Verified Carbon Standard Project Verification Report

PROTECTION OF THE BOLIVIAN AMAZON FOREST

PROJECT NUMBER (ID) V011090.00ver

Project Title	PROTECTION OF THE BOLIVIAN AMAZON FOREST
Version	Report Version 02
Report ID	*VO11090.00ver-v02*

Report Title	VCS Project Verification Report - PROTECTION OF THE BOLIVIAN AMAZON FOREST
Client	Redd Services Pte Ltd +591 74752400 Nicanor Salvatierra 179 Zona Central Riberalta, Bolivia
Pages	22
Date of Issue	07 June 2013
Prepared By	Environmental Services, Inc. - Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division
Contact	Corporate Office at: 7220 Financial Way, Suite 100, Jacksonville Florida 32256-USA; Phone: 904-470-2200 Fax: 904-470-2112 www.esicarbon.com
Approved By	Shawn McMahon – Lead Verifier and Janice McMahon – Regional Technical Manager
Work Carried Out By	Shawn McMahon – Lead Verifier, Stewart McMorrow – Verification Team Member, Caitlin Sellers – Verification Team Member, Richard Scharf – Verification Team Member, Steve Ruddell – Verification Team Member/REDD Technical Expert, and Janice McMahon – QA/QC

Summary:

Environmental Services, Inc., (ESI) was contracted by the Project Proponent to conduct the project verification of *Protection of the Bolivian Amazon Forest* on 08 December 2011.

The goal of *Protection of the Bolivian Amazon Forest* is to protect the property as a carbon sink, maintain the biodiversity values of the property, and enhance the local economic environment with sustainable livelihoods. The climate objective is to avoid emissions from deforestation during the project timeframe. The project area is slated for conversion to cattle grazing and agriculture.

The project consists of protection of moist tropical Amazon forest property in Bolivia through 2041 by purchasing the property from the deforestation agent and avoiding planned deforestation. Redd Services Pte Ltd (Project Proponent) owns the property, developed the project and conducted the technical analysis.

The verification assessed the likelihood that implementation of the project will result in the greenhouse gas emission removal enhancements as stated by the project developer and to ensure that the project complies with VCS Standard (v3.3 October 2012) criteria. The methodology employed in the verification process was derived from all items in ESI's verification process. This included utilizing VCS documents and ISO 14064-3 to develop and implement a sampling plan. During the site visit, the project area was reviewed in the field, and 28.5% of all plots established by the project proponent within the project were sampled. Additionally, independent remote sensing analysis indicates that no deforestation or degradation has occurred in the project area during the monitoring period.

The baseline scenario is planned deforestation. The project falls within the Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) category (Scope 14).

The scope of the verification included the GHG project and baseline scenarios; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHG's; and time periods covered. The geographic verification scope was defined by the project boundary, which included one project area (grouped), the carbon reservoir types, management activities, growth and yield models, inventory program, and contract periods.

The verification criteria followed the guidance documents provided by VCS and included the following: VCS Program Guide (October 2012 v3.4); VCS Standard (October 2012, v3.3); Program Definitions (01 October 2012, v3.4); Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Requirements (October 2012, v3.3); AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (October 2012, v3.2); and Approved VCS Methodology VM0007 Version 1.1, 7 September 2011 REDD Methodology Module REDD Methodology Framework (REDD-MF), Sectoral Scope 14.
A summary of all findings is included in Appendix B.

ESI confirms all verification activities including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance, monitoring and project documentation adherence to VCS Standard v3.2 as documented in this report are complete. ESI concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that *Protection of the Bolivian Amazon Forest* dated 22 March 2012 meets the requirements of the VCS Standard (v3.3, October 2012).

The GHG assertion provided by Redd Services Pte Ltd and verified by ESI has resulted in the GHG emission reduction or removal of 69,250 tCO_2 equivalents by the project during the verification period/reporting period (20 October 2011 – 19 October 2012). This is calculated based on a total of 71,102 tCO2 equivalents sequestered as of the date of monitoring/verification less the uncertainty deduction of 2.6% (69,250 tCO2 when applied). This does not include the 16% deduction based on the non-permanence risk assessment tool.

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The verification objective included an assessment of compliance with the VCS Standard (v3.3, October 2012) and the likelihood that implementation of the planned GHG project will result in the GHG emission removal enhancements as stated by the project developer (ISO 14064-3:2006). The periodic verification event ensures an independent assessment that ex-post GHG emission reductions and removals have occurred as a result of the project during the monitoring period, conducted in accordance with the VCS rules. This verification assessed the GHG emission removals through AFOLU projects, specifically Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD).

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of the verification included the GHG project and baseline scenarios; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHG's; and time periods. The geographic verification scope was defined by the project boundary, which included multiple project areas (grouped), the carbon reservoir types, management activities, growth and yield models, inventory program, and contract periods. The scope of the *Protection of the Bolivian Amazon Forest* project was outlined by the project developer prior to the validation initiation and is re-defined as follows:

Baseline Scenario	Avoided Planned Deforestation and conversion to pasture
Activities/Technologies/Processes	Reduced emissions from deforestation and degradation (REDD); forest/biodiversity protections. VCS Methodology: VM0007
Sources/sinks/Reservoirs	Sinks: above- ground and below-ground biomass Sources: biomass burning, combustion
GHG Type	Carbon dioxide (with potential emissions for CH_4 and N_2O)
Time Period	Project start date: 20 October 2011 Project crediting period: 20 October 2011 to 19 October 2041 Verification Period: 20 October 2011 to 19 October 2012
Project Boundary	Project Location- ML1ASP, 235 Ha of forest in the Department of Beni, Bolivia. The Project boundary encompasses 235 Ha of secondary forest in Bolivia. The instance is located in the department of Beni, 150 km south of Riberalta and forms part of the Bolivian Amazon Forest.

The criteria follow the verification guidance documents provided by VCS, located at http://www.v-c-s.org/program-documents, and include the following: VCS Program Guide (October 2012 v3.4); VCS Standard (October 2012, v3.3); Program Definitions (01 October 2012, v3.4); Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Requirements (October 2012, v3.3); AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (October 2012, v3.2); and Approved VCS Methodology VM0007 Version

1.1, 7 September 2011 REDD Methodology Module REDD Methodology Framework (REDD-MF), Sectoral Scope 14.

1.3 Level of Assurance

The level of assurance was used to determine the depth of detail that the verifier placed in the verification and sampling plan to determine if there are any errors, omissions, or misrepresentations (ISO 14064-3:2006). ESI assessed the project (general principles, data, sampling descriptions, documentation, calculations, etc.) to provide *reasonable assurance* to meet the Project Level requirements of the VCS Program. The evidence used to achieve a *reasonable* level of assurance is specified in the following sections.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

This project will protect the Bolivian Amazon forest from planned deforestation, initially protecting 235 hectares of tropical rain forest.

Protection of the project areas will prevent the emissions from deforestation and conversion to pastures and allow the forest to reclaim its status as a primary forest.

The project is a grouped project and the instances must be located in the only geographic area defined by the union of the Departments of Pando or Beni in Bolivia. The instances must be under threat of planned deforestation for conversion to agricultural activities as defined under VM0007 at the time the project proponent took ownership of the project area.

The project starts with only one instance but this number is expected to grow with time. The instance is located in the department of Beni, 150 km south of Riberalta and forms part of the Bolivian Amazon Forest. The project area is home to species listed in the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources Red List for Threatened Species. Species listed as vulnerable and endangered include *Cedrela odorata*, *Bertholletia excelsa*, *Amburana cearencis*. The project are has suffered in the past to some degree or other from selective logging, deforestation for agricultural purposes and deforestation resulting from human induced fires.

In protecting the forest, the project will pay special attention to endangered and vulnerable tree species native to the region while ensuring that the communities surrounding the project areas do not suffer the full impact of job losses associated with forest preservation. In addition to protecting the forests in the project areas, the project will enrich the project areas with endangered and vulnerable tree species. The prevention of deforestation will lead to the loss of employment opportunities. This will be mitigated by the project's area enrichment with endangered and vulnerable tree species that will generate employment throughout the duration of the project.

2 VALIDATION PROCESS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

2.1 Validation Process

Please refer to Section 2 of the VCS Validation Report dated 26 March 2012 prepared by ESI and submitted to VCSA.

2.2 Validation Findings

2.2.1 Gap Validation

Not Applicable

2.2.2 Methodology Deviations

The PD and Monitoring Plan meet all of the requirements of the methodology and do not deviate from the baseline scenario, additionality determination or inclusion of project GHG sources, sinks and reservoirs.

2.2.3 Project Description Deviations

There were no project description deviations.

2.2.4 New Project Activity Instances

Although this is a grouped project, at this time there have been no new project activity instances.

2.3 Validation Conclusion

ESI confirmed all validation activities including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance and the PD adherence to the VCS Standard (v3.3, October 2012) as documented in ESI's Validation Report (dated 26 March 2012) are complete and concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that the project documentation *Protection of the Bolivian Amazon Forest* dated 22 March 2012 meets the requirements of the VCS Standard (v3.3, 2012).

3 VERIFICATION PROCESS

3.1 Method and Criteria

The verification process closely followed the process outlined in the documents above and ESI's procedures for VCS verifications outlined within our Management System Manual. The sampling methodology is derived from all items in our verification process stated above, which utilized the VCS guidance documents, selected methodology (VM0007), and ISO 14064-3. Sample size and techniques were based on the project parameters and best professional judgment. Plots selected for detailed review (plot checks) were at the discretion of the verifier and were selected through a risk-based assessment.

For the field verification, the sample size for the plot verification was 6 plots of the 21 available plots or 28.5%. Of the 21 plots available to sample, ESI sampled the following plots: Plot 9, Plot 21, Plot 22, Plot 16, Plot 12, and Plot 8.

These plots were selected to provide the necessary sample size to meet a reasonable level of assurance; as directed by the professional judgment of the Lead Verifier. Direct field measurement occurred at each plot identified and mimicked the monitoring/inventory design conducted by the project proponent.

ESI also performed an independent remote sensing analysis using Landsat imagery. To evaluate potential deforestation in the project area for the monitoring period that ends one year from the project start date of 20 October 2011, ESI acquired satellite imagery from 2011 and 2012 to

perform a visual interpretation of forest cover change. Based on the results of the visual analysis performed using the imagery, it does not appear that any significant land cover change, degradation or deforestation has occurred in the project area from October 2011 to September/October 2012.

The verification criteria followed the guidance documents provided by VCS and included the following:

- VCS Program Guide (October 2012, v3.4)
- VCS Standard (October 2012, v3.3)
- Program Definitions (October 2012, v3.4)
- Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Requirements (v3.3, October 2012)
- AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (v3.2, October 2012)
- VM0007 REDD Methodology Modules (REDD MF) v1.1
- Approved VCS Tool VT0001 Version 1.0 "Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in VCS AFOLU Project Activities" (21 May 2010)
- VCS Module LK-ASP of VCS Methodology VMD0009 (03 December 2010)
- VCS Module VMD0001 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of carbon stocks in the above- and belowground biomass in live tree and non-tree pools (CP-AB) (03 December 2010)
- VCS Module VMD0005 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of carbon stocks in the long-term wood products pool (CP-W)
- VCS Module VMD0006 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of baseline carbon stock changes and greenhouse gas emissions from planned deforestation (BL-PL)
- VCS Module VMD0015 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Methods for monitoring of greenhouse gas emissions and removals (M-MON) (03 December 2010)
- VCS Module VMD0017 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of uncertainty for REDD project activities (X-UNC) (03 December 2010)
- VCS Module VMD0013 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of greenhouse gas emissions from biomass burning (E-BB)
- VCS Module VMD0011 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of emissions from market effects (LK-ME)
- VCS Module VMD0016 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Methods for stratification of the project area (X-STR)

3.2 Document Review

A detailed review of all project documentation was conducted to ensure consistency with, and identify any deviation from, VCS program requirements, the methodology (Approved VCS Methodology VM0007 Version 1.1, 07 September 2011 REDD Methodology Module REDD Methodology Framework (REDD-MF), Sectoral Scope 14.), and the PD. Initial review focused on the validated PD and monitoring report and included an examination of the project details, implementation status, data and parameters, and quantification of GHG emission reductions and removals. Along with a review of the monitoring report, documentation for the selected sample was requested, provided and subsequently reviewed for consistency, accuracy, and appropriateness with regard to VCS program requirements, methodological requirements, and the PD. Documents reviewed include land ownership documentation, property boundaries, maps and aerials, data from monitoring, biomass and carbon calculation spreadsheets, and responses to corrective action/clarification requests.

AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (October 2012 v3.2) was used by the project proponent to assess overall project risk. The final score was calculated to be 16%. The information in this report was evaluated by verifiers and found to have been conducted appropriately and in

compliance with VCS Standards v3.3. No discrepancies were found in the evaluation of the elements of the Risk Analysis.

The verification included a review of the validated Project Description (PD) and Monitoring Report, relative to the field conditions observed and interviews with project management staff. For this verification, the project area was reviewed in the field, and 6 of the available 21 sample plots or 28.5% of all plots established by the project proponent within the project were sampled.

3.3 Interviews

Interviews were conducted at multiple levels of the Protection of Bolivian Amazon Forest project to assess understanding of program requirements and to determine if baseline monitoring was conducted appropriately. Interviews included discussions with project senior management, field managers, staff and local stakeholders affected by the project. The following is a list of the main interviewees and those whose names were recorded:

- Fermin Aldabe – Project Proponent- owner of Redd Services Pte Ltd
- Harry Gilder Padilla Melgar – Regional Manager
- Miguel Suarez – Los Cayuses Community Leader
- German Jimenez – Instance Supervisor
- Adela Siripi-Saldatierra – Community Member
- Saul Jimenez – Forestry Technician
- Anonymous – 3 unnamed Takana-Cavineno community members (individuals were not willing to give their names).

3.4 Site Inspections

Site inspections occurred on 06 February 2012 to 12 February 2012. As part of the site visit, a resurvey of the inventory plots in the project area was conducted and 6 of the 21 available plots or 28.5% of the inventory plots were re measured. During the site inspections, ESI assessed the following items:

- project and stand boundaries;
- project documents including ownership evidence, ownership records of deforestation agent, contracts, PRA and other documentation.
- pre-project conditions, as evidenced by condition of adjacent or nearby non-project areas
- proxy area conditions and common practice evidence
- current project conditions, including reported tree species, reported growth characteristics (diameter, or similar), reported biomass volume, and implementation of management plan/monitoring (historical and current)
- conversion plan
- project support and community involvement

Direct field measurement of forest and plot characteristics was performed, with a detailed review of field measurement methodologies sufficient to satisfy the professional discretion of the Lead Verifier. Project carbon stocks were correctly estimated to be 277.4tCO2e per hectare.

3.5 Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy

When potential material discrepancies/non-conformities were identified during the verification process, a non-conformance request (NCR) or request for clarification (CL) was issued. The project proponent was given up to 30 days to respond to the NCR or CL list. The ESI verification

team identified 60 NCRs. All NCR's were addressed satisfactorily by the project proponent during the project verification process. These NCRs provided necessary clarity to ensure the project was in compliance with VCS program requirements for GHG projects and the validated PD. All issues and their resolutions are attached (Appendix B).

During the course of verification efforts, there were several small grammatical errors that exist within the project documents. While efforts were made to correct these, small errors still exist. These errors do not materially affect the project and do not represent any omissions, or misrepresentations. Specifically, under the project calculations spreadsheets, the term CHB and DHB are listed. These represent circumference and diameter at breast height.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

The project activities and Monitoring Plan, as described in the validated PD, has been fully implemented. There are no remaining issues from the previous validation, and this is the initial verification.

4.2 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations

ESI conducted an intensive review of all input data, parameters, formulas, connections, conversions, statistics and resulting uncertainties and output data to ensure consistency with the VCS Standard, the project PD and the methodology. Further, ESI reproduced calculations for selected samples to ensure accuracy of the results. All data, conversion factors, formulas, and calculations were provided by the project proponent in spreadsheet format to ensure all formulas were accessible for review. The project proponent also provided a step-by-step overview of calculations to ensure ESI understood the approach and could confirm its consistency with the methodology and PD.

ESI also conducted a comprehensive assessment of all data collection and storage procedures to ensure all opportunities for error in transposition of data between data were minimized.

Uncertainty was assessed as required. ESI recalculated the statistics independently to confirm the accuracy of the reported precision.

Field data collection utilized appropriate principles of forestry data collection, including appropriate tools and methods. Collected data was handled appropriately, including a structured process for quality check. Analysis of collected data used appropriate formulas, conversions, and parameters, supported by scientific literature. Where ranges of parameters exist, or other types of formulaic uncertainty, appropriately conservative values were used in data analysis.

4.3 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals

During ESI's verification the evidence provided by the project proponent was sufficient in both quantity and quality to support the determination of GHG emission removals reported by the project. Throughout the verification, the project proponent demonstrated a commitment toward conservativeness and took all measures appropriate to ensure the reliability of all evidence provided. Interviews conducted (oral evidence) are outlined in Section 3.3, and the all documents received from the project proponent supporting the determination of GHG removals are included in Appendix A.

4.4 Management and Operational System

The management system employed by Redd Services Pte Ltd utilizes appropriate field measurement methods (systematic, appropriate measurement tools and techniques), data collection and management techniques (identified responsibilities for data accuracy; appropriate data quality control), and data analysis. Accordingly, in the process of the verification, ESI confirmed the suitability and appropriateness of Redd Services Pte Ltd 's management system for monitoring and reporting.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

After review of all project information, procedures, calculations, and supporting documentation and selected site visits, ESI confirms that the monitoring conducted by the project proponent, along with the supporting Monitoring Report, are accurate and consistent with all aforementioned VCS criteria, the validated PD, and the selected methodology. ESI confirms that *Protection of the Bolivian Amazon Forest* has been implemented in accordance with the validated PD.

ESI confirms all verification activities, including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance, monitoring and project documentation adherence to the VCS Standard v3.3, as documented in this report are complete. ESI concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that *Protection of the Bolivian Amazon Forest* meets the requirements of the VCS Standard (v 3.3).

The GHG assertion provided by Redd Services Pte Ltd and verified by ESI has resulted in the GHG emission reduction or removal of 69,250 tCO2 equivalents by the project during the verification period/reporting period (20 October 2011 –19 October 2012). This is calculated based on a total of 71,102 tCO2 equivalents sequestered as of the date of monitoring/verification less the uncertainty deduction of 2.6% (69,250 tCO2 when applied). This does not include the 16% deduction based on the non-permanence risk assessment tool.

GHG Emission Reductions or Removals	tCO_2e
Baseline Emissions	69,250
Project Emissions	0
Leakage	0
Net GHG emission reductions or removals	**69,250**

Report Submitted to:	Voluntary Carbon Standard Association 1730 Rhode Island Ave. NW, Suite 803, Washington, D.C. 20036 Fermin Aldabe +591 74752400 vcsbolivia@yahoo.com
Report Submitted by:	Environmental Services, Inc. -Corporate Office 7220 Financial Way, Suite 100 Jacksonville, Florida 32257
ESI Lead Verifier Name and Signature	 Shawn McMahon Lead Verifier
ESI Division Regional Technical Manager Name and Signature	 Janice McMahon Vice President and Forestry, Carbon and GHG Division Regional Technical Manager
Date:	7 June 2013

SPM/SMM/JPM/RMB/VO11090.00 VCS Verification Report-v2-final.doc
K:pf 6/7/13f

APPENDIX A

Received from Project Proponent on 2011-12-13

- Reglamentacion Especial de Desmontes y Quemas Controladas.pdf
- ds_24453_reg_ley_forestal.pdf
- Ley Forestal 1700.pdf
- de desmonte Monte Libano V3.pdf
- ordenamiento.jpg
- monte libano.pdf
- Notes.doc
- KML_587.kml
- lista docs.txt

Received from Project Proponent on 2011-12-15

- VM0007VCU.xls
- VM0007BSL.xls
- VM0007LK.xls
- VM0007P.xls
- Foundation for Enterprise Development FUNDEMPRESA.docx
- Monte Libano.pdf
- Permit Request.jpg
- Plan de desmonte.pdf
- Presentation Plan Ref Remove from the property Mount Lebanon.docx
- SD 26732.pdf
- Forest Law 1700.pdf
- DE BENI.doc
- Res 131-97.pdf
- SD 24453.pdf
- VCSVR.pdf
- VCSPPD.doc
- VCSPPD.pdf
- VCSVR.doc
- Stratification.pdf
- ML1ASP.kml
- PLUS.pdf
- Distribucion.pdf

Received from Project Proponent on 2011-12-16

- Tree Locations.pdf.pdf
- Field Records 1.pdf.pdf
- Field Records 2.pdf.pdf
- Notification.pdf
- PRA.pdf
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20110813_233_068_L2_BAND3.tif.zip
- L71233068_06820040630_B10.tif.zip
- L71233068_06820040630_B20.tif.zip

- L71233068_06820040630_B30.tif.zip
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND1.tif.zip
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND2.tif.zip
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND3.tif.zip
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20110813_233_068_L2_BAND1.tif.zip
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20110813_233_068_L2_BAND2.tif.zip
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND1.tif\LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND 1.xml
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND1.tif\LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND 1.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20110813_233_068_L2_BAND6.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20110813_233_068_L2_BAND7.tif
- LE72330682004182ASN01.tar
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND1.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND2.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND3.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND4.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND5.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND6.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND7.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20110813_233_068_L2_BAND1.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20110813_233_068_L2_BAND2.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20110813_233_068_L2_BAND3.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20110813_233_068_L2_BAND4.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20110813_233_068_L2_BAND5.tif

Received from Project Proponent on 2011-12-27

- Appendix 2. IUCN Red List Information on Threatened and Endangered Species.pdf"

Received from Project Proponent on 2011-12-30

- Received from Project Proponent on 2012-01-03
- Received from Project Proponent on 2012-01-19
- Risk Analysis.pdf
- Spreadsheet link.doc
- VM0007VCU.xls
- VM0007BSL.xls
- VM0007LK.xls
- VM0007P.xls

Received from Project Proponent on 2012-01-25

- VCSVR.2.pdf
- VCSPPD 2.pdf

Received from Project Proponent on 2012-01-30

- SAUL.gpx

Received from Project Proponent on 2012-02-27

- VCSPPD.3.pdf
- Proxy areas 2011.kml
- VCSPPD.3.pdf
- VCSVR.3.pdf
- 19900919.pdf
- 19941017.pdf

- 19971009.pdf
- 19980724.pdf
- 19991116.pdf
- 20011020.pdf
- 20050609.pdf
- 20110813.pdf
- FRA 2000 Section 2.pdf
- FRA 2000 Section 3.pdf
- Files\NPV.pdf
- Files\PLUS.pdf
- Files\Proxy 2001.pdf
- Files\Proxy 2011.pdf

Received from Project Proponent on 2012-02-28

- 19900919.pdf
- 19971009.pdf
- PLUS.pdf
- FRA 2000 Section 3.pdf
- img-302091324-0001.pdf

Received from Project Proponent on 2012-02-29

- VCSPPD.3.pdf

Received from Project Proponent on 2012-03-09

- VM0007VCU.xls
- image001.png
- NCR reply.xls
- NPV.xls
- NPVVCS.xls

Received from Project Proponent on 2012-03-16

- VCSVR.4.pdf
- Proxy and Forest 2001.pdf
- Proxy and Forest 2011.pdf
- VCSPPD0.4.pdf
- VM0007P.xls
- VM0007VCU.xls
- VM0007BSL.xls
- VM0007LK.xls

Received from Project Proponent on 2012-03-19

- VM0007P.xls

Received from Project Proponent on 2012-03-22

- VM0007BSL.xls
- VM0007LK.xls
- VM0007P.xls
- VM0007VCU.xls
- VCSPPD.5.pdf
- VCSVR.5.pdf

Received from Project Proponent on 2012-05-18

- Verification.7z
- VCS Monitoring Report v3.2_0.pdf
- VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report, v3.1.pdf
- VCS Risk Report Calculation Tool, v3.0.xls

Received from Project Proponent on 2012-05-21

- Monitoring_Report_v8.pdf
- photo.JPG

Received from Project Proponent on 2012-05-22

- P6_LISS3_20120828_310_085_L2_BAND2.tif
- P6_LISS3_20120828_310_085_L2_BAND3.tif
- P6_LISS3_20120828_310_085_L2_BAND4.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20100927_233_068_L2_BAND1.tif
- PANDO.pdf
- BENI.pdf
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20100927_233_068_L2_BAND1.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20100927_233_068_L2_BAND2.tif
- LANDSAT_5_TM_20100927_233_068_L2_BAND3.tif
- NPVVCS.xls
- Pando Land Registry.pdf
- PRA.pdf
- P6_LIS3_20100815_310_085_L2_BAND2.tif
- P6_LIS3_20100815_310_085_L2_BAND3.tif
- P6_LIS3_20100815_310_085_L2_BAND4.tif

Received from Project Proponent on 2012-05-28

- VM0007LK.xls
- -Bolivia - VCS Project Verification NCR-CL-OFI -v1.docx
- Monitoring_Report_v9.doc
- Project area LANDSAT_5_TM_20011020_233_068_L2_BAND3 (2).pdf
- 2013-05-28\VCSPPD0.5.FINALbis.pdf
- 2013-05-28\Verification.7z

Received from Project Proponent on 2012-06-04

- VM0007VCU.xls
- Monitoring_Report_v10.doc
- Monitoring_Report_v10.pdf

APPENDIX B

Item #	VCS Standard 3.1 Requirements (15 July 2011)	Applicability to the Project (Y or N/A)	Requirement Met (Y, N, or N/A)	Location in PD or Supporting Documents	ESI Internal Comments	Non-conformity Report (NCR)/Clarification (CL)/Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)	Round 1 Response from Client 2/9/2012	Round 1 ESI Comments 3/14/2012	Non-conformity Report (NCR)/Clarification (CL)/Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)	Round 2 ESI Comments 2012-03-19
1	Projects shall apply methodologies eligible under the VCS Program. Methodologies shall be applied in full, including the full application of any tools or modules referred to by a methodology. The list of methodologies and their validity periods is available on the VCS website.	Y	n	page 3 of PDD	PDD states using VM0007; however there are several other modules and calculations from tools that are referenced in the baseline, leakage and project scenarios.	Please include a full listing of tools and modules in section 2.1 of the PDD. Only VM0007 and BI-PI are listed.	Modules added to section 2.1	A full listing of all tools and moduels has been added to section 2.1. NCR is satisfied.		
2	Grouped projects shall have one or more clearly defined geographic areas within which project activity instances may be developed. Such geographic areas shall be defined using geodetic polygons as set out in Section 3.11 below.	y	n	Page 6 and possible attachments.	PDD states project zone is defined by the Departments of Pando, Beni or Santa Cruz in Bolivia. No map found of the geographic areas. Geographic areas with no initial project activity instances shall not be included in the project unless it can be demonstrated that such areas are subject to the same (or at least as conservative) baseline scenario and rationale for the demonstration of additionality as a geographic area that does include initial project activity instances.	Please provide a map in the PDD that shows the project zone. This is defined as the Departments of Beni, Pando and Santa Cruz in the PDD. A map needs to be attached.	Map of project zone to be included. Santa Cruz was omitted from project	A map is attached to the PDD as appendix B for geographic area. Additionaly the Summary lists the project zone as only being the Departments of Beni and Pando. NCR is satisfied.		
3	The baseline scenario for a project activity shall be determined for each designated geographic area, in accordance with the methodology applied to the project. Where a single baseline scenario cannot be determined for a project activity over the entirety of a geographic area, the geographic area shall be redefined or divided such that a single baseline scenario can be determined for the revised geographic area or areas.	y	n	Page 18 of PDD	Baseline calculations given as attachment. Baseline calcs do not appear to provide baseline information for any areas except the actual project location. No proxy areas have been identified as discussed in PDD at end of section 2.2. Geographic areas with no initial project activity instances shall not be included in the project unless it can be demonstrated that such areas are subject to the same (or at least as conservative) baseline scenario and rationale for the demonstration of additionality as a geographic area that does include initial project activity instances.	Please provide evidence of the use of proxy areas and provide maps showing location of proxy areas in relation to the project area. Please reference if these are the proxy areas referred to in Section 2.2 of the PDD.	There is only a single project area which is defined in terms of two departments (Beni and Pando).Section 3.4.5 is satisfied because the baseline scenario in section 3.4 is determined for the designated geographic area. No proxy areas are necessary to fulfill this point of the standard. I have included a statement "to determine risk of abandonment " in section 2.2 to disambiguate	Maps of proxy areas have been provided to verifier. Proxy areas were converted to pature and have not been abondoned as evidenced by several maps showing proxy areas that were provided. Additional information was added to section 2.2 of the PDD for this discussion.	Maps of proxy areas do not reference the location of the project area. Please provide an updated map that shows the location of the project area	Proxy area maps have been resubmitted and now show the location of the project area in relation to the proxy areas. NCR is satisfied.
4	The additionality of the initial project activity instances shall be demonstrated for each designated geographic area, in accordance with the methodology applied to the project. Where the additionality of the initial project activity instances within a particular geographic area cannot be demonstrated for the entirety of that geographic area, the geographic area shall be redefined or divided such that the additionality of the instances occurring in the revised geographic area or areas can be demonstrated.	y	n	pages 15-18 of PDD	Additionality only discussed for the actual project location, not the designated geographic area. Geographic areas with no initial project activity instances shall not be included in the project unless it can be demonstrated that such areas are subject to the same (or at least as conservative) baseline scenario and rationale for the demonstration of additionality as a geographic area that does include initial project activity instances.	Please demonstrate that the geographic areas that will contain future instances will be subject to the same baseline scenario and conditions as the initial project activity instance.	The project has a single geographic area and it has an instance. Section 2.5 shows the additionality of the instance and therefore this point is satified. A statement showing this is in first table of section 1.13	As stated in section 1.1 of the PDD, the instances must be locted in the only geographic area defined by the union of the Departments of Pando and Beni in Bolivia. Additionaly, Section 1.13 states that new instances will be incorporated only if they satisfy the requirements under VM0007, module VDM0006 and the other criteria listed in section 1.13. NCR is satisfied.		
5	1) Meet the applicability conditions set out in the methodology applied to the project.	y	n	Page 10 of PDD	PDD lists conditions for applicability of the methodology. PDD only lists eligibility in Summary Description. This is a one line reference to the methodology VM0007. PDD states that the instances must be under threat of planned deforestation for conversion to agricultural activities as defined under VM0007 at the time the project proponent took ownership of the project area.	Please provide a demonstration that the entire project area met the definition of a forest in Bolivia or a relevant definition of forest 10 years prior to the initiation of the project. Please remove the areas on the map that have been recently deforested as discussed in the site visit.	The FAO definition is used as allowed under the methodology. Reference to the methodology is in section 2.2. Applicability to the instance is in appendix A. Maps are for validator only.	Under section 2.2, Step 1.a, the project adopts the FAO definition of forest as allowed under the methodology VM0007 and VCS definition of a forest. Landsat-5 imageray shows that the project area has been consistent with this definition of forest for at least 10 years. Landsat imagery reviewed. Instance 1 is within a property having 500has. According to Appendix A, third paragraph...Of the property's 500has, an area of 167.5has to the east of the project area was not suitable for agriculture and therefore the deforestation agent did not request a permit to deforest. Furthermore, the deforestation agent had deforested an area of 19 has located to the west of the project area and this area was also excluded from the project. Therefore only 313.50has make up the project instead of 500has. NCR is satisfied.		
6	5) Have proof of title, in respect of each project activity instance, held by the project proponent from the respective start date of each project activity instance (i.e., the date upon which the project activity instance began reducing or removing GHG emissions).	y	n	Page 9 PDD and site visit	PDD refers to ownership but not dates of ownership	Please provide more detail regarding the ownership transfer status for the project area. Please confirm the exact date of ownership transfer. Project proponent did explain and show the official documents of ownership to verifier, however this explanation needs to be included in the PDD. Ownership documents are pending final registration from the government of Bolivia.	This request is included in the appendix	Appendix A states "The Bolivian Government sanitized the property under Law 1715 in 31 May 2005. This confirmed the deforestation agent's legal ownership. The project proponent purchased the property on the 13 October 2011. The National Institute of Agrarian Reform recognized the project proponent's ownership on 28 October 2011. The project proponent has presented the request to register the property in the land registry that is pending." NCr is satisfied.		
7	Where inclusion of a new project activity instance necessitates the addition of a new project proponent to the project, such instances shall be included in the grouped project within two years of the project activity instance start date or, where the project activity is an AFOLU activity, within five years of the project activity instance start date. The procedure for adding new project proponents is set out in VCS document Registration and Issuance Process.	y	n		Not applicable yet, however not mentioned in PDD.	Please confirm assurance that where inclusion of a new project activity instance necessitates the addition of a new project proponent to the project, such instances shall be included in the grouped project within two years of the project activity instance start date or, where the project activity is an AFOLU activity, within five years of the project activity instance start date. The procedure for adding new project proponents is set out in VCS document Registration and Issuance Process.	added at end of section 1.13	PDD now states that inclustion of new project activities that necessitate the addition of a new project proponent, then such instances whall be included in the grouped project within 5 years of the project activity instance start date. This is acceptable given that this project is an AFOLU Reducing Emissions from Avoided Planned Deforestation. NCR is satisfied.		
8	1) A delineation of the geographic area(s) within which all project activity instances shall occur. Such area(s) shall be defined by geodetic polygons as set out in Section 3.11 below.	y	n	maps provided	No maps provided that show geographic areas. Perhaps located in the Landsat images sent over.	Please define geographic areas by geodetic polygons as set out in Section 3.11. Please provide a map showing the project zone as an appendix to the PDD.	List has too many points. Consider methodology deviation? Map included appendix.	Map provided of geographic zone in appendix B. NCR is satisfied. Please see NCR above that relates to location of project area within this map.		
9	5) A description of the central GHG information system and controls associated with the project and its monitoring.	y	n		Not specifically listed in PDD.	Please include a description of the central GHG information system and controls associated with the project and its monitoring.	See section 1.13	Section 1.13 states "The grouped project has a central GHG information system and controls associated with the project and its monitoring. The central GHG infomation system and controls will require that All data will be digitalized, stored at different locations and stored for at least 2 years beyond the crediting period as required under section 3.18.1 of the VCS Standard v3.2. For all instances the following tasks will be undertaken 1. The baseline scenario will be reviewed every ten years. 2. Monitor carbon stocks and greenhouse gas emissions. 3. Estimation of ex-post net carbon stock changes and greenhouse gas emissions 4. Monitor leakage and greenhouse gas emissions In addition, all instances will be subjected to the same procedures of section 4 with regards to 1. Data to be collected: list of data and parameters 2. Overview of data collection procedures 3. Quality control and quality assurance procedure 4. Data archiving 5. Organisation and responsibilities of the parties involved in all the above 6. Frequency" NCR is satisfied.		
10	**3.5 METHODOLOGY DEVIATIONS** Deviations from the methodology applied to the project are permitted where they represent a deviation from the criteria and procedures relating to monitoring or measurement (but not quantification) of GHG emission reductions or removals set out in the methodology. Deviations relating to any other part of the methodology shall not be permitted. Methodology deviations shall not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emissions reductions or removals.	y	n	Page 18 of PDD	Nothing entered in this section.	Please complete this section in the PDD and state if there are any deviations to the methodologies.	statement added in section 2.6	PDD states that there are no deviations to the methodology. NCR is satisfied.		
11	Equivalence in type and level of activity of products or services provided by the project and the baseline scenario shall be demonstrated and, where appropriate, any significant differences between the project and the baseline scenario shall be explained.	y	n		PDD lists the chosen baseline and give reasons why it was chosen.	Please add a description in the baseline section of the PDD that describes equivalence in type and level of activity of products or services provided by the project and the baseline scenario shall be demonstrated and, where appropriate, any significant differences between the project and the baseline scenario shall be explained.	See section 1.13	Under section 1.13, the PDD states "There are no equivalent type and level of activity of products or services provided by the project and the baseline scenario. On the contrary, in the baseline scenario, the project area produces cattle and in the project, the forest remains standing. This significant difference between the project and the baseline scenario is to be expected in this methodology, as agricultural activities are incompatible with forest remaining forests". NCR is satisfied.		
12	1) A summary of the project details.	y	n	Page 3 of VR	VR gives a very brief description of the project but leaves out several details	Please include a more detailed description of the project in the project summary. Please formulate this description in such as way that an uninformed person can read the summary and have a good overview of what the project is set out to accomplish.	Details added to introduciton	The project summary has been updated to provide a more clear description of what the project aims to accomplish. NCR is satisfied.		
13	**3.18.1 Records Relating to the Project** The project proponent shall ensure that all documents and records are kept in a secure and retrievable manner for at least two years after the end of the project crediting period.	y	n	Page 40 of PDD	All data will be digitalized and stored at different locations.	Please identify exactly how long the information will be stored. Please reference the requirement that data is stored for at least 2 years beyond the crediting period.	Statement added in Section 4.3	This is outlined and explained in section 1.13 of the PDD. It states that info will be stored in two diffferent locations for at least 2 years. NCR is satisfied.		

14	e) Identification and demonstration of compliance with relevant laws, statues and other regulatory frameworks, an indication of whether the project has been registered or rejected under any other GHG program and provision of information relevant to the demonstration of compliance with VCS requirements with respect to such, and a demonstration that the project neither has nor intends to generate other forms of GHG related environmental credits for VCUs claimed under the VCS Program (noting that the project may be registered sequentially with the VCS and other GHG programs, as set out in Section 3.12.4).	y	n	Page 8 of PDD	PDD states that "There are no legal constraints from relevant local, regional and national laws, statutes and regulatory frameworks to the project. "	Please provide a listing of any and all relevant laws that would pertain to this project and confirm that each will be complied with. Please explain in detail the Bolivian Government process for repossessing land if not found to be used for economic or social benefit. Please incorporate the forest law 1700, 1997 and national resolution 131/97 in this discussion and relate all of these laws to the current project area and deforestation plans and activities.	See section 1.11		PDD gives a discussion of all the relevant laws that pertain to this project. Compliance is confirmed through both the PDD and site visit. PDD also incorporates the relevance of key laws and how they impact the current project. NCR is satisfied.		
15	f) Additional information relevant to the project, including eligibility criteria for new instances of project activities for grouped projects, a description of any leakage management plan or mitigation measures and any further information which may relate to the eligibility of the project, risks to net GHG emission reductions or removals, the quantification of net GHG emission reductions or removals, and an indication of commercially sensitive information that has been excluded from the public project description.	y	n	Pages 8 and 9 of PDD	PDD lists eligibility criteria, leakage management and mitigations, and lists items that were withheld form the PDD for commercially sensitive reasons. PDD does not list any risks to the net GHG reductions nor does it reiterate the GHG removals.	Please include in this section the risks to GHG reductions or removals as well as a quantification of the GHG reductions and removals.	See section 1.13		The PDD now lists illegal logging and firewood collection as possible risks to the project. It gives a discussion on why fuel wood collection is not deemed a risk. The PDD lists that the quantificaiton of GHG reductions removals is carried out in the Section 3 of the PDD and merits no additional information in the section 1.13. Leakage management is described in this seciton as well. NCR is satisfied.		
16	5) A summary of any environmental impact assessments conducted.	y	n	Page 44 of PDD	PDD states "This project does not impact the environment. Rather it improves it by increasing biodiversity with the enrichment of endangered and vulnerable species in the ICUN Red List of threatened Species. "	Please provide a summary of any environmental impact assessments conducted or explain why they have not been completed.	See section 5		PDD states that no environmental impact was conducted because the project only serves to protect the environment and thus an impact assessment is not needed. NCR is satisfied.		
17	6) A summary of relevant outcomes from any stakeholder consultations conducted.	y	n	Pges 44-45	PDD describes possible issues associated with the project as they relate to local individuals, but does not actually list any contact or comments received regarding the project.	Please list any relevant outcomes from actual consultations with stakeholders. Listing found in calculations spreadsheets. Please identify who the individuals where in the PRA or state why their names are not available.	Section 4.3:Monitoring ex-post degradation and section 6. IS THIS FOR PRA OR WHAT?		PDD describes that interviews were conducted with members of surrounding communities and the main issue found was that the carbon project reduces short term employment. The survey was conducted using on site project managers, who were not instructed to take names of respondents. This information was gathered while on site. A copy of the notification and original questionaire were provided for the verifyer's files. NCR is satisfied.		

	VCS AFOLU Requirements Version 3.0 (08 March 2011)	Applicability to the Project (Y or N/A)	Requirement Met (Y or N)	Location in PD or Supporting Documents	ESI Internal Comments	Non-conformity Report (NCR)/Clarification (CL)/Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)		Response from Client	Non-conformity Report (NCR)/Clarification (CL)/Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)	Round 2 ESI Comments 2012-03-19
18	3.1.2 Implementation of the project activities shall not lead to the violation of any applicable law, regardless of whether or not the law is enforced.	Y	n	Page 8 of PDD	PDD states that no laws will be violated, but does not give a listing of relevant laws.	Please list all relevant laws that pertain to this project and demonstrate that they will not be violated.	See section 1.11	PDD gives a discussion of all the relevant laws that pertain to this project. Compliance is confirmed through both the PDD and site visit. PDD also incorporates the relevance of key laws and how they impact the current project. NCR is satisfied.		
19	3.4.2 Maps of the project area.	y	n	Maps provided to verifier.	No map is provided in the PDD	A map needs to be attached to the PDD as an appendix or a map needs to be added to the PDD.	Map provided	Two new maps are added to the PDD, but niether shows the project location within the geographic zone. Please include a map that indicates the location of the project area within the geographic zone.	Please revise the project area map to include the total ownership on the map, along with a location of the project area. Please add a legend to the project area map that then labels all the different land coverage types on the property.	New PDD has an updated project area and geographic area map that both include the entire ownership and the location of the project area. All land coverage types are labeled and the legend has been updated. NCR is satisfied.
20	3.4.4 Total size of the project area.	y	n	Pages 6-7 of PDD	PDD states 332.44 Ha, but the calculation spreadsheet shows two strata, of which 235 Ha is used for the calculations. PDD lists 500 Ha as total ownership.	Please describe the difference between the total ownership and the actual project area. Please detail the areas that are not to be included in the project and state why. Please demonstrate that recently cleared areas are no longer part of the current project. Please identify these areas on a revised map that is attached to the PDD.	See appendix A	The PDD appendix A adds "Instance 1 is within a property having 500has. Of the property's 500has, an area of 167.5has to the east of the project area was not suitable for agriculture and therefore the deforestation agent did not request a permit to deforest. Furthermore, the deforestation agent had defoested an area of 19 has located to the west of the project area and this area was also excluded from the project. Therefore only 311.5Dhas make up the project instead of 500has." The PDD indicates that the area outside of the project site, owned by the project proponent is no longer owned by the agent of deforestation nor was it identified in the original deforestation permit. Therefore it is not considered to be under threat of deforestation and there is no permit to do so. NCR is satisfied.		
21	3.5.1 The potential for leakage shall be identified, and projects are encouraged to include leakage management zones as part of the overall project design. Leakage management zones can minimize the displacement of land use activities to areas outside the project area by maintaining the production of goods and services, such as agricultural products, within areas under the control of the project proponent or by addressing the socio-economic factors that drive land use change.	y	n	Page 9 of PDD	PDD gives a description of the management framework of the various supervisors and offers information regarding management zones.	Please describe where the leakage management areas are. Please describe if reference or proxy areas were used to determine rates of leakage. Please demonstrate why the rest of the 500 Ha property is not an onsite leakage area.	Section 1.13 Paragraph replaced.	PDD further clarifies what parts of the leakage tool were used, which determin if proxy areas or leakage management areas are to be used. Since the agent of deforestation is known, the project proponent was able to look to only one property, thus the deforestation agent had no previous history of deforestation. Further the agent of deforestation owns no other property that can be defoested, then the project proponent is allowed to use the planned rate of deforestation from the planned deforestation baseline module. The PDD indicates that the area outside of the project site, owned by the project proponent is no longer owned by the agent of deforestation nor was it identified in the original deforestation permit. Therefore it is not considered to be under threat of deforestation and there is no permit to do so. NCR is satisfied.		
22	3.5.2 Activities to mitigate leakage and sustainably reduce deforestation and/or degradation are encouraged and may include the establishment of agricultural intensification practices, lengthened fallow periods, agroforestry and fast-growing woodlots on degraded land, forest under-story farming, ecotourism and other sustainable livelihood activities, and/or sustainable production of non-timber forest products. Leakage mitigation activities may be supplemented by providing economic opportunities for local communities that encourage forest protection, such as employment as protected-area guards, training in sustainable forest use or assisting communities in securing markets for sustainable forest products, such as rattan, vanilla, cacao, coffee and natural medicines.	y	n	page 9 of PDD	Under section 1.13 page 9 there is a somewhat confusing statement regarding leakage management.	Please provide more detail that demonstrates how the leakage management program will work and why it is needed if leakage is projected to be 0.	Section 1.13 Paragraph replaced.	Leakage is discussed in the appendix A, item F, as well as in Section 1.13. The leakage management program consists on monitoring the properties owned by the deforestation agent as evidenced by land registry records. At this point in time, the deforestation agent does not own any properties that can be deforested. If properties that can be deforested exist in the future, they will be monitored for deforestation and if so, they will be used in the calculation to determine leakage. The leakage management program therefore is necessary (even if today leakage is deemed to be zero) becasue in the future, identified deforestation agents may own property that can be deforested.When identified deforestation agents do own land that can be legally deforested, the project will include them as part of its leakage management areas. NCR is satisfied.		

	VCS AFOLU Requirements (REDD) 3.0	Applicability to the Project (Y or N/A)	Requirement Met (Y or N)	Location in PD or Supporting Documents	ESI Internal Comments	Non-conformity Report (NCR)/Clarification (CL)/Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)		Response from Client	Non-conformity Report (NCR)/Clarification (CL)/Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)	Round 2 ESI Comments 2012-03-19
23	4.2.5 Eligible REDD activities are those that reduce net GHG emissions by reducing deforestation and/or degradation of forests. Deforestation is the direct, human-induced conversion of forest land to non-forest land. Degradation is the persistent reduction of canopy cover and/or carbon stocks in a forest due to human activities such as animal grazing, fuelwood extraction, timber removal or other such activities, but which does not result in the conversion of forest to non-forest land (which would be classified as deforestation), and qualifies as forests remaining as forests, such as set out under the IPCC 2003 Good Practice Guidance. The project area shall meet an internationally accepted definition of forest, such as those based on UNFCCC host-country thresholds or FAO definitions, and shall qualify as forest for a minimum of 10 years before the project start date. The definition of forest may include mature forests, secondary forests, and degraded forests. Under the VCS, secondary forests are considered to be forests that have been cleared and have recovered naturally and that are at least 10 years old and meet the lower bound of the forest threshold parameters at the start of the project. Forested wetlands, such as floodplain forests, peatland forests and mangrove forests, are also eligible provided they meet the forest definition requirements mentioned above.	Y	n	Page 7 of PDD	PDD needs to justify how forest is defined in Bolivia and demonstrate that the property qualified as forest for 10 years prior to the project start date.	PDD needs to justify how forest is defined in Bolivia and demonstrate that the property qualified as forest for 10 years prior to the project start date.	see section 2.2 Step 1.a. and appendix	FAO definition of forest has been provided as well as additional information regarding forest change as it relates to the FAO forest definition. The forest property under review for this project qualifies as forest. Strata 2 has suffered a disturbance in the form of a fire, however land use for that strata did not change as a result and according to the FAO definition of forest change, still is regarded as a forest. Project site visit confirms that the strata 2 meets the definition of a forest. NCR is satisfied.		

24	4.4.7 For inclusion of the non-CO2 gases, evidence shall be provided to demonstrate that the practice for which the project plans to claim credit is not common practice in the area. The guidance in the IPCC 2003 Good Practice Guidelines for LULUCF and the IPCC 2006 Guidelines for National GHG Inventories may be used to estimate such GHG emissions.	Y	n	general	Site visit confirms that common practice is to clear the land for livestock use. Further, relevant laws in Bolivia are in conflict and tend to lead to clearing the land unless the land is deemed to be a special type of forest area.	Please describe the common practice activities in Bolivia as it relates to similar lands in the project zone. Please detail the reasons why the project does not constitute common practice.	Section 2.5 step 4	PDD describes how common proactice in this type of forest is to clear the area for agriculture and to clear the trees, all of which is for economic gain. To leave the forest in place is not financially v viable without carbon finance. There fore the project is considered additional and not common practice. NCR is satisfied.		
	Approved VCS Methodology VM0007 REDD Methodology Module Framework (REDD-MF) **Version 1.1, 7 September 2011 REDD Methodology Sectoral Scope 14**	**Applicability to the Project (Y or N/A)**	**Requirement Met (Y or N)**	**Location in PD or Supporting Documents**	**ESI Internal Comments**	**Non-conformity Report (NCR)/Clarification (CL)/Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)**		**Response from Client**	**Non-conformity Report (NCR)/Clarification (CL)/Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)**	**Round 2 ESI Comments 2012-03-19**
25	Land in the project area has qualified as forest at least 10 years before the project start date.	y	n	Page 10 of PDD	PDD does not reference maps or any justification for this statement.	Please demonstrate through maps or other method that the area was forest 10 years before the project start date. Please include the definition of a forest in Bolivia as a reference point.	see section 2.2 Step 1.a. and referenced appendix	FAO definition of forest has been provided as well as additional information regarding forest change as it relates to the FAO forest definition. The forest property under review for this project qualifies as forest. Strata 2 has suffered a disturbance in the form of a fire, however land use for that strata did not change as a result and according to the FAO definition of forest change, still is regarded as a forest. Project site visit confirms that the strata 2 meets the definition of a forest. NCR is satisfied.		
26	o Planned deforestation (VCS category APD);	y	n	Page 10 of PDD	Listed elements of this are on page 10 of PDD and in reference material.	Please make reference to every document that would demonstrate these statements made to justify this application of the methodology. Please list these referenced documents in the PDD.	see section 2.2	PDD includes several references to the various laws and mandates that set requirements for deforestation and permitting. These are listed in section 1.11. NCR is satisfied by these documents and documents viewed during site visit.		
27	If land is not being converted to an alternative use but will be allowed to naturally regrow (i.e. temporarily unstocked), this framework shall not be used.	y	n		Project proponent is leaving out approx. 95 Ha that was previously burned and is regrowing.	Please discuss the status of Strata 2 as it relates to fire history, current status, and future applicability for carbon crediting. Please state what inventory procedures were applied to the strata and how these will be completed for future monitoring.	See appendix	PDD states that the strata 2 suffered a human induced or natural causes and was temporarily unstocked. The FAO definition of a forest states " If new forest trees are established in the relatively near future, the land is classified as forest throughout the regeneration period (and this regrowth is named "reforestation"). FAO also defines homestory as being less than 10 years. By review	Guidance from VCS (Carolyn Ching 14 March 2012) indicates that partial inventory of an instance (in this case	Strata 2 has been dropped from the project due to lack of inventory at this time. PDD states that an inventory conducted for inventory of the area
28	It shall be demonstrated that post-deforestation land use shall not constitute reforestation.	y	n		This item not found in PDD	Please provide a demonstration or statement that confirms this item. We need to see evidence that this property complied with the definition of forest 10 years prior to start of project date. Definition of forest	See appendix A	FAO definition of forest has been provided as well as additional information regarding forest change as it relates to the FAO forest definition. This strata 2 did not appear to be subject to human caused deforestation as defined in the FRA 2000 definition of forest		
29	Where, pre-project, unsustainable fuelwood collection is occurring within the project boundaries modules BL-DFW and LK-DFW shall be used to determine potential leakage	y	n		This item not found in PDD	Please provide a demonstration or statement that confirms that unsustainable fuel wood collection is not a source of leakage or emissions for this project.	See 1.13. Wood collection is not a leakage source contemplated under BL-PL	Section 1.13 gives a description of why fuelwood collection is not a source of leakage for this project. Further, the site visit confirmed that unsustainable fuelwood collection is not an issue. There are plenty of areas where dead wood is available. Further, technologies for collection and processing of firewood are not apparent on or near the site. NCR is satisfied.		
30	a. The geographic boundaries relevant to the project activity; Use **BL-PL, BL-UP, OR BL-DFW, and/or LK-ASP**	y	n	Pages 11-15 of PDD	It is unclear if BL-PL was used or if any module was used.	Please identify which module was used for determination of project boundaries as per the methodology, step 1.	clarified in table 1 step 0 and step 1.a of sectin 2.2	There are several areas where BL-PL is mentioned as being used. The project boundaries were selected by the original deforestation plan, as well as prevously deforested or barren areas as determined while on site. NCR is satisfied.		
31	b. The temporal boundaries; 1.Start date and end date of the "historical reference period 2. Start date and end date of the "project crediting period" 3.Date at which the project baseline shall be revised 4.Duration of the monitoring periods	y	n	page 4 of PDD	Start date, end date and crediting period are provided. Date for Project baseline revision is every 10 years. Project crediting period is 30 years. Monitoring periods are every 5 years or less. Historical reference period is not mentioned in the PDD.	Please provide a historical reference period as required in the VM0007 methodology, Step 1. b.1.	Added to step 1.b	Section 2.2, 1b, Historical reference period is defined as 10 years prior to the start of the project. NCR is satisfied.		
32	Project participants shall use T-ADD to identify credible alternative land use scenarios and to evaluate both the alternatives and the proposed project scenarios and to demonstrate the additionality of the project scenario. The assessment and demonstration of additionality shall be presented in the VCS PD.	y	n	Pages 15-18 of PDD	I think T-ADD was used here.	Please add a title to reflect Step 2.3 just above Sub-step 2A. This identifies the approach. Further, please identify what module is being used at the beginning of the Additionality section. Finally, please include the overview of project costs to the validator/verifier as indicated on page 17 of PDD, 5b-step 2B.	Added module being used in section 2.5. I do not see a step 2.A in section 2.3	Project financial plan was provided to verifyer and is asked that it remain confidential. All other changes were made in the latest version of the PDD. NCR is satisfied.		
33	? Monitoring of actual carbon stock changes and greenhouse gas emissions	y	n	Pages 39-44 of PDD	It is unclear how the yearly projection of carbon stocks was calculated.	Please reference the source and calculations for the yearly estimation of the carbon stock accrual. The calculations and sources of yearly carbon stock accrual rates need to be stated and or referenced in the PDD.	see section 3.4 above estimates and table in section 1.7	Section 3.4 states the use of a reference for the above ground biomass, a root to shoot ratio and expantion factors for carbon, with a final product of 4689.5 tCO2e. No actual calculations are provided.	Please provide a separate calculation that details the entire numerical calculation. Please include this as an addition to the calculations spreadsheets provided to verifyers or show the actual calculations in the PDD.	Updated carbon stock calculations have been supplied to verifiers. Calculation is performed appropriately. Reference verified for yearly estimate of accrual. Please see VM0007BSL and see 'carbon stock accrual tab'. NCR is satisfied.
34	The baseline of a REDD project activity is estimated ex ante. Methods for estimating baseline carbon stock changes and greenhouse gas emissions are provided in the following modules12: The results of the estimations shall be presented in the VCS PD.	y	n	procedure is listed on pages 18-19	The baseline calculations process is detailed in the PDD. Verification of the baseline procedures took place during the site visit and were found to be adequate. Further, field data was supplied to the validator.	Please identify if the non-tree biomass inventory data was included in the calculations and estimations of biomass and carbon. If it was not used, please discuss the reasoning for abandoning the data and if it will be used in the future on this instance.	Included in appendix A	Appendix A of Monitoring Report details that non- tree biomass was emitted for conservative reasons. There would be no non-tree biomass in the baseline scenario and most likely some amount in the project scenario. Further table 2 of the VM0007 allows for conservative omission of carbon pools. NCR is satisfied.		
35	A description of how the baseline scenario is identified and the description of the identified baseline scenario shall be given in the VCS PD.	y	n	Page 15 of PDD	A description of what the baseline activity and the reasons why it is the most credible scenario are presented.	This description on page 15 is not adequate. Please follow the format given in VMD0006 and address each of the items listed as a basis for this discussion.	See section 2.4	Section 2.4 gives a step by step detail of reasons why the selected baseline scenario is the most probable and credible. NCR is satisfied.		
36	2 The project proponent wishes to claim credits for avoided forest degradation caused by extraction of wood for fuel or charcoal or carbon sequestration in forest land that would have been deforested in the baseline case. In such cases, the methods described in M-MON (Monitoring of greenhouse gas emissions and removals).	y	n	See calculations files, PDD and monitoring report.	The project proponent has inventoried the carbon stocks and is validating and verifying the one project instance at the same time. The project instance is for avoided planned deforestation. Therefore, at the time of inventory of the baseline conditions, the project is also being verified. There is not time difference between the two events.	Please clarify the procedures used for the inventory process. Please make reference to the sizes of the nested plots and clarify the three sizes of nests within the plots. There are at least two areas in the Monitoring report that are conflicting in the size of the nested plots. Please correct these items and make reference to the location of the final inventory description.	See section 4.3 monitoring carbon stocks	This is better explained now under monitoring of carbon stocks. Conflicting sizes of nested plots has been corrected to be 35 X 35 meters as the largest nest. NCR is satisfied.		
	VCS Version 3 Risk Analysis March 8, 2011, v3.0	**Applicability to the Project (Y or N/A)**	**Requirement Met (Y or N)**	**Location in PD or Supporting Documents**	**ESI Internal Comments (Validation)**	**Non-conformity Report (NCR)/Clarification (CL)/Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)**		**Response from Client**		
37	**Risk Assessment- Internal Risk Items**	y	n	Risk Analysis file VM007vCU	Please demonstrate financial viability through financial statements or similar means.	Please provide a financial viability plan or similar that supports your findings under this item.	similar means? What is the minimal document	Financial information was provided to verifyer. Financial viability is stated in the NVP.pdf document. NCR is satisfied.		
38	**Risk Assessment- Internal Risk Items**	y	n	Risk Analysis file VM007vCU	Need to provide a demonstration of the costs associated with this item to demonstrate the value given. See 2.2.3 item 1) in Risk Analysis tool.	Please provide the financial information that supports your findings under this item.	See table to the right NPV Comparison	Financial information was provided to verifyer. Financial viability is stated in the NVP.pdf document. NCR is satisfied.		
39	**Risk Assessment-Natural Risk Items**	y	n	n	Fire risk reference is provided.	Please identify source of information used to determine these risk items. Fire risk reference info is provided. Please explain how fire risk is minimal when there is evidence of recent fire on the project site.	Sources cited. Fires due to human intervention and not produced by nature. Generally accepted definition of "natural risk" given	Updated Risk Analysis provided as of March 9 2012. Email from VCS regarding this issue has been provided to verifyer. NCR is satisfied.		
	VCS Module VMD0006 Version 1.0 BL-PL	**Applicability to the Project (Y or N/A)**	**Requirement Met (Y or N)**	**Location in PD or Supporting Documents**	**ESI Internal Comments**	**Non-conformity Report (NCR)/Clarification (CL)/Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)**		**Response from Client**		
40	Strata must be spatially discrete and defined on the basis of forest carbon stocks	y	n		No identification of how the two strata were identified or any characteristics of the strata.	Please identify how the strata were selected and identified.	Appendix A	PDD states that strata were selected on the basis of stocking level and human or natural history. There remains a question as to the final qualification of strata 2 but that is being determined in other NCR's . This NCR is satisfied on the basis of the selection method.		
41	1.2 Area of deforestation Aplanned,i	y	n	Page 7 of PDD and calculations spreadsheet	332.44 is listed in the PDD but there are two strata identified and only 235 is included in the calculations for carbon credit.	Please clarify the actual area for deforestation in the PDD. In this section, please identify if strata 2 is intended to be subject to carbon crediting in future verifications. If this is the case, please identify how the baseline inventory was conducted. A baseline inventory needs to be established in order to compare for future carbon crediting. If the baseline inventory will be deferred, please identify when it is intended to be conducted.	Appendix A	Strata 2 is intended for carbon crediting but the inventory is being delayed until a future date. Strata 2 is confirmed at 78.5 ha. Total area for deforestation would have been 313.5 ha. Strata 2 baseline is being considered to be 0. NCR is satisfied.		
42	Legal permissibility for deforestation	y	n	Page 7 of PDD	PDD states that the agent had applied for permission to deforest.	Please describe how legal permission to deforest has been proven and demonstrated. Please add this discussion to the PDD in the baseline section.	Appendix A	This item is discussed in section 2.2 and in detail under section 1.1. PDD gives a good explanation of the forest laws and what plans and permits were sought for the purposes of deforestation. NCR is satisfied.		
43	Suitability of project area for conversion to alternative non-forest land use	y	n	Page 7 of PDD	PDD states the government has classified the location as suitable for grazing of cattle.	Please demonstrate the government land classifications for the project area and total ownership with reference to the legal ability to deforest the site.	Appendix A	This issue has been addressed in the PDD and through personal observations during the site visit. PLUS.pdf document provided as evidence of this. NCR is satisfied.		

44	1.4 Likelihood of deforestation	y	n	page 18 of PDD	Guidelines for this are on page 7 of module.	PDD states that likelihood of deforestation is 100%. Please justify this assumption using the guidance in VMD0006	Added to section 2.4	The deforestation agent had a valid deforestation permit that also identified a schedule. The history of non-action on the deforestation agent's part resulted in taking of some of his land by the Bolivian government. The deforestation agent had begun the deforestation on parts of the property that were left out of the project area.Given this scenario, the likelihood of deforestation as being 100% is likely and satisfies the NCR.			
45	1.5 Risk of abandonment	y	n	Page 18 of PDD	Risk of abandonment does require the use of proxy areas.	Please discuss how the value of 0 was determined for risk of abandonment. Please provide all information for proxy areas used for this determination. Please provide maps and descriptions of these proxy areas. Please also demonstrate that these proxy areas are applicable based on the qualities listed in BL-PL.	See section 2.4	Proxy area maps were provided that show similar lands and the claim is made that these lands were owned by the same class of deforestation agent. The 5 proxy areas selected to satisfy the risk of abandonment condition have the same land conversion practices, post deforestation land use, management and land use rights as the instance. Coordinates and Landsat-5 imagery have been given to validator. Proxy areas appear to portray common practice in Bolivia from a land use perspective. NCR is satisfied.			

	VCS Module VMD0009 Version 1.0 LK-ASP	Applicability to the Project (Y or N/A)	Requirement Met (Y or N)	Location in PD or Supporting Documents	ESI Internal Comments	Non-conformity Report (NCR)/Clarification (CL)/Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)		Response from Client	Non-conformity Report (NCR)/Clarification (CL)/Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)	Round 2 ESI Comments 2012-03-19
46	Main calculation #1, page 2 of the module.	y	n	Page 21 of PDD and VM0007LK spreadsheet provided.	The calculation sheet does not list a value for this step.	Please show your calculations for this step .	This is step 5 of the calculation in section 3.3 . NOTHING DONE	All assumptions and added descriptions of the leakage calculations have been added to the PDD in Appendix A, item g.. Updated spreadsheets showing the calculations have been requested. NCR is satisfied pending reciept of updated and corrected spreadsheets.	Calculations have been updated due to change in scope of project area. Strata 2 has been dropped and recored as such in calculations. NCR is satisfied.	
47	Option 1.2 Baseline deforestation based on historic deforestation average.	y	n	Page 21 of PDD and VM0007LK spreadsheet provided.	Lists the Ha as the answer	Please show your calculations for this step . Please describe in the PDD Leakage section all assumptions that relate to this calculation according to the guidance in VMD0009, page 3. Also please reconcile the difference between strata 2 ha listed in BSL calculation sheet step 1, D8 and D9 cells, with LK, step 1, cells C8 and C9.	See appendix A.g	All assumptions and added descriptions of the leakage calculations have been added to the PDD in Appendix A, item g.. Updated spreadsheets showing the calculations have been requested. NCR is satisfied pending reciept of updated and corrected spreadsheets.	Please submit all corrected calculations spreadsheets to ESI. Please include labels and units for every number that appears in the calculations spreadsheets.Specificall y please correct strata ha figures.	Spreadsheets have been revised and submitted to verifiers. Strata 2 has been removed. NCR is satisfied.
48	Step 2. Estimate new projection of forest clearance by the baseline agent of deforestation with project implementation if no leakage is occurring.	y	n	Page 21 of PDD and VM0007LK spreadsheet provided.	The calculation sheet does not list a value for this step.	Please show your calculations for this step . Please describe in the PDD Leakage section all assumptions that relate to this calculation according to the guidance in VMD0009, page 4	See appendix A.g	All assumptions and added descriptions of the leakage calculations have been added to the PDD in Appendix A, item g.. Updated spreadsheets showing the calculations have been requested. NCR is satisfied following reciept of updated and corrected spreadsheets.		
49	Step 3. Monitor all areas deforested by baseline agent of deforestation through the years in which planned deforestation was forecast to occur.	y	n	Page 21 of PDD and VM0007LK spreadsheet provided.	The calculation sheet does not list a value for this step.	This step does not appear to have been used. Please explain the absence of this calculation.	See appendix A.g	All assumptions and added descriptions of the leakage calculations have been added to the PDD in Appendix A, item g.. Updated spreadsheets showing the calculations have been requested. NCR is satisfied pending reciept of updated and corrected spreadsheets.	Please demonstrate that the deforestation agents current land holdings are not qualified to be deforested legally.	Deforestation agent does not own any lands at this time. This was initially an error and has been corrected. Project proponent has monitoring plans to track the activities of the agent of deforestation. No deforestation has occurred at time of verification. NCR is satisfied.
50	Step 4. Monitor greenhouse gas emissions outside the project boundary by baseline agent of deforestation	y	n	Page 21 of PDD and VM0007LK spreadsheet provided.	The calculation sheet does not list a value for this step.	Please show your calculations for this step . Please describe in the PDD Leakage section all assumptions that relate to this calculation according to the guidance in VMD0009, page 4. Please also demonstrate that the property currently held by the deforestation agent is not deemed to be legally deforested.	See appendix A.g			
51	PDD Step 5	y	n	Page 21 of PDD and VM0007LK spreadsheet provided.	The calculation sheet does not list a value for this step.	Please show your calculations for this step . Please describe in the PDD Leakage section all assumptions that relate to this calculation according to the guidance in VMD0009, page 4	See appendix A.g	All assumptions and added descriptions of the leakage calculations have been added to the PDD in Appendix A, item g.. Updated spreadsheets showing the calculations have been requested. NCR is satisfied pending reciept of updated and corrected spreadsheets.		
52	PDD Step 7	y	n	Page 21 of PDD and VM0007LK spreadsheet provided.	No calculations included.	Please show your calculations for this step . Please describe in the PDD Leakage section all assumptions that relate to this calculation according to the guidance in VMD0009, page 4	This was modified to step 6 in section 3.3,See appendix A.f	All assumptions and added descriptions of the leakage calculations have been added to the PDD in Appendix A, item g.. Updated spreadsheets showing the calculations have been requested. NCR is satisfied following reciept of updated and corrected spreadsheets.		

Item number	*Approved VCS Module VMD0015, Version 2.1 (20 November 2012), REDD Methodological Module: Methods for monitoring of greenhouse gas emissions and removals (M-MON), Sectoral Scope 14*	Applicability to the Project (Y or N/A)	Requirement Met (Y or N)	Location in PD or Supporting Documents	ESI Internal Comments	NCR/CL/OFI- May 24, 2013	Response from Client	ESI response	Response from Client	NCR/CL/OFI Satisfied (Y or N)
1	Medium resolution remotely sensed spatial data shall be used3 (30m x 30m resolution or less, such as Landsat, Resourcesat-1 or Spot sensor data).	Y	pending	Section 3.2 of PD and resourcesat-1 images and landsat images submitted	Three landsat images were submitted to verifiers however the project area is not referenced on the photos, nor is there any reference or description of the reference area. The imagery submitted is from before the start date.	CL: Please indicate in the PD and on the landsat images exactly where the project area is and what constitutes the reference area.	Please see attached validated PD with project location and attached LandSat 5 image with project area. Reference area only applies to unplanned deforestation.	Project proponent has submitted the requested information. Issue is addressed.		
2	*The methodological procedures used in M-MON steps 1-2 above must be documented, accroding to items a-d as listed in STEP 3 of the M-MON module.(page 13)*	Y	pending	Appendix A of Monitoring Report	Section 4.2 of the Monitoring report (vdl) states " Landsat-5 imagery for the baseline year (2011) was used. Unfortunately this satellite was removed from service that same year. ResourceSat-1 imagery with reasonable cloud cover was not available for that year. Therefore imagery from 2010 was used to cross correlate between Landsat-5 and ResourceSat-1. This process involved geo-referencing both images with the use of geo-referenced Landsat-7. Visual inspection showed that both images matched their deforestation amount. ResourceSat-1 imagery for 2010 and 2012 were geo-referenced and geometrically corrected as set out in step 5.1 of GOFC-GOLD 2008 Sourcebook for REDD. No cloud and shadow was required due to the absence of clouds. Visual inspection as allowed in Step 5.2 was implemented and no degradation was observed." The project needs to explicitly document items listed in Step 3 items a-d of the module.	NCR: The Methodology module indicates that each of the steps 1 and 2 as well as items a-d (Page 13 of M-MON) must be described in the PD or Monitoring Report. Please explicitly document each of the steps taken for this analysis in the monitoring report. Please list each step in sequence as they are listed in the M-MON tool.	Please see section 4.2 of revised monitoring report	Details were added to the monitoring report and numbered as requested. Issue is addressed		
	Approved VCS Module VMD0011, Version 1.0 (3 December 2010), REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of emissions from market effects (LK-ME), Sectoral Scope 14	Applicability to the Project (Y or N/A)	Requirement Met (Y or N)	Location in PD or Supporting Documents	ESI Internal Comments	NCR/CL/OFI- May 24 2013	Response from Client	ESI response		
3	Use Equation 1 on page 2 to calculate Net greenhouse gas emissions due to market-effects leakage. The sections below determine the parameters used in equation 1.	Y	pending	Section 1.13, 3.3 of PD	Project is calculating market effects leakage as listed in step 6 of Section 3.3 of PD.	Please present a tab in the calculations document that shows the application of this calculation including all required components, even if the results are 0.	Please see the attached spreadsheet.	Calculations included in VMD007LK.xls. Issue is addressed.		
4	**The next step is to estimate the emissions associated with the displaced logging activity. This is based on the total volume that would have been logged in the baseline in the project area across strata and time periods (Calculated using Equation 3 on page 3)**	Y	pending line 18	Section 1.13 of PD, VMD0007BSL.xls, section 3.1 of Monitoring Report	It is not clear where this calculation was presented.	Please provide a separate tab in the calculations that shows this step.	Please see the attached spreadsheet.	Calculations included in VMD007LK.xls. All wood but in the project would have been non marketable and burned on site in order to clear the land. The project area was selectively logged several years prior to the project start. Because of this, there is no market leakage effect. Issue is addressed.		

5	The carbon emission due to the displaced logging has two components: The biomass carbon of the extracted timber (see also module CP-W which uses the same equation) and The biomass carbon in the forest damaged in the process of timber extraction:These two components, together with other parameters, are used in Equation 4 on Page 4 to calculate the Carbon emissions due to timber harvests in the baseline scenario	Y	pending.line 18	Section 1.13 of PD, VMD0007BSL.xls, section 3.1 of Monitoring Report	It is not clear where this calculation was presented.	Please provide a separate tab in the calculations that shows this step.	Please see the attached spreadsheet.	Calculations included in VMD007LK.xls. Project area has no marketable timber, therefor the final result of Market leakage is 0. Issue is addressed.
6	Merchantable biomass as a proportion of total aboveground tree biomass for stratum i within the project boundaries (PMPi)	y	y	Section 4.1 of PD and references.	Included in Data and parameters monitored, however it is not clear where this calculation was presented.	Please provide a separate tab in the calculations that shows this step.	Please see the attached spreadsheet.	Calculations included in VMD007LK.xls. Issue is addressed.
7	Within each stratum divide the summed merchantable biomass (defined as "Total gross biomass (including bark) of a tree 30 cm DBH or larger from a 30 cm stump to a minimum 10 cm top DOB of the central stem") by the summed total aboveground tree biomass	y		Section 4.1 of PD and references.	It is not clear where this calculation was presented.	Please provide a separate tab in the calculations that shows this step.	Please see the attached spreadsheet.	Project has no marketable biomass and therefor this step is not needed. Project has submitted the information requested in the attached calculations spreadsheet. Issue is addressed.
8	Merchantable biomass is equal to merchantable volume multiplied by wood density (Dmi)	y	y	Section 4.1 of PD and references.	Mean wood density= 594 t/m3 used.Regional average (0.58 t d.m.m-3- tropical Africa; 0.60 t d.m.m-3- tropical America; 0.57 d.m.m-3- tropical Asia) from Brown, S. 1997. Estimating Biomass and Biomass Change of Tropical Forests: a Primer. For the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Rome, 1997. FAO Forestry Paper - 134. ISBN 92-5-103955-	Please provide a separate tab in the calculations that shows this step.	Please see the attached spreadsheet.	VMD07LK.xls spreadsheet submitted. Project area does not contain any marketable biomass and so the total for market leakage is 0. The rest of the market leakage calculations are not needed, however the process is shown in the attached spreadsheet. Issue is addressed.