

CCBA Validation Report

JARI/AMAPÁ REDD+ PROJECT IN THE STATE OF AMAPÁ, BRAZIL

SUBMITTED BY: DNV GL USA AND CANADA SUSTAINABILITY, BUSINESS ASSURANCE

Date of first issue: 11 March 2016		Project No.: PRJC-514042-2014-CCS-USA	
Approved by: Tom Gosselin		Organizational unit: DNV GL USA & Canada Sustainability – Climate Change Services	
Client: Biofilica Investimentos Ambientais S.A., Jari Celulose S.A. and Jari Florestal S.A		Client Contact: Rebeca Lima	
<p>Summary:</p> <p>DNV GL (USA) has performed a validation of the “Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project” in the state of Amapá, Brazil on the basis of criteria defined by the Climate Community and Biodiversity (CCB) Standards Third Edition and the VCS methodology, “VM0015 – Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation, version 1.1, 3 December 2012” as well as criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. This validation report summarizes the findings of the CCBS validation.</p> <p>The validation consisted of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the project design, the baseline and the monitoring plan, ii) an onsite inspection and follow-up interviews with project stakeholders and the issuance of the finding list, and iii) the resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report and opinion.</p> <p>The project activity is to employ carbon finance in order to avoid unplanned deforestation of tropical forests and therefore reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The project utilizes a Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD+) project methodology, specifically using forest protection and monitoring as well as implementing sustainable development activities among the communities in order to reach emissions reductions goals.</p> <p>In summary, it is DNV GL’s opinion that the “Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project” in the state of Amapá, Brazil, as described in the CCBA Project Design Document /75/ version 2.0, meets all relevant CCBA requirements.</p>			
Report No.: 2016-7836	Subject group: Environment	Indexing terms:	
Report title: Validation Report for the Jari/Amapa REDD+ Project in the state of Amapa, Brazil		Key words: Forestry Validation	Service: Validation Forestry
Work carried out by: Kyle Holland		<input type="checkbox"/> No distribution without permission from the client or responsible organizational unit <input type="checkbox"/> Free distribution within DNV after 3 years <input type="checkbox"/> Strictly confidential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unrestricted distribution	
Work reviewed by: Edwin Aalders			
Date of this revision: 30 March 2016	Revision No: 02	Number of pages: 86 (with appendix)	
<p>© Det Norske Veritas (U.S.A.), Inc.</p> <p>Det Norske Veritas (U.S.A.), Inc. 155 Grand Avenue, Suite 500, Oakland, CA 94612</p> <p>All rights reserved. This publication or parts thereof may not be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying or recording, without the prior written consent of Det Norske Veritas (U.S.A.), Inc.</p>			

ABBREVIATIONS

AFOLU	Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Uses
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CCBA	Climate Community and Biodiversity Alliance
CCBS	Climate Community and Biodiversity Standard
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CL	Clarification Request
CO2	Carbon Dioxide
DR	Document Review
DSEA	Socioeconomic and Environmental Assessment
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FPIC	Free, Prior and Informed Consent
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
GHG	Greenhouse Gas(es)
GWP	Global warming potential
HCV	High Conservation Value(s)
IBAMA	Brazilian Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources
IEF	State Forestry Institute
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
PDD	Project Design Document
REDD+	Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation plus sustainable management of forests, conservation of forest carbon stocks and enhancement of forest carbon stocks
RURAP	Amapá Rural Development Institute
SEMA	Secretary of State for the Environment
SFM	Sustainable Forestry Management
SRAA	Regional Secretariat for Agriculture and Environment
TARE	Technical Assistance and Rural Extension
tCO2e	Tonnes CO2 equivalent
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
VCSA	VCS Association
VCU	Voluntary Carbon Unit

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
a. <i>Objective</i>	2
b. <i>Scope and Criteria</i>	2
c. <i>CCB Project Description</i>	3
d. <i>Level of Assurance</i>	4
2. Methodology	4
a. <i>Review of Documents</i>	5
b. <i>Follow-up Interviews</i>	11
c. <i>Site Inspections</i>	13
d. <i>Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy</i>	13
3. Validation Findings	14
a. <i>1. General Section</i>	14
b. <i>2. Climate Section</i>	20
c. <i>3. Community Section</i>	22
d. <i>4 Biodiversity Section</i>	26
CCBS Compliance Checklist	31
APPENDIX A	32

1. Introduction

Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A, Jari Celulose S.A. and Jari Florestal S.A (from henceforth referred to as the “project proponents”) has commissioned DNV GL (U.S.A.) Inc. Climate Change & Environmental Services (DNV GL) to perform a validation of the “Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project” (the project) in the state of Amapá, Brazil. This validation report provides a description of the steps involved in conducting the validation and the findings of the validation based on the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards (Third Edition) (CCBS), as well as criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The validation team consisted of the following personnel:

<i>Role</i>	<i>Last Name</i>	<i>First Name</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Type of involvement</i>					
				Desk review	Site visit / Interviews	Reporting	Supervision of work	Technical review	TA 14.1.1 competence
Team leader (Validator)	Holland	Kyle	USA	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Verifier	Amaral	Marcio	BR	✓	✓	✓			
Project Manager	Hirst	Michelle	USA				✓		
Technical reviewer	Aalders	Edwin	Norway					✓	✓

a. Objective

The purpose of a validation is to have an independent third party assess the project design against all criteria set out by the CCBA. Validation is a requirement for all CCBA projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended climate, community, and biodiversity benefits. The final decision on the registration of a proposed project rests with the CCBA.

b. Scope and Criteria

The validation scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the CCBA Project Design Document (CCBA PDD). The CCBA PDD is reviewed against the criteria stated in the CCB Standards (Third Edition – December, 2013), and the the VCS methodology, “VM0015 – Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation, version 1.1, 3 December 2012.”

In particular, the project was assessed against the CCB Standards Third Edition to determine which of the fourteen required and three optional CCB Standards criteria the project satisfies. As specified by CCBA, an 'approved' project is one that meets all 14 of the required CCB Standards criteria.

The validation is not meant to provide any consulting for the project participants. However, stated requests for clarifications (CL) and/or corrective actions (CAR) may have provided input for improvement of the project design.

c. CCB Project Description

The "Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project" has been developed under a partnership between Biofilica Investimentos Ambientais S.A., Jari Florestal S.A. and Jari Celulose S.A. (the latter two both belonging to Grupo Jari) which are all based in Brazil. The project activity is to employ carbon finance in order to avoid unplanned deforestation of tropical forests and therefore reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The project utilizes a Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD+) project methodology, specifically using forest protection and monitoring as well as implementing sustainable development activities among the communities in order to reach emissions reductions goals. During the project lifetime, the project also provides biodiversity conservation and socio-economic benefits to local communities living within and around the project area.

Land use pressures in the area include agricultural and grazing development as well as human settlements and large infrastructure work. Thus project treatments are aimed at three main areas: forest protection and monitoring, scientific research; especially related to natural resources and biodiversity as well as socio-economic development of communities with a focus on sustainable business chains. Integrating FSC (Forest Stewardship Council) certified low impact forest management and revenue from carbon credits brought about by REDD+ project activities are essential in order to carry out these project treatments so that they are effective.

The project is located in the Brazilian state of Amapá, specifically within the Valley of Jari, in the municipalities of Laranjal do Jari and Vitória do Jari. The Valley of Jari fills a significant biodiversity role in providing habitat for a variety of diverse flora and fauna, some of which are considered threatened or endangered, and it also serves as an ecological corridor between several conservation areas. Over two thousand rural families live in and depend on the resources of the valley.

The project zone consists of 240,696 hectares of several different forest types including open and dense sub-montane Ombrophilous forests, lowland Ombrophilous forest and river-influenced pioneer formation forests. Other vegetative classes present within the project zone include freshwater water swamp and floodplain vegetation as well as wooded savanna without riparian forest and savanna parkland without riparian forest. The project area is embedded within the project zone and consists of 65,980 hectares of the above described dryland forest types. Within the project area, all land has qualified as forest as defined by the 2010 FAO definition for a minimum of 10 years prior to the project start date of February 14, 2011 /75/.

The project has been developed as a REDD+ project under the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) and has been validated and undergone a previous successful verification. The project is now looking to qualify as a REDD+ project under the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standard so that its project activities relating to biodiversity conservation and enhancement of sustainable socio-economic activities may be recognized. The project has elected for a 30 year crediting period starting on February 14, 2011 and

ending on February 14, 2041. The project start date was established as the date when the first socio-economic and environmental assessment planning meeting was held.

d. Level of Assurance

DNV GL provides reasonable assurance that the emission reduction estimations for the “Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project” are conservative and meet the CCBS criteria and approved VCS methodology “VM0015 – Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation, version 1.1, 3 December 2012” criteria.

To ensure complete transparency, DNV GL has included any clarification or corrective actions that were raised in this validation report in an appendix found at the end of this report (see Appendix A).

2. Methodology

The validation consisted of the following three phases:

- A desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring methodology.
- Site visit and interviews with project stakeholders.
- The resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report and opinion.

The validation process includes the following events and activities:

- Opening meeting, introduction and project orientation;
- Desk Review of the Project Design Document (PDD) and supplemental documentation including data, models, and maps of project zone;
- Site visit from 21 September 2015 to 25 September 2015. The site visit included:
 - Project overview and orientation
 - Interviews with representatives of the communities of Vitória do Jari;
 - Interviews with assistants of the RURAP group;
 - Interviews with local community members in the vicinities of Laranjal do Jari and Vitória do Jari;
 - Interview with the Regional SEMA manager;
 - Interview with the Secretary of the SRAA ;
 - Interviews with members of the local retired community
 - Interviews with staff of Fundação JARI
 - Interviews with staff of the Forestry Department of Fundação JARI;
 - Interviews with staff of Jari Celulose
 - Field tours of the project area;
 - Field tours of the local communities
 - Closing meeting and presentation of preliminary findings.
- Review of stakeholder comments;
- Review of collected evidence and supporting documentation;
- Issuance of findings;
- Project proponent responses to findings;
- Preparation of final report;
- Technical review of final report;

- Submission of final report to CCBA.

Findings established during the validation can either be seen as a non-fulfilment of validation protocol criteria or where a risk to the fulfilment of project objectives is identified (see Figure 1). Corrective Action Requests (CAR) are issued where:

- Mistakes have been made with a direct influence on project results.
- Validation protocol requirements have not been met.
- There is a risk that the project would not be accepted as a VCS or CCBA project or that emissions reductions will not be certified.

The term Clarification (CL) may be used where additional information is needed to fully clarify an issue.

<i>Draft report corrective action requests and requests for clarifications</i>	<i>Project participants' response</i>	<i>Final conclusion</i>
<i>If the conclusions from the draft Validation are either a Corrective Action Request or a Clarification Request, these should be listed in this section.</i>	<i>The responses given by the project participants during the communications with the validation team should be summarized in this section.</i>	<i>This section should summarise the validation team's responses and final conclusions. The conclusions should also be included in Table 1, under "Final Conclusion."</i>

Figure 1: Validation Protocol Table

a. Review of Documents

The Project Design Document version 2.0 dated February 3, 2016 /75/ was submitted by the project proponents along with additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, which were assessed as part of the validation. The project documentation followed the guidance set out in the CCB Standards, Third Edition - December 2013.

The following table lists the documentation that was assessed during the validation:

Documentation provided that relate directly to the VCS and climate portions of the project:

Ref	Name of Document with Author and Description
/1/	Amapa_RiskTool_v.3.doc; Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A.; Non-Permanence Risk Report
/2/	FAO2001.pdf; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; Protecting Plantations from Pests and Diseases
/3/	Montagnini & Jordan (2005), pg.30.pdf; Florencia Montagnini and Carl Jordan; Tropical Forest Ecology: The Basis for Conservation and Management, <i>assorted excerpts</i>
/4/	Montagnini & Jordan (2005), pg.31.pdf; Florencia Montagnini and Carl Jordan; Tropical Forest Ecology: The Basis for Conservation and Management
/5/	Montagnini & Jordan (2005), pg.32.pdf; Florencia Montagnini and Carl Jordan; Tropical Forest Ecology: The Basis for Conservation and Management

Ref	Name of Document with Author and Description
/6/	Nair, 2001.pdf; K.S.S. Nair ; Pest Outbreaks in Tropical Forest Plantations
/7/	Amapa_MonitoringReport_2012e2013_v.3.2.docx; Bioflica Investimentos Ambientais S.A.; Monitoring Report
/8/	Activities and Investments Schedule_updated.xlsx; Bioflica Investimentos Ambientais S.A.; Activity Investment Plan with costs and scheduling
/9/	Convenio_Conta_REDD+.doc; Bioflica Investimentos Ambientais S.A.; Project proponents works contract, evidence of roles and responsibilities
/10/	VCS_PDD_English_v.2.docx; Bioflica Investimentos Ambientais S.A.; Project Description
/11/	Proj_Investment Plan_20151015.pdf; Bioflica Investimentos Ambientais S.A.; Project Investment Plan Presentation
/12/	Fundo Socio Ambiental REDD+ Jari - Final.pptx; Bioflica Investimentos Ambientais S.A.; Social-environmental Program Presentation
/13/	Monitoring accuracy assessment_v2.rar; Bioflica Investimentos Ambientais S.A.; Shapefiles for accuracy assessment samples
/14/	Aspectos e Impactos do Grupo Jari.xls; Bioflica Investimentos Ambientais S.A.; Monitoring of social impacts management 26 January 2016
/15/	PMFS_Para_updated.pdf; Jari Florestal; Sustainable Forest Management 2014/2015
/16/	CAR 6_CL 1_ CL 16; Grupo Jari; Herbicide Application Instructions
/17/	PA - Controle de Formigas rev 11.pdf; Jari Celulose ; Ant Control instructional document
/18/	PA - Controle de lagartas.pdf; Grupo Jari ; Caterpillar Control instructional document
/19/	PA - Plano de atendimento Õ incândios florestais rev 0.009.pdf; Jari Celulose ; Forest fire emergency plan document
/20/	PA - PrevenáΔo e controle de incândios florestais rev 0.006.pdf; Jari Celulose ; Preventing forest fires instructional document
/21/	Cronograma de palestras nas Comunidades - 2013.pdf; Grupo Jari ; Forest fire lecture schedule 2013
/22/	Cronograma de palestras sobre incêndios florestais - 2012.pdf; Grupo Orsa (Former Grupo Jari); Forest fire lecture schedule 2012
/23/	Memórias Workshop Estratégico Jari – 07 de Outubro de 2014.pdf; Grupo Jari ; Strategic Workshop minutes – October 7, 2014
/24/	Memórias_consultas_conta_REDD+.pdf; Bioflica Investimentos Ambientais S.A.; Strategic Workshop notes & questions – October 7, 2014
/25/	AMAPA_Baseline_Study_2011.pdf; Bioflica Investimentos Ambientais S.A.; Amapa Baseline Study 2011
/26/	VCS Monitoring Report Jari-Amapá Project 2012_2013_v3.xlsx; Bioflica Investimentos Ambientais S.A.; Monitoring report GHG calculation tables

Ref	Name of Document with Author and Description
/27/	VCS Verification Report_Biofilica_DNV_v1 Final.pdf; DNV GL; Most recently submitted VCS verification report (pending approval from VCS)

Documentation provided that relate directly to the CCBA portion of the project:

Ref	Name of Document with Author and Description
/28/	AMAPA_DSEA_Relatório Final.pdf; Biofilica Investimentos Ambientais S.A; Environmental Diagnosis of Jari/Amapa Region
/29/	AMAPA_DSEA_Relatório Final_Anexos.pdf; Biofilica Investimentos Ambientais S.A; Annexes for the Environmental Diagnosis of Jari/Amapa Region
/30/	DSEA_Poema.pdf; Jari Cellulose, Poema; Socio-environmental Diagnosis of Jari/Amapa Regional Communities
/31/	201303_RelFJ.pdf; Biofilica Investimentos Ambientais S.A, Fundação JARI ; Quarterly report for Spring 2013
/32/	201403_RelFJ.pdf; Biofilica Investimentos Ambientais S.A, Fundação JARI ; Quarterly report for Spring 2014
/33/	201503_RelFJ.pdf; Biofilica Investimentos Ambientais S.A, Fundação JARI; Partial executive report for Spring 2015
/34/	Cochrane&Laurance2008pdf.pdf; Mark A. Cochrane, William F. Laurance; Journal article <i>"Synergisms among Fire, Land Use, and Climate Change in the Amazon"</i>
/35/	Fearnside2005.pdf; Phillip M. Fearnside; Journal article <i>"Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon : history, contents and consequences"</i>
/36/	Hidashi neto2012.PDF; José Hidasi Neto, Marcus Vinicius Cianciaruso; Journal article <i>"Recurring burning effects on the functional diversity of Amazonian birds"</i>
/37/	McNeeleyetal2001.pdf; Jeffrey A. McNeely; Global Strategy on Invasive Alien Species
/38/	Pimenteletal2001.pdf; David Pimentel et al; Journal article <i>"Economic and environmental threats of alien plant, animal, and microbe invasions"</i>
/39/	Annex 1 - Socioeconomic and Environmental Diagnosis 1.pdf; Biofilica Investimentos Ambientais S.A, Orsa Florestal ; Socio-economic and environmental diagnostic study from 2011
/40/	Annex 2 - Socioeconomic and Environmental Diagnosis 2.pdf; Biofilica Investimentos Ambientais S.A, Orsa Florestal ; Annexes for socio-economic and environmental diagnostic study from 2011
/41/	Endangered species flora.xlsx; List of endangered plant sightings and their relative locations
/42/	Annex 10 - Minutes 1 Amapa Forum.pdf; State Environmental Secretary, Amapa government; Minutes from forum for climate and environmental services
/43/	Annex 15 - Signed invitation from Amapa Government.pdf; State Environmental Secretary, Amapa government, Invitation from state government

Ref	Name of Document with Author and Description
/44/	Decreto nº 5975.pdf; Brazilian government; legal decree for forest rights
/45/	Instrucao 05 2006.pdf; Ministry of the environment; Legal instructions for SFM activity
/46/	SFM Plan_Amapa.pdf; Orsa Florestal; SFM management plan for Amapa
/47/	SFM Plan_Para.pdf; Orsa Florestal; SFM management plan for Para
/48/	Annex 4 - Meeting 1 - State of Amapa government agencies.pdf; Instituto Estadual de Florestas (IEF) do Amapa; Summary of state meeting with IEF
/49/	Annex 6 - Communities - meeting 1.pdf; Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A; Signed minutes for community meeting
/50/	Manual_Workers_Safety_Right.pdf; Grupo Orsa; Manual for workers' rights and safety measures
/51/	Presentation_Workers_Integration_Treining_2014.pdf; Grupo Jari; Presentation for worker training for forestry operations
/52/	Workers_Safety_Rights_Policy_Integration_Traing_Content.doc; General worker policy introduction and FAQs
/53/	ISST.N °.60.POTÓ.pdf; Grupo Jari; Worker safety bulletin about harmful insects
/54/	ISST.67 - DENGUE PODE MATAR.pdf; Grupo Jari ; Worker safety bulletin about sanitation
/55/	ISST.N ° 63 Quedas - Todo Cuidado é pouco.pdf; Grupo Jari ; On-the-job worker safety bulletin
/56/	ATA - 1ª reuniao FAMCSA imprimir.pdf; Amapa state government environmental secretary; Minutes from climate change and environmental services meeting
/57/	ATA DA REUNIÃO DOS PREFEITOS.pdf; Amapa state government environmental secretary; Minutes from forest concession meeting
/58/	C_EDS_010_2013_ConviteIIIWorkshop_REDD+FLOTA_Biofilica.pdf; Embrapa Amapa; invitation to REDD+ workshop
/59/	Empresa Biofílica-1.pdf; Amapa state government environmental secretary; letter to project proponents about climate change and environmental forum
/60/	Minuta Politica Amapaense de Mudanças CLimaticas e SA.pdf; Amapa state government; bill draft for state policy on climate change and conservation policy in the environmental sector
/61/	Relatorio de Visita as Comunidades_Cajari.docx; Grupo Jari ; Presentation of forest management and communication tool with Rio Cajari region stakeholders
/62/	Relatório POA 01Jari Florestal.pdf ; Jari Florestal; FSC public summary of annual forestry operating plans
/63/	Relatorio de Visita as Comunidades_Freguesia.docx ; Grupo Jari ; Presentation on forest management, public consultation of HCVs and communication tool to stakeholders of Freguesia
/64/	Activities and Investments Schedule_updated.xlsx ; Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A; Activity Investment Plan with costs and scheduling

Ref	Name of Document with Author and Description
/65/	Modelo REDD JARI AMAPA_adicionalidade e risco_CCBS_20150720.xlsx; Risks and additionality analysis per the REDD+ model
/66/	Lista de Presença_Instituições Locais.pdf; Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A; Signed meeting minutes of local institutions
/67/	AMAPA_Consulta_Stakeholders_Macapa_noticia_site_IEF.pdf ; Instituto Estadual de Florestas (IEF) do Amapa; Summary of state meeting with IEF
/68/	AMAPA_CamaraTecnicaREDD_I_Agosto_2012.pdf; Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A; Technical REDD+ review presentation
/69/	Lista de presença_Fé em Deus_França Rocha.pdf; Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A; Signed meeting minutes
/70/	Comunidades Reuniao.jpg ; Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A; Project area map with communities
/71/	Comunidades Reuniao A3.pdf ; Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A; Project area map with land use
/72/	Procedimento de Recebimento de Retornos e Resolução de Conflitos – REDD+ Jari.pdf ; Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A; Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure
/73/	Annex 10 - SFM consultation - July 2014.pdf ; Grupo Jari; Summary of July 2014 meeting about SFM activities with photographs and signatures
/74/	Annex 11 - SFM consultation - November 2014.pdf; Grupo Jari: Summary of November 2014 meeting about SFM with photographs, signatures and feedback
/75/	CCB_PD_201602_COMPLETE_v2.docx; Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A; CCBA Project Design Document

Methodologies, tools and other guidance by VCSA and CCBA

Ref	Name of Document
/76/	VCS: VCS Guidance, Standardized Methods, version 3.3, 8 October 2013
/77/	VCS: VCS Policy Brief: Double Counting: Clarification of Rules, version 1.0, 1 February 2012
/78/	VCS: VCS Program Definitions, version 3.5, 8 October 2013
/79/	VCS: VCS Program Guide, version 3.5, 8 October 2013
/80/	VCS: VCS Project Description Template, version 3.2, 8 October 2013
/81/	VCS: VCS Standard, version 3.5, 25 March 2015
/82/	VCS: VCS Validation and Verification Manual, version 3.1, 8 October 2013
/83/	VCS: VCS Verification Report Template, version 3.3, 8 October 2013
/84/	VCS: VCS AFOLU Requirements, version 3.4, 8 October 2013
/85/	VCS: VCS Monitoring Report Template, version 3.3, 8 October 2013

Ref	Name of Document
/86/	VCS: VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, version 3.2, 4 October 2012
/87/	VCS: Non-Permanence Risk Report Template, version 3.1, 4 October 2012
/88/	VCS: VCS Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation, version 1.1, 3 December 2012
/89/	CDM: Guidelines on Assessment of Different Types of Changes from the Project Activity as Described in the Registered PDD
/90/	CCBA: Climate Community and Biodiversity Standard Third edition, December 2013
/91/	CCBA: Social and Biodiversity Impacts Assessment Manual Part 1, version 2.0, September 2011
/92/	CCBA: Social and Biodiversity Impacts Assessment Manual Part 2, September 2011
/93/	VCS: VT0001 – Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in VCS Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Project Activities, version 3.0, February 01, 2012

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

Ref	Source Name and Link
/94/	Protecting Plantations from Pests and Diseases; http://www.fao.org/3/a-ac130e.pdf
/95/	Tropical Forest Insect Pests; http://www.lacbiosafety.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/tropical-forest-insect-pests-ecology1.pdf
/96/	Landsat Data; http://glovis.usgs.gov/
/97/	Google Earth; https://www.google.com/earth/
/98/	Fires in the Rain Forest; http://rainforests.mongabay.com/0809.htm
/99/	The Amazon basin in transition; http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v481/n7381/full/nature10717.html
/100/	NASA: Severe Climate Jeopardizing Amazon Forest; http://www.jpl.nasa.gov/news/news.php?release=2013-025
/101/	Modelling the long-term impacts of selective logging on genetic diversity and demographic structure of four tropical tree species in the Amazon forest; http://ainfo.cnptia.embrapa.br/digital/bitstream/item/84716/1/1-s2.0-S0378112707006020-main.pdf
/102/	DNV Climate Change Services Accreditation ; http://www.v-c-s.org/det-norske-veritas-climate-change-services
/103/	VCS approved Validation Report for the Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project; http://www.vcsprojectdatabase.org/#/project_details/1115
/104/	VCS approved Verification Report for the Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project; http://www.vcsprojectdatabase.org/#/project_details/1115

b. Follow-up Interviews

In the period from 21 September 2015 to 25 September 2015 DNV GL conducted various interviews with community members, the project proponents' staff, staff of other involved project entities and other stakeholders.

Interview Topics

Interviewed Organization	Interview Topics
RURAP	Project design, stakeholder consultation, FPIC, and management capacity
Jari Celulose	Project design, stakeholder consultation, net impacts
Fundação JARI	All elements of project design and CCB requirements
SRAA	Stakeholder consultation, HCV
SEMA	Project design, additionality and legal compliance

Interviews

Ref	Date	Name / Organization	Community / Locality	Role	Topic
/105/	22/9/2015	Sr. Pedro Araújo (Nena)	Igarapé das Pacas		G1, G3, G5, B2, CM1
/106/	22/9/2015	Sr. Orlando Carvalho / RURAP	RURAP (Igarapé das Pacas) ¹	Technical Assistant	G1, G3, G4, G5
/107/	22/9/2015	Sr. Antônio dos Santos Bahia / RURAP	RURAP (Igarapé das Pacas) ¹	Technical Assistant	G1, G3, G4, G5
/108/	22/9/2015	Raimundo (Fininho)	Igarapé das Pacas		G1, G3, G5, B2, CM1
/109/	22/9/2015	Sr. Osvaldo	Água Azul		G1, G3, G5, B2, CM1
/110/	22/9/2015	Domingos Barbosa dos Santos	Nova Conquista		G1, G2, G3, G5, CM1
/111/	22/9/2015	Marcos Antônio F. Souza	Nova Conquista		G1, G2, G3, G5, CM1

¹ These are assistants of the RURAP community who advised the community during our visit;

Ref	Date	Name / Organization	Community / Locality	Role	Topic
/112/	22/9/2015	Osvaldo José de Carvalho Sanches / RURAP	RURAP (Vitória do Jari)	Rural Extension Technician	G1, G3, G5
/113/	22/9/2015	Linaldo Dário Loureiro Ferreira / RURAP	RURAP (Vitória do Jari)	Local Unit Leader	G1, G3, G5
/114/	23/9/2015	Davi Cesar / Fundação JARI	Jari Celulose ²	Responsible for REDD Project HCV	G1, G2, G3, G4, CM1, CM2, B1
/115/	23/9/2015	Augusto Praxedes Neto / Fundação JARI	Fundação Jari ²	Manager of Sustainability and Institutional Relations	G2, G3, G4, CM3
/116/	23/9/2015	Marco Antônio dos Santos de Oliveira / Fundação JARI	Fundação JARI ²	Coordinator of Labor Security and Industrial Hygiene	G3
/117/	23/9/2015	Ordilei Batista de Souza / Fundação JARI	Fundação JARI ²	Work Safety Technician	G3
/118/	23/9/2015	Maria de Lurdes	SRAA	Secretary of the SRAA	G1, G3, G5, CM1
/119/	24/9/2015	Cap. Miranda / SEMA	SEMA	Regional SEMA Manager	G5, B3
/120/	24/9/2015	José Gilcian da Silva / Fundação JARI	Fundação JARI ²	Forest Technician	G1, CM1, CM3, B3
/121/	24/9/2015	Oseniro da Cunha de Souza	Comunidade Retiro		G1, G3, CM2, CM3, B2, B3
/122/	24/9/2015	Gonçalo Francisco de Araújo	Comunidade Retiro		G1, G3, CM2, CM3, B2, B3
/123/	24/9/2015	Paulo Roberto da Silva / Fundação JARI	Fundação JARI ²	Infrastructure Manager	G1, CM2, CM3

² These are employees of Fundação Jari.

c. Site Inspections

On 21-25 September 2015, a field inspection and interviews on-site were carried out within the project area and project zone. As part of this inspection the following activities were performed:

- An assessment of the implementation and operation of the proposed project activities through visual inspection and through interviews with the project proponents' staff.
- Confirmation of the applicability of the methodology.
- Assessment of the project boundaries and the stand information using a GPS.
- Assessment of the accuracy in the LULC maps and other cartography.
- Assessment of the implementation of the SOPs of forest inventory.
- Assessment of the monitoring provisions;

d. Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy

The objective of this phase of the validation is to resolve any outstanding issues which need be clarified prior to DNV GL's positive conclusion on the project design.

To guarantee the transparency of the validation process, the concerns raised by DNV GL and the response provided by the project proponents are documented in Appendix A.

A corrective action request (CAR) is raised if one of the following occurs:

The project participants have made mistakes that will influence the ability of the project activity to achieve real, measurable additional emission reductions;

The VCS/CCBS requirements have not been met;

There is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated.

A clarification request (CL) is raised if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable requirements have been met.

3. Validation Findings

a. 1. General Section

G1 – Project Goals, Design and Long-term Viability

The project aims to finance revenues of carbon offset sales in order to achieve several climate, community and biodiversity objectives within the project area. Climate, community and biodiversity goals have been designed to address issues identified by the project communities, which DNV GL has been able to verify through on-site inspection and interviews /106/, /107/, /112/, /113/, /114/, /115/, /119/, /121/, /122/. DNV GL has been able to confirm that the information provided in the CCBA Project Design Document /75/ is accurate and complete. The Project Design Document provides a summary of project's major climate, community and biodiversity objectives:

- Climate objectives: Mitigate global climate changes through greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) reductions caused by deforestation and forest degradation using sustainable forest management and forest conservation. It is expected that the emission of 3,450,278.8 tCO₂e will be avoided within the 30 years of the project, with an annual average of 115,009.3 tCO₂e. The project also aims to reduce the occurrence and risks associated to extreme weather events.
- Community objectives: Promote the enhancement of social welfare and generate income through the improvement of agricultural productivity, in order to secure the people living in the countryside with decent living conditions and harmonious coexistence with the forest.
- Biodiversity objectives: Support the conservation of biodiversity, including endemic species of plants and animals in the IUCN, CITES and IBAMA lists.

DNV GL confirmed that the information provided in the Project Design Document concerning each project activity is accurate and complete. Upon visiting the project area, it could be confirmed by DNV GL that the project activities were occurring as described in the Project Design Document and that the project activities would contribute to the net positive impact of the project /7/, /112/, /114/, /115/, /119/, /120/. A schedule was provided by the project proponents to the audit team outlining project activities and their tentative implementation; this document will be a key component in the future to ensure that planned project activities are moving forward effectively /8/. The project employs an adaptive management technique so that project activities may be open to shift over the years based on input from community members and stakeholders. Using the adaptive management approach allows for effective project activity implementation throughout the project lifetime as well as long term viability beyond the project lifetime. The planned project activities are the following /75/:

- Sustainable Forest Management, FSC-certified
- Monitoring of Deforestation and estimating carbon stocks
- Property Surveillance
- Community outreach and project participation through various channels such as: Technical Board Meetings, Development of Property Use Plans, Participatory Organizational Workshops, Community Development Plans, Risks and Impacts Assessments, Family Assessments, Socioeconomic and Environmental Assessments (DSEA)

- Improvements in agricultural activities through the Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (TARE), Workshops and training in agro-extractive techniques
- Improvement of communication channels
- Identifying and maintaining High Conservation Values (HCVs) related to community wellbeing and biodiversity
- Biodiversity Monitoring and Scientific Research
- Creation of seedling nurseries and wood collection catalogues

A list of the major risks, both natural and human-induced was included. The identified risks include lack of interest from stakeholders and government support, land encroachment by new farming squatters, difficulties commercialising carbon credits, reduced supply of natural resources activities, restriction on land use and land conversion, human-induced fires and management of the socio-environmental fund, among others /10/, /75/. For each of these risks, the project proponents have outlined mitigation strategies /75/, /19/, /20/, /21/, /65/.

DNV GL confirmed that the Project Design Document demonstrates that the project design includes specific measures to ensure the maintenance and enhancement of high conservation values (HCVs) in the project zone. The measures include identification and protective management of fundamental forest areas which are key elements for basic needs of local communities as well as the monitoring and protection of forest areas containing significantly high concentrations of global biodiversity relating to endemic and endangered species /7/, /8/, /28/, /29/, /30/, /63/, /75/.

The Project Design Document /75/ is confirmed to include the project lifetime and accreditation period, which is 30 years commencing on February 14, 2011 and ending on February 14, 2041. During this time, benefits will be constantly monitored and subject to verification under CCBA, preferably every two years throughout the lifetime of the project

DNV GL was able to confirm the project area location and basic physical parameters presented by the project proponents in the Project Design Document /75/ through on-site inspection, interviews with relevant stakeholders as well as through review of other geographical information /70/, /71/, /96/, /97/, /106/, /107/, /120/. Basic descriptions of climate, hydrology, and soils are presented in the CCB Standard Project Design Document, and were found to be consistent with the information provided in the Project Design Document /75/.

As described in the Project Design Document /75/, the project zone is 97.6% primary forest, while pastures comprise 0.85% and secondary forests make up 1.55% of the total coverage. The information on existing vegetation presented in the Project Design Document /75/ was verified by the DNV GL audit team through interviews /118/, /119/, /120/, on-site inspection, a review of the provided documents /28/, /29/, /70/, /71/ as well as outside sources used to check the project proponents' claims /96/, /97/. DNV GL was able to confirm that the information presented on the condition of vegetation within the project zone is complete.

The boundaries of the project area and project zone are presented adequately in the Project Design Document /70/, /71/, /75/. The definitions of the boundaries of the project area and project zone are in line with the definitions provided in the CCB Standard /90/ and are accurate as confirmed by DNV GL /7/, /10/, /75/, /96/, /97/.

The Project Design Document provides an accurate map of the project area, project zone and leakage area as confirmed by DNV GL /70/, /71/, /75/.

DNV GL can confirm that the project has clear objectives to generate climate, community and biodiversity benefits and that it is designed to meet these objectives. Risks are identified and managed to generate and maintain project benefits within and beyond the lifetime of the project.

G2 – Without-project Land Use Scenario and Additionality

DNV GL has confirmed that the without-project land use (baseline) projections of net emission reductions are based on the approved VCS Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation, version 1.1 /88/. The project baseline has been constructed according to the approved methodology and results within the CCBA Project Design Document /75/ reference the approved VCS Project Description /10/.

In line with the VCS Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation /88/, the project proponent has identified the agents of deforestation.

Agent of Deforestation	Associated Driver	Constraints to agent mobility
Farmers	Subsistence and small-scale agriculture	Distance agents are willing/able to walk

The project proponents have identified the primary agent of deforestation as squatting farmers who are migrants coming to the area, often from the towns of Laranjal do Jari and Vitória do Jari and from the states of Pará and Maranhão. These squatting farmers clear forest land, build up small settlements and partake in small-scale crop and livestock activities. Farmed areas may be as large as 200 hectares. Development of these small scale crop and livestock activities open up paths and trails which allow for increased access into formerly inaccessible forested areas and thus increased deforestation occurs in these areas as squatting farmers clear cut land for continued agricultural and livestock activities /75/, /106/, /107/, /112/, /118/.

In line with the VCS methodology /88/, the CCB Project Design Document has identified alternative land use scenarios in the absence of the project. These include:

- The continuation of the land-use prior to the Project implementation, i.e. deforestation caused by squatters (without-project land use scenario)
- Conducting sustainable forest management activities with an FSC certification but not registered as a VCS AFOLU project
- Conducting sustainable forest management with an FSC certification and without additional REDD+ activities.

The without-project land use scenario consists of continuation of prior land use patterns, specifically deforestation caused by squatters driven by the need for small scale agriculture and subsistence farming. This scenario has been projected based on historical rates of deforestation observed in the reference region as well as the environmental characteristics of the area and various spatial drivers. The without-project scenario is an accurate representation of what would have happened without project, as it represents historical levels of enforcement which could be confirmed through onsite interviews with relevant personnel /118/, /119/, /121/, /122/. DNV GL confirms that the project has correctly applied the

baseline scenario for the VCS methodology /88/ that is used for this project through on-site inspection, interviews /106/, /107/, /118/, /119/, /120/ and provided documents /25/, /27/, /35/, /65/.

Since the without-project land use scenario is an accurate representation of what would happen without the project, any benefit generated by the project above baseline levels will be truly additional.

DNV GL has confirmed that the project has properly demonstrated its additionality through use of the VCS-approved “VT0001 – Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in VCS Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Project Activities” /93/ in such that:

- The AFOLU activities are equal or similar to the activities proposed in the Project, within their limits, certified or not as a VCS AFOLU Project, do not incur in the violation of any applicable law even if the law is not applied; and
- The VM0015 baseline methodology provides a stepwise approach to justify the definition of the determination of the most probable baseline scenario

DNV GL confirms that the above requirements and all other requirements related to the VCS-approved tool /93/ have been exemplified and discussed in the entirety of all steps and included in the VCS validated and verified Project Description /10/. Conclusively, the project can be considered additional.

G3 – Stakeholder Engagement

DNV GL can confirm that project measures have been designed in order to ensure the ongoing involvement of stakeholders, diversification of livelihoods and enhancement of community resilience. These measures will ensure that beyond the project’s lifetime, community and other stakeholder benefits will be maintained. The project recognizes respects and supports the right to land, territories and resources, including statutory and traditional rights of indigenous peoples and from other actors within the community. DNV GL can verify that information within the Project Design Document is accurate, as claims were corroborated with provided additional documentation /28/, /29/, /30/, /39/, /40/, /58/, /59/, /61/, /63/, /66/, /69/, /73/, /74/ and on-site inspections which included interviews with community members and other local stakeholders /106/, /107/, /109/, /110/, /112/, /113/, /121/, /122/.

Through on-site inspection and various interviews with local stakeholders/106/, /107/, /109/, /110/, /112/, /113/, /116/, DNV GL can confirm that the project has a multiphase approach to stakeholder engagement. Through this approach, and as part of the FPIC process, stakeholders are able to impact project design, file grievances, and give or withhold free prior and informed consent to participation in the project /63/, /67/, /69/, /72/, /73/, /74/.

The stakeholder engagement process has been designed to continue throughout the project lifetime in order to influence all stages of project development. Communities and stakeholders will participate with and provide input to the project monitoring program and the revision of the theory of change models to ensure their continued participation as part of an adaptive management approach to project management /75/. This process will form the basis for ongoing adjustment and continual improvement to project activities. Community outreach, feedback and project participation occurs through various channels such as:

- Technical Board Meetings
- Development of Property Use Plans
- Participatory Organizational Workshops
- Community Development Plans

- Risks and Impacts Assessments
- Family Assessments
- Socioeconomic and Environmental Assessments (DSEA)
- Feedback and Grievance and Redress Procedure

These channels are outlined in detail in the Project Design Document /75/ and the DNV GL audit team was able to verify their legitimacy through relevant documentation (/12/ /14/, /22/, /23/, /24/, /28/, /29/, /30/, /39/, /40/, /49/, /58/, /69/, /73/, /74/), on-site inspection and interviews with key project personnel /108/, /109/, /112/, /113/, /115/, /116/, /123/.

DNV GL was able to confirm that the availability of information and access to channels of participation were functional for all community members and other relevant stakeholders /12/, /75/, /112/, /115/. Likewise, it was confirmed that information about worker's rights, job training, worker-related safety measures and best practices was made accessible for community members and other stakeholders /16/, /17/, /18/, /19/, /20/, /21/, /50/, /51/, /52/, /53/, /54/, /55/, /72/, /106/, /116/, /120/. The project proponents provide a list of applicable laws and regulations pertaining to workers' rights and also describe how the Human Resources Program creates equal employment opportunities /75/.

DNV GL can confirm that the project proponents have fulfilled all CCBA project requirements /90/ pertinent to stakeholder engagement.

G4 – Management Capacity

DNV GL confirmed that the information provided in the CCB Project Design Document /75/ is accurate and complete concerning project proponents and their roles in project development and implementation. The project proponents for the project consist of a partnership between Biofíllica Inverimentos Ambientais S.A, Jari Florestal S.A. and Jari Celulose S.A., the latter two of which are subsidiaries of the larger Grupo Jari. A clear identification of these roles and responsibilities of project proponents and implementation partners is provided in the Project Design Document /75/ as well as in additional documentation /9/.

DNV GL confirms that the information provided in the Project Design Document /75/ describing management skills are complete and accurate and that key skills are truthfully described. Through on-site verification via interviews and observation, DNV GL confirms that project personnel are well trained and informed in their respective duties and technical skills /106/, /112/, /114/, /112/, /116/, /117/, /118/, /119/, /120/, /123/.

The project proponents provide adequate descriptions of their financial arrangements in the Project Design Document /75/ and also provide additional supporting documents specific to investment measures and cost scheduling /8/, /9/, /11/, /31/, /32/, /33/, /57/, /65/ by which DNV GL was able to corroborate their claims.

Conclusively, DNV GL is able to confirm that the project has adequate human and financial resources for effective implementation.

G5 – Legal Status and Property Rights

As described within the Project Design Document /75/, the project recognizes, respects and supports the right to land, territories and resources, including statutory and traditional rights of indigenous peoples and from other actors within the community. An analysis of the current land use and property rights has

been reported in the Project Design Document, including how unresolved conflicts in the project area are addressed. Likewise, DNV GL was able to confirm that the project is based on an internationally accepted legal structure which complies with the relevant statutory and customary requirements and it has the necessary approvals from the appropriate state, local and indigenous authorities /43/, /44/, /45/, /48/, /49/, /56/, /57/, /59/, /60/, /75/.

DNV GL can verify that information within the Project Design Document is accurate, as claims were corroborated with provided additional documentation /14/, /28/, /29/, /30/, /31/, /32/, /33/, /39/, /40/, /49/ and on-site inspections which included interviews with community members and other local stakeholders /106/, /107/, /112/, /113/, /121/, /122/.

As described in the Project Design Document /75/, participation in local community meetings is evidence that community members are made aware of their free, prior and informed consent (FPIC). These meetings are on-going and upon completion will likely fulfill FPIC requirements. Ultimately each member within a community is free to decide if they want to participate; involvement was prior to the development of any activity with the communities; members and stakeholders were informed of project information in a timely and appropriate way; and the participation on the project is voluntary meaning that members need to consent and can withdraw from the project activities at any time. Through on-site observation and interviews with local community members and other relevant stakeholder groups, DNV GL can confirm that the project proponents have initiated the process for obtaining the free, prior and informed consent of the individuals directly affected by the project activities throughout all steps of the project /61/, /62/, /63/, /66/, /69/, /73/, /74/, /109/, /113/.

As stated within the CCB Project Design Document /75/, it was confirmed by DNV GL through on-site observation and interviews /105/, /106/, /113/, /121/, /122/ that no encroachment on private, community or government property took place and that no individuals were involuntarily displaced or relocated because of project creation or implementation of project activities. During the site visit, FSC-required consultation with communities whose customary rights may be affected by harvesting activities had not been fully implemented because harvest activities were still in an early planning phase. However as identified through interviews /112/, /113/, /121/, /122/ and through on-site observation, certain FSC activities that will be implemented as part of the project may possibly address the customary rights in the future. Given the current absence of harvesting activities and full consultation near planned harvest sites, DNV requests forward action to engage stakeholder as part of FSC activities to protect customary rights, specifically but not limited to, harvesting Brazil nuts in the project area (see Appendix A).

DNV GL can also verify that the project complies with all relevant national and state laws. Equally so, the project proponents included a list of applicable local laws along with an explanation of why local laws are often not considered relevant. As this was not initially included in the Project Design Document, a finding was issued but later cleared (see Appendix A for more details). DNV GL's review of applicable laws and regulations was found to be complete and was confirmed through a similar inquiry carried out for the VCS portion of the audit /10/, /27/.

As described in the Project Design Document /75/, Jari Celulose S.A (of Grupo Jari) is the beneficial owner of the property where the project is located, in accordance with two deed titles from August 30, 2006 and March 5, 2009 which were granted by the government of the State of Amapá, Brazil. Biofíllica Investimentos Ambientais S.A. has a contract with Grupo Jari and Jari Celulose S.A. to carry out the Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project, thus Biofíllica Investimentos Ambientais is the developer of the Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project, in partnership with Jari Florestal and Jari Celulose, and it holds part of the REDD+ credits to be generated in the property. Jari Celulose, as per the Brazilian Federal Constitution and Civil Code is

the owner of the properties where the project is occurring and it holds the rights of use as well as the rights of economic and natural resource management of the property /44/, /45/, /57/.

No third party disputes over the ownership of the area or natural resources was identified where the project is occurring and there are no traditional squatters claiming recognition of ownership of any area where the project is occurring. This was confirmed by DNV GL through on-site inspection and interviews with project personnel and relevant stakeholders /106/, /107/, /112/, /113/, /119/, /121/, /122/.

b. 2. Climate Section

CL1 – Without-Project Climate Scenario

According to the Climate section of the CCBA Standard /90/, a climate section is not required for projects that have met the requirements of a recognized GHG Program. Because the “Jari Amapá REDD+ Project” has previously undergone successful VCS validation and verification /103/, /104/, the climate section of this report is not required. The CCB Project Design Document /75/ refers to the carbon stocks estimates and associated calculations provided in the VCS Project Description /10/.

As part of the VCS validation and verification, reviews of carbon accounting data, parameters, calculation methods and QAQC procedures were observed during on-site inspection. DNV GL was able to confirm that these have been determined following sound methods which are in compliance with the VCS Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation v1.1 /88/, the VCS Standard /81/ and the VCS AFOLU requirements /84/. Supporting evidence consists of the VCS-approved validation and verification reports /103/, /104/, VCS Project Description /10/, the most recent VCS monitoring report /7/ and the most recent VCS verification report /27/ which has been submitted to VCS and is pending approval.

CL2 – Net Positive Climate Impacts

DNV GL utilized the VCS Standard /81/, VCS AFOLU Requirements /84/, the VCS Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation v1.1 /88/ and on-site observations to evaluate the GHG emission reduction calculations included in the VCS Project Description /10/ that was referenced in the CCB Project Design Document /75/. Although planned emissions from project activities are expected (such as the installation of infrastructure for forest management), unplanned deforestation emissions are not expected and a conservative estimate indicates that implementation of project activities will significantly increase project effectiveness before half of the project lifetime has occurred /75/.

DNV GL is able confirm that all significant emission sources are included and project emissions calculations are carried out correctly in order to demonstrate the net positive climate impacts of the project /7/, /10/, /26/, /27/.

CL3 – Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”)

DNV GL can confirm that the project proponents have correctly followed the appropriate procedure for measuring leakage outlined within the VCS-approved Methodology for Avoided Unplanned

Deforestation /88/. According to the methodology, the following considerations have to be acknowledged:

DNV GL found that activity displacement leakage is applicable to this project, although it is very unlikely to occur because the project is designed to prevent it. Possible leakage may be attributed to squatters or farmers living inside or close to the project area that act as agents of deforestation /75/, /106/, /107/, /112/. If they are no longer permitted to farm or carry out their subsistence activities in the project area, they may move just outside the project area to continue to do so. However, because social activities exist in and around the project area which aim to promote the welfare of the communities through means that reduce deforestation, it is not expected that leakage will occur as a result of the project and its activities. Likewise, leakage by increased livestock activity, displacement of forest fires or decrease in carbon stocks due to leakage prevention measures is not expected. To be conservative, a leakage displacement factor of 10% was applied for the first 4 years and decreases until reaching 0% at the end of the fixed baseline period. A leakage belt was defined for the project using the mobility approach described in the VCS methodology /88/. Spatial limits for the leakage belt were defined using the deforestation risk map with data from the Project area and conservation units /75/.

Leakage prevention measures will not contribute to reduced carbon stocks as these activities will coincide with the social activities of the project in which sustainable techniques in both agricultural productions and extraction of non-timber forest products are promoted. Likewise, prevention measures will not consist of activities that promote significant increase of non-CO2 emissions such as CH4 and N2O thus these will not be accounted for. Leakage prevention measures take place in the boundaries of the defined leakage belt management areas near communities directly affected by the project and where deforestation occurred until 2010. These details were described appropriately in the CCBA Project Design Document /75/ and demonstrated through appropriate documentation /7/, /10/, /14/, /27/, /103/, /104/ and on-site observation.

In conclusion, DNV GL finds the leakage assessment to conform to the requirements in the VCS-approved methodology /88/.

CL4 – Climate Impact Monitoring

The monitoring plan /10/, /15/, /46/, /47/, /75/ correctly identifies all the parameters that have to be monitored as defined under the VCS-approved methodology /88/ and has constructed and implemented a reasonable system which encompasses frequency, spatial aspects and techniques of monitoring events for project activities.

In order to undertake the monitoring effectively, the project has prescribed a number of different Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and instructional documents which address:

- Sustainable Forest Management Plans /15/, /46/, /47/
- Assorted forestry training and SOPs /16/, /17/, /18/, /20/, /21/, /51/
- Safety Measures /19/, /50/, /52/, /53/, /54/, /55/

A monitoring plan has been developed and implemented to meet the requirements of methodology and related tools. This was assessed through the verification of CCBA requirements /90/, VCS-approved Methodology requirements /88/, the project proponents' monitoring plans /15/, /46/, /47/ various standard operating procedures and training documents /16/, /17/, /18/, /19/, /20/, /21/, /50/, /51/.

/52/, /53/, /54/, /55/ as well as through interviews with relevant staff members /116/, /117/, /118/, /119/, /120/, /123/.

The project activity parameters being monitored were discussed with the project proponents. The project proponents have developed sufficient guidance for image classification and monitoring of carbon in soils and biomass in order to ensure that reliable field data is collected. The frequency of the data collection depends on the specific parameter included in the monitoring plan /7/, /10/, /15/. DNV found that these are in line with the requirements of the VCS-approved methodology /88/.

It is DNV's opinion that the project participants are able to continue to implement the monitoring plan as they have already done so for previous VCS monitoring periods. For more details please refer to the most recent VCS verification report /27/ and the VCS-approved Project Description /10/.

GL1 – Climate Change Adaptation Benefits

The project proponents have elected not to pursue these optional Gold Level criteria.

c. 3. Community Section

CM1 – Without-Project Community Scenario

DNV GL can confirm that original conditions (the without-project scenario) within the Project Design Document /75/ that have been provided by the project proponents including details related to historical events, population, ethnicity, livelihood, health, gender, education, age and socio-economic status for the included communities are accurate. The project proponents have illustrated with sufficient detail and supporting evidence the original conditions of the project area and that the requirements related to the description of the original conditions within in the project area and the surrounding project zone are met.

The project proponents also provide a detailed description of the expected changes under the without-project land use scenario in the Project Design Document /75/ in which a continuation of the baseline would occur. In such, progressive deforestation would take place in the project area and surrounding project zones by agents clearing forest for subsistence farming and small agricultural operations. Commensurably, social conditions within the community would also continue as they would in the baseline scenario. With little to no access to public policy, education, healthcare, sanitation measures or technology, communities within and surrounding the project area would continue into a spiral of poverty characterized by low productivity, population growth, forest fragmentation and an overall lack of access to human needs and advancements that would be provided by the project.

DNV GL can verify that this information described within the Project Design Document is accurate, as claims were corroborated with provided additional documentation /8/, /12/, /14/, /25/, /28/, /29/, /30/, /35/, /39/, /40/ and on-site inspections which included interviews with community members and other local stakeholders /105/, /106/, /107/, /109/, /112/, /113/, /121/, /122/.

CM2 – Net Positive Community Impacts

The project proponents have outlined in great detail within the CCBA Project Design Document the net positive impacts that the project has on local communities. As outlined within the Project Design Document /75/, the project proponents have chosen to use the theory of change method, also known as the casual model /91/, /92/ in order to estimate the impacts of project activities on the community. This method was applied to each of the main project activities described earlier in this report.

During the site visit, DNV GL assessed the direct, indirect and possible future impacts of project activities to local communities and found that the assertions made within the Project Design Document are accurate and that the project proponents will deliver significant and measureable benefits back to the communities throughout the project lifetime and beyond /105/, /108/, /112/, /113/, /114/. The project proponents also discussed how the project enhances and maintains the “castanhais” (Brazil nut tree) that is the High Conservation Value present in the project zone that is of great importance to the economic well-being of the communities.

DNV GL can confirm the above claims in the Project Design Document and that the project proponents did in fact consult directly with local communities in their amplification of desirable impacts stemming from project activities /49/, /58/, /73/, /73/, /75/. This verification was done through on-site interviews as well as by reviewing the results of the various community workshops and meetings carried out by project personnel with local communities /12/, /22/, /23/, /24/, /49/, /59/, /61/, /62/, /63/, /66/, /68/, /73/, /74/, /105/, /106/, /107/, /109/, /110/, /112/, /113/, /114/, /121/, /122/.

As far as minimizing risks, costs and negative impacts, the project proponents have also laid out a series of activities to mitigate such costs, risks and negative impacts which can be found in the Project Design Document /65/, /75/. The project proponents were able to identify (though it is very unlikely that these would occur) several potential costs, risks and negative impacts which may affect communities within the project. These include reduced supplies of natural resources essential to community survival (hunting, non-timber forest products), lack of other stakeholder interest and increased populations of people coming to be near to project and reap project benefits.

To mitigate potential costs, risks, and negative impacts, the project proponents have outlined future strategies and strategies that have already been implemented. These include monitoring of and sustainably managing HCV areas to limit over exploitation of non-timber forest products, increased community and REDD+ Technical Board meetings on favorable dates in order to discuss the monitoring plan and monitoring plan results /1/, /12/, /23/, /24/, /42/, /65/, implementation of strict operating procedures to limit impacts of low forest management and forest surveillance to patrol for illegal and non-conformance to the project activities, among others /46/, /47/, /62/, /75/. DNV GL was able to confirm these mitigation strategies using the provided documentation described above and through on-site observation. DNV GL found both the list of costs, risks and potential negative impacts as well as their mitigation plans appropriate for the situation at hand and witnessed during on-site inspection.

In conclusion, DNV GL can confirm that the project identified costs, risks and negative impacts along with viable mitigation strategies and that overall, the project generated net positive impacts on the well-being of communities over the project lifetime, including the maintenance and enhancement of the High Conservation Values in the project zone that are highly important to the well-being of the communities.

CM3 – Other Stakeholder Impacts

DNV GL found no evidence from interviews with community members, other stakeholders or project personnel to conclude that any harm due to project activities could affect other stakeholders or areas that provide basic ecosystem services in critical situations, areas that are fundamental to meeting the basic needs of other stakeholders or areas that are critical for the traditional cultural identity of other stakeholders /106/, /107/, /108/, /109/, /112/, /113/, /114/, /121/, /122/.

Among some other stakeholders (rural communities) not assisted by the project, no negative offsite impacts are expected since these communities will not experience any sort of land use restriction and will not be forced to change their ways of life /75/, /112/. In fact, these other stakeholders may experience shared benefits due to the project such as conservation of forest cover, local business expansion, reduced marginalization, and decline in criminal activity as well as improved access to production chains, public policy and infrastructure /75/, /106/, /107/, /112/, /123/. DNV GL agrees with the project proponents' claim that the project is not likely to result in any net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups and can confirm these claims through interviews /106/, /107/, /112/, /113/, /114/, /121/, /122/ and on-site inspection.

DNV GL has confirmed that the project proponents have appropriately demonstrated the information in the Project Design Document /75/ concerning the well-being of other stakeholder groups not being negatively impacted or harmed by project activities.

CM4 – Community Impact Monitoring

The selection of community variables and indicators to be monitored by the project proponents has been chosen using the theory of change method /90/, /91/, /92/. DNV GL has confirmed /14/, /75/, /106/, /107/, /112/, /113/, /114/, /115/ that the project proponents have plans to ensure that project monitoring and reporting continues in subsequent years, guided by community input from the community development committees and other project stakeholders, which are incorporated into the monitoring plan in order to insure that project objectives, activities, and their expected impacts are being achieved and monitored appropriately. Some of these community development committees include:

- The Family Assessment – Initial valuation of activity implementation and familial statuses/conditions which is carried out every two years.
- DOP workshops – Social monitoring tool to assess level of satisfaction with the project, relationships with local government institutions, access to public policies and other relevant community issues
- Property Plan of Use (PU) – Participatory process in which properties are mapped and micro-zoning is carried out in order to properly allocate areas of production, conservation, infrastructure and housing. The PU is carried out every 5 years with all farms involved in project activities and it allows for the development land use efficient strategies and facilitates visual assessment of goals achieved

DNV GL was able to confirm that gathered social data is clearly defined and is regarded as very useful for management purposes and for other in-depth analysis. Since baseline surveys have been conducted /25/, /30/, /39/, /40/ and since some data provides already net benefits, it will be possible to confirm

that the project is delivering net community benefits. The project proponents process these data at each verification event in order to demonstrate project benefits.

Although the project is not expected to have any negative impact on HCVs in the project zone or project area, potential negative impacts have been identified for the community HCVs, the Brazil nut tree. Monitoring of HCV areas are included in the project's monitoring plan along with measures needed to enhance the attribute and mitigation measures in case of negative impacts. As complete validation of the Brazil nut tree is still occurring thus field monitoring and public consultation is planned to continue for the next two years. All monitoring indicators for this HCV are still annually reported upon in the project's monitoring report /7/.

DNV GL deems that considering the project circumstances this monitoring procedure is adequate. The project proponent has developed a full monitoring plan in conjunction with the project's VCS component /10/ and has committed to continue to disseminate the plan and the results of monitoring in the form of a report /7/, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.

GL2 – Exceptional Community Benefits

The project proponents have elected not to pursue these optional Gold Level criteria.

d. 4 Biodiversity Section

B1 – Biodiversity Without-project Scenario

Current biodiversity in the project zone is mainly sourced from the socio-economic environmental studies /28/, /29/, /39/, /40/, /41/ which indicate that the project area contains an exceptional biodiversity /75/.

The project area is located within the Valley of Jari which is part of the endemic area known as the Guyana Shield, which includes the northern state of Pará, the state of Amapá and its neighbors Suriname and French Guiana. The valley has diverse and numerous populations of floral and faunal species, many of which are classified as endangered or threatened on the IUCN Red List.

The biodiversity conditions of the project area and project zone are key focal points of the REDD+ project as a whole. The project proponents have performed environmental assessment studies /28/, /29/ in the past and have identified floral and faunal species which act as key indicator species for ecological health of the area as well as potential High Conservation Values (presence of endemic and endangered species) /75/. These indicator species, potential HCVs and general biodiversity assessments of the area have been incorporated into the monitoring plan under the VCS component of this project /7/, /10/. DNV GL is able to confirm the original conditions of biodiversity in the project area using provided documentation /28/, /29/, /30/, /35/, /39/, /40/, /41/ interviews with relevant project personnel /106/, /114/, /118/, /119/, /120/, /121/, /122/ and additional documentation /99/, /100/, /101/.

The project proponents identified that the main threats to biodiversity are linked to increasing levels of forest degradation and deforestation brought about by subsistence farming and small-scale agricultural activity /75/ and events linked to these activities /34/, /36/. In the Project Design Document /75/, the land-use scenario in the absence of the project is characterized by continued deforestation due to slash and burn techniques utilized by small scale farmers for agriculture and subsistence living. Consequently, biodiversity in the area would sharply decrease and some species would disappear altogether as a result of habitat loss, fragmentation, genetic erosion, temperature fluctuations, invasive species establishment, predatory exposure, changes in precipitation and migratory patterns, among others. DNV GL can confirm that the expected changes under the without-project land use scenario described in the Project Design Document are accurate through review of provided documents /28/, /29/, /30/, /34/, /35/, /36/, /37/, /38/, /39/, /40/, /75/ and additional documents /94/, /95/, /98/, /99/, /100/, /101/ as well as interviews /114/, /118/, /119/, /120/, /121/, /122/, /123/ and on-site inspection.

DNV GL can verify that the project proponents have accurately described original biodiversity conditions in the project zone and expected changes under the without-project scenario within the Project Design Document /75/.

B2 – Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts

Changes to biodiversity as a result of the project have been estimated using the theory of change method /90/, /91/, /92/. DNV GL can confirm that the theory of change process in this respect provides a structured, cause and-effects oriented and reasonable approach to estimating how project activities will result in specific outputs, which lead in turn to outcomes and subsequent long-term impacts. Typical to many conservation projects, there is the possibility that negative, and/or unforeseen impacts may occur. DNV GL reviewed alongside the project team the full range of potential negative impacts they have identified that may arise from the project activity and found these to be credible. Positive biodiversity

impacts include:

- Maintained or enhanced richness, diversity and abundance of native species
- Reduced forest degradation and deforestation, consequently conserving wildlife habitats
- Increased scientific research and local knowledge, encouraging protection for endemic and/or endangered species
- Maintenance of vegetative cover and ecological corridors between the project area and neighbouring protected areas

Any potential negative impacts were found to be generally related to Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) activities. While the implementation of low-impact FSC-certified SFM activity allows for the inhibition of illegal logging and invasion by small farmers, simply through having the company present, there are some potential negative impacts which are associated. However, if negative impacts were to occur in the project area, they would mostly be short-lived and of low severity; they would potentially include increased movement of people and vehicles in the project area, noise production, slight local suppression of forest due to opening of roads and infrastructure and increasing hunting and fishing as a result of opening roads to be more accessible /46/, /47/, /62/. DNV GL can confirm that due to the project's conservation focus, these negative impacts will be limited or not occur at all because REDD+ project activities are aimed directly at preventing these negative impacts /10/, /15/, /28/, /29/, /46/, /47/, /115/, /120/, /123/ and if negative impacts are to occur, they are monitored and managed in order to avoid illegal activities, as required under FSC certification. In many cases, the REDD+ activities are aimed directly to complement SFM activities in terms of mitigating any possible negative impacts.

Thus DNV GL can confirm that there will be little to no negative changes to biodiversity that may result from project activities and if they do occur, the project proponents are committed to assessing the negative impacts to biodiversity, and have incorporated strategies to manage them into their monitoring plans /7/, /10/, /75/.

The project proponents provided its datasheets and survey results showing evidence of the methodologies used to monitor biodiversity changes within the project area and the results of monitoring /28/, /29/, /39/, /40/, /41/. The audit team also assessed the biodiversity data collection techniques and analysis during the site visit and deemed them appropriate.

The project proponents clearly state within the Project Design Document that there will not be any negative impacts on the HCVs as their mission and day-to-day activities are to conserve such areas. The audit team was able to confirm this during the on-site assessment of the project activities being implemented and through interviews with relevant project personnel /114/, /118/, /119/, /120/, /123/. The project proponents also clearly state and demonstrate that no genetically modified organisms (GMOs) are being used. Although the project does employ the use of non-native crop species (cassava, maize, rice, beans and watermelon), the project proponents addressed this issue during the findings process with sufficient explanations and evidence (see Appendix A) /75/, /118/. The project proponent has committed to using non-GMO seeds in the Project Design Document /75/.

Thus, DNV GL can confirm that the project generates net positive impacts on biodiversity within the project zone over the project lifetime, the use of non-native species is appropriately justified and invasive species and GMOs are not used.

B3 – Offsite Biodiversity Impacts

The project proponents state that the activities undertaken due to the project will result in no offsite negative impact on biodiversity /75/. Following the site visit, DNV GL was able to confirm that the project will not result in any potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts through on-site observation, interviews /106/, /107/, /112/, /120/, /123/ and review of documentation /15/, /28/, /29/, /30/, /46/, /47/, /62/. The project area is surrounded by protected areas and areas where the project's social activities are aligned to mitigate any possible leakage from the implementation of project activities. In fact, as a result of the protection of ecological corridors due to project activity implementation, it is expected that the increased connectivity of spaces around the project area will have offsite positive biodiversity impacts due to the project activities.

Project activities which have been identified by the project proponent in order to mitigate any possible leakage include biodiversity monitoring of SBIA identified variables /91/, /92/ and conservation activities such as the seedling nursery and wood collections /75/ to educate the public through sharing knowledge of the highly diverse area where the project exists. These are incorporated as REDD+ activities which are designed to offset any negative implications which may arise offsite from sustainable forest management activities. It is unlikely that these mitigation techniques will be implemented outside of the project area however as it is mostly surrounded by protected areas and communities which are included in the social activities of the project, thus offsite negative impacts on biodiversity will like be minimal to non-existent.

DNV GL verified these claims made by the project proponent on the site visit. Likewise, DNV GL confirmed that the information provided in the Project Design Document /75/ concerning unmitigated negative off-site biodiversity impacts was accurate and complete in that no major negative impacts on biodiversity outside the project zone have been identified /106/, /107/, /112/, /120/. This was confirmed as true during the site visit by the audit team.

B4 – Biodiversity Impact Monitoring

According to the Project Design Document /75/, biodiversity variables for monitoring as well as indicators that are relevant to measuring the effectiveness of efforts to maintain or enhance HCVs will be selected based on input from communities, other stakeholders, and relevant documentation such as the Social Biodiversity Impact Assessment Manual /91/, /92/. The monitoring plan included as part of the VCS component of this project will be used in part where applicable /7/, /10/, /27/, /104/. Monitoring will take place every two years and will assess changes in biodiversity resulting from project activities within and outside the project zone. Defined indicators will be re-measured and compared with the values obtained in the baseline in order to define changes in these indicators and confirm net biodiversity benefits. DNV GL was able to verify these claims through interviews with project personnel /106/, /107/, /112/, /114/, /120/, as well as through a review of the project proponents' monitoring plans /7/, /8/, /39/, /40/, /75/.

Although the project is not expected to have any negative impact in HCV in the project area or project zone, possible changes will be conducted as part of biodiversity monitoring /7/, /10/, /75/ and through the updating of the socio-environmental diagnosis /29/, /30/. This will ensure detecting any undesired impact towards biodiversity and HCVs and acts in consequence.

The project proponents commit to disseminating 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. DNV GL deems that considering the project circumstances this monitoring procedure is adequate.

GL3 – Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits

DNV GL is able to confirm that the information provided in the CCB Project Design Document /75/ concerning the demonstration of high biodiversity conservation priority through the vulnerability criterion is complete and accurate.

DNV GL confirmed through interviews /114/, /119/, /120/ and on-site inspection that at least 30 individuals of the following Vulnerable (VU) species according to the IUCN red list (<http://www.iucnredlist.org/search>) are present in the project area:

- *Bertholletia excelsa* - Vulnerable A1acd+2cd ver 2.3

Furthermore, DNV GL also confirmed the presence of at least 1 individual of the following Critically Endangered (CR) and Endangered (EN) species according to the IUCN red list in the project area:

- *Vouacapoua Americana* - Critically Endangered A1cd+2cd ver 2.3
- *Pouteria amapaensis* - Endangered B1+2b ver 2.3
- *Pouteria decussate* - Endangered B1+2c ver 2.3

Hence, the Project would comply with the vulnerability criterion set forth by GL3 of the CCB Standard /90/. The demonstration of high biodiversity conservation priority through the irreplaceability criterion was not argued.

DNV GL was able to verify through interviews /114/, /119/, /120/ and through appropriate documentation /28/, /29/, /39/, /40/, /41/, /75/ that the project conserves biodiversity at sites of global significance based on the Key Biodiversity Area framework.

CCB Validation Conclusion

DNV GL (U.S.A.) Inc. Climate Change & Environmental Services (DNV GL) has performed a validation of the project “Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project” in the state of Amapá, Brazil on the basis of criteria defined by the Climate Community and Biodiversity Standard (CCBS) Third Edition and the VCS methodology “VM0015: Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation, version 1.” as well as criteria for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The project proponents are: Biofílica Investimentos Ambientais S.A, Jari Florestal S.A. and Jari Celulose S.A. DNV GL has confirmed that the project proponents have the right to all and any reductions generated by the Project. The review of the Project Design Documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided DNV GL with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria. The project correctly applies the approved VCS methodology element “VM0015: Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation, version 1.1” for the quantification of GHG emissions reductions and monitoring of leakage.

The “Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project” has an overall objective of contributing to mitigating climate change and contributing to sustainable environmental management, community development, poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation in state of Amapá, Brazil. Adequate training and monitoring procedures have been implemented to monitor how climate, community, and biodiversity are affected by the project activities. In summary, it is DNV’s opinion that the “Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project” in the state of Amapá, Brazil as described in the CCBA Project Design Document Version 2.0 of February 3, 2016 meets all relevant CCBS requirements, at the Gold Level for Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits.

CCBS Compliance Checklist

General Section

Conformance

G1.	Project Goals, Design and Long-term Viability (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
G2.	Without-project Land Use Scenario and Additionality (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
G3.	Stakeholder Engagement (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
G4.	Management Capacity (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
G5.	Legal Status and Property Rights (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Climate Section

CL1.	Without-Project Climate Scenario (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
CL2.	Net Positive Climate Impacts (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
CL3.	Offsite Climate Impacts ('Leakage') (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
CL4.	Climate Impact Monitoring (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
GL1.	Climate Change Adaptation Benefits (Optional)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Community Section

CM1.	Without-Project Community Impacts (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
CM2.	Net Positive Community Impacts (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
CM3.	Other Stakeholder Impacts (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
CM4.	Community Impact Monitoring (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
GL2.	Exceptional Community Benefits (Optional)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Biodiversity Section

B1.	Biodiversity Without-Project Scenario (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
B2.	Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
B3.	Offsite Impact Monitoring (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
B4.	Biodiversity Impact Monitoring (Required)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
GL 3.	Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits (Optional)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

CCBA Validation Level Attained:

Approved (all requirements met)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gold (all requirements and also at least one optional Gold Level criterion met)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX A

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS, CLARIFICATION REQUESTS AND FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
1.	<p>CAR 1</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G1</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G1, Concept, Footnote 10</p> <p>All project benefits take into account positive and negative impacts and are relative to conditions under the without-project land use scenario described in G2.</p> <p>Although the project proponent has made some discussion of benefits in the without-project scenario in Section G2, it has made no specific mention of positive and negative benefits in section G1 and does not reference section G2 for discussion of without-project land use scenarios. Please provide evidence that the project benefits take into account positive and negative impacts and that impacts are relative to conditions under the without-project land use scenario.</p>	<p>In order to avoid redundancy Section G2 (that contains the description of projects positive and negative benefits) was mentioned at the end of section G1.2 Climate, Communities and Biodiversity Objectives.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent now references Section G2 in which adequately discusses positive and negative impacts. Thus the finding is closed.</p>
2.	<p>CAR 2</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G1.9</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G1.9</p> <p>Define the project start date and lifetime, and GHG accounting period and biodiversity and community benefits</p>	<p>The implementation schedule was improved and key dates and milestone were turned explicit in Table 7.</p> <p>It is important to note that many activities are to be continuously throughout Project's lifetime.</p> <p>Tables 8 and 10 were added to clarify the FSC-Certified forest management implementation schedule.</p> <p>Additionally as a support for development of projects financing plan a timetable was prepared and provided</p>	<p>DNV Assessment December 15, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has provided an improved implementation schedule as well as additional tables to clarify timeline and milestones of FSC activities. However the identification of HCV is a key milestone that is referenced in section B1.4 of the Project</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>assessment period if relevant, and explain and justify any difference between them. Define an implementation schedule, indicating key dates and milestone in the project's development.</p> <p>The project proponent has provided a project start date and lifetime as well as an implementation schedule. However, the implementation schedule provided (Table 7) does not expand past 2015. Please provide a complete implementation schedule which indicates key dates and milestones in project development so that future auditors can assess project performance.</p>	<p>to the auditor.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>Identification and maintenance of HCV related to community well being and biodiversity were included in table 7 as project activity with their respective implementation schedule and milestone.</p> <p>Workshops with the communities to fully identify potential risks and negative impacts were described along with other community level workshops (DOP and Community Development Plans). On table 7 the implementation schedule and a milestone for these workshops were stabilised.</p>	<p>Design Document but not included in the implementation schedule. Also regarding CM2, workshops with each community to fully identify potential risks and negative impacts is missing from the schedule. Please include all milestones in the implementation schedule. This finding remains open.</p> <p>DNV Assessment February 1, 2016</p> <p>The project proponent has now included identification and maintenance of HCVs related to community well-being and biodiversity as well as their milestones within the implementation schedule shown in table 7 of the Project Design Document.</p> <p>Concerning CM2, the project proponent now discusses identification of potential risks and negative impacts as measures carried out in community level workshops. Additionally, milestones concerning potential risks and negative impacts are now discussed in the implementation schedule shown in table 7.</p> <p>The finding is closed.</p>
3.	<p>CAR 3</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015,</p>	<p>Besides the application of the risk tool is to be provided as an Annex, main important natural risk for projects expected benefits were turned explicit in the Project Description, Section</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>Section G1.10</p> <p>Non-Permanence Risk Report – 23 June 2015, Section 3</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G1.10</p> <p>AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool version 3.2, Section 3</p> <p>Identify likely natural and human-induced risks to the expected climate, community and biodiversity benefits during the project lifetime and outline measures needed and taken to mitigate these risks.</p> <p>The project proponent provides an acceptable list of human induced risks along with mitigation/management strategies. However, the project proponent does not discuss natural risks. Although reference to the Risk Report is made, a discussion of natural risks should be included in the Project Design Document.</p> <p>Please identify natural risks to climate, community and biodiversity benefits in the Project Design Document and outline measures needed and taken to mitigate these risks.</p>	<p>G1.10.</p> <p>The natural risk discussed was the one related with forest fire. A risk analysis and mitigation measures in place where presented and discussed.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>An explicit discussion of how the natural risk of forest fire relates to climate and biodiversity benefits was included in the Project Description, Section G1.10.</p>	<p>The project proponent discusses the natural risk of forest fire in the Project Design Document. However, there is no explicit discussion of how this risk relates to climate and biodiversity benefits. Thus the finding remains open.</p> <p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>February 1, 2016</p> <p>The project proponent discusses in Section G1.10 of the Project Description Document how fire risk relates to climate, biodiversity and their benefits. The project proponent references their claims with scientific articles and provides copies of these articles as additional documentation (see “Fearnside2005.pdf” and “Cochrane&Laurance208.pdf”).</p> <p>Therefore the finding is closed.</p>
4.	<p>CAR 4</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.5</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3.4 and Footnote 43</p> <p>A plan must be developed and implemented to continue communication and consultation</p>	<p>The technical board, DOP workshops, Property Use Plan, Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (TARE) and Family Assessment are not just a way of achieving project’s objectives, but also integrates a process of learning and adapting the activities themselves, instigating adaptation on the approach, the resources and the management structure it self. Those activities integrate Project’s adaptive management process, because they establish conditions for receiving</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent provides an improved explanation of how various programs coincide with adaptive management. Therefore, the finding is closed.</p>

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
<p>between the project proponents and Communities, including all the Community Groups, and Other Stakeholders about the project and its impacts to facilitate adaptive management throughout the life of the project.</p> <p>Adaptive management is an approach that accepts that management must proceed without complete information. It views management not only as a way to achieve objectives, but also as a process for probing to learn more about the resource or system being managed. Learning is an inherent objective of adaptive management. Adaptive management is a process where policies and activities can adapt to future conditions to improve management success.</p> <p>The TARE Program and Property of Use Plan are referred to in the context of adaptive management but it is unclear how these activities constitute adaptive management per the requirement. Please develop a plan to facilitate adaptive management throughout the life of the project or clearly identify how these referenced activities meet this requirement.</p>	<p>participatory inputs and information to future adapt the activities themselves and to improve management success.</p> <p>In a more explicit way each of the activities mentioned above collaborates with the adaptive management in the following aspect:</p> <p><u>Technical Board Meetings</u>: As Project’s official space of dialogue and articulation between communities and other stakeholders any demand can be discussed during its meetings and a resolution should be collectively made. The results of all others project activities will be divulged and discussed through this space, facilitating the collection of feedbacks and comments that should also be addressed. In that manner the Technical Board is the more direct tool of adaptive management proposed by the Project.</p> <p><u>DOP Workshops (and Community Development Plans)</u>: According with the presented in Table 7, these workshops aims to identify communities relation with other stakeholders and they main socioeconomic development demands in order to conduct the Technical Board as much efficient as possible. Since they are expected to happen every 5 years on each engaged communities, they will allow the continuous adaptation of the Technical Board over the project lifetime.</p> <p><u>Property Use Plan (PU)</u>: Together with TARE activities, the Property Use Plan allows the project to look to specific demands of each family and to adapt TARE activities to each farmer desires and vocation and not just implement “one size fits all land use solution”. It is to be reviewed every 5 years, allowing</p>	

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
		<p>continuous adaptation of TARE approach for each family over the project lifetime.</p> <p><u>Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (TARE)</u>: Even being one of the Projects main activities it represents Projects most regular contact with families and communities. Each family is to be visited by Fundação Jari staff at least once a month. With this frequency spontaneous demands can more quickly be addressed or directed to a future discussion or solution. Or if an request regarding TARE activities itself is made Fundação Jari staff is oriented to adapt their work and approach in the field. It allows continuous “micro adaptation” of project activities.</p> <p><u>Family Assessment</u>: Once this activity will monitor engaged families socioeconomic aspects, it results will allow proponents, communities and stakeholders (through the Technical Board) to discuss changes and appropriate adaptation on project’s scope and approach. Additionally, the family assessment is also interested on understanding families demands for the project.</p>	
5.	<p>CAR 5</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.5.6-9</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3.5.6 and Footnote 66</p> <p>Submit a list of all national and local laws and regulations in the host country that are relevant to the project activities.</p>	<p>The local municipal laws were not presented or discussed because the competence to regulate Grupo Jari activities and the REDD+, due to their size and scope, is from the federal and state government.</p> <p>According with the National Environmental Policy, Law 6.938, article 10 “the construction, installation, expansion and operation of activities that manage natural and environmental resources, effectively or</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent provides an explanation of why local municipal laws were not included. However for transparency, this explanation should be included in the Project Design Document.</p>

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
<p>Provide assurance that the project is complying with these and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved. Local laws include all norms given by organisms of government whose jurisdiction is less than the national level, such as departmental, municipal and customary norms.</p> <p>The project proponent provides a list of applicable national and state laws as well as assurance that the project is complying with these. However, local laws that are relevant to the project activities are not listed. Please provide a list of local laws and regulations that are relevant to project activities and provide assurance that the project is complying with these.</p>	<p>potential cause of impacts, of any sort, being able to cause environmental degradation will depend on environmental licence to happen.”</p> <p>Adding to that the National Council of Environment (CONOMA) states on its resolution CONAMA 237 in regard of activities with potential risks for the environment on its Article 5 that “Is just the Federal or the State Environmental Agency that have jurisdictional power to provide licence or regulate environmental activities and initiatives on the following conditions:</p> <p>I – Localized or developed across more than one municipality or inside conservation units (...);</p> <p>II – located or developed on forested and others type of natural vegetation (...).”</p> <p>In that manner the project Federal and State Laws regulate activities. Its execution, monitoring and licence would be depending on IBAMA (Brazilian Institute of Environment and Natural Resources – Federal Agency) or IMAP (Amapá’s Environment and Land Planning Institute – State Agency).</p> <p>Even the producers have to follow the federal and the state laws in regard of their agricultural, extractive and land use practices.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>The explanation in regard of competencies between federal, State and Municipal level was incorporated in the Project Description, along with Local laws, especially environmental laws and directive plan for each</p>	<p>As the project proponent is working with communities to implement agroforestry activities outside of the Grupo Jari land holdings on other private lands, please clearly and transparently justify that local environmental laws don’t apply to these project activities.</p> <p>Thus the finding remains open.</p> <p>DNV Assessment February 1, 2016</p> <p>The project proponent has included a sufficient explanation as to why local laws are not applicable to the project in Section G5.6-9 of the Project Description Document. Additionally, the project proponent has provided a list of the local laws and environmental codes that exist in the project area despite the municipalities’ inability to enforce them and therefore their lack of applicability.</p> <p>Thus the finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
		<p>municipality (Laranjal and Vitória do Jari). Noting the Laranjal do Jari has its Environmental Code from 2006 (outdate in relation with the national law) and its Directive Plan since 2006, while Vitoria do Jari, through several direct consultations, doesn't have neither an Environmental Code nor a Directive Plan. The discussing process has started in Vitoria do Jari several times but due to changing in the Government it hasn't been finished neither approved so far.</p>	
6.	<p>CAR 6</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section CM1.3</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section CM1.3</p> <p>Describe the expected changes in the well-being conditions and other characteristics of Communities under the without-project land use scenario, including the impact of likely changes on all ecosystem services in the Project Zone identified as important to Communities.</p> <p>The project proponent provides expected changes in the well-being conditions of Communities in the without-project scenario in terms of socio-economic conditions; however, the proponent fails to describe the impact of likely changes on ecosystems services.</p> <p>Please describe the expected changes in the well-being conditions and other characteristics of Communities under the without-project land use scenario in terms of the impact of likely changes on</p>	<p>The expected changes for the communities under the without-project scenario I terms of the impact of likely changes on all ecosystem services in the Project Zone that are identified as important to the communities were described in section CM1.3.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent provides a discussion of ecosystem services expected to change under the without-project land use scenario. The finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	all ecosystem services in the Project Zone that are identified as important to Communities.		
7.	<p>CAR 7</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G4.2</p> <p>Non-Permanence Risk Report – 23 June 2015, Section 1</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G4.2</p> <p>Document key technical skills 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 and carbon projects at the scale of this project. If relevant experience is lacking, the proponents must either demonstrate how other organizations are partnered with to support the project or have a recruitment strategy to fill the gaps.</p> <p>The project proponent refers to Table 1 and Table 2 in the Project Design Document for various proponents’ key technical skills that are required to implement the project successfully. The project proponent also references the Non-Permanence Risk Report for details about the management team’s expertise and prior experience implementing land management and carbon projects at the scale of this project. For transparency purposes, this information should be stated explicitly within the Project Design Document.</p>	<p>The management team’s expertise and prior experience implementing land management and carbon projects were turned explicit in the Project Description, Section G4.2.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent now includes descriptions of the management team’s expertise and prior experience in Section G4.2. The finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>Please clearly document the management team’s expertise and prior experience implementing land management and carbon projects within the Project Design Document.</p>		
8.	<p>CAR 8</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section CM2</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section CM2.1, Footnote 94 and Footnote 95</p> <p>Use appropriate methodologies to assess the impacts, including predicted and actual, direct and indirect benefits, costs and risks, on each of the identified Community Groups (identified in G1.5) resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario. The assessment of impacts must include changes in well-being due to project activities and an evaluation of the impacts by the affected Community Groups. This assessment must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about changes in well-being of the Community Groups under the with-project scenario, including potential impacts of changes in all ecosystem services identified as important for the Communities (including water and soil resources), over the project lifetime.</p> <p>The following manual is recommended for guidance on appropriate methodologies: Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment Manual (Richards and Panfil, 2011). Available at www.climate-standards.org.</p> <p>“Impacts” include benefits, costs and</p>	<p>The impacts assessment in section CM1.2 was restructured to reflect the casual relations (now also better explained in section G1.8). The reference of the “Potential Risk Section” was updated to Section G1.10, and section G1.10 itself was also updated to better explain the potential risks from the communities’ perspective.</p> <p>It is important to notice, as it is now better explained in the section G1.5 and 6 that communities in the Project Zone show to have similar patterns of social organization and livelihoods, which justify the identification of them as one group of communities, as described in Section CM1.1 through the historical description.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent now discusses benefits in terms of cultural aspects, human rights and rights to land territory. Project proponent has provided discussion on how various stakeholder groups can be identified as one community and thus the discussion on impacts has been improved. A discussion of actual and predicted impacts has been included. A discussion of costs and risks has been included. Although it is unclear whether an appropriate methodology was effectively applied, the required benefits, costs and risks are discussed. This findings is closed.</p>

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
<p>risks, including those related to social, cultural, environmental and economic aspects and to human rights and rights to lands territories and resources. Costs include those related to responsibilities and also opportunity costs. Note that the term “benefits” refers to positive impacts and the phrase “costs and risks” equates with negative impacts.</p> <p>The project proponent assesses direct and indirect benefits and some costs and risks. Both direct and indirect benefits are discussed in terms of social, environmental and economic aspects but are not discussed in terms of cultural aspects, human rights or rights to lands territories and resources. Costs (in both the “Costs” section and in the “Negative Impacts” section) are not explicitly discussed in terms of responsibilities. The “Negative Impacts” section discusses some opportunity costs. The “Potential Risks” section references section G1.3 which does not include any details on project risks. Some risks are briefly discussed in the “Potential Risks” section and some are discussed in the “Negative Impacts” section.</p> <p>The project proponent discusses potential impacts of changes in all ecosystem services including water and soil resources. However the project proponent does not discuss predicted and actual impacts. The project proponent fails to discuss impacts in terms of each of the identified Community Groups, instead speaking generally of all groups. The project proponent states that impacts were estimated based on the theory of change analysis as proposed by Richards and Panfil. However because this section is incomplete as described above, it is unclear whether or not the project proponent adequately utilized the Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment</p>		

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>Manual as guidance for this analysis.</p> <p>Please discuss direct and indirect benefits in terms of cultural aspects, human rights and rights to lands territories and resources. Please include (at least part of, or restate) the discussion of negative impacts in terms of costs and risks, as detailed in the CCB Standard (Footnote 95). Please discuss costs in terms of responsibilities. Please correct the risk reference to section G1.3. Please provide a complete discussion of all project risks. Please discuss predicted and actual impacts. Please discuss all impacts as specific to each of the previously identified Community Groups. Please effectively use the recommended Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment Manual for guidance on appropriate methodologies.</p>		
9.	<p>CAR 9</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section CM2</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section CM2.2</p> <p>Describe measures needed and taken to mitigate any negative well-being impacts on Community Groups and for maintenance or enhancement of the High Conservation Value attributes (identified in CM1.2) consistent with the precautionary principle.</p> <p>The project proponent discusses some negative impacts but fails to clearly provide measures needed and taken to mitigate negative well-being impacts on Community Groups. The project proponent does not describe the</p>	<p>The potential HCV described in the CM1.2 was updated to meet most recent discussions among project proponents and Fundação Jari.</p> <p>The potentially negative impacts on the identified potential HCV attribute were identified in section CM2, as well as the measures taken to mitigate the negative impacts and to maintain or enhance the attribute.</p> <p>It's worth to note that the "castanheiras" as potential HCV yet should be validated in the field and through public consultation, what project proponents propose to do in the next 2 years.</p> <p>This happens because not necessarily every "castanhal" will be an HCV and a careful field assessment (timely appropriated) should be carried out.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent provides a greater discussion of the measures taken to mitigate negative impacts. The project proponent also discussed negative impacts on HCVs and measures taken to mitigate these impacts. Therefore the finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>measures needed and taken to mitigate any negative impacts for the maintenance or enhancement of the High Conservation Value attributes; HCV is only briefly described along with a unjustified statement that no negative impacts are expected in relation to tourist attraction.</p> <p>Please completely describe all negative or potentially negative impacts on Community Groups and provide measures needed and taken to mitigate any negative well-being impacts on Community Groups. Please completely describe all negative or potentially negative impacts on High Conservation Values and provide measures needed and taken to mitigate any negative impacts affecting the maintenance or enhancement of the High Conservation Value.</p>		
10.	<p>CAR 10</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section CM4</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section CM4.1</p> <p>Develop and implement a monitoring plan that identifies community variables to be monitored, Communities, Community Groups and Other Stakeholders to be monitored, the types of measurements, the sampling methods, and the frequency of monitoring and reporting. Monitoring variables must be directly linked to the project’s objectives for Communities and Community Groups and to predicted outputs, outcomes and impacts identified in the project’s causal model related to the well being of Communities (described in G1.8). Monitoring must</p>	<p>It is important to notice, as it is now better explained in the section G1.5 and 6 that communities in the Project Zone show to have similar patterns of social organization and livelihoods, which justify the identification of them as one group of communities, as described in Section CM1.1 through the historical description.</p> <p>A monitoring plan was developed and added in Section CM4, containing listed variables (indicators) to be measured, types of measurements or units, sampling methods, frequency of monitoring and reporting.</p> <p>This monitoring plan was built taken into account project’s casual relation and actual and predicted impacts to the communities, including benefits costs and impacts. It was turned explicit what variable is related with what type of monitoring (benefits</p>	<p>DNV Assessment December 15, 2015</p> <p>An extensive list of indicators was provided by the project proponent as the monitoring along plan as well a greater discussion of how community programs fit into the monitoring plan. However, it is unclear how each indicator is directly linked to the project’s predicted outputs, outcomes and impacts. For each selected indicator, please identify and justify which output, outcome and impact is being monitored and how this variable is effectively linked to the causal model for the well-being of communities. This finding remains open.</p>

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
<p>assess differentiated impacts, including benefits, costs and risks, for each of the Community Groups and must include an evaluation by the affected Community Groups.</p> <p>The project proponent describes various plans, programs and workshops (Family Diagnostic tool, DOP workshops and Plan of Use of Property) which will act as the monitoring plan; however there is no centralizing discussion as to how these programs collectively comprise a complete monitoring plan per the requirement. Likewise, listed variables to be measured, types of measurements, sampling methods as well as the frequency of monitoring and reporting are briefly described absent a discussion of how they will be used for/with monitoring. There is no explicit discussion of how monitoring assesses impacts such as benefits, costs and risks. No differentiation has been made between distinct Communities, Community Groups and Other Stakeholders; the project proponent generally addresses these as the “communities” or “other stakeholders.” There is no evaluation of monitoring by each of the affected Community Groups provided.</p> <p>Please clearly identify community variables to be monitored, Communities, Community Groups and Other Stakeholders. Moreover, please provide a complete description of how monitoring variables directly link to the project’s objectives and to predicted outputs, outcomes and impacts. Please provide a complete description of sampling methods, types of measurements, frequency of monitoring and reporting and discuss how they fit into the monitoring plan. Please describe how programs such as the Family Diagnostic tool, DOP workshops and Plan of Use of Property coherently fit into the</p>	<p>and/or costs and/or risk).</p> <p>It was better described how the Familiar Assessment, the DOP workshops and the Property Use Plan coherently fit into the monitoring plan.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>In the Project Description, Section CM4 the indicators were linked (through a cluster approach) with the focus issue they are related with on Project’s casual model and to the relative project’s predicted outputs, outcomes and impacts.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>February 1, 2016</p> <p>The project proponent now provides an explanation of how each indicator is linked to the project’s predicted outputs, outcomes and impacts. The project proponent has provided a detailed explanation in Table 25 of the Project Description Document in which certain indicators for each project activity are grouped together and the outputs, outcomes and impacts which relate to the group of indicators are specified and justified in their relations to the indicators.</p> <p>This finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>monitoring plan. Please discuss how monitoring assesses impacts such as benefits, costs and risks specifically for each of the Community Groups. Please include a monitoring evaluation from each of the affected Community Groups.</p>		
11.	<p>CAR 11</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section CM4</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section CM4.2</p> <p>Develop and implement a monitoring plan to assess the effectiveness of measures taken to maintain or enhance all identified High Conservation Values related to community well-being.</p> <p>A monitoring plan for HCVs is not presented or referenced in the PDD. The project proponent states there are no monitoring measures that need to be taken to maintain or enhance the HCV because there are no touristic routes or plans for touristic routes that may affect HCV. The HCV must be monitored even if no changes to maintenance or enhancement are expected; otherwise there would be no way to confirm that this is in fact the case. Overall, it is unclear throughout all of the Community Section (namely this Section, CM4 as well as Section CM1.2) if the HCV described as the Santo Antonio do Jari Waterfall is actually being established and treated as a High Conservation Value. The waterfall is identified as a potential, but not affirmative, HCV in Section CM1.2. However, throughout other Community Sections (such as here in Section CM4) it is referenced as though it was a definite HCV despite multiple instances where it is stated that no monitoring or</p>	<p>The potential HCV described in the CM1.2 was updated to meet most recent discussions among project proponents and Fundação Jari.</p> <p>The potentially negative impacts on the identified potential HCV attribute were identified in section CM2, as well as the measures taken to mitigate the negative impacts and to maintain or enhance the attribute.</p> <p>It's worth to note that the "castanheiras" as potential HCV yet should be validated in the field and through public consultation, what project proponents propose to do in the next 2 years.</p> <p>This happens because not necessarily every "castanhal" will be an HCV and a careful field assessment (timely appropriated) should be carried out.</p> <p>A monitoring plan were developed in section CM4 to monitor the potential HCV presented.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent clearly identified which community features are considered HCVs and which are not. The identified HCV now has a monitoring plan associated with it. Thus, the finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>management is necessary to maintain its value as an HCV; these inconsistencies are contradictory.</p> <p>Please clearly identify whether the Santo Antonio do Jari Waterfall is being treated as an HCV, whether other HCV features exist. If it is being considered an HCV, please develop and implement a monitoring plan to assess the effectiveness of measures taken to maintain or enhance all identified High Conservation Values related to community well-being, even if no changes to maintenance or enhancement are expected.</p>		
12.	<p>CAR 12</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section CM4</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section CM4.3</p> <p>Disseminate the monitoring plan, and any results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means.</p> <p>The project proponent does not explicitly present the community monitoring plan. The project proponent states that the results of the socioeconomic studies will be made publically available online through the pages of the project proponents but does not provide an address to these pages or any other supporting evidence. There is no explicit statement that the monitoring plan is disseminated, made publically available</p>	<p>The monitoring plan to the communities is now turned explicit in the project description (Section CM4). Once the a final version of the Project Description is approved by the VVB it will be upload in Biofilica’s webpage (www.biofilica.com.br) and it content will be disseminated among communities and other stakeholders during the first Technical Chamber meeting of 2016.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>In the Project Description, Section CM4, it was described how the monitoring plan and any results of the monitoring plan will be communicated to communities and other stakeholders through appropriated means.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent states that the monitoring plan will made publically available through the company’s website and disseminated among communities and other stakeholders. However this information is not presented in the Project Design document.</p> <p>Please describe how the monitoring plan, and any results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan, are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means. This finding remains open.</p> <p>DNV Assessment February 1, 2016</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>or that summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means. Likewise, there is no evidence that the monitoring plan is disseminated or made publically available. There is no description of how summaries are communicated to Communities and Other Stakeholders and no evidence that summaries are communicated through appropriate means to Communities and Other Stakeholders.</p> <p>Please include the community monitoring plan. Please provide evidence that any results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan are made publically available on the internet. Please discuss how the monitoring plan is disseminated, ensuring its public availability online and how summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means. Please provide evidence that the monitoring plan is disseminated, made publically available online and that summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means.</p>		<p>The project proponent has now described how the monitoring plan and any results of monitoring are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders. In section CM4 of the Project Description Document, the project proponent explains that the monitoring plan and any results will be given to stakeholders during every first meeting of the Technical Board on REDD+ each year and will also be made available online. The project proponent also states that a verbal explanation of the contents of the Project Description Document, including the monitoring plan, will be provided by Fundação Jari staff at every first meeting of the Technical Board each year.</p> <p>Thus the finding is closed.</p>
13.	<p>CAR 13</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section B1.1 and Section B1.2</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section B1.2</p> <p>Identify the areas that need to be managed to maintain or enhance the identified HCVs.</p> <p>The HCVs described elsewhere in the</p>	<p>Even in Sections B1.1 and B1.2 project proponent has just identified potential HCVs. This was turned explicit in the section B1.2.</p> <p>The project proponent does not identify Jari Valley and the “Guyana Shield” as areas that need to be managed to maintain or enhance the identified HCV. The information regarding the importance of those areas (and the fact the that Project area is located within them) was only used to support the “potentiality” of the presence of HCV attribute 1 in the project area. This was also turned</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>December 15, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has not identified the presence of biodiversity HCV but recognizes the potential for HCV 1. The project proponent identifies a strategy for identifying HVC 1 within the next two years. See FAR 3. This finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>PDD are identified as potential HCVs but referenced in this Section (and throughout the rest of the Biodiversity Section) in a manner that suggests they are definitive. The project proponent identified the Valley of Jari and the “Guyana Shield” as areas that need to be managed to maintain or enhance the identified HCVs. The Guyana Shield is an extremely vague reference as it spans over two states in Brazil and expands into other countries, including most of Suriname, Guyana and part of Venezuela. Within the Project Zone, it is unclear how this area will be managed to maintain or enhance its HCVs. Likewise, the Valley of Jari encompasses two Brazilian states, Amapa and Para, whose combined size total over 1.3 million square kilometres.</p> <p>Please confirm and explicitly identify which attributes are being treated and managed as High Conservation Values. If identified HCVs are being treated as definite HCVs, please identify manageable areas within the Project Zone per the requirement.</p>	<p>explicit in the section B1.2.</p> <p>This potential HCV attribute still have to be validated in order to “manageable areas within the Project Zone” be identified.</p>	
14.	<p>CAR 14</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section B2.5</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section B2.6</p> <p>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. Justify any use of non-native species over native species. The project proponent provides justification of the use of non-native species over native species. However the project proponent does not describe possible adverse effects of non-native</p>	<p>Despite the project encouragement to use native species by rural communities, such as acai, chestnuts and curauá, some non-native species are used by the project, such as cassava, corn, rice, watermelon and beans. These agricultural species are worldwide-domesticated food species and were introduced into the region during the historical time and are an important source of food and income to rural and urban communities in the region as part of the local culture. Widely grown in other regions of Brazil, these species are not recognized by any threaten to native species.</p> <p>According with Global Invasive Species Program none of the species used (worldwide-domesticated food species) are listed as invasive specie. This means they don’t represent any threat</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent is required to identify <i>any possible</i> adverse effects even if non-native species are widely used and not recognized as threats to native species. 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. Justify any use of non-native species over native species. This finding remains open.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>species used by the project on the region's environment. The project proponent states that the non-native species are widely grown in other regions of Brazil and are not recognized as threats to native species.</p> <p>Please describe any 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, even if non-native species are widely used throughout the country and are not recognized as threats to native species.</p>	<p>to the natural ecosystem, once they need the man care and farm to grown, such as soil management, irrigation and weed control. Especially, because they are not adapted to the rainforest microclimate conditions and they've being cultivated in the region for centuries without any unexpected spread or disease introduction/facilitation being reported.</p> <p>Thus, the agricultural worldwide-domesticated species used by the project's communities does not have any negative effect over native species.</p> <p>This information was updated on the Project Description under section B2.5.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>The section B2.5-6 in the Project description was updated in order to 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, and their use was justified.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment February 1, 2016</p> <p>The project proponent provides a thorough explanation of possible adverse effects of non-native species used by the project on the region's environment especially in terms of native species and the facilitation of diseases in section B2.5-6 of the Project Description Document. Likewise the project proponent also includes a reasonable argument justifying their use of non-native species over native species. The project proponent cites valid references to support their claims and provides copies of these references as additional documentation.</p> <p>Thus, the finding is closed.</p>
15.	<p>CAR 15</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section B4</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section B4.1, Footnote 120 and Footnote 121</p> <p>Develop and implement a monitoring plan that identifies biodiversity variables to be monitored, the areas to be monitored, the sampling methods, and the frequency of monitoring and reporting. Monitoring variables must be</p>	<p>The list of variables considering project's biodiversity objectives and to predicted activities, outcomes and impacts identified in the project's causal model related to biodiversity (described in G1.8) was now provided in Section B4, along with the sampling methods and frequency of monitoring and report.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Monitoring will happen within the Project Area Boundaries, however the exact location of the plots will be decided with the start of the field monitoring activities begin and will also depend on the final design of the Forest Management</p>	<p>DNV Assessment December 15, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent now includes a more complete monitoring plan which includes frequency of monitoring and more in depth monitoring activities.</p> <p>An extensive list of indicators was provided by the project proponent as the monitoring plan However, it is unclear</p>

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
<p>directly linked to the project's biodiversity objectives and to predicted activities, outcomes and impacts identified in the project's causal model related to biodiversity (described in G1.8).</p> <p>Potential variables may include but are not limited to: species abundance, population size, range, trends and diversity; habitat areas, quality and diversity; landscape connectivity; and forest fragmentation.</p> <p>The following manual is recommended for guidance on appropriate monitoring methodologies: Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment Manual (Richards and Panfil, 2011). Available at www.climate-standards.org</p> <p>The project proponent describes three indicator species that will be used for monitoring and provides some details on the sampling design and a brief outline of sampling methods and the frequency of monitoring. There is no discussion of the frequency of reporting or details about specific areas to be monitored. The project proponent does not discuss specific biodiversity variables to be monitored nor do they link monitoring variables to the project's biodiversity objectives, predicted activities, outcomes and impacts. The project proponent does not mention that it used the Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment Manual.</p> <p>Please provide a complete discussion of sampling methods, frequency of monitoring, areas to be monitored and frequency of reporting. Please identify biodiversity variables to be monitored and discuss how they are directly linked to the project's biodiversity objectives and to predicted activities, outcomes</p>	<p>Activities (the first POA, for instance), once one of the objectives is to monitor the impacts of the sustainable forest management.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>On section B4 of the PDD the indicators (through a cluster approach) were linked to project's expected outputs, outcomes and impacts, and with the focal issue on project's casual model that they are related with.</p>	<p>how each indicator is directly linked to the project's predicted outputs, outcomes and impacts. For each selected indicator, please identify and justify which output, outcome and impact is being monitored and how this variable is effectively linked to the causal model for biodiversity. This finding remains open.</p> <p>DNV Assessment February 1, 2016</p> <p>The project proponent now provides an explanation of how each indicator is linked to the project's predicted outputs, outcomes and impacts related to biodiversity. The project proponent has provided a detailed explanation in Table 31 of the Project Description Document in which certain indicators for each project activity are grouped together and the outputs, outcomes and impacts which relate to the group of indicators are specified and justified in their relations to the indicators.</p> <p>This finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	and impacts identified in the project's causal model related to biodiversity.		
16.	<p>CAR 16</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section B4</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section B4.3</p> <p>Disseminate the monitoring plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means.</p> <p>The project proponent states that the monitoring plan and its results will be made publically available online in the appropriate language and provides a link to the Biofilica website. However, the monitoring plan and any corresponding results cannot be located online at the provided link. The project proponent does not state that summaries of the monitoring plan and its results are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means. However no evidence provided to demonstrate that this has occurred.</p> <p>Please ensure that the monitoring plan and the results of monitoring are made publically available. Please ensure and provide evidence that summaries of the monitoring plan and the results of monitoring are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means.</p>	<p>The monitoring plan to the biodiversity is now turned explicit in the project description (Section B4). Once the a final version of the Project Description is approved by the VVB it will be upload in Biofilica's webpage (www.biofilica.com.br) and it content will be disseminated among communities and other stakeholders during the first Technical Chamber meeting of 2016.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>Section B4 on the PDD was updated to describe how the monitoring plan and the results of the monitoring plan and the results of monitoring will be communicated to communities and other stakeholders through appropriate means.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent states that the monitoring plan will made publically available through the company's website and disseminated among communities and other stakeholders. However this information is not presented in the Project Design document.</p> <p>Please describe how the monitoring plan and the results of monitoring will be communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means. This finding remains open.</p> <p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>February 1, 2016</p> <p>The project proponent has now described how the monitoring plan and any results of monitoring are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders. In section B4 of the Project Description Document, the project proponent explains that the monitoring plan and any results will be given to stakeholders during every first meeting of the Technical Board on REDD+ each year and will also be made available online. The project proponent also states that a verbal explanation of the contents of</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
			<p>the Project Description Document, including the monitoring plan, will be provided by Fundação Jari staff.</p> <p>Therefore the finding is closed.</p>
17.	<p>CAR 17</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section GL3</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section GL3, Concept</p> <p>Projects conserve biodiversity at sites of global significance for biodiversity conservation selected on the basis of the Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) framework of vulnerability and irreplaceability.</p> <p>The project proponent discusses endangered, critically endangered and vulnerable species in the context of Red List of Endangered Species of IUCN and states that the project’s role in biodiversity conservation fulfils the vulnerability criteria described by CCB. However, the project proponent does not explicitly discuss biodiversity conservation on the basis of the Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) framework of vulnerability and irreplaceability. Please clearly discuss selected biodiversity conservation on the basis of the Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) framework of vulnerability and irreplaceability.</p>	<p>The Project’s biodiversity conditions meet with the criterion of “Vulnerability” was discussed on the basis of the Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) framework of vulnerability and irreplaceability. See Section GL3.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent discusses biodiversity in the context of the Key Biodiversity Area framework of vulnerability and irreplaceability. This finding is closed.</p>
18.	<p>CAR 18</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section GL3</p>	<p>The recent population trend of each selected trigger specie was described was discussed in section GL3, along with the most likely changes under the without-project scenario.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section GL3.2</p> <p>Describe recent population trends of each of the Trigger species in the Project Zone at the start of the project and describe the most likely changes under the without-project land use scenario.</p> <p>The project proponent does not discuss recent population trends of each Trigger species and does not describe the most likely changes under the without-project land use scenario. Please describe recent population trends of each of the Trigger species in the Project Zone at the start of the project and describe the most likely changes under the without-project land use scenario.</p>		<p>discusses the recent population trends of each selected trigger species and trends in the without-project scenario. Thus the finding is closed.</p>
19.	<p>CAR 19</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section GL3</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section GL3.4</p> <p>Include indicators of the population trend of each Trigger species and/or the threats to them in the monitoring plan and demonstrate the effectiveness of measures needed and taken to maintain or enhance the population status of Trigger species.</p> <p>The project proponent lists critically endangered, endangered and vulnerable species but does not discuss indicators of the population trend of each species. The project proponent does not discuss threats to Trigger species in terms of the monitoring plan. Measures needed and</p>	<p>Indicator of population trend of the selected trigger species was presented, as well as measures needed and taken to maintain or enhance the population status and their effectiveness.</p> <p>R1 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>Supporting evidences were included in the Project Description section B1. These evidences were properly referred in section GL3.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent provides a greater discussion on trigger species in terms of threats and measures needed to maintain or enhance populations. Although there is an adequate discussion of measures that are needed to enhance or maintain populations, there is no supporting evidence to prove that this is occurring.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the Project Zone presents the referenced species in section GL3 or B1.1. If so, please provide supporting evidence. This finding remains open.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>taken to maintain or enhance the population status of a Trigger species are briefly mentioned in the form of a “warning mechanism” that is created in data processing when any Trigger species is sampled by wildlife researchers or is present in the forest inventories but no further details are provided about the “warning mechanism” or how it specifically works. The “warning mechanism” is described as effective because it will help in the following of actual trends of Trigger species populations; however, the actual effectiveness of this system is not demonstrated nor is there any evidence of it or its effectiveness provided.</p> <p>Please include indicators of the population trends of each Trigger species and/or discuss threats to Trigger species in terms of monitoring. Please provide a complete description of measures needed and taken to maintain or enhance the population status of a Trigger species and provide evidence that these measures are being carried out. Please demonstrate and provide evidence that measures needed and taken to maintain or enhance the population status of Trigger species are effective.</p>		<p>DNV Assessment February 1, 2016</p> <p>The project proponent now references the Socioeconomic and Environmental Diagnosis document (see “Annex 1 - Socioeconomic and Environmental Diagnosis 1.pdf”) throughout section B1 and section GL3 of the Project Description Document. This diagnostic document discusses monitoring events which have occurred and collected records from monitoring, thus sufficing as supporting evidence that measures are being taken to enhance and maintain populations as indicated in the Project Description Document.</p> <p>Additionally, the project proponent provides an excel spreadsheet entitled “Endangered species flora.xlsx” which has a tally of floral species encountered in the project area thus acting as evidence that monitoring activities such as observation and species counts are occurring.</p> <p>Thus the finding is closed.</p>
20.	<p>CAR 20</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G1.10, CM2</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G1.10, CM2.1, CM2.2</p> <p>Identify likely and natural and human-</p>	<p>The risks presented in Section G1.10 were updated to include additional risks assessment, also considering the impacts assessment in section CM1.2.</p> <p>It is important to state that until the delivery of this responses it wasn’t possible to assemble with the communities participating on the project, and to best identify potential negatives risks and impacts ideally the</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent provides a thorough discussion of risks to community benefits in Section CM2 and provides reference to Section G1.10 where many other risks relate to community benefits and include a discussion on</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>induced risks to the expected climate, community and biodiversity benefits during the project lifetime and outline measures needed and taken to mitigate these risks. During the site visit, based on multiple household interviews, several risks were identified for multiple project activities. These risks include the effects of selective logging, expansion of logging roads and limits on land use and land use conversion.</p> <p>Please fully identify likely and natural and human-induced risks to the expected climate, community and biodiversity benefits during the project lifetime and completely outline measures needed and taken to mitigate these risks.</p>	<p>should be consulted, especially on the CCBS optics. Therefore the project proponent assume the commitment of promoting workshops with each community participating with this end, to identify potential risks and negative impacts, until the next verification period.</p>	<p>mitigation actions. See FAR 4. This finding is closed.</p>
21.	<p>CAR 21</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.4</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3.4</p> <p>A plan must be developed and implemented to continue communication and consultation. During the site visit, based on household interviews and discussions with the project proponents, no communication plan was identified. Please develop and implement a plan to continue communication and consultation per the requirement.</p>	<p>A Plan to continue communication and consultation throughout the project's lifetime was developed and described in section G3.4.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has provided a detailed plan of communication in section G3.4 so that communication and consultation are continued in the future throughout the communities. The finding is closed.</p>
22.	<p>CAR 22</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.8</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3.8</p>	<p>The Procedure already in place was adapted to the Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project, provided as an annex of the Project Description and was uploaded in Biofilica's webpage (www.biofilica.com.br), in local language (Portuguese), in order to be public available to communities and order stakeholders. The procedure, as</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure is now available on the proponent's website and is in the local language. Thus the finding is</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>The Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure must be publicized and accessible to Communities and Other Stakeholders. As observed the site visit, the procedure is private and not accessible to Communities and Other Stakeholders. Please publicize the procedure and make it accessible to Communities and Other Stakeholders.</p>	<p>well as the Stakeholders comment form, will be distributed and recalled every Technical Board meeting. This is described in Section G3.8.</p>	<p>closed.</p>
<p>23.</p>	<p>CAR 23</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.8</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3.8</p> <p>Grievances and project responses, including any redress, must be made publically available. As observed during the site visit, grievances and project responses are not made publically available. Please make grievances and project responses, including any redress, publically available.</p>	<p>As mentioned in the procedure adapted to the Jari/Amapá all comments received (through form, direct communication or virtual communication) may be submitted unnamed and may or may not be turned public, depending on the claimant's personal option. The Project's opts to follow the practice in order for the claimant's to feel more comfortable an confident on submitting their comment or complaint, because isn't rare cases in which a stakeholder tell on illegal activities observed in the region and if it is mandatory to turn public every received comments it may restrict the comments/ complaints that could be received. This is described in Section G3.8.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016): Project proponents agree on making every grievance, responses or redress publically available on Biofilica's website (www.biofilica.com.br), as it is now stated on the Project Description, section G3.8.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016): Proper changes were made on the redress mechanism and it was updated on Biofilica's website and made public available in local language.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment December 16, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent needs to make grievances, responses or redress publically available. This finding remains open.</p> <p>DNV Assessment February 1, 2016</p> <p>In section G3.8 of the Project Description Document, the project proponent explains that the Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure and feedback channel mechanisms are verbally reviewed by Fundação Jari and Biofilica members at the end of every Technical Board meeting and hard copies of the Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure are also made available.</p> <p>Additionally, the project proponent stated that the Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure as well as all forms of comments, grievances and project responses will be made publically available on</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
			<p>Biofíllica’s website in the local Portuguese language. When the website was checked to assure the documents were present, it was confirmed that the Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure was available.</p> <p>However, the Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure on the Biofíllica website states that comments and grievances can be made public or not depending on the applicant’s preferences. The comments, grievances and project responses must be made publically available even if the identities of those submitting are made anonymous. Please indicate that this is so in the Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure.</p> <p>Thus the finding remains open.</p> <p>DNV Assessment March 7, 2016</p> <p>The project proponent has updated the Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure on the Biofíllica website to indicate that any comments or grievances, as well as any redress or responses will be made publically available on the website.</p> <p>Thus the finding is closed.</p>
24.	<p>CAR 24</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015,</p>	<p>Both activities were better described in Table 7, section G1.8.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>Section G1.8</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G1.8, CM2.1, CM2.2, CM3.1, CM3.2</p> <p>Describe each project activity. Although project activities are briefly described in the PDD, the descriptions omit important details about certain project activities. Negative impacts of some project activities may be associated with these omissions.</p> <p>Please fully describe the surveillance activity including bulletins and reports submitted to law enforcement.</p> <p>Please fully describe the structuring and implementation of the socio-environmental fund including the eligible application of funds to pay for biodiversity and climate monitoring.</p> <p>Please fully identify negative impacts of these project activities per the referenced requirements.</p>	<p>The main information about way of action of the surveillance team was turned explicit in section G1.8, after table 8.</p> <p>Additional information about the Structuring of the Socio-environmental Fund was also added in section G1.12.</p> <p>Their negative impacts were also better explored in sections G1.10 and Section CM2.</p>	<p>Project activities including surveillance activities are described in detail in Section G1.8. Information about the structure and application of the socio-environmental fund was added in section G1.12.</p> <p>Greater details concerning negative impacts of these project activities are included. Thus the finding is closed.</p>
25.	<p>CAR 25</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G1.13</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G1.13, G1.14, G1.15, Terms and Definitions</p> <p>According to the terms and definitions, the programmatic approach allows the expansion of project activities to generate net climate benefits to new land areas. The project area is the land area in which project activities aim to demonstrate net climate benefits. Hence the programmatic approach is to</p>	<p>R1 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>There was a misunderstanding. In fact, considering the definition of programmatic approach regarding the expansion in order to “generate net climate benefits”, the Project doesn’t intend to use the programmatic approach. This is now clarified on the Project Description section G1.13.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>February 1, 2016</p> <p>At the end of section G1.12 in the Project Description Document, the project proponent clarifies that the project is not using the programmatic approach.</p> <p>Although it is indicated that the programmatic approach will not be used, the project proponent does state that rural communities located within the Project Zone may be included in the project’s social</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>expand the project area subsequent to project validation.</p> <p>The project proponent is using the programmatic approach (see CL3). However the project proponent does not expect to include any new areas which directly conflicts with the definition of the programmatic approach. As the programmatic approach has been elected, the project must establish criteria for new lands to be added to the project area subsequent to validation. However the project proponent does not include specific eligibility criteria for new lands in the project area. Please provide eligibility criteria for new lands added to the project area subsequent to validation. Please provide scalability limits per the requirements of indicator G1.15.</p>		<p>activities in the future but these potential new areas will not be included in the future Project Area as a means to generate net climate benefits. Thus the programmatic approach is not applicable in this sense or in any other sense relating to the project. The project proponent has now clearly indicated this in the Project Description Document.</p> <p>The finding is closed.</p>
26.	<p>CAR 26</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section GL3, B1.1</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section GL3.1.1 and Section GL3.1.2</p> <p>Demonstrate that the Project Zone includes a site of high biodiversity conservation priority by meeting the vulnerability criteria defined below:</p> <p>1.1 Vulnerability</p> <p>Regular occurrence of a globally threatened species (according to the IUCN Red List) at the site:</p> <p>a. Critically Endangered (CR) and Endangered (EN) species - presence of at least a single individual; or</p>	<p>R1 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>Supporting evidences were included in the Project Description section B1. These evidences were properly referred in section GL3.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>February 1, 2016</p> <p>The project proponent now references the Socioeconomic and Environmental Diagnosis document (see “Annex 1 - Socioeconomic and Environmental Diagnosis 1.pdf”) throughout section B1 and section GL3 of the Project Description Document. This diagnostic document contains records of species sightings which fulfil the vulnerability requirement described in section GL3.</p> <p>Specifically, the document cites that there are 237 individuals of critically endangered <i>Vouacapoua Americana</i>, 1 individual of the endangered <i>Pouteria amapaensis</i> and 1 individual of the endangered <i>Pouteria</i></p>

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
<p>b. Vulnerable species (VU) - presence of at least 30 individuals or 10 pairs.</p> <p>Unsupported with evidence in sections GL3 or B1.1, it does not appear that at least one endangered (or critically endangered) individual or at least 30 vulnerable individuals or 10 pairs of vulnerable individuals exist at a site in the Project Zone. To achieve biodiversity gold, please provide supporting evidence.</p> <p>Also see CL 18.</p>		<p><i>decussata</i> within the Project Zone. Furthermore, the document cites that there are 260 individuals of the vulnerable species <i>Bertholletia excels</i> within the Project Zone. The project proponent describes these species and their count tallies accordingly in section GL3.</p> <p>Thus, the project proponent provides the cited evidence that the Project Zone includes a site of high biodiversity conservation priority by meeting the vulnerability criteria. Specifically, that the Project Zone has the regular occurrence of at least a single critically endangered and endangered species or the regular occurrence of a vulnerable species in the form of 30 individuals or 10 pairs. The project proponent demonstrates that both vulnerability options are fulfilled in the Project Zone, thus far exceeding the minimal requirement.</p> <p>Additionally, the project proponent provides an excel spreadsheet entitled "Endangered species flora.xlsx" which has a tally of floral species encountered in the Project Zone, including all of the above species, which further demonstrates that the project fulfils the biodiversity gold criterion of vulnerability as it is described above.</p> <p>Thus the finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
27.	<p>CL 1</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G1.8</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G1.8</p> <p>Briefly describe each project activity and the expected outputs, outcomes and impact of the activities identifying the causal relationships that explain how the activities will achieve the project’s predicted climate, community and biodiversity benefits. Causal relationships should be built upon a theory of change analysis, and based on the same analysis of drivers and actors of land use or land-use change used for the without-project scenario.</p> <p>Please provide a more detailed discussion of the casual relationships that explain how project activities achieve project goals using a theory of change analysis. Specifically, clarify how project outcomes relate to project objectives.</p>	<p>The casual relationships, that explain how project activities achieve project goals using the theory of change analysis, was better described in section G1.8, a manner to clarify how project outcomes relate to project objectives.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent provides a additional explanation of the causal relationships of project activities, explaining in detail how project objectives relate to outcomes and thus how project goals are accomplished using the theory of change analysis. Thus the finding is closed.</p>
28.	<p>CL 2</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G1.12</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G1.12</p> <p>Demonstrate that the financial mechanisms adopted, including actual and projected revenues from GHG emissions reductions or removals and</p>	<p>As set out in section G1.12:</p> <p>To demonstrate that projected revenues from GHG Emissions Reductions provide an adequate flow of funds to project implementation and to achieve expected climate, community and biodiversity during the project lifetime, the investment analysis mentioned above was also used with the addition of the projected revenues from GHG Emissions Reductions. To guarantee comparability with the previous</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>December 17, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has provided additional documentation demonstrating scheduled activities and investments as well as documentation outlining the flow of funds. Additionally, the project proponent presents these items in the Project Description. Thus the finding is</p>

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
<p>other sources, provide an adequate actual and projected flow of funds for project implementation and to achieve the project's climate, community and biodiversity benefits.</p> <p>Please provide a complete flow of funds and project implementation plan.</p>	<p>analyses the same financial indicator (NPV) was applied and the same base year of 2012 was used. It was demonstrated that projected revenue from GHG Emissions Reductions is not only adequate to cover for project implementation of REDD+ activities, but also improves the overall profitability of keeping the forest cover on the Project Area. The financial spreadsheet, that contains the projected cash flow for the entire project lifetime was made available.</p> <p>Additionally, with the selling of project's first vintage of emissions reductions credits, at the end of 2014 it was decided to structure a "fund" where 80% of the revenue will go to be reinvested in the project. After almost a year of consultation a first proposal was built to direct resources to project's activities under 3 strategic lines: Climate, Community and Biodiversity, plus costs with management and maintenance in order to turn the project economically sustainable.</p> <p>During 2015 a details proposal was discussed of how the resources already available should be invested. Along with this a investment plan (based on project implementation plan) was developed until 2021, when project achieves 10 years of existence. 2021 was chose in order to allow a more realistic financial perspective of the activities to be implemented. It need to be reviewed constantly in order to be as realistic as possible.</p> <p>The following evidences were provided: Additionally spreadsheet; Consultation Memories; Minutes of the Strategic Workshop;</p> <p>REDD+ account juridical structure</p>	<p>closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
		proposed; Investment Plan spreadsheet.	
29.	<p>CL 3</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G1.13</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G1.13</p> <p>Specify the Project Area(s) and Communities that may be included under the programmatic approach and identify any new Project Area(s) and Communities that have been included in the project since the last validation or verification against the CCB Standards.</p> <p>Please clearly identify if the project is using the programmatic approach.</p>	<p>Yes. The project is using a programmatic approach. Because all rural communities located within the Project Zone, listed in Table 4 and presented in Figure 7, may be included in the Project under the programmatic approach in the future, preferably those identified as “directly impacted”. However, Project Proponents do not expect or plan to include any new area as part of the Project Area. Just communities to be included in the social activities.</p> <p>It was turned explicit in section G1.13.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment December 17, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has clearly stated in the Project Design Document that it is using the programmatic approach and has identified the communities within the Project Zone that are included in the programmatic approach. See CAR 25. This finding is now closed.</p>
30.	<p>CL 4</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.1, G3.2, G3.3, G3.4, G3.5, G3.6</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3</p> <p>Communities and Other Stakeholders are involved in the project through full and effective participation, including access to information, consultation, participation in decision-making and implementation, and Free, Prior and Informed Consent.</p> <p>Please provide complete evidence and/or documentation of Free, Prior and</p>	<p>The presence list of all meeting reported in section G3.4 were made available.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>The presence lists and the publication on IEF’s website provided describe briefly each meeting, date, time, location, topics discussed and participants. There were provided the presence list for each meeting described in section G3.4.</p> <p>For the purposes of transparency and consistency each document provided was referred in the Project Description and provided as an annex.</p> <p>The presence lists and the publication on IEF’s website are supportive</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>Although the project proponent has provided documentation with a list of signatures, it is unclear what these signatures are and whether they conform to all of the principles of Free, Prior and Informed Consent. For the purposes of transparency and consistency, the project proponent must reference these additional documents in the Project Design Document as the appropriate annexes. Thus the finding is still open.</p>

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
<p>Informed Consent.</p>	<p>evidence of the meetings described in section G3.4 that represents the first contact with communities and other stakeholders regarding project design and implementation. Although the main results are described in the Project Description the most meaningful of them is probably the Technical Board, a result of the meeting with regional agencies, demonstrating the influence of those meeting in the Project design and implementation.</p> <p>Even after this first consultation a participatory process and continuous consultation is in place, as described in section G3.5.</p> <p>This information were also added on the Project Description, section G3.4.</p> <p>R3 (Feb 2016):</p> <p>The argument of how these meeting described suffice is now added on the PDD section G3, along with memories of communities consultation in regard of SFM activities. It is important to note that the Project relies on a continuous participation process and there are several more workshops planned to discuss and build the Project with communities and other stakeholders.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>February 1, 2016</p> <p>The project proponent has now referenced the signed meeting documentation in section G3.4 of the Project Description Document as the appropriate annexes. It has been clearly demonstrated that the signatures are from various community meetings. The project proponent has also started in this section that involvement in the meetings is voluntary for all community individuals.</p> <p>However, there is no additional discussion in section G3.4 of how the project conforms to the principles of Free, Prior and Informed Consent. Likewise, the provided signed documents do not address these principles nor do they show that the individuals who signed were aware of these principles.</p> <p>Section G5.1-5 discusses the principles of Free, Prior and Informed Consent extensively and references several documents pertaining to these principles and that the proper processes were carried out to ensure them. However, these documents are not provided.</p> <p>Please provide the appropriate signed documentation demonstrating that community members have been made aware of the principles of Free, Prior and Informed Consent. Please reference these</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
			<p>documents appropriately in the Project Description Document.</p> <p>The finding remains open.</p> <p>DNV Assessment March 1, 2016</p> <p>In section G3.4 of the Project Description Document, the project proponent includes an argument which explains how various community meetings adhere to and demonstrate fulfilment of the requirements involving free, prior and informed consent.</p> <p>The project proponent also includes additional documentation of SFM activities meetings signed by participating community members.</p> <p>However as observed during the site visit, assessed from responses and noted in FAR 1 and 4 there still remain opportunities to enhance community involvement to strengthen FPIC especially related to customary rights and SFM activities.</p> <p>Please see DNV assessment for FAR 1.</p> <p>As this is a validation assessment and the project proponent has committed to improving stakeholder consultation and completing</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
			FPIC among communities whose rights may be affected, this finding is closed.
31.	<p>CL 5</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.8</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3.8</p> <p>Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedures are established and functional.</p> <p>Please provide the established Grievance Redress Procedure document.</p>	<p>A Grievance Redress Procedure for the REDD+ project was adapted based on Grupo Jari procedure already in place in order to adapt it for the REDD+ project reality. As now it is described in section G3.8.</p> <p>The procedure was made available, uploaded on Biofilica’s website (www.biofilica.com.br) and will be divulged in the first Technical Board of 2016 to all the communities’ members engaged and other stakeholders.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has made the Grievance Redress Procedural document available online as well as an additional Project Design Document attachment. The project proponent has also made reference to these locations within the Project Design Document so that they can be easily found. Thus the finding is closed.</p>
32.	<p>CL 6</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.2</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3.2</p> <p>Explain how relevant and adequate information about potential costs, risks and benefits to Communities has been provided to them in a form they understand and in timely manner prior to any decision they may be asked to make with respect to participation in the project.</p> <p>Please describe what specific information relating to potential costs, risks and benefits has been provided to Communities.</p>	<p>During the first meetings (those hold in 2012) the main risks discussed were about the high complexity of REDD+ initiatives, lack of official regulation (nationally and jurisdictionally), difficulties of articulation with local communities, difficulties of articulation with state and local governmental agencies, high development costs (to be cover by the project proponents) and uncertainty of return, and high flotation on carbon prices. This can be seen on the presentation used to guide the discussions ate the time.</p> <p>After that others costs and risks of the project to communities started to came out more explicitly with project’s building-up and were clarified verbally, specially during the Technical Board, DOP workshops and TARE visits. The main concerned passed to the project proponents by the communities is in regard of restriction on the land use and deforesting and about maintenance of roads so they can have</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>In Section G3.2, the project proponent has not described what specific information relating to potential costs, risks and benefits has been provided to Communities. For the purposes of transparency, please describe what specific information relating to potential costs, risks and benefits has been provided to Communities in the Project Description.</p> <p>DNV Assessment February 1, 2016</p> <p>In section G3.2 of the Project Description Document, the project proponent has provided a more in depth</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
		<p>better access to their lands.</p> <p>Every time this topics are brought up they are clarified, especially that the project doesn't impose any restriction on the land use.</p> <p>However a few new risks and impacts were brought to light recently, which indicates the need of a particular discussion with communities' members in regard of costs and impacts. To be carried out, preferably during the next meeting of the Technical Board.</p> <p>Regarding risks of the Sustainable Forest Management to be carried out in the Project Area some consultation has been done in 2013 as part of the SFM Plan preparation, during this meetings the goal was to present basic concepts of the SFM operations. The main concern raised by the communities' members was in regard of possible damage to the Brazil Nut tree, new roads for them to have better access to the area and the risk of access restrictions. There were explained the Brazil Nut is protected by law and no damaged is expected, as well as no restriction to the area will be imposed and that they will be able to use de SFM roads net.</p> <p>After the SFM Plan approval before the beginning of the operation the Project proponents commits to carry deeper workshops embracing SFM basic concepts, costs and risks to the communities to the communities surrounding every UPA to be managed every year, prior to the SFM activities start.</p> <p>Evidence of the consultation was provided to the auditor team.</p>	<p>discussion concerning information related to potential costs, risks and benefits that has been provided to communities.</p> <p>The project proponent described in detail the potential risks, costs and benefits that were discussed at initial Technical REDD+ Board meetings and DOP workshops, as well as more recent issues relating to potential risks, costs and benefits that will be discussed at upcoming meetings and throughout the future in accordance with the updated implementation schedule.</p> <p>Thus the finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
		<p>The costs and risks presented in Section G1.10 were updated to include additional costs and risks assessment, also considering the impacts assessment in section CM1.2.</p> <p>It is important to state that until the delivery of this responses it wasn't possible to assemble with the communities participating on the project, and to best identify potential negatives risks and impacts ideally the should be consulted, especially on the CCBS optics. Therefore the project proponent assume the commitment of promoting workshops with each community participating with this end, to identify potential risks and negative impacts, until the next verification period.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>For transparency purposes all the specific information relating to potential costs, risks and benefits provided to the communities and future workshops planned were clarified and turned explicit in the Project Description section G3.2.</p>	
33.	<p>CL 7</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.4 and Section G3.5</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3.4</p> <p>Describe how Communities including all the Community Groups and Other Stakeholders have influenced project design and implementation through Effective Consultation, particularly with a</p>	<p>As described in section CM1.2 the HCV attribute identified was yet identified as a “potential”, which means it still have to be validated including through consultation. It is part of project activities to definitely validate the HCV presence with the communities within the next two years, as set out in section CM1.2.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has provided details as to how the communities and other stakeholders help to determine and evaluate High Conservation Value areas and how these inputs and evaluations are used in constructing project design concerning HCV maintenance.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>view to optimizing Community and Other Stakeholder benefits, respecting local customs, values and institutions and maintaining high conservation values.</p> <p>Please clarify how Community Groups and Other Stakeholders have influenced project design with respect to HCV maintenance.</p>		<p>The project proponent has not identified the presence of community HCV but recognizes the potential. The project proponent identifies a strategy for identifying community HVC within the next two years. See FAR 3. This finding is closed</p>
34.	<p>CL 8</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.4 and Section G3.5</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3.4, Footnote 42</p> <p>A plan must be developed and implemented to continue communication and consultation between the project proponents and Communities, including all the Community Groups, and Other Stakeholders about the project and its impacts to facilitate adaptive management throughout the life of the project.</p> <p>Where conformance with the CCB Standards is being applied to a project already under implementation, project proponents must either provide documentation of appropriate consultations 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 Other Stakeholder benefits and respect local customs.</p> <p>Please provide the plan for continued communication and consultation in order to facilitate adaptive management</p>	<p>A communication plan for continued communication and consultation in order to facilitate adaptive management throughout the project lifetime was developed and described in Section G3.4.</p> <p>It is important to highlight that even this plan may be adapted during its implementation.</p> <p>Regarding the demonstration of “how more recent consultations have been effective in evaluating Community benefits and adapting project design and implementation to optimize Community and Other Stakeholder benefits and respect local customs”, this was described in section G3.5. For instance the Property Use Plan it self didn’t existed in the first Project’s proposal to communities, but after proper feedback and discussions in the Technical Board it was suggested and adapted to communities expectations.</p> <p>Every process is documented in Fundação Jari activities report and technical board minutes.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>December 16, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has provided information about the influence of the Technical Board and an enhanced discussion on how consistent meetings help to facilitate adaptive management throughout the project lifetime by encouraging communal consultation and communication about the project among stakeholders and community groups. Thus the finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	throughout the entire life of the project.		
35.	<p>CL 9</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.8</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3.8</p> <p>The project shall include a process for receiving, hearing, responding to and attempting to resolve Grievances within a reasonable time period. The Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure shall take into account traditional methods that Communities and Other Stakeholders use to resolve conflicts.</p> <p>Please provide the document(s) for the Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure.</p>	<p>As it is now set in Section G3.8, Grupo Jari procedure was adapted to the use of Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project and was made available to the auditor. Besides, the procedure is now also available in Biofilica’s webpage (www.biofilica.com.br).</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has made the Grievance Redress Procedural document available online as well as an additional Project Design Document attachment. The project proponent has also made reference to these locations within the Project Design Document so that they can be easily found. Thus the finding is closed.</p>
36.	<p>CL 10</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.11</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3.11</p> <p>Submit a list of all relevant laws and regulations covering worker’s rights in the host country.</p> <p>Describe measures needed and taken to inform workers about their rights. Provide assurance that the project meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering worker rights and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.</p>	<p>As set out in section G3.11, “Integration Training” is a regular training carried out after hiring and before starting activities of forest management and during these trainings employees are empowered regarding their rights and applicable legislation. The “Integration Training” happens every year and aims to inform new workers about health, safety and security instructions (most of them also regulated by some law) and their rights and applicable law. Longstanding workers also participate on the “Integration Training” in order to recycle and update them about those same issues. “Integration Training” general agenda and content was provided to the auditor team, although it is annually updated.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment December 16, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has included information in the Project Design Document about integration training for new and longstanding employees. Evidence that needed measures are taken to inform workers about their rights has been provided. During the site visit, evidence was observed through interviews and document review that demonstrates the project meets or exceeds applicable laws and is in compliance. This finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>Please provide greater detail concerning measures needed and taken to inform workers about their rights. Likewise, please provide evidence that needed measures are taken to inform workers about their rights. Clearly demonstrate and/or provide evidence that the project meets or exceeds applicable laws and show how this compliance is achieved.</p>		
37.	<p>CL 11</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.12</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3.12</p> <p>Comprehensively assess situations and occupations that might arise through the implementation of the project and pose a substantial risk to worker safety. Describe measures needed and taken 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 are minimized using best work practices in line with the culture and customary practices of the communities.</p> <p>Please clarify how workers are informed of risks to safety and safety precautions.</p>	<p>As set out in section G3.11 and G3.12, “Integration Training” is a regular training carried out after hiring and before starting activities of forest management and during these trainings employees are empowered risks and safety precautions. The “Integration Training” happens every year and aims to inform new workers about health, safety and security instructions and their rights and applicable law. Longstanding workers also participate on the “Integration Training” in order to recycle and update them about those same issues. “Integration Training” general agenda and content was provided to the auditor team, although it is annually updated.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has provided an improved discussion concerning worker safety and details on how workers are informed of risks to safety. Thus the finding is closed.</p>
38.	<p>CL 12</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section B2.1 and Section B2.2</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section B2.1</p>	<p>Direct and indirect impacts of changes in biodiversity as well as predicted and actual impacts of changes in biodiversity resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario were presented in Table 30, section B2.1.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has provided thorough examples of direct/indirect and predicted/actual impacts of changes in biodiversity</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>Use appropriate methodologies to estimate changes in biodiversity, including assessment of predicted and actual, positive and negative, direct and indirect impacts, resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario in the Project Zone and over the project lifetime. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions.</p> <p>Please clearly describe and designate direct and indirect impacts of changes in biodiversity as well as predicted and actual impacts of changes in biodiversity resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario.</p>		<p>resulting from activities in the with-project scenario. Thus the finding is closed.</p>
39.	<p>CL 13</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G5.6-9</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G5.7</p> <p>Document that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, including the established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the Communities.</p> <p>Please provide documented evidence that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, especially the established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the Communities.</p>	<p>As described in the Project Description in July 27th 2012 a meeting was carried out among Project proponents and Instituto Estadual de Florestas (IEF – Amapa Forest State Institute), Secretaria do Estado do Meio Ambiente (SEMA – Amapa State Environment Department), Instituto de Desenvolvimento Rural do Amapa (RURAP – Rural Development Agency for the Amapa State) and Secretaria de Estado da Industria Comercio e Mineracao (SEICOM – State Department of Industry, Commerce and Mining).</p> <p>The outputs of this meeting was not just the recognize of Jari/Amapa REDD+ Project but also to seek for synergies between Amapa States initiatives and project proponents. The outputs of the meeting was also posted at IEF website (provided).</p> <p>After this meeting and due to Amapa government intention of developing an legal framework to deal with environmental services in the state, and further on to develop a REDD+</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has provided documents showing the approval from the appropriate authorities. However, most of the provided documents remain unsigned. Additionally, the proponent should make reference to the location of these documents in the Project Design Document. Thus, the finding is still open.</p> <p>DNV Assessment February 1, 2016</p> <p>In section G3.4 and section G5.6-9 of the Project Description Document, the project proponent references various meetings and states that documentation for these meetings is available as an</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
		<p>Jurisdictional Program (both not approved yet) Biofilica and Grupo Jari were invited to be members of Amapa State Forum on Environmental Services, that aim to support the built of the legal framework. This invitation was based not only in the recognition of Jari Amapa REDD+Project but once the project was the first official initiative in the state, the proponents could share their experience, challenges and outcomes with governmental intuitions on Amapa and help them on the legal framework development.</p> <p>The invitation signed by Amapa Environment Secretary and all Forum minutes were provided.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>The minutes of all the meetings of the Amapá State Forum on Environmental Services and the signed invitation from Amapá Environmental Secretary were referred in the Project Description section G5.6-9 and provided as annex of the Project Description. Besides the documents mentioned in section G3.4.</p> <p>It is important to highlight that there <u>is no signed</u> official approved once there is still no approved jurisdictional program or system in place for Amapá State that could regulate the approval and the registration of the project, however Biofilica's intense participation and collaboration (invited by the government) in the State Environmental Forum and other efforts to develop the legal framework demonstrate Jari/Amapá REDD+ Project acceptance by the Authorities.</p> <p>The first and the second responses to this finding were turned explicit in the</p>	<p>outside annex.</p> <p>While the majority of the provided meetings documentation remain unsigned, one document entitled "Annex 15 - Signed invitation from Amapa Government.pdf" does have a signature from the appropriate authority. However, the project proponent provides a sufficient explanation in section G5.6-9 as to why the official meetings documents are unsigned; due to the fact there is no approved jurisdictional program or system in place for the Amapá state that could regulate the approval and registration of the project.</p> <p>The project proponent goes on to state that their intense participation and government-invited collaboration with the state's Environmental Forum as well as their contributions to developing a legal REDD+ framework demonstrate that the authorities are aware of the project and accept the project. While this does not serve by any means as a proper approval by the competent authorities, it does allow for some insight. Because there is not official way to legally approve the project, having close collaboration with government actors and working with them to develop a jurisdictional program is the closest means to fulfilling this requirement.</p> <p>Thus there is sufficient enough</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
		Project Description section G5.6-9.	information to close the finding. The finding is closed.
40.	<p>CL 14</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section GL1</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section GL1 and GL1.4</p> <p>The project provides significant support to assist Communities and/or biodiversity in adapting to the impacts of climate change. Strategies to help Communities and biodiversity adapt to climate change are identified and implemented. Demonstrate that the project activities assist Communities and/or biodiversity to adapt to the probable impacts of climate change. Assessment of impacts of project activities on Communities must include an evaluation of the impacts by the affected Communities.</p> <p>Please clearly identify if the project is seeking Climate Level Gold Certification. If seeking, please make an affirmative statement in this section and also provide a confirmation and brief description in the “Gold Level” summary on the title/introduction page.</p>	No. The project is not seeking for the climate gold level certification.	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has clarified that it is not seeking climate gold level certification. Thus the finding is closed.</p>
41.	<p>CL 15</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section B2.2</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section B2.2</p>	Section B2.2 was restructured in order to better demonstrate that project’s impacts on biodiversity in the Project Zone are positive when compared with the without-project land use scenario.	<p>DNV Assessment December 17, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has provided an improved discussion which demonstrates that the with-project scenario impacts on biodiversity in the</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>Demonstrate that the project's net impacts on biodiversity in the Project Zone are positive, compared with the biodiversity conditions under the without-project land use scenario (described in B1).</p> <p>Please provide complete support (greater detail, logic and connection) which demonstrates that the project's impacts on biodiversity in the Project Zone are positive when compared with the without-project land use scenario.</p>		<p>Project Zone have a net positive effect when compared with the impacts of the without project land use scenario. This finding is closed.</p>
42.	<p>CL 16</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section B2.3 and Section B2.4</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section B2.3</p> <p>Describe measures needed and taken to mitigate negative impacts on biodiversity and any measures needed and taken for maintenance or enhancement of the High Conservation Value attributes (identified in B1.2) consistent with the precautionary principle.</p> <p>Please confirm and specify which attributes are definitely being treated and managed as High Conservation Values. Please include a complete discussion (stronger support, greater detail and more consideration about potential negative impacts that can be mitigated) of measures needed and taken for maintenance or enhancement of High Conservation attributes.</p>	<p>As better explained in section B2.4:</p> <p>The potential High Conservation Value identified in section B1.2 was the HCV attribute number 1, related with the presence of endemic and endangered species. The activities and measures that need to be taken to maintain and enhance this attribute are the activities already proposed by the Project (Table 6). The potential impacts on the potential HCV attribute identified are the same that are resented in table 30 once this attribute is related with the existence of endangered species, that may occur all over the Project Zone. It is important to highlight that to identify exactly location of area to be managed and/or determined as HCV 1 the project should yet implement it field biodiversity monitoring activity.</p> <p>According with the described in section B2.1 and table 30, the potential negative impacts are mainly the ones related by the sustainable forest management activities but these impacts are already to be mitigated through the application of reduced impact logging technics and several additional quality procedures. In the same logic all the positive impacts actual and predicted, directed and indirect described in section B2.1 and</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>December 16, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent clearly identifies which HCV attributes are being treated and managed as HCVs and consequently those that are clearly not so. The project proponent has made reference to other Sections of the Project Design Document where greater support concerning negative impacts and mitigation measures can be applied to this HCV.</p> <p>As the presence of biodiversity HCV is currently being confirmed, the specific measures needed and taken for maintenance or enhancement cannot be full assessed. See FAR 3 and FAR 5. This finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
		<p>table 30 are also applied to HCV attribute 1.</p> <p>Measures taken and needed to maintain and enhance are mainly the maintenance of the forest cover, the controlling of forest degradation, reducing of intense fragmentation processes, habitat loss, genetic erosion and extinction of species and ecological functions, all the benefits expected by the project scenario, as described in section B2.2. In that manner Project activities already aim to generate positive impacts on this attribute and the potential positive and negative impacts are the same described in B2.1 and B2.3. Which means that the already proposed project activities are the actions taken and need to enhance and maintain this attribute.</p>	
43.	<p>CL 17</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section B2.4</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section B2.4</p> <p>Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values (identified in B1.2) are negatively affected by the project.</p> <p>Please confirm and specify which attributes are being treated and managed as High Conservation Values. Please include a complete discussion (strong support, detail, examples and consideration of potential negative impacts) about High Conservation Values not being negatively affected by the project. Provide evidence and/or demonstrate that no High Conservation Values are negatively affected by the project.</p>	<p>As better explained in section B2.4:</p> <p>The potential High Conservation Value identified in section B1.2 was the HCV attribute number 1, related with the presence of endemic and endangered species. The activities and measures that need to be taken to maintain and enhance this attribute are the activities already proposed by the Project (Table 6). The potential impacts on the potential HCV attribute identified are the same that are resented in table 30 once this attribute is related with the existence of endangered species, that may occur all over the Project Zone. It is important to highlight that to identify exactly location of area to be managed and/or determined as HCV 1 the project should yet implement it field biodiversity monitoring activity.</p> <p>According with the described in section B2.1 and table 30, the potential negative impacts are mainly the ones related by the sustainable forest management activities but these impacts are already to be mitigated through the application of reduced impact logging technics and several additional quality procedures. In the</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent clarifies which attributes are being managed as HCVs and references the appropriate Section in the PD which discusses potential negative impacts.</p> <p>As the presence of biodiversity HCV is currently being confirmed, it is not possible to confirm whether HCV may be negatively affected by the project. See FAR 3 and FAR 5. This finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
		<p>same logic all the positive impacts actual and predicted, directed and indirect described in section B2.1 and table 30 are also applied to HCV attribute 1.</p> <p>Measures taken and needed to maintain and enhance are mainly the maintenance of the forest cover, the controlling of forest degradation, reducing of intense fragmentation processes, habitat loss, genetic erosion and extinction of species and ecological functions, all the benefits expected by the project scenario, as described in section B2.2. In that manner Project activities already aim to generate positive impacts on this attribute and the potential positive and negative impacts are the same described in B2.1 and B2.3. Which means that the already proposed project activities are the actions taken and need to enhance and maintain this attribute.</p>	
44.	<p>CL 18</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section GL3</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section GL3.1.1 and Section GL3.1.2</p> <p>Demonstrate that the Project Zone includes a site of high biodiversity conservation priority by meeting the vulnerability criteria defined below, identifying the ‘Trigger’ species that cause(s) the site to meet any of the following qualifying conditions and providing evidence that the qualifying conditions are met:</p> <p>1.1 Vulnerability</p> <p>Regular occurrence of a globally threatened species (according to the</p>	<p>Section GL3 was restructure to better attend this requirement.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016): Supporting evidences were included in the Project Description section B1. These evidences were properly referred in section GL3.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment December 17, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent elects to use the vulnerability condition to demonstrate compliance with this criterion. However no supporting evidence is provided for the Project Zone to support conformance to this indicator. Please see CAR 26. This finding remains open.</p> <p>DNV Assessment February 1, 2016</p> <p>Due to the closing of CAR 26, this finding is also closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>IUCN Red List) at the site:</p> <p>a. Critically Endangered (CR) and Endangered (EN) species - presence of at least a single individual; or</p> <p>b. Vulnerable species (VU) - presence of at least 30 individuals or 10 pairs.</p> <p>Please demonstrate and provide evidence that the Project Zone includes a site of high biodiversity conservation priority by meeting the vulnerability criteria described above. In short, please demonstrate and provide evidence of at least one endangered or critically endangered individual; or demonstrate and provide evidence of at least 30 vulnerable individuals or 10 pairs of vulnerable individuals. If the vulnerability criteria are fulfilled, please identify the “Trigger” species that cause(s) the site to meet the qualifying conditions.</p>		
45.	<p>CL 19</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section GL3</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section GL3.3</p> <p>Describe measures needed and taken to maintain or enhance the population status of each Trigger species in the Project Zone, and to reduce the threats to them based on the causal model that identifies threats to Trigger species and activities to address them. Following good practice guidance for in-situ species management including active management measures and re-introduction, as appropriate, and consistent with any relevant existing species management plan.</p>	<p>Section GL3 was restructure to better attend this requirement.</p> <p>R2 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>In the section GL3 additional measures were described to maintain the population of the trigger species according with the Brazilian law and the species management in place.</p> <p>It is important to notice that the measures described are planned to happen in the SFM activities to be carried by the Project and are consistently already in place in neighbour since 2004 in the SFM initiative already carried out by The Project proponents in the Pará State.</p> <p>As supporting evidence the SFM Plan of Pará area was provided to the auditor, along with the SFM plan of the Amapá area (Project Area), both describing this measures.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment</p> <p>November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent provides an improved discussion concerning the measures needed and taken to maintain or enhance the population status of each trigger species.</p> <p>The project proponent also references these measures in connection to the causal model exemplified in an early table However there is no discussion or evidence provided that in-situ species management is followed or that such management is consistent with any existing species management plan.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>Please provide a complete discussion (strong support, detail, examples and considerations of threats as well as potential negative impacts of monitoring activity) of the measures needed and taken to maintain or enhance the population status of each Trigger species in the Project Zone. Using the causal model, please provide a complete discussion on how threats will be reduced and identified as well as how activities will address threats. Describe and provide evidence that good practice guidance for in-situ species management is followed, including any appropriate active management measures and re-introduction. Describe and provide evidence that in-situ species management is consistent with any relevant existing species management plan.</p>	<p>R3 (Feb 2016):</p> <p>The PDD was amended to proper reference the SFM Plans of Amapá and Pará for containing the applicable in-situ species management.</p>	<p>Thus the finding remains open.</p> <p>DNV Assessment February 1, 2016</p> <p>In section GL3 of the Project Description Document, the project proponent now provides a discussion of trigger species management in the form of Table 32. This table provides a thorough description of measures needed and taken to maintain and enhance species populations and carry out species management.</p> <p>However, section GL3 references Table 30 and section B4 in terms of how in-situ species management is consistent with the existing monitoring plan. Section B4 references also Table 30 for biodiversity monitoring. However, Table 30 discusses (incompletely) biodiversity impacts and does not specifically discuss species management as part of biodiversity monitoring. Table 31 in section B4 may be a more appropriate reference as it discusses indicators, sampling methods and sampling frequency for biodiversity related monitoring.</p> <p>Moreover, there is still no referenced evidence in section GL3 that in-situ management is being carried out. While the project proponent has provided additional documentation which demonstrates that in-situ</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
			<p>species management is occurring, there is no reference in section GL3 of the Project Description Document of these additional documents as annexes.</p> <p>Please amend the reference in Section GL3 to properly reflect a table which demonstrates that in-situ species management follows an existing species management plan. Also, please reference in section GL3 the additional documents as annexes to exemplify that in-situ species management is occurring.</p> <p>Thus the finding remains open.</p> <p>DNV Assessment April 17, 2016</p> <p>In section GL3 of the Project Description Document, the project proponent now makes reference to the proper table and supporting sections in order to describe the measures needed and taken as well as the monitoring plan.</p> <p>The project proponent also demonstrates that in-situ species management is occurring and that it is aligned with an existing species management plan by referencing the Sustainable Forest Management Plan for Para and for the Project Area which have been provided as additional documents.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
			Thus the finding is closed.
46.	<p>CL 20</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G1.12</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G1.12</p> <p>Please provide a projected flow of funds for project implementation.</p>	<p>As set out in section G1.12:</p> <p>To demonstrate that projected revenues from GHG Emissions Reductions provide an adequate flow of funds to project implementation and to achieve expected climate, community and biodiversity during the project lifetime, the investment analysis mentioned above was also used with the addition of the projected revenues from GHG Emissions Reductions. To guarantee comparability with the previous analyses the same financial indicator (NPV) was applied and the same base year of 2012 was used. It was demonstrated that projected revenue from GHG Emissions Reductions is not only adequate to cover for project implementation of REDD+ activities, but also improves the overall profitability of keeping the forest cover on the Project Area.</p> <p>The financial spreadsheet, that contains the projected cash flow for the entire project lifetime was made available.</p> <p>Additionally, an investment plan (based on project implementation plan) was developed until 2021, when project achieves 10 years of existence. 2021 was chose in order to allow a more realistic financial perspective of the activities to be implemented. It needs to be reviewed constantly in order to be as realistic as possible.</p> <p>The investment Plan until 2021 was provided.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has now included a projected flow of funds for project implementation. Therefore the finding is closed.</p>

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
47.	<p>CL 21</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section CM2</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section CM1.2</p> <p>Please provide the draft annual operating plan for forest extraction and any evidence of community consultations about the associated project activity.</p>	<p>The draft annual operation plan was provided, along with evidence of consultation regarding the SFM activities.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment November 24, 2015</p> <p>The project proponent has provided a draft of the annual operating plan for forest extraction and has provided evidence of community consultations. Thus the finding is closed.</p>
48.	<p>FAR 1</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G3.3, G3.4, G5.2</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G3.3, G3.4</p> <p>During the site visit, based on community household interviews and interviews with Other Stakeholders, questions were raised about the implementation status of the project. Using the communication plan and other resources, please consider maintaining and improving effective communication with Communities and Other Stakeholders.</p>	<p>A Plan to continue communication and consultation throughout the project's lifetime was developed and described in section G3.4.</p> <p>This plan should be implemented and improved with project's progress in order to guarantee an effective communication between communities and other stakeholders.</p>	<p>DNV Assessment February 21, 2016</p> <p>At the time of verification, the auditor may seek to verify that FPIC requirements have been met as they specifically relate to criteria G5 and customary access rights to Brazil nut trees in SFM activity areas. At the time of validation, no SFM activities had taken place.</p>
49.	<p>FAR 2</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G1.9</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G1.9</p>	<p>R1 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>On the Project Description section G1.8 table 7 item 5.5 a milestone of inclusion of 3 communities located in the Project Zone every 5 years. This information was also updated on Project Description section G1.9 table 9.</p>	

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	<p>Although the project proponent has defines an implementation schedule -- indicating key dates and milestone in the project's development – it does not indicate all project activities. Specifically, the implementation schedule could include key dates and milestones related to the expansion of the non-FCS activities to communities within the project zone.</p>	<p>It may be important to note that due to the current status of the Project (CCB Validation phase) its difficult to restrict some milestone like the expansion of the non-FSC activities to other communities within the Project Zone specifying the communities to be included. This is because, among other factors, there is the condition of resources availability to be evaluated in the future, the needed of adjustment on estimative of time/staff needed to work with each specific community/family and, more importantly, the need of workshops with other communities (possibly to be included in the project activities) prior to the schedule definition in order to have their consent, align expectation, expected benefits, risks and costs. In that manner the name and specificities of the communities to be included in the project activities will be better discussed during the monitoring reports, when the expansion happen.</p>	
50.	<p>FAR 3</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section B1.1, B1.2, CM1.2</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section B1.2, Section CM1.2</p> <p>Please complete the HCV analyses for community and biodiversity.</p>	<p>R1 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>The complete HCV analyses for community and biodiversity will be carried out according with the schedule and milestones defined in table 7 section G1.8.</p>	
51.	<p>FAR 4</p> <p>Document Reference: Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section G1.10, CM2</p> <p>Standard Reference: CCB Standards Third Edition, Section G1.10, CM2.1, CM2.2</p>	<p>R1 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>As it is now described in section G1.8 table 7 item 5.8 the Project Proponent assumes the commitment of promoting workshops with each community to fully identify potential risks and</p>	

	Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Response by project participants	Verification conclusion
	Please assume the commitment of promoting workshops with each community to fully identify potential risks and negative impacts.	negative impacts in 2016 and 2017.	
52.	<p>FAR 5</p> <p>Document Reference:</p> <p>Project Design Document – 31 July 2015, Section B2.3 and Section B2.4</p> <p>Standard Reference:</p> <p>CCB Standards Third Edition, Section B2.3</p> <p>Please include a complete discussion of measures needed and taken for maintenance or enhancement of High Conservation attributes for biodiversity upon the conclusion of the presence of HVC. Please completely assess the potential negative effects by the project on HVC. See CL16, CL17 and FAR 3.</p>	<p>R1 (Jan 2016):</p> <p>Once the identification of High Conservation Values to communities and biodiversity is validated in order to complete the HCV analyses (FAR 3 and Project Description section G1.8 table 7 items 5.12 and 5.16), a complete discussion of measures needed and taken for maintenance or enhancement of HCV will be included, along with a complete assess of potential negative effects by the project on HCV.</p>	

5%

