.
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, monitored in 2011.
Type of monitoring equipment:	Direct measurement of skidder Supplementary Documents\Annex O Monitoring\Selective Logging Data\Harvest_data\SurveyofLoggingActivities.JPG
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA

If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Interviews, observation and recalculation. One logging site from 2006 was observed and the length and width (area) of skid trails reported appeared reasonable. Six plots in the forest inventory were remeasured and the forest inventory was used per the deviation to estimate emissions. Emissions from skid trails are immaterial.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>Fuel consumed (VMD0014)</i>
Measuring frequency:	None listed
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	No, these emissions were optionally excluded per AFOLU requirements.
Type of monitoring equipment:	None
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good	NA

monitoring practise?	
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	NA
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	NA
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter:	<i>Ai (VMD0016)</i>

(as in monitoring plan):	
Measuring frequency:	At the project start and whenever biomass stocks are re-measured (at least every 10 years)
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, t initial stratification.
Type of monitoring equipment:	GIS and remote sensing data.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The delineation of the boundaries was verified with Google Earth and observed in the field during the site visit.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation)	Yes

ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>EBSL SS (VMD0017)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Monitored once every ten years (when the baseline is revisited)
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, the carbon stocks and sources were assessed for each baseline period.
Type of monitoring equipment:	NA
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA

Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Based on interviews and observations, no new stocks or sources were discovered between the two baseline periods.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	<i>EP,SS (VMD0017)</i>
Measuring frequency:	Monitored at least once every five years
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, the carbon stocks and sources were assessed for each baseline period.
Type of monitoring equipment:	NA

Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Based on interviews and observations, no new stocks or sources were discovered between the two baseline periods.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	UBSL,SS (VMD0017)
Measuring frequency:	Monitored once every ten years (when the baseline is revisited)
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, uncertainty was calculated for each baseline period.
Type of monitoring equipment:	Spreadsheets.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report	The calculations were reviewed step-by-step to

verified?	determine whether they were made according to the methodology.
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan):	UP,SS (VMD0017)
Measuring frequency:	Monitored at least once every five years
Reporting frequency:	Verification
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, uncertainty was calculated for each baseline period.
Type of monitoring equipment:	Spreadsheets.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment equal or more accurate as stated in monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the monitoring plan? If the monitoring plan does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency	NA

represent good monitoring practise?	
Company performing the calibration:	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period? If the calibration does not cover the whole period please indicated how the project has revised its GHG calculations for the period that calibration was not valid.	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The calculations were reviewed step-by-step to determine whether they were made according to the methodology. It was discovered that uncertainty in carbon stock estimates was not correctly calculated (see CAR 3).
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the project proponent consulted a statistician.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

4.2 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations

Monitoring data and parameters were reviewed on numerous occasions as both desk review exercises and interviews. The review was a risk-based assessment that primarily focused on measurements and calculations of the following:

- Soil organic carbon which comprises a significant portion of credit generation
- Aboveground biomass which is difficult to measure

- Emissions from natural disturbance (hurricane)
- Uncertainty calculations based on assumption and sampling design
- Leakage calculations
- Determination of VCUs (application of uncertainty deduction, leakage and buffer pool allocation to gross emissions reductions)

The majority of emission reductions were a result of baseline emissions. Per the model BL-PL, these were calculated using the deforestation rate from six proxy areas. The project developer used the most conservative rate from the six proxy areas. Equations for these calculations can be found in BL-PL, the PDD, and below:

$$D\%_{planned,i,t} = \left(\sum_{pn=1}^{n^*} \left(\frac{D\%_{pn}}{Yrs_{pn}} \right) \right) / n$$

Where:

$D\%_{planned,i,t}$ Projected annual proportion of land that will be deforested in stratum i during year t . If actual annual proportion is known and documented (e.g. 25% per year for 4 years), set to proportion; %

$D\%_{pn}$ Percent of deforestation in land parcel pn etc of a proxy area as a result of planned deforestation as defined in this module; %

Yrs_{pn} Number of years over which deforestation occurred in land parcel pn in proxy area; years

n Total number of land parcels examined

pn 1, 2, 3 ... n^* land parcels examined in proxy area

i 1, 2, 3 ... M strata

Carbon stocks were calculated by summing pools selected by the developer as follows, per VM0007:

$$C_{BSL,i} = C_{AB_tree,i} + C_{BB_tree,i} + C_{AB_non-tree,i} + C_{BB_non-tree,i} + C_{DW,i} + C_{LI,i} + C_{SOC,i}$$

Where:

$C_{BSL,i}$ Carbon stock in all pools in the baseline in stratum i ; t CO₂-e ha⁻¹

$C_{AB_tree,i}$ Carbon stock in aboveground biomass in the baseline in stratum i ; t CO₂-e ha⁻¹

$C_{BB_tree,i}$ Carbon stock in belowground biomass in the baseline in stratum i ; t CO₂-e ha⁻¹

$C_{AB_non-tree,i}$ Carbon stock in aboveground non-tree vegetation in stratum i ; t CO₂-e ha⁻¹

$C_{BB_non-tree,i}$ Carbon stock in belowground non-tree vegetation in stratum i ; t CO₂-e ha⁻¹

$C_{DW,i}$ Carbon stock in dead wood in the baseline in stratum i ; t CO₂-e ha⁻¹

$C_{LI,i}$ Carbon stock in litter in the baseline in stratum i ; t CO₂-e ha⁻¹

$C_{SOC,i}$ Carbon stock in soil organic carbon in the baseline in stratum i ; t CO₂-e ha⁻¹

i 1, 2, 3 ... M strata

Project emissions are calculated based on project monitoring, also per VM0009:

$$\Delta C_P = \sum_{t=1}^{t^*} \sum_{i=1}^M \left(\Delta C_{P,DefPA,i,t} + \Delta C_{P,DefDistPA,i,t} + \Delta C_{P,DegW,i,t} + \Delta C_{P,DegF,i,t} + \Delta C_{P,DegDist,i,t} + \Delta C_{P,SelLog,i,t} \right) + GHG_{P-E,i,t} - \Delta C_{P,Enh,i,t} \quad (1)$$

Where:

ΔC_P Net greenhouse gas emissions within the project area under the project scenario; t CO₂-e

$\Delta C_{P,DefPA,i,t}$ Net carbon stock change as a result of deforestation in the project area in the project case in stratum i at time t ; t CO₂-e

$\Delta C_{P,DefDistPA,i,t}$ Net carbon stock change as a result of deforestation caused by natural disturbance in the project area in the project case in stratum i at time t ; t CO₂-e

$\Delta C_{P,DegW,i,t}$ Net carbon stock change as a result of degradation through wood extraction in the project area in the project case in stratum i at time t ; t CO₂-e

$\Delta C_{P,DegF,i,t}$ Net carbon stock change as a result of fire induced degradation in the project area in the project case in stratum i at time t ; t CO₂-e

$\Delta C_{P,DegDist,i,t}$ Net carbon stock change as a result of degradation due to natural disturbance in the project area in the project case in stratum i at time t ; t CO₂-e

$\Delta C_{P,SelLog,i,t}$ Net carbon stock change as a result of degradation through third-party certified selective logging in the project area in the project case in stratum i at time t ; t CO₂-e

$GHG_{P-E,i,t}$ Greenhouse gas emissions as a result of deforestation and degradation activities within the project area in the project case in stratum i in year t ; t CO₂-e

$\Delta C_{P,Enh,i,t}$ Net carbon stock change as a result of forest growth and sequestration during the project in areas projected to be deforested in the baseline¹ in stratum i at time t ; t CO₂-e

i 1, 2, 3 ... M strata

t 1, 2, 3, ... t^* years elapsed since the start of the REDD project activity

Leakage is estimated based on VMD0009 LK-ASP, as follows:

$$\Delta C_{LK-AS,planned} = \sum_{t=1}^{t^*} \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{c=1}^C \left((D\%_{planned,i,t} * A_{planned,i}) * \Delta C_{BSL,i} \right) * PF_c * LK_{CP-ME,c,i}$$

¹ For areas with a degradation baseline (i.e. using BL-DFW) this parameter shall be set to zero, for areas with baseline set by BL-UP and BL-PL this parameter may be conservatively set to zero.

Where:

$\Delta C_{LK-AS,planned}$	Net CO ₂ emissions due to activity shifting leakage for projects preventing planned deforestation; t CO ₂ -e
$D\%_{planned,i,t}$	Projected annual proportion of land that will be deforested in stratum i at year t ; %
$A_{planned,i}$	Total area of planned deforestation over the baseline period for stratum i ; ha
$\Delta C_{BSL,i}$	Net carbon stock changes in all pools in baseline stratum i ; t CO ₂ -e ha ⁻¹
PF_c	Proportion of available area for production of commodity c that is currently forested; dimensionless
$LK_{CP-ME,c,i}$	Leakage factor for displacement of class of planned deforestation agents; dimensionless
c	1, 2, 3, ... C commodities
i	1, 2, 3, ... M strata
t	1, 2, 3, ... t^* years elapsed since the start of the REDD project activity

Allocation to the buffer pool was calculated per the the guidelines in the VCS tool for buffer determination, as follows:

$$Buffer_{TOTAL} = Buffer_{PLANNED} + Buffer_{UNPLANNED} + Buffer_{DEGRAD-FW/C}$$

$$Buffer_{PLANNED} = \left(\left(\Delta C_{BSL,planned} - \sum_{t=1}^{t^*} \sum_{i=1}^M (E_{FC,i,t} + N_2 O_{direct,i,t}) \right) - \left(\Delta C_{P,(PlannedDeforestationAreas)} - \sum_{t=1}^{t^*} \sum_{i=1}^M (E_{FC,i,t} + N_2 O_{direct,i,t}) \right) \right) * (1 - Buffer\%)$$

$$Buffer_{UNPLANNED} = 0$$

$$Buffer_{DEGRAD-FW/C} = 0$$

Where:

$Buffer_{PLANNED}$	Buffer withholding for planned deforestation project areas; t CO ₂ -e
$Buffer_{UNPLANNED}$	Buffer withholding for unplanned deforestation project areas; t CO ₂ -e

$Buffer_{DEGRAD-FW/C}$	Buffer withholding for degradation through extraction of fuelwood project areas; t CO ₂ -e
$\Delta C_{BSL,planned}$	Net greenhouse gas emissions in the baseline from planned deforestation; t CO ₂ -e
$\Delta C_{BSL,unplanned}$	Net greenhouse gas emissions in the baseline from unplanned deforestation; t CO ₂ -e
$\Delta C_{BSL,degrad-FW/C}$	Net greenhouse gas emissions in the baseline from degradation caused by fuelwood collection and charcoal making; t CO ₂ -e
ΔC_P	Net greenhouse gas emissions within the project area under the project scenario; t CO ₂ -e
$E_{FC,i,t}$	Emission from fossil fuel combustion in stratum i in year t ; t CO ₂ -e
$N_2O_{direct-N,i,t}$	Direct N ₂ O emission as a result of nitrogen application on the alternative land use within the project boundary in stratum i in year t ; t CO ₂ -e
$Buffer\%$	Buffer withholding percentage; %
i	1, 2, 3, ... M strata
t	1, 2, 3, ... t^* years elapsed since the start of the REDD VCS project activity

Table 1. Risk Rating

Risk Category	Risk Rating
a) Internal Risk	0
b) External Risk	0
c) Natural Risk	3.5
Overall Risk Rating (a + b + c)	3.5

Emissions reductions given in the PDD (table 12) were as follows and match the monitoring report (no difference between predicted and actual):

Total Net GHG Emission Reductions resulting from Rio Bravo Climate Action Project

	$\Delta C_{BSL,planned}$		$\Delta C_{P,Planned}$ DeforestationAreas		ΔC_{LK}		C_{REDD}	
	Net GHG Emissions under baseline		Net GHG emissions under project		Net GHG emissions due to leakage		Total Net GHG Emission Reductions	
	Total	VCS	Total	VCS	Total	VCS	Total	VCS
	Cumul.	Eligible Cumul.	Cumul.	Eligible Cumul.	Cumul.	Eligible Cumul.	Cumul.	Eligible Cumul.
	t CO ₂ e							
1996	333,735	0	42,554	0	67,028	0	224,153	0
1997	667,470	0	85,133	0	134,056	0	448,280	0
1998	1,001,204	0	91,635	0	201,084	0	708,485	0
1999	1,334,939	0	104,466	0	268,112	0	962,361	0
2000	1,668,674	0	110,968	0	335,140	0	1,222,566	0
2001	2,002,409	0	111,169	0	402,167	0	1,489,072	0

2002	2,336,144	333,735	111,280	110	469,195	67,028	1,755,669	266,596
2003	2,669,879	667,470	111,446	277	536,223	134,056	2,022,210	533,137
2004	3,003,613	1,001,204	116,115	4,946	603,251	201,084	2,284,247	795,174
2005	3,337,348	1,334,939	120,240	9,071	670,279	268,112	2,546,829	1,057,757
2006	3,798,705	1,796,296	120,312	9,143	762,944	360,776	2,915,449	1,426,376
2007	4,260,061	2,257,652	120,381	9,212	855,608	453,441	3,284,072	1,794,999
2008	4,641,412	2,639,003	121,856	10,686	932,238	530,071	3,587,318	2,098,246
2009	4,641,412	2,639,003	128,124	16,955	932,238	530,071	3,581,050	2,091,977
2010	4,641,412	2,639,003	296,926	185,757	932,238	530,071	3,412,248	1,923,176

Other measurements and calculations were assessed, including belowground biomass, allometry and project emissions. Belowground biomass is based on a root-to-shoot ratio of aboveground biomass. Allometry is based on published equations that were verified by the project proponent per the methodology (see CAR 8). Evidence was collected by observation of the project area to support the calculations of project emissions from illegal logging and FSC selective logging (also see parameter tables). No errors were discovered in the calculations, however if errors were inadvertently missed they would be immaterial given that the total emissions reductions are primarily attributed to the baseline.

Upon review of the calculations of soil organic carbon (SOC), estimates were found to be in line with IPCC defaults for this forest type. Project estimates of SOC were based on soil samples obtained in the project area in 1998 while for the baseline, IPCC defaults. The defaults used in the calculation of baseline SOC were verified using the IPCC GPG 2006.

Aboveground biomass was physically re-measured on six plots in the project area. The measurements obtained by the verification team were similar to those obtained in 2000 for the original inventory. In most cases, trees could be relocated on plots (see CL 5). Some plots were not correctly allocated to a portion of the project area per the methodology (see CL 6). After the addition of a deviation (see section 2.2.2) carbon stock estimates for this area were determined to be conservative (also see FAR 2).

Emissions from natural disturbance as a result of a hurricane during the monitoring period were conservatively estimated. Although no plots in the affected areas were re-measured as part of the verification site visit, the estimates provided seem conservative given the amount of destruction elsewhere in the region and the prior inventory estimates.

Uncertainty was assessed by reviewing the sampling design and provided calculations. Upon the site visit, evidence that plots were clustered on transects was observed (see CAR 3 and CL 7). Upon the addition of a deviation, the estimates of standard error were verified as correct for the clustered plot design. Estimates of total carbon stocks remained unchanged as a result of this deviation.

Leakage and VCS calculations were spot-checked using the provided Excel workbooks and found to be in conformance with the methodology.

It is the opinion of DNV that the assumptions, emission factors and default values that were applied in the calculations have been justified.

4.3 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals

The evidence discovered during this audit was sufficient in quantity, quality and reliability. Where ever possible, evidence that presented a risk of material misstatement was further investigated as presented by iterations of audit findings in Appendix A of this report. A risk-based assessment was conducted that identified areas of potential material mistatement in the calcuation of emissions reductions or removals which is presented in Section 4.2 of this report.

Although some of the data and parameters monitored were not in accordance with the frequency provided in the methodology (see section 4.1 of this report), most are cumulative in nature and therefore immaterial. For instance, if deforestation is not observed in 2010 then it could not have existed in 2005. Likewise for some data and parameters, differences from year-to-year are likely to be minuscule in nature and thus immaterial. For instance, carbon stock in belowground tree biomass assumed to be killed per unit area resulting from the creation of the skid trails will not affect the overall calculations of emissions reductions or removals given the volume of baseline emissions avoided by the project.

Wherever possible and upon the identification of risk, provided figures were cross-checked with independent calculations or secondary documentation, such as IPCC defaults and figure published in academic papers.

Proof of title was confrimed by offfical land certificates /17/ and an updated title abstract (see CL 3).

4.4 Management and Operational System

The Programme for Belize and The Nature Conservancy have well-developed management systems that have been in existence prior to the project start date (though it should be noted that not all parameters required for verification were monitored under this management system in the past). Responsibilities are clearly delineated and the identified parties are competent to handle subsequent events of non-conformity, internal audits and management review. The project proponent has demonstrated success with their broader program and the Rio Bravo Climate Action Project. All evidence collected during the course of the verification audit indicates that these successes will continue into the future.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

Det Norske Veritas U.S.A. Inc (DNV) has performed the verification of the emission reductions that have been reported for the “Rio Bravo Climate Action Project” for the period 01 Jan. 2002 to 31 Dec. 2010.

The project participants are responsible for the collection of data in accordance with the monitoring plan and the reporting of GHG emissions reductions from the project.

It is DNV’s responsibility to express an independent verification statement on the reported GHG emission reductions from the project.

DNV conducted the verification on the basis of the approved methodology VM0007 (version 1.1), the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS PD of 1 Dec 2011 and the monitoring report (version 9) dated 1 Dec. 2011. The verification included i) checking whether the provisions of the monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan were consistently and appropriately applied and ii) the collection of evidence supporting the reported data.

DNV’s verification approach draws on an understanding of the risks associated with reporting of GHG emission data and the controls in place to mitigate these. DNV planned and performed the verification by obtaining evidence and other information and explanations that DNV considers necessary to give reasonable assurance that reported GHG emission reductions are fairly stated.

In our opinion the GHG emissions reductions of the “Rio Bravo Climate Action Project” for the period 01 Jan. 2002 to 31 Dec. 2010 are fairly stated in the monitoring report (prversion 9) dated 1 Dec. 2011.

The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly on the basis of the approved methodology VM0007 (version 1.1) and the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS PD of 1 Dec 2011.

Det Norske Veritas U.S.A. Inc is able to certify that the emission reductions from the “Rio Bravo Climate Action Project” during the period 01 Jan. 2002 to 31 Dec. 2010 amount to 1,660,260 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent, detailed as below.

Reporting period: 01 Jan. 2002 to 31 Dec. 2010

Verified GHG emission reductions or removals in the above reporting period:

GHG Emission Reductions or Removals	tCO ₂ e
Baseline Emissions	2,639,003
Project Emissions	185,757
Leakage	530,071
Uncertainty	0
Net GHG Emission Reductions	1,923,176
Buffer Pool	262,916
Net GHG emission reductions or removals after Buffer Pool deduction	1,660,260

Net GHG emission reductions or removals have been adjusted to contribute 262,916 tCO₂e to the buffer pool. Rounding errors in the numbers presented equal one tCO₂e. Unrounded numbers were in the actual calculations.

DNV does not assume any responsibility towards the issuance and utilization of the VCU's hereby verified and certified. Request for issuance of VCU's shall be made by the project proponent to an approved VCS Program Registry based on the requirements set out under the most recent version of the VCS Program Guidelines clause on VCS Registration.

The verification of reported emission reductions is based on the information made available to DNV and the engagement conditions detailed in this report. DNV cannot be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on this report.

6 REFERENCES

Documentation provided by the project participants

- /75/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: VCS PD for project activity “Rio Bravo Climate Action Project” and associated Annexes, Version 7 dated 28 Nov 2011.
- /76/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: *Rio Bravo Climate Action Project Monitoring Report*, Version 8 dated 28 Nov 2011.
- /77/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: *Rio Bravo Climate Action Project Application of Baseline Report* dated 28 Nov 2011.
- /78/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: *Rio Bravo Climate Action Project Summary of Land Tenure Information Report* dated 9 Sept 2011.
- /79/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: *Rio Bravo Climate Action Project Agricultural Expansion and Management in Northern Belize Results of Survey* dated May 2011.
- /80/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: *Rio Bravo Climate Action Project Definition of Project Boundary Report* dated 8 Sept 2011.
- /81/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: *Rio Bravo Climate Action Project Analysis of the Potential of Natural Risks within the Rio Bravo Project Area* dated Sept 2011.
- /82/ The Nature Conservancy, Programme for Belize, and Winrock International: *Non-Permanence Risk Report, Rio Bravo Climate Action Project*, Version 1 dated 8 Sept 2011.

Standards, methodologies, and other guidance by the VCSA

- /83/ VCSA: VCS Standard, version 3.1.
- /84/ VCSA: Methodology “REDD Methodology Modules (REDD_MF)”, version 1.1.
- /85/ VCSA: Guidance from Carolyn Ching, RE: AFOLU Risk Assessment Clarification dated 11 Oct 2011.

Documentation used by DNV to validate / cross-check the information provided by the project participants

- /86/ IPCC: *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*
- /87/ DNV: *VCS Methodology Element Report Revision of VMD00015 Methods for Monitoring of GHG Emissions and Removals*, Version 1 dated 22 Nov 2011.
- /88/ Government of Belize: Official Land Certificates for Block 14, Parcel 3 and Block 13, Parcel 6

dated 2 Jan 1996.

- /89/ Landfolio Registry: Certified True Copies of Clear Title for Block 14, Parcel 3 and Block 13, Parcel 6 dated 23 Sept. 2011.
- /90/ Programme for Belize: *Rio Bravo Conservation and Management Area Management Plan (Edition V) 2006 – 2010* dated July 2006.
- /91/ Chave et al.: *Tree allometry and improved estimation of carbon stocks and balance in tropical forests*, Oecologia, dated 22 June 2005.
- /92/ Programme for Belize: *Rio Bravo Conservation and Management Area Sustainable Timber Programme Forest Management Plan and Operational Guidelines 2006 – 2010* dated February 2006.

APPENDIX A

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS, CLARIFICATION REQUESTS AND FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS

First round Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	First round Summary of response	First round Validation team conclusion	Second round Summary of response	Second round Validation team conclusion
CAR 1: Please conduct an NPV analysis per section 2.2.3.1 of the AFOLU non-permanence risk tool.	The NPV analysis has been completed and included in <i>Annex P: Risk Assessment – Opportunity Cost</i> . Results of the analysis can be found in the supplementary document: <i>Notes to Rio Bravo Non-Permanence Risk Assessment.doc</i> .	The revised NPV analysis is now in conformance. CAR Closed.		
CAR 2: Upon discussion with knowledgeable local community members, it appears that the project area would have been salvage logged before conversion to agriculture. Per the AFOLU requirements laid out in 4.4.8.1.a, wood products must therefore be included in the baseline scenario.	The Baseline Carbon Stock Report provides an estimate of the timber extracted following deforestation and prior to conversion to cropland. The harvested wood products resulting from this extraction are then calculated. This text has been updated to Section 2.5 and 3.3 of the Baseline Carbon Stock Report to add clarity to this issue. It is assumed that following removal of timber, all remaining biomass is burned. Text regarding this issue can also be found in the report 'Rio Bravo – Application of the Baseline Report' in section 2.3.	The reference report accounts for wood products in the baseline scenario. CAR Closed.		

First round Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	First round Summary of response	First round Validation team conclusion	Second round Summary of response	Second round Validation team conclusion
CAR 3: Please compare the description of the plot allocation and sampling design (see CL 7) to VMD0001 and provide an explanation of any deviations.	VMD0001 states 'measurements in sampled fixed area plots or sample points using prisms employing representative random or systematic sampling'. The plots within the Rio Bravo project were established using stratified systematic sampling with a random start. Plots were then established along regularly spaced transects.	The plot allocation does not appear to match section II of VMD0001 (Procedures). VMD0001 does not specify transects nor does it provide unbiased estimators of total carbon stocks in aboveground tree biomass when plots are clustered on transects. Please define an unbiased estimator of total carbon stocks in aboveground tree biomass and standard error of this total when plots are clustered on transects. Also, please clearly define these deviations from VMD0001 PD.	Biomass plots that are along transects have been clustered and the estimation of variance/standard error calculated using the Taylor Series Linearization method in the statistical package 'Stata 10.1' using the commands SVY (svy set and svy mean). The method used was advised to us by a statistician with a doctorate in Survey Methodology and Dr. West the author of "Applied Survey Data Analysis". A deviation request has been added to the PD. See Annex B: Comparison of biomass estimation	CAR Closed. A first-order Taylor series expansion is used to estimate the variance in total carbon stocks. This estimator is minimally biased. As expected, this estimator resulted in lower precision.

First round Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	First round Summary of response	First round Validation team conclusion	Second round Summary of response	Second round Validation team conclusion
CAR 4: For your analysis of leakage risk, please provide evidence that you consulted experts in the production of key commodities per VMD0009.	**This has taken place. Currently waiting for confirmation and evidence from Alex Martinez**	Open pending confirmation to Alex Martinez	A letter from Jan Meerman has been provided.	CAR Closed. Evidence provided in the letter from Jan Meerman indicates she was consulted as an expert in agricultural commodities.
CAR 5: Per VCS Standard 3.11, please provide a .kml file of the project area.	KML file is know located in the GIS supplementary folder along with the shapefile.	CAR closed.		
CAR 6: Per AFOLU requirements 3.1.4 please identify potential negative socio-economic impacts and steps to mitigate them.	An analysis of the socio-economic impacts has been included in <i>Annex T: Programme for Belize, Rio Bravo Social Impact Assessment</i> .	A socio-economics impact assessment has been added to Annex T. CAR Closed.		

First round Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	First round Summary of response	First round Validation team conclusion	Second round Summary of response	Second round Validation team conclusion
CAR 7: The monitoring report does not conform to the methods specified in VMD0015 with respect to degradation through wood extraction (illegal logging 2.2.1). Please revise the monitoring report or methodology accordingly. This relates to using buffered GPS points and forest inventory data to estimate emissions from illegal logging which is not an option in the module.	A methodology deviation has been requested that will result in a conservative estimate of emissions from illegal logging. All mahogany and cedar trees found within areas accessible to illegal loggers are assumed to be removed in the first two years. Based on survey results, a buffer has been created around all access points. Based on forest inventory data, the average biomass of mahogany and cedar trees per hectare was estimated. The estimated area of potential degradation was then multiplied by the biomass of these trees to conservatively estimate the total emissions resulting from illegal logging.	Text in the monitoring report indicates only biomass of mahogany trees was removed. Please bring the monitoring report into conformance with your response.	Text has been updated	CAR Closed. The monitoring report now conforms to the revised version VMD0015 and matches the response to this finding. This text accurately reflects evidence of illegal logging observed during the site visit.

First round Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	First round Summary of response	First round Validation team conclusion	Second round Summary of response	Second round Validation team conclusion
CAR 8: VM0001 specifies that allometric equations must have been “based on datasets that comprise at least 30 trees.” However the palm equations used to estimate carbon stocks in aboveground tree biomass appear to be based on datasets comprised of 15 trees.” Please revise the monitoring report to be in conformance with VMD0001.	Unfortunately, we were not able to locate additional palm data. In addition, combining the palm data is not possible due to their different growth patterns. Therefore, the palms have been removed from the biomass database	The biomass of palms is conservatively removed from the database. CAR Closed.		
CL 1: Please produce a copy of the cash flow analysis for the project.	The Cash Flow analysis has been completed and included in <i>Annex P: Risk Assessment – Financial Viability</i> . Results of the analysis can be found in the supplementary document: <i>Notes to Rio Bravo Non-Permanence Risk Assessment.doc</i> .	CL closed with attached evidence.		

First round Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	First round Summary of response	First round Validation team conclusion	Second round Summary of response	Second round Validation team conclusion
CL 2: Please send a copy of the memorandum of understanding between the government of Belize and the project proponent referred to by the Ministry of Lands and the Ministry of Finances which assigns carbon rights to the project proponents.	The Project Proponent has been changed to Programme for Belize (PfB). PfB is the project implementer and titled owner of the project area, and holds full control and oversight of the project. The <i>Comprehensive Agreement</i> (Annex K) explicitly assigns the carbon rights to the Financial Participants in Section 5.4. Furthermore, the term Financial Participants is defined in the Recitals section of the agreement, and does not include the Govt of Belize. A copy of the resolution assigning the carbon rights to the Financial Participants is in <i>Annex B: Government Letters of Support: Commitments by the Govt of Belize</i>. This resolution was signed by the Prime Minister of Belize, clearly assigning the rights to any offsets to the Financial Participants (Section 4). Also included in <i>Annex B: Government Letters of Support: Commitments by the Govt of Belize</i>, is the Host Country Approval Letter, signed by the then Deputy Prime Minister (and current Prime Minister) which also clearly recognizes the financial participant's rights to any offsets (paragraph 5).	With the submission of this evidence, the CL is closed		

First round Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	First round Summary of response	First round Validation team conclusion	Second round Summary of response	Second round Validation team conclusion
CL 3: Please provide an updated abstract based on a title search for the project area.	Land register reports were requested on 23-Sep-2011. Copies of these land register reports can be found in <i>Annex D: Land Titles</i> . These reports confirm the Programme for Belize is the current land owner of the project area: Block 13, Parcel 6 and Block 14, Parcel 3.	Land register reports are sufficient, CL closed.		
CL 4: Please provide evidence that the government of Belize is not a financial investor nor has financial interest in carbon credits that the project might generate.	A letter from the Belizean Ministry of Finance can be found in <i>Annex P: Risk Assessment - GOB C-SEQ Endorsement2011</i> .	Letter meets these requirements, CL closed.		

First round Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	First round Summary of response	First round Validation team conclusion	Second round Summary of response	Second round Validation team conclusion
CL 5: The provided SOP for plot measurement does not match the measurements taken with respect to 1. edge trees (in/out decision), 2. Palms (nest in plots), 3. Notes on DBH measurement location on the bole. Please either correct the SOP or the field measurements.	SOP manual has been updated. All palms in medium nest in data have been removed. Therefore palms are only found in small nest. SOP 7 Boundary trees: Place the DME directly by the center of the tree and take a reading of distance to the plot center. If it is exactly on the border of the plot then the first tree will be in and the second tree will be out. Continue to alternate boundary trees between in and out of the plot. SOP 8 Palm trees: If palms with dbh > 5.0 cm are present in the small ring, measure and record height because biomass is more closely related to height than to diameter. If possible an aluminum numbered tag should be attached at dbh. If palms are present in any other region of the plot (medium or large) they should not be measured. SOP 6 Measuring dbh of trees: All trees will be measured at dbh (1.3 m above ground) or in the case of buttressed trees at the point above the buttress where the bole becomes non-flared. For trees with defects at dbh, the diameter will be measured above or below the defect. To measure forked trees, the diameter of each fork of the tree that originates at or below 1.5 m was counted as a separate tree. Each fork will be counted as an individual tree and with a diameter taken at 1.3 m above	Updated SOP meets requirements, CL closed.		
VCS Validation Protocol				

First round Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	First round Summary of response	First round Validation team conclusion	Second round Summary of response	Second round Validation team conclusion
CL 6: No plots appear in the southernmost portion of the northern block of the project area. Please justify how the sample is representative of the southern area in the northern block.	See Annex A: Response to CL 6. The forest inventory data was used to demonstrate that the biomass within the southern portion of Block 13, Parcel 6 is within the range of biomass found within the carbon stock plots found in other portion of the project.	The results of statistical tests are presented but no calculations are provided. Please provide the calculations used to perform the statistical tests.	See Annex A: Response to CL6. The response has been updated to demonstrate that the biomass within the southern portion of Block 13 Parcel 6 is highly likely to be well represented by the existing biomass plots.	CL Closed. Although no plots were measured in the southern most portion of Block 13, Parcel 6, the biomass in this southern portion was stratified separately and conservatively estimated. This can be inferred from the statistical test based on supplementary inventory data which indicates this added stratum could be 86% of the carbon elsewhere in the project area on a per unit area basis. This is consistent with observations made during the field visit.

First round Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	First round Summary of response	First round Validation team conclusion	Second round Summary of response	Second round Validation team conclusion
CL 7: Please provide an explanation of the plot allocation and sampling design.	Information on plot location updated in the “Rio Bravo Baseline Carbon Pool Stock Report” in section 2.2.2. The plots were established using stratified sampling with a random start. Locations for starting transects were random access points and then plots established at regular 100 meter intervals, plot centers were established 30 meters at right angles to the left of the transect. The plots had at least a 100 meter buffer from property boundaries. Systematic sample unit selection was expected to result in greater precision than random sample unit selection. Original reports written during plot establishment (eg Belize Report.doc) state this to be the sampling design used.	CL Closed. See CAR 3.		
CL 8: Please add additional evidence to support the risk analysis and buffer determination.	The Non Permanence Risk Report included in <i>Annex P: Risk Assessment</i> has been revised to clearly support the risk analysis and buffer determination.	Report revision adequate, CL closed.		

First round Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	First round Summary of response	First round Validation team conclusion	Second round Summary of response	Second round Validation team conclusion
CL 9: Please clearly mark your scores in the risk analysis and buffer determination.	The Non Permanence Risk Report included in <i>Annex P: Risk Assessment</i> has been revised to clarify the scoring of each section.	CL Closed.		
CL 10: Please provide VCS guidance on the interpretation of table 2, financial viability, with respect to the interpretation of cash flow (positive vs. negative).	A copy of the email from the VCSA has been included in <i>Annex P: Risk Assessment - RE_AFOLU Risk Assessment Clarification from VCSA (Carolyn Ching)</i> .	Guidance produced, CL closed.		

First round Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	First round Summary of response	First round Validation team conclusion	Second round Summary of response	Second round Validation team conclusion
CL 11: Provide a detailed assessment of the productivity of alternative areas of the country for commodity production (VMD0009).	As stated in VMD0009, the productivity assessment was based on soil type, elevation, and precipitation. Elevation and precipitation are similar throughout the forested alternative areas as precipitation is similar throughout the country and elevation was one of the criteria used to select the forested alternative areas. (Step 2). Based on advisement from several crop and soil science researchers, the productivity of forested alternative areas was evaluated through the use of soil quality indicators present within the Harmonized World Soil Database. The average value of each indicator in the forested alternative areas was estimated through an area-weighting. This analysis is present in the excel file 'Supplementary Documents\Annex R Leakage\Rio Bravo Leakage Analysis.xlsx'. As stated in Step 4, these indicators were then compared to the project area.	Assessment provided, CL closed.		

First round Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	First round Summary of response	First round Validation team conclusion	Second round Summary of response	Second round Validation team conclusion
CL 12: Please clarify the author of the land use management plan provided in annex O.	The author of Land Use Management Survey was Dareece Chuc. This correction has been made to all references in the supporting documentation: <i>Monitoring Report (v2)</i> <i>Rio Bravo - Application of VMD0009 LK-ASP Report (v2)</i> <i>Survey of Agricultural Expansion and Management in Northern Belize (v2)</i> <i>Land Use management survey - Data (v2)</i>	Clarification made, CL closed.		
CL 13: Please describe how ranger patrols mitigate the risk from extreme weather and geologic risk.	This was a data entry error. References to ranger patrols as mitigation to weather and geologic risk have been eliminated in the revised <i>Non-Permanence Risk Report</i> .	Correction made, CL closed.		
CL 14: Per VMD 0001 please provide evidence that allometric equations used by the project were validated, and please also provide the data used to build the equations. Alternatively, build new equations.	Validation done on five trees. Text has been updated to "Appendix A Applicability of Allometric Equations" in "Rio Bravo – Baseline Carbon Pool Stocks Report"	Validation performed, CL Closed.		

First round Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	First round Summary of response	First round Validation team conclusion	Second round Summary of response	Second round Validation team conclusion
CL 15: Please provide copies of logging/scale records/receipts as supporting evidence for estimates of emissions from wood extraction and selective logging.	Copies of all logging receipts have been submitted. They may be found here: Supplementary Documents\Annex O Monitoring\Selective Logging Data\Harvest_data\TimberHarvest_Invoices	Copies provided, CL closed.		
CL 16: Please provide the data and an analysis of the data to estimate the logging gap emissions factor applied in this project.	Based on the revision of the monitoring module, a logging damage default factor was used. Therefore, this information is no longer required.	Default accepted, CL closed.		

Forward Action Request

Forward action requests	Reference to Table 1	Response by project participants	Validation conclusion
FAR 1: The project proponent should acquire new field measurements of all pools, including SOC per VMD0001 by the end of 2012 prior to subsequent verification.			
FAR 2: The project proponent should allocate and measure plots in stratum 3 per VMD0001 by the end of 2012 prior to subsequent verification.			