Validated by:

Rainforest Alliance

65 Millet St. Suite 201
Richmond, VT 05477 USA
Tel: 802-434-5491
Fax: 802-434-3116
www.rainforest-alliance.org

Carbon Forestry Validation Audit
Managed by:
Africa Regional Office
Tel: +34 608 76 90 09
Fax: +34 91 791 26 92
Contact Person: Mateo Cariño Fraisse
Email: mcf@nepcon.net

CCB Standards
The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance

Rainforest Alliance

Validation **Assessment** Report for:

Sofala Community Carbon Project in Mozambique

Report Finalized:	1 September 2010
Draft Final Report Issued:	28 July 2010
Draft Report Issued:	02 February 2010
Audit Dates:	15-21 November 2009
Audit Team:	Mateo Cariño Fraisse, Adam Gibbon, Dr Romana Rombe Bandeira
Type of Validation:	CCBA
Validation code:	RA-VAL-CCB-
Validation issued:	
Latitude and Longitude:	S-34.107825, E-18.961558

Report based on Standard(s): Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, Second Edition, December 2008

Organization Contact:	Philip Powell
Address:	PO Box 679, Wetherby LS22 9BD, UK

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to document conformance with the requirements of The Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) project design validation standards by Envirotrade, who are the project proponents, hereafter referred to as "Company". The report presents the findings of SmartWood auditors who have evaluated company systems and performance against the applicable standard(s). Section 2 below provides the audit conclusions and any necessary follow-up actions by the company through corrective action requests.

This evaluation follows Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, Second Edition, December 2008. These were not developed by Rainforest Alliance, but by the CCBA. SmartWood CCBA evaluation reports are kept confidential in the draft stage. When finalized and successfully approved, the report is posted on SmartWood's website and that of the CCBA.

The Rainforest Alliance's certification program, SmartWood, was founded in 1989 to certify responsible forestry practices and now focuses on providing a variety of certification and auditing services. In 2005, Rainforest Alliance extended our role as a forest assessor/auditor to standards and services that included verification of forest carbon projects. Rainforest Alliance has the following status with the listed climate related standards and systems:

- CarbonFix – *we are a verifier*
- Chicago Climate Exchange - we are an *associate member* and an approved *verifier*
- Climate Action Reserve – *our accreditation is pending.*
- Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance – we are a *member* and an approved *verifier*
- Plan Vivo – *we are a verifier*
- Voluntary Carbon Standard – we are an accredited *validator & verifier*

The CCBA Standards are primarily project design standards and demonstrated conformance to the standard in this audit related to the planning, development, and design of the project in the inception or start-up phase. Conformance related to systems, design, and proposed activities in the process of development by the project. The standards were not used to measure project implementation, thus conformance to the standard was not meant to evaluate any delivery of emissions reductions, community or biodiversity benefits, or other results hoped to be achieved through future performance of the project. The CCBA Standards were designed to be a tool to demonstrate high-quality project design that should lead to multiple-benefits in addition to carbon sequestration and emissions reductions. Use of the standards may increase confidence in land based carbon projects.

Dispute resolution: If SmartWood clients encounter organizations or individuals having concerns or comments about Rainforest Alliance / SmartWood and our services, these parties are strongly encouraged to contact SmartWood Headquarters directly. Formal complaints or concerns should be sent in writing.

2 AUDIT CONCLUSIONS

2.1 Summary of Conformance to CCBA Standards

Summary from Final Report

Envirotrade made considerable changes to their PDD as well as providing additional supporting material in order to meet the corrective action requests that were raised in the draft report by the Rainforest Alliance. The PDD now presents a clear picture of the project's structure. It also better captures the complexity and dynamism of the work undertaken thus far. The project has now demonstrated that it

meets the mandatory and optional criteria for CCB validation. As such it can be awarded a Gold Level Validation for providing exceptional climate change adaptation, community and biodiversity benefits. The project must continue to work with a recognized carbon standard to transparently quantify the carbon benefits through peer reviewed technical specifications and ensure that the processes monitoring and related payments are clearly document, well executed and done with the endorsement of the local communities.

Summary from Draft Report

The Sofala community carbon project in Mozambique has now been running for seven years and was found to be having significant positive benefits on the ground, in one of the world's poorest regions. The project has numerous project activities, such as agroforestry, REDD and micro-business establishment and employs many staff to achieve the project objectives. The project is divided into two project zones, and has thousands of distinct project areas which are parcels of land for which farmers have signed contracts and agreed to plant/maintain trees or avoid deforestation in exchange for ex-ante carbon payments linked to annual monitoring. The project is well integrated into the local community and has been the subject of numerous academic studies. The relative maturity and complexity of this project has presented a challenge in documenting all the projects facets into one coherent project design document that explains the history, present status and future plans for the project. This has resulted in a number of corrective action requests (CARs) linked to the lack of clear documentation of complex processes. The project has also to conduct a High Conservation Value assessment, which is a fundamental component of the CCBA standard. This has resulted in one CAR that impacts many criteria.

It should be noted that all the criteria for the Gold Level section GL2, and GL3 'Exceptional Community Benefits' and 'Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits' were met. However a Gold Level validation can only be awarded if all the mandatory criteria are met (by addressing all CARs issued).

General Section	**Conformance:**		
G1. Original Conditions in the Project Area	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
G2. Baseline Projections	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
G3. Project Design & Goals	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
G4. Management Capacity and Best Practices	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
G5. Legal Status and Property Rights	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required

Climate Section	**Conformance:**		
CL1. Net Positive Climate Impacts	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
CL2. Offsite Climate Impacts ("Leakage")	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
CL3. Climate Impact Monitoring	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required

Community Section	**Conformance:**		
CM1. Net Positive Community Impacts	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
CM2. Offsite Stakeholder Impacts	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
CM3. Community Impact Monitoring	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required

Biodiversity Section	**Conformance:**		
B1. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
B2. Offsite Biodiversity Impacts	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
B3. Biodiversity Impact Monitoring	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required

Gold Level Section	**Conformance:**		
GL1. Climate Change Adaptation Benefits	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
GL2. Exceptional Community Benefits	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
GL3. Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required

CCBA Validation Level Attained:

Approved	Yes ☒	No ☐
Gold	Yes ☒	No ☐

2.2 Auditor Recommendation

Based on Project's conformance with VCS requirements, the auditor makes the following recommendation:		
Final Report Conclusions		
☒	*Validation approved:* No CARs issued	
☐	*Validation not approved:* Conformance with CAR(s) required	
Draft Final Report Conclusions		
☒	*Validation approved:* No CARs issued	*The Project proponent has 7 days from the date of this report to submit any comments related to the factual accuracy of the report or the correctness of decisions reached. The auditors will not review any new material.*
☐	*Validation not approved:* Conformance with CAR(s) required	
Draft Report Conclusions		
☐	*Validation approved:* No CARs issued	*Envirotrade have until 4 March 2010 to submit amended documentation and evidence to close the corrective action requests identified in this report. If these changes result in a positive assessment, the report will be closed, and a validation statement issued. If the submitted documentation does not result in the closure of all corrective action requests the report will be closed with the project not receiving validation. The project will then have six months from the date of this report to submit further amended documents and evidence to close the corrective action requests. This additional review by Rainforest Alliance would require a further contract to be negotiated, based on the level of required to review the updated documentation remotely.*
☒	*Validation not approved:* Conformance with CAR(s) required	

2.3 Corrective Action Requests

2.3.1 Corrective Action Requests (CARs)

Note: CARs describe required actions or improvements that address COMPANY non-conformances identified during audits. CARs include defined timelines for completion. CARs issued during assessments /reassessments shall be closed prior to issuance of Validation. CARs issued during audits shall be closed within timeline or result in suspension.

CAR 01/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G1.1, G1.2, G.1.5, G1.6, G1.7, G3.1, G3.2, G3.10, G4.3
Non-conformance:	In section G1.1 of the PDD figure 1 shows the location of the two "project areas". However, based on discussions with the project proponents, the areas actually represent the two project zones, which are part of one project. The 'Basic Information' section on page 3 of the PDD describes the project as being in the district of Gorongosa. However, one of the project zones is outside of this district. This inconsistent treatment of the two project zones, and a bias towards documenting project information for primarily the Gorongosa portion continues throughout the PDD. Another example can be found at section G3.2 of the PDD, which begins by specifically referencing "sustainable land management in Nhambita". Therefore, it is not clear if the information presented beneath is applicable to both project zones. Four project activities are described; these are "forest management", "timber utilization and sustainable harvesting", "agroforestry" and "non-timber forest products". The terminology in this section is not consistent with other sections: for example, REDD or avoided deforestation is not mentioned. It appears to be part of the "forestry management" activities in the PDD, but there is no distinction drawn between the difference in activities that take place on community managed lands and those that take place on individually managed lands.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall describe all project attributes and activities for both project zones as appropriate using descriptions of activities consistent with other parts of the PDD and supporting documents.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	The PDD now describes explicitly the two project sites: The project considers now one project zone (Sofala province) with 2 project sites (the Gorongosa project site and the Zambezi Delta project site) where the project areas are located (over a thousand *machambas* (fields) with an average of 1.03ha plus the REDD areas, from 2 ha to 5249 ha). This is reinforced by adding new maps, and differentiating the activities and attributes in each zone. In addition the PDD has been reworked to be more consistent in the terminology employed.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 02/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G1.1, G1.3, G1.5, G1.6
Non-conformance:	There is an inconsistent use of the terms 'project area' and 'project zone', and the terminology used to name the projects zones, i.e Gorongosa *vs*. Nhambita throughout the PDD.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall use both the terms project area/project zone/project region, and the names of each project zones consistently throughout the PDD and in line with CCBA definitions.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	The PDD has been clarified with unequivocal uses of the terms and naming. The project considers now one project zone (Sofala province) with 2 project sites (the Gorongosa project site and the Zambezi Delta project site) where the project areas are located (over a thousand *machambas* (fields) with an average of 1.03ha plus the REDD areas, from 2 ha to 5249 ha)
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 03/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G1.2
Non-conformance:	In section G1.2 of the PDD there is a thorough description of vegetation types. However, the descriptions do not include the condition of the vegetation types. For example one Savanna site visited during the audit had evidence of illegal logging for honey collection.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall describe the condition of vegetation within the project area.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	The condition of the vegetation types is now described in section G1.2 of the PDD. In addition, monitoring carried out by Eduardo Mondlane University (MOU signed) will determine the condition in the future.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 04/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G1.3, G3.3
Non-conformance:	There are no examples provided in the PDD of how the project area was mapped at a local level for agroforestry activities.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall describe the process for defining project areas and provide examples in the PDD.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	The PDD explains now how the agroforestry areas are mapped by the community technicians using the GPS and how the area is calculated by this means. All contracts have a map associated, as the PDD shows in an example.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 05/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G2.1
Non-conformance:	Section G2.1 of the PDD simply presents the results of a study done to determine baseline deforestation rates in the area from remote sensing data. There is no information provided about the likely future land uses on areas where the agroforestry project activities occur. Under the Plan Vivo system that is being implemented the baselines are calculated in the technical specifications that are used for each project type. The technical specifications for the activities on agricultural land describe the baseline as being static (no loss or gain to carbon stocks over a 100 year period). It was explained that, because of the slash and burn system employed by farmers in the project zones, the static baseline was not intended to be representative of what would actually happen on one piece of land, but rather the net impact of always having a field cleared for farmland. This was considered acceptable, but was not documented, even within the technical specifications.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall document the methodologies and results for determining the baseline for all the systems employed.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	The revised PDD in section G2.1 now contains baseline information regarding both the REDD and agroforestry activities. The section is focused on the quantification of the baseline carbon changes rather than assessing potential land use scenarios. The method used to generate the baseline data is now well explained. The REDD Technical Specification does include an acceptable defense of why baseline deforestation data will continue and the auditors found no evidence to suggest any other scenario than the continuation of traditional practices on agriculture areas.

CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 06/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G1.7, B1.1
Non-conformance:	An appropriate methodology (using the Shannon index) has been employed to estimate biodiversity, but the biodiversity information concerns only flora.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall include biodiversity information detailed for both flora and fauna species.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	Studies carried out in and around the Gorongosa National Park before the commencement of the project and using information that was available to the project developers highlighted a link between the management of natural resources in the neighboring communities and the survival of the biodiversity of the park. The project was designed, in consultation with the management of the park, to preserve and protect the bio-diversity in the protected area. Envirotrade now considers flora taxa the most vital for study in the miombo ecosystem and this project, where trees are the focus. Nevertheless, as part of their commitment to develop a biodiversity monitoring plan, which has been outlined to some extent already, Envirotrade will invite a bird expert to carry out a bird survey, since this taxa is considered especially relevant. This will also provide information for eco tourism, which is one of the project's micro-businesses, and will be used to assess the success of agro-forestry activities. A simple biodiversity index will be used to compare the difference between the sites.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 07/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G1.5, G1.7
Non-conformance:	The PDD is the combination of a lot of sources, studies, reports, and other documentation generated to support to the project. These were in fact presented to the auditors and were found to be significant. Nevertheless, is difficult to understand where the data comes from, as many of these are not included in the PDD in the indicators response and not even in the references. Examples are Chidamba (2004) or Marzoli (2008).
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall include references in the PDD to all the relevant documentation produced and used by the project.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	Envirotrade clarified that although they have revised the PDD and referenced the missing documents, some of the documents originally sent to the auditors were not directly used to build the PDD and thus were not referenced in it, but were sent as additional sources of information.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 08/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G1.6, G4.3
Non-conformance:	This project has been running for some years now, and this is reflected in the PDD, which will be evolving in the future. The version presented to the auditors as the more up to date is from August 2009, but some changes that occurred before that have not been included in this version. For example, the information provided in table on page 24 of the PDD (Zambezi Delta land tenure) needs clarifying and the status of NGO's involvement needs updating, as some of the mentioned NGO's are not part of this process anymore.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall update the PDD to reflect the current situation of the project at the date of the PDD version.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	The PDD was updated to an April 2010 version to reflect all the new changes in the project.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 09/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G1.8.1 to 1.8.6, G3.6, CM1.2, CM3.2, B1.2, B3.2
Non-conformance:	The project protection of concerned natural ecosystems and the low-to-no impact of the project activities are highlighted by the project proponents and confirmed in consultations with local NGO´s or documents reviewed (Campbell 1986; MICOA, 2008; Marzoli 2008). Nevertheless, no specific HCV assessment has been carried out. Some regional documents related to the importance of the miombo forest were listed in the PDD, but there is no link with the particularities of the values in the project zones. As a result, no specific measures to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes have been defined.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall design a plan to complete HCV evaluation including attributes as listed from G 1.8.1 to 1.8.6 for the project zones, including clear steps and resources for defining measures to enhance or maintain the value attributes, the implementation of these measures, the demonstration that none would be negatively affected by the project, and the mechanism to assess their effectiveness.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	Envirotrade has used the ProForest HCVF toolkit to comprehensively determine the HCV in the project sites, with a result of 63.7% of the project area within one of the 6 HCV categories. Four different categories, grouping different HCV, have been appointed and maps have been included in the PDD: • High biodiversity closed canopy forests, such as gallery/riverine forests and dry tropical forests • Protected areas (Inhamitanga Forest Reserve) • Woody vegetation on steep slopes • Culturally important areas General management recommendations have been included in the PDD for these categories. In the Plan Vivo annual report progress on protection and maintenance of HCV zones are to be documented to test the effectiveness of the measures taken. The monitoring plan has been already outlined to some extent (using community technicians, the University Eduardo Mondlane, satellite imagery, questionnaires, surveys, and others) to check their status and it is expected to be finished within 6 months after validation (12 months is the

	maximum allowed by CCB)
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 10/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G2.3, CL1.1
Non-conformance:	Table 5 shows the impact of the deforestation on the remaining carbon stock within the project area. It was explained during the field audit by the project proponents that the deforestation rate of 2.4% was distributed proportionally between the forest types. It was also explained that all credits issued so far had been based on a carbon loss of 73.3 t CO_2 ha^{-1} and that a new version of the technical specification was currently under review by the Plan Vivo Foundation. The history of the methods used to calculate emissions in the past and the recent move to more sophisticated techniques was not found to be well documented.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall transparently document which technical specifications were used to calculate emissions historically and currently and for which ones changes are planned. Any changes made or errors discovered between versions should be documented.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	Sections G2.3 and CL1.1 now contain a history of the Technical Specifications used. The no-burning system is now described in the PDD and a Technical Specification has been created and submitted for peer review. See **OBS 19/10**.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 11/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G2.3
Non-conformance:	Table 6 was not explained in the text. For example, there is no definition of the distinction between 'old' and 'new' contracts. In addition, the PDD has yet to explain contracts or define the systems that the project uses. As such this table would be difficult for a reader to interpret.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall clearly define in the PDD the land use systems employed and how they relate to contracts.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	Sections G2.3 and CL1.1 provide a clear explanation of the systems utilized by the project. The contracting process is explained in sections G3.2, G3.3 and G3.4. The table mentioned above has been removed.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 12/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G3.4
Non-conformance:	The implementation schedule is defined, although it was found to be incomplete. After discussions with the project proponents it appears that the REDD related project activities rolled out on a slightly different time period than the rest of the activities, which is not documented in the PDD. In addition, during the introductory meeting of the field audit the project proponents explained that the project as a whole had two phases. A ramping up period of approximately 10 years, and a 5 year period of transferring project implementation and governance entirely to the local communities. These future plans were not discussed in the PDD and are of fundamental importance to the design of the project.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall clearly explain the timeline of the project to date for all project activities and explain the key dates in the future running of the project.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	In the revised PDD the phasing of the REDD project is mapped in section G2.3 of the PDD and described in detail in the document called, "Implementation of REDD in Sofala Project". The exit strategy is now explained in section G3.4.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 13/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G3.10
Non-conformance:	Conflict solving process has been described in a general and flexible way, mainly related with land occupation rights and land use title, but there are other potential conflicts involving other stakeholders and no clear and publicly available grievance process was found.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall formalize and publicize a clear process for handling unresolved conflicts and grievances that arise during project planning and implementation. Project management must attempt to resolve all reasonable grievances raised, provide a written response within 30 days, and document the grievances process.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	Envirotrade has developed a 3 stage grievance policy to provide a mechanism to deal with these cases at the lowest level possible within the organisation at which the matter can be resolved. The process is explained now in the PDD, and it includes written response within 5-10 working days.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 14/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G4.1
Non-conformance:	Most of the organizations (Envirotrade Group, Mozambique Carbon Livelihoods Trust, the University of Edinburgh, the Edinburgh Centre for Carbon Management, the Administration of the Gorongosa National Park) involved in the project and their responsibilities are clearly described in the PDD. There is no reference to Envirotrade Mozambique Limitada and its relationship with Associação Envirotrade Carbon Livelihoods, nor if the latter is already a legally approved association. There is also a lack of description of the coordinator and project proponent, Envirotrade Carbon Limited.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall clarify the name, role, and constitution of all the project proponent and organizations involved in the project.	

Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	The PDD has been modified by deleting Associação Envirotrade Carbon Livelihoods (which has been created to replace Envirotrade Mozambique Limitada but is not yet officially published in *Bulletim da Republica*), and also by describing Envirotrade Carbon Limited as the project developer replacing Envirotrade Limited in early 2009.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 15/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G4.2
Non-conformance:	In section G4.2 of the PDD the key technical skills that will be required to implement the project successfully are not documented. The previous section G4.1 does state the responsibilities of the project but without a list of key skills, the absence of gaps is not easy to detect. The prior experience of the management team is not stated. During the field audit, observations suggested that the management team have adequate experience and competence to execute the project successfully. However, this has not been documented.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall document the technical skills required to implement the project or the management teams experience and expertise in project implementation.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	The PDD has been completed to include all the team's professional skills.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 16/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G4.6
Non-conformance:	While conversations with project staff revealed an effort in worker safety issues, no use of safety equipment has been seen e.g. in the sawmill.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall evidence the delivery and enforcement of use of the safety equipment to the workers of the project.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	Envirotrade has provided receipts to evidence the purchase of safety equipment and the handover of this material to the micro-businesses. In addition, the contract of operation for the mill does show the manager agreeing to abide by health and safety requirements. The micro-businesses are now independent of Envirotrade management and as such the ability of the project to directly enforce policies is diminished. The auditors were satisfied that through persistent training (by Gary Cross, who advises the bee keeping and mill operations) all reasonable steps to ensure worker safety were being taken. See **OBS 23/10.**
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 17/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: CL1.1
Non-conformance:	The project proponents explained during the field audit that there has been one case (*Faidherbia sp*. plantations) where an error had been discovered in the modeling used to calculate emissions reductions. An updated technical specification had been made, but not yet used. Plan Vivo and Envirotrade have agreed in principal that a deduction should be made from the risk buffer once the Plan Vivo database is up and running. Envirotrade have not yet documented the quantified impact this will have on their buffer stocks. Table 9 contains an ex-ante projection of the carbon sequestration over the crediting period. It is not clear what assumptions have been used to create the data presented here or exactly which technical specifications have been used.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall describe the process for handling the impacts of changes made to technical specifications.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	Envirotrade have explained that, *"A deduction will be made from the total Plan Vivo projects risk buffer which will be proportional to the credits which were produced in error. The modalities of this process are still in development. In theory the deductions will be made in the public registry and will be in the region of 88,000 tCO_2e or 60% of the project buffer. "* Working with Plan Vivo to handle this situation was considered to be an acceptable approach, given that Plan Vivo's systems are built on the need for transparent and conservative carbon accounting. Table 9 has been removed.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 18/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: CL1.3
Non-conformance:	In section CL3.1 of the PDD the text does not address the criterion. Criterion 3.1 is to estimate the emissions related to project activities. The text discusses the permanence risk buffer.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall estimate any other GHG emissions resulting from project activities or demonstrate that they are not significant.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	In the revised PDD, section CL1.3 has been completely revised and no longer discusses permanence risk. Project activity emissions are found to be insignificant based on a 2008 study. The findings were presented in a spreadsheet called, "Calculator Gorongosa". The calculation of flight emissions was found to contain an error in the formula. This error has been corrected, although it did not affect the overall result – that the project emissions are <1% of expected project benefits.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 19/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: CL2.3
Non-conformance:	In section CL2.3 it is stated that no project leakage is expected. This was considered acceptable by the review team, due to the mitigation activities and project design explained in the previous sections. However, the section also discusses the use of the Voluntary Carbon Standard's risk buffer. The VCS's buffer system is to account for permanence, not leakage and the internal reference given to CL1.1 is incorrect.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall explain their process for making adjustments to the GHG emissions net balance should leakage be detected.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	CL2.3 has been updated and the reference to VCS removed which was inserted in error. Any leakage found during monitoring will be have its impacts quantified through consultation with the Plan Vivo Foundation.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 20/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: CM3.1, CM3.3, B3.1, B3.3
Non-conformance:	The monitoring results are distributed as part of the project's annual reporting process to Plan Vivo. However the audit team has seen very different PV annual reports (2006-08), without a clear plan with a comprehensive and justified variables range and frequencies to be followed-up.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade shall present the monitoring plan for all project activities and the past results. The frequency of monitoring and reporting for all climate, community and biodiversity issues shall be clearly indicated in the PDD.	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	There is past information in the various Plan Vivo and EU reports, but now frequency of monitoring has been made clearer in the PDD. A new monitoring plan will be completed within 6 months of validation with more detail.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

CAR 21/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: CL3.2
Non-conformance:	It is not clear how the monitoring data gathered will be used to quantify the actual climate benefits of the project, since the monitoring results are linked to payments to farmers, not GHG quantification.
Corrective Action Request: Envirotrade must document how the monitoring results are used to estimate actual emissions reductions/sequestration due to project activities	
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:	In Envirotrade's response to the Draft Report it is explained that the monitoring of the agroforestry systems may be revised to enable quantification of the carbon stocks. In addition, it was clarified that trees lost to mortality are replaced, so the planned sequestration should always occur unless complete failure occurs. A full explanation of the REDD monitoring that will occur is presented. This includes MODIS/Radar data analysis that will allow carbon stock changes to be tracked. In a telephone interview Lucy Goodman explained plans to compare Radar, transect and optical data to find the optimal strategy for

	quantifying emissions from future deforestation and degradation.
CAR Status:	CLOSED
Follow-up Actions (if any):	

2.3.2 Observations

Note: Observations are issued for areas that the auditor sees the potential for improvement in implementing standard requirements or in the quality system; observations may lead to direct non-conformances if not addressed.

OBS 01/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G1.4
Section 1.4 of the PDD presents an overview of the methods used to calculate the current carbon stocks for the REDD, agroforestry and woodlot project areas. The methods and results are supported by extensive literature such as peer-reviewed scientific articles and masters theses. It is not clear why Grace *et al.,* (2007) is used as a reference for Table 1 when Ryan (2009) was used on page 13 for the same data.	
Observation: Envirotrade should use consistent referencing for the sources of carbon stock data.	

OBS 02/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: CL1.1
The project uses the Plan Vivo approach to estimate changes in carbon stocks due to project activities. There are two broad categories of activities that will contribute to net positive climate impacts are quantified, these are: REDD areas, and agroforestry systems. The project also carries out other activities such as the distribution of pigeon pea that will yield a net positive climate impact but for which the impact is not quantified. The PDD could be clearer in linking these broad project types to the activities listed.	
Observation: Envirotrade should use project related terms consistently.	

OBS 03/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G2.5
Without project scenario is described at general level in the PDD for the various indicators, namely threatened species, species abundance, species diversity, landscape connectivity, forest fragmentation, among others. This analysis has been done in a general level, and it is not very specific to the project zone.	
Observation: Envirotrade should use the HCV evaluation for the project zone to describe more in-depth how the 'without project' reference scenario would affect biodiversity in the project zone.	
Action taken to address OBS: This has been addressed in the revision of the PDD	

OBS 04/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G3.11
In section G3.11 exhaustive explanation has been provided on the adopted financial mechanism, the organizational structure of the project according to Plan Vivo specifications and the Mozambique carbon Livelihoods Trust and the flow of goods/funds. Some explanations given led to the REDD activities only (i.e. *1st paragraph on page 58)* while applicable to all of them, creating confusion.	
Observation: Envirotrade should clarify the activities concerned by the financial mechanisms, such as MCLT.	

OBS 05/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: CL2.2
Most of the stakeholders interviews revealed a good awareness raised concerning the displacement of the wood collection/logging to other areas, but there was still a small minority for which the message was fundamentally not to clear the *mashambas* associated to the project and for which the displacement could be a possibility if needed in the future, as it was not a current need.	
Observation: Envirotrade should continue the efforts on raising awareness within the population to avoid displacement of the activities	

OBS 06/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: B1.3
It has not been indicated the extent and steps for *Gliricidia sp.* use being phased out.	
Observation: Envirotrade should clearly indicate in the PDD the steps for changing tree species in their systems.	

OBS 07/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: B1.3
Seeds origin is not mentioned in the PDD: i.e. *Faidherbia sp.* comes from Malawi.	
Observation: Envirotrade should mention seeds origin in the PDD.	

OBS 08/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: B3.1
The PDD states that biodiversity variables for monitoring were selected having trees as the focus, but no fauna indicators have been identified.	
Observation: Envirotrade should include fauna indicators as part of the biodiversity variables to be monitored.	

OBS 09/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: CL1.4
The text in section CL1.4 of the PDD does not meet the requirements of this criterion. However, based on observations made on the field audit, the project activities clearly will have a net positive impact on the climate.	
Observation: Envirotrade should demonstrate that the net climate impact of the project is positive using the structure provided in the CCBA criterion CL1.4.	

New Observations issued in the Draft Final Report:

OBS 13/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G1.7, B1.1
The project was designed, in consultation with the management of the park, to preserve and protect the bio-diversity in the protected area. Now, Envirotrade plans to invite a bird expert from the Ornithological Society in Maputo to carry out a bird survey, since the avian taxa is considered especially relevant, but no other available information from other relevant stakeholders as the National Park has been noted.	
Observation: Envirotrade should continue the relationship with the National Park and/or other stakeholders to expand the scope of the biodiversity studies to other fauna taxa and sources of already available information.	

OBS 14/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: CM3.2, B3.2
The monitoring plan has been already outlined to some extent to analyze the status of the HCV, and it is expected to be finished within 6 months after validation. Thus, the specific indicators and how the results are going to be used are still not clear.	

Observation: Envirotrade should include in the monitoring plan should specific indicators to report on the status of the HCV and based on this update the specific measures to enhance or maintain them.

OBS 15/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G3.10
Envirotrade has developed a harassment policy and a 3 stages grievance policy to provide a mechanism to deal with these cases at the lowest level possible within the organization at which the matter can be resolved. This has been made public in the PDD, but no evidence has been provided of other means more accessible to the stakeholders.	
Observation: Envirotrade should evidence other means to make accessible the harassment and grievance policy to the full range of stakeholders.	

OBS 16/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G3.10
Envirotrade has developed a harassment policy and a 3 stages grievance policy to provide a mechanism to deal with these cases at the lowest level possible within the organization at which the matter can be resolved. The grievances process and project responses are to be documented in the monitoring plan, but it is not clear how this is going to be done practically.	
Observation: Envirotrade should ensure that there is a system to document the harassment and grievance policy processes.	

OBS 17/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G1.4
The information required to meet the climate related criteria was found in the PDD, however, often it was not organized under the correct headings.	
Observation: Envirotrade should organize the climate change information into the correct sections of the PDD template.	

OBS 18/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G2.3
In section CL1.1 of the PDD there is an explanation of how technical specifications have evolved over time. Section G2.3 does explain that a carbon value of 73.3 t C ha^{-1} was used prior to the adoption of the new REDD Technical Specification in 2009, however it is not clear how many credits were created using this value, and whether any corrections had been made or were planned. However, this was found to be a typo, and in fact the original carbon density value used for REDD areas was 73.3 t CO_2 ha^{-1}. In a document called, “Implementation of REDD in Sofala Project” the use of this number, and the history of REDD activities is presented.	
Observation: Envirotrade should use the correct units throughout the PDD.	

OBS 19/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: CL1.1
Issues of ambiguity were found in the as yet unapproved ‘no burning’ technical specification. The Auditors acknowledge that the no burning technical specification has been submitted for peer review as required by the Plan Vivo. Given the relatively small quantities of carbon involved (<4% of total) there is not a risk of the outcome of that review affecting the net benefits of the project. In addition there is no evidence to suggest that not burning could lead to increased net emissions. Therefore it was accepted that an OBS would be issued to complete this process and make any required changes by the verification. It should be noted that of the agroforestry system, overall the no burning system is the third largest creator of emissions reductions (see table on p91 of the PDD).	
Observation: Envirotrade should complete the peer review process for the no burning technical specification.	
Action taken to address OBS:	

OBS 20/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: CL1.3
Project activity emissions are found to be insignificant based on a 2008 study. The findings were presented in a spreadsheet called, “Calculator Gorongosa ". The calculation of flight emissions was found to contain an error in the formula. This error has been corrected, although it does not affect the overall result – that the project emissions are <1% of expected project benefits.	

Observation: Envirotrade should correct the calculation of emissions from project related flights to account for the number of miles flown per flight.

OBS 21/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G1.4
The PDD states (on p15) that the Technical Specifications can be found at www.miombo.org.uk. This is correct but they are within another large document. It would be clearer if the more direct link of the Plan Vivo website is provided, especially since this is where approved TS's will officially be posted.	
Observation: Envirotrade should reference the Plan Vivo website as the primary source of technical specifications.	

OBS 22/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: CL1.1
Figure 32 on page 96 of the PDD was found to be confusing. Some systems have a positive emissions baseline (REDD), whilst some are steady or negative (Agroforestry), therefore it was not clear how this table was compiled.	
Observation: Envirotrade should provide a clear explanation of how baseline and project emissions data is summarized in figure 32.	

OBS 23/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: G4.6
While conversations with project staff revealed an effort in worker safety issues, no use of safety equipment has been seen e.g. in the sawmill. Envirotrade has provided receipts to evidence the purchase of safety equipment and the hand ver of this material to the micro-businesses. In addition, the contract of operation for the mill does show the manager agreeing to abide by health and safety requirements. The micro-businesses are now independent of Envirotrade management and as such the ability of the project to directly enforce policies is diminished. The auditors were satisfied that through persistent training (by Gary Goss, who advises the bee keeping and mill operations) all reasonable steps to ensure worker safety were being taken. However the effectiveness of this training should be monitored and continual improvement demonstrated	
Observation: Envirotrade should monitor the success of efforts to improve the uptake of the available safety equipment in the microbusinesses.	

Please note: For the optional Gold Level criterion, Rainforest Alliance does not issue corrective action requests, since compliance with these criteria is not mandatory for CCBA validation. Where an optional criterion is found to be in non-compliance an Observation will be issued. In order to obtain Gold Level validation the all Observations for optional criterion for at least one of the Gold Level sections must be addressed.

OBS 10/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: GL1.1
In section GL1.1 of the PDD droughts and floods are identified as threats that are likely to rise due to climate change in Mozambique. However, no details are provided about the likely regional changes that are projected.	
Observation: Envirotrade should be more explicit in the link between the national level data and the potential impact climate change will have on land use in the project region.	
Action taken to address OBS: Within the limitations caused by the availability of data, the PDD explains the potential impacts of expected climate change. CLOSED	

OBS 11/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: GL1.2
Criterion GL1.2 requires that risks to the projects benefits caused by climate change/variability are identified, and mitigation strategies documented. This has not been done in the PDD. Section GL1.3 simply states that the project will reduce the impact of droughts and floods.	
Observation: Envirotrade should identify any risks to the project's climate, community and biodiversity benefits resulting from likely climate change and climate variability impacts and explain how these risks	

will be mitigated.
Action taken to address OBS: The PDD now identified risks associated with possible drought as well as demonstrating how the project is already mitigating any foreseeable impacts. CLOSED

OBS 12/10	Reference Standard & Requirement: GL1.3
Section GL1.3 identifies drought related crop failure as a threat to communities and climate change more broadly as a threat to slowly reproducing organisms. Whilst these threats are real, no attempt has been made to link the broad statements to the actual project zone.	
Observation: Envirotrade should relate broad climate change/variability related threats to the specific circumstances found within the project zone.	
Action taken to address OBS: The project uses information on past climate related disasters in Mozambique to illustrate the potential scale of impacts. CLOSED	

2.4 Actions Taken by Company Prior to Report Finalization

The draft report was sent to Envirotrade with 21 Corrective Action Requests. Envirotrade worked to solve the issues by doing a review and making changes to the PDD, and then subsequent changes in the relevant associated documentation, including the Technical Specifications.
Envirotrade has also developed new tools such as the High Conservation Values evaluation, based on the ProForest HCVF toolkit, an exit strategy explaining the key dates in the future running of the project, a grievance and an harassment policy, and outlined a monitoring plan that will be completed 6 months after the validation.

A list of the documents provided as exhibits in this phase can be checked in 3.3.

3 AUDIT PROCESS

3.1 Field Audit Overview[1]

Note: The table below provides an overview of the audit scope. See standard checklist appendix for specific details on auditor qualifications, staff interviewed, and audit findings per facility audited.

Location/Facility	Date(s)	Length of Audit	Auditor(s)
Team meeting. Envirotrade camp, Nhambita	15/11	1,5 h	Romana R. Bandeira Mateo Cariño Fraisse Adam Gibbon
Opening meeting. Envirotrade camp, Nhambita	15/11	3 h	Romana R. Bandeira Mateo Cariño Fraisse Adam Gibbon
Stakeholders' meetings (Provincial Directorate for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs, Provincial Directorate of Agriculture/ Provincial Forest Services , NGO *Agência do Desenvolvimento Económico Local de Sofala*–ADEL, WWF Mozambique, auditing agency CONTABIL LDA. Beira, Sofala Province.	16/11	1 day	Romana R. Bandeira Mateo Cariño Fraisse Adam Gibbon

[1] See 3.2 for details on the sites visited

REDD areas. Mbulawa Mudoda.	17/11	0,5 day	Mateo Cariño Fraisse Adam Gibbon
Stakeholders' consultation (District Services for Economic Activities, Púnguè Local Authorities for the Locality of Punguè). Gorongosa Village	17/11	0,5 day	Romana R. Bandeira
Stakeholders' consultation: Natural Resources Management Committee Headquarters for the Nhambita Community	17/11	2,5 h	Romana R. Bandeira Mateo Cariño Fraisse Adam Gibbon
Documents review. Envirotrade camp, Nhambita	18/11	0,5 day	Romana R. Bandeira Mateo Cariño Fraisse Adam Gibbon
Evaluation of agroforestry sites (Pavua, Chimuala)	18/11	0,5 day	Romana R. Bandeira Adam Gibbon
Evaluation of agroforestry sites Nursery visit. (Nhambita, Bue-Maria, Munhanghana).	18/11	0,5 day	Mateo Cariño Fraisse
Consultations with representatives for Guma, Mponda, Cherimadzi and Gorra communities. Mponda Primary School	19/11	4 h	Romana R. Bandeira Mateo Cariño Fraisse
Farmer contracts and Database analysis. Mponda Primary School	19/11	4 h	Adam Gibbon
Evaluation of agroforestry sites (Mponda)	19/11	3 h	Romana R. Bandeira Adam Gibbon
Evaluation of agroforestry sites (Cherimadzi)	19/11	3 h	Mateo Cariño Fraisse
FSC certified neighboring company: TCT Dallman Company. Catapú, Sofala Province	19/11	1,5 h	Romana R. Bandeira Mateo Cariño Fraisse Adam Gibbon
Nursery visit. Mponda	19/11	0,5 h	Romana R. Bandeira Mateo Cariño Fraisse
Nursery visit, Mantega Community	20/11	1 h	Romana R. Bandeira
Evaluation of agroforestry sites (Mponda)	20/11	3 h	Romana R. Bandeira
Stakeholder consultation. Gorongosa National Park	20/11	3,5 h	Mateo Cariño Fraisse Adam Gibbon
Document review. Envirotrade site. Nhambita	20/11	5 h	Mateo Cariño Fraisse Adam Gibbon
Microbusiness visit (sawmill, carpentry, honey) Envirotrade site. Nhambita	20/11	2h	Mateo Cariño Fraisse

Closing meeting. Envirotrade camp, Nhambita	20/11	2 h	Romana R. Bandeira Mateo Cariño Fraisse Adam Gibbon

3.2 Description of Audit Process

The audit team conducted three main activities in the field: on-farm/forest inspections, interviews with land owners and Envirotrade staff, including community coordinators, and interviews with stakeholders. Field evaluation was then followed up on review of documents, databases, and management issues at the Envirotrade camp in Nhambita.

On-farm/forest inspection and interviews with landowners

The sites for field visits were selected by taking a representative sample based on start date of contract, type of system employed (the various agroforestry systems or REDD), and location (in both project zones). The aim was to review 2% of the contracts and visit 1% of the producers under contract.

The Gorongosa project zone had approximately 1500 contracted landowners which represents 1500 project areas with different agroforestry systems being employed, dating back to the contract year of 2004-2005. The site selection was based on a random sample balanced by logistical constraints. Some farms were nominated specifically by Envirotrade to demonstrate specific circumstances (for example, to ensure all systems were visited). In addition, within the Gorongosa project zone we visited one of the 21 REDD areas, which is the very biggest area with 5249 ha (range from 5249 to over a ha)

The Zambezi project zone has in 2010 approximately 235 contracted landowners which represents 450 project areas, with different agroforestry systems being employed dating back to the contract year of 2007-2008. The site selection was based on a random sample balanced by logistical constraints.

The farm inspections typically began with the community technician and/or farmer explaining the history of land use on the site and the tree planting associated with the project. The audit team checked this oral history with the files and asked Envirotrade for explanations. The audit team walked each plot to determine how well elements such as tree spacing, growth, survival, species, and planted area matched the records.

The farmer was interviewed to grasp her or his understanding of the project. The audit team also tried to ascertain how satisfied the farmer was with his or her engagement with the project and if there had been any disputes. The farmer was asked about the amount and frequency of payments, the benefits they intend to receive besides carbon payments, expenses they had incurred in project establishment, etc. Figures and statements were checked against the farmers' contracts, the project databases, and payment record folders.

Project coordinators were asked to demonstrate their monitoring and measuring methodologies and techniques with the audit team observing. Audit team members checked recorded data and made some measurements of their own to compare with Envirotrade results.

Interviews with Envirotrade staff

Envirotrade staff, including the Envirotrade Projects Director, Project Manager, Operations Managers, Administrator, Science Responsible for Envirotrade Projects, database responsible, NTFP Specialist, community technicians, patrol team, and drivers accompanied the audit team on the entire

field visit. Throughout the field visit, Envirotrade staff was informally interviewed by the audit team to ascertain management practices, monitoring methodologies, training practices and needs, and information about the carbon sequestration resulting from the project's implementation.

Interviews with stakeholders

During the field visit, several meetings were held with government structures at different level (Sofala Provincial Directorate for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs, Department for Environmental Management, Sofala Provincial Directorate for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs, Department of Natural Resources Assessment/ National Directorate of Lands and Forests, Ministry of Agriculture, Gorongosa District Service for Economic Activities, Púnguè and Mponda Localities Governements), Development Agencies (GTZ), Financial auditing agencies (CONTABIL, LDA), NGO's (Agência do Desenvolvimento Económico Local de Sofala – ADEL, WWF Mozambique, Associação Rural de Ajuda Mútua-ORAM, Carr Foundation), and community associations (Association, Natural Resources Management Committee for the Nhambita , Mponda, Mantega, Chirimadzi, and Gorra Communities, microbusiness), community chiefs and members.

The audit team discussed the Envirotrade project with all these stakeholders in order to understand their perspective on the project, legal issues, communication, relationships, etc.
The community members were invited to give their general impressions of the project, including its benefits to the community, and to explain how the community viewed the project. The leaders were asked to explain their roles with respect to the project, specifically, their responsibilities for and experiences with substantiating tenure claims and conflict resolution. The local Natural Resources Management Committee members were also asked to identify risks they associated with the project.

Non-forest sites visited:

Date	Location & site description	Audit activities
16/11	Beira, Sofala Province. Sofala Provincial Directorate for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs	Consultation about project impact and relevance for the communities and implementation of activities
16/11	Beira, Sofala Province. Sofala Provincial Directorate of Agriculture/ Provincial Forest Services	Consultation regarding the project impact and implementation process
16/11	NGO *Agência do Desenvolvimento Económico Local de Sofala* (ADEL) in Beira, Sofala Province	Consultation regarding the project impact and relationships
16/11	NGO WWF Mozambique, Coordination Office in Beira, Sofala Province	Consultation regarding the project impact and relationships
16/11	Auditing agency CONTABIL LDA in Beira, Sofala Province	Consultation regarding the auditing process for the project
16/11	Department of Natural Resources Assessment/National Directorate of Lands and Forests, Ministry of Agriculture in Maputo	Consultation by phone, regarding deforestation areas in the project zone

17/11	Association FUMA Nhambita at the Natural Resources Management Committee Headquarters for the Nhambita Community	Consultation about the project impact, consultation and communication, training, recruitment processes, farm integration and contract system, suggestions for improvement
17/11	District Services for Economic Activities, Gorongosa Disctrict at the Gorongosa Village	Consultation about the project relevance and impact in the project zone
17/11	Púnguè Local Authorities for the Locality of Punguè, at the Gorongosa Village	Consultation about the project relevance and impact in the project zone, project consultation and communication, training, recruitment processes
18/11	NGO GTZ based in Beira, Sofala Province	Consultation by phone regarding the project impact and relationships
18/11	NGO ORAM based in Beira, Sofala	Consultation by phone regarding the project relevance, impact and relationships
19/11	TCT Dallman Company in Catapú, Sofala Province	Consultation about project relevance, impact and relationships
19/11	Consultations with representatives for Guma, Mponda, Chirimádzi and Gorra communities at the Mponda Primary School	Meeting for consultation about the project relevance and impact in the project zone, project consultation and communication, training, recruitment processes
20/11	Gorongosa National Park	Consultation about the impact and relationship with the project.
20/11	Microbussiness (sawmill, carpentry, apiaries). Nhambita	Consultation about the project impact on the community members and its projection in the future.
16-20/11	Envirotrade site, Nhambita	Document review

Agroforestry sites evaluated:

Date	Name / Location	Total Area (ha)	Systems / Contract Date	Audit Activities
17/11	Mbulawa Mudoda	5248.83	REDD 07/08	Interview with team who protect the REDD area through fire break creation, early burning and patrols. Walk through area. Observation of measurement techniques. Demonstration of stratification techniques.
18/11	Laurinda Ferreira / Pavua	0.48	Faidherbia 08/09 No burning 08/09	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Comparison to contract and maps.
18/11	Anita Chuva / Pavua	0.42	Faidherbia 08/09 No burning 08/09	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Comparison to contract and maps.
18/11	Bernardo Simbe Chimuala / Pavua	3.87	Gliricidia 05/06 Homestead 05/06 Boundary 06/07	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Comparison to contract and maps.

			No burning 06/07 Faidherbia 08/09 (replaced Gliricidia 05/06)	
18/11	Cardoso Ernesto Pavua	0.95	Homestead 08/09 No burning 08/09 Faidherbia 08/09	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Demonstration of monitoring techniques. Comparison to contract and maps.
18/11	Deolinda Manuel Nsengo/Munhanganha	4,42	Faidherbia 07/08, 08/09	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Demonstration of monitoring techniques. Comparison to contract and maps.
18/11	Maneca Luis/ Chicare	2,54	Boundary 04-05	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Demonstration of monitoring techniques. Comparison to contract and maps.
18/11	Chitambe Jorge João/Nhambita	16,9	Boundary 04-05, 05-06, 06-07 Faidherbia 08/09 Cashew 07-08 Homestead 08/09	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Demonstration of monitoring techniques. Comparison to contract and maps.
18/11	Simão Raposo/Nhambita	7,43	Boundary 04-05, 05-06 Faidherbia 08/09 Cashew 06-07 Homestead 08-09	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Demonstration of monitoring techniques. Comparison to contract and maps.
18/11	Chingamoio Antonio Jemuse/Nhambita	11,99	Boundary 04-05, 05-06, 06-07 Faidherbia 08/09 Cashew 07-08 Homestead 06-07	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Demonstration of monitoring techniques. Comparison to contract and maps.
18/11	Maria Francisco /Bue-Maria	2,39	Boundary 04-05, Cashew 07-08, Faidherbia 08-09	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Demonstration of monitoring techniques. Comparison to contract and maps.
18/11	Joanita Miquitaio Jone/Bue-Maria	2,69	Boundary 05-06 Faidherbia 08-09 Cashew 07-08	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Demonstration of monitoring techniques. Comparison to contract and maps.
18/11	Francisco Rosa Macbeque/Bue-Maria	0,25	Cashew 08-09	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Demonstration of monitoring techniques. Comparison to contract and maps.
18/11	Maria Raete Alfanete/Bue-Maria	2,41	Boundary 05-06, 07-08 Faidherbia 08-09	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Demonstration of monitoring techniques. Comparison to contract and maps.
18/11	Ngaite Joalinho Manuel/Nhambita	3,228	Boundary 04-05, 07-08	Technician interview and observation of plantings. Demonstration of monitoring techniques. Comparison to contract and maps.
18/11	Jorge Ernesto Branco, Magalla Zebedia/Munhanganha		Owner of the nursery	Interview about project impact to local communities

19/11	Joao Chadreque	1,72	Cashew 07/08	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Comparison to contract and maps.
19/11	Jose Armando	1,45	Boundary 07/08 Homestead 07/08 Faidherbia 08/09 (no contract but trees planted)	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Comparison to contract and maps.
19/11	Chano Samo	1,06	Boundary 07/08 Homestead 07/08 No burning 07/08	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Comparison to contract and maps.
19/11	Antonio Mirione	1,43	Boundary 07/08 No Burning 07/08	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Comparison to contract and maps.
19/11	Lucia Henriques/Cherimadzi	1,64	Boundary 07/08	Farmer and technician interview.
19/11	Vena José Duarte/Cherimadzi	1,00	Boundary 07/08	Farmer and technician interview.
19/11	Beti Carlos/Cherimadzi	1,15	Boundary 07/08	Farmer and technician interview.
19/11	Jose Sacue Quembo/Cherimadzi	1	Boundary 07/08 NF 07/08	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Comparison to contract and maps.
19/11	Dias Dique Melo/Cherimadzi	1	Boundary 07/08	Farmer and technician interview and observation of plantings. Comparison to contract and maps.
19/11	Mponda, Zambezi Delta Area		Nursery owner	Interview about project impact to local communities
20/11	Ernesto Fulai Jesse, Matenga	6,37	Boundary Woodlot Cashew Faidhebia 07/08 No burn Ln Mantega, Mecumbúzi	Interview to check contract and farm activities, the monitoring process, plants survival, process of farmer involvement with the project
20/11	Geraldo Luís Lore	0,22	Homestead 08-09 No burn In Mantega Community, Mecumbúzi	Interview to check contract and farm activities, the monitoring process, plants survival, process of farmer involvement with the project
20/11	Ismael Jose	0,05	Homestead	Interview to check contract and farm activities, the monitoring process, plants survival, process of farmer involvement with the project
20/11	Ibraimo Fibione Capendecare	5,68	Boundary 07-08 Boundary 07-08 Faidherbia 08-09 Woodlot 07-08 No burn 07-08 In Mantega Community, Mecumbúzi	Interview to check contract and farm activities, the monitoring process, plants survival, process of farmer involvement with the project
20/11	Marta Veríssimo and Adelino Veríssimo	3,3	Woodlot 06-07 No burn 06-07 In Pávua	Interview to check contract and farm activities, the monitoring process, plants survival, process of farmer involvement with the project
20/11	Armando Joaquim	1,32	Cashew 2007 Homestead	Interview to check contract and farm activities, the monitoring process, plants

			Glericidia No burn In Pávua	survival, process of farmer involvement with the project
20/11	Mantega Community, Mecumbúzi		Nursery owner	Interview about project impact to local communities

3.3 Documents reviewed

Submitted after the field audit in response to the draft Report

- 2010-18-04-PDD-CCBA-Sofala-post audit_FINAL.doc
- 2010-18-04-PDD-CCBA-Sofala-post audit_FINAL.pdf
- Envirotrade SOF Exit Strategy.pdf
- ET POL Grievance Policy.pdf
- ET POL Harassment Policy.pdf
- Falcao 2010.pdf
- Ghee 2010, prerelease.pdf
- Implementation of REDD in Sofala Project.pdf
- Machamba sem queimada.pdf
- N'hambita Carbon Crediting Technical Note written by ECCM.pdf
- Protective Clothing to sawmill.pdf
- SOF Envirotrade monitoring manual DRAFT.pdf
- Sofala HCVF report.pdf
- 120610 Sofala_AC.xlsx
- Nhambita Final Report main part.doc (EU "Evaluation of N'hambita Pilot Project" Final Report November 2009, Antonio Marzoli and Piero Del Lungo)
- comments_on_ML_evaluation_amended2.doc (Comments on the document above)
- 2009 Casey's thesis chapter 6 - uncertainty.pdf
- 2009 Calculator Gorongosa
- 120610 Sofala_AC.xlsx
- Avoided burning on agricultural land_LG_v6.pdf
- comments_on_ML_evaluation_amended2.doc
- Nhambita Final Report main part.doc
- Queries for completion of Draft Final CCBA and PV audit report For Lucy 170610_LG.doc
- response to smartwood_LG_JG.doc
- TermoEntrega.pdf
- EquipamentoSerracao.pdf
- EquipamentoSeguranca.pdf
- EntregaEquipamento.pdf

Prior to, or during, the Field Audit

- CCBA PDD, V13, 30 August 2009
- 2008 Sofala Report to Plan Vivo (and Appendixes)
- Technical specifications:
  1. 050609 MOZ-NHA-TS-DIP var faidherbia
  2. 080509 MOZ-NHA-TS-Boundary
  3. 080509 MOZ-NHA-TS-DIP var Gliricidia
  4. 080509 MOZ-NHA-TS-FO-Mango

5. 080509 MOZ-NHA-TS-Homested Planting
6. 080509 MOZ-NHA-TS-Woodlot
7. 080509 MOZ-NHA-TS-FO-Cashew

- Conservation of miombo woodland in Mozambique, V2.2, 21 Sept 09 (in peer review)
  (*older versions were also seen for some systems, but frequently the date or version number was not present*)

- Actions Required to Establish Conservation Areas (no date or version, filename = 34ACTI~1)
- Avoided deforestation areas transect protocol (stratification) (no date or version, filename = 370104~1)
- PSP measurement program document
- Modelling deforestation rate on population size
- Forest Management Plan
- Spadavecahia, L.; Williams, M. & Wright, J. 01-09-04 Synthesis of Remote Sensing Products and a GIS Database to Estimate Land Use Change: an Analysis of the Nhambita Community Forest, Mozambique. Landsat 2000 Classification. 26 p.
- Sambane, E.C.C. 2005. Above-ground Biomass Accumulation in Fallow Fields at the Nhambita Community – Mozambique. M.Sc. Thesis. University of Edinburgh. 79 p.
- Zolho, R. Effect of Fire Frequency on the Regeneration of Miombo Woodland in Nhambita, Mozambique. M.Sc. Thesis. University of Edinburg
- Wallentin, G. 2006. Carbon Change Rate and Assessment of its Drivers in Nhambita, Mozambique. University of Edinburgh. 18 p.
- Flaherty, S. 2008. Analysis of Land Use Change Using Spot Images. N´hambita Pilot Project, Final Report, September 2008. Institute of Geography, School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, Drummond Street, Edinburgh EH8 9XP
- Marzoli, A. 2008. Inventário Florestal Nacional. Ministério de Agricultura. Direcção Nacional de Terras e Florestas. Maputo, 98 p.
- Relatório sobre o processo de visionagem na Comunidade de Matondo. Programa de Desenvolvimento Rural, Sofala. República de Moçambique. Ministério da Agricultura e Desenvolvimento Rural e da Cooperação Técnica Alemã GTZ 30p. By Charles Chidamba. 01/2004
- Herd, A.R.C. 2007. Exploring the Socio-Economic Role of Charcoal and the Potential for Sustainable Production in the Chicale Regulado, Mozambique. A dissertation presented for the degree of Master of Sciences. University of Edinburgh. 77p.
- Rohit Jindal. Impact Assessment of the Nhambita Community Carbon Project, Mozambique. 408 p. (follow up socio-economic data from 2008)
- Jindal, R. 2004. Measuring the Socio-Economic Impact of carbon Sequestration on Local Communities: An Assessment Study with Specific Reference to the Nhambita Pilot Project in Mozambique. M.Sc. Thesis. University of Edinburgh. 113 p.
- Minihousehold Census (mini census Chicare Regulado).
- Mini Household Census. April 2009.
- Williams, M.; Ryan, C.M.; Rees, R.M.; Sambane, E.; Fernando, J.; Grace, J. 2008. Carbon Sequestration and Biodiversity of Re-growing Miombo Woodlands in Mozambique. Forest Ecology and management. 254: 145-155. Science Direct. www.science.direct.com
- Furley, P.A.; Rees, R.M.; Ryan, C.M.; Saiz, G. 2008. Savanna Burning and the Assessment of Long-term Fire Experiments with Particular Reference to Zimbabwe. Progress in Physical Geography. 32 (6): 611-634

- Carbon sequestration and biodiversity of regrowing miombo woodlands of Malawi (Walker et al., 2008)
- Policy and procedure Manual (draft)
- Staff CVs
- Training materials, educational movies and reports:
  1. António Serra: Princípios Básicos de Plantação. Guião de Treinamento.
  2. António Serra: Mudanças Climáticas. Manual de Treinamento.
  3. António Serra: Technical Specification Training Manual. Envirotrade Moçambique. Princípios Básicos de Plantação. Guião de Treinamento Mfumaya Nhambita. ECCM. The Edinburgh Centre for Carbon Management/Envirotrade/The University of Edinburgh. Funded by the European Union.
  4. António Serra: Feijão Boer (Ndodze). Guião de Treinamento. Envirotrade Moçambique
  5. Relatório Anual de Actividades 2008-2009. Envirotrade Moçambique
  6. Panflet Fundação Carbono Para Vida. Mozambique Carbon Livelihoods Trust. Contabil.
  7. Seca e Desertificação. Promarte. ABC do Ambiente. 2. VHS – PAL, 51 MIN.
- Pigeon Pea Training manual (slides)
- Tree planting techniques slides
- Treiamento Tecnicos slides
- Trust Fund leaflet
- Portugese Envirotrade leaflet
- Climate change manual
- Farmers selection report for 2008
- Comparison of average survival rate between four communities in Zambesi Project Zone
- Systems for 2009 and Performance Analyss 2009
- Resume – Statistical Report
- Zambezi Database (contracts and sales)
- Zambezi Database (Monitoring 2009)
- Gorongosa Database (contracts and sales)
- Gorongosa Payments File
- 2009 Carbon Calculator Forestry Spreadsheet
- No burning Carbon Calculator
- 2009 Agroforestry Carbon Calculator (older versions seen as well)
- 2006-2009 Forestry Payments and Monitoring Reports
- Contracts, monitoring reports and carbon calculators for all farmers listed as having their sites visited.
- BBC DVD – Taking the credit, 2009
- Conferences attended by project staff
- Williams, M.: Quantifying and monitoring Carbon Stocks in Tropical Woodlands. University of Edinburgh/School of Geosciences.
- Rohit Jindal: Payments for Ecosystem Services and Poverty Alleviation. The University of Edinburgh. Michigan State University.
- António Serra: Zambezi Delta Floodings. The Plan Vivo Contribution to Developemnt Strategy
- Powell, P. 2007. Carbon Livelihoods Program. Changing how the World Thinks about Climate Change. Envirotrade. Presentation - 2007
- Ryan, C. Fire and Biospheric carbon Management
- Barbir, J. 2009. Socio-Environmental Approach to Drip Irrigation System Implementation as a Climate Change Adaptation Measure Within N´hambita Community Carbon Project Area, Mozambique. Joint European Master in Environmental Studies. Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona. Technical University of Hamburg-Harburg.

- Appendix G Gorongosa Monitoring Sofala-2008

3.4 Stakeholder consultation process

The CCBA Standards require that project proponents make the PDD and other supporting documents of a project for validation available to the CCBA. CCBA upon receipt of the documents post them on its website and invites the public for comments within 30 days.

The public notification was sent to international stakeholders on October 28. At the same time, the project design document (PDD) was posted in the CCB website.
The project proponent also sent various notices informing about the CCB process and seeking comments on the project from stakeholders at national level. Stakeholders included National Director of Land and Forest, Eduardo Mondlane University, Department of Forest at National Department of Land and Forest, Minister for Coordination of Environmental Affairs (MICOA), and Forest and Wildlife – Sofala. This communications have been checked by the audit team.

During the field visit, several meetings were held with government structures at different level (Sofala Provincial Directorate for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs, Department for Environmental Management, Sofala Provincial Directorate for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs, Department of Natural Resources Assessment/ National Directorate of Lands and Forests, Ministry of Agriculture, Gorongosa District Service for Economic Activities, Púnguè and Mponda Localities Governements), Development Agencies (GTZ), Financial auditing agencies (CONTABIL, LDA), NGO's (Agência do Desenvolvimento Económico Local de Sofala – ADEL, WWF Mozambique, Associação Rural de Ajuda Mútua-ORAM, CARR Foundation), and community associations (Association, Natural Resources Management Committee for the Nhambita , Mponda, Mantega, Chirimadzi, and Gorra Communities, microbusiness), community chiefs and members.

3.5 Public Comments Received

No comments have been received to date from the international announcement.

Appendix A: COMPANY DETAILS

1 CONTACTS

1.1 Primary Contact for Coordination with SmartWood

Primary Contact, Position:	Philip Powell, Project Director
Address:	P O Box 679, Wetherby LS22 9BD, UK
Tel/Fax/Email:	+44 1937 579945/ +44 1937573131/philip.powell@envirotrade.co.uk

1.2 Billing Contact

Contact, Position:	Philip Powell, Project Director
Address:	P O Box 679, Wetherby LS22 9BD, UK
Tel/Fax/Email:	+44 1937 579945/ +44 1937573131/philip.powell@envirotrade.co.uk

2 SmartWood Website Customer Fact Sheet

Note: upon Validation, the SmartWood website posts and maintains Customer Fact Sheets for companies with the information in the table below at http://www.ra-smartwood.org/

Field	Text for Customer Fact Sheet	Has this Info Changed?
Contact, Title: (Sales & Marketing)	Philip Powell, Project Director	Yes ☐ No ☒
Address:	P O Box 679, Wetherby LS22 9BD, UK	Yes ☐ No ☒
Tel/Fax/Email/Website:	+44 1937 579945/ +44 1937573131/ philip.powell@envirotrade.co.uk	Yes ☐ No ☒
Products/Descriptions:	Validated Carbon credit	Yes ☐ No ☒

3 Validation Scope

3.1 Scope Definition:

The scope of the validation audit is to assess the conformance of Envirotrade's agroforestry and REDD project in Sofala province, Mozambique, against the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance Standards, Second Edition. The project covers 2 project zones, in the Gorongosa National Park buffer zone and in the Zambezi Delta, with an area of 511,392 ha subject to change with new incorporations. The land is community owned. The audit assesses the project with respect to the baseline scenarios presented in the project design document. The audit assesses all material GHG sources, sinks and reservoirs required by the CCBA. The project has a lifetime of 100 years.

3.2 Type of Legal Entity: Limited

3.3 Jurisdiction: UK

Appendix B: STANDARD CHECKLIST CCBA STANDARDS

1 Evaluation of Project

Project Name:	Sofala Community Carbon Project
Contact for Validation:	Philip Powell, Project Director
Address:	P O Box 679, Wetherby LS22 9BD, UK
Tel/Fax/Email:	+44 1937 579945/ +44 1937573131/philip.powell@envirotrade.co.uk

2 Evaluation Details

Auditor(s), Qualifications:	**Mateo Cariño Fraisse** Mateo is the Forest and Climate Services Coordinator for the Mediterranean and Africa. Mateo speaks French, Spanish, English, and Portuguese, holds a masters degree in Forestry, and has gained experience in forest fires (Spain), research (France), management plans (Comoros Islands), FSC and Carbon projects assessments (Costa Rica, DR Congo, Cameroon, Morocco, Guatemala, UK, Uruguay, Portugal, México, Brazil, Bolivia), funding projects (Fundación Biodiversidad, AECID, DFID, CBFF) and delivering trainings (Spain, Bolivia, UK, DR Congo, Cameroon, Brazil, Morocco). Mateo has completed a lead auditor training by SmartWood. **Adam Gibbon** Adam is Technical Specialist for the Rainforest Alliance Climate Change Initiative. Adam has led the technical climate change related side of ten CCBA validations, one VCS validation and four VCS methodology reviews, that are either completed or currently underway. Adam was also involved in one CCX verification. Adam is a qualified lead auditor for the Climate Action Reserve and was a CCX forestry verifier committee participant. Adam has trained over 60 people in Spain, Bali and Vietnam in AFOLU project auditing and project development. Recipients of the training included Rainforest Alliance auditors, government officials, private consultants and NGO representatives. Adam was lead author of recent Rainforest Alliance publication entitled, “Guidance on coffee carbon project development using the (CDM) simplified agroforestry methodology” as well as two scientific articles currently in press. Before joining Rainforest Alliance Adam worked at Oxford University as a researcher. His research emphasized the potential of carbon markets to finance sustainable management of forest resources. He led a team conducting a landscape scale assessment of carbon stocks in the Peruvian Andes’ cloud forests and montane grasslands. Adam earned a distinction on the Environmental Change and Management MSc. Program at Oxford University, winning prizes for his dissertation and overall performance. He was awarded the Sir Walter Raleigh Scholarship at Oriel College, Oxford. He graduated with a first class degree from Durham University, with a BSc in Natural Sciences, specializing in Geology, Chemistry & Geography. **Romana Rombe Bandeira** Romana is assistant professor since 2000, Eduardo Mondlane University. Areas of work include Forest protection, protection and rehabilitation of ecosystems, wildfires, forest health, pest ecology. Design, coordination and implementation of several research projects and publications in the fields of forest protection. Supervision of more than 15 final year undergraduate students and MSc work. Consultancy work and management positions within the Faculty of Agronomy and Forestry Engineering such as Associate Dean for Research and Extension (2001-2004); Associate Dean for Academic Issues (2005-2008). Worked at the National Commission of Planning/ National Directorate for Planning/Agrarian Department, in charge of forest policy analysis and analysis of the national forest production and statistics. Has been involved in the evaluation of research projects in the biology topic for the Ministry of High Education and Technology (2002); IUCN (2003); University Open Fund (2008). Gender analysis and diagnosis for the Faculty of Agronomy and Forestry Engineering (1995).

3 Standard Checklist

Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, Second Edition, December 2008

GENERAL SECTION

G1. Original Conditions at Project Site - Required

Concept
The original conditions at the project area[2] and the surrounding project zone[3] before the project commences must be described. This description, along with baseline projections (G2), will help to determine the likely impacts of the project.

Indicators
The project proponents must provide a description of the project zone, containing all the following information:

General Information

1) The location of the project and basic physical parameters (e.g. soil, geology, climate).

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	In section G1.1 of the PDD figure 1 shows the location of the two "project areas". However, based on discussions with the project proponents, the areas actually represent the two project zones, which are part of one project. The 'Basic Information' section on page 3 of the PDD describes the project as being in the district of Gorongosa. However, one of the project zones is outside of this district. This inconsistent treatment of the two project zones, and a bias towards documenting project information for primarily the Gorongosa portion continues throughout the PDD, as does the inconsistent use of the terms 'project area' and 'project zone' and the terminology used to name the projects zones, i.e Gorongosa *vs*. Nhambita.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	The PDD now describes explicitly the two project sites: The project considers now one project zone (Sofala province) with 2 project sites (the Gorongosa project site and the Zambezi Delta project site) where the project areas are located (over a thousand *machambas* (fields) with an average of 1.03ha plus the REDD areas, from 2 ha to 5249 ha). This is reinforced by adding new maps, and differentiating the activities and attributes in each zone. In addition the PDD has been reworked to be more consistent in the terminology employed. The PDD has been also improved with univocal uses of the terms and naming. The project considers now one project zone (Sofala province) with 2 project sites (the Gorongosa project site and the Zambezi Delta project site) where the project areas are located (over a thousand *machambas* (fields) with an average of 1.03ha plus the REDD areas, from 2 ha to 5249 ha)		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 01/10 CLOSED, CAR 02/10 CLOSED**		

2) The types and condition of vegetation within the project area.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	In section G1.2 of the PDD there is a thorough description of vegetation types. However, the descriptions do not include the condition of the vegetation types. For example one Savanna site visited during the audit had evidence of illegal logging for honey collection. The vegetation types include 'tropical (miombo) woodland', 'savanna', 'riverine or riparian forest', 'secondary woodland' and 'mashambas.' Attributes of these

[2] The 'project area' is defined as the land within the carbon project boundary and under the control of the project proponent.
[3] The 'project zone' is defined as the project area and the land within the boundaries of the adjacent communities potentially affected by the project.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>types are shown in table 1. It would appear that a rigorous scientific method has been used to acquire this data. However, what is not clear in the PDD is how the permanent plots and areas sampled relate to the two project zones (Gorongosa and Zambezi). For example, the inventory referenced in the first line of section G1.2 refers to the “Nhambita community forest”, so it is not clear how applicable this is to other areas.

The methods used to classify forest type and gather biomass data within one of the REDD project areas was demonstrated during the field audit. The methods were carried out accurately by well trained project staff. The methods were appropriate to the aims of estimating carbon stocks and stratifying the landscape.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Findings from 2nd review: 28 JULY 10</td><td>The PDD has been clarified, now describing the two project locations well.
The condition of the vegetation types is now described in section G1.2 of the PDD. In addition, monitoring carried out by Eduardo Mondlane University (MOU signed) will determine the condition in the future.

There remains a lack of clarity surrounding where the plots were located that determined the biomass of the different forest types. During a conversation with Lucy Goodman of Envirotrade, it was explained that eighty seven plots of between 0.25 and 1.00 hectares were used to determine carbon stocks presented in section G1.2 (and used in the technical specification. The REDD Technical Specification shows how many plots were used for each forest type. The following breakdown of the plot locations was also provided in the table below.

More detailed forest inventories are planned for the two largest REDD areas to verify the data used in the technical specification.

<table>
<tr><td>Location</td><td>Number</td></tr>
<tr><td>Chicare</td><td>73</td></tr>
<tr><td>Marromeu</td><td>8</td></tr>
<tr><td>Qurimbas</td><td>6</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>Conformance</td><td>Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐</td></tr>
<tr><td>CAR/OBS</td><td>CAR 01/10 CLOSED, CAR 03/10 CLOSED</td></tr>
</table>

3) The boundaries of the project area and the project zone.

<table>
<tr><td>Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10</td><td>The boundaries for the project zone are clearly shown in Figures 5 and 6 in section G1.3 and Figure 7 of the PDD in section G3.3. There are two distinct project zones called Gorongosa and Zambezi. The other two figures in section G3.3 show the locations of the project sites for the agroforestry activities and the areas of the community carbon conservation areas. However, there were no examples provided of how the project area was mapped at a local level for agroforestry activities. During the field visit, project area specific maps were seen. One exists for each project area. The maps are either hand drawn ‘Plan Vivos’ or GPS derived project area outlines.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Findings from 2nd review: 28 JULY 10</td><td>The PDD has been clarified with univocal uses of the terms and naming. The project considers now one project zone (Sofala province) with 2 project sites (the Gorongosa project site and the Zambezi Delta project site) where the project areas are located (over a thousand machambas (fields) with an average of 1.03ha plus the REDD areas, from 2 ha to 5.249 ha)
The PDD explains now how the agroforestry areas are mapped by the community technicians using the GPS, and how the area is calculated by this mean. All contracts have a map associated, as the PDD shows in an example.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Conformance</td><td>Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐</td></tr>
<tr><td>CAR/OBS</td><td>CAR 02/10 CLOSED , CAR 04/10 CLOSED</td></tr>
</table>

Climate Information

4) Current carbon stocks within the project area(s), using stratification by land-use or vegetation type and methods of carbon calculation (such as biomass plots, formulae, default values) from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's 2006 Guidelines for National GHG Inventories for Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use[4] (IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU) or a more robust and detailed methodology.[5]

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Section 1.4 of the PDD presents an overview of the methods used to calculate the current carbon stocks for the REDD, agroforestry and woodlot project areas. The methods and results are supported by extensive literature such as peer-reviewed scientific articles and masters theses. It is not clear why Grace *et al.,* (2007) is used as a reference for Table 1 when Ryan (2009) was used on page 13 for the same data.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	G1.4 of the PDD no longer provides information on the current carbon stocks, but presents an ex-ante estimate of the sequestration that will occur due to the project activities. However, the Technical Specifications that are used to estimate pre-project carbon stocks are not referenced. There remains ambiguity throughout the PDD and REDD technical specification as to the exact source of data related to carbon stocks. (See findings in section G1.2 above) The PDD states (on p15) that the Technical Specifications can be found at www.miombo.org.uk. This is correct but they are within another large document. It would be clearer if the more direct link of the Plan Vivo website is provided, especially since this is where approved TS's will officially be posted.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**OBS 01/10**,**NEW OBS 17/10, NEW OBS 21/10**		

Community Information

5) A description of communities[6] located in the project zone, including basic socio-economic and cultural information that describes the social, economic and cultural diversity within communities (wealth, gender, age, ethnicity etc.), identifies specific groups such as Indigenous Peoples[7] and describes any community characteristics.[8]

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The PDD focuses mainly on one of the project zones, namely Nhambita, with less information for the Zambezi project zone. As outlined above, there is some inconsistency in project areas designation, sometimes referred as Nhambita, sometimes as Sofala Community Project, throughout the PDD. Some description is provided in page 17 regarding institutional structure for Púngué Administrative Post but not for the other Administrative Posts and Regulados. Communities in the mentioned project zone were described including diversity, information about religion aspects, local and other institutional structures. However, cultural information was not given in detail.

[4] Volume 4 Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/vol4.html
[5] In cases where a published methodology is used, the full reference must be given and any variations from the published methodology must be explained.
[6] 'Communities' are defined as all groups of people—including Indigenous Peoples, mobile peoples and other local communities—who live within or adjacent to the project area as well as any groups that regularly visit the area and derive income, livelihood or cultural values from the area. (See Appendix B: Glossary for more information.)
[7] 'Indigenous Peoples' are defined as distinct, vulnerable, social and cultural groups whose members identify themselves as belonging to an indigenous cultural group. (See Appendix B: Glossary for more information.)
[8] Community characteristics may include shared history, culture, livelihood systems, relationships with one or more natural resources, or the customary institutions and rules governing the use of resources.

	Other related sources (i.e Chidamba (2004)) are not referenced in the PDD.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	The PDD has been very much clarified. On one hand describing explicitly the two project sites: The project considers now one project zone (Sofala province) with 2 project sites (the Gorongosa project site and the Zambezi Delta project site) where the project areas are located (over a thousand *machambas* (fields) with an average of 1.03ha plus the REDD areas, from 2 ha to 5.249 ha). This is reinforced by adding new maps, and differentiating the activities and attributes in each zone. On the other hand the PDD has been reworked to be more consistent in the terminology employed. The PDD has been improved also with univocal uses of the terms and naming. The project considers now one project zone (Sofala province) with 2 project sites (the Gorongosa project site and the Zambezi Delta project site) where the project areas are located (over a thousand *machambas* (fields) with an average of 1.03ha plus the REDD areas, from 2 ha to 5.249 ha) Envirotrade has clarified that although they have revised the PDD and referenced the missing documents, some of the documents sent to the auditors were not directly used to build the PDD and thus were not referenced on it, but were sent as other sources of information.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 01/10 CLOSED, CAR 02/10 CLOSED, CAR 07/10 CLOSED**		

6) A description of current land use and customary and legal property rights including community property[9] in the project zone, identifying any ongoing or unresolved conflicts or disputes and identifying and describing any disputes over land tenure that were resolved during the last ten years (see also **G5**).

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Land use has been described in detail, including use of forests and natural resources, use rights on traditional land, and legal provisions to prevent conflicts, but as said above most information is for the Gorongosa area and not for the Zambezi Delta. The project has been interacting with organizations such as GTZ and the NGO ORAM, which gave assistance at the project initial phase in 2000 to place boundaries and community land delimitations to avoid conflicts regarding land rights. The information provided in the table on page 24 of the PDD (Zambezi Delta land tenure) needs clarifying and the status of NGO's involvement needs updating, as some of the mentioned NGO's are not part of this process anymore. In page 12 there are contradictions, probably linked with use both the terms project area/project zone/project region (*the Chicare Régulado covers an area of 48,596 ha. Outside of the project area there are 21,046 ha which are part of the project. In addition, the project area covers the 34,830 ha for Mucombeze. The total Gorongosa project region is therefore 55,877 ha*). Consultations with a local NGO referred that project existence in the project region helped to ease tense relationships between Gorongosa National Park and the surrounding communities. The project factor attracted communities from inside the park to the buffer zones where communities were able to use agricultural practices in their farms and as a consequence reduce pressure to natural resources and illegal hunting. Project activities are positively appreciated by the communities. A local partner project stated that the communities involved in the project benefited from changes brought by the project such as safe water, schools, better use and management of natural resources including wildfire control and increased income from micro-business (i.e carpentry, nurseries, and honey).		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**			
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐

[9] Including lands that communities have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used or acquired.

CAR/OBS	**CAR 01/10 CLOSED, CAR 02/10 CLOSED, CAR 08/10 CLOSED**

Biodiversity Information

7) A description of current biodiversity within the project zone (diversity of species and ecosystems[10]) and threats to that biodiversity, using appropriate methodologies, substantiated where possible with appropriate reference material.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The PDD provides information on plant biodiversity, ecosystems and threats based on a preliminary inventory (Mushove, 2003). Biodiversity data in the project zone not described in detail. Main drivers to threats have been indicated and summarized into 4 main drivers namely land clearance for agriculture, charcoal production, wildfires and logging. An appropriate methodology (using the Shannon index) has been employed to estimate biodiversity. Methodological considerations explained in PDD section G1.7. page 2. Nevertheless, estimates of biodiversity are provided only for flora (table 2 in page 26). The details concern only the Gorongosa zone.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	The PDD has been clarified. The PDD is successful in describing explicitly the two project sites: The project considers now one project zone (Sofala province) with 2 project sites (the Gorongosa project site and the Zambezi Delta project site) where the project areas are located (over a thousand *machambas* (fields) with an average of 1.03ha plus the REDD areas, from 2 ha to 5.249 ha). This is reinforced by adding new maps, and differentiating the activities and attributes in each zone. In addition the PDD has been reworked to be more consistent in the terminology employed. Studies carried out in and around the Gorongosa National Park before the commencement of the project and using information that was available to the project developers highlighted a link between the management of natural resources in the neighboring communities and the survival of the biodiversity of the park. The project was designed, in consultation with the management of the park, to preserve and protect the bio-diversity in the protected area. Envirotrade considers now flora taxa the most vital for study in the miombo ecosystem and this project, were trees are the focus. Nevertheless, as part of their commitment to develop a biodiversity monitoring plan, which has been outlined to some extent already, Envirotrade will invite a bird expert from to carry out a bird survey, since this group is considered especially relevant. This will increase also provide information for eco tourism, which is one of the projects micro-businesses, and will be used to assess the success of agro-forestry activities. A simple biodiversity index will be used to compare the difference between the sites.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 01/10 CLOSED, CAR 06/10 CLOSED, CAR 07/10 CLOSED, OBS 13/10**		

8) An evaluation of whether the project zone includes any of the following High Conservation Values (HCVs) and a description of the qualifying attributes:[11]

8.1. Globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values;

a. protected areas[12]

[10] Equates to habitat types, biotic communities, ecoregions, etc.

[11] These high conservation value criteria are based on those defined by the High Conservation Value (HCV) Resource Network http://hcvnetwork.org/. Practical help is available for using HCVs in each region, including generic guidance documents (Toolkits) and Country Pages.

[12] Legally protected areas equivalent to IUCN Protected Area Management Categories I-VI (see http://www.iucn.org/about/union/commissions/wcpa/wcpa_work/wcpa_strategic/wcpa_science/wcpa_categories/index.cfm

b. threatened species[13]
c. endemic species[14]
d. areas that support significant concentrations of a species during any time in their lifecycle (e.g. migrations, feeding grounds, breeding areas).

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Both the project protection nature of concerned ecosystems and the low/none impact of the project activities are highlighted by the project proponents and confirmed by in consultations local NGO´s or documents review (Campbell 1986; MICOA, 2008; Marzoli 2008). Nevertheless, no specific HCV assessment has been carried. Some regional documents related to the importance of the miombo forest have been listed in the PDD, but there is no link with the particularities of the biodiversity values in the project zones and lifecycles for the species in that area. Rare and endangered species are mentioned for the project zone, but information is given as examples for some species and only by higher *taxa* categories for most of them.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Envirotrade has used the ProForest HCVF toolkit to comprehensively determine the HCV in the project sites, with a result of 63, 7% of the project area within one of the 6 HCV categories. Four different categories, grouping different HCV, have been appointed and maps have been included in the PDD: • High biodiversity closed canopy forests, such as gallery/riverine forests and dry tropical forests • Protected areas (Inhamitanga Forest Reserve) • Woody vegetation on steep slopes • Culturally important areas		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 09/10 CLOSED**		

8.2. Globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape-level areas where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance;

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Both the project protection nature of concerned ecosystems and the low/none impact of the project activities are highlighted by the project proponents and confirmed by in consultations local NGO´s or documents review (Campbell 1986; MICOA, 2008; Marzoli 2008). Nevertheless, no specific HCV assessment has been carried. Some regional documents related to the importance of the miombo forest have been listed in the PDD, but there is no link with the particularities of the values in the project zones.
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Envirotrade has used the ProForest HCVF toolkit to comprehensively determine the HCV in the project sites, with a result of 63, 7% of the project area within one of the 6 HCV categories. Four different categories, grouping different HCV, have been appointed and maps have been included in the PDD: • High biodiversity closed canopy forests, such as gallery/riverine forests and dry tropical forests • Protected areas (Inhamitanga Forest Reserve) • Woody vegetation on steep slopes • Culturally important areas

for definitions) as well as areas that have been proposed for protected area status by the relevant statutory body but have not yet been officially declared, and including areas protected under international conventions (e.g., Ramsar sites, World Heritage Sites, UNESCO Man-and-Biosphere Reserves, etc.).

[13] Species that qualify for the IUCN Red List threat categories of Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN) and Vulnerable (VU). (See www.iucnredlist.org and Appendix B: Glossary for more information.) Additional national or regional listings should also be used where these may differ from the IUCN Red List.

[14] Species for which the entire global range is restricted to the site, the region or the country (the level of endemicity must be defined).

Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 09/10 CLOSED**		

8.3. Threatened or rare ecosystems;

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Both the project protection nature of concerned ecosystems and the low/none impact of the project activities are highlighted by the project proponents and confirmed by in consultations local NGO´s or documents review (Campbell 1986; MICOA, 2008; Marzoli 2008). Nevertheless, no specific HCV assessment has been carried. Some regional documents related to the importance of the miombo forest have been listed in the PDD, but there is no link with the particularities of the values in the project zones		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Envirotrade has used the ProForest HCVF toolkit to comprehensively determine the HCV in the project sites, with a result of 63, 7% of the project area within one of the 6 HCV categories. Four different categories, grouping different HCV, have been appointed and maps have been included in the PDD: • High biodiversity closed canopy forests, such as gallery/riverine forests and dry tropical forests • Protected areas (Inhamitanga Forest Reserve) • Woody vegetation on steep slopes • Culturally important areas		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 09/10 CLOSED**		

8.4. Areas that provide critical ecosystem services (e.g., hydrological services, erosion control, fire control);

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The PDD includes, at general level, indications of wildlife habitat protection and consequent biodiversity and economic impacts, wetlands, areas for soil conservation through prevention of soil erosion, and other climate change adaptation benefits. This information has been confirmed by consultations to local government officials. As said above, this information is not linked anyhow with the project area and its' specificities.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Envirotrade has used the ProForest HCVF toolkit to comprehensively determine the HCV in the project sites, with a result of 63, 7% of the project area within one of the 6 HCV categories. Four different categories, grouping different HCV, have been appointed and maps have been included in the PDD: • High biodiversity closed canopy forests, such as gallery/riverine forests and dry tropical forests • Protected areas (Inhamitanga Forest Reserve) • Woody vegetation on steep slopes • Culturally important areas		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 09/10 CLOSED**		

8.5. Areas that are fundamental for meeting the basic needs of local communities (e.g., for essential food, fuel, fodder, medicines or building materials without readily available alternatives); and

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Miombo role in meeting local communities' basic needs is described in the PDD focusing on the people high dependence on this ecosystem for medicines, forest products, honey extraction, fruits. Various documents are listed in the PDD in this regard and others such as (Chidamba 2004; Nielsen, 2006). The audit team consultations to Government officials and community leaders confirmed that the stakeholders have been involved in the identification. This is not included in a full HCV assessment.

Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Envirotrade has used the ProForest HCVF toolkit to comprehensively determine the HCV in the project sites, with a result of 63, 7% of the project area within one of the 6 HCV categories. Four different categories, grouping different HCV, have been appointed and maps have been included in the PDD: • High biodiversity closed canopy forests, such as gallery/riverine forests and dry tropical forests • Protected areas (Inhamitanga Forest Reserve) • Woody vegetation on steep slopes • Culturally important areas		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 09/10 CLOSED**		

8.6. Areas that are critical for the traditional cultural identity of communities (e.g., areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in collaboration with the communities).

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Areas of relevance for the communities are pointed out, in section G1.8, including areas with historic importance. A proposal from the community associations regarding preservation of specific areas including cultural forests and non timber forest products harvesting areas is a consequence of the consultation process (see Chidamba 2004). Consultations to involved communities, local authorities, Community Based Natural Resources Management Committees, traditional leaders. This is not included in a full HCV assessment.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Envirotrade has used the ProForest HCVF toolkit to comprehensively determine the HCV in the project sites, with a result of 63, 7% of the project area within one of the 6 HCV categories. Four different categories, grouping different HCV, have been appointed and maps have been included in the PDD: • High biodiversity closed canopy forests, such as gallery/riverine forests and dry tropical forests • Protected areas (Inhamitanga Forest Reserve) • Woody vegetation on steep slopes • Culturally important areas		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 09/10 CLOSED**		

G2. Baseline Projections- **Required**

Concept
A baseline projection is a description of expected conditions in the project zone in the absence of project activities. The project impacts will be measured against this 'without-project' reference scenario.

Indicators
The project proponents must develop a defensible and well-documented "without-project" reference scenario that must:

1) Describe the most likely land-use scenario in the absence of the project following IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU or a more robust and detailed methodology,[15] describing the range of potential land-use scenarios and the associated drivers of GHG emissions and justifying why the land-use scenario selected is most likely.

Findings from 1st	An historic baseline methodology was used involving historical rates and patterns of

[15] In cases where a published methodology is used, the full reference must be given and any variations from the published methodology must be explained.

review: 02 Feb 10	deforestation as recommended in IPCC GL. (see Spadavecahia et. al. 2004). According to the National Directorate for Lands and Forests, globally, deforestation rates in the Sofala Province is 0.63% (Marzoli, 2008) but the Provincial Services of Forests and Wildlife as well as the Province Directorate for the Coordination of Environment Affairs refers to a relatively higher deforestation in the project zones prior to its existence, comparing to other regions of the Province. Section G2.1 of the PDD simply presents the results of a study done to determine baseline deforestation rates in the area from remote sensing data. There is no information provided about the likely future land uses on areas where the agroforestry project activities occur. Under the Plan Vivo system that is being implemented the baselines are calculated in the technical specifications that are used for each project type. The technical specifications for the activities on agricultural land describe the baseline as being static (no loss or gain to carbon stocks over a 100 year period). It was explained that, because of the slash and burn system employed by farmers in the project zones, the static baseline was not intended to be representative of what would actually happen on one piece of land, but rather the net impact of always having a field cleared for farmland. This was considered acceptable, but was not documented, even within the technical specifications.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	The revised PDD in section G2.1 now contains baseline information regarding both the REDD and agroforestry activities. The section is focused on the quantification of the baseline carbon changes rather than assessing potential land use scenarios. The method used to generate the baseline data is now well explained. The REDD Technical Specification does include an acceptable defense of why baseline deforestation data will continue and the auditors found no evidence to suggest any other scenario than the continuation of traditional practices on agriculture areas. More information about the likelihood of future scenarios is presented in section G2.3.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 05/10 CLOSED**		

2) Document that project benefits would not have occurred in the absence of the project, explaining how existing laws or regulations would likely affect land use and justifying that the benefits being claimed by the project are truly 'additional' and would be unlikely to occur without the project.[16]

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The PDD, in section G2.2 presents three barriers to implementation that the project overcomes. These are financial, capacity and compliance with land law barriers. The project was found to be additional as the farmers had neither the technical capacity no financial means to implement tree planting or sustainable forest management projects.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

3) Calculate the estimated carbon stock changes associated with the 'without project' reference scenario described above. This requires estimation of carbon stocks for each of the land-use classes of concern and a definition of the carbon pools included, among the classes defined in the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU.[17] The timeframe for this analysis can be either the project lifetime (see **G3**) or the project GHG

[16] Project proponents must demonstrate that project activities would not have been implemented under business as usual due to significant financial, technological, institutional or capacity barriers. Actions implemented by the project must not be required by law, or project proponents must demonstrate that the pertinent laws are not being enforced. Project proponents must provide credible and well-documented analyses (e.g., poverty assessments, farming knowledge assessments, or remote sensing analysis) to demonstrate that the 'without project' reference scenario reflects land-use practices that are likely to continue or that otherwise differ from the land-use practices expected as a result of project activities.

[17] Above-ground biomass, below-ground biomass, deadwood, litter, soils.

accounting period, whichever is more appropriate.[18] Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO_2 GHG emissions such as CH_4 and N_2O in the 'without project' scenario. Non-CO_2 gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of CO_2-equivalent) of the project's overall GHG impact over each monitoring period.[19]
Projects whose activities are designed to avoid GHG emissions (such as those reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), avoiding conversion of non-forest land, or certain improved forest management projects) must include an analysis of the relevant drivers and rates of deforestation and/or degradation and a description and justification of the approaches, assumptions and data used to perform this analysis.[20] Regional-level estimates can be used at the project's planning stage as long as there is a commitment to evaluate locally-specific carbon stocks and to develop a project-specific spatial analysis of deforestation and/or degradation using an appropriately robust and detailed carbon accounting methodology before the start of the project.[21]

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	In section G2.3 of the PDD the method to calculate the past deforestation rate between 1991-2000 and 1999-2007 is presented. However, it is not clear how the area studied relates to the project areas or how appropriate the rate calculated in the study is for these areas. These aspects are discussed in the technical specification, but the technical specification is not referenced here. It was understood, after discussions with the project proponents that the deforestation rate of 2.4% was not going to be used in the Zambezi project zone, and that another approach to REDD would be adopted. This plan is not mentioned in any documentation. It was also mentioned that for the earliest REDD contracts a different baseline was used and then the new one retrospectively employed. Due to the lack of clarity over versions of documentation and their use this is not easy to track. There is a thorough description of the drivers of deforestation. These are agricultural encroachment and charcoal manufacture as well as logging and burning. Charcoal related deforestation was excluded from the baseline deforestation calculations because it is illegal in the buffer zone of the national park. This omission is conservative. For the agroforestry systems the baselines are assumed to be static. For the woodlot system the baseline is assumed to be 18 ± 9 t C ha^{-1}, whilst for all the agroforestry systems the baseline is 2.77 t C ha^{-1}. However please see CAR 05/10, regarding the clear referencing and documentation of the methods used to calculate baselines. Local sampling was used to determine these values. It is not clear why uncertainty values are presented for one baseline and not the other or how the uncertainty is handled. Table 5 shows the impact of the deforestation on the remaining carbon stock within the project area. It was explained during the field audit by the project proponents that the deforestation rate of 2.4% was distributed proportionally between the forest types. It was also explained that all credits issued so far had been based on a carbon loss of 73.3 t CO_2 ha^{-1} and that a new version of the technical specification was currently under review by the Plan Vivo Foundation. The history of the methods used to calculate emissions in the past and the recent move to more sophisticated techniques was not found to be well documented. Table 6 was not explained in the text. For example, there is no definition of the distinction between 'old' and 'new' contracts. In addition, the PDD has yet to explain contracts or define the systems that the project uses. As such this table would be difficult for a reader to interpret.
Findings from 2nd	In the revised PDD the text accompanying Figure 20 on page 43 explains the

[18] In some cases, the project lifetime and the project GHG accounting period may be different.
[19] The following CDM Executive Board tool can be used to test the significance of emissions sources: http://cdm.unfccc.int/EB/031/eb31_repan16.pdf.
[20] The analysis may use a model that is based on historical rates and patterns of deforestation and degradation or predict the expected increases or decreases in deforestation and degradation.
[21] The 'start of the project' is defined as the start of implementation of activities that will directly cause the project's expected GHG emissions reductions or removals.

review: **28 JULY 10**	relationship of the REDD areas to the baseline deforestation determination exercise. It is now clearly explained in Section G2.3 that the Zambesi Delta area will use a different baseline for REDD that has yet to be determined. The technical specifications use mean data for the carbon stocks in the baseline and project scenario. In section CL1.1 of the PDD there is an explanation of how technical specifications have evolved over time. Section G2.3 does explain that a carbon value of 73.3 t C ha^{-1} was used prior to the adoption of the new REDD Technical Specification in 2009, however it is not clear how many credits were created using this value, and whether any corrections had been made or were planned. However, this was found to be a typo, and in fact the original carbon density value used for REDD areas was 73.3 t CO_2 ha^{-1}. In a document called, "Implementation of REDD in Sofala Project" the use of this number, and the history of REDD activities is presented. The tables that had caused confusion in the original PDD have been removed.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 10/10 CLOSED**, **CAR 11/10 CLOSED,NEW OBS 18/10**		

4) Describe how the 'without project' reference scenario would affect communities in the project zone, including the impact of likely changes in water, soil and other locally important ecosystem services.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	A detailed account has been presented on socio-economic impacts in "without project" scenario for the several indicators, such as source of income, food production, natural resources use in section G2.4, page 39. The audit team confirmed this information through field observations and accounts from reports (Rohit 2008), and also by interviews with farmers, Community Based Natural Resources Management Committees, and other relevant NGO´s, specially on sources of income, food production, and natural resources use.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

5) Describe how the 'without project' reference scenario would affect biodiversity in the project zone (e.g., habitat availability, landscape connectivity and threatened species).

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Without project scenario is described at general level in section G2.5. for the various indicators, namely; threatened species, species abundance, species diversity, landscape connectivity, forest fragmentation, among others. Consultations to studies in the project area in Williams, Ryan *et al* (2008) government officials, NGO´s about threatened species, species abundance, population sizes, forest fragmentation, habitats area, and availability, quality and diversity. This analysis has been done only in a general level and should more specific after the HCV assessment has been carried, as it is not very specific to the project zone.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**			
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**OBS 03/10**		

G3. Project Design & Goals - **Required**

Concept
The project must be described in sufficient detail so that a third-party can adequately evaluate it.

Projects must be designed to minimize risks to the expected climate, community and biodiversity benefits and to maintain those benefits beyond the life of the project. Effective local participation in project design and implementation is key to optimizing multiple benefits, equitably and sustainably. Projects that operate in a transparent manner build confidence with stakeholders and outside parties and enable them to contribute more effectively to the project.

Indicators
The Project proponents must:

1) Provide a summary of the project's major climate, community and biodiversity objectives.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	In section G3.1 a summary of the projects objectives are summarized. However, they are said to be based on project activities initiated in Nhambita village, when in fact they are initiated over a broader area.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	The PDD has been clarified and explains the project with respect to both sites.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 01/10 CLOSED**		

2) Describe each project activity with expected climate, community and biodiversity impacts and its relevance to achieving the project's objectives.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Section G3.2 of the PDD begins by specifically referencing "sustainable land management in Nhambita". Therefore, it is not clear if the information presented beneath is applicable to both project zones. Four project activities are described; these are "forest management", "timber utilization and sustainable harvesting", "agroforestry" and "non-timber forest products". The activities are well described and the benefits for climate, community and biodiversity are clear. However, the terminology in this section is not consistent with other sections: for example, REDD or avoided deforestation is not mentioned. It appears to be part of the "forestry management" activities in the PDD, but there is no distinction drawn between the difference in activities that take place on community lands and those that take place on private lands.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	The PDD has been clarified, with project types being referred to consistently, and both project areas being described.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 01/10 CLOSED**		

3) Provide a map identifying the project location and boundaries of the project area(s), where the project activities will occur, of the project zone and of additional surrounding locations that are predicted to be impacted by project activities (e.g. through leakage).

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The project zones and locations of the agroforestry project areas are well mapped. There is no expected leakage so no leakage zones are mapped. However, there are no examples provided in the PDD of how the project area was mapped at a local level for agroforestry activities
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	The PDD explains now how the agroforestry areas are mapped by the community technicians using the GPS, and how the area is calculated by this mean. All contracts have a map associated, as the PDD shows in an example.

Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 04/10 CLOSED**		

4) Define the project lifetime and GHG accounting period and explain and justify any differences between them. Define an implementation schedule, indicating key dates and milestones in the project's development.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The crediting period is defined as being 100 years. Farmers receive the money form credit sales ex-ante over a seven year period. After seven years it is expected that the activities are self financing. The justification for using this system is thorough and follows the Plan Vivo system. The implementation schedule is defined, although it was found to be incomplete. There was a trial phase in 2002 with 53 farmers. A research pilot ran from August 2003 – August 2008 where numerous activities including establishing community associations, building nurseries, conduction baseline assessments and training. The project has been fully operative since 2008. Maps are provided that show the various phases of expansion spatially (Figure 7). However, after discussions with the project proponents it appears that the REDD related project activities rolled out on a slightly different time period. This is not documented here. In addition, during the introductory meeting of the field audit the project proponents explained that the project as a whole had two phases. A ramping up period of approximately 10 years, and a 5 year period of transferring project implementation and governance entirely to the local communities. These future plans were not discussed in the PDD and are of fundamental importance to the design of the project.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	In the revised PDD the phasing of the REDD project is explained in a separate document called "Implementation of REDD in Sofala Project". The exit strategy is now explained in section G3.4, and in more detail in a document called, "Envirotrade SOF Exit Strategy".		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 12/10 CLOSED**		

5) Identify likely natural and human-induced risks to the expected climate, community and biodiversity benefits during the project lifetime and outline measures adopted to mitigate these risks.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	In section G3.5 of the PDD six risks are identified. These are; "risk of flooding", "risk of fire", "social risks", "institutional capacity risks", "financial risks" and "institutional/political risks". Each risk has a mitigation action explained. During interviews with stakeholders that the audit team conducted, these were also the main risks identified, especially with NGO´s, District Authorities, and the Community Association.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

6) Demonstrate that the project design includes specific measures to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes identified in **G1** consistent with the precautionary principle.[22]

[22] The 'precautionary principle' is defined in the Preamble to the *Convention on Biological Diversity* (1992): '[W]here there is a threat of **significant reduction** or loss of biological diversity, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to avoid or minimize such a threat.'

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Both the project protection nature of concerned ecosystems and the low/none impact of the project activities are highlighted by the project proponents and confirmed by in consultations local NGO´s or documents review (Campbell 1986; MICOA, 2008; Marzoli 2008). The project emphasizes miombo ecosystem protection as an outcome by deliberate conservation of specific areas within forest management. As said in G1 though, no HCV assessment has been carried for the project zones. As a result, no specific measures to ensure their maintenance or enhancement have been defined.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Envirotrade has used the ProForest HCVF toolkit to comprehensively determine the HCV in the project sites, with a result of 63, 7% of the project area within one of the 6 HCV categories. Four different categories, grouping different HCV, have been appointed and maps have been included in the PDD: • High biodiversity closed canopy forests, such as gallery/riverine forests and dry tropical forests • Protected areas (Inhamitanga Forest Reserve) • Woody vegetation on steep slopes • Culturally important areas General management recommendations have been included in the PDD for these categories. In the Plan Vivo annual report progress on protection and maintenance of HCV zones are to be documented to test the effectiveness of the measures taken. The monitoring plan has been already outlined (using community technicians, the University Eduardo Mondlane, satellite imagery, questionnaires, surveys, and others) to check their status and it is expected to be finished within 6 months after validation (12 months is the maximum allowed by CCB) Thus, the specific indicators and how the results are going to be used are still not clear.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 09/10 CLOSED, OBS 14/10**		

7) Describe the measures that will be taken to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The measures that bring benefits even after project finishes such as soil fertility, income from fruit production, firewood, or land tenure are summarized in the PDD.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

8) Document and defend how communities and other stakeholders[23] potentially affected by the project activities have been identified and have been involved in project design through effective consultation,[24] particularly with a view to optimizing community and stakeholder benefits, respecting local customs and values and maintaining high conservation values. Project developers must document stakeholder

[23] 'Other stakeholders' are defined as the main groups potentially affected by the project activities that are not living on or adjacent to the project site.

[24] Effective consultation requires project proponents to inform and engage broadly with all community groups and other stakeholders using socially and culturally appropriate methods. Consultations must be gender and inter-generationally inclusive and must be conducted at mutually agreed locations and through representatives who are designated by the communities themselves in accordance with their own procedures. Stakeholders affected by the project must have an opportunity to evaluate impacts and raise concerns about potential negative impacts, express desired outcomes and provide input on the project design, both before the project design is finalized and during implementation.

dialogues and indicate if and how the project proposal was revised based on such input.[25] A plan must be developed to continue communication and consultation between project managers and all community groups about the project and its impacts to facilitate adaptive management throughout the life of the project.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	A list of all stakeholders involvement process has been detailed in section G3.8, as well as the communication procedures. This included consultation to the communities and stakeholders through stakeholders summits, meetings, apart from community briefings, meetings with government officials. Documents confirming the consultation and communication process include Chidamba (2004). The team has confirmed these steps through consultations with the communities, receiving input on their involvement in the project design and consultation process. The project proponents have also included the tools that will be used to continue communication and consultation in the future.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

9) Describe what specific steps have been taken, and communications methods used, to publicize the CCBA public comment period[26] to communities and other stakeholders and to facilitate their submission of comments to CCBA. Project proponents must play an active role in distributing key project documents to affected communities and stakeholders and hold widely publicized information meetings in relevant local or regional languages.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The project proponent sent various notices, translating a number of key documents into Portuguese, to inform about the CCB process and seeking comments on the project from stakeholders at national level. Stakeholders included National Director of Land and Forest, Eduardo Mondlane University, Department of Forest at National Department of Land and Forest, Minister for Coordination of Environmental Affairs (MICOA), and Forest and Wildlife – Sofala. The steps taken also include the establishment of communication platforms for the different stakeholders, such as the involvement of community associations in project activities, or the project website allowing access to specific documents. This communications have been checked by the audit team.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

10) Formalize a clear process for handling unresolved conflicts and grievances that arise during project planning and implementation. The project design must include a process for hearing, responding to and resolving community and other stakeholder grievances within a reasonable time period. This grievance process must be publicized to communities and other stakeholders and must be managed by a third party or mediator to prevent any conflict of interest. Project management must attempt to resolve all

[25] In cases where it is unclear whether a project will be implemented or not, it is acceptable to start with a preliminary community consultation, provided there are plans for appropriate full engagement before the start of the project. Where conformance with the Standards is being applied to a project already under implementation, project proponents must either provide documentation of appropriate consultation during the project design phase or demonstrate how more recent consultations have been effective in evaluating community benefits and adapting project design and implementation to optimize community and stakeholder benefits and respect local customs.

[26] 'The CCBA public comment period' is the process whereby CCBA posts project documents that are under evaluation by an auditor for conformance with the Standards on www.climate-standards.org for at least 30 days with an invitation and link for public comments to which the auditor must respond in the audit report.

reasonable grievances raised, and provide a written response to grievances within 30 days. Grievances and project responses must be documented.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Conflicts solving process has been described in a general and flexible way, mainly related with land occupation rights and land use title. The communities and traditional leaders' involvement in the management of natural resources and conflict resolution, process of delimiting land limits and titling were confirmed in interviews with local authorities, government officials, and NGO´s. It is worth again noting the focus is on the Nhambita society. It's important to note that divergences have been detected between Envirotrade and some members of the administration of the Gorongosa NP. While many steps have been taken in order to solve the issues, no clear and publicly available grievance process was found. Also, while most of the stakeholder comments were positive on the communication flow, the audit team has received some comments complaining about not having a response when asking i.e. for payments delays or underpayments. Other concerns have been found related to the management of some microbusinesses, that seem to come from a misunderstanding and lack of communication from the part of the community, would also probably will be reduced with a documented process of handling the arising issues.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Envirotrade has developed a harassment policy and a 3 stages grievance policy to provide a mechanism to deal with these cases at the lowest level possible within the organization at which the matter can be resolved. The process is explained now in the PDD, and it includes written response within 5-10 working days. This has been made public in the PDD, but no evidence has been provided of other means more accessible to the stakeholders. The grievances process and project responses are to be documented in the monitoring plan, but it is not clear how this is going to be done practically. The grievance procedure applies to the whole project area.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 01/10 CLOSED, CAR 13/10 CLOSED, OBS 15/10, OBS 16/10**		

11) Demonstrate that financial mechanisms adopted, including projected revenues from emissions reductions and other sources, are likely to provide an adequate flow of funds for project implementation and to achieve the anticipated climate, community and biodiversity benefits.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	In section G3.11 exhaustive explanation has been provided on the adopted financial mechanism, the organizational structure of the project according to Plan Vivo specifications and the Mozambique carbon Livelihoods Trust and the flow of goods/funds. The PDD highlights their strategy to ensure financial sustainability through the production of timber,non-forest products and carbon. Figure 11 shows the project organizational structure with reference to the Plan Vivo specifications. Some explanations given led to the REDD activities only (i.e. *1st paragraph on page 58)* while actually being applicable to all of them, creating confusion.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**OBS 04/10**		

G4. Management Capacity and Best Practices - **Required**

Concept
The success of a project depends upon the competence of the implementing management team. Projects that include a significant capacity-building (training, skill building, etc.) component are more likely to sustain the positive outcomes generated by the project and have them replicated elsewhere.

Best practices for project management include: local stakeholder employment, worker rights, worker safety and a clear process for handling grievances.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Identify a single project proponent which is responsible for the project's design and implementation. If multiple organizations or individuals are involved in the project's development and implementation the governance structure, roles and responsibilities of each of the organizations or individuals involved must also be described.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Most the organizations (Envirotrade Group, Mozambique Carbon Livelihoods Trust, the University of Edinburgh, the Edinburgh Centre for Carbon Management, the Administration of the Gorongosa National Park) involved in the project and their responsibilities are clearly described in the PDD. There is no reference to Envirotrade Mozambique Limitada and its relationship with Associação Envirotrade Carbon Livelihoods, nor if the latter is already a legally establish or in-the-process association. There is also a lack of description of the coordinator and project proponent, clarifying if it's Envirotrade Carbon Limited (as by page 3 of the PDD) or only Envirotrade (as by page 2 of the PDD).		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	The PDD has been modified on one hand deleting Associação Envirotrade Carbon Livelihoods (which has been created to replace Envirotrade Mozambique Limitada but is not yet officially published in Bulletim da Republica), and on the other hand describing Envirotrade Carbon Limited as the project developer replacing Envirotrade Limited in early 2009.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 14/10 CLOSED**		

2) Document key technical skills that will be required to implement the project successfully, including community engagement, biodiversity assessment and carbon measurement and monitoring skills. Document the management team's expertise and prior experience implementing land management projects at the scale of this project. If relevant experience is lacking, the proponents must either demonstrate how other organizations will be partnered with to support the project or have a recruitment strategy to fill the gaps.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	In section G4.2 of the PDD the key technical skills that will be required to implement the project successfully are not documented. The previous section G4.1 does state the responsibilities of the project but without a list of key skills, the absence of gaps is not easy to detect. The prior experience of the management team is not stated. During the field audit, observations suggested that the management team have adequate experience and competence to execute the project successfully. However, this has not been documented.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	The PDD has been completed to include all the team's professional skills.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 15/10 CLOSED**		

3) Include a plan to provide orientation and training for the project's employees and relevant people from the communities with an objective of building locally useful skills and knowledge to increase local participation in project implementation. These capacity building efforts should target a wide range of people in the communities, including minority and underrepresented groups. Identify how training will be passed on to new workers when there is staff turnover, so that local capacity will not be lost.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	A plan highlights training of community extension workers, forest technicians, staff and workshops organized by the company. The project appears to contribute for continuous knowledge transfer assured also by the establishment of appropriate school programmes. By checking reports and from interview accounts it is clear that training is inclusive of all groups. Availability of training manuals and technical guidelines used, training of forest and agroforestry technicians documented in page 16 (Training materials, educational movies and reports); conferences attended by staff members and articles published on related matters and environmental education materials in page 17 (Conferences attended by project staff) As said before, all the explanations in the PDD refer to the Nhambita area only. The PPD doesn't seem updated either when saying *"an external review will be sought after two or three years of the pilot project"* on page 60.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	The PDD has been updated to an April 2010 version to reflect all the new changes in the project and refers to all project sites.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 01/10 CLOSED, CAR 08/10 CLOSED**		

4) Show that people from the communities will be given an equal opportunity to fill all employment positions (including management) if the job requirements are met. Project proponents must explain how employees will be selected for positions and where relevant, must indicate how local community members, including women and other potentially underrepresented groups, will be given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The team found a transparent process for hiring people and for community involvement in the project design. This involvement, on a voluntary basis, has been confirmed by local traditional leaders, Community Based Natural Resources Management Committee and producers		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

5) Submit a list of all relevant laws and regulations covering worker's rights in the host country. Describe how the project will inform workers about their rights. Provide assurance that the project meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering worker rights[27] and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Annex I presents a list of relevant labour laws in Mozambique. There is also a workers Union working with the Community Association. It's worth noting that as the project is Plan Vivo driven process there is an emphasis on the rights of the community / workers.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐

[27] 'Workers' are defined as people directly working on project activities in return for compensation (financial or otherwise), including employees, contracted workers, sub-contracted workers and community members that are paid to carry out project-related work.

CAR/OBS	

6) Comprehensively assess situations and occupations that pose a substantial risk to worker safety. A plan must be in place to inform workers of risks and to explain how to minimize such risks. Where worker safety cannot be guaranteed, project proponents must show how the risks will be minimized using best work practices.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	While conversations with project staff revealed an effort in worker safety issues, no use of safety equipment has been seen e.g. in the sawmill.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Envirotrade has provided receipts to evidence the purchase of safety equipment and the handover of this material to the micro-businesses. In addition, the contract of operation for the mill does show the manager agreeing to abide by health and safety requirements. The micro-businesses are now independent of Envirotrade management and as such the ability of the project to directly enforce policies is diminished. The auditors were satisfied that through persistent training (by Gary Goss, who advises the bee keeping and mill operations) all reasonable steps to ensure worker safety were being taken. See **OBS 23/10.**		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 16/10 CLOSED, NEW OBS 23/10**		

7) Document the financial health of the implementing organization(s) to demonstrate that financial resources budgeted will be adequate to implement the project.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The project has built structures to ensure financial sustainability through the production of timber and NTFPs in the community and through the sale of carbon offsets generated by carbon sequestration and management activities. An independent trust fund (MCLT) has been established to administer the proceeds of the sale of carbon offsets generated by project activities. Envirotrade Group takes on the responsibility of covering any shortfalls at the community trust by extending interest-free loans. The audit team checked the budgets of the Project and held a meeting with Contabil, a firm auditing the flow of funds from the carbon sales.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

G5. Legal Status and Property Rights - **Required**

Concept
The project must be based on a solid legal framework (e.g., appropriate contracts are in place) and the project must satisfy applicable planning and regulatory requirements.

During the project design phase, the project proponents should communicate early on with relevant local, regional and national authorities in order to allow adequate time to earn necessary approvals. The project design should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate potential modifications that may arise as a result of this process.

In the event of unresolved disputes over tenure or use rights to land or resources in the project zone, the project should demonstrate how it will help to bring them to resolution so that there are no unresolved disputes by the start of the project.

Indicators
Based on information about current property rights provided in **G1**, the project proponents must:

1) Submit a list of all relevant national and local laws[28] and regulations in the host country and all applicable international treaties and agreements. Provide assurance that the project will comply with these and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Annex I presents a list of relevant labour laws in Mozambique. Also, a list including the 1995 National Environment Policy, the Agrarian Policy, The Land Policy, The 1997 National Policy and Strategy of the Department of Forestry and Wildlife (DNFFB), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Montreal protocol, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change (UNFCCC), UNFCCC Kyoto Protocol, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands is presented in the PDD.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

2) Document that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, including the established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the communities.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The project works in a good relationship with various government institutions, universities, NGO's, and above all the communities, and has obtained the environmental license by the MICOA (Ministério para Coordenação de Acção Ambiental). This has been checked by the audit team during the stakeholders meetings.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

3) Demonstrate with documented consultations and agreements that the project will not encroach uninvited on private property, community property,[29] or government property and has obtained the free, prior, and informed consent of those whose rights will be affected by the project.[30]

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	It has been indicated and verified in the field that the project gets assistance from Non Government Organizations regarding land law and related matters. Both producers and local government officials have confirmed the efforts to get communities to register and get legal status and use of Plan Vivo specifications Legal contracts in the process of Project transactions and activities have been also confirmed. The communities consent has also been checked with a positive result during stakeholders meetings.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

4) Demonstrate that the project does not require the involuntary relocation of people or of the activities important for the livelihoods and culture of the communities.[31] If any relocation of habitation or activities

[28] Local laws include all legal norms given by organisms of government whose jurisdiction is less than the national level, such as departmental, municipal and customary norms.
[29] Including lands that communities have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used or acquired.
[30] In conformance with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
[31] Restricting the evaluation to activities that comply with statutory laws or conform with customary rights. 'Customary rights' to lands and resources refers to patterns of long-standing community land and resource usage in accordance with

is undertaken within the terms of an agreement, the project proponents must demonstrate that the agreement was made with the free, prior, and informed consent of those concerned and includes provisions for just and fair compensation.[32]

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The project states clearly that it is not relocating people. This has been confirmed through consultations to Community Based Natural Resources Management Committees and traditional leaders, stating that all activities are implemented on land of community owing land rights.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

5) Identify any illegal activities that could affect the project's climate, community or biodiversity impacts (e.g., logging) taking place in the project zone and describe how the project will help to reduce these activities so that project benefits are not derived from illegal activities.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The aim of the project is to mitigate the risk of illegal activities through incentives and microbusiness against the illegal acts. The use and applicability has been confirmed by the field visits and the accounts from Community Based Natural Resources Management Committees.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

6) Demonstrate that the project proponents have clear, uncontested title to the carbon rights, or provide legal documentation demonstrating that the project is undertaken on behalf of the carbon owners with their full consent. Where local or national conditions preclude clear title to the carbon rights at the time of validation against the Standards, the project proponents must provide evidence that their ownership of carbon rights is likely to be established before they enter into any transactions concerning the project's carbon assets.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The communities have legal land use rights and are entitled to sell the products arising from their use of the land. This is entrenched in law in Mozambique. The government extends so-called DUATs, which is a license to trade products of the land. Communities in the project zones have obtain or are in the process of obtaining these DUATs.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

Indigenous Peoples' and local communities' customary laws, values, customs, and traditions, including seasonal or cyclical use, rather than formal legal title to land and resources issued by the State.

[32] In conformance with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

CLIMATE SECTION

CL1. Net Positive Climate Impacts - Required

Concept
The project must generate net positive impacts on atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHGs) over the project lifetime from land use changes within the project boundaries.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Estimate the net change in carbon stocks due to the project activities using the methods of calculation, formulae and default values of the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU or using a more robust and detailed methodology.[33] The net change is equal to carbon stock changes *with* the project minus carbon stock changes *without* the project (the latter having been estimated in **G2**). This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defendable assumptions about how project activities will alter GHG emissions or carbon stocks over the duration of the project or the project GHG accounting period.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The project uses the Plan Vivo approach to estimate changes in carbon stocks due to project activities. There are two broad categories of activities that will contribute to net positive climate impacts are quantified, these are: REDD areas, and agroforestry systems. The project also carries out other activities such as the distribution of pigeon pea that will yield a net positive climate impact but for which the impact is not quantified. The PDD could be clearer in linking these broad project types to the activities listed. The Plan Vivo technical specifications are used to calculate the net climate benefit (per ha) for each project activity. The data from technical specifications is put into 'carbon calculators which calculate the benefits of carrying out project activities over any given area for an individual producer. It was understood by the audit team that the technical specifications had undergone a number of changes over the period of project implementation. However, due to a lack of version control on documents and a lack of cross referencing between the carbon calculators used to calculate emissions reductions and the technical specifications it was difficult to work out which method had been used to generate each of the emissions reductions credits. In 2006 a new system called 'no burning' was devised to incentives farmers not to burn agri-residues on their *mashambas* where other systems were being operated. Farmers currently received a fixed payment per year based on 0.5 t C ha^{-1} yr^{-1} emissions reductions if annual monitoring events reveal that no burning has occurred. No technical specification has been produced for "no burning". The value of 0.5 t C ha^{-1} yr^{-1} cannot be traced to any written document, but was believed to have originated from academic staff involved with the project. The amount to be paid for no burning was not included in the contract farmers signed (only attached as a carbon calculator). This had led to some confusion amongst farmers as to what they needed to do to receive the payments. (**CAR 10/10**) The project proponents explained during the field audit that there has been one case (*Faidherbia sp*. plantations) where an error had been discovered in the modeling used to calculate emissions reductions. The issue, whereby carbon sequestration was overestimated, affected contracts signed between 2005 and 2009. An updated technical specification had been made, but not yet used. It was understood by the

[33] In cases where a published methodology is used, the full reference must be given and any variations from the published methodology must be explained.

	audit team that the project did not want to punish farmers who signed contracts before the error was discovered by paying them less money because this would undermine trust in the project. The auditors have discussed the matter with the Plan Vivo foundation and it is understood that there has been transparent dialogue between Plan Vivo and Envirotrade on this matter. Plan Vivo and Envirotrade have agreed in principal that a deduction should be made from the risk buffer once the Plan Vivo database is up and running. Envirotrade have not yet documented the quantified impact this will have on their buffer stocks. The PDD states that the approach to calculating the changes due to project activities involves calculating the "average net increase in carbon stored in biomass and forest products over a 100 year period relative to the baseline". However, in discussions with the project proponents it became apparent that the modeling exercise done in the CO2FIX model was not based on an assumption that the trajectory of carbon stocks would follow those shown in the model. A different, 'tonne year', accounting method was being implemented, this could not be fully explained at the time of the audit and details of this were not currently documented in the PDD or technical specifications. Table 9 contains an ex-ante projection of the carbon sequestration over the crediting period. It is not clear what assumptions have been used to create the data presented here or exactly which technical specifications have been used. For example, what is the area assumed for each system? What data is used to calculate the actual removals? How do the units correspond to those in the technical specification?
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	The revised PDD has a clear description of the version changes that have taken place in technical specifications. However, there is still no clear link to the current versions of the Technical Specification and the table in CL1.1 does not make the status of the Technical Specifications clear with respect to the Plan Vivo approval process. There is no explanation about the number of contracts signed / credits issues for REDD before the technical specification was written (2009). Section CL1.1 of the PDD now contains an explanation of the methodology for determining the benefits of the 'no burning' system,. A draft technical specification has also been presented (v6). The benefits of the system are conservatively estimated at 1 t C ha^{-1} y^{-1}. The Technical Specification does reference peer reviewed literature, but the comparison link between the input from agricultural residue and the difference between indigenous forest and agricultural soil carbon was not clear. The values presented in the technical specification relate to losses that occur on conversion and not to the gains that can occur through agricultural residue input. The flowing sentence in the PDD was found to be unclear, "*In the project zones this means not burning would correspond to an additional 13.2 $tCha^{-1}$ compared to the long term equilibrium when burning (half of difference between 22.8 $tCha^{-1}$ and 9.6 $tCha^{-1}$).*" The units in the following sentence from page 89 are thought to be a typo, "*The carbon dioxide equivalent or carbon credits due to the farmer is therefore 7 x 3.67 or 26 $tCha^{-1}$*" The Auditors acknowledge that the no burning technical specification has been submitted for peer review as required by the Plan Vivo. Given the relatively small quantities of carbon involved there is not a risk of the outcome of that review affecting the net benefits of the project. In addition there is no evidence to suggest that not burning could lead to increased net emissions. Therefore it was accepted that an OBS would be issued to complete this process and make any required changes by the verification. The change in the Faidherbia Technical Specification has been estimated to 43% of the buffer (number provided by Envirotrade in response to CARs). This approach is undergoing Plan Vivo approval.

	Figure 32 on page 96 of the PDD was found to be confusing. Some systems have a positive emissions baseline (REDD), whilst some are steady or negative (Agroforestry), therefore it was not clear how this table was compiled.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 10/10 CLOSED, CAR 17/10 CLOSED, OBS 02/10, NEW OBS 19/10, NEW OBS 22/10.**		

2) Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO_2 GHG emissions such as CH_4 and N_2O in the *with* and *without* project scenarios if those gases are likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO_2-equivalent) of the project's overall GHG emissions reductions or removals over each monitoring period.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Non CO_2 GHG emissions are not expected to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease of the projects overall GHG emissions reductions/removals. The project is open to considering their inclusion this if future studies find that they are significant.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

3) Estimate any other GHG emissions resulting from project activities. Emissions sources include, but are not limited to, emissions from biomass burning during site preparation, emissions from fossil fuel combustion,[34] direct emissions from the use of synthetic fertilizers,[35] and emissions from the decomposition of N-fixing species.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	In section CL3.1 of the PDD the text does not address the criterion. Criterion 3.1 is to estimate the emissions related to project activities. The text discusses the permanence risk buffer. Observations made by the audit team suggest that the emissions from most sources were not large. No fertilizers were used and no burning was used for site preparation (although the land may have been previously burnt for clearance).		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	In the revised PDD, section CL1.3 has been completely revised and no longer discusses permanence risk. Project activity emissions are found to be insignificant based on a 2008 study. The findings were presented in a spreadsheet called, "Calculator Gorongosa ". The calculation of flight emissions was found to contain an error in the formula. This error have been corrected, although it does not affect the overall result – that the project emissions are <1% of expected project benefits.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 18/10 CLOSED,NEW OBS 20/10**		

4) Demonstrate that the net climate impact of the project is positive. The net climate impact of the project is the net change in carbon stocks plus net change in non-CO_2 GHGs where appropriate minus any other GHG emissions resulting from project activities minus any likely project-related unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts (see CL2.3)

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The text in section CL1.4 of the PDD does not meet the requirements of this criterion. However, based on observations made on the field audit, the project activities clearly will have a net positive impact on the climate. The project databases (and each technical specification) also demonstrate that the project produces net-carbon benefits. In addition, it should be noted that the project does not account for increases in soil

[34] The following CDM Executive Board tool can be used to quantify these emissions: http://cdm.unfccc.int/EB/033/eb33_repan14.pdf

[35] The following CDM Executive Board tool can be used to quantify these emissions: http://cdm.unfccc.int/EB/033/eb33_repan16.pdf

	carbon due to agroforestry activities or avoided losses through REDD activities. This is a conservative omission according to early scientific studies.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	The revised PDD now states, "The net climate impact is 1,111,576 tCO_2e. " in section CL1.4. Given that this value will change as new contacts are signed, it would be clearer if this were caveated.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**OBS 09/10**		

5) Specify how double counting of GHG emissions reductions or removals will be avoided, particularly for offsets sold on the voluntary market and generated in a country with an emissions cap.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The project has two databases, one for each project zone that allows sales of carbon credits to be tracked from the farm, to the buyer. This system will avoid double counting In addition, when functional the Plan Vivo certificates database will provide a public register. In the case that Mozambique should engage in a national GHG program the data will be shared with the appropriate agencies.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

CL2. Offsite Climate Impacts ("Leakage") - Required

Concept
The project proponents must quantify and mitigate increased GHG emissions that occur beyond the project area and are caused by project activities (commonly referred to as 'leakage').

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Determine the types of leakage[36] that are expected and estimate potential offsite increases in GHGs (increases in emissions or decreases in sequestration) due to project activities. Where relevant, define and justify where leakage is most likely to take place.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The project is designed based on an integrated approach to landscape management. As such potential leakage types have been identified and mitigated against.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

2) Document how any leakage will be mitigated and estimate the extent to which such impacts will be reduced by these mitigation activities

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	In section CL2.2 of the PDD three main leakage risks are identified; (i) displacement of agricultural development, (ii) displacement of charcoal making, (iii) woodland

[36] Offsite changes in GHG emissions can result from a variety of causes including:
- activity shifting or displacement;
- market effects (particularly when timber harvest volumes are reduced by the project);
- increased investment in the project zone;
- decreased investment in the project zone; and
- alternative livelihood programs or other leakage prevention activities.

	conservation could displace fuel wood collection. Management activities to mitigate against these have been identified. Most of the stakeholders interviews revealed a good awareness raised concerning the displacement of the wood collection/logging to other areas, but there was still a small minority for which the message was fundamentally not to clear the *mashambas* associated to the project and for which the displacement could be a possibility if needed in the future, as it was not a current need.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**OBS 05/10**		

3) Subtract any likely project-related unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts from the climate benefits being claimed by the project and demonstrate that this has been included in the evaluation of net climate impact of the project (as calculated in **CL1.4**).

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	In section CL2.3 it is stated that no project leakage is expected. This was considered acceptable by the review team, due to the mitigation activities and project design explained in the previous sections. However, the section also discusses the use of the Voluntary Carbon Standard's risk buffer. The VCS's buffer system is to account for permanence, not leakage and the internal reference given to CL1.1 is incorrect.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	CL2.3 has been updated and the reference to VCS removed which was inserted in error. Any leakage found during monitoring will be have its impacts quantified through consultation with the Plan Vivo Foundation.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 19/10 CLOSED**		

4) Non-CO_2 gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO_2-equivalent) of the net change calculations (above) of the project's overall off-site GHG emissions reductions or removals over each monitoring period.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Non-CO_2 gases are not likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO_2-equivalent) of the net change calculations (above) of the project's overall off-site GHG emissions reductions or removals over each monitoring period.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

CL3. Climate Impact Monitoring - **Required**

Concept

Before a project begins, the project proponents must have an initial monitoring plan in place to quantify and document changes (within and outside the project boundaries) in project-related carbon pools, project emissions, and non-CO_2 GHG emissions if appropriate. The monitoring plan must identify the types of measurements, the sampling method, and the frequency of measurement.

Since developing a full monitoring plan can be costly, it is accepted that some of the plan details may not be fully defined at the design stage, when projects are being validated against the Standards. This is acceptable as long as there is an explicit commitment to develop and implement a monitoring plan.

Indicators

The project proponents must:

1) Develop an initial plan for selecting carbon pools and non-CO_2 GHGs to be monitored, and determine the frequency of monitoring. Potential pools include aboveground biomass, litter, dead wood, belowground biomass, wood products, soil carbon and peat. Pools to monitor must include any pools expected to decrease as a result of project activities, including those in the region outside the project boundaries resulting from all types of leakage identified in CL2. A plan must be in place to continue leakage monitoring for at least five years after all activity displacement or other leakage causing activity has taken place. Individual GHG sources may be considered 'insignificant' and do not have to be accounted for if *together* such omitted decreases in carbon pools and increases in GHG emissions amount to less than 5% of the total CO_2-equivalent benefits generated by the project.[37] Non-CO_2 gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of CO_2-equivalent) of the project's overall GHG impact over each monitoring period. Direct field measurements using scientifically robust sampling must be used to measure more significant elements of the project's carbon stocks. Other data must be suitable to the project site and specific forest type.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The project has already been underway for a number of years and as such monitoring has already started. The monitoring is intended to follow Plan Vivo guidelines. Whilst section CL3.1 of the PDD gives an overview of monitoring activities, it also includes information that is not so relevant.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	In the revised PDD CL3.1 contains a focused explanation of the monitoring plans. Section G2.3 explains which pools are considered by the project. These were found to be appropriate.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

2) Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Section CL3.2 describes the monitoring activities for the REDD and agroforestry portions of the project. The plans to monitor the REDD project activities seem appropriate, and the third party evaluation by Eduardo Mondlane University adds confidence and assurance to the monitoring system. The PDD states that a monitoring plan exists, and it was found to be a component of the REDD technical specification. . The PDD states that there will be an, "annual inspection of MODIS NDVI", yet this had not been done. It is not clear how the monitoring data gathered will be used to quantify the actual climate benefits of the project, since the monitoring results are linked to payments to farmers, not GHG quantification. The agroforestry monitoring indicators are taken from the technical specifications and reported in section CL3.2 of the PDD. During the field audit the project proponent's explained that the monitoring indicators were not linked to the CO2FIX model used to estimate emissions sequestration. Therefore it is not clear what the indicators represent. The project proponents also explained that the monitoring indicators were about to be changed, yet this is not mentioned in the PDD. There is no discussion in the PDD about monitoring for avoided burning. Monitoring form templates and completed forms for agroforestry projects were seen by the audit team during the field audit. Monitoring was being successfully implemented and the results were being used to determine payments. The monitoring methods were also demonstrated. The payments records (document entitled 2006-2009 forest payment and monitoring report) indicated that most REDD areas had not received the full payment due to issues with continued decreases in carbon stocks, but these were not quantified. The monitoring results are distributed as part of the project's annual reporting process to Plan Vivo. Appendix G Gorongosa Monitoring Sofala-2008 was found to contain a

[37] The following CDM Executive Board tool can be used to test the significance of emissions sources: http://cdm.unfccc.int/EB/031/eb31_repan16.pdf

	thorough summary of monitoring and in the Zambezi delta summary and analysis of monitoring was seen.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	In Envirotrade's response to the Draft Report it is explained that the monitoring of the agroforestry systems may be revised to enable quantification of the carbon stocks. In addition, it was clarified that trees lost to mortality are replaced, so the planned sequestration should always occur unless complete failure occurs. A full explanation of the REDD monitoring that will occur is presented. This includes MODIS/Radar data analysis that will allow carbon stock changes to be tracked. In a telephone interview Lucy Goodman explained plans to compare Radar, transect and optical data to find the optimal strategy for quantifying emissions from future deforestation and degradation.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 21/10 CLOSED**		

COMMUNITY SECTION

CM1. Net Positive Community Impacts - Required

Concept
The project must generate net positive impacts on the social and economic well-being of communities and ensure that costs and benefits are equitably shared among community members and constituent groups during the project lifetime.

Projects must maintain or enhance the High Conservation Values (identified in G1) in the project zone that are of particular importance to the communities' well-being.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Use appropriate methodologies[38] to estimate the impacts on communities, including all constituent socio-economic or cultural groups such as indigenous peoples (defined in **G1**), resulting from planned project activities. A credible estimate of impacts must include changes in community well-being due to project activities and an evaluation of the impacts by the affected groups. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defendable assumptions about how project activities will alter social and economic well-being[39], including potential impacts of changes in natural resources and ecosystem services identified as important by the communities (including water and soil resources), over the duration of the project. The 'with project' scenario must then be compared with the 'without project' scenario of social and economic well-being in the absence of the project (completed in **G2**). The difference (i.e., the community benefit) must be positive for all community groups.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Methodological approaches of project impact measurements were provided in this section of the PDD. To carry out the livelihood analysis the project monitors two different groups, namely a control group and the target group, using the Sustainable Rural Livelihoods approach. The PDD describes the indicators to measure community benefits, comparison between with project and without project scenarios. Five asset types are described, namely natural, social, human, physical and financial assets. The meetings with local traditional leaders and producers confirmed such benefits on the different asset types such as the development of community associations, conservation of environmental resources, improvement of infrastructure (e.g. school), communication, or training (e.g. farm activities to improve plants survival)		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

2) Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in **G1.8.4-6**[40] will be negatively affected by the project.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Both the project protection nature of concerned ecosystems and the low/none impact of the project activities are highlighted by the project proponents and confirmed by in consultations local NGO´s or documents review (Campbell 1986; MICOA, 2008;

[38] See Appendix A of CCB Standard "Potential Tools and Strategies".
[39] Restricting the evaluation to well-being based on activities that comply with statutory laws or conform with customary rights.
[40] **G1.8.4** Areas that provide critical ecosystem services (e.g., hydrological services, erosion control, fire control);
G1.8.5 Areas that are fundamental for the livelihoods of local communities (e.g., for essential food, fuel, fodder, medicines, or building materials without readily available alternatives); and,
G1.8.6 Areas that are critical for the traditional cultural identity of communities (e.g., areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in collaboration with the communities).
Note that High Conservation Values G1.8.1-3 that are more related to biodiversity conservation are covered in B1.

	Marzoli 2008). The PDD includes in section G1.8, at general level, indications of wildlife habitat protection and consequent biodiversity and economic impacts, wetlands, areas for soil conservation through prevention of soil erosion and other climate change adaptation benefits, Miombo role in meeting local communities' basic needs, areas of relevance for the communities, etc as HCV, but then in this section of the PDD it says that no HCV have been identified: As said in section G1.8, there is not yet a full HCV assessment to check any of these statements. It is worth mentioning that from the audit team observations at the field visit any of these values seems to be negatively affected by the project.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Envirotrade has used the ProForest HCVF toolkit to comprehensively determine the HCV in the project sites, with a result of 63, 7% of the project area within one of the 6 HCV categories. Four different categories, grouping different HCV, have been appointed and maps have been included in the PDD: • High biodiversity closed canopy forests, such as gallery/riverine forests and dry tropical forests • Protected areas (Inhamitanga Forest Reserve) • Woody vegetation on steep slopes • Culturally important areas General management recommendations have been included in the PDD for these categories. In the Plan Vivo annual report progress on protection and maintenance of HCV zones are to be documented to test the effectiveness of the measures taken. Although no negative impacts are expected from the project, the monitoring plan has been already outlined (using community technicians, the University Eduardo Mondlane, satellite imagery, questionnaires, surveys, and others) to check their status and it is expected to be finished within 6 months after validation (12 months is the maximum allowed by CCB)		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 09/10 CLOSED**		

CM2. Offsite Community Impacts - **Required**

Concept
The project proponents must evaluate and mitigate any possible social and economic impacts that could result in the decreased social and economic well-being of the main stakeholders living outside the project zone resulting from project activities. Project activities should at least 'do no harm' to the well-being of offsite stakeholders[41].

[41] Restricting the evaluation to well-being based on activities that comply with statutory or conform with customary rights.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Identify any potential negative offsite stakeholder impacts that the project activities are likely to cause.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Negative impacts are not expected, taking into account results of a socio economic and environmental impact assessment. It has been confirmed by government officials that no EIA required for the project due to its nature.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

2) Describe how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite social and economic impacts.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	There are no negative impacts expected, which has been confirmed by government officials after visiting the project.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☒
CAR/OBS			

3) Demonstrate that the project is not likely to result in net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	There are no negative impacts expected, which has been confirmed by government officials after visiting the project.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☒
CAR/OBS			

CM3. Community Impact Monitoring - **Required**

Concept
The project proponents must have an initial monitoring plan to quantify and document changes in social and economic well-being resulting from the project activities (for communities and other stakeholders). The monitoring plan must indicate which communities and other stakeholders will be monitored, and identify the types of measurements, the sampling method, and the frequency of measurement.

Since developing a full community monitoring plan can be costly, it is accepted that some of the plan details may not be fully defined at the design stage, when projects are being validated against the Standards. This is acceptable as long as there is an explicit commitment to develop and implement a monitoring plan.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Develop an initial plan for selecting community variables to be monitored and the frequency of monitoring and reporting to ensure that monitoring variables are directly linked to the project's community development objectives and to anticipated impacts (positive and negative).[42]

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The PDD provides an indication of studies, reports and impact monitoring periodicity and procedures as an initial plan for monitoring communities. In section CM3.1 methods of assessing and measuring socio-economic impacts are presented for three areas of impact: local incomes, local food production and gender. Reports on such assessments include Rohit (2004) and Rohit (2008). Local government officials, NGO´s and community leaders confirmed, during the consultations that positive impacts have resulted from the project activities. The monitoring results are distributed as part of the project's annual reporting process to Plan Vivo. However the audit team has seen very different PV annual reports (2006-08), without a clear plan with variables and frequencies to be followed-up.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	There is past information in the various Plan Vivo and EU reports, but now frequency of monitoring has been made clearer in the PDD. A new monitoring plan will be completed within 6 months of validation with more detail.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 20/10 CLOSED**		

2) Develop an initial plan for how they will assess the effectiveness of measures used to maintain or enhance High Conservation Values related to community well-being (G1.8.4-6) present in the project zone.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Both the project protection nature of concerned ecosystems and the low/none impact of the project activities are highlighted by the project proponents and confirmed by in consultations local NGO´s or documents review (Campbell 1986; MICOA, 2008; Marzoli 2008). As said in section G1.8, there has not yet been a full HCV assessment, and so no measures have been developed.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Envirotrade has used the ProForest HCVF toolkit to comprehensively determine the HCV in the project sites, with a result of 63, 7% of the project area within one of the 6 HCV categories. Four different categories, grouping different HCV, have been appointed and maps have been included in the PDD. General management recommendations have been included in the PDD for these categories. In the Plan Vivo annual report progress on protection and maintenance of HCV zones are to be documented to test the effectiveness of the measures taken. The monitoring plan has been already outlined (using community technicians, the University Eduardo Mondlane, satellite imagery, questionnaires, surveys, and others) to check their status and it is expected to be finished within 6 months after validation (12 months is the maximum allowed by CCB) Thus, the specific indicators and how the results are going to be used are still not clear.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 09/10 CLOSED, OBS 14/10**		

3) Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The PDD provides an indication of studies, reports and impact monitoring periodicity and procedures as an initial plan for monitoring communities. In section CM3.1 methods of assessing and measuring socio-economic impacts are presented for three

[42] Potential variables may include but are not limited to: income, employment generation, health, market access, schools, food security and education.

	areas of impact: local incomes, local food production and gender. Reports on such assessments include Rohit (2004) and Rohit (2008). Local government officials, NGO´s and community leaders confirmed, during the consultations that positive impacts have resulted from the project activities. The monitoring results are distributed as part of the project's annual reporting process to Plan Vivo. However the audit team has seen very different PV annual reports (2006-08), without a clear plan with variables and frequencies to be followed-up.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	There is past information in the various Plan Vivo and EU reports, but now frequency of monitoring has been made clearer in the PDD. A new monitoring plan will be completed within 6 months of validation with more detail.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 20/10 CLOSED**		

BIODIVERSITY SECTION

B1. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts - **Required**

Concept
The project must generate net positive impacts on biodiversity within the project zone and within the project lifetime, measured against the baseline conditions.

The project should maintain or enhance any High Conservation Values (identified in G1) present in the project zone that are of importance in conserving globally, regionally or nationally significant biodiversity.

Invasive species populations[43] must not increase as a result of the project, either through direct use or indirectly as a result of project activities.

Projects may not use genetically modified organisms (GMOs)[44] to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals. GMOs raise unresolved ethical, scientific and socio-economic issues. For example, some GMO attributes may result in invasive genes or species.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Use appropriate methodologies[45] to estimate changes in biodiversity as a result of the project in the project zone and in the project lifetime. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defendable assumptions. The 'with project' scenario should then be compared with the baseline 'without project' biodiversity scenario completed in **G2**. The difference (i.e., the net biodiversity benefit) must be positive.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	A rather general account has been presented in the PDD on without project biodiversity scenario (G.2.5, page 40) and compared with "with project scenario" (page 87), however, biodiversity studies specific for the project zones including both flora and fauna species have still to be carried out.
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Studies carried out in and around the Gorongosa National Park before the commencement of the project and using information that was available to the project developers highlighted a link between the management of natural resources in the neighboring communities and the survival of the biodiversity of the park. The project

[43] 'Invasive species' are defined as non-native species that threaten ecosystems, habitats or species in the project zone as identified in the Global Invasive Species Database: http://www.issg.org/database, from scientific literature, and from local knowledge.
[44] 'Genetically modified organisms' are defined as any living organism that possesses a novel combination of genetic material obtained through the use of modern biotechnology and which is capable of transferring or replicating genetic material.
[45] See Appendix A of CCB Standard "Potential Tools and Strategies" for further guidance.

	was designed, in consultation with the management of the park, to preserve and protect the bio-diversity in the protected area. Envirotrade considers now flora taxa the most vital for study in the miombo ecosystem and this project, were trees are the focus. Nevertheless, as part of their commitment to develop a biodiversity monitoring plan, which has been outlined to some extent already, Envirotrade will invite a bird expert from to carry out a bird survey, since this group is considered especially relevant. This will increase also provide information for eco tourism, which is one of the projects micro-businesses, and will be used to assess the success of agro-forestry activities. A simple biodiversity index will be used to compare the difference between the sites.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 06/10 CLOSED, OBS 13/10**		

2) Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in **G1.8.1-3**[46] will be negatively affected by the project.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The project indicates that the project will increase protection of the high conservation value miombo woodland. No assessment on biodiversity was done but from consultations to local officials and NGO´s it is expected that protection of the miombo woodland is likely to occur. Assessments are necessary for measurable accounts.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Envirotrade has used the ProForest HCVF toolkit to comprehensively determine the HCV in the project sites, with a result of 63, 7% of the project area within one of the 6 HCV categories. Four different categories, grouping different HCV, have been appointed and maps have been included in the PDD. General management recommendations have been included in the PDD for these categories. In the Plan Vivo annual report progress on protection and maintenance of HCV zones are to be documented to test the effectiveness of the measures taken. Although no negative impacts are expected from the project, the monitoring plan has been already outlined (using community technicians, the University Eduardo Mondlane, satellite imagery, questionnaires, surveys, and others) to check their status and it is expected to be finished within 6 months after validation (12 months is the maximum allowed by CCB)		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 09/10 CLOSED**		

3) Identify all species to be used by the project and show that no known invasive species will be introduced into any area affected by the project and that the population of any invasive species will not increase as a result of the project.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The species used by the project are identified and listed in the technical specifications, which is the handy document and may be updated at different moments than the PDD It has not been clearly indicated in this section B1.3 the extent and steps for *Gliricidia sp.* use being phased out. However, it was confirmed during field visits and consultations to producers that *Gliricidia sp.* has no longer been used for plantations for some years. The use of *Faidherbia sp.* to replace *Gliricidia sp.* was confirmed during

[46] **G1.8.1** Globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values, including protected areas, threatened species, endemic species and areas that support significant concentrations of a species during any time in their lifecycle(e.g., migrations, feeding grounds, breeding areas);
G1.8.2 Globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape-level areas where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance;
G1.8.3 Threatened or rare ecosystems.
Note that High Conservation Values G1.8.4-6 that are more related to community well-being are covered in CM1.

	field visits and interviews to producers. Seeds origin should be mentioned in the PDD, as i.e. *Faidherbia sp.* comes from Malawi.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**OBS 06/10, OBS 07/10**		

4) Describe possible adverse effects of non-native species used by the project on the region's environment, including impacts on native species and disease introduction or facilitation. Project proponents must justify any use of non-native species over native species.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The use of *Faidherbia sp.* to replace *Gliricidia sp.* was confirmed during field visits and interviews to producers The PDD reports the use of *Cajanus cajan* and the advantages of this crop have been listed, including increase in soil and food for human consumption.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

5) Guarantee that no GMOs will be used to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	GMOs have not been used in the project.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

B2. Offsite Biodiversity Impacts - **Required**

Concept
The project proponents must evaluate and mitigate likely negative impacts on biodiversity outside the project zone resulting from project activities.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Identify potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts that the project is likely to cause.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	It is not expected that the project will cause negative offsite biodiversity impacts. No HCVF assessment has been carried yet, but consultations with other NGO's, Gorongosa National Park managers, and government officials also considered that biodiversity impacts of the project are positive.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

2) Describe how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite biodiversity impacts.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	This criterion is not applicable, see B2.1.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☒
CAR/OBS			

3) Evaluate likely unmitigated negative offsite biodiversity impacts against the biodiversity benefits of the project within the project boundaries. Justify and demonstrate that the net effect of the project on biodiversity is positive.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	This criterion is not applicable, see B2.1.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☒
CAR/OBS			

B3. Biodiversity Impact Monitoring - Required

Concept

The project proponents must have an initial monitoring plan to quantify and document the changes in biodiversity resulting from the project activities (within and outside the project boundaries). The monitoring plan must identify the types of measurements, the sampling method, and the frequency of measurement.

Since developing a full biodiversity-monitoring plan can be costly, it is accepted that some of the plan details may not be fully defined at the design stage, when projects are being validated against the Standards. This is acceptable as long as there is an explicit commitment to develop and implement a monitoring plan.

Indicators

The project proponents must:

1) Develop an initial plan for selecting biodiversity variables to be monitored and the frequency of monitoring and reporting to ensure that monitoring variables are directly linked to the project's biodiversity objectives and to anticipated impacts (positive and negative).[47]

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Biodiversity variables were selected (trees being the focus) and described in section B3.1; It was indicated and explained that an increase of tree biodiversity is likely to occur. The frequency of monitoring and reporting, as indicated in G.3.3, would be annual monitoring of tree biodiversity at the same time as annual monitoring of forest management areas. While annual reporting for biodiversity is expected, as per PV procedures, this is not indicated in this section.
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	There is past information in the various Plan Vivo and EU reports, but now frequency of monitoring has been made clearer in the PDD. A new monitoring plan will be completed within 6 months of validation with more detail.

[47] Potential variables may include but are not limited to: species abundance; population size, range, trends and diversity; habitat area, quality and diversity; landscape connectivity; and forest fragmentation.

Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 20/10 CLOSED, OBS 08/10**		

2) Develop an initial plan for assessing the effectiveness of measures used to maintain or enhance High Conservation Values related to globally, regionally or nationally significant biodiversity (**G1.8.1-3)** present in the project zone.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Both the project protection nature of concerned ecosystems and the low/none impact of the project activities are highlighted by the project proponents and confirmed by in consultations local NGO´s or documents review (Campbell 1986; MICOA, 2008; Marzoli 2008). No specific HCV assessment has been carried. Some regional documents related to the importance of the miombo forest have been listed in the PDD, but there is no link with the particularities of the values in the project zones. As a result, no specific measures to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes have been defined.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Envirotrade has used the ProForest HCVF toolkit to comprehensively determine the HCV in the project sites, with a result of 63, 7% of the project area within one of the 6 HCV categories. Four different categories, grouping different HCV, have been appointed and maps have been included in the PDD. General management recommendations have been included in the PDD for these categories. In the Plan Vivo annual report progress on protection and maintenance of HCV zones are to be documented to test the effectiveness of the measures taken. The monitoring plan has been already outlined (using community technicians, the University Eduardo Mondlane, satellite imagery, questionnaires, surveys, and others) to check their status and it is expected to be finished within 6 months after validation (12 months is the maximum allowed by CCB) Thus, the specific indicators and how the results are going to be used are still not clear.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 09/10 CLOSED, OBS 14/10**		

3) Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	In section B3.3 of the PDD the monitoring procedures and periodicity are mentioned namely annual monitoring of tree biodiversity at the time of monitoring forest management areas through point transect and connectivity and fragmentation monitored by GIS analysis. The monitoring results are distributed as part of the project's annual reporting process to Plan Vivo. However the audit team has seen very different PV annual reports (2006-08), without a clear plan with variables and frequencies to be followed-up.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	There is past information in the various Plan Vivo and EU reports, but now frequency of monitoring has been made clearer in the PDD. A new monitoring plan will be completed within 6 months of validation with more detail.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**CAR 20/10 CLOSED**		

GOLD LEVEL SECTION

GL1. Climate Change Adaptation Benefits - Optional

Concept

This Gold Level Climate Change Adaptation Benefits criterion identifies projects that will provide significant support to assist communities and/or biodiversity in adapting to the impacts of climate change. Anticipated local climate change and climate variability within the project zone could potentially affect communities and biodiversity during the life of the project and beyond. Communities and biodiversity in some areas of the world will be more vulnerable to the negative impacts of these changes due to: vulnerability of key crops or production systems to climatic changes; lack of diversity of livelihood resources and inadequate resources, institutions and capacity to develop new livelihood strategies; and high levels of threat to species survival from habitat fragmentation. Land-based carbon projects have the potential to help local communities and biodiversity adapt to climate change by: diversifying revenues and livelihood strategies; maintaining valuable ecosystem services such as hydrological regulation, pollination, pest control and soil fertility; and increasing habitat connectivity across a range of habitat and climate types.

Please note: For the optional Gold Level criterion, Rainforest Alliance does not issue corrective action requests, since compliance with these criteria is not mandatory for CCBA validation. Where an optional criterion is found to be in non-compliance an Observation will be issued. In order to obtain Gold Level validation the all Observations for optional criterion for at least one of the Gold Level sections must be addressed.

Indicators

The project proponents must:

1) Identify likely regional climate change and climate variability scenarios and impacts, using available studies, and identify potential changes in the local land-use scenario due to these climate change scenarios in the absence of the project.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	In section GL1.1 of the PDD droughts and floods are identified as threats that are likely to rise due to climate change in Mozambique. However, no details are provided about the likely regional changes that are projected.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	In the revised PDD, the limitations of using global climate models to predict future climate change and variability at a regional level are discussed. With these caveats in mind, the general anticipated trends of drying and warming are discussed, as predicted by groups of models used by the IPCC. The proponents give examples of possible impacts but highlight that management decisions will have a bigger impact on the vegetation compared to changes in precipitation and temperature. There is little more the project can do at this stage other than monitor the latest science and projections.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**OBS 10/10 CLOSED**		

2) Identify any risks to the project's climate, community and biodiversity benefits resulting from likely climate change and climate variability impacts and explain how these risks will be mitigated.[48]

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Criterion GL1.2 requires that risks to the projects benefits caused by climate change/variability are identified, and mitigation strategies documented. This has not been done in the PDD. Section GL1.3 simply states that the project will reduce the impact of droughts and floods.
Findings from 2nd	The PDD now identified risks associated with possible drought as well as

[48] Examples of how risks from climate change can be mitigated include the choice of species (adapted to various temperatures, precipitation, seasonality, salinity of water table, diseases/pests, etc.), the methods used to implement GHG emissions reduction activities, certainty of water sources critical for project success and location of activities in relation to anticipated land cover changes (e.g. flooding) expected as a result of climate change.

review: **28 JULY 10**	demonstrating how the project is already mitigating any foreseeable impacts.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**OBS 11/10 CLOSED**		

3) Demonstrate that current or anticipated climate changes are having or are likely to have an impact on the well-being of communities[49] *and/or* the conservation status of biodiversity[50] in the project zone and surrounding regions.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Section GL1.3 identifies drought related crop failure as a threat to communities and climate change more broadly as a threat to slowly reproducing organisms. Whilst these threats are real, no attempt has been made to link the broad statements to the actual project zone. For example, which slowly reproducing organisms does the project hope to facilitate the migration of through corridor maintenance?		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	The project uses information on past climate related disasters in Mozambique to illustrate the potential scale of impacts.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	**OBS 12/10 CLOSED**		

4) Demonstrate that the project activities will assist communities[51] *and/or* biodiversity[52] to adapt to the probable impacts of climate change.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	In section GL1.4 of the PDD diversifying food crops and cash generation are documented as examples of project benefits that will increase the adaptive capacity of the communities within the project zone. These were thought to be well substantiated. However, the projects contribution to increasing the adaptive capacity of biodiversity was not thoroughly defended.
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Section GL1.4 has been expanded to provide more examples.

[49] Project proponents can demonstrate, for example, evidence of decreased access to natural resources of importance for communities' livelihoods and overall well-being. Climate change models that detail the predicted effects on these natural resources, such as freshwater, and participatory evaluations can be used to demonstrate anticipated impacts on communities.

[50] Project proponents can demonstrate evidence of a change in actual range, phenology or behavior of a species found within the project zone. For a range change, the project proponents should demonstrate that the change affects the entire range of the species and not just a subset of the range (which might be part of natural variation and offset by gains in other parts of the species range). Alternatively, the project proponents can demonstrate anticipated negative changes in the range of one or more species found in the project area using modeling techniques. The recommended modeling tool is Maxent because of its ease of implementation and performance (http://www.cs.princeton.edu/~schapire/maxent/). Recommended climatologies are IPCC4 A1 or A2 scenarios, Hadley or Japan high resolution GCM, downscaled to 1km (also available on the internet at http://www.worldclim.org). Best practice is to have this analysis conducted by a researcher who has published on climate and species distribution modeling using Maxent in the peer-review literature.

[51] Where communities are predicted to experience or are experiencing decreased access to natural resources because of climate change, project proponents must demonstrate that activities are likely to decrease communities' dependence on these natural resources. For example, where freshwater access is affected by climate change, a project can improve water management for maximum efficiency or provide alternative agricultural methods or products that require less water. Project activities may also help communities adapt to new planting and harvesting schedules to ensure maximum yields. Other climate change adaptation assistance can involve helping communities prepare for 'extreme events' such as floods, droughts and mudslides.

[52] Where an actual range or phenology change in a species is identified, project proponents must demonstrate that the project activities will make a significant contribution to mitigating this impact of climate change. Examples include: creating suitable habitat in an area that is becoming climatically suitable for a species that is losing climatically suitable habitats in other parts of its range; and providing a native food source for a species that is suffering population declines because of timing mismatches between its food needs and food availability linked to climate change (such as spring emergence of vegetation or insects). Where a modeled range impact is demonstrated, project proponents should demonstrate that the project significantly contributes to improving species' ability to occupy a new range or creates habitat in areas to which the species is migrating.

Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

GL2. Exceptional Community Benefits – OPTIONAL

Concept

This Gold Level Exceptional Community Benefits criterion recognizes project approaches that are explicitly pro-poor in terms of targeting benefits to globally poorer communities and the poorer, more vulnerable households and individuals within them. In so doing, land-based carbon projects can make a significant contribution to reducing the poverty and enhancing the sustainable livelihoods of these groups. Given that poorer people typically have less access to land and other natural assets, this optional criterion requires innovative approaches that enable poorer households to participate effectively in land-based carbon activities. Furthermore, this criterion requires that the project will 'do no harm' to poorer and more vulnerable members of the communities, by establishing that no member of a poorer or more vulnerable social group will experience a net negative impact on their well-being or rights.

Indicators

Project proponents must:

1) Demonstrate that the project zone is in a low human development country OR in an administrative area of a medium or high human development[53] country in which at least 50% of the population of that area is below the national poverty line.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The project covers a rural area characterized by low household income (Sofala Province, ranked second highest among all of Mozambique's provinces for absolute poverty of children, with 59% of the children in the province living in absolute poverty, and fourth highest for severe health deprivation, with 17% of the children in Sofala suffering from severe health deprivation) in one of the world's poorest countries (i.e. UNICEF, 2003)		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

2) Demonstrate that at least 50% of households within the lowest category of well-being (e.g., poorest quartile) of the community are likely to benefit substantially from the project.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	This information is included in reports such as Spadavecahia, L, 2000: Jindal, R. 2004; and the Minihousehold Census (mini census Chicare Regulado).		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

3) Demonstrate that any barriers or risks that might prevent benefits going to poorer households have been identified and addressed in order to increase the probable flow of benefits to poorer households.

[53] Low, Medium, and High Human Development Countries defined in the latest UNDP Human Development Report http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_20072008_en_complete.pdf

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The PDD explains in section GL2.3 the potential risk posed by the tsetse fly with consequence in the reduction of usable land per family for crop and animal production. The PDD highlights the sustainable use of the miombo woodlands for timber with the project technical support as an alternative for income and the rural economy as a whole. The lack of resources is another barrier that the project would prevent by the timber production and to find alternative means of income generation and be able to Diversify smallholder production systems, register the lands, etc		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

4) Demonstrate that measures have been taken to identify any poorer and more vulnerable households and individuals whose well-being or poverty may be negatively affected by the project, and that the project design includes measures to avoid any such impacts. Where negative impacts are unavoidable, demonstrate that they will be effectively mitigated.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	Section GL2.4 in the PDD indicates that the project is accessible to any resident in the project areas and promotes income increase to those involved in project activities, not negatively affecting any community members. This has been confirmed during consultations to local government officials, traditional leaders, community associations and project farmers.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

5) Demonstrate that community impact monitoring will be able to identify positive and negative impacts on poorer and more vulnerable groups. The social impact monitoring must take a differentiated approach that can identify positive and negative impacts on poorer households and individuals and other disadvantaged groups, including women.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	The project document used Rohit (2008) as source of information on community impact monitoring to identify the impacts on the poor and more vulnerable groups		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

GL3. Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits – OPTIONAL

Concept

All projects conforming to the Standards must demonstrate net positive impacts on biodiversity within their project zone. This Gold Level Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits criterion identifies projects that conserve biodiversity at sites of global significance for biodiversity conservation. Sites meeting this optional criterion must be based on the Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) framework of vulnerability and irreplaceability.[54] These criteria are defined in terms of species and population threat levels, since these are the most clearly defined elements of biodiversity. These scientifically based criteria are drawn from existing best practices that have been used, to date, to identify important sites for biodiversity in over 173 countries.

Indicators

Project proponents must demonstrate that the project zone includes a site of high biodiversity conservation priority by meeting either the vulnerability *or* irreplaceability criteria defined below:

1) Vulnerability

a. Regular occurrence of a globally threatened species (according to the IUCN Red List) at the site:

b. Critically Endangered (CR) and Endangered (EN) species - presence of at least a single individual; or

c. Vulnerable species (VU) - presence of at least 30 individuals or 10 pairs.

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	A list is provided regarding globally endangered and vulnerable animal species. The following species have been identified: • *Lycaon pictus* (Endangered) • *Panthera leo* (Vulnerable) • *Hippopotamus amphibius* (vulnerable) • *Trigonoceps occipitalis* (Vulnerable)		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

Or,

2) Irreplaceability

a. A minimum proportion of a species' global population present at the site at any stage of the species' lifecycle according to the following thresholds:[55]

b. Restricted-range species - species with a global range less than 50,000 km^2 *and* 5% of global population at the site; or

c. Species with large but clumped distributions - 5% of the global population at the site; or

d. Globally significant congregations - 1% of the global population seasonally at the site; or

e. Globally significant source populations - 1% of the global population at the site;

Findings from 1st review: 02 Feb 10	In section GL3.2 reports the use of information regarding proportion of species at the site from previous studies before the project start, in consultation with the park

[54] See Appendix A of CCB Standard "Potential Tools and Strategies" for further guidance.

[55] While there is wide consensus on the need for a sub-criterion for bioregionally restricted assemblages, this sub-criterion has been excluded from the Standards until guidelines and thresholds have been agreed.

	management.		
Findings from 2nd review: **28 JULY 10**	Same as previous findings.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			