

VERIFICATION REPORT

KARIBA REDD+ PROJECT



AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U.

Document Prepared By: AENOR

Contact Information: 6 Génova. 28004 Madrid – Spain

www.aenor.com

Project Title	Kariba REDD+ Project
Version	1.3
Report ID	Kariba REDD_MP5_CCB&VCS Verification Report_1.3

Report Title	Kariba REDD+ Project Verification Report
Client	Carbon Green Investments (CGI)
Pages	85
Date of Issue	28-October-2022
Prepared By	AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U.
Contact	Génova, 6. 28004 Madrid – Spain Telephone +34 914326000 jfuentes@aeonr.com, jcgomez@aeonr.com www.aenor.com
Approved By	Jose Luis Fuentes
Work Carried Out By	Lead auditor: Juan Carlos Gómez Auditor in trainee: Javier Cócera Technical reviewer: Elena Llorente

Summary

AENOR has carried out the verification of the Kariba REDD+ Project under the VCS and CCB Programs. The project is a Reduction Emission from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) project implemented in Northern Zimbabwe. The project aims to protect an area of 784,987 ha of forest by implementing activities in conjunction with the local population. Decreasing deforestation is to be achieved through a series of activities that are designed to significantly improve the livelihood of locals, through improved agriculture, beekeeping, fuel wood plantations and fire management.

The project start date is 1 July 2011 for VCS and 1 October 2011 for CCB and will be operational until 30 September 2041. The crediting period for VCS is from 1 July 2011 and ending 30 June 2041. The estimated net GHG emissions reductions and removals at validation for the 30-year project span were 196,513,929 tCO₂e, at an average of 6,550,464 tCO₂e/yr. The emissions reduction for the current monitoring period (01-July-2019 to 30-June-2021) is 7,889,849 tCO₂e. This is not a grouped project.

The purpose of the verification was to determine the conformance of the project with respect to the VCS Version 4 and CCB Second Edition and the validated PD, and the assessment of the ex-post monitored anthropogenic GHG emissions reductions and/or removals and the climate, community and biodiversity impacts that have occurred as a result of the project's activities. The scope of the verification was to assess the conformance of validated project, once implemented, with the VCS and CCB requirements and requirements in the validated PD. The process was performed through a combination of desk review, interviews, and communications with relevant personnel. This is the fifth verification event, corresponding to the monitoring period from 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2021.

During the verification 11 CLs and 5 CARs were raised for VCS and 11 CLs and 4 CARs for CCB. All these issues were appropriately closed by means of corrections, more clear explanations, and other supporting documents.

Once all issued detected were appropriate resolved, AENOR carried out this final verification report and deems with reasonable level of assurance that the project complies with all the verification criteria. The assessment team has no restrictions or uncertainties with respect to the compliance of the project with the verification criteria. Hence, the audit team concludes that the cumulative net GHG emissions reductions or removals of 7,889,849 tCO₂e over the monitoring period has been quantified in accordance with VCS rules. A buffer discount rate of 14% was applied, resulting 6,785,270 VCUs eligible for issuance. AENOR confirms that the project has achieved the Climate Gold and Biodiversity Gold distinctions for the verified monitoring period in accordance with the Second Edition CCB Standards.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	4
1.1	Objective	4
1.2	Scope and Criteria	4
1.3	Level of Assurance.....	4
1.4	Summary Description of the Project	5
2	Verification Process.....	6
2.1	Audit Team Composition (<i>Rules 4.3.1</i>)	6
2.2	Method and Criteria.....	7
2.3	Document Review	9
2.4	Interviews	9
2.5	Site Inspections	11
2.6	Resolution of Findings.....	12
2.7	Eligibility for Validation Activities	13
3	Validation Findings.....	13
3.1	Participation under Other GHG Programs	13
3.2	Methodology Deviations.....	13
3.3	Project Description Deviations (<i>Rules 3.5.7 – 3.5.10</i>)	13
3.4	Minor Changes to Project Description (<i>Rules 3.5.6</i>).....	14
3.5	Monitoring Plans (CL3.2, CM3.3, B3.3)	14
4	Verification Findings.....	14
4.1	Public Comments (<i>Rules 4.6</i>)	14
4.2	Summary of Project Benefits.....	14
4.3	General.....	14
4.4	Climate	22
4.5	Community	33
4.6	Biodiversity	38
4.7	Additional Project Implementation Information	41
4.8	Additional Project Impact Information	41
5	Verification Conclusion	42
	Appendix 1: List of Evidence Provided	44
	Appendix 2: Stakeholders Interviewed.....	46
	Appendix 3: Monitoring field records of sample plots reviewed	53
	Appendix 4: Corrective Actions and Clarification Requests	54

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The objective of the verification audit was to conduct an independent assessment of the project to determine:

- The extent to which methods and procedures, including monitoring procedures, have been implemented in accordance with the validated project description (PD), including the monitoring plan.
- The extent to which GHG emission reductions and removals reported in the monitoring report (MR) are materially accurate.
- The extent to which climate, community and biodiversity impacts reported in the MR that have occurred or are on track to occur as a result of the project are materially accurate.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of the verification included the review of the GHG project and implementation; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies, and processes of the project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHG's; and time periods covered. The project follows the framework an Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land-Use (AFOLU) project. Project activities are categorized as a Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) project. The geographic verification scope is defined by the project boundary, the carbon reservoir types, management activities, inventory program, and contract periods.

The monitoring period for this verification is from 01-July-2019 to 30-June-2021.

The scope of this audit included a verification of the projects calculated reductions and removals with the Verified Carbon Standard requirements. In addition, the audit assessed the project with respect to the validated baseline scenarios presented in the PD and the fulfilment of the climate, community, and biodiversity criteria against the CCB Standard.

Criteria from the following documents were used to assess this project:

- VCS Standard v4.2
- VCS Program Guide v4.1
- VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v 4.0
- CCB Program Rules v 3.1
- CCB Standard Second Edition

Unless otherwise indicated, the assessment was performed against the most recent version of the relevant VCS and CCB guidance documents.

1.3 Level of Assurance

The assessment was conducted to provide a reasonable level of assurance of conformance against the defined audit criteria and materiality thresholds within the audit scope. Based on the audit findings, a

positive evaluation statement reasonably assures that the project GHG and benefits assertions are materially correct and are a fair representation of the data and information.

The threshold for materiality with respect to the aggregate of errors, omissions, and misrepresentations relative to the total reported GHG emission reductions/removals was one percent (1%), as established for large projects by the VCS Standard.

All the revisions of the verification report before being submitted to the client were subjected to an independent internal technical review to confirm that all verification activities had been completed according to the pertinent AENOR instructions required. The technical review was performed by a technical reviewer(s) qualified in accordance with AENOR's qualification scheme for CDM/VCS validation and verification.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The Kariba REDD+ Project is located in northwestern Zimbabwe, partly along the southern shore of Lake Kariba. The project area of 784,987 hectares of forest (consisting of woodland and open woodland) spans four provinces: Matabeleland North, Midlands, Mashonaland West and Mashonaland Central. The project is administered by four Rural District Councils (RDCs): Binga, Nyaminyami, Hurungwe and Mbire.

The project is community based and consists of implementation of activities in conjunction with the local population. The main causes of deforestation are socioeconomic (subsistence agriculture, the collection of firewood and poaching activities) and settlements. Decreasing deforestation is achieved through a series of activities that are designed to significantly improve the livelihood of locals, through improved agriculture, beekeeping, fuel wood plantations and fire management. The implementation of project activities is an ongoing effort.

In addition, a significant share of the project's carbon income is invested in general activities that promote and guarantee project sustainability. The project's Community and Project Sustainability Fund is structured to benefit entire communities, specifically including the poorest members of society. The fund is used to improve health and education in the project area through longer-term activities.

The project start date is 1 July 2011 for VCS and 1 October 2011 for CCB and will be operational until 30 September 2041. The crediting period for VCS is from 1 July 2011 and ending 30 June 2041. The estimated net GHG emissions reductions and removals at validation for the 30-year project span were 196,513,929 tCO₂e, at an average of 6,550,464 tCO₂e/yr. The emissions reduction for the current monitoring period (01-July-2019 to 30-June-2021) is 7,889,849 tCO₂e. This is not a grouped project.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Audit Team Composition (*Rules 4.3.1*)

Name	Position in the team
Juan Carlos Gómez	Lead auditor
Javier Cócera	Auditor in trainee
Elena Llorente	Technical Reviewer

Juan Carlos Gómez has more than 7 years of professional experience in climate change. He is a forest engineer and holds a master in sustainable development and corporate responsibility. He is an expert in the development of climate change mitigation and adaptation policies and has worked in LATAM countries and Africa, auditing AFOLU projects under VCS and CCB.

Javier Cócera is a forest engineer with a master in forest management. He has developed his career focused to the forest management. Mainly he has been working through sustainability in two ways: in forestry consultancy, developing forest management plans, working with GIS and LiDAR both in the field and the office and getting experience of the forest resources; and in developing environmental footprint projects and sustainability reports. Currently, Javier is working in AENOR as auditor trainee focused in AFOLU projects.

Elena Llorente has a degree in Environmental Sciences, she has more than 15 years of experience in Sustainable development projects having worked as lead validator/verifier in CDM and other voluntary schemes. She is expert in Climate, Community and Biodiversity aspects.

The following table summarizes the experience of the team members in the assessment of climate, community, and biodiversity impacts in similar projects.

Country	Project	Standard	Team member/ Role
Benin	Pendjari and W-Benin National Parks REDD+ Project	VCS & CCB	Elena Llorente / Auditor Javier Cócera / Auditor in Trainee Juan Carlos Gómez / Technical Reviewer
Central African Republic	Chinko Conservation Area REDD+ Project, Central African Republic	VCS & CCB	Elena Llorente / Auditor Javier Cócera / Auditor in Trainee Juan Carlos Gómez / Technical Reviewer
Colombia	Bajo Calima y Bahía Málaga (BCBM) REDD+ Project	VCS & CCB	Juan Carlos Gómez / Auditor
Colombia	Cajambre REDD+ Project	VCS & CCB	Juan Carlos Gómez / Auditor
Colombia	Mutató REDD+ Project	VCS & CCB	Juan Carlos Gómez / Auditor
Colombia	Concosta REDD+ Project	VCS & CCB	Juan Carlos Gómez / Auditor
Colombia	Sivirú, Usaragá, Pizarro y Pilizá (SUPP) REDD+ Project	VCS & CCB	Juan Carlos Gómez / Auditor
Colombia	Carmen del Darién (CDD) REDD+ Project	VCS & CCB	Juan Carlos Gómez / Auditor
Colombia	Rio Pepe y ACABA REDD+ Project	VCS & CCB	Juan Carlos Gómez / Auditor

Country	Project	Standard	Team member/ Role
Colombia	Acapa – Bajo Mira y Frontera (ACAPA-BMF) REDD+ Project	VCS & CCB	Juan Carlos Gómez / Auditor
Gabon	Results-Based Payments under the Central African Forest Initiative Gabon Partnership	FREL	Juan Carlos Gómez / Lead Auditor Elena Llorente/ Technical Reviewer
Indonesia	Indonesia - Norway Verification of reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation	FREL	Juan Carlos Gómez / Lead Auditor Elena Llorente/ Technical Reviewer
Indonesia	Sumatra Merang Peatland Project (SMPP)	VCS & CCB	Juan Carlos Gómez / Lead Auditor
Kenya	TIST Program in Kenya, CCB-001	VCS & CCB	Juan Carlos Gómez / Lead Auditor
Kenya	TIST Program in Kenya, VCS-005	VCS & CCB	Juan Carlos Gómez / Lead Auditor
Kenya	TIST Program in Kenya, VCS-009	VCS & CCB	Juan Carlos Gómez / Lead Auditor
Mozambique	Revegetation with fruit Trees in North Manica Province, Mozambique	VCS	Juan Carlos Gómez / Lead Auditor
Pakistan	Delta Blue Carbon - 1 – The Indus Delta Mangrove Restoration Project Phase 1	VCS & CCB	Juan Carlos Gómez / Lead Auditor Elena Llorente/ Technical Reviewer
Peru	REDD+ Project in the Alto Huayabamba Conservation Concession (CCAH)	VCS & CCB	Elena Llorente Pérez / Lead Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez / Auditor
Peru	Forest Management to reduce deforestation and degradation in Shipibo Conibo and Cacataibo indigenous communities of Ucayali region	VCS & CCB	Elena Llorente Pérez / Lead Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez / Auditor
Uganda	TIST Program in Uganda, VCS-CCB 011	VCS & CCB	Juan Carlos Gómez / Lead Auditor
Zambia	Lower Zambezi REDD+ Project	VCS	Juan Carlos Gómez / Lead Auditor
Zambia	Luangwa Community Forests Project	VCS	Juan Carlos Gómez / Lead Auditor
Zambia	COMACO Landscape Management Project	VCS	Juan Carlos Gómez / Lead Auditor Javier Cócera / Lead Auditor in Trainee

2.2 Method and Criteria

The verification was performed through a combination of document review and interviews with relevant personnel, as discussed in Sections 2.3 through 2.5 of this report. At all times, the project was assessed for conformance to the criteria described in Section 1.2 of this report. As discussed in Section 2.6, findings were issued to ensure that the project was in full conformance to all requirements.

A project specific Verification and Sampling Plan was developed to guide the verification auditing process to ensure efficiency and effectiveness. The purpose of the Verification and Sampling Plan was to present a risk assessment for determining the nature and extent of verification procedures necessary to ensure the risk of auditing error was reduced to a reasonable level. The Verification & Sampling Plan methodology was derived from all items in the verification process stated above. Specifically, the sampling plan utilized the VCS guidance documents, ISO 14064-3 and the *Standard for Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project*

Activities and Programme of Activities Version 09.0. Random samplings were carried out considering a confidence interval of 95% and error of 10%. Specifically samplings were carried out to determine the project beneficiaries to interview and the original field records from the monitored plots to review (see Section 2.5). Appendix 3 includes the list monitoring plots sampled and verified. The estimation of the sample size was carried out following the common equation:

$$n = \frac{Z_{\alpha}^2 \cdot N \cdot p \cdot q}{e^2(N - 1) + Z_{\alpha}^2 \cdot p \cdot q}$$

Any modifications applied to the Verification and Sampling plan were made based upon the conditions observed for monitoring in order to detect the processes with highest risk of material discrepancy.

The verification activities in which risks were assessed were the evaluations of the monitoring system (data flow, data control procedures, etc.) but mainly the quality of raw data as well as sources and the calculation spreadsheets. AENOR reproduced and verified 100% of spreadsheets /15-17/ for the monitoring period 01 July 2019 to 30 June 2021. The project boundary and project area for the monitoring period were 100% checked using the GIS database /50-52/. The carbon stock changes, and the land used classes in the project area were also 100% verified /18-19/ /21-22/ and crosschecked with validated values in the PD /14/.

AENOR carried out a deep and meticulous review of the spreadsheets /15-19/ and the project monitoring web-based monitoring system MOVERS /21-22/ to verify the correct application of the methodology (formulae, equations /23-26/) and checked that data required for calculating the GHG reductions and removals were appropriately provided. The data of a sample (57%) of original field records of sample plots /30-32/ monitored during the monitoring period were cross checked with the input data used for GHG calculations /21-22/. Monitoring procedures were reviewed by randomly selecting a biomass permanent sample plot (PSP), in which plot monitoring was reproduced and video recorded by project crew /33/. AENOR confirms with a reasonable level of assurance that the claimed emission reductions and removals are free from material errors, omissions, or misstatements.

Project beneficiaries and other stakeholders were interviewed to verify project impacts. The number of individuals to interview (sample size) was determined as explained above. Stakeholders were interviewed combining live interviews with written questionnaires /56-64/. A total of 244 interviews were carried out, including project management, employees, and beneficiaries (see section 4.5.1 and Appendix 2).

AENOR confirms that sufficient evidence was presented for the reported net anthropogenic GHG emission reductions and removals and other climate, community, and biodiversity benefits, and that there is a clear audit trail that contains the evidence and records that validate the stated claims in this verification report since:

- Sufficient evidence available: The project participant has provided the 100% of data used in the calculations to achieve the final amount of GHG emission reductions and removals reported.
- Nature of evidence: The raw data were collected from reliable sources. They are detailed in the project documents and have been provided to the verification team and were checked during the interviews.
- Cross-checked evidence: AENOR cross-checked the collected information through interviews with stakeholders and reproducing calculations.

Hence, AENOR confirms that the stated figures in the monitoring report are correct and confirms that is able to certify the ex-post net anthropogenic GHG reductions and removals and the project benefits based on verifiable and reliable evidence.

2.3 Document Review

A detailed review of all project documentation was conducted to ensure consistency with, and identify any deviation from VCS program requirements, CCB program requirements, the methodology (VM0009, v1.1), and the validated PD. Initial review focused on the MR and included an examination of the project details, implementation status and internal reports, data and parameters, and quantification of GHG emission reductions and removals. Documents reviewed included data from monitoring, plot records, maps, field reports, community development activity reports, SOPs, biomass and carbon calculation spreadsheets, and responses to Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and Clarifications (CLs).

The verification included a review of the validated PD and MR, relative to the field conditions and interviews with project management staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries. Modifications to the Verification and Sampling plan were made based upon the conditions observed for monitoring in order to detect the processes with highest risk of material discrepancy.

The VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v4.0 was used by the Project Proponent (PP) to assess overall project risk. AENOR reviewed the Non-Permanence Risk Report /2/ provided with the verification supporting documentation and confirmed that the Project adheres to the requirements set out in the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool. Each risk factor was thoroughly assessed for conformance. The final score was calculated to be 14%.

For a listing of all documents received from the client and assessed for this verification, see Appendix 1. Numerical references to evidence are provided throughout this report, following the numeration provided in Appendix 1.

2.4 Interviews

Interviews were performed as part of the verification process in order to confirm and verify the information provided in the documents (see Appendix 1). AENOR's verification team gathered the testimonies and opinion of people with different roles and relation with the project. This included interviews with project management and in-country staff in relation to project activities implementation and project monitoring. Local community members were interviewed in relation to participation in the project, support received, consultation processes, forest conservation activities, and project benefits expected and achieved. A total of 244 interviews were carried out by different means: 3 project management, 11 local community members employed by the project, and 230 project beneficiaries. Appendix 2 provides the full list of stakeholders interviewed.

The way in which the VVB selected the interviewees was as follows:

The project proponent provided the MR, which lists the numbers of people involved in the different activities.

Subsequently, AENOR used the document "CDM Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities Version 09.0" to determine the sample size of beneficiaries to be interviewed in the verification. A confidence interval of 95% and an error of 10% was used. Given that the total number of

people participating was 11.315, the population to be sampled is 96 with the following formula $n = Z\alpha^2 \cdot N \cdot p \cdot q / e^2 N - 1 + Z\alpha^2 \cdot p \cdot q$

This number of people has been distributed among the weight that each group has in the total. Thus, community members involved in improved agricultural activities will have a higher weight than people involved in plantation activities. As there are different communities within the project area, also the sampling has been distributed among these communities, trying to be the more equal and partial.

Once the weights or percentages for each interview were obtained, each person was randomly selected from a total list of stakeholders provided by the project proponent. Then, it was communicated to the PP the list of people which the VVB considered appropriate for the assessment.

In the end, more samples were taken, and extra interviews were conducted, more than recommended by the CDM equation. A total of 244 people were interviewed by both means, while the formula recommended 96 people.

The PP has provided different testimonials requested by the VVB like written testimonials and direct interviews.

For the gathering of the testimonies, the PP has been moving around the project area to find the people selected in different activities or villages. On the other hand, for the people selected for the interview, all the interviewees were recruited two days in a general location with good internet connection, where they were interviewed directly by the personnel of AENOR. The information complementary to the interviews, was uploaded to the platform where AENOR downloaded and reviewed to find possible issues or inconsistencies with the information. AENOR currently has access to all the testimonies as well as the recording of the direct interviews and had the possibility to review the information more times. The PP has provided also pictures of the people interviewed by written testimonies, and these pictures is correlated with the form and the list of people required by AENOR. By this way, it is possible to identify the person with the activity and village of the project.

Interviewees were asked specific questions regarding the impact of the Project to the community and biodiversity as to cross-check with the information reported on the MR. Additionally, the personal opinion regarding the Project was asked to all interviewees, expressing all of them their positive impression. As for biodiversity trends, specific questions were made in terms of number and species spotted by the interviewees that access the forest regularly. All interviewees asked confirmed the positive trend reported on the MR and stated their positive opinion regarding the impact on the biodiversity and ecosystems of the project area.

Due to COVID-19 health restrictions, all interviews were carried out through a combination of live videoconferences and written questionnaire answering. Live interviews took place between December 14th to 16th, 2021. Written testimonies were gathered between December 2021 and January 2022. Currently, AENOR and the PP have all the interviews and testimonies available for reviewing or uploading if necessary.

2.5 Site Inspections

Due to the exceptional situation caused by the COVID-19 crisis and the travel restrictions established by governments for safety reasons, it was not possible to carry out a site visit as part of the verification process of the project.

In accordance with VERRA's COVID-19 Travel Guidance for Projects (dated 18 March 2020), an exemption of the site visit was requested on the ground of the extraordinary situation and considering that a reasonable level of assurance was achievable by other means. AENOR as VVB proposed to carry out a remote verification audit that ensured the achievement of the assurance level required by both the CCB and VCS programs.

The remote audit was based on the following auditing techniques:

- Document review and cross checks between the information provided in the in the MR, the PD and supporting information and evidence provided by the PP's emissions calculations, GIS database, and supporting information and evidence provided.
- Review, based on the selected methodologies, tools and the other applied methodological regulatory documents, of the appropriateness of formulae and accuracy of calculations.
- Telephone, teleconference and/or e-mail interviews for the implementation of project activities and the elaboration of project's documents.
- Cross checks between information provided by interviewees to ensure that no relevant information has been omitted.

For the verification of project activities and monitoring, the following means were used:

Activity/Project impact	Verification means
Community gardens: 18 actives	• Photographic evidence
Improved agriculture trainings: 10,061 people trained	• Testimonial evidence: 101 interviews to beneficiaries. • Attendance lists and training reports
Beekeeping training: 1,552 people trained 200 kits provided	• Photographic evidence • Testimonial evidence: 36 interviews to beneficiaries. • Attendance lists and training reports
Tree planting and seedling production: 81 people trained	• Photographic evidence • Testimonial evidence: 34 interviews to beneficiaries. • Attendance lists and or training reports
Improved education: 46 schools supported USD 14,775 spent	• Photographic evidence. • Testimonial evidence: 27 interviews to beneficiaries. • Reports, financial statements, and other documents.

Activity/Project impact	Verification means
Improved healthcare: 17 clinics supported USD 9,180 spent	• Photographic evidence • Testimonial evidence: 17 interviews to beneficiaries. • Reports, financial statements and/other documents
Improved infrastructure 137 boreholes maintained, resuscitated, or repaired	• Photographic evidence • Testimonial evidence: 7 interviews to beneficiaries. • Reports, financial statements and/other documents
Employment creation: 21 employees	• Testimonial evidence: 11 interviews to employees • Contracts and/or other documental evidence
Early burning: 2,452 km Road maintained: 2,719 km	• Photographic evidence • Testimonial evidence: 5 interviews • Reports
Patrolling activities	• Photographic evidence • Reports
17 vulnerable and endangered species protected	• Photographic evidence • Monitoring reports
Monitoring activities	• Field records of permanent sampling plots (PSP), soil plots and leakage plots monitored during the monitoring period (see Appendix 3). • Video recording of monitoring procedures in the PSP M036 and field records of last monitoring.

2.6 Resolution of Findings

All documentation provided by the PP was assessed against the applicable version of the relevant VCS and CCB guidance document. Several clarification requests (CL) and corrective action requests (CAR) were raised and submitted to the PP, which addressed them either by providing to the audit team the requested information or by making the appropriate corrections. Updated versions of the documentation were submitted by the PP and the audit team reassessed them against the guidance documentation. This process was repeated iteratively until all CL and CAR were fully closed. Specifically, 11 CLs and 5 CARs were raised for VCS and 11 CLs and 4 CARs for CCB.

All CARs and CLs issued by the AENOR audit team during the verification process have been closed. In accordance with Section 4.1.13 of the VCS Standard, all findings issued during the verification process and the inputs for their closure are described in Appendix 4 of this report.

There was one outstanding FAR from the previous verification. The previous VVB audit team requests that future auditors examine the inventory SOPs while on the ground to determine whether specific language can be added to strengthen the description of methods.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, AENOR's audit team was not able to perform activities on the ground during the current verification (see section 2.5). However, the audit team was able to review the SOP for Data Collection: Tree and Soil Inventory of Permanent Sample Plots /28/, including the modifications incorporated by the PP to the version reviewed by the auditors of the previous verification. It is the opinion of AENOR that the SOP has been improved with specific language to describe monitoring procedures in detail to prevent any confusion when singular situations (irregular stems, prominent buttress, forked trees, etc.) may arise. Additionally, the audit team was able to verify the correct application of the updated SOP in a PSP that was recorded on video /33/ by the field team for the verification process and found that monitoring procedures are described with enough detail to prevent misinterpretations. Thus, AENOR considers the FAR from the previous verification closed.

2.6.1 Forward Action Requests

No FAR has been raised for the next verification event.

2.7 Eligibility for Validation Activities

AENOR holds accreditation for validation for the relevant sectorial scope 14 under which this project activity is classified.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

The project has not been registered, and is not seeking registration, under any other GHG programs. The project has already been validated and registered under the VCS Program.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

Not applicable. No new methodology deviations were applied during the monitoring period.

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

There is one new PD deviation. In section 1.4 of the validated VCS PD, the organizations Black Crystal and Environment Africa were described as other entities involved in the project. However, according to the information of the PP, after the validation and verification of the first monitoring period, these two entities have participated further in the project. Thus, they are not listed in section 2.1.4 of the MR along with other entities involved in the project.

The PD deviation has no impact on the applicability of the methodology, the additionality nor the appropriateness of the baseline scenario. AENOR deems that the deviation has been appropriately described and justified by the PP in the MR and that the project remains in compliance with the CCB and VCS rules. Thus, the deviation is valid.

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

Not applicable. There are no minor changes to the PD during this monitoring period.

3.5 Monitoring Plans (CL3.2, CM3.3, B3.3)

Not applicable. Monitoring plans have already been validated.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Public Comments (*Rules 4.6*)

The MR was subjected to a 30-day public comment period from 18-October-2021 to 17-November-2021. No public comments were received during the public comment period.

4.2 Summary of Project Benefits

Section 1 of the MR provides information about the project benefits. Achievements for the current monitoring period and for the project lifetime are detailed with specific data per categories.

As specific and remarkable achievements for the current monitoring period the MR in its section 1.1 states i) food security enhancement; ii) alternative sources of income and forest conservation, iii) improved education, iv) improved healthcare, v) forest cover conservation, and vi) biodiversity conservation.

In addition, the project reports in section 1.2 of MR standardized benefits data related to i) GHG emission reductions, ii) training of community members, iii) employment creation, iv) improved access to clean water, and v) biodiversity conservation.

Data are supported with evidence and records checked through interviews to relevant stakeholders and desk review. The section has been completed appropriately with data from the sources provided such as monitoring records /21/ /43-44/ /48-49/, GIS data /50-55/, records of training activities /35-40/, stakeholders' engagement reports /45/ and meetings records /41-42/, employees /64/, etc. The audit team verified that the achievements reported in sections 1.1 and 1.2 of the MR are substantiated with the information provided in the MR and that the corresponding sections are properly referenced.

In opinion of AENOR, the project benefits are credible based on the supporting documents provided by PP and evidence received during the AENOR interviews to stakeholders, records checked and field records.

4.3 General

4.3.1 Implementation Status (*G3.4, CL1.5*)

During this verification process, AENOR has not detected project changes in regards of the project title, its purposes, and objectives. After crosschecking the information on the MR with the validated PD, no material discrepancy has been found. One deviation has been properly described and justified as PD deviation.

The audit team reviewed the evidence provided by the PP of the project activities implemented during the monitoring period and reported in the MR. Evidence was provided in form of records and attendance lists

/34-42/, monitoring data and surveys /21-22/ /30-33/ /43-45/ /48-49/ and pictures, video recordings and internal reports /56-63/. The information provided in the MR was verified with the evidence mentioned above and cross-checked with interviews to stakeholders.

Related to the compliance with the Monitoring Plans, sections 3.1, 4.3 and 5.3 of the MR provide information about the monitoring plans and actions carried out for the current monitoring period. AENOR has reviewed the information on these sections and the procedures put in place to perform the monitoring /28-29/ /33/ /46/ /47/ and deems that they are in accordance with the procedures described in the validated monitoring plans. AENOR checked the monitoring plans contained in the validated PD and compared it with the MR to verify whether there was any difference that would cause an increase in estimates of the GHG emission reductions or removals or distort the surveying of community and biodiversity impacts in the current monitoring period. AENOR has confirmed that there are no material discrepancies between the actual monitoring system and the monitoring plans set out in the PD and the applied methodologies.

Also, the PP effectively monitors the required parameters to determine the project's removals by sinks and emissions by sources as required by the monitoring plan and the applicable methodologies, as well as the community and biodiversity indicators. The parameters reported, including source, frequency and review criteria as indicated in the monitoring plans were verified to be correct and in line with the monitoring plans of the validated PD. Necessary management system procedures including responsibility and authority of monitoring activities have been verified to be consistent with the PD. Knowledge of personnel associated with the project activity was also found to be satisfactory. In opinion of the audit team, the implemented monitoring system is suitable and appropriate for tracking the impacts of the project on the climate, community, and biodiversity.

According to the implementation schedule, there are different dates for the starting of the project. Training and capacity building around biomass sampling began on the 1st of July 2011. During the remainder of the month PSPs were established and initial biomass sampling had been collected. By the 1st of October 2011, all community outreach had been concluded (stakeholder engagement, surveys, trainings, etc.). On the 1st October 2011, the four RDC office had been established and equipped. All project activities were being implemented in October 2011.

After the review of the MR, spreadsheet calculations /15-29/ and the other documents to support calculations such as the web-based monitoring system /21-22/, GIS information /50-55/, and field records /30-32/, AENOR deems that project status is in compliance with applicable methodologies and implementation is in support of the VCS principles of Conservativeness and Accuracy.

There is no evidence of double counting or that the project has participated nor been rejected under any other GHG programs. GHG emission reductions and removals generated by the project are not included in an emission trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading. The project has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit.

Section 2.1.10 of the MR describes the contribution of the project to sustainable development goals (SDGs) of Zimbabwe. The project activities implemented during the monitoring period have a direct contribution to SDGs 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 13 and 15, as the information provided in the MR and the supporting documents has been able to demonstrate.

No new methodology deviations were applied during the monitoring period. Two methodology deviations from the validated PD still apply:

1. Creation of the point grid: PP created 6 sub-grids with regular spacing and random origin to merge them in order to obtain a sample size $\geq m_{DF}$ [eq.6 from pilot sample].
2. Selection of co-variates in eq. 7: no covariate was included in eq. 7. The form of equation 7 was estimated using a multiple regression analysis.

One PD deviation has been applied and validated for this monitoring period (fifth) (see section 3.3). PD deviations were included in previous MRs:

1. First MR: i) Soil carbon stock is not verified in the first verification but will be included in following verification events. The project proponents will also include the soil emissions from the 2011-2012 monitoring period in the second verification event.
2. Second MR: i) Soil carbon stock is not verified in the first or second verification but could be included in following verification events.
ii) Deviations related to the biomass SOPs: The SOPs have been slightly updated to give clarifications on procedures already previously applied in the field and to include improvements in the measurement.
iii) Contact info in section 1.4 was updated compared to the validated PD due to changes in the roles in project implementation.
3. Third MR: i) A gap validation was performed to allow the project developer to use the same climate method under CCB and VCS (refer to the third Monitoring Report going from 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2016, Section 4.2, pages 37 and 38).
ii) An analysis of uncertainty was conducted on the soil plots data, and it was determined that 6 sample plots (Forested) could be removed from the analysis. The uncertainty when considering only two strata (woodland and open woodland) only reduced after the removal of more than 7.5 plots. It was therefore decided to remove 3 plots from Open woodland and 3 plots from Woodland strata. After a random selection of plots, two plots were replaced - NY090 and M118. Those are replaced by plots B002 and H038.

No minor changes to the PD have been reported during the lifetime of the project.

Hence, after a complete review of the different documents provided and the interviews carried out, AENOR is able to confirm that the project implementation is in accordance with the project description contained in the PD and the implementation status described in the MR. There are not material discrepancies between project implementation and the project description.

4.3.2 Risks to the Project (G3.5)

Section 2.2.5 of the MR addresses the risks to the project benefits. The PP has identified natural and human-induced risks. The PP includes the description of each identified risk and the activities implemented to reduce or mitigate them.

The PP has identified the following risks and explained different activities or measures to mitigate them. The topics identified were: lack of water source for community gardens, COVID-19 lockdown restrictions, degraded beehives, under application of mulch, illegal settlements and deforestation, illegal fires, climate change and poaching. Specifically, poaching is a persistent human-induced risk for the expected

biodiversity benefits of the project and the wildlife population inside the project area; however, the project proponent implements anti-poaching activities such as snare removal and patrolling to release the pressure on wildlife. Through the implementation of those mitigation measures, the project has successfully reduced pressure on biodiversity caused by severe poaching.

The PP has categorized the health and safety risks to employees, and it is identified that project employees may face some risk while conducting their duties. It is stated that each employee needs to be fully informed of these risks before official employment commences, and the main risks project employees may face include, vehicle/motorbike accident, malaria, dangerous animals, armed poachers and injuries associated with firefighting activities.

Some of the measures to mitigate these risks are: drive at a safe speed and possess a valid driver's license as well as a good maintenance of the vehicles. All game scout that may encounter poachers or dangerous animals have received sufficient training in self-protection and antipoaching before employment and further refresher training by the project at the start of employment. Finally, all staff are also required to wear the personal protective clothing that is provided by the project and each manager is to have a first aid kit with contents sufficient to treat minor injuries and medicines to treat common illnesses and malaria. The first aid kit must be checked frequently and updated whenever necessary.

The PP has provided the Kariba REDD+ project Employees Risk Management Plan /6/, where the most relevant risks are explained as well as the way in which the staff need to be informed about the risks and the manner to minimize each of them.

AENOR deems that the PP correctly identified the risks to the project benefits but the most important is that created, and it is implementing actions to reduce or diminish the negative impacts of these risks in the benefits on the climate, community, and biodiversity. The audit team was able to confirm the implementation of the mitigation activities through pictures, records, and the testimony of the affected stakeholders interviewed /56-62/.

In addition, the PP has developed a Non-Permanence Risk Report /2/ to estimate the risks on Climate benefits in accordance with the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v 4.0.

4.3.3 Enhancement of High Conservation Values (G3.6)

The MR explains in section 2.2.6 that the HCVs identified for the project area (HCV1, HCV5 and HCV6) are either dependent on the prevention of deforestation or are maintained by the community-based approached. The main project goals, listed in section G3.1 of the validated CCB PD, enhance the HCVs. Measures to maintain HCVs are listed appropriately in the MR in section 2.2.6 and demonstration is provided in section 4.1.3 and 5.1.2 onwards.

AENOR has checked through the documental evidence provided by the PP and interviews to stakeholders the implementation of activities focused to protect forest areas, such firefight training activities /39/, early burnings /58/, patrolling /60/, etc. Many activities related to securing and satisfying the basic needs are developed, such as training in conservation farming /36/ and gardening /40/ /59/, boreholes perforation and maintenance /56/, alternative incomes like beekeeping /35/, etc. Given that forest conservation, including the protection and maintenance of HCV areas, is one of the key objectives of the project, and multiple project activities are dedicated specifically to maintaining or enhancing forest ecosystems and provided basic community services and diversification of incomes, impacts on HCVs have been positive as compared

to the without project scenario. Therefore, AENOR confirms that project activities are maintaining or even enhancing the HCVs.

4.3.4 Benefit Permanence (G3.7)

According to the information provided in section 2.2.7 of the MR, project activities are designed to be financially self-sufficient in the long run. After initial investments have been made and capacity reaches a certain level, the local population will be able and willing to continue with the project activities to generate additional income through the production of honey and increased agricultural yields. Additionally, the project has set up a sustainability fund (the Longevity Trust) which receives a portion of net revenues from carbon sales. The fund is managed by The Kariba Trust which is responsible for managing and investing the longevity fund and future allocations of this fund after the lifetime of the project.

AENOR verified with the beneficiaries of the project receiving training in activities such as conservation farming, gardening, tree planting and beekeeping and when asked if they would continue with these activities without the support of the project, all of them responded affirmatively. They justified they answer on the benefits that the improved agricultural techniques and the diversification of income in form of honey production provide them. All the interviewees stated that due to the trainings received from project activities, they have gained the know-how to implement these activities independently. Additionally, they showed considerable awareness on the importance of preserving the forest of the project and the benefits of its conservation for their daily lives.

Finally, the audit team reviewed the deed of the Longevity Trust /10/ and was able to verify the financial health of the project /8-9/. A report of the benefits provided by the Fund /34/ was reviewed by the audit team and its information cross-checked and confirmed by the community members interviewed.

Based on the above-mentioned verification and evidence, AENOR considers that the project is implementing activities that will be self-replicated by the project beneficiaries due to the capacitation provided by the project and the obvious benefits they generate to the community. The Trust ensure the provision of funding beyond the project lifetime. Thus, it is the opinion of the audit team that the PP has developed and is implementing reasonable measures to enhance project benefits beyond the project lifetime in accordance with the validated PD.

4.3.5 Stakeholder Engagement (G3.8 – G3.9)

Section 2.3 of the MR provides information on the stakeholder engagement regarding community consultation, public comment period publicity, distribution of project information and conflicts and grievances.

The audit team reviewed the project's adaptive management plan /4/ in which ongoing communication and consultation procedures are described and crosschecked this information with the community consultation processes described in the MR and the validated PD. Meeting reports were provided to the audit team /5/, demonstrating the application of the adaptive management plan in order to steer project implementation in accordance with community needs and inputs. The consultations described in the MR and the meetings reports was confirmed by the community members interviewed. Section 4.3.2 of the MR, in which the results of the community monitoring are described demonstrated that the implementation of project activities takes into consideration the needs expressed by the community members and that their input is considered in project development.

Project information, including the public comment period for verification, is widely distributed in the communities of the project area. The distribution methods include, besides the Verra Registry website, provision of the MR and summaries in local language through the Rural District Councils (RDCs), with hard copies to each local chief and councilor. Additionally, project information, updates, upcoming, verifications, public comment periods and grievances are published in the newsletter provided to the communities.

The audit team crosschecked these statements made on the MR with the community members interviewed during the verification process and all of them confirmed the distribution of project information, showed good knowledge of the project goals, activities, and results, as well as stated to have been informed in advance of the verification and the option to express any comment in relation to the project to the auditors. All interviewed showed good knowledge of the communication channels established by the project and which to use depending on the nature of the issue. The audit team reviewed the newsletter provided to the communities /7/ and verified that project implementation and monitoring information is being provided, as well as information on how to submit comments to the MR.

Thus, it is the opinion of AENOR that public comment period for verification was publicized to communities and other stakeholders using the communication methods identified in the validated PD and their submission of comments to VCS was facilitated. Project implementation and monitoring information, and other key documents, were distributed to communities and other stakeholders during the monitoring period. All community members interviewed stated that information is shared in public meetings in their own language.

AENOR deems that the stakeholder consultation practices carried out by the PP during the monitoring period ensures the participation of all community groups and other stakeholders in the design and implementation of the project, respecting their values, customs, and institution, as well as optimizing community benefits. Based on the evidence and the testimonies of community members and representatives directly consulted by the audit team, AENOR considers that continuous communication with stakeholders has been properly carried out throughout the monitoring period, directly with communities and other stakeholders or through their legitimate representatives, and that this communication has been effective in allowing stakeholders to influence the project implementation. The stakeholder input has been properly documented and it is appropriately reflected in the project's documents, such as the adaptative management meetings /4/ and council meetings /42/.

4.3.6 Stakeholder Grievance Redress Procedure (G3.10)

Annex 2 of the validated CCB PD presents the grievance procedure set up by the PP. The audit team required the community members to describe the procedure they should follow (according to them) to file any complaint or grievance with the project. All respondents demonstrated to have a good knowledge of the grievance procedure, as defined by the PP, and stated to have received information on the process by project staff.

According to section 2.3.4, no grievances have been received during the monitoring period. The verifiers asked all stakeholders interviewed, including community members, project beneficiaries and project employees, about any grievance they might had towards the project or knowledge of any existing grievance or complaint from other people. All interviewees responded negatively regarding the existence of any closed or pending grievance during the monitoring period. The audit team didn't find any evidence of grievance during the monitoring period.

According to the above evidence, AENOR deems that the grievance redress procedure is implemented according to the project's validated design.

4.3.7 Worker Relations (G4.3 – G4.6)

According to the MR, the project currently employs 21 full time staff, which have been trained to fulfill their obligations. The audit team interviewed project employees and through their statements evidence that they have received training on the relevant fields of their activities. The knowledge the interviewed employees demonstrated that all were trained and are well-versed in the skills needed to carry out their jobs.

Employees were asked about their recruitment process, and they expressed that the job openings are announced in project communities. The candidates are chosen based on interest for working and their merit. Equal opportunity is provided to all community members and there is no evidence of discrimination.

The employment and worker's rights in Zimbabwe are governed by the Labour Act. To ensure the workers know and use their rights, they are encouraged to form workers committees, within which all issues related to the employment are discussed and subsequently brought forward to the CGI team. The project operates legally in Zimbabwe and CGA is a legally registered entity. The project is therefore governed by the laws of the country. All employees are required to sign a legally binding employment contract. All general terms and conditions of employment are subject to the requirements put in place by the Labour Act. This is to ensure that both CGA and all their employee's fulfil their legal obligations. All employees of the Kariba REDD+ Project are informed about their rights at the commencement of their employment. Furthermore, to ensure the workers know and use their rights, they are encouraged to form workers committees, within which all issues related to the employment are discussed and subsequently brought forward to the CGI team. All employees interviewed by the audit team stated to be aware of their rights as workers and to be capacitated regarding those rights by the PP.

The PP has developed an Employee Risk Management Plan /6/, reviewed by the audit team, in which the occupational risks associated to each job position (on the ground manager, field officer, game scout, etc.) are identified and risk prevention measures are described. This document is used to inform employees on their occupational risk. When asked about risk prevention, all interviewed employees stated to have received capacitation regarding risk prevention and properly enumerated the risks associated to their job positions and the risk prevention measures.

AENOR did not detect incompliances checking the documents provided and interviewing to the workers. Then, the audit team deems that the project fulfills with CCB requirements related to labor relations.

4.3.8 Technical and Management Capacity (G4.2, G4.7)

According to the information provided by the PP, there has been no change in the project staff during this monitoring period. The technical skills of the PP and other partner organizations were maintained and that project activities were implemented successfully.

The audit team was able to review the management staff CVs /13/ and interview key staff from GCI and South Pole. It is the opinion of the audit team that they have the suitable and appropriate technical and management capacity to develop the project. The project proponent has a great team specialized in different capacities, mainly grouped in: Carbon Accounting, Community and Biodiversity and Project Management. Within these categories there are more activities in which the team is specialized. The project

team has the commitment to maintain the capacities, and due to this maintenance, the PP has stated that most of the project members are still being part of the project since its implementation. Specifically, for this monitoring period, there has not been changes in the staff.

The PP has provided the list of the main project staff, and it has been assessed by the VVB by the CV /13/ assessment. Additionally, the PP has provided the Carbon Green Africa (CGA) Team Leaders Operational Procedure to demonstrate the monitoring and management needs of the project are met. AENOR has reviewed the information provided and deems that they comply with the requirements for the proper development of the project.

Regarding the financial health, the audit team had access to financial information of the project, including sales invoices, revenue distribution sheets and cash flow statements /8-9/. Based on this evidence, the audit team deems that the financial health of the implementing organization is adequate to support project implementation.

Thus, AENOR deems that the PP and partner entities have the capacity to implement the project in accordance with the validated project design.

4.3.9 Legal Status (G5.1)

Section 2.5.1 of the MR refers to the validated CCB PD (sections G5.1 and G5.2) and validated VCS PD (section 1.11). There have been no changes in regulation since project validation.

Furthermore, the relevant laws pertaining to property rights include: the forestry Act of 1990; the Rural District Councils Act of 2002; and the Traditional Leaders Act of 1998.

The verification team has crosschecked the information provided on the validated PDD with the relevant laws mentioned above. It has been confirmed that no changes have been done since validation. The VVB has compared the laws described in section 2.5.1 of the MR with the general information of the project. Complementary, through the interviews performed by the VVB, AENOR did not find any evidence to demonstrate that the laws are not being abided. Therefore, AENOR did not detect any incompliances related to laws and regulations during the verification process.

4.3.10 Rights Protection and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (G5.3-G5.5)

According to the MR and the validated CCB PD, the land in the project area is communally owned. The Rural District Councils (RDCs), which include democratically elected councils for each ward and the local chiefs, administered the land at the district level. The PP provided for review the agreements signed between CGI and the RDCs and leaseholders /12/. These documents, verified by the auditors, include bilateral agreements and memorandums of agreement with all RDCs and leaseholders of all four districts in which the project area is located. The audit team has been able to verify that these documents evidence that the project recognizes, respects, and supports property and use rights in the project area. Free, prior, and informed consent has been obtained from all local communities affected by the project.

The project does not lead to involuntary removal or relocation of property rights holders from their lands or territories and have not forced rights holders to relocate activities important to their culture or livelihood, therefore no compensation was needed.

Additionally, interviews with local community members demonstrated to the auditors their full acceptance and agreement with the project activities. Furthermore, a common answer of the interviewees when asking about suggestions or comments on how the project could be improve was the request of project activities to be scaled up in order to reach and benefit more community members.

Based on the information provided in the MR and gathered from the PP and local stakeholders, AENOR can confirm that the project does not lead to the involuntary removal or relocation or property rights holders from their lands or territories and that the project protects the rights of indigenous peoples, communities, and other stakeholders in accordance with the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, and the validated project design.

4.3.11 Identification of Illegal Activities (G5.5)

The PP identified poaching of wildlife, illegal cutting of trees and illegal settlements as illegal activities that could affect the project's impacts. The project has implemented measures to prevent these activities, such as creating legal employment opportunities and alternative livelihoods (beekeeping /35/, conservation farming /36/ and gardening /59/, tree planting /37/) and antipoaching patrols. The PP stated that all incidences of illegal settlements and deforestation are reported to the local authorities. The project team also continues to engage with the general communities regularly through awareness raising campaigns.

In addition, the PP has demonstrated that some techniques and activities are being implemented to reduce illegal activities. For example, beekeeping adds value to standing forests and enables the locals of the area to generate income streams that do not cause deforestation.

Local community members interviewed confirmed the effectiveness of the measures in reducing illegal cutting, while patrol reports /60/ and the increase trends in animal species sightings since project start reported in section 5.1.1 of MR and recorded in biodiversity monitoring sheets /48/.

Thus, AENOR deems that the PP implements measure that are effective in the mitigation of illegal activities that could affect the project benefits.

4.4 Climate

4.4.1 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

Procedures for quantifying the GHG emission reductions were conducted in accordance with the approved VCS methodology VM0009: Methodology for Avoided Mosaic Deforestation of Tropical Forests, version 1.1. The verification team performed an intensive review of all input data, parameters, formulas, calculations, conversions, statistics and resulting uncertainties and output data to ensure consistency with the VCS documentation, methodologies and associated tools, and the PD. Further, the verification team reproduced calculations for selected samples to ensure accuracy of the results. Previously to these reproductions of some samples, the audit team reviewed and checked the document in a general way, checking the formula used and the source of the data and parameters. Conversion factors, formulas, and calculations were provided by PP in spreadsheet format /15-19/ to ensure all formulas were accessible for review. The PP also provided access to the web-based monitoring system MOVERS /21/ and a subset of monitoring data from the system to spreadsheet format /22/ for verification. Where applicable, references for analysis methods or default values were checked against relevant scientific literature for best practice.

Baseline emissions

As reported in section 3.2.1 of the MR and verified by the audit team, the PP applied equations 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27 and 29:

Total baseline emissions, eq.20:

$$C_{BE}^{[m]} = C_{BE,AGB}^{[m]} + C_{BE,AGNT}^{[m]} + C_{BE,BGB}^{[m]} + C_{BE,BGNT}^{[m]} + C_{BE,SDW}^{[m]} + C_{BE,SOIL}^{[m]}$$

Baseline emissions from above-ground biomass in trees, eq.21:

$$C_{BE,AGB}^{[m]} = F_{DF}(t_2^{[m]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m]})C_{AGB}^{[m]} - F_{DF}(t_2^{[m-1]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m-1]})C_{AGB}^{[m-1]}$$

Baseline emissions from above-ground biomass in non-trees, eq.23

$$C_{BE,AGNT}^{[m]} = F_{DF}(t_2^{[m]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m]})C_{AGNT}^{[m]} - F_{DF}(t_2^{[m-1]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m-1]})C_{AGNT}^{[m-1]}$$

Baseline emissions from below-ground biomass in trees, eq.24:

$$C_{BE,BGB}^{[m]} = p_{BGB} \left[F_{DF}(t_2^{[m]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m]})C_{BGB}^{[m]} - F_{DF}(t_2^{[m-1]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m-1]})C_{BGB}^{[m-1]} \right]$$

Baseline emissions from below-ground non-tree biomass, eq.26:

$$C_{BE,BGNT}^{[m]} = F_{DF}(t_2^{[m]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m]})C_{BGNT}^{[m]} - F_{DF}(t_2^{[m-1]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m-1]})C_{BGNT}^{[m-1]}$$

Baseline emissions from standing dead wood, eq.27:

$$C_{BE,SDW}^{[m]} = F_{DF}(t_2^{[m]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m]})C_{SDW}^{[m]} - F_{DF}(t_2^{[m-1]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m-1]})C_{SDW}^{[m-1]}$$

Baseline emissions from soil, eq.29:

$$C_{BE,SOIL}^{[m]} = \sum_{i \in M} S(t_2^{[m-1]} - t_2^{[m-i-1]}, t_2^{[m]} - t_2^{[m-i]}, \hat{\lambda}, \hat{\lambda}_{max}) \left[F_{DF}(t_2^{[m-i]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m-i]}) - F_{DF}(t_2^{[m-i-1]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m-i-1]}) \right] C_{SOIL}^{[m-i]}$$

The following table summarizes the results achieved by the PP for each equation:

Equation	Parameter	Woodland	Open Woodland	Total
Eq.21	$C_{BE,AGB}^{[m=5]}$	1,406,096	2,721,627	4,127,723
Eq.23	$C_{BE,AGNT}^{[m=5]}$	35,384	53,483	88,867
Eq.24	$C_{BE,BGB}^{[m=5]}$	590,556	1,143,090	1,733,646
Eq.26	$C_{BE,BGNT}^{[m=5]}$	14,862	22,463	37,325
Eq.27	$C_{BE,SDW}^{[m=5]}$	38,491	15,368	53,859
Eq.29	$C_{BE,SOIL}^{[m=5]}$	778,961	1,069,468	1,848,429
Eq.20	$C_{BE}^{[m]}$	2,864,350	5,025,499	7,889,849

The following table summarizes the parameters used/estimated by the PP for the calculation of the baseline emissions and the means used for their verification.

Parameter	Equation	Value	Assessment procedure
$F_{DF} \left(t_2^{[m=4]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m=4]} \right)$	21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29	0.25507	Value verified /15/ with validated PD.
$C_{AGB}^{[m=4]}$ WL	21	36,358,952.38	Value verified /15/ with previous MR and VR.
$C_{AGB}^{[m=4]}$ OWL	21	53,287,677.42	Value verified /15/ with previous MR and VR.
$F_{DF} \left(t_2^{[m=5]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m=5]} \right)$	21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29	0.31884	Value verified /15/ with validated PD.
$C_{AGB}^{[m=5]}$ WL	21	33,496,969.72	Calculations from sample /30/ verified and reproduced /21-23/.
$C_{AGB}^{[m=5]}$ OWL	21	51,165,836.71	Calculations from sample /30/ verified and reproduced /21-23/.
$C_{BE,AGB}^{[m=5]}$ WL	21	1,406,096	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BE,AGB}^{[m=5]}$ OWL	21	2,721,627	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BE,AGB}^{[m=5]}$ Total	20	4,127,723	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{AGNT}^{[m=4]}$ WL	23	614,550.37	Value verified /15/ with previous MR and VR.
$C_{AGNT}^{[m=4]}$ OWL	23	808,545.78	Value verified /15/ with previous MR and VR.
$C_{AGNT}^{[m=5]}$ WL	23	602,613.43	Calculations from sample /30/ verified and reproduced /21-23/.
$C_{AGNT}^{[m=5]}$ OWL	23	814,572.92	Calculations from sample /30/ verified and reproduced /21-23/.
$C_{BE,AGNT}^{[m=5]}$ WL	23	35,384	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BE,AGNT}^{[m=5]}$ OWL	23	53,483	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BE,AGNT}^{[m=5]}$ Total	20	88,867	Calculation reproduced /15/.
p_{BGB}	24	100	Value verified /15/ with validated PD.
$C_{BGB}^{[m=4]}$ WL	24	15,270,769.70	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BGB}^{[m=4]}$ OWL	24	22,380,832.17	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BGB}^{[m=5]}$ WL	24	14,068,722.43	Calculations from sample /30/ verified and reproduced /21-23/.
$C_{BGB}^{[m=5]}$ OWL	24	21,489,676.29	Calculations from sample /30/ verified and reproduced /21-23/.
$C_{BE,BGB}^{[m=5]}$ WL	24	590,556	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BE,BGB}^{[m=5]}$ OWL	24	1,143,090	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BE,BGB}^{[m=5]}$ Total	20	1,733,646	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BGNT}^{[m=4]}$ WL	26	258,112.77	Value verified /15/ with previous MR and VR.
$C_{BGNT}^{[m=4]}$ OWL	26	339,576.79	Value verified /15/ with previous MR and VR.
$C_{BGNT}^{[m=5]}$ WL	26	253,100.87	Calculations from sample /30/ verified and reproduced /21-23/.

Parameter	Equation	Value	Assessment procedure
$C_{BGNT}^{[m=5]}$ OWL	26	342,112.02	Calculations from sample /30/ verified and reproduced /21-23/.
$C_{BE,BGNT}^{[m=5]}$ WL	26	14,862	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BE,BGNT}^{[m=5]}$ OWL	26	22,463	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BE,BGNT}^{[m=5]}$ Total	20	37,325	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{SDW}^{[m=4]}$ WL	27	96,627.25	Value verified /15/ with previous MR and VR.
$C_{SDW}^{[m=4]}$ OWL	27	368,468.80	Value verified /15/ with previous MR and VR.
$C_{SDW}^{[m=5]}$ WL	27	198,023.88	Calculations from sample /30/ verified and reproduced /21-23/.
$C_{SDW}^{[m=5]}$ OWL	27	342,973.04	Calculations from sample /30/ verified and reproduced /21-23/.
$C_{BE,SDW}^{[m=5]}$ WL	27	38,491	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BE,SDW}^{[m=5]}$ OWL	27	15,368	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BE,SDW}^{[m=5]}$ Total	20	53,859	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$S(t_2^{[m-1]} - t_2^{[m-i-1]}, t_2^{[m]} - t_2^{[m-i]}, \hat{\lambda}, \hat{l}_{max})$	29	0.28234	Value verified /15/ with validated model (3 rd MR).
$C_{SOIL}^{[m=5]}$ WL	29	43,264,423.24	Calculations from sample /31/ verified and reproduced /16/ /18/.
$C_{SOIL}^{[m=5]}$ OWL	29	59,399,529.21	Calculations from sample /31/ verified and reproduced /16/ /18/.
$C_{BE,SOIL}^{[m=5]}$ WL	29	778,961	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BE,SOIL}^{[m=5]}$ OWL	29	1,069,468	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BE,SOIL}^{[m=5]}$ Total	20	1,848,429	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_{BE}^{[m=5]}$	20	7,889,849	Calculation reproduced /15/.

Project emissions

No burning of biomass has taken place during the monitoring period. Thus, as per methodology VM0009 v1.1, the project emissions are 0.

Leakage emissions

Leakage emissions are estimated as per equation 32 of the VM0009:

$$C_{LE}^{[m]} = \hat{f}_{LE}^{[m]} C_{BE}^{[m]}$$

The estimated leakage factor for the monitoring period is determined according to the conditions of equation 33:

$$\text{Let } \bar{o}^{[m]} = \frac{1}{\#(J^{[m]})} \sum_{i \in J^{[m]}} o_i$$

$$\text{Let } x = \max \begin{cases} F_{LE}(t_2^{[m]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m]}, \hat{\delta}_{LE}) \\ F_{LE}(t_2^{[reevaluation-1]}, \hat{\eta}^{[reevaluation-1]}, \hat{\delta}_{LE}) \\ \bar{o}^{[m-1]} \end{cases}$$

$$\hat{f}_{LE}^{[m]} = \frac{\alpha_{LE}}{p_{forest} \alpha_{project}} \times \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \bar{o}^{[m]} - x \leq 0 \\ \bar{o}^{[m]} - x & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

Considering that this is the last monitoring period prior to baseline re-evaluation, $F_{LE}(t_2^{[m]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m]}, \hat{\delta}_{LE})$ and $F_{LE}(t_2^{[reevaluation-1]}, \hat{\eta}^{[reevaluation-1]}, \hat{\delta}_{LE})$ are the same. Since the difference between $\bar{o}^{[m]}$ and the maximum of the options above is negative, the leakage factor $\hat{f}_{LE}^{[m]}$ ends up as 0. Thus, leakage emissions for the monitoring period are 0.

The following table summarizes the parameters used/estimated by the PP for the calculation of the leakage emissions and the means used for their verification.

Parameter	Equation	Value	Assessment procedure
$\bar{o}^{[m]}$	33	0.1080	Input data from sample /32/ verified and calculation reproduced /17/.
$F_{LE}(t_2^{[m]}, \hat{\eta}^{[m]}, \hat{\delta}_{LE})$	33	0.2164	Calculation reproduced /17/ with validated model from PD.
$F_{LE}(t_2^{[reevaluation-1]}, \hat{\eta}^{[reevaluation-1]}, \hat{\delta}_{LE})$	33	0.2164	Calculation reproduced /17/ with validated model from PD.
$\bar{o}^{[m-1]}$	33	0.12	Value verified /17/ with previous MR and VR.
$\hat{f}_{LE}^{[m]}$	32	0	Calculation reproduced /17/.
$C_{LE}^{[m]}$	32	0	Calculation reproduced /17/.

Uncertainty

Confidence deduction $C_U^{[m]}$ is estimated using equation 35 of the VM0009, which in turn depends on the average uncertainty in carbon stocks and the baseline model at monitoring period $U^{[m]}$ (eq.36).

Confidence deduction, eq.35:

$$C_U^{[m]} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } U^{[m]} \leq 0.15 \\ \frac{C_{BE}^{[m]}(U^{[m]} - 0.15)}{1 - 0.15} & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

Since $U^{[m]}$ is lower than 0.15, there is no confidence deduction for the monitoring period. The following table summarizes the parameters used/estimated by the PP for the determination of the confidence deduction.

Parameter	Equation	Value	Assessment procedure
U_{DF}	15	0.04634	Value verified /15/ with validated PD.
U_{SCL}	19	0.13607	Value verified /15/ with validated PD.
$\hat{\sigma}_{SE,AGB}$	47	6268068.73	Calculation reproduced /17/ with validated model from PD.
$\hat{\sigma}_{SE,BGB}$	47	2632588.87	Calculation verified /21-22/.
$\hat{\sigma}_{SE,AGNT}$	47	77601.56	Calculation verified /21-22/.
$\hat{\sigma}_{SE,BGNT}$	47	32592.65	Calculation verified /21-22/.
$\hat{\sigma}_{SE,SDW}$	47	137728.53	Calculation verified /21-22/.
$\hat{\sigma}_{SE,SOC}$	49	2126512.29	Calculation reproduced /18/
$\hat{\sigma}_{SE,TOTAL}$	63	7125118.79	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$U_{TOTAL}^{[m]}$	67	0.06195	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$U^{[m]}$	36	0.07662	Calculation reproduced /15/.
$C_U^{[m]}$	35	0	Calculation reproduced /15/.

Net GHG emission reductions and removals

The net GHG emission reductions and removals are estimated using equation 34 of VM0009:

$$C_{BE}^{[m]} = C_{BE}^{[m]} - C_U^{[m]} - C_{PE}^{[m]} - C_{LE}^{[m]}$$

The following table summarizes the GHG emission reductions and removals per vintage:

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)
2019	1,972,462	0	0	1,972,462
2020	3,944,925	0	0	3,944,925
2021	1,972,462	0	0	1,972,462
Total	7,889,849	0	0	7,889,849

The net anthropogenic GHG reductions and removals due to the project activity for the monitoring period (01-July-2019 to 30-June-2021) amount to 7,889,849 tCO₂e. The total number of buffer credits that to be deposited into the AFOLU pooled buffer account are 1,104,579 and were estimated applying risk rating of 14% to the net carbon stock changes. Thus, the VCUs eligible for issuance are 6,785,270.

AENOR reproduced calculations in the spreadsheets /15-18/ to achieve the same results and deems they are depicted clearly and correctly in the provided sheets. AENOR verification team was able to trace calculations directly from the field measurements (original field records /31-33/) and found no material transposition errors to the data management system (MOVERS /21/). Formulae used are in compliance with the MR, the PD and the methodology. The default values used to determine the parameters are appropriate as well. Thus, the net amount of VCUs to be issued is accurate and realistic.

AENOR verified the consistency and accuracy of each parameter detailed in it Section 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 of the MR by crosschecking the information in the MR with the information in PD as well as checking values and reproducing the calculations in the spreadsheet calculation package /15-19/ and did not find inconsistencies. The audit team verified that all the parameters used in the spreadsheets and reported in the MR matched with the data on MOVERS /21/. Therefore, AENOR deems that values reported for the parameters are accurate and consistent. AENOR checked that the values of these parameters are appropriately and correctly used in equations

The data and parameters monitored to calculate the VCU to be issued are the ones stated in section 3.1.2 of the MR. AENOR checked that the list of parameters to be monitored was complete and consistent with information in the monitoring plan of the PD.

Regarding the accuracy of spreadsheet, formulae, conversions and aggregations and consistent use of data and parameters, the PP elaborated a complete procedure to assure the accuracy and appropriateness of data. During the verification process, AENOR not only verified the original records /20/ /30-32/ and spreadsheet calculations /15-19/, data and parameters but also the AENOR team could verify that the PP conducted a rigorous QC/QA procedure of its field measurements, including assessments of uncertainty /15-16/ /21/. Thus, AENOR deems the PP performed good practices in this assessment and concludes that GHG reductions and removals were quantified correctly in accordance with the PD and applied methodology.

AENOR did not find inconsistencies between the PD, technical annexes, MR, and spreadsheet calculations.

After a deep and thorough review and reproduction of calculations and the corresponding tracks to the other spreadsheets, AENOR deems the parameters monitored and available at validation are correct, reliable, and consistent. Information in the monitoring report is in compliance with the PD, the calculations provided and the applicable methodologies. Then, the results showed in the MR are reliable, consistent, and accurate.

4.4.2 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

The data and parameters used to determine GHG emission reductions and removals are listed in section 3.1 of the MR.

The PP has standardized data collection and processing through SOPs and perform multiple quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) assessments. A web-based data entry form is used for all the data, except soil carbon and leakage, measured in the field, as required by the methodology. All data sheets included a field to record crew composition. Hard copies are kept for the data on soil carbon. The data is analyzed using an excel sheet and various copies are kept as a backup. Additional QA/QC procedures include:

- SOP are used for field data measurements.
- Training courses are held for all relevant personnel on all data collection and analysis procedures. Trainings and field protocol for sampling forest degradation are implemented.
- A check cruise has been established. A random sample of 20 biomass plots were re-measured in this monitoring period. These plots were subject to re-measurement by a different field crew with the same level of training, following the same SOP. The results of the original monitoring session

were compared with the outcome of the QA/QC samples to ensure that no non-conformities are identified.

- A centralized data system (such as an online server-based and backed-up MOVERS) is used for all the pools, except for soil carbon and leakage.

AENOR has verified that the monitoring plan is being implemented as the described in the project description. AENOR checked that key workers are fully involved in monitoring events (training, measuring, archiving, reporting, quality control, etc.). QA/QC procedures are considered strict at identifying, reviewing, and handling inconsistencies found in order to improve the management of the project.

Roles and responsibilities along with data management and archival system are also detailed in the monitoring report and other supported documents.

Interviews with the project staff and inspection of data and results demonstrated that the PP possess all the competencies required for reporting of GHG emissions reductions on accurate way.

Data presented to the audit team were clear and coherent and processing steps could be traced to the corresponding sections of the methodology and monitoring plan with transparency.

The monitoring plan provides means for internal data review and quality control, and the data presented by the PP included the results of these internal assessments. AENOR considers that information provided is sufficiency and the quality of that information is appropriate to determine the GHG reductions.

4.4.3 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

The project utilized the non-permanence risk analysis tool, AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool 4.0, to assess risk according to internal risk, external risk, natural risk, and mitigation measures for minimizing risk. The verification team reviewed the Non-Permanence Risk Report /2/ following VCS Standard v4.2 section 3.2.9 and confirmed that the project adheres to the requirements set out in the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool.

At all levels, the verification team evaluated the rationale, appropriateness, and justifications of risk ratings chosen by the project proponent. Each risk factor was thoroughly assessed for conformance. A brief review of each factor is shown in the table below.

Risk factor	Risk Rating	Assessment
Internal Risks		
Project Management: It is assessed using table 1 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool.	-2 (total may be less than zero)	a) The project does not consider planting activities to claim GHG credits. Risk rating=0 is justified. b) Deforestation and degradation agents in the project area are the local population due to the conversion of forest land to cropland or grazing land for subsistence and small-scale farming, logging of timber for domestic use and fuelwood collection. Risk rating=2 is justified.

Risk factor	Risk Rating	Assessment
		c) Management team includes individuals with significant experience in all skills necessary to successfully undertake project activities Risk rating=0 is justified. d) Management team maintains a presence in-country and less than one travel day from project site. Risk rating=0 is justified. e) The management team has extensive experience in AFOLU project design and carbon accounting under the VCS program. Risk rating=-2 is justified. f) The project has adopted an adaptive management plan. The plan defines internal responsibilities and ways of communication and reporting defining an ongoing monitoring and adaptation process for the project. Risk rating=-2 is justified.
Financial viability: It is assessed using table 2 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool.	0 (total may not be less than zero)	a)-d) The project has already reached breakeven point. Risk rating=0 is justified. e)-h) The project has already reached breakeven point. Risk rating=0 is justified. i) Not applicable.
Opportunity Cost: It is assessed using table 3 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool.	-2 (total may be less than zero)	a)-f) The baseline activities over the length of the project crediting period are subsistence-driven. Risk rating=0 is justified. g) Not applicable. h) The project has established a fund that constitutes a legally binding commitment to continue the management practices that protect the carbon stocks over the length of the crediting period. Risk rating=-2 is justified. i) Not applicable.
Project Longevity: It is assessed using table 4 of the VCS AFOLU Risk Tool.	15 (total may not be less than zero)	a) Not applicable b) Contracts have been signed with RDCs and leaseholders. The contracts cover the entire project lifetime of 30 years. Risk rating=15 is justified.
Total internal risk=11 (total may not be less than zero)		
External Risks		

Risk factor	Risk Rating	Assessment
Land Tenure and resources access/impact: It shall be assessed using table 6 of the Risk Tool.	0 (total may not be less than zero)	a) Not applicable. b) The ownership is hold by the local communities, represented by four RDCs in the project area. Risk rating=2 is justified. c)-d) There are no disputes over land tenure or ownership of the project area nor disputes over access/use rights. Risk rating=0 is justified. e) Not applicable. f) CGI, RDCs and leaseholders signed agreements over 30 years, covering the entire project crediting period. Risk rating=-2 is justified. g) Not applicable.
Community engagement: It shall be assessed using table 7 of the Risk Tool.	-5 (total may be less than zero)	a) Local Stakeholder Consultations have been done in the entire project area. Risk rating=0 is justified. b) Stakeholder consultations have been conducted on 27% of land in addition to the project area. It can therefore be assumed that more than 20% of households living within 20 km of the project boundary outside the project area, and who are reliant to the project area, have been consulted. Risk rating=0 is justified. c) The project generates net positive impacts on social and economic well-being of local communities is validated under the CCB Standards Risk rating=-5 is justified.
Political Risks: It shall be assessed using table 8 of the Risk Tool.	6 (total may not be less than zero)	a-e) Zimbabwe presents a score of -0.79 according to the World Bank Institute's Worldwide Governance Indicators. AENOR verified the value and reliability of source. Risk rating=6 is justified. f) Not applicable
Total external risks=1 (Total may not be less than zero)		
Natural risks		
Fire Risk: It shall be assessed using table 10 of the Risk Tool.	LS*M=1.25	The likelihood of a natural fire is less than 10 years, with minor significance to carbon stocks. This project is also implementing significant fire mitigation activities such as firefighting trainings and early burnings. Thus LS= 5 is reasonable. Mitigation (M) measures: 0.25

Risk factor	Risk Rating	Assessment
Pest and disease outbreaks: It shall be assessed using table 10 of the Risk tool.	LS*M=0	Several studies have shown a negative correlation between the biodiversity of ecosystems and the emergence of outbreaks of pests and diseases that affect these ecosystems. Considering that the project will enhance the native habitats and protect its species, it is assumed that no loss of the carbon stocks will be produced. Thus LS= 0 is reasonable. Mitigation (M) measures: Not applicable.
Extreme weather: It shall be assessed using table 10 of the Risk tool.	LS*M=0.5	Zimbabwe has been experiencing droughts-related problems during the latest years; however, mopane woodlands and miombo woodlands, which are the major vegetation covers found in the project area, are highly resistant to droughts As part of its agricultural improvement activities, the project enhances drought-resistant species and varieties as well as conservational agriculture Thus LS= 1 is reasonable. Mitigation (M) measures: 0.5
Geological risks: It shall be assessed using table 10 of the Risk Tool.	LS*M=0	Even though Kariba is located within a region of medium risk of earthquakes, the physical characteristic of the environment creates an insignificant risk for the carbon stocks in case of the occurrence of such event. Thus LS= 0 is reasonable. Mitigation (M) measures: Not applicable
Total natural risks=1.75		
OVERALL RISK RATING=11+1+1.25=13.25 Then an overall risk rating of 14% is considered.		

AENOR has checked that information provided in the NPRR for the monitoring period is consistent with supporting documents provided. The assumptions and justifications provided to determine the risk rating of each risk factor are elaborated and they are based on provided documents using conservative assessments. AENOR deems that information provided is consistent and appropriate from reliable sources. Thus, the overall risk rating of 14% is credible and realistic.

4.4.4 Dissemination of Climate Monitoring Plan and Results (CL3.2)

Project information, including the monitoring plan and results, is widely distributed in the communities of the project area. The distribution methods include, besides the Verra Registry website, provision of the MR and summaries in local language through the RDCs, with hard copies to each local chief and councilor. Additionally, monitoring results are published in the newsletter provided to the communities.

The audit team crosschecked these statements made on the MR with the community members interviewed during the verification process and all of them confirmed the distribution of project information, showed good knowledge of the project goals, activities, and results. The audit team reviewed the newsletter provided to the communities /7/ and verified that monitoring information and results are being provided. Thus, it is the opinion of AENOR that the results of climate monitoring have been disseminated in accordance with the validated project design during the monitoring period.

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

The validated PD considers as main adaptation strategy the diversification of income beyond agriculture, different crops and varieties, irrigation and water conservation and conservational agriculture.

The PP has demonstrated the implementation of this strategy, including the promotion of honey production /35/, conservation farming and gardening /36/ /40/ /59/, and the improvement of irrigation through the construction and maintenance of boreholes and solar water pumps /56/. All project beneficiaries interviewed have stated that thanks to project activities they have been able to diversify their source of income (honey production) and that the yields of their crops have increased (conservation farming), allowing them to sell the surplus.

Additionally, the firefighting trainings /39/ and early burnings /58/ reduce climate change associated risks such as wildfires, protecting community assets and biodiversity in the project area. The development of boreholes helps to adapt to increasing droughts predicted, as well.

It is the opinion of the audit team that the activities implemented contribute to increase the resilience of communities to climate change effects, reducing the pressure of these communities as well on the forests of the project area. This has a direct effect on the conservation of the habitat and reduction of poaching. Thus, the audit team deems that activities implemented assist communities and biodiversity to adapt to the probable impacts of climate change, mitigating their effect.

4.5 Community

4.5.1 Community Impacts (CM1.1)

The MR states in section 4.1.1 the community impacts achieved by the project during the monitoring period. The following table summarizes the impacts per community group during the monitoring period and the documental evidence assessed by the audit team to verify them:

Community Group	Impact	Change in Well-being	Evidence assessed
Local communities living in the Binga, Nyaminyami, Hurungwe and Mbire RDCs and the community leaders from these four districts (community leaders include representatives of local associations, traditional leaders, the RDCs and local NGOs).	Improved knowledge and skills	255 training workshops on improved agriculture and community gardens, 71 beekeeping workshops, and 3 workshops on tree planting and seedling production conducted.	/35-37/ /40/
	Improved infrastructure in the project area	2,719 km of road maintained, and 137 boreholes repaired and maintained.	/56/ /61/
Community leaders from Binga, Nyaminyami, Hurungwe and Mbire RDCs (community leaders include	Improved tools and technology	Community leaders benefited from the capacity building. Anti-poaching and fire	/39/ /42/ /60/

Community Group	Impact	Change in Well-being	Evidence assessed
representatives of local associations, traditional leaders, the RDCs and local NGOs).		management activities involved community leaders from local associations, NGOs and RDCs.	
	Improved investment in the four participating districts	Portion of all net revenues from the sale of carbon credits contributed towards a sustainability fund (Longevity Trust)	/9/ /10/
Local communities living in the Binga, Nyaminyami, Hurungwe and Mbire RDCs	Improved health and education in the project area.	17 clinics and 46 supported. Improved nutrition and income from community gardens.	/40/ /57/ /59/ 59/
	Improved food security	12,926 people recorded to be practicing conservation farming techniques. More than 16,000 people positively impacted both directly and indirectly by community gardens.	/36/ /43/ /40/ /58/
	Improved access to water (water resources)	137 boreholes repaired and maintained. Over 34,250 people estimated to have been positively impacted	/43/ /56/
	Improved employment opportunities	21 permanent staff	/43/ /64/
	Improved availability of forest and non-timber products	Forest conservation in the project provides important natural resources and ecosystem services to local community members in the project area.	/44-45/
	Improved natural capital	Forest conservation in the project area protects wildlife and biodiversity in the project area. Healthy ecosystems contribute to	/21/ /48-49/ /63/

Community Group	Impact	Change in Well-being	Evidence assessed
		valuable ecosystem services which many local community members rely upon for their livelihoods.	

In addition to the documental evidence listed above, the community impacts were verified via interviews to the local stakeholders. As described in section 2.2 and 2.4 of this report, sampling of all reported project beneficiaries was carried in order to interview them. The sample size was calculated applying the formula presented in section 2.2. The interviewees were selected using a stratified random sampling approach, considering for the stratification the different categories of benefits. The following table summarizes the number of stakeholders interviewed per district to verify the community impacts (see Appendix 2 for the full list of interviewees):

Category	Number of interviews				
	Mbire District	Binga District	Hurungwe District	Nyaminyami District	Total
Project employees	4	3	1	3	11
Improved Agriculture-Conservation farming	14	11	11	11	47
Improved Agriculture - Gardening/ Garden support	14	12	12	16	54
Tree Planting/ Nursery Establishment	12	8	8	8	36
Beekeeping	13	8	8	8	37
Borehole resuscitation	2	2	2	1	7
Schools support	9	4	2	12	27
Clinics support	-	10	1	6	17
Early burning/ Road maintenance	1	2	1	1	5
Total	69	60	46	66	241

In total, 241 local stakeholders were interviewed, including both beneficiaries from project activities and local community members employed by the project. General questions were asked to all interviews about the relation with the project, services from the forest and access to it, improvement of the livelihood thanks to the project, participation in consultation processes, communication channels, and existence of conflicts and grievance. Additionally, sets of specific question were asked depending on the type of beneficiary to better assess the effective impact of each project activity.

All the reported impacts were confirmed by the interviewed stakeholders. In the opinion of AENOR, the assessment of impacts is accurate and reflects faithfully the project benefits on communities. Based in all the documents reviewed abovementioned and the opinion expressed by the interviewed local stakeholders, the audit team deems that the net impact of project activities on community groups is positive.

4.5.2 Net Positive Community Well-being (CM1.1)

The PP carried out a survey about satisfaction with the project and its impacts between April and May 2021, interviewing 380 people, including local community members, direct project beneficiaries and employees. Section 4.1.2 of the MR presents the results of the survey, which have been verified and cross-checked by the audit team with the original survey records /43-44/.

The survey's results show no perception of any negative effect from the project, considering the majority of the respondents that the project has positively or very positively impacted them and being satisfied or very satisfied with the project. This perception was confirmed by all project stakeholders interviewed by the audit team, showing none of them any hint of dissatisfaction with the project. The most common response to the question regarding any suggestion to improve the project was that it should be expanded to further incorporate and benefit more people.

Based on this evidence and the nature of the project activities' design and implementation, the audit team deems that the net impact of project activities on community groups is positive.

4.5.3 Protection of High Conservation Values (CM1.2)

According to the assessment made by the PP in the validated PD, the community related HVC that might be affected by the project are *HCV5: Natural areas critical for meeting the basic needs of local people* and *HCV6: Areas critical for maintaining the cultural identity of local communities*.

The survey mentioned in the previous section includes specific questions related to access to the forest for basic and cultural needs. All respondents stated that their access was not restricted. The same result was achieved in the interviews carried out by the audit team as part of the verification process. Thus, AENOR deems that the community related HVCs have not been negatively affected by the project. Furthermore, the project is protecting the forests and, thus, the HCVs.

4.5.4 Other Stakeholder Impacts (CM2.2-CM2.3)

According to validated PD, no negative offsite stakeholder impacts are expected to occur. As stated in section 4.2.1 of the MR, the project focuses on providing communities with attractive alternative livelihoods, which reduce the pressure on local forests, by providing positive incentives.

The only identified potentially affected stakeholders include the local populations from the four participating RDCs which do not form part of the project. However, the council members actively participate in the project via regular meetings /5/ /42/, as part of the adaptive management /4/. The continuous consultation allows the PP to identify any negative impact and put in place the adequate measures to prevent it. The audit team considers this approach to be appropriate to prevent any minimize any negative impact on other stakeholders.

Assessment by the audit team concluded that the likelihood of net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups is adequately addressed in the MR. In opinion of AENOR, the claim of net positive other stakeholder well-being impacts during the monitoring period is supported by evidence (as discussed in previous sections), is credible and reflects faithfully the project benefits on these communities. According to AENOR observations, the net impacts of the project activities are positive for each stakeholder group.

4.5.5 Community Monitoring Plan (CM3.1, CM3.2, GL2.5)

A plan for monitoring community impacts was developed early in the project lifetime and successfully validated. The Community monitoring plan, including the project areas, project activity, key results, indicator or variable per district, data collection method, targeted community, monitored impacts, frequency of monitoring and results of the most recent monitoring, is included in section 4.3.2 of the MR.

All community activities are monitored continuously by the OGM teams and are reported upon verification. The progress in implementing these activities is monitored through a set of indicators measuring direct effects. These indicators are tracked on an on-going basis by the OGM teams, while activities are implemented.

In order to monitor indirect socio-economic effects of the project, a second set of indicators is used. These indicators are assessed in survey campaigns, which are carried out prior to verifications, i.e. at least every 5 years. The surveys address a) the general population in the project area b) direct beneficiaries of the project and c) employees of the project. The surveys also cover the High Conservation Values (HCVs) identified in the project area.

The activities described within the monitoring plan are: improved agriculture (conservation farming and community gardens), beekeeping, fuel wood plantations, social forestry, fire management, alternative and sustainable construction, newsletters and community and project sustainability fund.

All these activities described in section 4.3.2 of the MR have been summarized for all RDCs, namely Binga, Nyaminyami, Hurungwe and Mbire.

The detailed information provided in the MR and monitoring record /43/ confirmed to AENOR that the monitoring plan is in place and monitoring is going on.

AENOR reviewed the community monitoring SOP /46/ and confirms that the dates, frequency, and sampling methods used are in accordance with the validated PD and with the procedures and systematics used in the verification event. AENOR confirms that community monitoring plan is implemented as described in the MR and the validated PD. Complementary, AENOR has crosschecked all these information with the information obtained from the interviews carried on during the audit and deems that the information provided on the MR is reliable and does not have evidence to demonstrate it is wrong. All the interviewees were able to talk and provide information about the different activities performed during this monitoring period. Therefore, AENOR deems the information provided is reliable.

4.5.6 Community Monitoring Plan Dissemination (CM3.3)

Project information, including the monitoring plan and results, is widely distributed in the communities of the project area. The distribution methods include, besides the Verra Registry website, provision of the MR and summaries in local language through the RDCs, with hard copies to each local chief and councilor. Additionally, monitoring results are published in the newsletter provided to the communities.

The audit team crosschecked these statements made on the MR with the community members interviewed during the verification process and all of them confirmed the distribution of project information, showed good knowledge of the project goals, activities, and results. The audit team reviewed the newsletter provided to the communities /7/ and verified that monitoring information and results are being provided.

Thus, it is the opinion of AENOR that the results of community monitoring have been disseminated in accordance with the validated project design during the monitoring period.

4.5.7 Optional Gold Level: Barriers to Benefits (GL2.3)

Not applicable. The project is not seeking Community Gold Level validation or verification.

4.5.8 Optional Gold Level: Protections for Poorer and the more Vulnerable (GL2.4)

Not applicable. The project is not seeking Community Gold Level validation or verification.

4.6 Biodiversity

4.6.1 Biodiversity Changes (B1.1)

The MR states in section 5.1.1 the biodiversity changes achieved by the project during the monitoring period, considering these changes as positive for biodiversity conservation. The reported trends are the following:

- Increase in total sightings of threatened species: sightings of during the monitoring period were eight times higher than those reported during the project first full year.
- Increase in total sightings of all species: sightings of all species during 2020 was 14 times higher than the first full year of the project and for 2021 period, 12 times higher.

The increase trend in the number of sightings since project start demonstrate, in opinion of the audit team, the effectiveness of the project in preserving the biodiversity of the project area and the increase in the number of individuals and diversity.

The verifiers checked the evidence provided by the PP /47-49/ and asked all interviewed stakeholders (see Appendix 2) about sightings of local fauna in the project area during the monitoring period. Community members reported encounters with wildlife, such as elephants, hippos, antelopes, baboons and other small primates, kudus, impalas, buffaloes, crocodiles, eagles, hyenas, and lions. When asked about their opinion regarding the trends on encounters, the majority of community members interviewed declared that frequency sightings have continuously increased since project start. This information was confirmed by the project field staff interviewed, which also provide description on the procedures for biodiversity monitoring and recording of sightings.

In opinion of AENOR, information about benefits on biodiversity from project activities is accurate since is based on verifiable records. The project's assessment of changes in biodiversity resulting from project activities in the project zone during the monitoring period are accurate and well justified.

4.6.2 High Conservation Values Protected (B1.2)

The project area, as per the validated PD, includes de biodiversity related *HCV1: Globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of threatened species*. Specifically, the project area is the habitat of the painted dog (EN), elephant (EN), lion (VU), leopard (VU) and cheetah (VU).

The main goal of the project is the conservation of the forests and natural areas within project area, which are the habitat of the above-mentioned species. With that aim, project activities are designed to reduce deforestation and enhance local fauna populations. Thus, no project activity that might negatively affect the HCV is implemented.

Moreover, the adaptive management approach /4/ implemented by the project /5/ is used to mitigate any potential indirect negative impact on the HCV, such as human-wildlife conflicts. In case of risk of these conflicts arises, scouts are deployed in the area warn community members or prevent poaching activities.

Based on the review of the project activities' design, the opinion of the stakeholders interviewed and the growing trend of threatened species sightings in the project area, AENOR deems that no HCV is negatively affected by the project. Furthermore, the project is actively working on protecting the HCV.

4.6.3 Invasive Species (B1.3)

According to the validated PD and the information reported in section 5.1.3, no invasive species, either floral or faunal, are used by the project. The audit team has found no evidence to the contrary.

4.6.4 Impacts of Non-native Species (B1.4)

Section 5.1.4 provides of the MR provides a list of non-native species used in the project, for which no adverse effects have been identified. The species used in the project are described in CCB validated PD as well as in section 5.1.4 of the MR. It is stated that there weren't adverse effects identified on those species categorized as non-native. All listed species are widely used in the project region for agroforestry purposes. Interviews with stakeholders provided no evidence of the use other non-native species beside those declared in the MR. Furthermore, the VVB deems that the usage of these species does not imply that negative effects could occur. These species have been used in all around the world with different purposes, and normally, the benefits are bigger than the issues. Then, the audit team deems that information provided and the analysis of the adverse effect that these species could bring to the project area is done correctly.

4.6.5 GMO Exclusion (B1.5)

The PP states that no GMOs were used in the project area during the monitoring period. The audit team has found no evidence to the contrary.

4.6.6 Negative Offsite Biodiversity Impacts and Mitigation (B2.2)

No offsite biodiversity negative impacts have been identified due to the project. As stated in the MR, by providing a corridor for wildlife in three adjacent national parks, the project has had a positive impact on biodiversity outside the project area. Leakage of poaching activities is not possible as there is hardly any wildlife left outside the project area, except for in the well-guarded national parks. Furthermore, the poachers mostly live within the project area where they benefit from the project activities.

AENOR considers these statements to be correct, based on the condition of the areas neighboring the project area, verified using satellite imagery, and the information provided by local stakeholders during the interviews. AENOR has verified and checked the area of the project with satellite imagery. It is stated that

the project acts like a corridor (the protection of the project area has had a synergic effect because the project area acts as a corridor between adjacent national parks. Using a visual inspection of remotely sensed imagery, AENOR can confirm that the project area is made up of several polygons, which despite not being 100% connected to each other, form a "corridor" of almost 450 kilometers in length in which important natural areas are connected. These include: Mana Pools National Park, Matusadona National Park and Safari Areas such as Chete, Charara, Doma and Chewore) and it has been the shape that the VVB has assessed for the compliance of the statements in section 4.6.6 about leakage of poaching. The location of the project has been assessed with satellite imagery, checking the differences between the inside and outside area. AENOR attempted to understand the dynamics between inside and outside the project area more holistically.

Complementary, the information assessed has been contrasted with the interviews to different stakeholder, having their opinion, direct opinion, about the project from local people, with the conclusion that the information provided by the PP in the MR is true and accurate. The information obtained through the interviews, was another key point to contrast the information assessed by AENOR on the satellite imagery and further information stated along the MR. Through the interviews, AENOR asked about the fauna that the community members saw inside the project on a regular basis and whether these sightings had increased as the project was implemented. The overwhelming response was that wildlife was commonly sighted in the project area.

4.6.7 Net Biodiversity Benefits (B2.3)

The project has created benefits within the project zone that are unparalleled in comparison with the baseline scenario had the project not been present. As mentioned above, the project has not generated any negative impact inside or outside the project area. Because of the project and its implemented project activities, the net effect of the project on biodiversity in and around the project zone is positive as it was demonstrated to AENOR.

4.6.8 Biodiversity Monitoring Results (B3.1, B3.2)

A plan for biodiversity monitoring was developed early in the project lifetime and successfully validated. Through document review AENOR confirmed the monitoring plan is in place and monitoring is going on. The PP has provided the SOP /47/ for Biodiversity Monitoring, where a set of indicators will yield a holistic picture of the biodiversity status and pressure on wildlife over time in the project area. Data collection for biodiversity monitoring takes place continuously in line with the project activities and is reported upon verification.

In line with the project's monitoring plan, the following indicators are measured: Poaching, Animal species richness and Plant species richness. There are two main approaches to biodiversity monitoring. Vehicle-based monitoring of the OGM teams and walking-based monitoring done by the RDC game scouts. The OGM teams do predominately vehicle-based monitoring. OGM teams record all sightings or signs of animals and birds whilst carrying out their daily duties. This is entered into an excel template as per the example attached. The total number of days spent monitoring is also recorded so that the sightings versus number of days spent on biodiversity can be monitored over time. All species are recorded, however as per monitoring plan, the focus is on the IUCN red listed species. Each district provides independent biodiversity information for both OGM and anti-poaching: dates, frequency and location.

The PP has demonstrated that monitoring is be able to identify positive and negative impacts on the biodiversity. Surveys and inventories results were provided to verifiers /48-49/.

After reviewing the biodiversity monitoring SOP /47/, AENOR confirms dates, frequency and monitoring methods used are in accordance with the validated PD. AENOR confirms that biodiversity monitoring plan is implemented as the MR and the validated PD. To conclude, AENOR has contrasted the information provided on the MR and PD, with the evidence provided and with the interviews carried on during the auditing process. Therefore, AENOR deems that the information of the BD monitoring plan and its results is accurate and complies with the CCB requirements.

4.6.9 Biodiversity Monitoring Plan Dissemination (B3.3)

Project information, including the monitoring plan and results, is widely distributed in the communities of the project area. The distribution methods include, besides the Verra Registry website, provision of the MR and summaries in local language through the RDCs, with hard copies to each local chief and councilor. Additionally, monitoring results are published in the newsletter provided to the communities.

The audit team crosschecked these statements made on the MR with the community members interviewed during the verification process and all of them confirmed the distribution of project information, showed good knowledge of the project goals, activities, and results. The audit team reviewed the newsletter provided to the communities /7/ and verified that monitoring information and results are being provided. Thus, it is the opinion of AENOR that the results of biodiversity monitoring have been disseminated in accordance with the validated project design during the monitoring period.

4.7 Additional Project Implementation Information

There is no additional information related to the implementation of the project.

4.8 Additional Project Impact Information

The PP has demonstrated that the project qualifies for the Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits Gold Level as required by GL3.1 of the CCB Standard Second Edition by meeting the vulnerability criteria. Specifically, the project zone is habitat for the painted dogs (*Lycaon pictus*), which are endangered (EN). Furthermore, the project area contains individuals of vulnerable (VU) species, such as African elephant (*Loxodonta africana*), lion (*Panthera leo*), leopard (*Panthera pardus*) and cheetah (*Acinonyx jubatus*).

The audit team verified the threat status of all the abovementioned species with the IUCN Red List. The presence of the species in the project area have been confirmed by the local stakeholders interviewed (as discussed in section 4.6.1 of this report) and by the photographic provided by the PP /63/.

Based on the increasing trend of the sighting of the trigger spices (eight times higher than the projects first year, as reported in the MR) and the fact that the activities developed by the project are contributing to the protection of their natural habitat, AENOR deems that the project is taking measures that are effective at maintaining or enhancing the population status of trigger species.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

After review of all project information, procedures, calculations, and supporting documentation and the interview process, AENOR confirms that the monitoring conducted by the Project Proponent, along with the supporting Monitoring Report, are accurate and consistent with all VCS Version 4 and CCB Second Edition criteria, the validated PD, and the selected methodology (VM0009 v1.1). AENOR confirms that the Kariba REDD+ Project Monitoring Report (Version 3 dated 04 March 2022) has been implemented in accordance with the validated PD including any validated changes as applicable.

AENOR confirms all verification activities, including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance, monitoring and project documentation adherence to VCS Version 4 (and all associated updates), and CCB Project Design Standards (Second Edition), as documented in this report are complete. AENOR concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that the Kariba REDD+ Project meets the requirements of VCS Version 4 (and all associated updates) and CCB Standards Second Edition for the monitoring period (01-July-2019 to 30-June-2021).

AENOR confirms all validation activities of one Project Description deviation to the Project Description during this verification event adhere to VCS Version 4 (and all associated updates), and CCB Standards Second Edition. AENOR concludes without any qualifications or limitation that the Kariba REDD+ Project complies with the validation criteria for projects set out in in CCB Second Edition and VCS Version 4.

The project is achieving the climate, community, and biodiversity benefits, including Gold Level Climate Adaptation Benefits and Gold Level Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits as described in the Monitoring Report.

The GHG assertion provided by the project proponent and verified by AENOR has resulted in a total net GHG Emission Reductions and Removals of 7,889,849 tCO₂e by the project during the monitoring period (01-July-2019 to 30-June-2021). Considering 14% of buffer withholding based on the VCS Non-Permanence Risk Assessment Tool v4.0, which means a buffer allocation of 1,104,579 tCO₂e, the Verified Carbon Units (VCU) to be issued are 6,785,270 tCO₂e.

Verification/monitoring period: From 01-July-2019 to 30-June-2021.

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

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Buffer credits to be deposited in the buffer pool	Net VCUs in each year to be issued (VCUs)
2019	1,972,462	0	0	1,972,462	276.145	1.696.318
2020	3,944,925	0	0	3,944,925	552.290	3.392.635
2021	1,972,462	0	0	1,972,462	276.145	1.696.318
Total	7,889,849	0	0	7,889,849	1.104.579	6.785.270

Overall non-permanence risk rating: 14%

VCUs buffer to be deposited: 1,104,579 tCO₂e.

Total VCUs to be issued: 6,785,270tCO₂e.

Madrid, 28 October 2022


Juan Carlos Gómez
Lead auditor

Approved by


José Luis Fuentes
Climate Change Unit Manager

APPENDIX 1: LIST OF EVIDENCE PROVIDED

No.	Project documents
1	Monitoring report: - Final version: 220304_CCB_VCS_Kariba_REDD_MR5_v3 - 220114_CCB_VCS_Kariba_REDD_MR5_v2 - 211001_CCB_VCS_Kariba_REDD_MR5_FINAL
2	Non-permanence Risk Report: 211124_NPRReport_Kariba
3	Monitoring report summaries: - KRP Monitoring Report Summary English 2021 - KRP Monitoring Report Summary Shona 2021 - KRP Monitoring Report Summary Tonga 2021
No.	General documents
4	Adaptive Management Plan
5	Adaptative Management Plan – Meeting reports
6	Employee Risk Management Plan
7	Project Newsletters
8	Cash Flow 2012-2041
9	Revenue Flow and Invoices
10	Kariba REDD+ Deed of Trust
11	130624_Monitoring Plan_Kariba_CCBS_final
12	Agreements with RDCs and leaseholders
13	Management team CVs
14	Annex 3_Parameters at Validation
No.	Climate
15	KARIBA ER MP 5_220110.xlsx
16	Kariba SOC ER_220110.xlsx
17	211124_Leakage MP5.xlsx
18	160907_Kariba SOC ER 3rd Monitoring Report Verified 2014_2016.xlsx
19	2021_Leakage plot data.xlsx
20	Leakage plot data hard copies
21	MOVERS (web-based Monitoring and Verification System)
22	MOVERS_data_export.xlsx
23	Allometric eqns_v3.xlsx
24	MOVERS Kariba_V2.docx
25	Biomass Strata.docx
26	Standard deviation.docx
27	MOVERS KARIBA project specific parameters_Plot example M003
28	Tree and Soil SOP: SOPs Tree and soil collection_2021_22_FINAL
29	Leakage SOP: SOP Leakage area data collection_final_Amended 2016
30	Biomass PSP original records sample (53 samples)
31	Soil plots original records sample (22 samples)
32	Leakage plots original records sample (34 samples)
33	PSP M036 monitoring video

No.	Community
34	Community and Project Sustainability Fund
35	Beekeeping Training & Meetings Records and attendance lists
36	CF Trainings & Meetings Records and attendance lists
37	Tree planting sessions' attendance lists
38	Environment meetings records and attendance lists
39	Firefighting Trainings & Meetings records and attendance lists
40	Gardening Trainings & Meetings records and attendance lists
41	Kariba REDD Awareness meetings' attendance lists
42	Council meetings records
43	Social monitoring June 2011-July 2021
44	Kariba Social Survey
45	Social monitoring interviews
46	160420_Kariba_social monitoring_SOP_Final (1)
No.	Biodiversity
47	140106_Kariba_Biodiversity monitoring_SOP_Final
48	140403_Kariba_biodiversity_wildlife_datasheet_SP version_2011_2021
49	Tree species per plot
No.	Geospatial
50	Kariba_PA.kmz
51	Kariba_Leakage.kmz
52	Kariba_RR.kmz
53	Biomass_Plots.shp
54	Leakage_Plots.shp
55	Soil_Plots.shp
No.	Activities additional evidence
56	Boreholes pictures and testimonies (Binga, Hurungwe, Mbire and Nyaminyami)
57	Clinics pictures and testimonies (Binga, Hurungwe, Mbire and Nyaminyami)
58	Early burning pictures and testimonies (Binga, Hurungwe, Mbire and Nyaminyami)
59	Gardens pictures and testimonies (Binga, Hurungwe, Mbire and Nyaminyami)
60	Patrols reports and pictures (Binga, Hurungwe, Mbire and Nyaminyami)
61	Road maintenance pictures and testimonies (Binga, Hurungwe, Mbire and Nyaminyami)
62	Schools support testimonies (Binga, Hurungwe, Mbire and Nyaminyami)
63	Vulnerable species pictures (Hurungwe, Mbire and Nyaminyami)
64	CGA Employees testimonies

APPENDIX 2: STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED

No.	Name	Mean	Location	Role/Relation to the project
1	Charles Ndondo	Live videoconference	Project area	Carbon Green Africa Managing Director
2	Pieter Bezuidenhout	Live videoconference	Project area	Carbon Green Africa Projects Development
3	Jonathan Konz	Live videoconference	-	South Pole Project Manager
4	Paradzai Mutombo	Live videoconference	Mbire District	Employee
5	Cloudy Winasi	Live videoconference	Mbire District	
6	Richman Johane	Live videoconference	Mbire District	
7	Tonderai Andrea	Written testimony	Mbire District	
8	Shadreck Ndlovu	Written testimony	Binga District	
9	Titus Muzamba	Written testimony	Binga District	
10	Andrew Mutare	Written testimony	Binga District	
11	Jeremiah Musunuri	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
12	David Matekenya	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
13	Leonard Chipura	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
14	Manuel nibiri	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
15	Magaret Kalonga	Live videoconference	Mbire District	Improved Agriculture (Conservation farming)
16	Mathrine Chiponda	Live videoconference	Mbire District	
17	Chariot Chiguta	Live videoconference	Mbire District	
18	Shushu Marengu	Written testimony	Mbire District	
19	Ezekial Garinga	Written testimony	Mbire District	
20	Stanley Nyadzayo	Written testimony	Mbire District	
21	Ruchiva Mupatapanja	Written testimony	Mbire District	
22	Mero Lungu	Written testimony	Mbire District	
23	Edmore Kabete	Written testimony	Mbire District	
24	Angel Kadzuramera	Written testimony	Mbire District	
25	Onai Chatora	Written testimony	Mbire District	
26	Susan Mathe	Written testimony	Mbire District	
27	Naison Gatsi	Written testimony	Mbire District	
28	Wonder Makura	Written testimony	Mbire District	
29	James Mudenda	Written testimony	Binga District	
30	Dickson Mumpande	Written testimony	Binga District	
31	Veronica Mazambanyama	Written testimony	Binga District	
32	Wonder Siabbeeta	Written testimony	Binga District	
33	Mary Mudimba	Written testimony	Binga District	
34	Jessie Muyuni	Written testimony	Binga District	

No.	Name	Mean	Location	Role/Relation to the project
35	Irene Mutale	Written testimony	Binga District	Improved Agriculture (Conservation farming)
36	Sabina Mudenda	Written testimony	Binga District	
37	Smile Muzamba	Written testimony	Binga District	
38	Siabantu Mudenda	Written testimony	Binga District	
39	Bwini Emulate Mutale	Written testimony	Binga District	
40	Rambisai Zangore	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
41	Farirai Nyangoma	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
42	Lilian Manyanga	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
43	Ramus Manyanga	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
44	Kudakwashe Zimuto	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
45	Jonis Sango	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
46	Melisa Musakawa	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
47	Maxwell Mawarire	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
48	Christina Mazhambe	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
49	Noster Chipo	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
50	Mary Tugwe	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
51	Koshiwa Muzamba	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
52	Chipo Mangisi	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
53	Chenesai Masaba	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
54	Lemas Garisamoyo	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
55	Elias Chakururama	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
56	Simelen Mulalazi	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
57	Joramu Masiyatama	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
58	Sibongile Moyo	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
59	Peter Kongobwe	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
60	Magoresa Siachadhuka	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
61	Gedeon Zandu	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
62	Fungai Mataya	Live videoconference	Mbire District	Improved Agriculture (Gardening)
63	Cloud Kanjere	Live videoconference	Mbire District	
64	Donewell Banda	Written testimony	Mbire District	
65	Shingirai Kadiki	Written testimony	Mbire District	
66	Faith Nyasora	Written testimony	Mbire District	
67	Sofia Kofi	Written testimony	Mbire District	
68	Zvionere Chaku	Written testimony	Mbire District	
69	Jim Vareta	Written testimony	Mbire District	
70	Jane Kanzambara	Written testimony	Mbire District	

No.	Name	Mean	Location	Role/Relation to the project
71	Chipo Shawu	Written testimony	Mbire District	Improved Agriculture (Gardening)
72	Machiva Gotamo	Written testimony	Mbire District	
73	Happiness Mutoni	Written testimony	Mbire District	
74	Smart Munsaka	Written testimony	Binga District	
75	Betina Munsaka	Written testimony	Binga District	
76	Egnes Munsaka	Written testimony	Binga District	
77	Keresia Mutale	Written testimony	Binga District	
78	Merena Mweembe	Written testimony	Binga District	
79	Connie Sibanda	Written testimony	Binga District	
80	Amos Mudenda	Written testimony	Binga District	
81	Belitha Nyoni	Written testimony	Binga District	
82	Emmanuel Sibanda	Written testimony	Binga District	
83	Smart Munsaka	Written testimony	Binga District	
84	Media Chiyangwa	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
85	Hilda Chahwanda	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
86	Prisca Fefe	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
87	Senzeni Chikondo	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
88	Jenifer Nyangube	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
89	Shamiso Perezo	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
90	Everness Chirodza	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
91	Winnie Makumbe	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
92	Loveness Chivhanga	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
93	Sarah Masendeke	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
94	Bridget Tembo	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
95	Muchaneta Mazhomba	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
96	Erinati Kamanga	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
97	Lucia Vakiri	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
98	Sibulewe Mangena	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
99	Maggie Chipunuka	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
100	Chamunorwa Mutuvira	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
101	Loveness Gasura	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
102	Inoitwa Shumba	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
103	Richard Mutombo	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
104	Sailos Gumuka	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
105	Alfred Chidzumo	Live videoconference	Mbire District	Tree Planting/Nursery Establishment
106	Gerald Mazikana	Live videoconference	Mbire District	

No.	Name	Mean	Location	Role/Relation to the project
107	Roderick Farashishiko	Live videoconference	Mbire District	Tree Planting/Nursery Establishment
108	Chiratidzo Kahumwe	Live videoconference	Mbire District	
109	Lucius Mawoneka	Written testimony	Mbire District	
110	Emmaculator Manyamba	Written testimony	Mbire District	
111	Simon Zhoya	Written testimony	Mbire District	
112	Herbet Matirenga	Written testimony	Mbire District	
113	Ester Kureka	Written testimony	Mbire District	
114	Bits Kureka	Written testimony	Mbire District	
115	Regis Chirheria	Written testimony	Mbire District	
116	Waddy Kachipindi	Written testimony	Mbire District	
117	Shupa Muchimba	Written testimony	Binga District	
118	Patrick Nyoni	Written testimony	Binga District	
119	Soliwe Dube	Written testimony	Binga District	
120	Maxwell Dube	Written testimony	Binga District	
121	Joel Sibanda	Written testimony	Binga District	
122	Maxwell Musaka	Written testimony	Binga District	
123	Marian Kunzekwenyika	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
124	Maxwell Gurajena	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
125	Pauliwe Matope	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
126	Loveness Muchero	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
127	Steria Peturo	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
128	Nyaradzai Mumba	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
129	Fungai Adam	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
130	Proleta Mukombwe	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
131	Jairos Chekera	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
132	Gabva Shayakunka	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
133	Phineas Mahlekete	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
134	Tichagwa Tapera	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
135	Netsai Maembekedze	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
136	Patience Chigoya	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
137	James Chikomba	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
138	Lasten Dube	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
139	Shoulder Sawara	Live videoconference	Mbire District	Beekeeping
140	Daiton Zuze	Live videoconference	Mbire District	
141	Ignatius Mupeti	Live videoconference	Mbire District	

No.	Name	Mean	Location	Role/Relation to the project
142	Takesure Kadamuchichi	Live videoconference	Mbire District	Beekeeping
143	Sinclair Marasha	Live videoconference	Mbire District	
144	Cosmos Chiunze	Written testimony	Mbire District	
145	Phanuel Kaduwaire	Written testimony	Mbire District	
146	Fabian David Machakwa	Written testimony	Mbire District	
147	Achem Chipangura	Written testimony	Mbire District	
148	Edwell Katurua	Written testimony	Mbire District	
149	Gift Kawodza	Written testimony	Mbire District	
150	Shodiak Mukombwe	Written testimony	Mbire District	
151	Takawira Chimusonde	Written testimony	Mbire District	
152	Conel Munsaka	Written testimony	Binga District	
153	Lyce Mutale	Written testimony	Binga District	
154	John Munsaka	Written testimony	Binga District	
155	Aizzah Mweembe	Written testimony	Binga District	
156	Greator Ndlovu	Written testimony	Binga District	
157	Lamek Mudenda	Written testimony	Binga District	
158	Joyce Ncube	Written testimony	Binga District	
159	Isaac Munsaka	Written testimony	Binga District	
160	Artwell Chikomo	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
161	Willard Phiri	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
162	Brian Mugumba	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
163	Sifelani Mugurachawi	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
164	Edmore Gora	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
165	Nathan Gandama	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
166	Lilian Manyanga	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
167	Sibongile Maposa	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
168	Tapfuma Rare	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
169	Thomas Kadungure	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
170	Marare Namasau	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
171	Cryson Mutemutema	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
172	Eliot Mandaza	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
173	Elijah Mandingwa	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
174	Robson Madzvamuse	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
175	Lloyd Ruhwatira	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
176	Bhoga Manoman	Written testimony	Mbire District	Borehole resuscitation

No.	Name	Mean	Location	Role/Relation to the project
177	Bright Mushaishi	Written testimony	Mbire District	
178	Lovemore Simagove	Written testimony	Binga District	
179	Simon Munsange	Written testimony	Binga District	
180	Otilia Makanyera	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
181	Jackson Jani	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
182	Emmanuel Majoni	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
183	Mawanga Kervin	Written testimony	Mbire District	Garden support
184	Lillian Manyanga	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
185	Sekai Zandu	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
186	Body Siachikazanga	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
187	Polite Sianjema	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
188	Sithokozile Shumba	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
189	Forgives Magumsu	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
190	Plascede Mutuvira	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
191	Mavhura Mponda	Written testimony	Mbire District	Schools support
192	Mupandiki Cosmas	Written testimony	Mbire District	
193	Ruzane Noah	Written testimony	Mbire District	
194	Machokot Munyaradzi	Written testimony	Mbire District	
195	Munyanyi Tarisai	Written testimony	Mbire District	
196	MugumbateTaizevei	Written testimony	Mbire District	
197	Musandaira Chiyedzo	Written testimony	Mbire District	
198	Chakona Shame	Written testimony	Mbire District	
199	Dhorobha Darlington	Written testimony	Mbire District	
200	Murumbi Magumisa	Written testimony	Binga District	
201	Marcus Chitswa	Written testimony	Binga District	
202	Mhara Jonisaa	Written testimony	Binga District	
203	Mushokore Taurai	Written testimony	Binga District	
204	Masikati Theresah	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
205	Masona Jester	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
206	Zulu Vincent	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
207	Chara Marshal	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
208	Marumisa Gwedha	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
209	Mutondoro Rutendo Prince	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
210	Mutema Rugare Raphael	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
211	Nyika George	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	Schools support

No.	Name	Mean	Location	Role/Relation to the project
212	Mujere Mahaso	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
213	Musunda Weston	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
214	Kutachi Anon	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
215	Moyo Moilah Mapurisa	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
216	Chahufa Vimbainashe	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
217	Muyangwa Innocent	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
218	Moffat Dube	Written testimony	Binga District	Clinics support
219	Muleya Yeya	Written testimony	Binga District	
220	Jailot Mutale	Written testimony	Binga District	
221	Gusta Mwiinde	Written testimony	Binga District	
222	Gladys Mutale	Written testimony	Binga District	
223	Athaliah Munsaka	Written testimony	Binga District	
224	Isah Mweemde	Written testimony	Binga District	
225	Ndaizeve Ngulube	Written testimony	Binga District	
226	Dezeman Dube	Written testimony	Binga District	
227	Mainara Munsaka	Written testimony	Binga District	
228	Mupindu Chalton	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
229	Mateyauwga Lameck	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
230	Chinamanyani Esnath	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
231	Jarimani Daniel	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
232	Nyani Ephraim	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
233	Musona Jonathan	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
234	Modreck Mbozi	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
235	Makombe Tendai	Written testimony	Mbire District	Early burning/ Road maintenance
236	Kingson Mpofu	Written testimony	Binga District	
237	Mudenda Wilson Tickey	Written testimony	Binga District	
238	Rugara Zvinodashe	Written testimony	Hurungwe District	
239	John Sikurukumwe	Written testimony	Nyaminyami District	
240	Merencia Bandira	Written testimony	Mbire District	Improved Agriculture (Gardening)/ Garden support
241	Jeritha Ndlovu	Written testimony	Binga District	
242	Moffat Mudenda	Written testimony	Binga District	
243	Mpendulo Mutale	Written testimony	Binga District	Tree Planting/Nursery Establishment/ Garden support
244	Tennis Mumpande	Written testimony	Binga District	

APPENDIX 3: MONITORING FIELD RECORDS OF SAMPLE PLOTS REVIEWED

Biomass plots			
1	B012	38	M106
2	B017	39	M108
3	B024	40	M111
4	B036	41	M117
5	B038	42	M120
6	B041	43	Ny076
7	B042	44	Ny080
8	B046	45	Ny081
9	B047	46	Ny082
10	B049	47	Ny085
11	B051	48	Ny086
12	H026	49	Ny087
13	H029	50	Ny089
14	H039	51	Ny091
15	H041	52	Ny095
16	H042	53	Ny096
17	H044		
18	H045		
19	H046		
20	H047		
21	H048		
22	H053		
23	H055		
24	H056		
25	H057		
26	H058		
27	H059		
28	H065		
29	H066		
30	M061		
31	M062		
32	M070		
33	M073		
34	M088		
35	M102		
36	M104		
37	M105		

Soil plots	
1	B002
2	B017
3	B041
4	H034
5	H038
6	M003
7	M037
8	M062
9	M079
10	M091
11	M101
12	M111
13	NY001
14	NY002
15	NY003
16	NY005
17	NY006
18	NY012
19	NY031
20	NY058
21	NY066
22	NY075

Leakage plots	
1	LE0001
2	LE0002
3	LE0003
4	LE0004
5	LE0007
6	LE0010
7	LE0011
8	LE0012
9	LE0013
10	LE0014
11	LE0015
12	LE0017
13	LE0019
14	LE0020
15	LE0021
16	LE0022
17	LE0023
18	LE0026
19	LE0028
20	LE0029
21	LE0030
22	LE0032
23	LE0033
24	LE0034
25	LE0039
26	LE0040
27	LE0041
28	LE0042
29	LE0043
30	LE0045
31	LE0046
32	LE0047
33	LE0049
34	LE0050

APPENDIX 4: CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AND CLARIFICATION REQUESTS

VCS Corrective action requests (CARs)

VCS CAR ID	01	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In accordance with the Instructions for completing the monitoring report of the Monitoring Report CCB v2.0, VCS v3.0, all instructions must be deleted from the final document.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>In accordance with the instructions, all instructions have now been deleted from the final document.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
Instructions in section 5.1.4 of the MR have not been removed. CAR still open.		
Project proponent response		Date: 04/03/2022
<i>The instruction text in Section 5.1.4 of the PD have now been removed.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 14/03/2022
The PP has made the adequate corrections. CAR closed.		

VCS CAR ID	02	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
According to the validated VCS PD section 4.7: 'All variables and parameters referred to in Annex B of VM0009 that are not available at validation are monitored as required by the methodology.' However, many of the parameters listed in Annex B of VM0009 v1.1 that are not presented as parameters available at validation are also not included as data and parameters monitored in section 3.1.2 of the MR.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>All variables and parameters have now been included in section 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 of the Monitoring Report.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The reported value for Average uncertainty in carbon stocks and the baseline model $U_{[m]}$ in section 3.1.2 does not match with value in spreadsheet <i>KARIBA ER MP 5_220110.xlsx</i>. CAR still open.		
Project proponent response		Date: 04/03/2022
<i>Thank you for picking up this error. This reported value for Average uncertainty in carbon stocks in the baseline model has been corrected to reflect the value in the spreadsheet KARIBA ER MP 5_220110. The updated value is 0.076623734.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 14/03/2022
The PP has made the adequate corrections. CAR closed.		

VCS CAR ID	03	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In the spreadsheet 210305_Kariba SOC ER tab 'Summary #1', the values of SOC from sampling plots in open woodland (OWL) are incorrectly used to estimate the average value for stratum woodland (WL) and vice versa. These incorrectly estimated values are inputted in spreadsheet KARIBA ER MP 5_FINAL to estimate the baseline emissions. Also, Standard error SOC is incorrectly estimated due to the same error.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>The values of SOC from the sampling plots have been updated in the Kariba SOC ER spreadsheet. The average values for open woodland (OWL) and woodland (WL) have also been corrected and the correct values have been inputted into the KARIBA ER MP_5 spreadsheet to estimate the baseline emissions. The estimation of standard error SOC has also be corrected in both spreadsheets.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Kariba SOC ER (220110) and KARIBA ER MP_5 (220110) spreadsheets located in Supporting documents_Findings/3_Climate/ER Estimations		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has made the adequate corrections. CAR closed.		

VCS CAR ID	04	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
Values for the following leakage plots are not updated for the current monitoring period in spreadsheet 210811_Leakage MP5: Leakage plot LE0009_21 Leakage plot LE0035_21 Leakage plot LE0037_21		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>The values for the plots were updated during this round of findings. Updating these plots have no implication in the observed degradation final value.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Update version of the spreadsheet now called: 211124_Leakage MP5 Follow this route to find it: Supporting documents_Findings/3_Climate/ER Estimations/Leakage		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has updated the values of the missing leakage plots. CAR closed.		

VCS CAR ID	05	Date: 15/11/2021
Description		
The governance score in section 2 of the NPRR, under political risk, has not been calculated using the most recent five years of available data from the World Bank Institute's Worldwide Governance Indicators, as required by the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v4.0.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>The governance score was update using the most recent five years of available data (2016-2020) as required by the tool. The value of the risk for the buffer discount is still the same.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated NPRT and WGI dataset: Supporting documents_Findings/3_Climate/ER estimations/NPRT/2. External Risks/Political Risk		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has estimated the governance score in accordance with the requirements of the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v4.0. CAR closed.		

VCS Clarification requests (CLs)

VCS CL ID	01	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 2.1.1 of the MR, it is reported that the project will generate a total of around 51,925,950 carbon credits from the reduction of deforestation. However, according to the validated VCS PD, the ex ante estimation of net GHG emission reductions during the lifetime of the project is 196,513,929 tCO₂e. Clarify the source of the figure reported in the MR.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>Thank you for picking up this error. This figure was carried over from a previous draft of the document. The figure has been updated to reflect the total estimated net GHG emission reductions expected during the lifetime of the project (196,513,929 tCO₂e) as stated in the PDD.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has clarified that the difference was due to an error, and it has been corrected. CL closed.		

VCS CL ID	02	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
The validated VCS PD includes as other entities involved in the project Black Crystal Consulting (Black Crystal) and Environment Africa (EA). Also, the validated CCB PD mentions these two entities as local partners. The second Monitoring Report (2014-2016) states in its section 1.4 that EA left the project. There is no mention to any status change related to Black Crystal in the current MR nor the previous. However, Black Crystal is not included in the current MR has <i>Other entities involved in the Project</i> (section 2.1.4). Clarify the status of Black Crystal in relation to the project during the monitoring period under verification		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>Black Crystal was not involved in the project during the monitoring period under verification. Black Crystal was only involved at the project start and was responsible for training the project team on biomass sampling topics. See section 2.4.2 (Worker Training)</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
N/A		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The removal of Black Crystal as Other entities involved in the Project has not been discussed in the current MR nor in previous MR. The PP is requested to discuss the removal as a PD deviation. CL still open.		
Project proponent response		Date: 04/03/2022
<i>The involvement of Black Crystal has been clarified in the Monitoring Report as a project description deviation (section 2.2.4). The initial training of the CGA team was conducted by Black Crystal at project start. They have not been involved in the Kariba REDD project since the initial validation and verification.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 14/03/2022
The PP has provided the requested information. CL closed.		

VCS CL ID	03	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 2.1.9 of the MR, as required by the template, provide the following information: a) Whether the project reduces GHG emissions from activities that are included in an emissions trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading. b) Whether the project has sought or received another form of social or environmental credit.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>The Monitoring Report has been updated. The project has not been registered nor is it seeking registration under any other GHG programme. The project has not sought or received another form of social or environmental credit.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has included the requested information. CL closed.		

VCS CL ID	04	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
The validated VCS PD describes two methodology deviations. However, section 2.2.2 of the MR states no methodology deviations were applied during this monitoring period. Clarify whether any of the two methodology deviations described in the PD still apply for the current monitoring period.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>The deviations mentioned in the VCS PD are still relevant since they relate to baseline processes. However, that does not mean the deviation was applied in the current monitoring period, rather the monitoring period is covered by a baseline period in which deviations were applied.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
N/A		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has clarified the applicability of the methodology deviations described in the validated PD. CL closed.		

VCS CL ID	05	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
Provide Annex 3 of the validated VCS PD containing data and parameters available at validation.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>Annex 3 of the validated VCS PD has been provided. See Supporting documents_Findings/3_Climate_PD Annex</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Supporting documents_Findings/3_Climate_PD Annex/ Annex 3_Parameters at Validation		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has provided the requested annex. CL closed.		

VCS CL ID	06	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 of the MR indicate the purpose of the data/parameters as per template requirement: • Determination of baseline scenario (AFOLU projects only). • Calculation of baseline emissions. • Calculation of project emissions. • Calculation of leakage. Also, in section 3.1.2, as required by the template, provide the numerical value monitored.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>In section 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 of the MR, the purpose of the data/parameters has now been included as per template requirement. Also, in section 3.1.2 the numerical values have been provided.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has provided the requested information regarding the purpose of the data/parameters and the numerical values monitored. CL closed.		

VCS CL ID	07	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 3.1.3 of the MR, as required by the template, describe the procedures used for handling any internal auditing performed and any non-conformities identified.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>Additional text has been included in section 3.1.3 to describe the internal auditing procedures and that no non-conformities were identified. 20 random sample plots (of the 235) were remeasured at the end of the verification period and the results compared to the original monitoring measurements. This QA can be reviewed in MOVERS under the Quality Check Data Sheets tab. South Pole also does an internal audit of all data entered into MOVERS and if any minor mistakes are identified they are communicated to CGA and the original field sheets are used to resolve the issue.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has provided the requested information regarding the procedures used for handling any internal auditing performed and any non-conformities identified. CL closed.		

VCS CL ID	08	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 3.1.3 of the MR: a) It is stated: 'carbon stocks are estimated for the fifth monitoring period by sampling 235 (100%) of the previously established PSPs.' Clarify whether all the 235 PSP were monitored during the current monitoring period. b) Provide information regarding the soil sample plots. Also, clarify why some sample plots have a value of 0 for 2020 and why sample plot MY118 is not included in spreadsheet 210305_Kariba SOC ER.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
a) <i>The text in section 3.1.3 of the MR has been updated to clarify that carbon stocks are estimated for the fifth monitoring period using 235 (100%) of the previously established PSPs. 112 of these PSPs were resampled during the monitoring period. This achieves a target of re-measurement of well above 20% of all PSPs per year of the crediting period and a complete re-measurement every five years as recommended in the VM0009 V1.1. All soil plots and leakage plots in the project area were remeasured during this monitoring period.</i> b) <i>Original soil field sheets have been provided as per the random selection requested in Annex 2 of the Audit Plan v2.1. A clarification has also been included in the MR under section 2.2.4 (Project Description Deviations). After the third monitoring an analysis of uncertainty was conducted on the soil plots data and it was determined that 6 sample plots (Forested) could be removed from the analysis. The uncertainty when considering only two strata (woodland and open woodland) only reduced after the removal of more than 7.5 plots. It was therefore decided to remove 3 plots from Open woodland and 3 plots from Woodland strata. After a random selection of plots, two plots were replaced - NY090 and M118. Those are replaced by plots B002 and H038. All the others remain the same. For this reason, some sample plots have a value of 0 for 2020 and why MY118 is not included in the spreadsheet.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated MR and original soil data sheets provided in Supporting documents_findings/3_Climate/ER Estimations/Soil plots		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
a) The PP has clarified the number of sample plots remeasured during the current monitoring period. b) The PP has clarified the reason for the missing data on specific sample plots. CL closed.		

VCS CL ID	09	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
Provide the following: a) GIS file with stratification of the project area. b) Source of SOC data monitored in sample points and used in spreadsheet 210305_Kariba SOC ER. c) Source/calculation of the Soil Carbon Loss Model.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>The following has been provided</i> a) <i>GIS file with the stratification of the project area</i> b) <i>Source of SOC data used in Kariba SOC ER (original data sheets as requested in Annex 2 of the Audit plan v2.1)</i> c) <i>Source/calculation of the Soil Carbon Loss Model. This was calculated during the third monitoring period (2014 to 2016). The original calculations have been provided in the spreadsheet "Kariba SOC ER 3rd Monitoring Report Verified 2014_2016". Please see tab "Data analysis" rows 162 to 197. The year in time used for this Monitoring period was 10.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
a) Supporting documents_Findings/GIS/Kariba Strata b) Supporting documents_Findings/3_Climate/ER Estimations/Soil plots c) Supporting documents_Findings/3_Climate/ER Estimations/Soil carbon loss model MR3		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has provided the requested documents. CL closed.		

VCS CL ID	10	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 3.2.1 and 3.2.3 of the MR, as required by the template, provide sufficient information to allow the reader to reproduce the calculation, including equations and assumptions used.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>Sufficient information has now been included in section 3.2.1 and 3.2.3 to allow the reader to reproduce the calculations.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has provided sufficient information in sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.3 to allow the reader to reproduce the calculation. CL closed.		

VCS CL ID	11	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
Provide evidence of the management team's experience to undertake project activities stated in section 1 of the NPRR (CVs).		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>The CVs of the management team have been provided. Please see Supporting documents_Findings/3_Climate/ER Estimations/NPRT/CVs</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
CVs of the Kariba REDD+ Project management team		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has provided the CVs and demonstrated the experience of the management team. CL closed.		

CCB Corrective action requests (CARs)

CCB CAR ID	01	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In the front page and section 1 of the MR it is stated that 138 boreholes were maintained during the monitoring period. However, in the rest of the document and evidence provided, the number of boreholes is reported as 137.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>Thank you for picking up this error. The front page and section 1 of the MR has been updated to reflect the correct number of boreholes that were maintained during the monitoring period (137). See Supporting documents_Findings/4_Community/Social monitoring/Direct effects</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has made the appropriate corrections. CAR closed.		

CCB CAR ID	02	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 1.2 of the MR, under Number of globally Critically Endangered or Endangered species, the total number of vulnerable and endangered species are reported. However, the indicator is exclusively for Critically endangered and Endangered. Additionally, throughout the MR, African elephant (<i>Loxodonta africana</i>) is reported as vulnerable (VU) species. However, according to IUCN's Red List of Threatened Species, the African elephant is currently classified as endangered (EN).		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
Section 1.2 of the MR has been updated to correctly reflect the number of Critically Endangered or Endangered species only (6). Additionally, the African elephant is now correctly reported as an endangered species. This change in classification only happened after the first version of the MR was submitted to the VVB. In the June 30, 2008 assessment by the IUCN Red List, the African Savanna elephant (<i>Loxodonta africana</i>) was listed as Vulnerable A2a (http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T12392A3339343.en). On the 13 November 2021 assessment, the same species was listed as Endangered A2abd (https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2021-2.RLTS.T181008073A204401095.en)		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has made the adequate corrections. CAR closed.		

CCB CAR ID	03	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
The end date of the crediting period reported in section 2.1.6 of the MR doesn't match with the date reported in the front page and the validated CCB PD.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>The end date of the crediting period was updated in section 2.1.6 and now matches with the date reported in the front page and the validated PDD.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has made the adequate corrections. CAR closed.		

CCB CAR ID	04	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 4.3.2 of the MR some indicators listed in the validated community monitoring plan (CM3.1 in CCB PD) and Social Monitoring SOP are not included: a) Number of community gardens Established b) Number of boreholes established c) Number honey processing centers Built d) Area established plantations e) Area mature plantations that can be Harvested f) Number wards in which traditionally conserved forest is mapped g) Total employees in OGM teams h) Number of man days spent patrolling Also, the frequency of reporting stated in the SOP does not match with the frequency stated in the PD. In addition, as required by the template, provide dates, frequency, sampling methods used, and other information regarding the monitoring process.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>The indicators listed in the validated community monitoring plan and social monitoring SOP have now been included in the Monitoring Report in section 4.3.2.</i> a) <i>No new community gardens were established during this monitoring period. 21 community gardens were supported during this monitoring period. See Supporting documents_Findings/4_Community/Social monitoring/Direct effects.</i> b) <i>No new boreholes were established during this monitoring period, but existing boreholes were maintain across the project area.</i> c) <i>No honey processing centres were built during this monitoring period. Hives and training were provided to community members.</i> d) <i>The status of fuel wood plantations has not changed since the last monitoring report. No new areas have been established as plantations.</i> e) <i>The status of fuel wood plantations has not changed since the last monitoring report. There are nonew areas of mature plantation that can be harvested.</i> f) <i>At present, the number of wards are not mapped in which forests are traditionally conserved. However, this activity continues to be implemented and explored.</i> g) <i>There are currently 21 employees in the OGM teams.</i> h) <i>The OMG team spent 10,699 man days patrolling during the monitoring period. More details of the OGM activities with regards to biodiversity can be found in section 5.3.2 of the monitoring report and in Supporting documents_Findings/5_Biodiversity/Biodiversity monitoring/Fauna 140403_Kariba_biodiversity_wildlife_datasheet_SP version_2011_2021/ under the "Sightings whole area" tab.</i> <i>Please also see the Remote site visit documentation that has been provided for further evidence of social impacts. Remote site visit documentation/Activities additional evidence.</i> <i>The frequency of reporting stated in the SOP is more regular than stated in the PD. This is a result of the adaptive management approach that has been taken during the project implementation and is not understood to be an issue. Both the PD and the SOP have been validated and verified by independent</i>		

<i>VVBs in the past. All community activities are monitored continuously by the OGM teams and are reported upon verification.</i>	
Documentation provided by Project proponent	
Updated section 4.3.2 of the monitoring report.	
VVB Assessment	Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has properly updated section 4.3.2 of the monitoring report. CAR closed.	

CCB Clarification requests (CLs)

CCB CL ID	01	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
Provide the following documents/evidence: a) Installation of 140,000 litre rainwater harvest system for the Chikova Secondary School Garden. b) Financial health of the implementing organizations. c) Free, prior and informed consent has been obtained from those whose rights may be affected by project activities (section 2.5.2). d) Project does not include any involuntary relocation (section 2.5.2). e) Road maintenance activities.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
a) <i>Photos of the 140,000 litre rainwater harvest system for the Chikova Secondary School Garden have been provided. See Supporting documents_Findings/4_Community/Chikova water tank</i> b) <i>Evidence of the financial health of the implementing organisation including Community distributions, invoices, KRT Distribution Resolutions, KRT Overview, Project district revenue.</i> c) <i>The land in the project area is communally owned. The project has not encroached uninvited on private property, community property, or government property. There have been no changes since validation. Refer to CCB PDD, section G5.3 (page 48) for demonstration that free, prior and informed consent has been obtained from those whose rights may be affected by project activities. See attached signed agreements with RDCs and leasholders in Supporting documents_Findings/2_General/Agreements with RDCs and leasholders</i> d) <i>The land in the project area is communally owned. The project has not encroached uninvited on private property, community property, or government property. There have been no changes since validation. Refer to CCB PDD, section G5.4 (page 49) for demonstration that the project does not include any involuntary relocation. See attached signed agreements with RDCs and leasholders in Supporting documents_Findings/2_General/Agreements with RDCs and leasholders</i> e) <i>Please see additional evidence of road maintenance activities provided for each district in the Remote site visit documentation/Activities additional evidence. This folder includes photos and testimonials from community members and OGM teams that were involved in road maintenance activities during this monitoring period.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
a) Supporting documents_Findings/4_Community/Chikova water tank b) Supporting documents_Findings/2_General/Financial health c) Supporting documents_Findings/2_General/Agreements with RDCs and leasholders d) Supporting documents_Findings/2_General/Agreements with RDCs and leasholders e) Remote site visit documentation/Activities additional evidence		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022

The PP has provided the requested evidence.
CL closed.

CCB CL ID	02	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
Throughout the MR, for boreholes, it is stated that a conservative number of 250 people impacted by each borehole was considered. Provide source/justification of the assumption.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>The conservative number of 250 people that are impacted by each borehole was determined by the project team who has over 10 years of experience working on the ground in the region. This number has been verified as being conservative during all past verifications and the project team is confident that the number of people impacted by each borehole is significantly higher than this conservative figure. This figure therefore does not have any references within the academic or technical literature but is rather the product of local, on the ground expert knowledge. Please see Remote site visit documentation/Activities additional evidence for photos and testimonials evidence of the scale of impact boreholes have in the project area. In most cases one borehole is relied upon by an entire school and community.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Remote site visit documentation/Activities additional evidence		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has clarified the source of the assumption. CL closed.		

CCB CL ID	03	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 2.1.7 of the MR, as required by the template, include the map of the project location provided in the CCB project description and indicate if there have been any changes to the map since validation.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>The map of the project location in section 2.1.7 is an updated version of that provided in the CCB project which is easier to read. The project boundaries are exactly the same as those in the validated PDD. The text has been updated to clarify that there have been no changes to the since validation.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated monitoring report.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has clarified the maps and stated that there has not been any change since validation. CL closed.		

CCB CL ID	04	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 2.2.5 of the MR, provide information on the actions needed and implemented during the current monitoring period to mitigate the risks identified in the validated CCB PD.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>Section 2.2.5 has been updated to provide more information on the risks identified in the validated CCB PD. The political and land-tenure risks identified in the validated CCB PDD established are no longer seen as significant risks to the project and are continued to be successfully mitigated through cooperation with local communities, chiefs, RDCs and the long-term contract that were signed with the RDCs covering the lifetime of the project. Fire risks are mitigated through the project's fire management activities. For a description of this activity during the period under review, please refer to Section 4.3.2 of the monitoring report. The project does however follow an adaptive management process and other risks have been identified and discussed as part of CGA's this adaptive management process.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 20/02/2022
The PP has provided clarification on the actions needed and implemented during the current monitoring period to mitigate the risks. CL closed.		

CCB CL ID	05	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 2.2.7 of the MR, as required by the template, describe the measures needed and implemented during the monitoring period to maintain and enhance the climate, community, and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>Section 2.2.7 has been updated to describe in more detail the measures needed and implemented during the monitoring period to maintain and enhance the climate, community, and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime. The Kariba REDD+ Project has set up a sustainability fund (also known as the Longevity Trust) which receives a portion of net revenues from carbon sales. The fund is managed by The Kariba Trust and is made up of 6 Trustees (majority of whom are independent). The Kariba Trust is responsible for managing and investing the longevity fund and future allocations of this fund after the 'end' of the project. The Trust also has a sub-committee which is made up of one senior representative from each district (government representatives) involved in the project. The sub-committee is responsible for allocating the community portion of net revenue to the various Community Share trusts within the various districts. The Community Share Trusts were set up by Government predating the project to manage local matters such as resource allocation and dispute resolution (they are made up of representatives of all local stakeholders Chiefs, Headmen, local leadership, Government Representatives and all private stakeholders in the area). The Community Share Trusts have proven to be efficient and well respected on the ground. All these process/institutions will continue to operate after the project period crediting period and aim to ensure long term sustainability in the project area. the financial architecture of the Kariba REDD+ Project includes a Community and Project Sustainability Fund. This fund will ensure that the basic project activities will be continued for at least a total of 100 years. During this monitoring period (as in all previous monitoring periods) a portion of all net revenues from the sale of carbon credits has been contributed toward the fund as outlined in the benefit sharing mechanism.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has provided the requested information. CL closed.		

CCB CL ID	06	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 2.3.3, as required by the template, describe the actions taken to ensure that informational meetings held to inform the local stakeholders were widely publicized and conducted in relevant local or regional languages.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>Section 2.3.3 has been updated to describe more clearly the actions taken to ensure meetings to inform the local stakeholders were widely publicized and conducted in relevant local or regional languages. Across the project area, a summary of this Monitoring Report (translated into the local languages) was made available for the community for one month before the site audit.</i> <i>The distribution was done as follows: one copy of the full Monitoring Report was sent to each council office with an additional copy sent to the council satellite office in Binga giving a total of five copies. As for the Monitoring Report summaries, one copy was sent to each council office, one copy to each chief and one copy to each ward councillor. All these copies were delivered as hard copies in person by the OGM who followed up with an explanation on how to submit any grievances through the communications channels outlined in the adaptive management plan either directly to council, OGM teams or CGA head office. As described previously, the projects OGM team is in continuous contact with the local communities about the project during site visits, meeting with chiefs and other leaders, and through field staff. Through this communication, the project team is further able to ensure that informational meetings held to inform the local stakeholders were widely publicized and conducted in relevant local or regional languages.</i> <i>In addition to that, all project updates are available in the monthly newsletter.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Update Monitoring Report		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has provided the requested information. CL closed.		

CCB CL ID	07	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 2.4.5, as required by the template, provide an assessment of substantial risks to worker safety that have arisen due to project implementation and show how risks were minimized.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>Section 2.4.5 has been updated to provide a more comprehensive explanation of substantial risks to worker safety that have arisen due to project implementation and show how risks were minimized. Although most job descriptions identified are not considered to be high risk it is accepted and understood that there is always the element of risk of accidents and injury. The key risks to worker safety that have been identified include vehicle accidents and malaria.</i> <i>Given the state of the roads in the project area workers are expected to drive at a safe speed and adhere to the maximum and minimum speed limits as set by the laws of the country, to reduce the chances of a vehicle accident and are required to have a valid driver's license. Vehicles are regularly maintained to ensure they are in good operating order. Workers are also required to carry a first aid kit with contents sufficient to treat minor injuries and medicines to treat common illnesses and malaria. First aid kits are checked frequently and updated whenever necessary. Finally, workers are required to carry a list of relevant medical emergency numbers to call if the need arises.</i> <i>Anti-poaching patrolling and firefighting also carry some risk. To mitigate these risks the OGM teams are trained by experienced members of the project team and the employees have been trained appropriately (see section 2.4.2 for more details on worker training).</i> <i>For anti-poaching activities, the OGM teams conduct their activities with the assistance of the RDC game scouts who all received training for their positions of employment even before the inception of the project. Firefighting training was also conducted at ward and village level, where community members received trainings across all four RDCs, learning how to safely suppress fires and make fireguards. They also received assistance establishing their own firefighting teams with committees.</i> <i>To further formalise the project's risk management, an Employee Risk Management Plan was developed and is used to inform employees on the key risks related to their job and to set a reporting framework around risks for employees</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report Supporting documents_Findings/2_General/Employee risk management plan		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has provided the requested information. CL closed.		

CCB CL ID	08	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In sections 3.1.4, 4.3.3 and 5.3.3 of the MR it is stated: 'The results of the monitoring are published in the monitoring reports, which is not only published online for public consultation, but was also distributed locally through summaries, which have been translated to Tonga and Shona and distributed in the project area.' Specify by which means the summaries are distributed in the project area.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>Sections 3.1.4, 4.3.3 and 5.3.3 have been updated to specify how the summaries were distributed in the project area. The distribution was done as follows: one copy of the full Monitoring Report was sent to each council office with an additional copy sent to the council satellite office in Binga giving a total of five copies. As for the Monitoring Report summaries, one copy was sent to each council office, one copy to each chief and one copy to each ward councillor. All these copies were delivered as hard copies in person by the OGM who followed up with an explanation on how to submit any grievances through the communications channels outlined in the adaptive management plan either directly to council, OGM teams or CGA head office. As described previously, the projects OGM team is in continuous contact with the local communities about the project during site visits, meeting with chiefs and other leaders, and through field staff. Through this communication, the project team is further able to ensure that the results of the monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan, have been communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has provided the requested information. CL closed.		

CCB CL ID	09	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 4.1.1, as required by the template, describe all the impacts on each community group (identified in the validated CCB project description in conformance with G1). Not all community groups identified in section G3.8 of the validated CCB PD have been included. Also, impacts must include all those identified in the validated CCB PD (section CM1.1).		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>Section 4.1.1 has been updated to describe all the impacts on each of the two community groups that were identified in the CCB PD, namely local communities and community leaders.</i> <i>Also, the impacts listed in section 4.1.1 have been updated to include all those identified in the validated CCB PD.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated monitoring report.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has provided the requested information. CL closed.		

CCB CL ID	10	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
In section 5.3.2, as required by the template, provide dates, frequency, locations, sampling methods used and other information regarding the monitoring process. Also, provide number of individuals per tree species, as per Biodiversity Monitoring SOP.		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>Section 5.3.2 has been updated to provide dates, frequency, locations, sampling methods used and other information regarding the monitoring process.</i> <i>Also, the number of individual tree species have been included for the twenty most common trees in the project area. The remainder can be found in Supporting documents_Findings/5_Biodiversity/Biodiversity monitoring/Flora</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report Supporting documents_Findings/5_Biodiversity/Biodiversity monitoring/Flora		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has provided the requested information. CL closed.		

CCB CL ID	11	Date: 12/11/2021
Description		
Provide information on how the project meet indicators of GL3 for Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits for the monitoring period, specifically trigger species trends (use section 7 of the MR).		
Project proponent response		Date: 15/01/2022
<i>Section 7 of the Monitoring Report has been updated to provide information on how the project meets indicators of GL3 for Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits for the monitoring period, specifically trigger species trends.</i>		
Documentation provided by Project proponent		
Updated Monitoring Report.		
VVB Assessment		Date: 22/02/2022
The PP has provided the requested information. CL closed.		