

STEP 1: RISK ANALYSIS

1 INTERNAL RISK

Project Management		
a)	Species planted (where applicable) associated with more than 25% of the stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued are not native or proven to be adapted to the same or similar agro-ecological zone(s) in which the project is located.	0
b)	Ongoing enforcement to prevent encroachment by outside actors is required to protect more than 50% of stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued.	0
c)	Management team does not include individuals with significant experience in all skills necessary to successfully undertake all project activities (ie, any area of required experience is not covered by at least one individual with at least 5 years experience in the area).	0
d)	Management team does not maintain a presence in the country or is located more than a day of travel from the project site, considering all parcels or polygons in the project area.	0
e)	<b>Mitigation:</b> Management team includes individuals with significant experience in AFOLU project design and implementation, carbon accounting and reporting (eg, individuals who have successfully managed projects through validation, verification and issuance of GHG credits) under the VCS Program or other approved GHG programs.	-2
f)	<b>Mitigation:</b> Adaptive management plan in place	-2
<b>Total Project Management [a + b + c + d + e + f]</b>		<b>-4</b>
Note: When a risk factor does not apply to the project, the score shall be zero for such factor		

Financial Viability		
Q	How many years does it take for the cumulative cashflow to break even?	d)
Q	What percentage of funding is needed to cover the total cash out before the project breaks even has been secured?	h)
a)	Project cash flow breakeven point is greater than 10 years from the current risk assessment	0
b)	Project cash flow breakeven point is between 7 and up to less than 10 years from the current risk assessment	0
c)	Project cash flow breakeven point between 4 and up to less than 7 years from the current risk assessment	0
d)	Project cash flow breakeven point is less than 4 years from the current risk assessment	0
e)	Project has secured less than 15% of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven	0

## RISK REPORT CALCULATION TOOL: VCS Version 3

f)	Project has secured 15% to less than 40% of funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven	0
g)	Project has secured 40% to less than 80% of funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven	0
h)	Project has secured 80% or more of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven	0
i)	<b>Mitigation:</b> Project has available as callable financial resources at least 50% of total cash out before project reaches breakeven	0
<b>Total Financial Viability [(a, b, c or d) + (e, f, g or h) + i]</b>		<b>0</b>
Note: When a risk factor does not apply to the project, the score shall be zero for such factor		

Opportunity Cost		
Q	What is the NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity compared to NPV of project activity?	d)
a)	NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be at least 100% more than that associated with project activities; or where baseline activities are subsistence-driven, net positive community impacts are not demonstrated	0
b)	NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be between 50% and up to 100% more than from project activities	0
c)	NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be between 20% and up to 50% more than from project activities	0
d)	NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be between 20% more than and up to 20% less than from project activities; or where baseline activities are subsistence-driven, net positive community impacts are demonstrated	0
e)	NPV from project activities is expected to be between 20% and up to 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity	0
f)	NPV from project activities is expected to be at least 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity	0
g)	<b>Mitigation:</b> Project proponent is a non-profit organization	-2
h)	<b>Mitigation:</b> Project is protected by legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period (see project longevity)	-2
i)	<b>Mitigation:</b> Project is protected by legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over at least 100 years (see project longevity)	-8
<b>Total Opportunity Cost [(a, b, c, d, e or f) + (g + h or i)]</b>		<b>0</b>
Note: When a risk factor does not apply to the project, the score shall be zero for such factor		
Total may not be less than zero		

Project Longevity
-------------------

## RISK REPORT CALCULATION TOOL: VCS Version 3

Q	Does the project have a legally binding agreement that covers at least a 100 year period from the project start date?	Yes
Q	What is the project Longevity in years?	100
Q	Legal Agreement or requirement to continue management practice?	Yes
a)	Without legal agreement or requirement to continue the management practice	0
b)	With legal agreement or requirement to continue the management practice	-20
<b>Total Project Longevity</b>		<b>0</b>
<p>Note: Total may not be less than zero.</p> <p>Any project with a legally binding agreement that covers at least a 100 year period from the project start date will be assigned a score of zero.</p> <p>Any project with a project longevity of less than 30 years fails the risk assessment</p>		
<b>Total Internal Risk (PM + FV + OC + PL)</b>		<b>0</b>
Note: Total may not be less than zero		

## 2 EXTERNAL RISK

Land and resource tenure		
Q	Are the ownership and resource access/use rights held by the same of different entities?	Same
a)	Ownership and resource access/use rights are held by same entity(s)	0
b)	Ownership and resource access/use rights are held by different entity(s) (eg, land is government owned and the project proponent holds a lease or concession)	0
c)	In more than 5% of the project area, there exist disputes over land tenure or ownership	0
d)	There exist disputes over access/use rights (or overlapping rights)	0
e)	WRC projects unable to demonstrate that potential upstream and sea impacts that could undermine issued credits in the next 10 years are irrelevant or expected to be insignificant, or that there is a plan in place for effectively mitigating such impacts	0
f)	<b>Mitigation:</b> Project area is protected by legally binding commitment (eg, a conservation easement or protected area) to continue management practices that protect carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period	-2
g)	<b>Mitigation:</b> Where disputes over land tenure, ownership or access/use rights exist, documented evidence is provided that projects have implemented activities to resolve the disputes or clarify overlapping claims	0
<b>Total Land Tenure [(a or b) + c + d + e + f +g]</b>		<b>0</b>
<p>Note: When a risk factor does not apply to the project, the score shall be zero for such factor</p> <p>Total may not be less than zero</p>		

Community Engagement		
a)	Less than 50 percent of households living within the project area who are reliant on the project area, have been consulted	0
b)	Less than 20 percent of households living within 20 km of the project boundary outside the project area, and who are reliant on the project area, have been consulted	0
c)	<b>Mitigation:</b> The project generates net positive impacts on the social and economic well-being of the local communities who derive livelihoods from the project area	0
<b>Total Community Engagement [a + b + c]</b>		<b>0</b>
Note: When a risk factor does not apply to the project, the score shall be zero for such factor Total may be less than zero		

Political Risk		
Q	What is the country's calculated Governance score?	1.62
a)	Governance score of less than -0.79	0
b)	Governance score of -0.79 to less than -0.32	0
c)	Governance score of -0.32 to less than 0.19	0
d)	Governance score of 0.19 to less than 0.82	0
e)	Governance score of 0.82 or higher	0
f)	<b>Mitigation:</b> Country implementing REDD+ Readiness or other activities such as: a) The country is receiving REDD+ Readiness funding from the FCPF, UN-REDD or other bilateral or multilateral donors b) The country is participating in the CCBA/CARE REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards Initiative c) The jurisdiction in which the project is located is participating in the Governors' Climate and Forest Taskforce d) The country has an established national FSC or PEFC standards body e) The country has an established DNA under the CDM and has at least one registered CDM A/R project	0
<b>Total Political [(a, b, c, d or e) + f]</b>		<b>0</b>
Note: When a risk factor does not apply to the project, the score shall be zero for such factor Total may not be less than zero		

<b>Total External Risk (LT + CE +PC)</b>	<b>0</b>
Note: Total may not be less than zero	

### 3 NATURAL RISK

Risk Category Factors		LS Value	Mitigation	Risk Rating
a)	Fire (F)	2	0.25	0.50
b)	Pest and Disease Outbreaks (PD)	2	0.25	0.50
c)	Extreme Weather (W)	2	0.25	0.50
d)	Geological Risk (G)	0	1.00	0.00
e)	Other natural risk (ON1)	0	1.00	0.00
f)	Other natural risk (ON2)	0	1.00	0.00
g)	Other natural risk (ON3)	0	1.00	0.00
<b>Total Natural Risk [F + PD + W + G + ON]</b>				<b>1.50</b>
Note: When a risk factor does not apply to the project, the score shall be zero for such factor				
Risk rating is determined by [LS x M]				

<b>Total Natural Risk (F + PD + W + G + ON)</b>	<b>1.50</b>
Note: Total may not be less than zero	
If the Total Natural Risk is above 35 then the project fails the entire risk analysis	

## STEP 2: OVERALL NON-PERMANENCE RISK RATING AND BUFFER DETERMINATION

Risk Category		Rating
a)	Internal risk	0.00
b)	External risk	0.00
c)	Natural Risk	1.50
<b>Overall risk rating (a + b + c)</b>		<b>10</b>
Note: Overall risk rating shall be rounded up to the nearest whole percentage		
The minimum risk rating shall be 10, regardless of the risk rating calculated		
If the overall risk rating is over 60 then the project fails the entire risk analysis		
<b>Total Risk Assessment</b>		<b>10%</b>
Net change in the project's carbon stocks		836373
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF CREDITS TO BE DEPOSITED IN THE AFOLU POOLED BUFFER ACCOUNT</b>		<b>83637</b>