

# CORDILLERA AZUL NATIONAL PARK REDD+ PROJECT VERIFICATION REPORT



Prepared By: Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc.  
3800 Clermont St. NW  
North Lawrence, Ohio 44666  
330.294.1242

<b>Project Title</b>	Cordillera Azul National Park REDD+ Project
<b>Version</b>	V3
<b>Report ID</b>	21084.00

<b>Report Title</b>	Cordillera Azul National Park REDD+ Project Verification Report
<b>Client</b>	Centro de Conservación, Investigación y Manejo de Áreas Naturales - Cordillera Azul (CIMA)
<b>Pages</b>	151
<b>Date of Issue</b>	14 April 2023
<b>Prepared By</b>	Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc.
<b>Contact</b>	Corporate Office: 2800 Clermont St. NW, North Lawrence, Ohio 44666; Phone: 330-294-1242; www.AsterGlobal.com
<b>Approved By</b>	Janice McMahon (President) and Shawn McMahon (Lead Verifier)
<b>Work Carried Out By</b>	Lead Verifier: Shawn McMahon; Verification Team Members: Caitlin Sellers, Caris Lyons, Take Joo Kim, Mansfield Fisher, Kevin Markham, Richard Scharf, Matthew Perkowski, Matthew Campbell, Sandesh Shrestha; Senior Internal Reviewer: Barbara Toole O'Neil; QA/QC: Janice McMahon

## Summary

Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc., (herein referred to as Aster Global or the Verification Team) was contracted by Centro de Conservación, Investigación y Manejo de Áreas Naturales - Cordillera Azul (CIMA) on 23 April 2021 to conduct the sixth VCS / fifth CCB monitoring period verification (VCS: 08 August 2018 – 31 December 2020; and CCB: 08 August 2018 – 31 December 2020) of Cordillera Azul National Park REDD+ Project Validated Project Description (PD) dated 20 December 2012. The Project falls under the VCS sectoral scope 14: – Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Uses (AFOLU), under the category Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD). Specifically, the project falls under the REDD+ category Avoided Unplanned Deforestation (AUD).

The Cordillera Azul National Park (PNCAZ) REDD+ Project encompasses approximately 1,351,963 hectares in the San Martin, Ucayali, Huánuco, and Loreto Departments in Peru. Through adherence and validation to VCS Methodology VM0007 REDD Methodology Framework and Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards (Second Edition, December 2008), the PNCAZ REDD+ Project's primary objective is "to prevent deforestation in PNCAZ by focusing on three main types of project activities: protecting the park; building local capacity for sustainable land use and improving the quality of life in the buffer communities; and strengthening relationships with local, regional and national government agencies" as stated in the CCB & VCS Project Description Document.

The VCS verification assessed compliance with the VCS Version 4 Program Guide, Standard, the VM0007 Methodology, the validated Project Document, and the likelihood that implementation of the planned GHG project has resulted in the GHG emission removal enhancements as stated by the Project Proponent (ISO 14064-3:2006).

The CCB verification assessed that implementation of the planned GHG project has occurred, resulting in the GHG emission removal enhancements (climate), community, and biodiversity benefits as stated by the Project Proponent (ISO 14064-3:2006). The verification objective is to ensure the validated project design documentation has been implemented in compliance with CCB Standards (Second Edition).

The scope of the verification followed Section 4.3.4 of ISO 14064-3:2006, and methods included assessment of the GHG project implementation; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHGs; and time periods covered. PNCAZ REDD Project follows the framework of project activities listed above.

The criteria followed the verification guidance documents provided by Verra located at <https://verra.org>. Unless otherwise indicated, the assessment was performed against the most recent version of the relevant VCS guidance documentation.

Verification to the VCS Program, and CCB Standards resulted in findings. VCS findings are included in Appendix B, and CCB findings are included in Appendix C. A risk-based approach was used to guide the verification and reach a reasonable level of assurance that no errors, omissions, nor misrepresentations resulting in a material misstatement have occurred. The materiality threshold dictated by the large project size was 1%. All findings were satisfied to a reasonable level of assurance.

After completion of a site inspection and review of all project information, procedures, calculations, and supporting documentation, Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc., confirms the Project is accurate, consistent, and complies with all VCS Version 4 criteria, CCB Second Edition criteria, the selected methodology (VM0007), and the validated Project Design Documentation (PD). Aster Global confirms

Cordillera Azul National Park REDD Project Monitoring Report (Version 3.1, dated 11 July 2022) has been implemented in accordance with VCS Version 4 and CCB Second Edition criteria.

Aster Global confirms all verification activities – including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance, and Project Description implementation adherence to VCS Version 4 (and all associated updates) and CCB Project Design Standards (Second Edition), as documented in this report – are complete. Aster Global concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions The Cordillera Azul National Park REDD Project Monitoring Report (Version 3.1, dated 11 July 2022) meets the requirements of VCS Version 4 (and all associated updates), CCB Project Design Standards (Second Edition), and the validated PD. In addition, Aster Global asserts the project complies with the criteria for projects set out in the Second Edition of the CCB Standards to achieve Gold Level distinction for Biodiversity.

The GHG assertion provided by CIMA and verified by Aster Global has resulted in the baseline emissions or removals of 12,869,129 tCO<sub>2</sub>e equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e) by the project during the verification period/reporting period (VCS and CCB: 08 August 2018 – 31 December 2020). This value is gross of the 10% (1,263,519 t CO<sub>2</sub>e) buffer withholding, based on the non-permanence risk assessment tool, and associated leakage allocation. This results in 11,371,671 t CO<sub>2</sub>e of credits eligible for issuance as VCUs.

## Table of Contents

<b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Objective .....	5
1.2 Scope and Criteria .....	5
1.3 Level of Assurance .....	6
1.4 Summary Description of the Project .....	6
<b>2 Verification Process .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Audit Team Composition (Rules 4.3.1) .....	6
2.2 Method and Criteria .....	7
2.3 Document Review .....	8
2.4 Interviews .....	8
2.5 Site Inspections .....	12
2.6 Resolution of Findings .....	14
2.7 Eligibility for Validation Activities .....	15
<b>3 Validation Findings .....</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs .....	15
3.2 Methodology Deviations .....	15
3.3 Project Description Deviations (Rules 3.5.7 – 3.5.10) .....	16
3.4 Minor Changes to Project Description (Rules 3.5.6) .....	16
3.5 Monitoring Plans (CL3.2, CM3.3, B3.3) .....	16
<b>4 Verification Findings .....</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1 Public Comments (Rules 4.6) .....	16
4.2 Summary of Project Benefits .....	17

4.3General.....	17
4.4 Climate .....	25
4.5Community .....	30
4.6Biodiversity .....	32
4.7Additional Project Implementation Information .....	35
4.8Additional Project Impact Information .....	35
<b>5Verification Conclusion .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Appendix A: Document list .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Appendix B: VCS NCR/CLS/OFI.....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Appendix C: CCB NCRS/CLS/OFI .....</b>	<b>77</b>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Objective

The objective of this verification was to ensure implementation of project activities and project compliance with the VCS Program Guide, VCS Standard, CCB Standards, selected methodology, and the validated Project Description (PD). Aster Global assessed the GHG emission removals for the AFOLU project, specifically REDD+.

### 1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of the verification included the GHG project and baseline scenarios; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHGs; time periods covered; evaluation of the sustainable development; and evaluation of the project's net climate, community, and biodiversity benefits. The geographic verification scope was defined by the project boundary, the carbon reservoir types, management activities, growth and yield models, inventory program, and contract periods. The scope of the project was outlined by the Project Proponent within the Project Description (PD) and is described as follows for the GHG project:

<b>Baseline Scenario</b>	Expanding threats of deforestation
<b>Activities/Technologies/Processes</b>	The Cordillera Azul National Park (PNCAZ) REDD+ Project avoids deforestation in the last large, intact expanse of lower montane forest remaining in Peru. Utilize VM0007 v1.3 – REDD Methodology for Unplanned Frontier Deforestation and CCB 2nd Edition for Climate, Community and Biodiversity benefits.
<b>Sources/Sinks/Reservoirs</b>	<p><u>Carbon Pools:</u>            Aboveground tree biomass (Included)            Aboveground non-tree biomass (Excluded)            Belowground Biomass (Included)            Deadwood (Included)            Harvested Wood Products (Excluded)            Litter (Excluded)            Soil Organic Carbon (Excluded)</p> <p><u>Carbon Sources:</u>            Biomass Burning (Excluded)            Fossil Fuel Combustion (Excluded)            Use of Fertilizers (Excluded)</p>
<b>GHG Type</b>	CO <sub>2</sub>
<b>Time Period (start date, crediting period, verification period)</b>	<p>Project State Date: 08 August 2008            Sixth VCS / Fifth CCB Monitoring Period: 08 August 2018 – 31 December 2020; the monitoring report uses the convention that the project year is the year at the end of the interval, i.e., project year 2019 is 08 August 2018 to 07 August 2019. The 2021 project year is a partial year that starts 08 August 2020 to 31 December 2020.            Crediting Period: 20 years (08 August 2008 – 07 August 2028)</p>
<b>Project Boundary</b>	Approximately 1,351,963 hectares Cordillera Azul National Park in the Departments of San Martin, Ucayali, Huánuco, and Loreto

The criteria followed the verification guidance documents provided by VCS located at <https://verra.org/project/vcs-program/>. These documents include the following:

- VCS Program Guide (v4.2, 22 June 2022)
- VCS Standard (v4.3, 22 June 2022)
- VCS Program Definitions (v4.2, 22 June 2022)
- AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (v4.0, 19 September 2019)
- VM0007 – Methodology for Avoided Ecosystem Conversion, v1.3
- Validated PD and previous monitoring reports (VCS and CCB)
- CCB Program Definitions (v3.0, June 2017)
- CCB Standards (Second Edition, v2.0, December 2008)
- CCB Program Rules (v3.1 June 2017)
- Guidance for the Use of the CCB Standards (May 2014)

### 1.3 Level of Assurance

The level of assurance determines the depth of detail the Verification Team placed in the Verification and Sampling Plan to determine if there are any errors, omissions, or misrepresentations (ISO 14064-3:2006). Aster Global assessed the project's implementation of general principles, data collection and processing, sampling descriptions, documentation, *ex post* calculations, etc., to provide *reasonable* assurance to meet the Project Level requirements of the VCS Program. Based on the verification findings, a final evaluation statement reasonably assures the project's GHG representations are materially accurate. The evidence used to achieve a *reasonable* level of assurance is specified in subsequent sections of this report.

### 1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The project is located within the boundaries of the Cordillera Azul National Park (PNCAZ), which is located within the San Martin, Ucayali, Huánuco, and Loreto Departments in Peru. The project area is approximately 1,351,963 hectares, dominated by an intact lower-montane forest in Peru. The project aims to reduce emissions related to Avoiding Unplanned Deforestation. According to the PD, "The project's primary objective is to prevent deforestation in PNCAZ by focusing on three main types of project activities:

- Protecting the park.
- Building local capacity for sustainable land use and improving the quality of life in the buffer zone communities.
- Strengthening relationships with local, regional, and national government agencies."

## 2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

### 2.1 Audit Team Composition (*Rules 4.3.1*)

For VCS/CCB verifications, Aster Global maintains an experienced internal staff of Lead Verifiers, in addition to Certified Foresters, Registered Professional Foresters, The Wildlife Society Biologists, M.S. and PhD Forest Biometricians, Remote Sensing/GIS Specialists, and VCS-approved AFOLU Experts in IFM, REDD, and WRC categories. Direct employees of Aster Global conducted all desktop verification activities. Aster Global's own Lead Verifiers and Project Specialists (e.g., Trained Forest Biometrician) were onsite conducting the field verification activities,

and subcontractors included on the audit team were employed for translation services (as applicable). Aster Global completed all calculation/modeling review in-house with our team of forest biometricians, GIS/remote sensing specialists, and soil scientist. Aster Global has been involved in over 68 VCS verifications and 36 CCB verifications, including 27 methodology assessments and has completed several verifications for REDD projects in South American countries. Aster Global has a specialist on staff with ten years of CCB experience who oversees project review for CCB components. All Aster Global staff involved in the verification audit have ecological, biodiversity, natural resources, and forestry backgrounds to fulfill these requirements.

## 2.2 Method and Criteria

The verification team assessed the Project's compliance with VCS Version 4.3, CCB Second Edition, and all associated updates, the selected methodology (VM0007, v1.3), and the validated PD dated 20 December 2012. The verification team assessed the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emission removals for the monitoring period/verification period (08 August 2018 – 31 December 2020) through Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land-Use (AFOLU) criteria under the categories Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD). Specifically, the Project falls under the REDD+ category Avoided Unplanned Deforestation (AUD). The verification team assessed whether the Project Proponent adequately addressed project emissions, unplanned reductions in carbon stocks, and any possible leakage outside of the project boundary.

The non-permanence risk analysis was completed for this verification. Further, following Section 2.1.2 of the VCS Validation & Verification Manual, V3.2, the objectives of the verification exercise were to evaluate the monitoring report and assess:

- The extent to which methods and procedures, including monitoring procedures, have been implemented in accordance with the validated project description. This includes ensuring conformance with the monitoring plan (MP).
- The extent to which GHG Emission Reductions or Removals reported in the monitoring report (MR) are materially accurate.

The criteria followed the verification guidance documents provided by VCS and CCB. Unless otherwise indicated, the assessment was performed against the most recent version of the relevant VCS or CCB guidance document. Please also see Section 1.2 of this report.

In the verification process, there is a risk that potential errors, omissions, and misrepresentations will be found; therefore, a risk-based approach was used to guide the collection of appropriate and sufficient evidence to support a *reasonable* level of assurance. A risk-based approach means that the verification team focused on items that might result in a material misstatement of the reported GHG assertion.

A project specific Verification and Sampling Plan (VSP) was developed to guide the verification auditing process to ensure efficiency and effectiveness. The purpose of the VSP was to present a risk assessment for determining the nature and extent of verification procedures necessary to ensure the risk of auditing error was reduced to a reasonable level. The VSP methodology was derived from all items in our verification process stated above. Specifically, the VSP utilized the VCS and CCB guidance documents and ISO 14064-3. Any modifications applied to the VSP were

made based upon the conditions observed for monitoring to detect the processes with highest risk of material discrepancy.

A detailed field plan was developed to guide the verification site visit and is embedded within the VSP. For the field sampling effort, direct measurement, observation, interviews, and review of the monitoring period emission reductions in the key areas were determined to be the greatest risk, followed by ground-truthing and review of project activities. Field sampling and techniques were based on the project parameters/scope and best professional judgment of the verification team to meet a *reasonable* level of assurance as directed by the professional judgment of the Lead Verifier.

Because the biomass inventory was previously validated and has not been updated, inventory plots were not selected for detailed review/re-measurement. An extensive review of all remote sensing data was undertaken of the project area and leakage belt to aid the Verification Team in establishing a reasonable level of assurance regarding confirming the reported areas of ex-post disturbance/deforestation (from the remote sensing analysis) for the quantification of project emissions and leakage emissions. For more detail related to the site visit portion of the verification, please see section 2.5.

### **2.3 Document Review**

A detailed review of all project documentation was conducted as part of the desktop verification component to ensure consistency with, and identify any deviation from, VCS Program requirements, CCB program requirements, the methodology (VM0007), and the validated PD. Initial review focused on the validated PD and MR relative to the field conditions observed and interviews with project management staff. Project details, implementation status, data and parameters, and quantification of GHG emission reductions and removals were thoroughly examined. Key supporting documents were also reviewed. These included monitoring data such as remote sensing data (i.e., satellite and aerial images) and GIS data (i.e., boundary layers and maps), Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), financial analyses, fire-specific monitoring data, biomass and carbon calculation spreadsheets, CCB interview/survey results, documentation provided to support assertions for community and biodiversity monitoring and impacts, and responses to Clarification Requests (CLs).

The VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool was used by the Project Proponent to assess overall project risk. The verification team reviewed the Non-Permanence Risk Report provided with the verification supporting documentation and confirmed that the project adheres to the requirements set out in the risk tool. Each risk factor was thoroughly assessed for conformance. Any identified nonconformance reports (NCR) and/or CL findings related to the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool/Report are in Appendix B. The final risk score was calculated to be 10%.

For a listing of all documents received from the Project Proponents for this verification, please see Appendix A.

### **2.4 Interviews**

Interviews were performed during the verification site visit by Aster Global staff Mansfield Fisher, and Kevin Markham, Audit Team Members, as part of the overall verification process. The interviews were conducted to confirm information provided in the project description, monitoring report, and supporting documents provided by the Project Proponent and to solicit additional

information as needed. Prior to the site visit, Aster Global provided the Project Proponent with a list of requested interviews with targeted project management staff, project employees, community members and other stakeholders. The Project Proponent provided the arrangements for the interviews. On-site interviews and informal discussions were conducted during the site visit (3 December 2021 - 12 December 2021). Interviewees were provided the option of communicating in either Spanish or English based on personal comfort and preference. Interviews were requested with, and held with, individuals representing the following groups of stakeholders:

CIMA Lima-based Staff (3 December 2021- 12 December 2021):

- Gonzalo Varillas Cueto – Executive Director
- Lily Rodriguez Bayona – Director of Institutional Development
- Karina Santos Galindo – PNCAZ Program Director
- Diego Olivera – Information Specialist
- Maríafé Cornejo – REDD Specialist

SERNANP (4 December 2021):

- Gustavo Montoya – Chief of Cordillera Azul National Park

CIMA Tarapoto-based Staff (4 December 2021):

- Alex Reátegui Reátegui – Regional Coordinator
- Newton Saldaña Saldaña – Field Technician
- Roman Mantilla Flores – Field Technician

PVC 15 Mishquiyaquillo Ranger Station (5 December 2021):

- Yovani Julco Huancos – Head Ranger
- Leoncio Manchoy Flores – Community Member and Park Volunteer

Lejía (6 December 2021):

- Marcelo Cuyan Burga – Municipal Agent
- Maximimino Chilcan Carranzo – PRT Committee
- Andres Carranza – Community Member
- Darwin Castillo – Community Member
- Didi Valentin Izquierdo – Community Member

- Rosel Soriano Chilcan – Community Member
- Mateo Rimarachin Flores – Community Member
- Robinson del Castillo Gonzales – CIMA Field Technician

Chambira – Indigenous Community (6 December 2021):

- Jesus Rosas Perez Leon – President of Cacao Association
- Nixon Vasquez Vilchenes – Community Leader
- Nazanio Vasquez Tantaleon – Community Member
- Pascual Peria Contreras – Community Member
- Melvin Arnale Flores – Community Member
- Maura Altamiran Delgado – Community Member

Alto Jorge Chavez (6 December 2021):

- Loronzo Calle Ponejo – Municipal Agent
- Marciel Diaz – Town Treasurer
- Antero Flores Medina – District Rondo Campesino

Nuevo Jaen (7 December 2021):

- Santos Castillo Cordova – Mayor
- Ulises Torillo Rubio – Rondo Campesino
- Wilson Arevalo Guevara – Chief of Rondo Campesino

CIMA Tocache-based Staff (7 December 2021):

- Consuelo Augusto Garrido – Regional Coordinator
- Jose Elias Hilario Yzquierdo – Technical Support

Pólvora Casa de Guardias CG 27 (7 December 2021):

- Josué David Flores Ríos – Park Guard

Cachiyacu – Cacao Cooperative of Nuevo Vision (7 December 2021):

- Miguel Fasales Bocereja – President of Association

- Jose Saguinula Linares – Administrative Technician
- Jary Isuiza Tuamama – Field Technician
- Olger Mejio Salazar – Field Technician

Santa Rosa de Shapaja (8 December 2021):

- Lorenzo Matos Ambrocio – Mayor
- Salomon Huoroneca Antonio – Former Mayor
- Segundo Miginio Gonzales Garcia – President of Rondo Campesino
- Yanet Flores Mendoza – Vice-president of Rondo Campesino
- Edwin Rodolgo Diaz Sanchez – Secretary of Rondo Campesino
- Mendalid Velasque Suyañ – Secretary of Rondo Campesino

Shapaja Casa de Guardias (8 December 2021):

- Salk Cenepo Chashnamote – Park Guard
- Jhon Quinchaya Pizarro – Park Guard

Cahuide (8 December 2021):

- Pedro Jimenes Lopez – Municipal Agent
- Demetio Sanchez Rojas – Former Municipal Agent
- Alfredo Arias Pareja – President of Rondo Campesino
- Arcenio Gonzales Coello – President JASS

Cahuide (9 December 2021):

- Rosa Graciela Huansi Morale – President, Vaso de Leche Women's Group
- Judith Milna Rodriguez Carillo – Community Member, Infirmary Technician

CIMA Tocache-based Staff (9 December 2021):

- Elvis Arevalo Espinoza – Technical Support

CIMA – Aspuzana Cacao Plant (10 December 2021):

- Daniel Ordeñez Huayami – Plant Manager
- Miguel Vasquez Salazar – Technical and Storage Manager
- Edwins Bans Sanchez Ramos – Field Technician
- Luis Maguiña Hinostriza – Field Technician
- Danilo Arezalo Espinoza – Field Technician

Maronilla and Alto Marona (10 December 2021):

- Vicente Vega Fustus – Farmer
- Carito Camacho Fasanando - Farmer
- 2 other farmers in Aspuzana Valley

CIMA – Aguaytia-based Staff (11 December 2021):

- Juan Batiston Flores Fabian – Coordinator
- Mariel Hildebrandt Vera – Field Technician

Yamino – Indigenous Community (11 December 2021):

- Claudio Perez Odicio – Community Chief
- Linder Perez Odicio – Municipal Agent
- Celis Tangoa Inocente – Lieutenant Governer
- Cesar Lopez Janchiva – Tourist Association, Monitor
- Mariela Perez Odicio – President, Artisan Association
- Diana Odicio Angulo – Artisan Association
- Marcelo Odicio Angulo – Vice President, FENACOCA

## 2.5 Site Inspections

The verification site inspection (field visit) occurred from 03 – 12 December 2021. The verification field activities closely followed Aster Global’s Verification and Sampling Plan methodology. Sample size and techniques were based on the project parameters, scope, and best professional judgment of the Lead Verifier. The verification team performed on-site reviews for representative community-based project activities identified as implemented or ongoing during the monitoring period and performed reviews of on-site documentation for project-related monitoring activities conducted by CIMA and SERNANP staff. Project activity locations or activities visited included the following:

03 December 2021: visit to Lima office of CIMA, site visit opening meeting, on-site review of documentation for project, CIMA organization and operation, and project activities; interviews conducted with CIMA staff

04 December 2021: visit to Tarapoto SERNANP and CIMA office, on-site review of documentation for Park/SERNANP and local CIMA office organizations, operations, and project activities; review Ranger monitoring reports; interviews conducted with Park technical specialists, CIMA's regional coordinator, and Park Chief

05 December 2021: visit to PVC 15 Mishquiyaquillo Ranger Station, on-site review of ranger records, biodiversity monitoring records, and documentation for processes; confirmation of remote sensing elements, visited community forest, checked boundaries, confirmed boundary signage, interviews with Park rangers, community leaders, and Park assistants

06 December 2021: visit to Shamboyacu area to meet with community members from Lejía, Chambira, and Alto Jorge Chavez, which were selected as representative of communities identified as active during monitoring period in field training for restoration activities or silvo-pastoral practices, economic capital activities supported by the project, Blue Agreements, or community initiatives under quality of life plans; Chambira also selected as representative indigenous community in western portion of project zone; interviews conducted with community members and leaders, CIMA staff, and CACAO Association

07 December 2021: visits to Nuevo Jaen, Pólvara Casa de Guardias (CG 27), and Cachiyacu – Cacao Cooperative (Nuevo Vision), interviews conducted with CIMA Tocache office and technical staff, Park rangers, community members and leaders; team attempted to field-review selected Accuracy Assessment points, but effort was terminated due to unsafe river conditions

08 December 2021: visit to Santa Rosa de Shapaja, interviews with community members and leaders, visited restoration site; visit to Casa de Guardias 57, on-site review of ranger records, interviews conducted with Park rangers; visit to Cahuide, interviews conducted with community members and leaders

09 December 2021: visit to Tocache CIMA/SERNANP office, on-site review of project technical assistance documentation, interviews conducted with CIMA staff; return visit to Cahuide for additional community interviews including Vaso de Leche women's group, and to observe signing ceremony for the Acuerdo Azul (Conservation Agreement)

10 December 2021: visit to Aspuzana Valley area including Tocache – Apuzana Cacao Plant in Maronilla to tour facility, review on-site records and documentation related to facility operations, restoration projects, and technical assistance provided by CIMA staff to regional farmers, conduct interviews with project staff; visit to nearby farm to observe results of technical assistance provided by CIMA including test plots, interviews with farmer and wife; Maronilla and Alto Marona farm visits to interview farmers participating in pilot technical assistance Cacao project

11 December 2021: visit to Yamino indigenous community, on-site review of projects implemented based on community-identified priorities established in project-supported quality of life plan; interviews conducted with community members and leaders, including representatives from Tourism Association, Artisan Association, Community Vigilance Association; visit to Aguaytía CIMA

office, on-site review of project activity documentation, interviews conducted with CIMA technical staff

12 December 2021: site visit closing meeting

## 2.6 Resolution of Findings

During the verification process, there was a risk that potential errors, omissions, and misrepresentations would be found. The actions taken when errors, omissions, and misrepresentations were found included: notifying the client of the issue(s) identified and expanding our review to the extent that satisfied the Lead Verifier's professional judgment.

The process of resolution of findings involved three formal rounds of assessment by the verification team. Findings were resolved during the verification by the Project Proponent implementing corrective actions, such as amending the MR and calculations, as well as providing written responses. This resulted in project documentation that was in conformance with the requirements of the VCS Standard and CCB Second Edition for GHG projects.

Findings were characterized in the following manner:

**Non-Conformity Reports (NCRs)** were issued as a response to material discrepancies in a part of the project and generally fell into one category:

- Non-conformity to a VCS or CCB guiding document listed in Sections 1.2 and 2.2 above
- Consistency among project documentation or calculations was lacking
- Mathematical formulae were incorrect
- Additional information was required by the verification team to confirm reasonable assurance for compliance

**Clarifications (CL)** were issued when language within a project document needed additional clarification to avoid ambiguity.

**Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)** were issued to the Project Proponent when an opportunity for improvement was identified.

During the verification, twenty-one (21) VCS findings and twenty-two (22) CCB findings were identified, for a total of forty-three (43) findings. Detailed summaries of each VCS finding, including the issue raised, responses, and final conclusions, are provided in Appendix B VCS NCRS/CLS/OFI summary. Please also see APPENDIX C: CCB NCRS/CLS/OFI summary for all findings raised during the CCB review. All NCRs/CLs were satisfactorily addressed and closed.

### 2.6.1 Forward Action Requests

Aster Global is submitting two (2) Forward Action Requests for the next verification. These are described below.

1. During the verification, one finding noted a potential land dispute observed during the site visit between the Chambira community and the project. After review, the verification team was reasonably assured the land dispute occurred due to a mapping misinterpretation by

the community and did not result in any non-conformance by the project. However, the verification team is herein issuing a Forward Action Request (FAR) for the next VVB to ensure the project provides an update on this misinterpretation of boundaries to further ensure VCS Standard and CCB requirements are being achieved.

2. Because the project is now more than halfway through the crediting period, which ends in August 2028, the verification team is issuing a FAR for the next VVB regarding the status of the proposed Endowment. The FAR was to ensure the status of the proposed endowment is reviewed and that the project provides the necessary status updates. Specifically, two items should be assessed: 1) to determine whether the endowment has been created; and 2) to assess whether reasonable measures have been taken to fund the endowment in accordance with the objective identified for this measure as presented in PD Section 1.6.

## **2.7 Eligibility for Validation Activities**

Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc., holds the required accreditation for the sectoral scope. Thus, this section is not applicable.

## **3 VALIDATION FINDINGS**

### **3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs**

The verification team found no evidence that the project has sought or is currently seeking other forms of environmental credits from its activities. The verification team is reasonably assured the project has not been registered, and is not seeking registration, under any other GHG programs. The Cordillera Azul National Park REDD+ Project currently only seeks carbon credits under the VCS program. This was confirmed through a risk-based internet review and interview with Project Proponents. Therefore, the verification team deems the project eligible to participate under the VCS Program.

### **3.2 Methodology Deviations**

A single methodology deviation is described in the MR which started during the 2008-2012 monitoring period and has been applied ever since. The project has transparently reported a change in the classification technique for the remote sensing-based monitoring. This change was necessitated due to the suspension of Landsat 5 image collection which occurred in 2011. As a result, the project is now using Landsat 8 images and will continue to do so. This change has been previously approved by Verra and previous VVBs and previously reported by the project in the 2008-2012 Project Implementation Report (PIR).

The MR states “While it was not a deviation from the methodology, adjustments were made to the monitoring plan. So, in accordance with the PIR 2008-2012 (section 2.2) a new classification technique used to overcome sensor errors had been done. This procedure was already justified and explained in the PIR 2008-2012, section 5 (Appendix 1).”

This deviation does is related to monitoring or measurement, does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals and has appropriately been reported in the MR.

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

No deviations to the PD were applied during this monitoring period.

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

Rule 3.5.6 allows minor changes to the validated PD at verification. During this verification period, one minor change to the PD was identified. This regarded not conducting the Mapping of Uses and Strengths (MUF) surveys for this monitoring period in full accordance with methods, frequency, or reporting requirements identified within the validated community monitoring plan. The verification team acknowledges the extenuating circumstances faced by the Project Proponent due to Covid-19 restrictions that were in place limiting in-country travel and meetings during a portion of the monitoring period. The verification team reviewed supporting documents, conducted site visit observations of monitoring data collected or compiled by park guards and CIMA technical staff, and reviewed supplemental information provided by the Project Proponent. The verification team determined that community monitoring was able to be reasonably accomplished by project staff through the second method included in the validated community monitoring plan, which included quarterly and annual reports issued from field activities, and interviews by project staff while providing technical assistance to communities. The verification team determined the table summarizing the data collection methods for the current monitoring period provided in Section 2.2.3 of the MR reasonably identifies how community monitoring was able to be accomplished during the monitoring period in general accordance with the intent of the community monitoring plan. The verification team determined that the Project Proponent's commitment to resume conducting the MUF for the next monitoring period demonstrates the change in monitoring method and frequency for this monitoring period was a temporary change from the validated monitoring plan.

The verification team reviewed the community monitoring minor PD change and determined that the changes from the community and biodiversity monitoring plan do not meet any of the situations listed in Rule 3.5.7 requiring a new validation or the validation of a PD deviation. The change from the validated monitoring plan would be considered minor and has been addressed in the explanation provided in Section 2.2.3 of the MR.

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

All Monitoring Plans have been previously validated against the CCB Standards during the initial validation activities. This section is not applicable for this verification.

## **4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS**

### **4.1 Public Comments (*Rules 4.6*)**

The public comment period was held from 13 October 2021 to 12 November 2021. There were no comments received or posted on the Verra webpage for this public comment period.

## 4.2 Summary of Project Benefits

Please see Section 1.4 of this report for a summary description of the Cordillera Azul National Park REDD project. Section 1.1 and 1.2 of the MR describes the unique project benefits and standardized metrics.

The project aims to reduce emissions related to Avoided Unplanned Deforestation through the protection and conservation of the Cordillera Azul National Park. Section 1 of the MR describes unique project benefits including climate, community and biodiversity, and standardized benefit metrics, including achievements specific to metrics. The unique project benefits of this project are to conserve and protect the Cordillera Azul National Park, develop and maintain the park and buffer zone as a place of global importance for research, improve the quality of life of communities in the buffer zone as established in the park's Master Plan through the development of conservation initiatives on community owned land, and protect indigenous people who live in isolation within the park and buffer zone. Specific Standardized Benefit Metrics include the maintenance of forest cover in the park, provide training opportunities to community members within the buffer zone with specific emphasis on opportunities for women, increase employment opportunities with specific emphasis on opportunities for women, improve the well-being of community members through the development and implementation of Quality of Life Plans (QLP), and continued protection of biodiversity within the project area. The verification team confirmed the achievements during this monitoring period through on-site interviews with project participants, project implementation staff, and a thorough review of supporting documents and evidence.

## 4.3 General

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

A comparison of the implementation schedules in the MR and PD shows the project has met key milestones identified in the PD for the period from the Project start date through the monitoring period and has identified additional key dates and milestones for the monitoring periods, including continued operations. The verification team reviewed the PD and MR and determined there are no discrepancies between the project implementation and project description. The verification team determined the monitoring plan was implemented completely and appropriately.

The verification team requested to visit examples of activities during the site visit and subsequently confirmed the implementation of items related to climate, community, and biodiversity. During the field visit the audit team conducted interviews with participating communities, staff responsible for the implementation of project activities, and management staff responsible for overseeing this implementation to substantiate the implementation status of the project. Furthermore, during the desktop review the verification team reviewed supporting documentation and evidence.

The GHG emission reductions generated by the project have not been included in an emissions trading program other than the VCS program and it has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit as confirmed through a risk-based review by the verification team (see Section 3.1). Section 2.1.10 of the MR states the project is contributing to sustainable development in Peru has the project has been recognized as an early initiative under the regulation of the Law of Remuneration Mechanisms for Ecosystem Services which promotes and regulates the

establishment of voluntary agreements to reward efforts to maintain and enhance ecosystem services within Peru.

The project start date is 08 August 2008. The project lifetime is from 08 August 2008 – 07 August 2028. The current monitoring period is from 08 August 2018 – 31 December 2020.

Section 1.8.1 of the validated PD contains an implementation schedule with milestones through 2018. Section 2.2.1 of the MR contains an implementation schedule with milestones through 2020. Milestones during the monitoring period include a Communal Conservation Agreements signed between CIMA and the local native communities, communities continued to develop and implement their Communal Strategic Planning, The Cordillera Azul National Park was included in the IUCN's Green List, and the selling of VCUs generated by the project.

The verification team did not identify material discrepancies for the project lifetime and accounting period presented in the PD and MR. Although dates for some anticipated events appear to have shifted in the implementation schedule from what was presented in the PD and some events such as generation of monitoring reports were not presented in the MR, the verification team determined that most would not present material discrepancies. An opportunity for improvement was noted to include the monitoring event and report generation events in the MR as indicated by the PD.

#### **4.3.2 Risks to the Project (G3.5)**

The verification team reviewed natural and human-induced risks to the expected project benefits outlined in section 1.13.4 of the validated PD and section 2.2.5 of the MR. Risks identified in the PD include concessions in the buffer zone, lack of land tenure in the buffer zone, illegal activities in the buffer zone, and increased tensions between communities CIMA is working with and those that will be worked with in the future. The MR includes an additional risk of climate change. Mitigation strategies for each risk are described in the MR along with examples of mitigation that occurred during the monitoring period.

The natural and human-induced risks identified in the MR are consistent with the risks identified by the PD, with the MR including risk due to climate change as well. The verification team reviewed the mitigation strategies identified for each and concluded the reasonable steps have been taken to mitigate the identified risks. Site visit observations and interviews with CIMA staff, Park guards, and community members substantiate the risk mitigation strategies outlined in the MR have been undertaken or are being undertaken. Two Opportunities for Improvement were issued to provide the correct documents and references that are cited in the MR.

#### **4.3.3 Enhancement of High Conservation Values (G3.6)**

The verification team reviewed actions identified in the MR as having been implemented to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the HCV attributes for comparison to the PD. To verify whether reasonable steps were taken to mitigate identified risks, the verifiers assessed identified risks through review of project and supplemental documentation, through site interviews with project technical staff, park staff, and community members, through site observations, and through review and assessment of additional clarification provided by the Project Proponent. The verification team concludes that project activities are expected to result in the long-term protection of Cordillera Azul National Park and that protection activities inside the park as well as land-use stabilization efforts

in the buffer zone are expected to maintain the abundance and diversity of the biota inside the park. Park guard patrol routes are used for both control and data collection and monitoring. The verification team determined the Project Proponent has implemented appropriate actions to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of HCVs consistent with the precautionary principle.

#### **4.3.4 Benefit Permanence (G3.7)**

The verification team reviewed the MR to assess whether plans have been or are being implemented to maintain and enhance CCB benefits beyond the project lifetime in accordance with measures identified in the validated PD. The verification team substantiated through site visit interviews and observations that project support of community-developed quality of life plans and technical support and training, measures that support benefit permanence, occurred during this verification period.

The verification team determined through interviews with project management staff that the creation of an endowment, identified as a key element of benefit permanence, had not yet taken place but was in the planning stages for implementation. The commitment for establishing this endowment measure was substantiated during site visit interviews with CIMA as a continued commitment for the project, and this commitment was further substantiated through identification in financial audit documents provided to the verification team identifying this measure as the second priority after Park operations and other project obligations are met, through identification in the Non-permanence Risk Report as an agreement between CIMA and the government, and through the commitment to initiate this trust fund as identified in Section III of the document “Resumen Informe sobre los Créditos de Carbono del Parque Nacional Cordillera Azul Generados y Negociados por CIMA (al 31 de Diciembre de 2021)” provided to the verification team. Because the project is now more than halfway through the crediting period, which ends in August 2028, the verification team identified review of the status of the endowment creation as a Forward Action Request (FAR) for the verification team conducting the next verification period, as detailed in Section 2.6.1 of this verification report.

The verification team reviewed supplemental materials provided by the Project Proponent that substantiated the ongoing training and capacity building and community support provided by the project. The verification team determined that facilitation in helping communities develop and implement quality of life plans and technical support provided during this verification period, along with documentation for planning for creating the endowment fund, demonstrate the Project Proponent is making progress on implementing measures to enhance project benefits beyond the project lifetime in accordance with the validated PD.

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

The verification team reviewed the PD to compare engagement plans against actions identified in the MR as taken for stakeholder engagement. The verification team interviewed Project Proponent representatives, community leaders, and community members to substantiate communication between the Project Proponent and stakeholders has occurred in accordance with the communication and consultation plan.

Site visit interviews generally substantiated the regular visits of CIMA’s field staff to communities provide an opportunity to present information and receive comments. Site visit interviews with

project staff and community members substantiated Covid-related travel and meeting restrictions presented extenuating circumstances that accounted for lapses in holding in-person meetings for a portion of this monitoring period. The interviews, along with review of supporting documentation, substantiated that other than during the Covid-related restrictions, the Project Proponent held regular meetings with a variety of community stakeholders, and the occurrence of these meetings and associated opportunities for project input are widely known throughout the communities.

Site visit interviews substantiate the close relationship with SERNANP and involvement of SERNANP in project design and implementation. Site visit interviews substantiate regular visits occurred by CIMA staff to the communities within the project zone during the reporting period up until pandemic-related restrictions prevented such interactions. Site visit interviews substantiate regular visits to communities resumed following easing of pandemic-related restrictions. Site visit interviews substantiate each community takes responsibility for how it participates in project-related activities and that CIMA's role is as facilitator and for support.

The 30-day comment period for the monitoring report was confirmed as publicized on the Verra webpage for the project. Site visit interviews substantiate information on the monitoring plan and public comment period was provided by CIMA to local community leaders and other stakeholders through letters and during direct presentations. Site visit interviews within the indigenous communities (Chambira and Yamino) visited by the verification team substantiate communication by CIMA in Spanish is acceptable based on the fluency in Spanish among the leaders and the majority of community members in these indigenous communities and based on confirmation of acceptability by leaders within these communities.

Some community members interviewed were not familiar with the availability of project summaries and the opportunity or process for providing comments. The verification team determined this to likely reflect communication by community leaders within the local community in the instances noted and noted that pandemic-related group gathering restrictions may have played some role. A copy of the notification sent to one local community leader was photographed by the verification team for documentation that project summaries and notification of the comment period were provided to local communities, and the Project Proponent provided supplementation documentation to substantiate monitoring summaries were provided to community leaders and also that community leaders were notified of the verification team's site visit.

Based on site visit interviews and review of supplemental documentation provided by the Project Proponent and observed during the site visit, the verification team concludes that although neither the 30-day comment period nor monitoring report or summaries for this monitoring period appear to have been posted on the CIMA website in accordance with the action identified in PD Section 7.1.3, the Project Proponent met the overall intent of public notification through appropriate postings on the Verra website, and through direct mailings to community leaders and community meetings within the project zone that provided the summary of monitoring results as well as links and contact information for accessing the Verra website and for providing comments.

Based on review of project documentation, additional clarification and supplemental documentation provided by the Project Proponent, as well as site visit interviews and observations, the verification team determined that the project carried out effective stakeholder engagement during this verification period.

#### **4.3.6 Stakeholder Grievance Redress Procedure (G3.10)**

The verification team reviewed the grievance redress procedure identified in the PD and assessed the implementation of the procedures in practice as part of site visit interviews. Site visit interviews substantiate the generally wide-spread understanding of community members regarding the opportunity to bring potential concerns or grievances to CIMA representatives or park guards but did not substantiate a general understanding of a more formal grievance process. Site observations noted information available at guard stations and in some communities visited. Additional information provided by the Project Proponent substantiates that in accordance with the process for handling unresolved conflicts and grievances outlined in the PD conflicts and potential conflicts not able to be resolved by park guards or staff at the local level are elevated to CIMA's field offices or Headquarters.

The verification team substantiated through site visit interviews with park guards, project technical staff, and project management staff that minor concerns or questions have been able to be handled at the local level or field office level through less formal means in consistency with the grievance redress procedure presented in the validated PD. No serious or unresolved grievances were reported as elevated to CIMA's Headquarters during the monitoring period.

One new potential grievance was brought to the attention of the verification team during the site visit, concerning potential overlapping claims between the indigenous community of Chambira and the park boundary field-surveyed and demarcated for the PNCAZ. This concern was brought to the attention of CIMA staff who elevated the concern to CIMA's Headquarters. The verification team was able to substantiate through follow-up discussion with CIMA and through supplemental information provided and added to the MR that the Project Proponent demonstrated adherence to the project's grievance redress procedure to begin addressing this newly raised concern. The verification team issued a FAR for the next verification period to assess the status of the concern voiced during the present verification site visit to the Chambira native community, and to verify this potential boundary conflict has been resolved, or is in the process of being resolved, in accordance with the project's grievance redress procedure.

Based on review of project documents, supplemental information provided, site visit interviews and observations, the verification team concludes that the project grievance redress procedure has been implemented according to the project's validated design.

#### **4.3.7 Worker Relations (G4.3 – G4.6)**

The verification team reviewed information presented in the MR and conducted site interviews with representative staff involved in various project activities. All employees interviewed stated that they had received training and considered it adequate. A document (Rodriguez et al. 2018) referenced in MR Section 2.4.2 and provided to the verification team provides a more detailed description for how local capacity has been built within the communities. Site visit observations and interviews substantiated the longevity of many of the field technical staff and continued involvement in project activities by past local leaders as well as the current local leaders. The verification team is reasonably assured that the substantiated capacity built during this verification period will not be lost.

Site visit observations and interviews substantiate the advertising of open job positions and recruitment efforts from within the local communities of the project zone. Employees and community leaders interviewed by the verification team were consistent in expressing belief that the hiring process was open and fair. Table 2.1 of the MR identifies the number of CIMA employees and park guards who are women. Site visit observations and interviews substantiate the hiring of women into project roles, including management positions.

The verification team substantiated during site visit interviews and observations that workers are informed of their rights at hiring and through availability of relevant documents and notifications. The support documents supplied by the Project Proponent for verification team review also provide descriptions for the processes by which compliance with the referenced labor laws are achieved and documented. These documents also identify who is responsible for ensuring compliance. The MR identifies an HR staff member added in 2021, who the verification team confirmed during interviews is now responsible for monitoring and ensuring compliance.

The verification team substantiated copies of CIMA's Safety and Health Management System at Work were available in the CIMA offices visited. Interviews substantiated that CIMA employees and SERNANP park guards for the project were informed of potential risks and how to minimize these risks as part of the employment process. Site observations substantiated park guards were provided with relevant and appropriate safety materials, including antivenom kits that were required to be carried with them while on patrols. Through review of project and supplemental documentation, substantiated by site visit interviews and observations, the verification team determined the project appropriately identified and minimized workplace risks, and the employees were well informed of the risks associated with employment by the project.

Through review of project and supplemental documentation, substantiated by site visit interviews and observations, the verification team determined the relationship between workers and the project upholds the intent and design presented in the validated PD.

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

The verification team reviewed the technical qualifications for the project staff outlined in section 2.4.1 of the MR as well as interviewed representative technical staff involved in project management or project activities. Information presented in the MR and provided to the verification team through supplemental materials substantiates the present project management team has demonstrated their expertise and ability to implement and manage this project over an extended period, and appropriate provisions exist to ensure the key technical and management skills are in place to continue to manage the project successfully over the project lifetime. The verification team reviewed supplemental materials and conducted interviews with community leaders and members that substantiated the Project Proponent is taking appropriate steps to assist community groups to improve key technical, managerial, and governance skills that should help ensure continued local community involvement in project implementation over the project lifetime.

The Project Proponent provided the verification team with financial documents substantiating the financial health of the Project Proponent and the other project partners involved in project implementation. Audits provided to the verification team for review were completed by Baker Tilly International which attested the audits they completed were conducted in accordance with

International Auditing Standards approved for application in Peru, by the Board of Deans of Colleges of Public Accountants of Peru. Those standards require that the financial auditor comply with ethical requirements and plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement. Review of the other supporting financial documents substantiates the financial health of CIMA based on recent and anticipated sales of carbon credits from the project and show that financial resources budgeted will be adequate to continue implementing the project. Review of financial documents, along with site visit interviews with the Project Proponent and SERNANP, provided reasonable assurance that the flow of REDD+ funds would be adequate in supporting implementation of project activities.

Based on substantiation of information presented in the MR and through review of supplemental documentation and through site visit interviews with staff employed in project activities, the verification team concludes the Project Proponent has the capacity to continue implementing the project in accordance with the validated PD.

#### **4.3.9 Legal Status (G5.1)**

The verification team reviewed information presented in the MR in comparison to information presented in the PD regarding assurances that the project is complying with all national and local laws and regulations relevant to project activities and where relevant how compliance is achieved. Section 2.5.1 of the MR lists relevant regulations and laws that have changed from the validated PD, none of which occurred during the monitoring period under verification, and restates that CIMA is committed to meeting or exceeding any regulation, standard, treaty, or international agreement that may cover its activities. Site visit observations and interviews substantiate the close relationship and communication with SERNANP, the government agency responsible for administration of national parks. No compliance concerns were identified during interviews with SERNANP staff. Review of supporting documentation provided by the Project Proponent and reviewed during the site visit demonstrating how the project is in compliance with identified laws, substantiated by site visit interviews, provided the verification team reasonable assurance that the project is in compliance with all local or national laws and regulations.

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

The verification team reviewed the information on rights protection and FPIC procedures for the project presented in the MR against the information provided in the validated PD. FPIC considerations were included by the verification team during site visit interviews with community members, including indigenous communities, as well as during interviews with project technical staff and park guards. The validated PD identifies the project area as constituting government lands included in the PNCAZ and that government approvals were received for the project. Site visit interviews with park guards and community members during the verification team site visit substantiated that subsistence hunting and fishing rights and harvesting of non-timber resources are recognized and allowed within specific zones of the project area.

Interviews with project staff, SERNANP, and community leaders and members, including from two representative indigenous communities, substantiate FPIC was obtained for project activities at project initiation in accordance with information presented in the PD and stated in the MR. Review of project documents and supporting documentation provided to the verification team, as well as

results of site visit interviews enables the verification team to conclude for the period under verification that existing property rights had been recognized, respected, and supported and further that the project had not encroached uninvited on private, community, or government property.

A potential boundary conflict was identified by the Chambira native community during the verification team site visit as described in verification report Section 4.3.6. The Project Proponent provided additional supporting documentation to demonstrate the Project Proponent has initiated efforts since the verification team site visit to meet with the Chambira native community to work towards resolution of this concern in conformance with requirements for ensuring FPIC. Based on discussions with CIMA and SERNANP, review of the descriptions added to the MR regarding events leading up to the potential boundary dispute, and interviews with leaders and members of the Chambira native community during the site visit, the verification team has concluded the project appropriately obtained FPIC at the onset of the project and that the current potential boundary dispute is based on results from titling of community territory undertaken in 2018. Because this disputed boundary concern had not been formally elevated to a grievance or conflict with the project during the monitoring period under verification, and because this disputed boundary concern had apparently only recently been brought to the attention of the Project Proponent, and because the Project Proponent has provided documentation that the Project Proponent has initiated efforts since the verification team site visit to meet with the Chambira native community to resolve this boundary concern, the verification team has determined that during the time period under verification the project was still operating under the FPIC initially obtained from the community. The verification team is issuing a FAR for the next verification period to assess the status of the concern voiced during the present verification site visit to the Chambira native community, and to verify this potential boundary conflict has been resolved, or is in the process of being resolved, in accordance with the project's grievance redress procedure to ensure that the project continues to comply with FPIC requirements.

The verification team confirmed through review of project documents, support documents, and site visit interviews with leaders of the Kakataibo indigenous community at Yamino and project technical staff that an area has been set aside that permits no entry or use by anyone as a safeguard to protect an area believed to be inhabited by a previously uncontacted group of Kakataibo.

Based on site visit interviews and review of project documents and support documents, including documentation related to the Project Proponent's actions to resolve the potential Chambira boundary concern, the verification team has reached an overall conclusion that the project has protected the rights of indigenous peoples, communities, and other stakeholders in accordance to the CCB Standards and validated PD.

#### **4.3.11 Identification of Illegal Activities (G5.5)**

The verification team reviewed the PD for actions identified as needed in order to compare to actions in the MR identified as implemented by the Project Proponent to reduce illegal activities that could affect the project's impacts. The verification team interviewed park rangers, project technical staff, and community members to substantiate actions taken to identify and respond to cases of illegal activities identified within the project area and project zone. The verification team reviewed original copies of ranger incident reports, monitoring logs, and patrol logs available at representative guard stations.

The verification team substantiated through review of on-site documentation and interviews with park guards, project technical staff, and community members that reasonable measures are undertaken to reduce illegal activities in accordance with the goals of the PD.

## 4.4 Climate

### 4.4.1 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

Aster Global conducted an intensive review of all input data, parameters, formulae, calculations, conversions, statistics, and resulting uncertainties and output data to ensure consistency with the VCS Standard, the validated PD, and VM0007. Data with associated factors, formulae, and calculations were provided by the Project Proponent in spreadsheet format to ensure all formulae were accessible for review. The verification team recalculated the analyses to confirm correctness and assess potential data transposition errors. The Project Proponent also provided answers to questions on calculations to ensure the verification team understood and could confirm its consistency with VM0007 and the validated PD.

An overview of the data and parameters monitored, along with verification team findings, are included in the table below. This is not an exhaustive list of all monitored parameters that are available for verification, but parameters/data checked as part of the comprehensive desktop review:

Data Unit / Parameter	Accuracy of GHG emission reductions and removals	Whether methods and formulae set out in the PD have been followed	Appropriateness of default values
$\Delta C_{BSL,PA,unplanned}$	The verification team confirmed that the validated parameter value was applied during this monitoring period and that the baseline period has been granted an extension from Verra. The validated value of this parameter for the monitoring period is approximately 11,695,428 tCO <sub>2</sub> e.	This parameter was derived from the validated baseline as described in the PDD.	Not applicable.
$\Delta C_{P,Def,i,t}$	The verification team confirmed that this parameter was appropriately calculated in-line with the VM0007 methodology and procedures described in the PDD. The calculated value of this parameter for the monitoring period is approximately 31,625 tCO <sub>2</sub> e.	The parameter was reviewed and re-calculated using methods set forth in the methodology and the PD and confirmed.	Not applicable.
$\Delta C_{P,LB}$	The verification team confirmed that this parameter was appropriately calculated in-line with the VM0007 methodology and procedures described in the PDD. The calculated value of this parameter for the monitoring period is 0 tCO <sub>2</sub> e.	The parameter was reviewed and re-calculated using methods set forth in the methodology and the PD and confirmed.	Not applicable.

$\Delta C_{P,DistPA,i,t}$	The verification team confirmed that this parameter was appropriately calculated in-line with the VM0007 methodology and procedures described in the PDD. The calculated value of this parameter for the monitoring period is approximately 202,313 tCO <sub>2e</sub> .	The parameter was reviewed and re-calculated using methods set forth in the methodology and the PD and confirmed.	Not applicable.
$A_{DefPA,u,i,t}$	The verification team confirmed that this parameter was appropriately calculated in-line with the VM0007 methodology and procedures described in the PDD. The calculated value of this parameter for the monitoring period is approximately 58 hectares.	The parameter was reviewed and re-calculated using methods set forth in the methodology and the PD and confirmed.	Not applicable.
$A_{DefLB,u,i,t}$	The verification team confirmed that this parameter was appropriately calculated in-line with the VM0007 methodology and procedures described in the PDD. The calculated value of this parameter for the monitoring period is approximately 47,785 hectares.	The parameter was reviewed and re-calculated using methods set forth in the methodology and the PD and confirmed.	Not applicable.

For this monitoring period, the project relied on the network of forest inventory plots and resulting analysis that were confirmed at validation and as allowed by VCS Standard v4.3. Although the project has surpassed the 10-year period for which the baseline is valid and must be reassessed, the project requested an exemption to this rule and was subsequently granted this exemption by Verra. To monitor deforestation in the project area and leakage belt the project conducted a remote sensing analysis as described in Section 3.1.3 of the Monitoring Report. The verification team acquired multispectral satellite imagery to review for disturbance or deforestation, in addition to ground truthing efforts from the site visit. Sentinel 2 sensor data was downloaded for the beginning and end of the reporting period to monitor the project area and detect any land cover changes.

The verification team observed analysis methods during a calculation walkthrough meeting with the Project Proponent where the features of VM0007 were discussed. It was confirmed that the project's on-going analysis methods for monitoring conform with the methodology. The verification team reviewed the monitoring period quantification results independently and confirmed that data sources are suitable and in compliance with VM0007 requirements.

Uncertainty calculations were reviewed in detail as prescribed by the methodology and confirmed. As the  $C_{REDD\_ERROR}$  was less than 15%, no uncertainty deduction was required.

The methods and formulae set out in the PD for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions, and leakage were confirmed. The total end of the monitoring period carbon stocks in all project activities for all relevant pools resulting from carbon stock changes were correctly quantified. Where

ranges of parameters exist, or other types of formulaic uncertainty, appropriately conservative values were used in data analysis.

In conclusion, the quantification methods for GHG emission reductions and removals have been performed correctly and in accordance with the validated PD and VM0007.

#### 4.4.2 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

During this verification assessment, the evidence provided by the Project Proponent was sufficient in both quantity and quality to support the determination of GHG emission removals reported by the project. Throughout the verification, the Project Proponent demonstrated a commitment toward conservativeness and took all appropriate measures to ensure the reliability of evidence provided.

The threshold for materiality with respect to the aggregate of errors, omissions, and misrepresentations relative to the total reported GHG emission reductions and/or removals was met for this project as defined in the Verification Sampling Plan. Materiality is a concept that errors, omissions, and misrepresentations could affect the GHG reduction assertion and influence the intended users (ISO 14064-3:2006). As defined by VCS Standard the materiality is 1% for this large project.

The evidence provided to determine emission reductions reported in the MR included values, notations, units, and sources. This evidence has been cross-checked with supplied emission reduction calculation spreadsheets. The procedure for data recording, transfer and final storage was also verified and found to be in compliance with the monitoring plan outlined in the PD.

The Verification team confirmed through cross checks that adequate monitoring mechanisms are in place where the required parameters need to be monitored. The verification team was provided access to the project's series of monitoring worksheets and inventory data, where monitoring data is compiled for quantification and reporting. These tools ensure accurate information flow for monitoring efforts. Section 3.1.3.4 of the MR provides additional detail on project data management methods and structure.

#### 4.4.3 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

The Cordillera Azul National Park (PNCAZ) REDD+ Project MR utilized the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, to assess risk. The verification team reviewed the Non-Permanence Risk Report following VCS AFOLU Requirements and confirmed that the project adheres to the requirements. At all levels, the verification team evaluated the rationale, appropriateness, and justifications of risk ratings chosen by the Project Proponent. Each risk factor was thoroughly assessed for conformance. Any identified NCR and/or CL findings related to the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool/Report are presented in Appendix B.

Risk Factor	Rationale & Quality	Conclusion
<b>Internal Risks</b>		
Project Management	The management team includes individuals that have the necessary skills and experience to implement all project activities. The Project Proponent has	A risk rating of -2 is appropriate given the rationale provided and all

	successfully managed projects that have generated GHG credits.	statements made are substantiated.
Financial Viability	Financial documents provided demonstrate the project has been operating in a cash positive state over the monitoring period.	A risk rating of <b>0</b> is appropriate given the rationale provided and supporting documentation reviewed by the verification team.
Opportunity Cost	As previously validated and verified, the project baseline is subsistence driven and project activities have shown net positive community impacts through certification through the CCB Program. The project proponent is a non-profit organization and is protected by a legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect carbon stocks over a minimum of 100 years.	A risk rating of <b>-4</b> is appropriate given the rationale provided.
Project Longevity	As previously validated and verified, the project area is a registered and protected national park within Peru, which protects the project area in perpetuity.	A risk rating of <b>0</b> is appropriate given the rationale provided.
Total Internal Risks		The project has a total Internal Risk score of <b>0</b> .
<b>External Risks</b>		
Land Tenure	The verification team confirmed that ownership and use rights are held by different entities. The verification team substantiated that currently there exists no disputes over access or use rights. The project has received approval from Verra that the evidence provided to demonstrate the “legally binding commitment to continue management practices” is sufficient to claim the Land Tenure Mitigation.	A risk rating of <b>0</b> is appropriate given the rationale provided and Verra’s substantiated approval.
Community Engagement	As previously validated and verified, while there may be people living within the project area these are uncontacted indigenous groups and an explicit unique project benefit is to ensure these indigenous groups remain uncontacted and therefore should not be consulted. Furthermore, the verification team	A risk rating of <b>-5</b> is appropriate given the rationale provided.

	confirmed that more than 20% of the households reliant on the project area living within 20 km of the project boundary have been consulted. The project has received CCB validation/verification demonstrating exceptional community benefit.	
Political Risk	The verification team confirmed Peru participates in REDD+ Readiness under the FCPF and that the Governance Score is between -0.32 and 0.19.	A risk rating of <b>0</b> is appropriate given the rationale provided.
Total External Risks		The project has a total External Risk score of 0.
<b>Natural Risks</b>		
Natural Risk	All natural risks were appropriately identified and justified. Where necessary the verification team reviewed supporting evidence, including interviews and observations. The verification team confirmed the risks for fire (0), pest and disease outbreak (0) and extreme weather (2), geological risk (1) are appropriate.	A risk rating of <b>3</b> is appropriate given the rationale provided.
Total Natural Risks		The project has a total Natural Risk score of <b>3</b> .
<b>Overall Risk Rating = 3%</b> <b>Non-Permanence Risk Rating = 10%</b>		

\*The Overall Risk Rating is 3 for this project; however, the project has appropriately applied the minimum risk rating of 10.

In summary, the project has accounted for risk factors in a reasonable manner and has reached an overall risk rating that encompasses all risks of non-permanence. The project has applied the Non-Permanence Risk Rating of 10%. As required, risk will be reassessed and given risk scores at each verification period.

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

The MR describes the dissemination of project monitoring plan and results in Section 3.1.4. The verification team interviewed community members, including village leadership during the site visit to determine the extent of distribution of project materials to all stakeholders. Site visit interviews confirmed that project materials are being disseminated to village leadership and further disseminated to community members and disadvantaged individuals.

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

Not applicable to this project.

## **4.5 Community**

### **4.5.1 Community Impacts (CM1.1)**

The verification team reviewed the community impacts identified in the validated PD and methods identified in the PD for assessing these impacts as the basis for review of community impacts presented in the MR. The verification team reviewed information provided in the MR, supplemental materials provided by the Project Proponent, and conducted interviews with project staff, community leaders, and community members representing communities and project activities on the western side of the project and the eastern side of the project to assess the general quality and accuracy of the impact assessment on both community groups identified in the PD.

The verification team confirmed Section 4.1.2 of the MR includes the community groups identified in Section 6.1 of the PD. The verification reviewed the justifications for the net-positive well-being impacts of identified community groups and determined them to be appropriate. Through review of project and supplemental documents and site visit interviews and observations, the verification team determined the activities reported as having occurred during this verification period were appropriately implemented by the Project Proponent and that the assessment of impacts is accurate.

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

The verification team reviewed the community impacts identified in the MR. The verification team was provided with additional clarification and supplemental information that confirmed assertions of positive impacts for specific community groups identified within the project zone. Interviews with community stakeholders from identified community groups supported the assertions of positive impacts from the project on the key focal issues. Community members interviewed during the site visit agreed the project strongly supported the communities, and interviewees endorsed the continuation of the project. The verification team concluded that based on review of the documentation provided and results of on-site visits and interviews, the net impact of project activities on all community groups is positive.

### **4.5.3 Protection of High Conservation Values (CM1.2)**

The verification team reviewed the HCVs identified in Table 1.4 of Section 1.10.7 of the PD, which included community-related HCVs. The verification team conducted site visit observations and interviews to substantiate representative examples of project activities designed to maintain or enhance the HCVs, as identified in Section 4.1.3 of the MR. Remote sensing data review substantiated the extent of intact forest within the project area. Site visit observations and interviews with park guards and community members substantiate that the project has not had a negative impact on community-related HCVs identified in the PD. Through the substantiation of the implementation or initiation of project activities to maintain or enhance HCVs paired with the general belief that HCVs were not negatively impacted during this monitoring period, the verification team determined that identified HCVs were not negatively affected by the project.

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

The verification team reviewed the assertion regarding no negative impacts identified on offsite stakeholders presented in the MR against the similar anticipated assertion presented the PD. Based on information presented in the PD, site visit observations, and site visit interviews that did not identify negative impacts to offsite stakeholders, the verification team concurs that the project is not likely to result in net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups.

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

The verification team undertook a review of the community monitoring results identified in Section 4.3.2 of the MR against the community variables, frequency, methods, and reporting identified in the community monitoring plan in the PD. The review confirmed that communities, community groups, other stakeholders, and HCVs related to community well-being identified in the PD were assessed during this monitoring period. Community variables monitored are identified in the MR. The verification team identified an inconsistency in frequency of monitoring identified by the PD for the Mapping of Uses and Strengths (MUF) surveys for this monitoring period. The verification team acknowledges the extenuating circumstances faced by the Project Proponent due to Covid-19 restrictions that were in place limiting in-country travel and meetings during a portion of the monitoring period. The verification team reviewed supporting documents, conducted site visit observations of monitoring data collected or compiled by park guards and CIMA technical staff, and reviewed supplemental information provided by the Project Proponent. The verification team determined that community monitoring was able to be reasonably accomplished by project staff through the second method included in the validated community monitoring plan, which included quarterly and annual reports issued from field activities, and interviews by project staff while providing technical assistance to communities. The verification team determined the table summarizing the data collection methods for the current monitoring period provided in Section 2.2.3 of the MR reasonably identifies how community monitoring was able to be accomplished during the monitoring period in general accordance with the intent of the community monitoring plan.

With the additional clarification and review of supplemental documentation from the Project Proponent, the verification team determined this discrepancy in monitoring can be included as a minor change to the PD for this period (See Section 3.4 of this report). The minor change to the PD by not conducting the MUF during this verification report was appropriately reported in the final version of the MR. Based on information and explanation provided by the Project Proponent, review of the validated monitoring plan and supporting documentation provided, and results of interviews with community members, park guards, and project technical staff, the verification team determined that the overall intent of the community monitoring plan had been met for the key indicators; the community monitoring deviation constituted a minor change applicable to this monitoring period that did not result in substantive over or under reporting of positive or negative impacts. The overall impact of the project on community well-being was confirmed as positive. The results reported in the MR were determined to accurately reflect monitored community impacts.

#### **4.5.6 Community Monitoring Plan Dissemination (CM3.3)**

The verification team reviewed the MR to evaluate the actions taken to disseminate the results of community monitoring during this verification period against the actions described in the PD. The

verification team confirmed that a project summary document in Spanish is available on the Verra project page. Site visit interviews with community members and leaders confirmed that copies of this period's MR summary were distributed. The verifiers also inspected a copy of the MR summary in the possession of one community leader. Additional documentation provided by the Project Proponent, including copies of transmittal letters to several community leaders that included the summary of monitoring report results prepared by the Project Proponent, substantiates the monitoring results were widely disseminated in accordance with the monitoring plan identified in the validated PD. Review of supplemental support documents, along with site visit interviews and observations substantiate the results of the community monitoring for this verification were disseminated in accordance with the validated project description.

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

Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.

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

Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.

## **4.6 Biodiversity**

### **4.6.1 Biodiversity Changes (B1.1)**

The verification team reviewed the methodologies used to estimate changes in biodiversity as a result of the project that are described in the PD and were determined to be appropriate during project validation. The verification team reviewed project documents and supporting documentation provided by the Project Proponent. The verification team substantiated through site visit interviews and observations of original monitoring records at representative guard stations and compilations of submitted monitoring records at CIMA offices the accuracy of data collected for several project activities, including documented reduction in number of violations recorded in the PNCAZ in 2017-2018 and 2019-2020 compared to baseline reporting (2008), natural forest restoration that has occurred in disturbed areas, and through the continued, documented presence of key indicator species. Site visit interviews substantiate that without the project illegal clearing would likely have occurred and unregulated illegal hunting would likely have a negative impact on key species. Through site visit interviews and observations, the verification team substantiated the ecosystem enhancement and biodiversity activities undertaken by the project during this verification, and the verification team substantiated the resultant positive impacts on biodiversity from the 'with project' scenario when compared to the baseline 'without project' scenario. Given the substantiated accuracy of data collected and the substantiated positive impacts on biodiversity through implementation of project activities, the verification team determined the project's assessment of changes in biodiversity resulting from project activities in the project zone during the verification period is accurate.

#### **4.6.2 High Conservation Values Protected (B1.2)**

The verification team reviewed the biodiversity-related HCVs identified in PD Table 1.4. Site visit interviews with CIMA staff and park guards and review of park guard records substantiate the landscape-level protections provided to habitats and other biodiversity-related HCVs identified for the project area (PNCAZ) and substantiate the monitoring of the subsistence hunting allowed within limited areas of the project area (PNCAZ). Site visit interviews determined that IUCN-listed threatened species are not allowed to be hunted within the project area (PNCAZ), which was substantiated by review of records at two park guard stations. Site visit interviews and observations identified no negative effects on other identified biodiversity-related HCVs and substantiated the habitat and wildlife protections and enhancement activities implemented or initiated were or are likely to result in positive effects on the identified HCVs. Based on interviews and review of evidence provided, the verification team concurs no HCV related to biodiversity will be negatively affected by the project.

#### **4.6.3 Invasive Species (B1.3)**

Section 5.1.3 of the MR states that no invasive species were used in project activities, which was determined to be consistent with the statement in Section 5.1.1 of the PD that no invasive species will be used or introduced into the project area (PNCAZ) as part of this project. The verification team visited multiple communities and farms, and cacao associations, and conducted interviews with community members, farmers, and CIMA technical staff to review project activities supported by the project within the project zone. The verifiers substantiated all species used in activities supported by the project were native or long-established or used in the area, and none are considered or listed as invasive in the Global Invasive Species Database. The verification team is reasonably assured no invasive species has been introduced by project activities into any area affected by the project and that the population of any invasive species did not increase as a result of the project.

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

The verification team reviewed Section 5.1.3 of the MR that states no exotic species were used in the project activities and evaluated this assertion during the site visit. Site visit observations and interviews with community members, park guards, and CIMA technical staff substantiate that no non-native species were used in restoration efforts or within the project area (PNCAZ). The verification team visited multiple communities and farms, and cacao associations, and conducted interviews with community members, farmers, and CIMA technical staff to review project activities supported by the project within the project zone. The verification team identified one non-native species of potential concern, tropical kudzu, observed in multiple locations and identified during interviews as a species used to help fix nitrogen on farms. The verification team determined that this species is not listed as invasive in the Global Invasive Species Database, was not introduced into the project zone as a result of project activities and is not endorsed for use by CIMA technical staff for project-supported activities. The verification team determined the use of other non-native species in gardens and plots in the project zone is justified for subsistence and small agricultural purposes and will not pose harm to the region's environment.

#### **4.6.5 GMO Exclusion (B1.5)**

The verification team reviewed the PD Section 5.1.1 that states no GMOs will be used or introduced into the PNCAZ as part of the project and Section 5.1.5 of the MR that states no GMOs were used in implementation of project activities during this verification period and evaluated these assertions during the site visit. Site visit observations to representative restoration sites and interviews with CIMA technical staff and community members substantiate trees used in restoration of degraded areas are derived from locally sourced, indigenous species. During the site visit, the verifiers identified no source of GMOs that would be used to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals. The verification team is reasonably assured that no GMOs were or will be used in project activities to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals.

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

The verification team reviewed Section 5.2.1 of the MR that provides justification for the project's determination that negative impacts on biodiversity outside of the project area are unlikely and evaluated this assertion during the site visit and through review of project documents and supporting documents. Site visit observations and site visit interviews with project partners and community members substantiate the justification provided in Section 5.2.1. The verifiers did not identify any additional potential negative offsite impacts through site visit interviews and observations or through review of project documents or supporting documents. As no negative offsite biodiversity impacts were identified by the Project Proponent or observed by the verifiers during the site visit, the verification team determined that no mitigation actions were warranted.

#### **4.6.7 Net Biodiversity Benefits (B2.3)**

The verification team reviewed Section 5.2.2 of the MR that describes several positive biodiversity benefits within the project area (PNCAZ) as well as within the project zone (buffer zone) and evaluated these assertions during the site visit. Positive biodiversity impacts were substantiated by the verification team through review of supporting documents, site visit interviews, and site visit observations. The verification team determined the net biodiversity impacts of the project are positive for this verification period based on substantiation of positive biodiversity impacts and the absence of any identified or expected negative offsite biodiversity impacts that would require mitigation.

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

The verification team undertook a review of the biodiversity monitoring results identified in Section 5.3.2 of the MR against the biodiversity variables identified for monitoring by the PD; the team further reviewed the frequency and methods identified for monitoring and reporting on results. Following additional clarification provided by the Project Proponent, the verification team determined biodiversity indicators and HCVs related to biodiversity identified in the PD are appropriately addressed as biodiversity variables to be monitored and reported in the MR. The review determined monitoring results are provided for each of the indicators and in general conformance with collection methods, data sources, and frequency identified in the validated PD. The verification team determined MR Section 5.3.2 provides additional information on biodiversity monitoring results from complementary methods that were undertaken in addition to the methods identified in the validated PD. Based on review of documentation provided by the Project

Proponent, documents made available at park guard stations and at CIMA offices for review during the site visit, and site visit interviews, the verification team concludes the biodiversity monitoring was carried out and reported in accordance with the project's validated design.

#### **4.6.9 Biodiversity Monitoring Plan Dissemination (B3.3)**

The verification team reviewed the MR to evaluate the actions taken to disseminate the results of biodiversity monitoring during this verification period against the actions described in the PD. The verification team confirmed that a project summary document in Spanish is available on the Verra project page. Site visit interviews with community members and leaders confirmed that copies of this period's MR summary were distributed. The verifiers also inspected a copy of the MR summary in the possession of one community leader. Additional documentation provided by the Project Proponent, including copies of transmittal letters to several community leaders that included the summary of monitoring report results prepared by the Project Proponent, substantiates the monitoring results were widely disseminated in accordance with the monitoring plan identified in the validated PD. Review of supplemental support documents, along with site visit interviews and observations substantiate the results of the biodiversity monitoring for this verification were disseminated in accordance with the validated project description.

#### **4.7 Additional Project Implementation Information**

No additional project implementation was provided in Section 6 of the MR.

#### **4.8 Additional Project Impact Information**

Additional Project Implementation Information is included in Section 7 of the MR; however, this additional information was not necessary for the verification team to conclude that the project has been implemented in accordance with all CCB indicators. This information was provided in part to report on additional research conducted in the PNCAZ during the monitoring period related to documenting the high levels of biodiversity, including HCV species. Interviews with project technical staff and review of representative cited documents substantiated the extensive research reported by the MR and substantiated the additional project implementation information provided is suitable for verification of the project's adherence to its validated PD, specifically regarding CIMA's commitment in PD Section 1.3 to collaborate with academic institutions.

### **5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION**

After a site inspection and review of all project information, procedures, calculations, and supporting documentation, Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc., confirms the Project is accurate, consistent, and complies with all VCS Version 4 criteria, CCB Second Edition criteria, the selected methodology (VM0007), and the validated PD. Aster Global confirms the Cordillera Azul National Park (PNCAZ) REDD Project Monitoring Report (Version 3.1, dated 11 July 2022) has been implemented in accordance with VCS Version 4 and CCB Second Edition criteria.

Aster Global confirms all verification activities – including objectives, scope and criteria, *reasonable* level of assurance, and PD implementation adherence to VCS Version 4 (and all associated updates) and CCB Project Design Standards (Second Edition), as documented in this report – are complete. Aster Global concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions the Cordillera

Azul National Park (PNCAZ) REDD+ Project Monitoring Report (Version 3.1, dated 11 July 2022) meets the requirements of VCS Version 4 (and all associated updates), CCB Project Design Standards (Second Edition), and the validated PD. In addition, Aster Global asserts the project complies with the criteria for projects set out in the Second Edition of the CCB Standards to achieve Gold Level distinction for Biodiversity.

The GHG assertion provided by Centro de Conservación, Investigación y Manejo de Áreas Naturales-Cordillera Azul (CIMA-Cordillera Azul) and verified by Aster Global has resulted in net emissions reductions and/or removals (NERs) of 11,371,671 tCO<sub>2</sub>e equivalents (tCO<sub>2</sub>e) by the project during the verification period/monitoring period (VCS and CCB; 08 August 2018 – 31 December 2020). This value is gross of the 10% (1,263,519 tCO<sub>2</sub>e) buffer withholding, based on the non-permanence risk assessment tool.

Monitoring period: From 08 August 2018 to 31 December 2020

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

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)	Leakage emissions (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
2018	2,144,855	39,302	0	1,894,998
2019	5,362,137	98,254	0	4,737,495
2020	5,362,137	96,383	0	4,739,179
Total	12,869,130	233,939	0	11,371,671

## APPENDIX A: DOCUMENT LIST

Documents Received	Date Received
CIMA-PNCAZ- 2020-MR_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4_V3.1_23.06.2022.docx	June 24, 2022
VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-CIMA-PNCAZ-REDD-proj_v4.1_rev23Jun2022.docx	June 24, 2022
21084.00_Cordillera Azul_CCB_Findings-Round3_rev20220623.docx	June 24, 2022
21084.00 Cordillera Azul VCS Round 3 Findings-rev13-06.xlsx	June 24, 2022
21084.00 Cordillera Azul VCS Round 2 Findings_revDOV_12.04.2022.xlsx	April 13, 2022
Wenceslao Espinoza Pajuelo.pdf	April 13, 2022
Rodolfo N Campo Ramirez.pdf	April 13, 2022
Vicente Vega Fuster.pdf	April 13, 2022
Nestor Andres Rojas Vasquez.pdf	April 13, 2022
Rufino Sellado Tolentino.pdf	April 13, 2022
Nestor Cholan de la Cruz.pdf	April 13, 2022
Neli Mari Liberado Lorenzo.pdf	April 13, 2022
Mansueto Merino Jara.pdf	April 13, 2022
Milca Arevalo Espinoza.pdf	April 13, 2022
Leonor Fasabi Solsol.pdf	April 13, 2022
Juliana Polinar Ruiz.pdf	April 13, 2022
Julio Matias Bedoya.pdf	April 13, 2022
Guillermo Torres Guevara.pdf	April 13, 2022
Jaun A Sanchez Benancio.pdf	April 13, 2022
Geuster Sanchez Rios.pdf	April 13, 2022
Esteban Dominguez Rivera.pdf	April 13, 2022
Edmundo F Cotillo Gonzales.pdf	April 13, 2022
Espinoza Malpartida Caszely.pdf	April 13, 2022
Dionicio Alejo Castillo.pdf	April 13, 2022
Anastacia Bravo Villanueva.pdf	April 13, 2022
9 CHAMBIRA_MUF2008.jpg	April 13, 2022
2. CIMA - Informe VCUs PNCAZ (al 31dic2021).pdf	April 13, 2022
3. Schedule 15. Technical Financial Sustainability Analysis (Aprobada por CD).pdf	April 13, 2022
1. Flujo de Caja Quinq.2019-2023 y 2024-2028 CAadm PNCAZ (12Abr2022).xls	April 13, 2022
VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-CIMA-PNCAZ-REDD-proj_v9_12.04.2022.docx	April 13, 2022
8 CHAMBIRA_MUF2005.jpg	April 13, 2022

CIMA-PNCAZ- 2020-Monitoring Report_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4_Version3.0_12.04.2022 (1).docx	April 13, 2022
7 CHAMBIRA_MUF2002.jpg	April 13, 2022
6 Ordenanza 004-2002-MPP-A_ACM.pdf	April 13, 2022
5 Acta CVCA Chambira 6-2-22.pdf	April 13, 2022
4 Examples_assemblies_and topics_FOCAL_CIMA_Aug18-Dec20.xlsx	April 13, 2022
1mapas_ACM_CEDISA.pdf	April 13, 2022
3 Destinatarios cartas redd_consulta y difusion.xlsx	April 13, 2022
10 S1_22ABR11_CN_Chambira+MUF2003_2005_2008.jpg	April 13, 2022
0 Delimitacion-ACMchambira.jpg	April 13, 2022
21084.00_Cordillera Azul_CCB_Findings-Round2_revDOV_02.04.2022.docx	April 13, 2022
6. PNCAZ Case_Inventory 2021_17-12-2021.xlsx	February 26, 2022
LB_veg.rst	February 26, 2022
PA_full_vegetation.rst	February 26, 2022
PA_full_vegetation.rst.xml	February 26, 2022
PA_full_vegetation.rst.ovr	February 26, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.shp	February 26, 2022
PA_full_vegetation.rst.aux.xml	February 26, 2022
PA_full_vegetation.RDC	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.shp.xml	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.shx	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.shp	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.sbx	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.prj	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.sbn	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.dbf	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.shx	February 26, 2022

PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.CPG	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.shp	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.shp.xml	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.sbx	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.prj	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.sbn	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.dbf	February 26, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.CPG	February 26, 2022
LB_veg.rst.ovr	February 26, 2022
LB_veg.rst.xml	February 26, 2022
LB_veg.rst.aux.xml	February 26, 2022
LB_veg.RDC	February 26, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.shp.xml	February 26, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.shx	February 26, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.CPG	February 26, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.dbf	February 26, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.prj	February 26, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.sbn	February 26, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.sbx	February 26, 2022
VMD000_1.PDF	February 26, 2022
MONITO_1.XLS	February 26, 2022
7.5 OFICIO MULTIPLE-D000020-2019-VMI_EstrategiaProteccionDerechosPPII_DACI (1).pdf	February 26, 2022
2.8 Josie Chambers (Thesis - seccion) Mayo2019 (2).pdf	February 26, 2022
Plan Maestro PNCAZ 2017 - 2021 (RP 032-2017-SERNANP).pdf	February 26, 2022
RP N 150-2015-SERNANP.pdf	February 26, 2022
RP 147 2018 SERNANP Aprueban Disposiciones Reglamento Lery ANPs Contrato Administración NL 2018-07-09.pdf	February 26, 2022
RD 45 SERNANP Aprobacion TdR para Planificacion.pdf	February 26, 2022

III Adenda al CdA del PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
II Adenda al CdA del PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
contrato CdA.pdf	February 26, 2022
Adenda al CdA del PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
Reconocimiento PIACI Kakataibo_DS N 004-2017-MC.pdf	February 26, 2022
Informe consultoría CIMA - Rosa Barrios.pdf	February 26, 2022
FCL-Vista Alegre-IPCV-Inf. factibilidad Categorización. (1).pdf	February 26, 2022
FCL-StaRosa(sh)-IPCV-Exclusion BPP.pdf	February 26, 2022
FCL-Sangamayo-IPCV-Anulacion AICON.pdf	February 26, 2022
FCL-San Juan-Resolucion de Categorizacion-08-09-2016.pdf	February 26, 2022
FCL-Pongolsla-PCV-Limites comunales.pdf	February 26, 2022
FCL-NvoSanMartin-IPCV-Resolucion Municipal.pdf	February 26, 2022
FCL-NvoJaen-IPCV-Titulacion.pdf	February 26, 2022
FCL-Maronilla-IPCV-Levantamiento topografico.pdf	February 26, 2022
FCL-Belaunde-IPCV-Expediente-10.pdf	February 26, 2022
FCL-El paraiso-IPCV-Categorizacion.pdf	February 26, 2022
FCL-Belaunde-IPCV-Categorizacion-Acta de verificacion.pdf	February 26, 2022
Cargos cartas verificación Proy. REDD_Tocache.pdf	February 26, 2022
Cargos cartas verificación Proy. REDD_Tarapoto.pdf	February 26, 2022
Cargos cartas verificación Proy. REDD_Contamana.pdf	February 26, 2022
Cargos cartas verificación Proy. REDD_Aguaytia.pdf	February 26, 2022
SENAMHI 2017. BRIEFING_20171102.pptx	February 26, 2022
SENAMHI 2017. Memoria 02nov.pptx	February 26, 2022
Lineamientos_Medidas_Picota_Ponaza.pdf	February 26, 2022
Lachi_Niquen Shamboyacu - Desborde de Ponasa 2017.pdf	February 26, 2022
INVITACIONES_TALLER IRMA_PICOTA_FINAL_22112019 vf.pdf	February 26, 2022
INDECI 2017 Informe Emergencias N° 856 - PRECIP. PLUVIALES San Martin.pdf	February 26, 2022
GOESAM 2017 Areas Afectadas PICOTA 2017.pdf	February 26, 2022

Eng.Thesis_ VERGARAY CUSQUIPOMA JOHAN CHRISTIAN .pdf	February 26, 2022
DS-024-2019-pcm-1740635-1-estado emergencia provincias SM.pdf	February 26, 2022
Diagnostico-Territorial-Simplificado_Picota_Ponaza.pdf	February 26, 2022
Plan Maestro PNCAZ 2017 - 2021 (Acta de validacion).pdf	February 26, 2022
Plan Maestro PNCAZ 2011 - 2016 Parte Gestión.pdf	February 26, 2022
Plan Maestro PNCAZ 2011 - 2016 PNCAZ (RP N° 064-2011-SERNANP).pdf	February 26, 2022
Plan Maestro PNCAZ 2003 - 2008.pdf	February 26, 2022
Plan Maestro PNCAZ 2011 - 2016 Parte Diagnostico.pdf	February 26, 2022
Plan Maestro PNCAZ 2003-2008 PNCAZ (RJ N° 245-2004-INRENA).pdf	February 26, 2022
Memoria descriptiva de la ZA del PNCAZ (R.J. 144-2007-INRENA).pdf	February 26, 2022
2.9 Elma Gely - Presentacion de hallazgos (25jun2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
Anexo2.1_MOU_ZRM_KOENIG_BONN_CIMA.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.9 Adaptive capacity (Rodriguez et al 2018).pdf	February 26, 2022
2.8 Josie Chambers (Thesis - seccion) Mayo2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.8 Monitoreo Fauna por GP (Pequeño y Pizarro 2018).pdf	February 26, 2022
2.7 Monitoreo Recuperacion en PNCAZ (Vergaray et al 2018).pdf	February 26, 2022
2.6 Support for IAA International development.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.7 Plataforma del WildID - cámaras trampa PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.3 S3_19JUN10_Sobrevuelo y expedicion aves_A4.jpg	February 26, 2022
2.6 Carátula Tesis Peces Cushabatay Pauya 2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.5 Sussex data_status_dic_2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.5 Catálogo de Especies Plantas - Aguaytia DISPLAMAZ 2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.5 Carátula Tesis Peces Biavo 2019.pdf	February 26, 2022

2.4 Medios de vida sostenibles deforestación y cadenas de suministro_ ODS español.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.5 Aguaytia-Yamino-Cuestionario Familiar-6.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.4 Jasmin Snoussi - Report Socioeconómica San Juan y Lejia (setiembre 2019-español).pdf	February 26, 2022
2.4 Marco Bustamante - U Cambridge Research Statement.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.4 Aguaytia-Yamino-Presentation de REDD+ - 6.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.3 REP_Manual de Reproducción y Manejo de Plantas.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.3 Informe final consultoria J.Odicio.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.3 Mapa Puntos de Sobrevuelo - Proyecto Morfología y Distribución en Aves.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.12 UPCH (junio 2019) PNCAZ e investigacion.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.3 Informe Parcela Botánica en Pauya-Cushabatay (CIMA).pdf	February 26, 2022
2.3 Establecim Parcela Permanente Pauya Cushabatay (set2018).pdf	February 26, 2022
2.3 Cinthia Infante - Borrador tesis Peces Ponasa-Mishquiyaquillo(10marzo2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
2.3 Eddy Diaz 2019 - Resumen Tesis Turismo PNCAZ PV16.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.2 Cinthia Infante 2019 - Presentación Tesis Peces Ponasa .pdf	February 26, 2022
2.2 Resolucion_Aprobacion_Tesis G.Acuna.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.2 Presentacion consultoria J.Odicio.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.2 Parcela Botánica permanente Pauya-Cusha (Coordinacion set2018).pdf	February 26, 2022
2.2 MSU Forestry Peru ISP SPF_Vfinal (Plan 2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
2.2 Evaluacion Ictiologica rios Ponasa y Mishquiyaqu set2018.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.2 Cinthia Infante 2019 - ResumenTesis Peces Ponasa .pdf	February 26, 2022
2.2 Acuerdo de Cooperación con la Universidad de Michigan.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.11.1 Oso - Carta Rioja SZF CIMA.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.1 Proyecto Amazon Fish en Pauya-Cushabatay (setiembre 2018).pdf	February 26, 2022
2.1 Rio Biabo_Pamela Andia.pdf	February 26, 2022

2.11.2 Oso - Presentación publicación.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.10.2 Josie Chambers - Informe Taller Moyobamba 2017.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.10.1 Josie Chambers Taller Junio 2019 Poster.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.1 Documento de trabajo Preseleccion ODS CIMA.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.1 CARTA N 035-2019-SERNANP-PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.1 Fotos Sobrevuelo a Pantanos de Altura del PNCAZ (26julio2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
2.1 Joel Collao - Resumen de Resultados.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.1 Achatz et al 2019 Uvulifer spp nov - Pescadero.pdf	February 26, 2022
Sobrevuelo PNCAZ sector norte (5junio2017).pdf	February 26, 2022
Nota técnica cams feri 2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
Reporte fauna 2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.2 Evaluacion Ictiologica rios Ponasa y Mishquiyacu set2018.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.1 Rio Biabo _Pamela Andia.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.2 Reporte fauna de caza 2018 (ene 2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
Manual ZPC (preliminar).pdf	February 26, 2022
Anexo_1.5 mapa amenazas PNCAZ.jpg	February 26, 2022
Ficha de verificacion ARA GOREL - Solicitud de CC Pauya Cushabatay.pdf	February 26, 2022
Curso GIS Nov 2017.pdf	February 26, 2022
CIMA Concesion de Conservacion - FORMATOS (Enero 2018).pdf	February 26, 2022
Areas de Patrullajes.pdf	February 26, 2022
Anexo_1.2_Monitoreo_SIG_Abril 2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
Anexo_1.3_Monitoreo_SIG_Mayo 2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
Anexo_1.1_Patrullajes_GPs_T2-2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
Anexo1.2_Reporte_Monitoreo_Marzo 2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
Anexo7.2_Programa_CyV_Iqt.pdf	February 26, 2022
Anexo7.1_Ficha_sector_patrullaje_CyV_CIMA.pdf	February 26, 2022
Ampliacion PNCAZ - Memoria (doc resumen).pdf	February 26, 2022
Anexo1.1_Patrullajes_guardaparques T1-2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
Acciones de Vigilancia y Control PNCAZ-2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
Ampliacion PNCAZ (Correo) Resumen y Hoja de Ruta a SERNANP (09MAR2017).pdf	February 26, 2022

Amenazas antrópicas sector sur oeste del PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
9 INFORME TRIMESTRE 3-2020_CIMA-SERNANP.pdf	February 26, 2022
8 INFORME TRIMESTRE 2-2020_CIMA-SERNANP_vf.pdf	February 26, 2022
6 INFORME TRIMESTRE IV 2019 (16ene2020).pdf	February 26, 2022
7 INFORME TRIMESTRE I 2020_CIMA-SERNANP_final.pdf	February 26, 2022
5 INFORME TRIMESTRE III 2019 (18oct2019) final.pdf	February 26, 2022
5. Acta Fiscal - Diligencia Fiscal Santa Ana -12-11-2020 (Caso Abanto).pdf	February 26, 2022
6. Acta Fiscal - Diligencia Fiscal Santa Ana -12-11-2020 (Punto 2).pdf	February 26, 2022
4 INFORME TRIMESTRE II 2019 (15julio 2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
3. Acata Fiscal Flor de Café (21-10-20).pdf	February 26, 2022
3 INFORME TRIMESTRE I 2019 (12 Abril 2019) final.pdf	February 26, 2022
3) Acta Fiscal de Diligencia Fiscal de Shanshuico -17-08-2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
2.8 Monitoreo Fauna por GP (Pequeño y Pizarro 2018).pdf	February 26, 2022
2.9 Adaptive capacity (Rodriguez et al 2018).pdf	February 26, 2022
2 INFORME TRIMESTRE IV 2018 (enero 2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
10 INFORME TRIMESTRE 4-2020_CIMA-SERNANP.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.3 Memoria Técnica del Monitoreo SIG (Ene-Set 2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
1.8b INFORME perdida bosque Cushbatay.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.7 Resumen_Reporte_Monitoreo_JUL-SET2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.4 Avance de chacras y vias - mapa (nov2018).pdf	February 26, 2022
1.4 Agenda y Mapa del Taller Wildlife Insights.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.1 Derrumbes dentro del PNCAZ (jun2019).jpg	February 26, 2022
1.2 Delitos 1_Aportes.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.1 SIG Analisis el Ganadero (imagen Abril 2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
1.1 Monitoreo_Trimestre ENE-JUN_2018.pdf	February 26, 2022
1 INFORME TRIMESTRE III 2018 (octubre 2018).pdf	February 26, 2022

FCL-Yamino-AA-Firma del acuerdo-3.pdf	February 26, 2022
Reporte Acuerdo de Conservación - Acuerdos Azules (CIMA 2018).xlsx	February 26, 2022
Acuerdos Azules (ratificacion) San Juan.pdf	February 26, 2022
Acuerdos Azules (ratificacion) Vista Alegre.pdf	February 26, 2022
Acuerdos Azules (ratificacion) Lejía.pdf	February 26, 2022
Acuerdos Azules (ratificacion) Paraíso.pdf	February 26, 2022
9 ACUERDO AZUL CN YAMINO_16MAR18.pdf	February 26, 2022
Acuerdos Azules (ratificacion) Alto Ponaza.pdf	February 26, 2022
6 ACUERDO AZUL C.P. SAN JUAN.pdf	February 26, 2022
7 ACUERDO AZUL C.P. VISTA ALEGRE.pdf	February 26, 2022
8 ACUERDO AZUL C.P. PARAISO.pdf	February 26, 2022
5 ACUERDO AZUL C.P. LEJIA.pdf	February 26, 2022
10 Acuerdo de Conservación JPNCAZ-COOPAIN-CIMA.pdf	February 26, 2022
4 ACUERDO AZUL C.P. ALTO PONAZA.pdf	February 26, 2022
3 ACUERDO AZUL C.P. SANTA ROSA.pdf	February 26, 2022
2 ACUERDO AZUL C.P. NUEVO JAEN.pdf	February 26, 2022
Sentencia de desalojo Ganadero Suarez (26 Agosto 2016).pdf	February 26, 2022
1 ACUERDO AZUL C.P. MARONILLA.pdf	February 26, 2022
Monitoreo ganadero (JUL2018) Chacra Sector Polvora.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.6 CIMA 2019 Plantilla PPT- AAF (22Marzo2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
Ganadería - Informe CG Pólvora (Agosto 2017).pdf	February 26, 2022
Ganadero - Mapa Analisis 2008-2017 (2017).pdf	February 26, 2022
1.1 SIG Analisis el Ganadero (imagen Abril 2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
Anexo5.2_Informe05_CIMA_Kakataibo_KB.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.8 FTP-NvoAlan-AT-AsTecPer-11(3).jpg	February 26, 2022
5.5 IUCN Incubator Conservation Finance Workshop Report_FINAL.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.5 NVF-AHPP-CIMA Cordillera Azul-GA008474-NCE3-2020-12-28.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.1 Correo en entrega ECA Kakataibo.pdf	February 26, 2022
Anexo5.1_PdT_preliminar_2020_CIMA_CAFE.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.9 FOTP-Nuevo Dorado-Elaboracion Biol fotos de actividad.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.a Reporte Planta Aspuzana T3_2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.9 FCL-Marionilla-IPCV-Documento-11.pdf	February 26, 2022

5.8 FCL-San Lorenzo-SAF CACAO fotos de actividad.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.7 Pasantía-Restauración-Lejía (17jun2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
5.7 FCL-Nuevo Dorado-IPCV Cacao.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.7 FCL-SntaRosaAguaytia-Cuadro de coordenadas-8.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.6 Pasantía-Restauración-Ahuashiyacu (13jun19).pdf	February 26, 2022
5.7 Comité de restauradores aspuzana.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.6 FCL-MancoCapac-IPCV-Solicitud(Prioridad8)-11.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.6 FCL-SntaRosaAguaytia-Lista de beneficiarios-8.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.5 Pasantía-Restauración-Lejía-04.07.19.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.5 Pasantía-Restauración-Ahuashiyacu-05.07.19..pdf	February 26, 2022
5.6 Acreditacion CIMA para Restauracion (set2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
5.5 FCL-SntaRosaAguaytia-Plan de trabajo-8.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.5 FCL-MancoCapac-IPCV-Resolucion(Prioridad1)-11.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.4 Reporte técnico arborizacion Aspuzana.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.4 FCL-NvoSnMartin(PH)-IPCV-Documentacion(Prioridad1)-11.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.4 FCL-Yamino-IPCV-P1 Manejo Forestal-Capacitación.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.3 FCL-Yamino-IPCV-P1 Manejo Forestal-RD SERFOR.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.30 FCL-Nvo. Trujillo-IPCV-Inf. Fact. Pto. Salud..pdf	February 26, 2022
5.3 FCL-Belaunde-IPCV-Documentacion(Prioridad3)-11.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.3 6TA REUNION CAR-SM.04.12.19_.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.29 FCL-Challual-IPCV-Inf. Tecnico a Solicitud Exclusion.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.27 FCL-Sangamayo-IPCV-Categorizacion.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.26 FCL-Sangamayo-IPCV-Prioridad Anulacion AICON.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.28 FCL-Challual-IPCV-OficioN°053-9.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.25 FCL-Chambira-IPCV-Prioridad1-8.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.24 FCL-Paraíso-IPCV-Cargo_Solicitud.-BITEL-3(8).pdf	February 26, 2022

5.23 FCL-Paraíso-IPCV-PLANO-CROQUIS_Terreno.Puesto.Salud_2.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.22 FCL-Paraíso- IPCV- ACTA_de.Validación.mapa_Zonas_de_Uso_1.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.21 FCL-Paraíso-IPCV- ACTA_de.Validación.mapa_ámbito.influencia_1.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.2 Nombramiento Junta Directiva CAR CIMA OFICIO N1311-2019_.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.20 FCL-Paraíso-IPCV-ACTA_de.Acuerdos.de.Colindncia_1.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.19 FCL-Paraíso-IPCV-Inf_Factibilidad.Proceso.Categorización-1(5).pdf	February 26, 2022
5.2 FCL-Yamino-IPCV-P1 Manejo Forestal-Plan capacitación-8.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.2 FCL-SnLorenzo-IPCV-Prioridad3-11(6).jpg	February 26, 2022
5.17 FCL-Paraíso-IPCV-Cargo Solicitud Apoyo-Categorización.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.18 FCL-Paraíso-IPCV-Cargo.Solicitud_Eva.Riesgo-1 (3).pdf	February 26, 2022
5.15 FCL-Ponaza-IPCV- Inf Factibilidad Proceso Categorización.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.16 FCL-Ponaza-IPCV-Cargo Eval Telefonía Movil BITEL.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.10 El Paraíso-FCL-Inf. Evaluc. Riesgos-11.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.14 Tahiti EA - asistencia técnica.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.14 FCL-Ponaza-IPCV-Informe Factibilidad Puesto Salud.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.13 FCL-EIParaiso-IPCV-Prioridad1- 9 (5).pdf	February 26, 2022
5.13 Chambira FOTP- Allima sachá.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.12 Nuevo Picota-FCL-IPCV-Mejoramiento de acceso.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.12 FCL-EI Paraiso-Categorización (Actas y resoluciones).pdf	February 26, 2022
5.11d Paraiso-FCL-IPCV-Pres. Exp. Categ.11.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.11a Paraíso-FCL-Inf. Tec. Riesgos.10.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.11c Paraíso-FCL-IPCV-OM-022-2018.Aprueb.ZUC.11.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.11b Paraíso-FCL-IPCV-Cosnt. no protec.11.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.11 OFICIO N1002-2018-MINAM-SG.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.10 FCL-Maronilla-IPCV-Posta de Salud Acta.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.1 FCL-SnLorenzo-IPCV-Acta(Prioridad14)-10.pdf	February 26, 2022

5.1 FCL-Yamino-IPCV-Reunión autoridades comunales-8.pdf	February 26, 2022
CONVENIO CIMA FECONACURPI 2017.pdf	February 26, 2022
Convenio Marco CIMA - Sub Region 02 de agosto.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.1 Correo en entrega ECA Kakataibo.pdf	February 26, 2022
Cuerpo de Paz - Voluntario Restauracion Carta N°050-2016-CIMA-DE(15Set16).pdf	February 26, 2022
Convenio CIMA - FENACOCA.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.9 2018 Convenio con DRAHCO_GOREHCO.pdf	February 26, 2022
Carta de Entendimiento CIMA - ARA-GOREL.pdf	February 26, 2022
CGF - Carta Compromiso de CIMA (febrero2017).pdf	February 26, 2022
carta 062 al Ministerio de Cultura (cargo)- Planes de Calidad de vida.pdf	February 26, 2022
REPORTE GESTIÓN PARTICIPATIVA PNCAZ 2019 - I ok.docx	February 26, 2022
ZEE-Mariscal, Yamino y SntaRosaAguaytia-Lista de Participantes-8.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.15 REPORTE GESTIÓN PARTICIPATIVA PNCAZ 2020 - II.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.5 Agenda Macro Region ORIENTE (marzo2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
OFICIO 037-2017 MINAM opinión Estrategia Comunicacio ZEE Aguaytia.pdf	February 26, 2022
Oficio 205-18-MINAM_revisión del estudio de cobertura y uso de tres comunidades nativas.pdf	February 26, 2022
ZEE-Mariscal Yamino SntaRosaAguaytia-(OFICIO N° 007-2017-GDSE-MPPA-A).pdf	February 26, 2022
ZEE-Mariscal, Yamino y SntaRosaAguaytia-Acta de Acuerdos-8.pdf	February 26, 2022
Gob Reg San Matin Solicita informacion.pdf	February 26, 2022
Carta N° 094-2017 información estudio de zonificación.pdf	February 26, 2022
FCL-Nuevo Trujillo-IPCV-Carta Expediente Nucleo Funcional.pdf	February 26, 2022
FCL-Nuevo Trujillo-IPCV-Expediente Nucleo Funcional.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.6 Articulacion para la gestion sostenible-Tocache (abril2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
4.6 Oficio MULTIPLE_INVITACIONES_TALLER IRMA_PICOTA_FINAL_22112019 vf.pdf	February 26, 2022

4.7 OFICIO N°045-2019-OFICINA DE DIRECCIÓN DE MEDIO AMBIENTE.pdf	February 26, 2022
Carta al GORESAM conformación equipo técnico Zonif AE.pdf	February 26, 2022
FCL-Yamino-PCV-actualizado.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.3 OrdenanzaRegional 035 Restauración-GORESAM-2018-12-27.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.8 FCL-AltoMarona-PCV-Documento-12.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.7c FCL-AltoMarona-EARC-Acta-11.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.7d FCL-AltoMarona-PCV-Aprobación-12.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.7a FCL-AltoMarona-PCV-Acta-9.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.7b FCL-AltoMarona-PCV-Acta-10.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.4 FCL-Nvo SMartin-IPCV-Aprobacion-11.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.5 FCL-Cahuide-PCV-Aprobacion-12.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.6 FCL-VillaHermosa-PCV-Aprobacion-12.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.2 FCL-NvoSMartin-NC-Aprobacion-11.pdf	February 26, 2022
Acta de validacion del Plan Maestro PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.2 FCL-Cahuide-PCV-Elaboracion-8.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.3 FCL-VillaHermosa-NC-Aprobacion-12.pdf	February 26, 2022
REDD en PNCAZ - MINAM CC (14feb2017).pdf	February 26, 2022
4.1 FCL-Cahuide-NC-difusion-6.pdf	February 26, 2022
4.1 EA-NvaEsperanza-EANF-Acta-12.pdf	February 26, 2022
Plan Maestro PNCAZ 2017-2021.pdf	February 26, 2022
info 3 cambio climático.pdf	February 26, 2022
info 1 servicios ambientales.pdf	February 26, 2022
Grupo REDD - Subnacional - Iniciativas tempranas PNCAZ (15set2017).pdf	February 26, 2022
3.5 Turismo Yamino (P6) - Informe Técnicas Guiado (14ago19).pdf	February 26, 2022
Folleto Estudio Reparticion Beneficios REDD+(CIFOR).pdf	February 26, 2022
Afiche REDD II Comunidades Febrero 2013.pdf	February 26, 2022
Comunicacion al SERNANP - Proyecto REDD PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
3.8 Turismo Yamino (P6) - Acta entrega materiales (27ago19).pdf	February 26, 2022
3.7 Turismo Yamino (P6) - Mantenimiento sendero (20-21set19).pdf	February 26, 2022
3.4 Turismo Yamino (P6) - Puent sendero Tornillal (16set2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
3.6 Artesanas Yamino (P6) - inscripción SUNARP (20ago19).pdf	February 26, 2022

3.1 Mapa atractivos turísticos PNCAZ.jpg	February 26, 2022
3.3 Turismo Yamino (P6) - Servicio higiénico (20ago19).pdf	February 26, 2022
3.4 Bungalows Yamino 4.jpg	February 26, 2022
3.3 Presentación de Capacitacion en TRC.pdf	February 26, 2022
3.3 Bungalows Yamino 3.jpg	February 26, 2022
3.2 Bungalows Yamino 2.JPG	February 26, 2022
3.2 Memoria Taller Turismo SPDA - CIMA (27 ago 2019)1.pdf	February 26, 2022
3.2 TurismoEmprende_GranCaminata.pdf	February 26, 2022
3.2 Invitación CIMA CANATUR - PERU.pdf	February 26, 2022
3.1c Taller Turismo CIMA-SPDA Resumen.pdf	February 26, 2022
3.2 Agenda de Capacitacion en TRC.pdf	February 26, 2022
3.1a Taller Turismo CIMA-SPDA Flyer.pdf	February 26, 2022
3.1b Taller Turismo CIMA-SPDA- Invitación.pdf	February 26, 2022
3.1 Visita Jon Strand al PV16 (set2018).pdf	February 26, 2022
3.1 Informe Acondicionamiento Restaurante Comunal YAMINO (21oct19).pdf	February 26, 2022
2017 Althelia_impact report.pdf	February 26, 2022
3.1 Bungalows Yamino 1.jpg	February 26, 2022
3.1 Carta de Intención Toyota (21febrero2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
2019 ALTHELIA_ACF1Report.pdf	February 26, 2022
2020 ACF-Impact-Report.pdf	February 26, 2022
2016 Althelia Impact Report.pdf	February 26, 2022
2018 Althelia_impact-report.pdf	February 26, 2022
CIMA - CCB VCS Monitoring Report Template CCBv2.0 VCSv3.4 (10dic2018)v2.pdf	February 26, 2022
Carta N° 043-2019-CIMA-DE_extension IT_22AGO2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
I.2 Actas de II Reunión_de_CdS_09_12_19de CdA PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
6.2 CM N° 00011-2019-MINAM-VMDERN_24JUN2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
6.1 Carta respuesta VERRA_24OCT2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
Verification_Statement_Template_CCBv3.0 Cordillera Azul.pdf	February 26, 2022
VCS Verification Representation, v3.3 Cordillera Azul.pdf	February 26, 2022
Cordillera azul verification report 2018_V02_Final.pdf	February 26, 2022
30-05-19 Acta I Reunión de CdS CdA PNCAZ .pdf	February 26, 2022

I.2 Carta 063-2018_remisión de información requerida_CdS_CdA_PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
I.1 CIMA CdS dic2019 carta 318-2019 SERNAP.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.5 Acta de II Reunión de CdS de CdA (4dic2018).pdf	February 26, 2022
2020 Acta de la Tercera Comisión de Seguimiento del CdA PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
2020 Acta de la Segunda Comisión de Seguimiento del CdA PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.6 CIMA 2019 Plantilla PPT- AAF (22Marzo2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
1.14 _Acta I de Sesión de CdS del CdA PNCAZ_2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.4 Convocatoria a cesion de CdS al CdA (mayo2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
Anexo5.2_Informe05_CIMA_Kakataibo_KB.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.8b INFORME perdida bosque Cushbatay.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.9 MEMORIA Ingreso CC Pauya Cushabatay (27set2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
5.1 Correo en entrega ECA Kakataibo.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.5 IUCN Incubator Conservation Finance Workshop Report_FINAL.pdf	February 26, 2022
5.5 NVF-AHPP-CIMA Cordillera Azul-GA008474-NCE3-2020-12-28.pdf	February 26, 2022
2020 ACF-Impact-Report.pdf	February 26, 2022
CAPLAC-Sostenibilidad Financiera PNCAZ.pptx	February 26, 2022
1.8a Carta 050-19 por CC Boca Pauya al GOREL.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.7 Docs CC solicitada por SGGFFS-GRDFFS-GOREL.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.4 Carta 044-2018-al GOREL_concesión de conservación.pdf	February 26, 2022
7.6b Pequeño Plantilla CAPLAC - Cordillera Azul.pdf	February 26, 2022
2019 ALTHELIA_ACF1Report.pdf	February 26, 2022
2018 Althelia_impact-report.pdf	February 26, 2022
7.8 CAPLAC - Sostenibilidad Financiera PNCAZ LORB.pdf	February 26, 2022
Anexo7.2_Programa_CyV_Iqt.pdf	February 26, 2022
ACTA N° 01 Com. Cons. FIP.pdf	February 26, 2022
7.7 Incubadora_CAPLAC.pdf	February 26, 2022
7.1 Lista Verde PNCAZ - CIMA (setiembre2019).pdf	February 26, 2022

7.6a Volante-cambio-climatico-2.jpg	February 26, 2022
7.4 Carta Grupo REDD+ Miembros titular y alterno CCN FIP.pdf	February 26, 2022
7.4 OFICIO MULTIPLE N013 - PM Escalera.pdf	February 26, 2022
7.1 Simposium Restauracion CIMA-JW.pdf	February 26, 2022
7.3 Cargo Carta 052-2019-CIMA-DE _instalación consejo de coordinación Plan Director.pdf	February 26, 2022
7.2 Restauracion PROGRAMA TALLER CAPACITACION (19set2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
7.3 Arboles en chacras - invitacion ICRAF.pdf	February 26, 2022
7.2 Carta 025-19 _SERNANP _conformación de mesa técnica financiera _PD ANPs.pdf	February 26, 2022
7.1 Presentacion restauracion-UNAS semana forestal.pdf	February 26, 2022
11.3- Auditoría a Estados Financieros 2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
I.2 Actas de II Reunión _de CdS 09 12 19de CdA PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
11.2- Auditoría a Estados Financieros 2018.pdf	February 26, 2022
6.6 Carta 045-2019-CIMA-DE para DGANP-SERNANP argumentacion 25 _pdf	February 26, 2022
6.3 Creditos autorizados y vendidos.pdf	February 26, 2022
6.4 Carta 035-2019 _autorización venta a futuro créditos carbono _pncaz.pdf	February 26, 2022
6.5 Carta 226-19 _SERNANP _Solic venta futuro créditos carbono _Proy REDD.pdf	February 26, 2022
6.3 Carta N° 043-2019-CIMA-DE _extension IT _22AGO2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
6.2 CM N° 00011-2019-MINAM-VMDERN _24JUN2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
6.2 Reporte Visita de BHP 04.11.19 _pdf	February 26, 2022
6.1 Ventas y Registros VCU REDD PNCAZ _SET2018.pdf	February 26, 2022
6.1 Carta respuesta VERRA _24OCT2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
6.1 Venta de Creditos _31MAR2019-xlsx.pdf	February 26, 2022
I.2 Carta 063-2018 _remisión de información requerida CdS CdA PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.5 Acta de II Reunión de CdS de CdA (4dic2018).pdf	February 26, 2022
I.1 CIMA CdS dic2019 carta 318-2019 SERNAP.pdf	February 26, 2022
Anexo 3.4.9 Acta Sesión CdS CdA PNCAZ 2018 _2.pdf	February 26, 2022
30-05-19 Acta I Reunión de CdS CdA PNCAZ _pdf	February 26, 2022

venados 01230146.AVI	February 26, 2022
1.14_Acta I de Sesión de CdS del CdA PNCAZ_2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
1.4 Convocatoria a cesion de CdS al CdA (mayo2019).pdf	February 26, 2022
Vergaray et al 2018 Monitoreo Recuperacion en PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
Vision PM PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
trompeteros 01290125.AVI	February 26, 2022
UICN Peces Red List -2016-003.pdf	February 26, 2022
Vasquez-Virola pseudosebifera-2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
Cusi et al 2020 Bolitoglossa.pdf	February 26, 2022
Rodriguez 2018 Sustainability ZEE y beneficios.pdf	February 26, 2022
Sentencia de desalojo Ganadero Suarez (26 Agosto 2016).pdf	February 26, 2022
Pequeño y Pizarro 2018 Monitoreo Fauna por GP.pdf	February 26, 2022
Resumen Eval Primates Aucayacu 2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
Nota técnica cams feri 2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
Ficha de verificacion ARA GOREL - Solicitud de CC Pauya Cushabatay.pdf	February 26, 2022
Herpailurus yagouaroundi.JPG	February 26, 2022
Ganadería - Informe CG Pólvara (Agosto 2017).pdf	February 26, 2022
Copia de III Adenda al CdA del PNCAZ.pdf	February 26, 2022
Copia de 1.d. II Adenda al CdA del PNCAZ (octubre 2014).pdf	February 26, 2022
Copia de 1.b. Contrato de Administracion del PNCAZ (8Ago2008).pdf	February 26, 2022
Copia de 1.c I Adenda al CdA del PNCAZ (noviembre 2013).pdf	February 26, 2022
Politica de SST.docx	February 26, 2022
RISST CIMA CORDILLERA AZUL VF.pdf	February 26, 2022
POLÍTICA DD HH.docx	February 26, 2022
POLITICADE PREVENCIÓN Y SANCION SOBRE HSL .REV_ (2).pdf	February 26, 2022
Map of the PNCAZ Surveillance and Control Posts.jpg	February 26, 2022
2. Technical Report November 2020-PVC 17-IPURURO .pdf	February 26, 2022

5. Minutes of Fiscal Verification_Caserío Tahiti_21.10.2021.pdf	February 26, 2022
4. Fiscal Decision 01-2021 (78-2021).pdf	February 26, 2022
3. Official Report N° 056-2021-SERNANP-Deforestación ZA PNCAZ-Sector Bajo Chambira-Ipururo[R].pdf	February 26, 2022
Cargos cartas verificación Proy. REDD_Tarapoto.pdf	February 26, 2022
1. Technical Report and Record of Findings GP N°01-2020-PVC 17-IPURURO.pdf	February 26, 2022
Cargos cartas verificación Proy. REDD_Tocache.pdf	February 26, 2022
Cargos cartas verificación Proy. REDD_Contamana.pdf	February 26, 2022
Cargos cartas verificación Proy. REDD_Aguaytia.pdf	February 26, 2022
VCS findings NPRR_Jurisdicciones_receptoras_cartas.jpg	February 26, 2022
6.2 CM N° 00011-2019-MINAM-VMDERN_24JUN2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
Carta N° 043-2019-CIMA-DE_extension IT_22AGO2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
G5.3-G5.4 Chambira GORESAM.pdf	February 26, 2022
6.1 Carta respuesta VERRA_24OCT2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
G4.3 Rodríguez et al 2018 sustainability-cima-paritcipative zoning.pdf	February 26, 2022
G4.7-MR 2.4.6 Informe Resumen de VCUs PNCAZ (31Dic2021).pdf	February 26, 2022
G5.3-G5.4 Acta reunión Chambira 6-2-22.pdf	February 26, 2022
G4.7-MR 2.4.6 Auditoría a Estados Financieros 2019.pdf	February 26, 2022
G4.7-MR 2.4.6 CIMA EEFF al 31.12.2020.pdf	February 26, 2022
G4.7-MR 2.4.6 Auditoría a Estados Financieros 2018.pdf	February 26, 2022
G3.9.2 Estrategia de comunicaciones PNCAZ_final.pdf	February 26, 2022
G3.9.1 - Appendix 10 PD - SecondaryStakeholderCommunicationPlan.pdf	February 26, 2022
CM3.2, B3.2 - InformeFauna2020_VF.pdf	February 26, 2022
G3.5-MR 2.2.5.1 - DS-024-2019-pcm-1740635-1-estado emergencia provincias SM.pdf	February 26, 2022
CM3.1 Achievements CAFE July 2020.pdf	February 26, 2022

VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-CIMA-PNCAZ-REDD-proj_v3_24.02.2022.pdf	February 26, 2022
21084.00_Cordillera Azul_CCB_Findings-Round1_revCIMA_24.02.2022.docx	February 26, 2022
21084.00 Cordillera Azul VCS Round 1 Findings - rev24.02.2022.xlsx	February 26, 2022
CIMA-PNCAZ- 2020-Monitoring Report_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4_Version2.0_24.02.2022.docx	February 26, 2022
Copia de 1.b. Contrato de Administracion del PNCAZ (8Ago2008).pdf	January 24, 2022
Copia de III Adenda al CdA del PNCAZ.pdf	January 24, 2022
Copia de 1.d. II Adenda al CdA del PNCAZ (octubre 2014).pdf	January 24, 2022
Copia de 1.c I Adenda al CdA del PNCAZ (noviembre 2013).pdf	January 24, 2022
LB_veg.rst	January 24, 2022
Copia de III Adenda al CdA del PNCAZ.pdf	January 24, 2022
Copia de 1.d. II Adenda al CdA del PNCAZ (octubre 2014).pdf	January 24, 2022
Copia de 1.c I Adenda al CdA del PNCAZ (noviembre 2013).pdf	January 24, 2022
Map of the PNCAZ Surveillance and Control Posts.jpg	January 24, 2022
Copia de 1.b. Contrato de Administracion del PNCAZ (8Ago2008).pdf	January 24, 2022
5. Minutes of Fiscal Verification_Caserío Tahiti_21.10.2021.pdf	January 24, 2022
4. Fiscal Decision 01-2021 (78-2021).pdf	January 24, 2022
6. PNCAZ Case_Inventory 2021_17-12-2021.xlsx	January 24, 2022
PA_full_vegetation.rst	January 24, 2022
3. Official Report N° 056-2021-SERNANP-Deforestación ZA PNCAZ-Sector Bajo Chambira-Ipururo[R].pdf	January 24, 2022
2. Technical Report November 2020-PVC 17-IPURURO .pdf	January 24, 2022
1. Technical Report and Record of Findings GP N°01-2020-PVC 17-IPURURO.pdf	January 24, 2022
RISST CIMA CORDILLERA AZUL VF.pdf	January 24, 2022
POLÍTICA DD HH.docx	January 24, 2022
POLITICADE PREVENCIÓN Y SANCION SOBRE HSL .REV_ (2).pdf	January 24, 2022

Politica de SST.docx	January 24, 2022
Estrategias y FOTP a 10 años.pptx	January 24, 2022
Estrategia-actividades economicas-3.12.21.pptx	January 24, 2022
PA_full_vegetation.rst.xml	January 24, 2022
PA_full_vegetation.rst.ovr	January 24, 2022
PA_full_vegetation.rst.aux.xml	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.shx	January 24, 2022
PA_full_vegetation.RDC	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.shp	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.shp.xml	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.dbf	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.prj	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.sbn	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.sbx	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.shp	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.shx	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.CPG	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.shp.xml	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.sbn	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.sbx	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.dbf	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.prj	January 24, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.shp	January 24, 2022
LB_veg.rst.xml	January 24, 2022
PA_2020_3321_final_classes_disturbance_strata_allincluded.CPG	January 24, 2022
LB_veg.rst.ovr	January 24, 2022

LB_veg.rst.aux.xml	January 24, 2022
LB_veg.RDC	January 24, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.shx	January 24, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.sbn	January 24, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.shp.xml	January 24, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.CPG	January 24, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.dbf	January 24, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.prj	January 24, 2022
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.sbx	January 24, 2022
Respuestas ASTER GLOBAL_20.01.2022.pdf	January 24, 2022
1. VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report v2.0 PNCAZ_REDD_Aug2018-Dec2020_rev20.01.2022.pdf	January 24, 2022
8. CdA (Administration contract)-20220124T143859Z-001.zip	January 24, 2022
7. Docs Deforestation Case-20220124T143827Z-001.zip	January 24, 2022
6. HR documents-20220124T143708Z-001.zip	January 24, 2022
3. PPT reunion inicial-20220124T143746Z-001.zip	January 24, 2022
Respuestas ASTER GLOBAL_20.01.2022 (1).pdf	January 20, 2022
Communities_priorities_verif_period_aug18-dec20-Table.xlsx	December 2, 2021
Region de referencia_REDD.mpk	December 2, 2021
VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report v1.0 PNCAZ_REDD_Aug2018-Dec2020.pdf	December 2, 2021
21084.00 Cordillera Azul VCS_CCB Site Visit Plan_revCIMA_26.11.2021.docx	November 26, 2021
3ra_actualiz.PCV-Yamino_2021.pdf	November 26, 2021
Nuevo_San_Martin_Tocache-PCV-11.pdf	November 26, 2021
AltoMarona-PCV-2019.pdf	November 26, 2021
Proyectos de Restauracion CIMA - lily.pdf	November 26, 2021
VillaHermosa-PCV-2019.pdf	November 26, 2021
PCV_Cahuide_2019.pdf	November 26, 2021
Verif_visit_proposed_itinerary_v3.xlsx	November 26, 2021
Suplementary_table_verif_maps.xlsx	November 19, 2021
S2_21NOV18_Comunidades-Asociaciones_A2.jpg	November 19, 2021
S2_21NOV18_Comunidades con PCV y AA_A2 (1).jpg	November 19, 2021
BD Encuesta Madera y Leña 2021.xlsx	November 17, 2021
Map of places for verification.jpg	November 17, 2021
Internal Labor Regulation.pdf	November 17, 2021
MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx	June 19, 2021

Appendix1_PNCAZ2020_copy.docx	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_benchmark_4621.dbf	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_benchmark_4621.sbn	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_benchmark_4621.sbx	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_benchmark_4621.shp.xml	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_benchmark_4621.shp	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_benchmark_4621.shx	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_benchmark_4621.CPG	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_benchmark_4621.prj	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_Classes_4621.cpg	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_Classes_4621.dbf	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_Classes_4621.prj	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_Classes_4621.sbn	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_Classes_4621.sbx	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_Classes_4621.shp	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_Classes_4621.shp.xml	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_Classes_4621.shx	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_benchmark_4621.dbf	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_benchmark_4621.sbn	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_benchmark_4621.sbx	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_benchmark_4621.shp.xml	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_benchmark_4621.CPG	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_benchmark_4621.prj	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_benchmark_4621.shp	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_benchmark_4621.shx	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_Classes_4621.cpg	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_Classes_4621.dbf	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_Classes_4621.prj	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_Classes_4621.sbn	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_Classes_4621.sbx	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_Classes_4621.shp	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_Classes_4621.shp.xml	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_Classes_4621.shx	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_33121.rst.vat.cpg	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_33121.rst.vat.dbf	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_33121_final_classes.RDC	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_33121_final_classes.rst.aux.xml	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_33121_final_classes.rst.ovr	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_33121.RDC	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_33121.rst.aux.xml	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_33121.rst.ovr	June 19, 2021

pa_2020_33121_final_classes_disturbance_inc_strata_allincluded.RDC	June 19, 2021
pa_2020_33121_final_classes_disturbance_inc_strata_allincluded.rst	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_33121_final_classes_Disturbance_inc.RDC	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_33121_final_classes_Disturbance_inc.rst	June 19, 2021
pa_2020_33121_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.RDC	June 19, 2021
pa_2020_33121_final_classes_nf_strata_allincluded.rst	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_33121_final_classes_NF.RDC	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_33121_final_classes_NF.rst	June 19, 2021
PA_2020_33121_final_classes.rst	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.RDC	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_33121_NF_strata.rst	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_33121_NF.RDC	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_33121_NF.rst	June 19, 2021
LB_2020_33121.rst	June 19, 2021
RRL_Classification_2020.rst.xml	June 19, 2021
AccuracyPoints_2020.xlsx	June 19, 2021
AA_2020_Points_3321.sbn	June 19, 2021
AA_2020_Points_3321.sbx	June 19, 2021
AA_2020_Points_3321.shp.xml	June 19, 2021
AA_2020_Points_3321.cpg	June 19, 2021
AA_2020_Points_3321.dbf	June 19, 2021
AA_2020_Points_3321.shp	June 19, 2021
AA_2020_Points_3321.shx	June 19, 2021
AA_2020_Points_3321.prj	June 19, 2021
ReferencePoints.kml	June 19, 2021
RRL_Classification_2020.rdc	June 19, 2021
RRL_Classification_2020.rst.aux.xml	June 19, 2021
RRL_Classification_2020.rst.ovr	June 19, 2021
RRL_Classification_2020.rst	June 19, 2021
CIMA-2020-Monitoring Report_11-6-21.pdf	June 17, 2021
Monitrorring Report.docx	May 4, 2020
PNCAZ_MonitoringWorkbook_revApr2023.xlsx	April 13, 2023
1. CIMA-PNCAZ- 2020-MR_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4_V3.1_31.10.2022 (1) - Edited 12Abr23.docx	April 13, 2023

APPENDIX B: VCS NCR/CLS/OFI

<b>Findings Number</b>	1
<b>VCS Standard</b> <b>VCS Version 4.0</b> <b>Requirements Document</b> <b>19 September 2019, v4.0</b> <b>(Section)</b>	3.1 General Requirements
<b>VCS Standard</b> <b>VCS Version</b> <b>4.0Requirements Document</b> <b>19 September 2019, v4.0</b> <b>(Description)</b>	3.1.3 Projects and the implementation of project activities shall not lead to the violation of any applicable law, regardless of whether or not the law is enforced.
<b>Requirement Met</b> <b>(Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess</b> <b>(Location in PD/MR or</b> <b>Supporting Documents)</b>	PD Section 1.11; MR Section 1.5.1
<b>Aster Global Findings</b> <b>Round 1</b>	Relevant laws are listed in section 1.11 of the PD and section 1.5.1 of the MR. The MR contains a brief explanation of the laws and how the project is in compliance with them, but the verification team was unable to find evidence or a demonstration of compliance for laws and regulations related to Worker's Rights.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI</b> <b>Round 1</b>	CL: Please provide evidence showing that project activities do not lead to the violation of any relevant laws or regulations.
<b>Response from Project Proponent</b> <b>Round 1</b>	Besides the laws and regulations listed in the MR, we attach the following HR documents. This information has also been added to the MR section 2.4.4. 1. Institutional policy on human rights 2. HSE policy 3. Sexual harassment prevention policy 4. Internal regulation on security and safe at work CIMA has an HR responsible since 2021.
<b>Aster Global Findings</b> <b>Round 2</b>	Thank for the additional documents. During the site visit the audit team interviewed multiple employees none of which mentioned that their worker's rights were being violated. The VVB is reasonably assured this criterion is satisfied.

<b>Findings Number</b>	2
<b>VCS Standard</b> <b>VCS Version 4.0</b> <b>Requirements Document</b> <b>19 September 2019, v4.0</b> <b>(Section)</b>	3.4 Project Documentation
<b>VCS Standard</b> <b>VCS Version</b> <b>4.0Requirements Document</b> <b>19 September 2019, v4.0</b> <b>(Description)</b>	3.4.3 The project proponent shall use the VCS Monitoring Report Template or an approved combined monitoring report template available on the Verra website, as appropriate, and adhere to all instructional text within the template.
<b>Requirement Met</b> <b>(Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y

<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	MR
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	The audit team reviewed the MR and found that the MR is missing subsection numbers.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please provide an updated MR that follows the template provided and required by Verra.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Updated MR attached.
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	The updated MR provided includes the subsection numbering required by the Verra template.

<b>Findings Number</b>	3
<b>VCS Standard VCS Version 4.0 Requirements Document 19 September 2019, v4.0 (Section)</b>	3.6 Ownership
<b>VCS Standard VCS Version 4.0 Requirements Document 19 September 2019, v4.0 (Description)</b>	6) An enforceable and irrevocable agreement with the holder of the statutory, property or contractual right in the land, vegetation or conservational or management process that generates GHG emission reductions or removals which vests project ownership in the project proponent.
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	PD Section 1.12.1; MR Section 2.5.3.1
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	In 2008 CIMA signed a management contract with the Peruvian government giving CIMA the right to develop a carbon project in the park. The contract gives CIMA legal authorization to use revenues from the sale of carbon credits for the 20 year contract term. The verification team was unable to locate evidence of the management contract.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please provide the management contract between CIMA and the Peruvian government for the verification team to review.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Administration contract is attached in Appendix "VCS findings 3.6 Ownership-CdA (Administration Contract)".
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	The management contracts between CIMA and the Peruvian government have been provided and entrust CIMA with the implementation of their Master Plan for the PNCA

<b>Findings Number</b>	4
<b>VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0 19 September 2019, v4.1 (Section)</b>	
<b>VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0</b>	New projects must use version 4 of the risk tool and risk reports

<b>19 September 2019, v4.1 (Description)</b>	
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report v1.0 PNCAZ_REDD_Aug2018-Dec2020.pdf
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	A Non-permanence Risk Report was provided, however it uses template version 3 which is not the most up-to-date version.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please update the risk report to template version 4.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Non-permanence Risk Report has been updated to V4.
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	An updated risk report was provided. This item is addressed.

<b>Findings Number</b>	5
<b>VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0 19 September 2019, v4.1 (Section)</b>	Table 2 Financial Viability (FV)
<b>VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0 19 September 2019, v4.1 (Description)</b>	d) Project cash flow breakeven point is less than 4 years from the current risk assessment
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report v1.0 PNCAZ_REDD_Aug2018-Dec2020.pdf
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	The risk report states that funding has been secured to cover cash out prior to the sale of credits and that the breakeven point was less than four years from the current assessment, however no financial documents were provided to the verification team in order to provide evidence for this risk score.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please provide verifiable evidence to support the risk score taken.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Non-permanence Risk Report has been updated. Supporting documentation is attached. This issue is also addressed in CCB finding G4.7, MR section 2.4.6 and Non-Permanence Risk Report.
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	1. The audit team reviewed the audited financial statements. However, the NPRT Section 2.2.2 item 1) states "The cash flow breakeven point is the year in which the cumulative cash flow is positive (i.e., cash flow in exceeds cash flow out) and stays positive. Breakeven should be calculated one cash flow basis based on generally accepted accounting principles. Cash flow in may include commercial revenue streams associated with the project, secured revenue, and conservatively projected revenues from the sale of GHG credits, other funding sources such as donor funds, upfront investments, or carbon prepayments, equity or loans. Cash flow out shall include, at a minimum, project implementation costs, costs associated with

	GHG credit generation (e.g., validation, verification and registration), and, where applicable, interest expenses, repayment of loans or forward purchase agreements and any required equity distributions." The VVB found no evidence that satisfies this requirement.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 2</b>	CL: Please provide a financial analysis that covers the entire crediting period. Additionally please provide clear assumptions and verifiable evidence for future cash flows and expenses.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 2</b>	The cash flow and supporting documentation are attached in appendix nr. 5.
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 3</b>	The audit team reviewed the cash flow analysis and supporting documentation and is reasonably assured the appropriate risk rating has been taken. This finding is closed.

<b>Findings Number</b>	6
<b>VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0 19 September 2019, v4.1 (Section)</b>	Table 2 Financial Viability (FV)
<b>VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0 19 September 2019, v4.1 (Description)</b>	h) Project has secured 80% or more of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report v1.0 PNCAZ_REDD_Aug2018-Dec2020.pdf
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	The risk report states that funding has been secured to cover cash out prior to the sale of credits and that the breakeven point was less than four years from the current assessment, however no financial documents were provided to the verification team in order to provide evidence for this risk score.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please provide verifiable evidence to support the risk score taken.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Non-permanece Risk Report has been updated. Supporting documentation is attached. This issue is also addressed in CCB finding G4.7, MR section 2.4.6 and Non-Permanence Risk Report.
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	This finding is marked pending the result of other findings related to Financial Viability

<b>Findings Number</b>	7
<b>VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0 19 September 2019, v4.1 (Section)</b>	Table 2 Financial Viability (FV)
<b>VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0</b>	h) Mitigation: Project is protected by legally binding commitment (see Section 2.2.4) to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period

<b>19 September 2019, v4.1 (Description)</b>	
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report v1.0 PNCAZ_REDD_Aug2018-Dec2020.pdf
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	CIMA has a management contract that covers the length of the crediting period, however no mitigation is taken which is correctly stated within the project's VCS NPRT; however, the mitigation credit is not properly applied in the quantification of the project's risk score.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please update the NPRT risk score if the project wishes to claim the mitigation credit noted in the finding.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	

<b>Findings Number</b>	8
<b>VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0 19 September 2019, v4.1 (Section)</b>	Table 6 Land Tenure
<b>VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0 19 September 2019, v4.1 (Description)</b>	d) There exist disputes over access/use rights (or overlapping rights)
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report v1.0 PNCAZ_REDD_Aug2018-Dec2020.pdf
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	During the site visit the audit team interviewed representatives from the Chambira community and they described a current boundary dispute with the Park.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: There is no discussion of this issue within the NPRT nor MR. Please add additional language to both documents to describe the current dispute with Chambira.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	<p>This case was raised only during the verification field visit and falls off the monitoring period.</p> <p>In the native community of Chambira, some people mention a case of overlapping areas between the community's territory and the Cordillera Azul National Park area. This happened due to a misreading and misinterpretation of the maps and external interests to accredit more forest to the native community for economic benefit.</p> <p>The basin maps were previously made by another institution (Cedisa) and they were given to the community, leading to misinterpretation of the local territory, although they were never made with that purpose. The current</p>

	<p>community’s claim is that the whole basin area would be communal territory, while, when the park was established, it covered the higher part of the basin. CIMA has been carrying out continuous and participatory work with the community since 2002, where 4 MUFs (Mapping of Uses and Strengths) were developed in 2003, 2005, 2008, and 2016. In 2017 the Quality of Life Plan (QLP) was prepared and in 2018, the priority “Titling of communal territory” was achieved (see Appendix G5.3-G5.4). In the MUFs, CIMA and the community leaders have jointly recognized the limits of the park and its territory. Likewise, for this year, a joint work plan was agreed to develop. The activities for this year are: to form a community vigilance committee, provide technical support to the Allima Sacha association, and the CN Chambira tourism committee.</p> <p>Following PD section 7.1.3, this is an issue that was picked up by CIMA’s team and the Cordillera Azul Programme Director was made aware immediately. CIMA has established a plan of activities to clarify the claims of overlapping areas. First, CIMA's technical team, the PNCAZ leadership team, and the community leaders of Chambira will conduct a field visit to corroborate and reaffirm the limits of both territories together. On the other hand, a work meeting will be held in the community to explain the maps and boundaries of both sectors.</p>
<p><b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b></p>	<p>Although this was discovered by the verification team outside the monitoring period it is clear that this boundary dispute has been ongoing, although CIMA may have been unaware.</p> <p>The audit team is requesting additional evidence related to this dispute in the form of the two different maps showing the titled land boundaries of the park and the basin map that led to this dispute. Additionally, the audit team is requesting that the project provide shapefiles or maps showing legally titled land that the Chambira community owns.</p>
<p><b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 2</b></p>	<p>CL: Please provide the additional requested evidence in line with the Finding.</p>
<p><b>Response from Project Proponent Round 3</b></p>	<p>CIMA has never had any issue of this kind with Chambira native community, neither verbally, nor officially, or in any other way. CIMA and the JPNCZA understand there is no overlap between the territory of the community and the Park. CIMA sees this as a recent map misinterpretation and immediate measures were put in place to solve the differences with the community. An extraordinary assembly was held between the park, the community and CIMA, on Feb.6.2022; it was agreed to revisit the limits of the Park, the joint field visit is in stand-by until the indigenous federation comes along for the visit (See Annex 5). As it was explained in Round 2 of the findings and in the updated NPRR, CEDISA, a local NGO was working on the establishment of a "municipal conservation area", which was formally established in Dec.5.2002 (see ANNEX 6). THE ACM used the micro-basin concept and CEDISA prepared different thematic maps (contained in CEDISA.2004). Of the four maps, only one (Limites de la cuenca, map 1 in Appendix: 1 Mapas CEDISA Chambira in Round 2 attachments) does not show the limits of the Park; this is the map the community is misreading. Proof that there has never been any issue, is CIMA’s continuous and participatory work with Chambira since 2002:</p> <p>4 MUFs (Mapping of Uses and Strengths) were developed in 2003, 2005, 2008, and 2016. The MUF process implies the recognition of communal boundaries by the communities themselves. During this process the park and the benefits it provides was recognised by the CN Chambira. The CN Chambira was formally recognized in 2008 (RD100-2008-GR-SM/SRA-SM, 8 Mz) and its territory at the end of 2018. A map overlapping the areas made</p>

	<p>during MUF, the ACM and the recognized territory of the CN Chambira is shown in Appendix 10.</p> <p>Additionally, in 2017, the Quality of Life Plan (QLP) for Chambira was completed and in 2018, the priority “Titling of communal territory” was achieved (see Appendices G5.3-G5.4 of Round 1).</p> <p>Likewise, a joint work plan was agreed to be develop. The activities for this year are: to form a community vigilance committee, provide technical support to the Allima Sacha association, and the CN Chambira tourism committee.</p>
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	<p>Thank you for the clarification. The audit team reviewed the additional evidence provided and believes that the land dispute discovered on the site visit is a result of misinterpretation of the mapping by the community. Importantly, the current boundaries have been confirmed correct multiple times through different consultations with the Chambira community. The VVB is reasonably assured that this is not a real land dispute but rather a misinterpretation of maps. This finding is closed.</p> <p>The VVB plans to issue a FAR to ensure that the project provides an update on this misinterpretation of boundaries during the next verification.</p>

<b>Findings Number</b>	9
<b>VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0 19 September 2019, v4.1 (Section)</b>	Table 6 Land Tenure
<b>VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0 19 September 2019, v4.1 (Description)</b>	g) Mitigation: Where disputes over land tenure, ownership or access/use rights exist, documented evidence is provided that projects have implemented activities to resolve the disputes or clarify overlapping claims
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	Site Visit Information
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	During the site visit the audit team interviewed representatives from the Chambira community and they described a current boundary dispute with the Park.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please provide documented evidence to satisfy the requirements of this mitigation.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	<p>This case was raised only during the verification field visit and falls off the monitoring period.</p> <p>In the native community of Chambira, some people mention a case of overlapping areas between the community's territory and the Cordillera Azul National Park area. This happened due to a misreading and misinterpretation of the maps and external interests to accredit more forest to the native community for economic benefit.</p> <p>The basin maps were previously made by another institution (Cedisa) and they were given to the community, leading to misinterpretation of the local territory, although they were never made with that purpose. The current community's claim is that the whole basin area would be communal territory, while, when the park was established, it covered the higher part of the basin.</p>

	<p>CIMA has been carrying out continuous and participatory work with the community since 2002, where 4 MUFs (Mapping of Uses and Strengths) were developed in 2003, 2005, 2008, and 2016. In 2017 the Quality of Life Plan (QLP) was prepared and in 2018, the priority "Titling of communal territory" was achieved (see Appendix G5.3-G5.4). In the MUFs, CIMA and the community leaders have jointly recognized the limits of the park and its territory. Likewise, for this year, a joint work plan was agreed to develop. The activities for this year are: to form a community vigilance committee, provide technical support to the Allima Sacha association, and the CN Chambira tourism committee.</p> <p>Following PD section 7.1.3, this is an issue that was picked up by CIMA's team and the Cordillera Azul Programme Director was made aware immediately. CIMA has established a plan of activities to clarify the claims of overlapping areas. First, CIMA's technical team, the PNCAZ leadership team, and the community leaders of Chambira will conduct a field visit to corroborate and reaffirm the limits of both territories together. On the other hand, a work meeting will be held in the community to explain the maps and boundaries of both sectors.</p>
<p><b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b></p>	<p>Thank you for the additional information. The VVB's interpretation of the VCS NPRT is that when this mitigation credit is claimed this inherently means there is a dispute within the project area. Based on this conclusion, the VVB is requesting documented evidence shows that shows CIMA is working to address the land dispute with the Chambira community. Specifically, the plan described in the project NPRT on page 10.</p>
<p><b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 2</b></p>	<p>CL: Please provide documented evidence to support the claim of this mitigation credit.</p>
<p><b>Response from Project Proponent Round 2</b></p>	<p>The mitigation score is claimed for the "Ganadero Suarez" issue, which happened in previous monitoring periods and it is stated as such in the NPRR.</p> <p>The Chambira issue from this period is explained as a misinterpretation of maps and CIMA does not recognise it as a land tenure conflict. Nevertheless, as suggested in a call on 24. March 2022 with Aster Global, CIMA is voluntarily implementing preventing actions to avoid the issue to escalate and transform itself in an actual land tenure conflict, as it has been mentioned in Round 1 responses. The next step in this process is that CIMA and SERNANP accompany the community in a regular patrol or visit in order to confirm the boundaries and reassure that is no overlapping.</p> <p>Besides, CIMA has continued regular work with the community, thus making it very unlikely that more than a few people sustain the land tenure claim.</p> <p>See also response and appendices to previous finding.</p>
<p><b>Aster Global Findings Round 3</b></p>	<p>Thank you for the clarification. Because the VVB and the Project agree that the issue with the project boundaries and the Chambira community does not constitute a land dispute and there are no current land disputes this mitigation credit cannot be claimed. Additionally, the VCS NPRT is written in present tense and is designed to be updated at each verification. This risk score cannot be claimed for land disputes that no longer exist. The Mitigation Credit states "Where disputes over land tenure, ownership or access/use rights exist, documented evidence is provided that projects have implemented activities to resolve the disputes or clarify overlapping claims." There exists no disputes over land tenure and therefore this mitigation credit is not applicable.</p>

<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 3</b>	CL: Please update the risk score to conform to the requirements of the VCS NPRT.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 3</b>	NPRR updated to conform the external risks evaluation, as there is no land tenure dispute.
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 4</b>	The VVB reviewed the updated VCS NPRT and confirmed the mitigation is no longer claimed. This finding is closed.

<b>Findings Number</b>	10
<b>VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0 19 September 2019, v4.1 (Section)</b>	Table 7 Community Engagement
<b>VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, Version 4.0 19 September 2019, v4.1 (Description)</b>	b) Less than 20 percent of households living within 20 km of the project boundary outside the project area, and who are reliant on the project area, have been consulted
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report v1.0 PNCAZ_REDD_Aug2018-Dec2020.pdf
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	The verification team was unable to find evidence to support the claim that more than 20 percent of households living within 20km of the project area were consulted during the monitoring period.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please provide verifiable evidence to demonstrate that at least 20 percent of the households living within 20km of the project have been consulted.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Updated MR attached. A map is also attached showing the jurisdictions where information and consultation letters were sent (VCS findings NPRR Jurisdicciones receptoras cartas.jpg).
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	The map provided shows the communities that are within 20km of the project area, however the MR and statements made within the NPRT do not demonstrate if 20 percent of these households were consulted during the monitoring period.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 2</b>	CL: Please provide verifiable evidence to support this risk score.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 2</b>	During the 24.03.2022 call it was discussed that CIMA took two approaches to tackle this consultation and communication requirement. The first one is more formal and consists of the letters that were sent to the jurisdictions informing about the REDD project, the verification period, the consultation period and giving the opportunity to formulate opinions and recommendations. CIMA's logic is that the jurisdictions represent each household, fulfilling the requirements. During that call, a request of explanation about the blank areas in the map provided, was presented by the VVB. CIMA's answer is that the map employs mostly district municipalities in order not to overcharge the map visually, which does not mean that these areas were left untouched. This areas are covered by provincial municipalities, which are included among the letter originally sent. Proof of the communications along these areas is the presence of Cahuide and Shapaja precisely in the blank patch near Tocache, which was visited by the VVB. In order to clarify this further, we are

	<p>providing the list of recipients of the letters, which correspond to the actual letters sent in previous appendices (3 Destinatarios carta REDD consutla y difusion.xls).</p> <p>The second approach, as it was informed in the NPRR is CIMA’s participatory approach with the FOCAL model. In this process, important matters are taken to communal meetings and practically every communication and decision requires community participation, fulfilling the requirement at the household level. Additionally it has to be noted that the FOCAL process is long, so many activites are included in the process, although the most tangible goals of this monitoring period have been the 4 new Quality of Life Plans and the delayed actualisation of Yamino’s QLP, plus the two Blue Agreements (Nuevo Jaen and Cahuide) signed during the verification field visit. Attached is a list of some of the activities that were taken to communal assemblies during the monitoring period (4 Examples assenblies and topics FOCAL CIMA Aug18-Dec20.xls).</p>
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 3</b>	The audit team reviewed the project's response and additional evidence and is reasonably assured that the correct risk score is taken. This finding is closed.

<b>Findings Number</b>	11
<b>VCS Methodology VM0007 Version 1.3, 20 November 2012 REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) Sectoral Scope 14 (Section)</b>	a. All Activity Types
<b>VCS Methodology VM0007 Version 1.3, 20 November 2012 REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF) Sectoral Scope 14 (Description)</b>	Baselines shall be renewed every 10 years from the project start date
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	CIMA-2020-Monitoring Report_11-6-21.pdf
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	The following documents have not been provided: 958_Baseline Extension Letter” and “Carta N 00011-2019-MINAM-VMDERN_Autorización extensión de Linea Base_Proj Redd.pdf” (Page 43, CIMA-2020-Monitoring Report_11-6-21.pdf). Please provide the above-mentioned documents for verification.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please address in line with findings.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	The letters are included in Appendices G3.4 - MR 3.1. and this issue is also solved in CCB finding G3.4.
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	The audit team confirmed the receipt of related documents. The documents are included in "G3.4 - MR 3.1.3 Revision of the baseline" folder. This item is closed.

<b>Findings Number</b>	12
<b>VCS Methodology VM0007</b> Version 1.3, 20 November 2012 <b>REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF)</b> Sectoral Scope 14 (Section)	c. Calculation of Verified Carbon Units
<b>VCS Methodology VM0007</b> Version 1.3, 20 November 2012 <b>REDD+ Methodology Framework (REDD-MF)</b> Sectoral Scope 14 (Description)	To estimate the number of Verified Carbon Units (VCUs) for the monitoring period $T = t_2 - t_1$ , this methodology uses equation 8 on Page 19
<b>Requirement Met</b> (Y, N or Pending)	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess</b> (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)	MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx / CIMA-2020-Monitoring Report_11-6-21.pdf
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	VCU calculation is confirmed correct. See "Summary table, MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx" and "Table 26, CIMA-2020-Monitoring Report_11-6-21.pdf". However, values in "Project emissions or removals (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)" don't match between the Excel spreadsheet and the MR.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please address in line with findings.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Corrected the values in MR for "Project emissions or removals (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)"
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	The audit team confirmed that Table 26 in "CIMA-PNCAZ- 2020-Monitoring Report_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4_Version2.0_24.02.2022.docx" correctly referenced "Summary table, MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx". This item is closed.

<b>Findings Number</b>	13
<b>Approved VCS Module VMD0010</b> Version 1.0 <b>REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoided unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU)</b> Sectoral Scope 14 (Section)	STEP 3. Estimation of unplanned deforestation displaced from the project area to the Leakage Belt
<b>Approved VCS Module VMD0010</b> Version 1.0 <b>REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoided unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU)</b> Sectoral Scope 14 (Description)	b. Ex post assessment: Measure the area deforested in the project area (A,PA,unplanned,t) and Leakage Belt (ALK,unplanned,t). Follow instructions and guidance in Module M-MON. Refer to page 4 for ex post leakage equation 1
<b>Requirement Met</b> (Y, N or Pending)	Y

<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	Leakage LB/Defor actual, MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	This requirement is correctly calculated in "Column H, Leakage LB, MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx", thus $\Delta\text{CLK-ASU-LB} = 0$ . However, in "Leakage LB, MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx", please check the totals (Cells D/E/G/H21). Please also update "Page 93, Table 21., CIMA-2020-Monitoring Report_11-6-21.pdf".
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please address in line with findings.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Values in (Cells D/E/G/H21) have been Updated. Table 21 in the monitoring report values have been updated as well
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	The audit team confirmed the update of Cells D/E/G/H21 and Table 21. This item is closed.

<b>Findings Number</b>	14
<b>Approved VCS Module VMD0010 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoided unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU) Sectoral Scope 14 (Section)</b>	STEP 4. Estimation of unplanned deforestation displaced from the project area to outside the Leakage Belt
<b>Approved VCS Module VMD0010 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoided unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU) Sectoral Scope 14 (Description)</b>	g. Ex post, as deforestation in the project area and Leakage Belt will be measured, $\Delta\text{CLK-ASU}$ , INM-OLB will be estimated as follows:
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	In "Defor actual, MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx", $\Delta\text{CP,DefLB,i,t}$ (tCO <sub>2</sub> ) values (Cells K:L 28:30) incorrectly applied from tab "Stocks".
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please address in line with the findings. Also update Table 20 in MR.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Corrected value from "stocks" tab in "Defor actual, MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx", $\Delta\text{CP,DefLB,i,t}$ (tCO <sub>2</sub> ) values (Cells K:L 28:30). Updated Table 20 in MR. Updated parameter table $\Delta\text{CP,DefLB,i,t}$
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	The audit team confirmed the update of Cells K/L28:30 and Table 20. This item is closed.

<b>Findings Number</b>	15
<b>Approved VCS Module VMD0010 Version 1.0</b>	STEP 4. Estimation of unplanned deforestation displaced from the project area to outside the Leakage Belt

<b>REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoided unplanned deforestation (LK- ASU) Sectoral Scope 14 (Section)</b>	
<b>Approved VCS Module VMD0010 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoided unplanned deforestation (LK- ASU) Sectoral Scope 14 (Description)</b>	(4) Determine whether leakage outside the Leakage Belt has occurred. Refer to page 9
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	Leakage OLB, MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	In "Leakage OLB, MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx", wrong coding was applied for Row 12. Please update. Please also update "Table 23, CIMA-2020-Monitoring Report_11-6-21.pdf".
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please address in line with the findings.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Corrected "Leakage OLB, MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx", coding for Row 12. Updated Table 23 in the monitoring report
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	The audit team confirmed the update of Row 12 and Table 23. This item is closed.

<b>Findings Number</b>	16
<b>Approved VCS Module VMD0010 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoided unplanned deforestation (LK- ASU) Sectoral Scope 14 (Section)</b>	STEP 5. Emissions from leakage prevention activities
<b>Approved VCS Module VMD0010 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoided unplanned deforestation (LK- ASU) Sectoral Scope 14 (Description)</b>	Where leakage prevention activities are implemented the emissions from biomass burning and fertilizer usage shall be counted and conservatively included in their entirety as emissions caused by project implementation. Stratification of leakage prevention activities shall be on the basis of biophysical parameters <sup>8</sup> . Refer to equation at beginning of Page 10
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y

<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	Site Visit
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	During the site visit the audit team saw examples of different kinds of activities that take place in the leakage belt, some of which included the use of fertilizers. Specifically, in the cacao farmer program implemented there is a specific program that purchases fertilizers and pesticides for farmers to apply. It is unclear to the audit team why these emissions are not accounted for.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please clarify why emissions from fertilizers are not accounted for in line with the methodology.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	The fertilization program with farmers started in 2021 and falls off the monitoring period.
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	Thank you for the clarification. The audit team was not provided verifiable evidence to substantiate the statement provided in the project's response.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 2</b>	CL: Please provide evidence to support the statement made in the project's Round 1 Response.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 2</b>	We are providing the agreements with the 20 farmers from the Aspuzana valley that receive specialised technical assistance, dated 2021. See Appendix 2 Acuerdos Productores Cacao in Round 2 Attachments.
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 3</b>	The audit team reviewed the additional evidence provided by the project and is reasonably assured this technical assistance and associated fertilizer applications have not occurred during this monitoring period. This finding is closed.

<b>Findings Number</b>	17
<b>Approved VCS Module VMD0010 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoided unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU) Sectoral Scope 14 (Section)</b>	V. TERMS ORIGINATING IN OTHER MODULES
<b>Approved VCS Module VMD0010 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoided unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU) Sectoral Scope 14 (Description)</b>	ΔCBSL,LK,unplanned (t CO2-e)
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	PROJ_DESC_985_20DEC2012.pdf / CIMA-2020-Monitoring Report_11-6-21.pdf
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	For ΔCBSL,LK,unplanned (Page 43, CIMA-2020-Monitoring Report_11-6-21.pdf), please provide the correct values. There seems

	to be confusion between the values of "Table 3.19: CBSL values for the Leakage Belt, PROJ_DESC_985_20DEC2012.pdf" and "Table 3.21: Calculation of $\Delta$ CTOT for leakage belt, PROJ_DESC_985_20DEC2012.pdf" applied in "Leakage LB, MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx", of which the value from "Table 3.21: Calculation of $\Delta$ CTOT for leakage belt" was applied.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please address in line with findings.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Parameter tables for $\Delta$ CBSL,PA,unplanned & $\Delta$ CBSL,LK,unplanned have been updated to the correct values. The values in Table 3.19: CBSL values for the Leakage Belt,"PROJ_DESC_985_20DEC2012.pdf" should be labeled as "CABtree". The correct values are in "Table 3.21: Calculation of $\Delta$ CTOT for leakage belt, PROJ_DESC_985_20DEC2012.pdf" This is the value for CBSL. Also updated the monitoring report where the value CBSL has been mistakenly labeled CTOT (Table 8) Workbook table on baseline tables_2020 has been updated
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	The audit team confirmed the update of $\Delta$ CBSL,LK,unplanned to the correct values in "Page 46, CIMA-PNCAZ- 2020-Monitoring Report_CCBv2.0_VCSv3.4_Version2.0_24.02.2022.docx". This item is closed.

<b>Findings Number</b>	18
<b>Approved VCS Module VMD0010 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoided unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU) Sectoral Scope 14 (Section)</b>	V. TERMS ORIGINATING IN OTHER MODULES
<b>Approved VCS Module VMD0010 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of emissions from activity shifting for avoided unplanned deforestation (LK-ASU) Sectoral Scope 14 (Description)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> CP, LB (t CO <sub>2</sub> -e)
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	Defor actual, MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	In "Defor actual, MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx", $\Delta$ CP,DefLB,i,t (tCO <sub>2</sub> ) values (Cells K:L 28:30) incorrectly applied from tab "Stocks".
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please address in line with findings.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Repeated from above (correct value for stocks was updated)

<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	The audit team confirmed the update of Cells K/L28:30. This item is closed.
<b>Findings Number</b>	19
<b>VCS Methodology VMD0017 Version 2.1 9 March 2015 Sectoral Scope 14 Estimation of uncertainty for REDD+ project activities (X-UNC) (Section)</b>	5.3 Part 3: Uncertainty Ex Post in the REDD Project Scenario
<b>VCS Methodology VMD0017 Version 2.1 9 March 2015 Sectoral Scope 14 Estimation of uncertainty for REDD+ project activities (X-UNC) (Description)</b>	Table 4 below provides the parameters and corresponding modules relevant to this section. See Table 4 on page 12.
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	MonitoringWorkbook2020_33121.xlsx / CIMA-2020-Monitoring Report_11-6-21.pdf
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	Has project scenario pool uncertainty "UncertaintyREDD_WPS" been accounted in the total uncertainty calculation?
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please address in line with findings.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Yes. It's in Column F of the uncertainty slide, value of UncertaintyBSL,SS = 7.5% (overall precision of 2009 inventory, 95% CI as % of mean). Project scenario pool uncertainty is zero because there is no new stock estimate (this was clarified in a later vs of the methodology, module X-UNC "Where no ex post (re-)measurements of carbon pools or GHG sources have been made, ie, uncertainty from these sources is already included in UncertaintyREDD-BSL,t*, UncertaintyREDD-WPS is set equal to zero."
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	The audit team confirmed the statement "Where no ex post (re-)measurements of carbon pools or GHG sources have been made, i.e., uncertainty from these sources is already included in UncertaintyREDD_BSL,t*," from VMD0017 that "UncertaintyREDD_WPS" doesn't need to be considered since no ex post (re-)measurements is conducted (i.e. UncertaintyBSL,SS needs to be only considered). This item is closed.

<b>Findings Number</b>	20
<b>Approved VCS Module VMD0016,Version 1.1 (9 March 2015), REDD Methodological Module: Methods for stratification of the project area (X-STR), Sectoral Scope 14 (Section)</b>	Parameters
<b>Approved VCS Module VMD0016,Version 1.1 (9 March 2015), REDD Methodological Module:</b>	This methodology produces the following two parameters:

<b>Methods for stratification of the project area (X-STR), Sectoral Scope 14 (Description)</b>	
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	MR, GIS Files
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	The audit team reviewed the Shapefiles provided and the VVB was not provided the strata shapefiles.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please provide the validation strata shapefiles.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Strata maps were shared via email on 1/24/2022 and are shared again with this submission
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	The VVB reviewed strata shapefiles and confirmed these criteria is satisfied. This item is addressed and closed.

<b>Findings Number</b>	21
<b>VCS MODULE VMD0015 REDD METHODOLOGICAL MODULE: METHODS FOR MONITORING OF GHG EMISSIONS AND REMOVALS (M-MON). Version 2.1, 20 November 2012</b>	5.1.2 Post-processing and accuracy assessment
<b>VCS MODULE VMD0015 REDD METHODOLOGICAL MODULE: METHODS FOR MONITORING OF GHG EMISSIONS AND REMOVALS (M-MON). Version 2.1, 20 November 2012 (Description)</b>	The overall classification accuracy of the outcome of the previous steps must be 90% or more.
<b>Requirement Met (Y, N or Pending)</b>	Y
<b>Evidence Used to Assess (Location in PD/MR or Supporting Documents)</b>	MR
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 1</b>	In review of the responses of the round 1 findings, the VVB noted that the statement in MR "Overall classification accuracy was 95% Results of the accuracy assessment are in Table appendix 1.4" contradicts with the overall accuracy (93.68%) reported in the Table appendix 1.4. It is unclear which value is correct.
<b>NCR/CL/OFI Round 1</b>	CL: Please update the MR to be consistent throughout using the correct accuracy value.
<b>Response from Project Proponent Round 1</b>	Value corrected in MR.
<b>Aster Global Findings Round 2</b>	The audit team confirmed the MR has been appropriately updated in line with the finding. Item closed.

**APPENDIX C: CCB NCRS/CLS/OFI**

<b>Indicator G1.1</b> – The location of the project and basic physical parameters (e.g. soil, geology, climate).	The project location was confirmed during validation and has not changed during this verification period.  Section 1.9 of the validated Project Description (PD) document and Section 2.1 of the Monitoring Report (MR) provide a description of the location of the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Validated PD section 1.9, MR Section 2.1
Findings:	The project location provided in the MR is consistent with the location provided in the validated PD. Basic physical parameters (e.g., soil, geology, climate) remain unchanged from the validated and are not required to be presented in the MR. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator G1.2</b> – The types and condition of vegetation within the project area.	The original conditions of the project area were described in the validated PD and cannot change.  Section 1.9.3 of the PD describes the vegetation within the project area.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Validated PD section 1.9.3
Findings:	The original types and condition of the vegetation are presented in the validated PD. This indicator was closed during validation and does not need to be reopened. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator G1.3</b> – The boundaries of the project area and the project zone.	The original conditions of the project area were described in the validated PD and cannot change.  Section 1.9 of the validated PD describes the boundaries of the project area and the project zone. Figure 2.1 in the MR shows the project area project zone.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 1.9 of PD, Figure 2.1 of MR, site visit interviews with CIMA
Findings:	The Project Area is described and depicted in a manner that is consistent with the validated PD. The Project Zone includes the project area and buffer zone.

	Interviews with CIMA substantiated no changes in the boundaries of the project area or project zone. This indicator was successfully closed during project validation and does not need to be reopened. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator G1.4</b> - Current carbon stocks within the project area(s), using stratification by land-use or vegetation type and methods of carbon calculation (such as biomass plots, formulae, default values) from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's 2006 Guidelines for National GHG Inventories for Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Uses (IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU) or a more robust and detailed methodology.	Carbon stocks were confirmed during validation and stratified forest categories are described in section 1.9 of the validated PD.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 1.9 of PD
Findings:	This indicator was addressed during project validation and does not need to be reopened. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator G1.5</b> - A description of communities located in the project zone, including basic socio-economic and cultural information that describes the social, economic and cultural diversity within communities (wealth, gender, age, ethnicity etc.), identifies specific groups such as Indigenous Peoples and describes any community characteristics.	A description of the communities at the start of the project was included in the validated PD and cannot change.  Section 1.10.1 of the PD describes the communities within the project zone. Figure 12 of the MR shows the location of communities within the project zone.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 1.10.1 of PD, Figure 12 of MR
Findings:	Figure 12 of the MR shows the location of communities within the project zone and is consistent with communities depicted in Figure 3.20 of the validated PD. Section 1.10.1 of the PD describes the communities in detail. This indicator was successfully closed during project validation and does not need to be reopened. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<p><b>Indicator G1.6</b> - A description of current land use and customary and legal property rights including community property in the project zone, identifying any ongoing or unresolved conflicts or disputes and identifying and describing any disputes over land tenure that were resolved during the last ten years (see also G5).</p>	<p>Land use and rights at the start of the project were covered in the validated PD.</p> <p>Section 1.10.4 of the PD describes the land use and property rights of the project area at the start of the project. Section 2.5 of the MR describes the legal status and property rights and an overview of project zone land ownership.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section 1.10.4 of PD, Section 2.5 of MR</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>This indicator was covered in the validated PD. The MR states that land use and rights are unchanged from the validated PD. Item closed.</p>
<p>Date Closed:</p>	<p>24 January 2022</p>
<p><b>Indicator G1.7</b> - A description of current biodiversity within the project zone (diversity of species and ecosystems) and threats to that biodiversity, using appropriate methodologies, substantiated where possible with appropriate reference material.</p>	<p>This indicator refers to the biodiversity at the start of the project, which was covered in the validated PD.</p> <p>Section 1.10.5 of the PD describes the biodiversity in the project area as well as a list of threatened and unique species and the start of the project. The MR covers biodiversity for the current monitoring period.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section 1.10.5 of PD</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>This indicator refers to the biodiversity at the start of the project, which was covered in the validated PD. Item closed.</p>
<p>Date Closed:</p>	<p>24 January 2022</p>
<p><b>Indicator G1.8</b> - An evaluation of whether the project zone includes any of the following High Conservation Values (HCVs) and a description of the qualifying attributes.</p> <p><b>Indicator 8.1</b> - Globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>protected areas</li> <li>threatened species</li> <li>endemic species</li> </ol>	<p>An evaluation of High Conservation Values (HCVs) in the project zone was covered during validation. Section 1.10.7 of the PD includes an overview of the HCVs found in the project zone. There are examples of all 6 areas of HCVs with the Cordillera Azul National Park (PNCAZ), including protected areas, threatened and endemic species, critical habitats, large landscape level areas, rare ecosystems, forests critical to water catchments and erosion control, and forests critical to subsistence needs and communities' cultural identities.</p>

<p>d. areas that support significant concentrations of a species during any time in their lifecycle (e.g. migrations, feeding grounds, breeding areas).</p> <p><b>Indicator 8.2</b> - Globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape-level areas where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.</p> <p><b>Indicator 8.3</b> Threatened or rare ecosystems.</p> <p><b>Indicator 8.4</b> - Areas that provide critical ecosystem services (e.g., hydrological services, erosion control, fire control).</p> <p><b>Indicator 8.5</b> - Areas that are fundamental for meeting the basic needs of local communities (e.g., for essential food, fuel, fodder, medicines or building materials without readily available alternatives).</p> <p><b>Indicator 8.6</b> - Areas that are critical for the traditional cultural identity of communities (e.g., areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in collaboration with the communities).</p>	<p>The current status of HCV protection and monitoring is mentioned throughout the MR.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section 1.10.7 of PD</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>This indicator refers to HCVs at the start of the project, which was covered in the validated PD. Item closed.</p>
<p>Date Closed:</p>	<p>24 January 2022</p>

## G2 Baseline Projections

<p><b>Indicator G2.1</b> - Describe the most likely land-use scenario in the absence of the project following IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU or a more robust and detailed methodology, describing the</p>	<p>Baseline projections were covered in the validated PD and are not subject to change.</p>
--	---

range of potential land use scenarios and the associated drivers of GHG emissions and justifying why the land-use scenario selected is most likely.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 2.4 of the PD
Findings:	This indicator was addressed during project validation and does not need to be reopened. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator G2.2</b> - Document that project benefits would not have occurred in the absence of the project, explaining how existing laws or regulations would likely affect land use and justifying that the benefits being claimed by the project are truly 'additional' and would be unlikely to occur without the project.	This indicator was addressed during project validation and is not subject to change.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 2.5 of PD
Findings:	This indicator was addressed during project validation and does not need to be reopened. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator G2.3</b> - Calculate the estimated carbon stock changes associated with the 'without project' reference scenario described above. This requires estimation of carbon stocks for each of the land-use classes of concern and a definition of the carbon pools included, among the classes defined in the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU. The timeframe for this analysis can be either the project lifetime (see G3) or the project GHG accounting period, whichever is more appropriate. Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO <sub>2</sub> GHG emissions such as CH <sub>4</sub> and N <sub>2</sub> O in the 'without project' scenario. Non-CO <sub>2</sub> gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of CO <sub>2</sub> -equivalent) of the	This indicator was addressed during project validation and is not subject to change.
--	--

<p>project’s overall GHG impact over each monitoring period.</p> <p>Projects whose activities are designed to avoid GHG emissions (such as those reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), avoiding conversion of non-forest land, or certain improved forest management projects) must include an analysis of the relevant drivers and rates of deforestation and/or degradation and a description and justification of the approaches, assumptions and data used to perform this analysis. Regional-level estimates can be used at the project’s planning stage as long as there is a commitment to evaluate locally-specific carbon stocks and to develop a project-specific spatial analysis of deforestation and/or degradation using an appropriately robust and detailed carbon accounting methodology before the start of the project.</p>	
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section 3 of PD</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>This indicator was addressed during project validation and does not need to be reopened. Item closed.</p>
<p>Date Closed:</p>	<p>24 January 2022</p>
<p><b>Indicator G2.4</b> - Describe how the ‘without project’ reference scenario would affect communities in the project zone, including the impact of likely changes in water, soil and other locally important ecosystem services.</p>	<p>This indicator was addressed during project validation and is not subject to change.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Sections 1.13.5, 2.4, and 6.1 of PD</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>This indicator was addressed during project validation and does not need to be reopened. Item closed.</p>
<p>Date Closed:</p>	<p>24 January 2022</p>
<p><b>Indicator G2.5</b> - Describe how the ‘without project’ reference scenario</p>	<p>This indicator was addressed during project validation and is not subject to change.</p>

would affect biodiversity in the project zone (e.g., habitat availability, landscape connectivity and threatened species).	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections 2.4 and 5.1 of PD
Findings:	This indicator was addressed during project validation and does not need to be reopened. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

### G3 Project Design and Goals

<b>Indicator G3.1</b> - Provide a summary of the project's major climate, community and biodiversity objectives.	The primary objective of the project is to prevent all deforestation in PNCAZ through park protection activities and buffer zone activities to stabilize and promote sustainable land use and improve the quality of life for the communities.  The primary goal of the project as well as secondary goals are described in section 2.1 of the MR.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 1.8 of PD, Section 2.1 of MR
Findings:	The project goals and objectives are clear and are in alignment with the primary objective identified in the validated PD. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator G3.2</b> - Describe each project activity with expected climate, community and biodiversity impacts and its relevance to achieving the project's objectives.	Section 1.8 of the validated PD describes project activities and their expected relevance for achieving the project's objectives. Section 1.1 of the MR lists the achievements for project activities that have been met.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 1.8 of PD, Section 1.1 of MR
Findings:	This indicator is a validation item addressed by the PD and is not required to be addressed again by the MR. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator G3.3</b> - Provide a map identifying the project location and boundaries of the project area(s), where the project activities will occur, of the project zone and of additional surrounding locations that are	Figure 1.2 of the validated PD shows the project area, buffer zone, and surrounding areas. Figure 2.1 in the MR matches the map found in the PD.
---	--

predicted to be impacted by project activities (e.g. through leakage).	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Figure 1.2 of PD, Figure 2.1 of MR, Project Location section of MR (2.1.7), interviews with CIMA
Findings:	Project map and location presented in the MR is the same as map and location presented in the validated PD. MR states the project location is unchanged from the validated PD. Interviews with CIMA substantiate no changes in the project location or boundaries. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<p><b>Indicator G3.4</b> - Define the project lifetime and GHG accounting period and explain and justify any differences between them. Define an implementation schedule, indicating key dates and milestones in the project's development.</p>	<p>The project start date is 8 August 2008. The project lifetime is from 8 August 2008 – 7 August 2028.</p> <p>The current monitoring period is from August 2018 – December 2020.</p> <p>Section 1.8.1 of the validated PD contains an implementation schedule with milestones through 2018. Section 2.2.1 of the MR contains an implementation schedule with milestones through 2020. Milestones during the monitoring period include a Communal Conservation Agreements signed between CIMA and the local native communities, communities continued to develop and implement their Communal Strategic Planning, The Cordillera Azul National Park was included in the IUCN's Green List, and the selling of VCU's generated by the project.</p> <p>The project has not been rejected by any other GHG program and is not seeking to register credits with any other program.</p> <p>There were no deviations from the methodology or PD during the monitoring period. An adjustment to the monitoring plan was justified and explained during a previous verification period.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections 1.6 and 1.8 of validated PD; Sections in MR for Project Start Date, Project Crediting Period, and Project Implementation Period (2.1.6 and 2.2.1); site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	There are no discrepancies identified for the project lifetime and accounting period presented in the PD and MR.

	<p>Although dates for some anticipated events appeared to have shifted in the implementation schedule from what was presented in the PD and some events such as generation of monitoring reports were not presented in the MR, the VVB determined that most would not present material discrepancies. An opportunity for improvement was noted to include the monitoring event and report generation events in the MR as indicated by the PD.</p> <p>The PD identifies 2018 as the date for beginning the baseline revision process and establishing schedule for the next 10 years. MR Section 2.2 does not provide information on these project implementation milestones.</p>
<p>Clarification Request (CL):</p>	<p>Please provide clarification in the MR as appropriate for the dates or anticipated dates for the baseline revision process and anticipated schedule for next 10 years. Please provide clarification in the appropriate section of the MR to document whether the delayed baseline revision warrants consideration as a minor change to project description or project description deviation.</p>
<p>Date Issued:</p>	<p>24 January 2022</p>
<p>Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:</p>	<p>Three aspects explain this finding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CIMA's five-year plan 2019-2023 includes one specific activity regarding baseline extension and project verification for the current monitoring period, hoping to achieve the baseline part in the first year of the five-year plan. For this to happen, this work needed to start in 2018, as stated in the PD.</li> <li>2. In 2019 an extension of the original baseline was received for all early initiative REDD+ projects in Peru, ending 31 December 2020. This extension time was justified on the nesting process and is mentioned in the MR section 3.1.3. With the granting of this extension, CIMA requested Verra the extension of the baseline in order to avoid methodological deviations and Verra agreed (see Appendices G3.4 - MR 3.1.3).</li> <li>3. Currently the nesting process is being discussed in the Environment Ministry, with participation from the interested parties and has not yet achieved an</li> </ol>

	<p>agreement. The nesting process could affect the amount of credit generation and therefore the most logical step is to wait until the process reaches an agreement in order to estimate the next phase. (25 February 2022)</p>
Evidence used to close CL:	<p>The VVB reviewed the clarification provided regarding the milestone identified in the PD for baseline revision and confirmed this milestone information is addressed in MR Section 3.1.1.1. MR template instructions for Section 2.2.1 include the requirement to make note of where dates have changed since the last validation or verification. No milestone dates presented in Section 2.2.1 of the MR for the last verification (2016-2018) have changed that would need to be noted in Section 2.2.1 of the presented MR.</p> <p>An opportunity for improvement (OFI) was noted in MR Section 2.2.1 for the number of Blue Agreements reported as signed in 2014; the number reported as “3” appears should be “5”. An OFI does not require action by the Project Proponent to close the finding.</p> <p>Item closed.</p>
Date closed:	11 March 2022

<p><b>Indicator G3.5</b> - Identify likely natural and human-induced risks to the expected climate, community and biodiversity benefits during the project lifetime and outline measures adopted to mitigate these risks.</p>	<p>Risks to the expected climate, community, and biodiversity benefits are outlined in section 1.13.4 of the validated PD and section 2.2 of the MR. Risks identified in the PD include concessions in the buffer zone, lack of land tenure in the buffer zone, illegal activities in the buffer zone, and increased tensions between communities CIMA is working with and those that will be worked with in the future. The MR includes an additional risk of climate change. Mitigation strategies for each risk are described in the MR along with examples of mitigation that occurred during the monitoring period.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 1.13.4; MR Section covering Risks to the Project (2.2.5); site visit observations and interviews with CIMA staff and community members
Findings:	The natural and human-induced risks identified in the MR are consistent with the risks identified by the PD, with the MR including risk due to climate change as well. The VVB reviewed the mitigation strategies identified for each and concluded the reasonable steps

	<p>have been taken to mitigate the identified risks. Site visit observations and interviews with CIMA staff, Park guards, and community members substantiate the risk mitigation strategies outlined in the MR have been undertaken or are being undertaken.</p> <p>The mitigation strategies include references to appendices or support documents that do not appear to be part of the MR or that have been provided to the VVB.</p> <p>The non-permanence risk assessment and reporting is a VCS item covered by the VCS verification and is addressed separately by that verification.</p>
Clarification Request (CL):	Please provide clarification as appropriate regarding the appendices and support documents referenced in this section. Please provide copies of this documents as appropriate for VVB review.
Date Evaluated:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	All the missing references were cited in the literature and missing supporting documents have been provided. (25 February 2022)
Evidence Used to Close CL:	<p>The VVB acknowledges the response by the Project Proponent and the availability of support documents from the links provided.</p> <p>However, as part of the mitigation strategy for Climate Change, the MR still contains the statement:  “Also see Appendix 1, section 2.3.1: Training of Park team (CIMA and Park rangers, authorities and farmers by Field Schools, as part of the restoration project. “</p> <p>Appendix 1 of the MR does not contain the referenced material. Section 2.3.1 of the MR does not contain the referenced material. The VVB was however able to find information in MR 2.4.2 on training of Park guards, CIMA technicians, and local government specialists; this training was substantiated through interviews during the site visit and review of training materials.</p> <p>The VVB was not able to locate among the support documents provided to the VVB the document referenced as “CIMA 2017” that was also referenced as part of the mitigation strategy for Climate Change;</p>

	<p>the References Cited section of the MR identifies this as “CIMA 2017. UCAYALI: SINERGIAS POR EL CLIMA. Lima, Peru. 28 pp.” The VVB was able to find a copy online to review.</p> <p>The VVB was not able to locate among the support documents provided to the VVB the document referenced as “Watanabe et al. 2017” that was also referenced as part of the mitigation strategy for Climate Change; this document is not listed in the References Cited section of the MR. The VVB however determined that based on the context in which this document was cited and the availability of other substantiating information, review of this document would not be critical in determining the mitigation activity identified was implemented.</p> <p>Two opportunities for improvement (OFI) were noted: 1) for providing the correct referenced location in the MR for information regarding Training of Park team (CIMA and Park rangers, authorities and farmers by Field Schools, as part of the restoration project; and 2) for including Watanabe et al. 2017 within the References Cited section of the MR. OFIs do not require action by the Project Proponent to close out the finding.</p> <p>Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	11 March 2022

<p><b>Indicator G3.6</b> - Demonstrate that the project design includes specific measures to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes identified in G1 consistent with the precautionary principle.</p>	<p>The project activities are expected to result in the long-term protection of Cordillera Azul National Park. Protection activities inside the park as well as land-use stabilization efforts in the buffer zone are expected to maintain the abundance and diversity of the biota inside the park. Park guard patrol routes are used for both control and data collection and monitoring.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections 2.4, 5.1, and 6.1.4 of PD; Enhancement of High Conservation Values section of MR (2.2.6); site visit observations of CIMA and Park guard records; site visit interviews with CIMA, Park guards, and community members
Findings:	Site visit observations and interviews substantiate measures have been undertaken in accordance with the precautionary principle to ensure the maintenance of high conservation value attributes identified in PD

	<p>Section 2.4. The MR states that data collected by park patrol routes and researchers show good populations of vulnerable species within the park.</p> <p>The MR section on Enhancement of High Conservation Values (G3.6) addresses a limited number of the specific measures identified by the PD as needed to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of HCV attributes consistent with the precautionary principle. This MR section references additional details in section 5.1.2, but this section is not provided in the MR.</p>
Clarification Request (CL):	Please provide clarification as appropriate within the MR to describe the actions implemented during the monitoring period to ensure maintenance or enhancement of the HCV attributes identified in the PD.
Date Evaluated:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Enhancement and maintenance of HCVs is performed through community and biodiversity activities implementation. In this sense, the relationship between the variables monitored and the maintenance of HCVs has been stated in the MR sections 2.2.6, 4.1.3 and 5.1.2. (25 February 2022)
Evidence Used to Close CL:	The VVB confirmed MR Section 2.2.6 has been revised to provide clarification for actions that occurred during the monitoring period to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes identified in the project description. The VVB also confirmed the references to other MR sections containing additional information are now correct. Item closed.
Date Closed:	11 March 2022
<b>Indicator G3.7</b> - Describe the measures that will be taken to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.	<p>The project lifetime is expected to be greater than 100 years due to the national park status of the project area. The Peruvian government is committed to ensuring the park continues to be privately managed and protected.</p> <p>In 2018 the PNCAZ was added to the IUCN Green List, which generates an additional commitment to maintain the high standards of conservation for the area.</p>

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 2.2 of MR, IUCN Green List
Findings:	<p>Instructions from the CCB and VCS Monitoring Report Template are to describe actions needed and implemented during the monitoring period to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes identified in the project description. The MR does not clearly describe measures needed or undertaken during this reporting period to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.</p> <p>Site visit interviews with CIMA identified specific measures associated with funding that appear to have been undertaken and are being undertaken to ensure CCB benefits continue beyond the project lifetime. These measures are not described in the MR.</p>
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please provide clarification as appropriate within MR Section 2.2.7 (Benefit Permanence) to describe the measures needed or taken to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime. Please provide supporting documentation as appropriate.
Date Evaluated:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	<p>Besides what has been already explained in the PD, it has to be emphasised that CIMA put a lot of time and resources in helping prepare the necessary documentation for the Green List and paid the salaries of the consultants who led this work. The park's inclusion in the Green List (second half of 2018: <a href="https://www.cima.org.pe/es/noticias/gestion-del-parque-nacional-cordillera-azul-reconocido-a-nivel-internacional-al-ingresar-a-lista-verde-de-la-uicn">https://www.cima.org.pe/es/noticias/gestion-del-parque-nacional-cordillera-azul-reconocido-a-nivel-internacional-al-ingresar-a-lista-verde-de-la-uicn</a>) optimises the park's exposure and allows opting for further funding, using the already existing park's budget as counterpart.</p> <p>This funding has allowed to work on different aspects of climate, community and biodiversity, as for example happened with the CAFE project, shortly described below.</p> <p>The Cafe project was funded by Technoserve. It provided CIMA with additional funding, that was employed to map the coffee farmers in the Aspuzana Valley and Tocache region, provided training for farmers and started producing and selling seedlings of</p>

	<p>native tree species to be employed in the restoration activities, also included in this project. The table below shows all additional projects that fell in the current monitoring period and the amount managed by CIMA.</p> <p>In addition to these smaller funding opportunities, the activity regarding REDD funding has been key over this monitoring period (See MR 2.4.6). The goal with these larger transactions is to achieve a trust fund to finance the park's operations in perpetuity. With the current Total involvement, this will likely start happening over 2021.</p> <p>(25 February 2022)</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Close NCR:</p>	<p>The VVB confirmed that MR Section 2.2.7 has been revised to identify measures implemented during the monitoring period to maintain and enhance the climate, community, and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime. The VVB concludes the project proponent is taking reasonable measures to enhance project benefits beyond the project lifetime in accordance with the measures identified in PD Section 1.6. One measure identified by the PD as needed does not appear to have been implemented yet, creation of an endowment to ensure continued funding for park management activities well after the project's end. The MR identifies this measure as a goal to be accomplished starting in 2021.</p> <p>The commitment for establishing this endowment measure was substantiated during site visit interviews with CIMA as a continued commitment for the project, and this commitment was further substantiated through identification in financial audit documents provided to the VVB identifying this measure as the second priority after Park operations and other project obligations are met, through identification in the Non-permanence Risk Report as an agreement between CIMA and the government, and through the commitment to initiate this trust fund as identified in Section III of the document "Resumen Informe sobre los Créditos de Carbono del Parque Nacional Cordillera Azul Generados y Negociados por CIMA (al 31 de Diciembre de 2021)" provided to the VVB.</p>

	<p>Because the project is now more than halfway through the crediting period, which ends in August 2028, the VVB intends to issue a Forward Action Request (FAR) to the VVB for the next verification period regarding the status of the proposed Endowment. The FAR would be to review the status of the proposed endowment for two purposes: 1) to determine whether the endowment has been created; and 2) to assess whether reasonable measures have been taken to fund the endowment in accordance with the objective identified for this measure as presented in PD Section 1.6.</p> <p>Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	11 March 2022

<p><b>Indicator G3.8</b> - Document and defend how communities and other stakeholders potentially affected by the project activities have been identified and have been involved in project design through effective consultation, particularly with a view to optimizing community and stakeholder benefits, respecting local customs and values and maintaining high conservation values. Project developers must document stakeholder dialogues and indicate if and how the project proposal was revised based on such input. A plan must be developed to continue communication and consultation between project managers and all community groups about the project and its impacts to facilitate adaptive management throughout the life of the project.</p>	<p>Initial consultation of communities and stakeholders took place during validation. Two main groups of stakeholders were identified: primary stakeholders are those who have a direct involvement in the project area, and secondary stakeholders are in the buffer zone and may be affected by project activities. Primary stakeholders are listed in table 7.1 of the PD and were involved in project design. Secondary stakeholder involvement is described in PD Section 7.1.2.</p> <p>Section 2.3 of the MR states that monthly visits of CIMA’s field staff to communities provide an opportunity to present information and receive comments. Information about the project is available on CIMA’s web page.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 7.1 of validated PD, sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.3 of MR; site visit observations and interviews with communities and other stakeholders
Findings:	Site visit interviews substantiate the close relationship with SERNANP and involvement of SERNANP in project design and implementation. Site visit interviews substantiate regular visits occurred by CIMA staff to the communities within the project zone during the reporting period up until pandemic-related

	<p>restrictions prevented such interactions. Site visit interviews substantiate regular visits to communities resumed following easing of pandemic-related restrictions. Site visit interviews substantiate each community takes responsibility for how it participates in project-related activities and that CIMA’s role is as facilitator and for support.</p> <p>Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<p><b>Indicator G3.9</b> - Describe what specific steps have been taken, and communications methods used, to publicize the CCBA public comment period to communities and other stakeholders and to facilitate their submission of comments to CCBA. Project proponents must play an active role in distributing key project documents to affected communities and stakeholders and hold widely publicized information meetings in relevant local or regional languages.</p>	<p>According to the Verra website, the project was open for public comment from 13 October 2021 – 12 November 2021. There were no public comments received. According to the MR, the public comment period was publicized on the CIMA web page. Letters were distributed during communal assemblies to publicize the public comment period.</p> <p>Direct presentations to stakeholders were conducted to facilitate discussions on parameters, results, and opportunities.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 7.1.3 of PD, Section 2.3 of MR; site visit interviews and observations, review of Verra website and CIMA website
Findings:	<p>No public comments were received through the Verra website.</p> <p>The 30-day comment period was confirmed as publicized on the Verra webpage for the project. Site visit interviews substantiate information on the monitoring plan and public comment period was provided by CIMA to local community leaders and other stakeholders through letters and during direct presentations. Site visit interviews within the indigenous communities visited by the VVB (Chambira and Yamino) substantiate communication by CIMA in Spanish is acceptable based on the fluency in Spanish among the leaders and most community members in these indigenous communities and based on confirmation of acceptability by leaders within these communities.</p> <p>Some community members interviewed were not familiar with the availability of project summaries and</p>

	<p>the opportunity or process for providing comments. The VVB determined this to likely reflect communication by community leaders within the local community in the instances noted and noted that pandemic-related group gathering restrictions may have played some role. A copy of the notification sent to one local community leader was photographed by the VVB for documentation that project summaries and notification of the comment period were provided to local communities.</p> <p>Comments were received by the VVB during community member interviews that information such as this was previously provided and posted within the communities on bulletin boards which are no longer present or in operation. This form of communication about the project was identified as desirable by the community members who discussed it. Communication about the project through posters distributed to communities appears to be part of the project’s communication plan identified in the PD.</p> <p>The PD states that project documents including monitoring reports as well as notice of CCB public comment period will be posted on CIMA’s website in both English and Spanish. The VVB was not provided with a link to these documents on the CIMA website and could not readily confirm these documents are available on CIMA’s website.</p>
<p>Clarification Request:</p>	<p>Please provide a copy of the communication plan referenced as available in Appendix 10 of the PD. Please provide clarification as appropriate whether the distribution of project information materials covering this monitoring period comply with the project’s communication plan identified in the PD.</p> <p>Please provide a link to the monitoring reports, or monitoring report summaries, and CCB public comment period on the CIMA website for VVB verification of such posting.</p>
<p>Date issued:</p>	<p>24 January 2022</p>
<p>Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:</p>	<p>A copy of Appendix 10 of the PD is provided and also the park’s new Communications Strategy dated 2021. This document was developed in coordination with Crodillera Azul’s administration and contemplates REDD+ as one of the topics to be tackled. It will be</p>

	<p>the basis to keep improving implementation and results dissemination.</p> <p>Following PD section 7.1.2, letters were sent to different stakeholder communicating results and the publicizing the public comment period. The PIR in spanish, which contains a summary of the project’s achievements was attached to this letter and CIMA’s Executive Director’s and Cordillera Azul Programme Director’s contact emails were provided. (25 February 2022)</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Close CL:</p>	<p>The VVB has confirmed MR Section 2.3.3 has been revised to provide clarification for how the project proponent notified key stakeholders about the CCB public comment period for the present verification. MR Section 2.3.3 has been revised to also provide additional clarification for how project information covering this monitoring period was disseminated or for how stakeholders were notified regarding how to access the information. The VVB confirmed MR Section 2.3.3 now also includes a link to project summary information available on CIMA’s website. Based on a review of the information on this website, the VVB has concluded that although the CIMA website does not appear to contain the full or summary monitoring reports, the summary information provided on CIMA’s website includes information for the monitoring period under verification.</p> <p>Based on site visit interviews and review of supplemental documentation provided by the Project Proponent and observed during the site visit, the VVB concludes that although neither the 30-day comment period nor monitoring report or summaries for this monitoring period appear to have been posted on the CIMA website in accordance with the action identified in PD Section 7.1.3, the project proponent met the overall intent of public notification through appropriate postings on the Verra website, and through direct mailings to community leaders and community meetings within the project zone that provided the summary of monitoring results as well as links and contact information for accessing the Verra website and for providing comments.</p>

	<p>The VVB acknowledges receipt and review of the requested document identified as comprising Appendix 10 of the PD, as well as acknowledges receipt and review of the document presenting Park’s new Communications Strategy. The VVB did not identify any additional commitments by the Project Proponent in these documents regarding additional methods for disseminating information about the 30-day public comment period for the monitoring report under verification.</p> <p>Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	11 March 2022

<p><b>Indicator G3.10</b> - Formalize a clear process for handling unresolved conflicts and grievances that arise during project planning and implementation. The project design must include a process for hearing, responding to and resolving community and other stakeholder grievances within a reasonable time period. This grievance process must be publicized to communities and other stakeholders and must be managed by a third party or mediator to prevent any conflict of interest. Project management must attempt to resolve all reasonable grievances raised, and provide a written response to grievances within 30 days. Grievances and project responses must be documented.</p>	<p>The MR states that the conflicts and grievances procedure is unchanged from the description in the validated PDD and that all issues have been satisfactorily resolved through the process.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Sections 7.1.2 and 7.1.3, MR Section 2.3.4, site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	<p>Site visit interviews substantiate the generally widespread understanding of community members regarding the opportunity to bring potential concerns or grievances to CIMA representatives or park guards but did not substantiate a general understanding of a more formal grievance process. Site observations noted information available at guard stations and in some communities visited.</p> <p>The PD states that some comments and conflicts are sent to the CIMA field offices or directly to the Head</p>

	<p>of PNCAZ when they can't be handled through less formal means at the local level. The MR provides a general summary of conflicts or grievances received by CIMA and summarizes general project responses. The MR does not provide documentation for specific conflicts or grievances, or responses by the project proponent.</p>
Clarification Request (CL):	<p>Please provide supporting documentation for the grievance redress procedure activities for the monitoring period. Please provide clarification as appropriate for specific conflicts or grievances received during the reporting period, and please provide the specific responses by the project proponent.</p>
Date issued:	<p>24 January 2022</p>
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	<p>Two events are described here: 1. The first one is rather an infraction and is the deforestation event in Q4-2020 in the Shanshuico-Ipururo sector (described in MR section 5.3.2 and supporting documentation is attached). 2. The second issue deals with land titling in the Chambira Native Community in the Shamboyacu area which can be defined as a potential conflict (described in MR section 2.3.4). This event became aware for CIMA only during the verification visit and falls off the monitoring period (2021). It also answers G5.3 and G5.4 and the solving procedure is described too in MR section 2.3.4. (25 February 2022)</p>
Evidence Used to Close CL:	<p>The VVB has reviewed additional information included in MR Section 2.3.4 and MR 5.3.2 as well as the supplemental documentation provided by the project proponent in response to the request for clarification. The additional information provided by the project proponent substantiates that in accordance with the process for handling unresolved conflicts and grievances outlined in the PD conflicts and potential conflicts not able to be resolved by park guards or staff at the local level are elevated to CIMA's offices or Headquarters.</p> <p>The VVB concurs that site visit interviews with community leaders, community members, park guards, and CIMA field staff did not identify other substantive concerns or grievances, and further substantiated conflicts and grievances are handled following the process outlined in the PD.</p>

	<p>The VVB intends to issue a Forward Action Request (FAR) for the VVB for the next verification period to assess the status of the concern voiced during the present verification site visit to the Chambira native community, and to verify this potential boundary conflict has been resolved, or is in the process of being resolved, in accordance with the project’s grievance redress procedure.</p> <p>Item closed.</p>
Date closed:	11 March 2022

<p><b>Indicator G3.11</b> - Demonstrate that financial mechanisms adopted, including projected revenues from emissions reductions and other sources, are likely to provide an adequate flow of funds for project implementation and to achieve the anticipated climate, community and biodiversity benefits.</p>	<p>This is a validation item and not required to be addressed in the MR.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 2.5.3, interviews with CIMA project management staff
Findings:	<p>This is an item successfully demonstrated and closed during validation. Interviews with CIMA project management staff substantiated project adherence to the financial plan outlined in the PD.</p> <p>Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

#### **G4 Management Capacity and Best Practices**

<p><b>Indicator G4.1</b> - Identify a single project proponent which is responsible for the project’s design and implementation. If multiple organizations or individuals are involved in the project’s development and implementation the governance structure, roles and responsibilities of each of the organizations or individuals involved must also be described.</p>	<p>The Project Proponent is Centro de Conservación, Investigación y Manejo de Áreas Naturales-Cordillera Azul (CIMA-Cordillera Azul). Gonzalo Varillas C. is the contact person. Other entities involved in the project include TerraCarbon LLC which provides technical assistance.</p> <p>The Project Proponent has not changed since validation, however the contact person for CIMA-Cordillera Azul has changed.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 1.3 of PD, Section 2.1 of MR

Findings:	The project proponent is CIMA-Cordillera Azul. Other entities and their roles are listed in section 2.1.1 of the MR. The MR provides the updated contact person for CIMA-Cordillera Azul. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator G4.2</b> - Document key technical skills that will be required to implement the project successfully, including community engagement, biodiversity assessment and carbon measurement and monitoring skills. Document the management team’s expertise and prior experience implementing land management projects at the scale of this project. If relevant experience is lacking, the proponents must either demonstrate how other organizations will be partnered with to support the project or have a recruitment strategy to fill the gaps.	The technical qualifications for the project staff are outlined in section 2.4.1 of the MR. There are project directors and staff in place to oversee project progress, finances, park management, project data, as well as many other project aspects. CIMA also collaborates with several institutions that provide an additional set of skills to assist in implementing project activities.  The MR states the only change in key project personnel since the last verification has been the Program Director and executive director of CIMA. The MR states that there has not been a change in the organigram and the personnel responsible for the project has been maintained.  TerraCarbon has provided technical support to assist in measurement and monitoring of forest carbon.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 1.3.1 of PD, Section 2.4.1 of MR; site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	The MR identifies key technical skills required for the continued implementation of the project. These skills are consistent with the skills identified in the PD as required. Site visit observations and interviews substantiates the project management team comprises individuals with the expertise and ability to perform their respective roles in managing a VCS/CCB project of this scale.  The project proponent has continued to partner with TerraCarbon to provide key technical support with measurement, monitoring, and modeling of forest carbon. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator G4.3</b> - Include a plan to provide orientation and training for the project’s employees and relevant people from the communities with an	CIMA maintains an anti-discriminatory hiring process that is outlined in their Internal Work Regulations. Positions will be advertised through postings, social media, and word of mouth throughout the
---	---

<p>objective of building locally useful skills and knowledge to increase local participation in project implementation. These capacity building efforts should target a wide range of people in the communities, including minority and underrepresented groups. Identify how training will be passed on to new workers when there is staff turnover, so that local capacity will not be lost.</p>	<p>communities. New employees will attend orientation and training to promote the safety of all employees.</p> <p>Several trainings took place during the monitoring period on restoration, the SMART system, camera traps, and survival for park guards.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section 1.3.2 of PD, section 2.4.2 of MR; site visit observations and interviews</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Site visit interviews substantiate trainings for park guard staff, CIMA staff, and community members occurred during the reporting period consistent with the training listed in the MR.</p> <p>Site visit interviews substantiate new employees and community members involved in training opportunities are provided with orientation regarding the project including project objectives and relevant project activities.</p> <p>Instructions from the Monitoring Report template require an explanation of how, once it has been built, local capacity is not lost. The MR is not clear in providing this information but states that worker training is unchanged from the description in the validated PDD.</p>
<p>Clarification Request (CL):</p>	<p>Please clarify as appropriate in MR Section 2.4.2 how local capacity is not lost.</p>
<p>Date Evaluated:</p>	<p>24 January 2022</p>
<p>Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:</p>	<p>Text added in MR: CIMA’s pursuit in the park’s protection has been able to maintain the personnel and the people involved in project activities along the years. The estimated average time of permanence in the institution (staff and rangers) is 10 years and the people in communities involved with activities are recognised as local leaders.</p> <p>Another aspect to be mentioned is the work stability CIMA has been able to maintain and the permanent presence in the communities, which acts as local capacity retention strategy. The comparative difference with other projects is the permanence of 20</p>

	<p>years so far, which currently is secured at least until 2028 by the Administration Contract with SERNANP. Rodriguez et al. 2018 (attached) article, emphasizes the importance of CIMA's long term engagement and presence in the area. (25 February 2022)</p>
Evidence Used to Close CL:	<p>The VVB confirmed MR Section 2.4.3 has been revised to provide an explanation for how local capacity is not expected to be lost once it has been built. The document (Rodriguez et al. 2018) now referenced in MR Section 2.4.2 and provided to the VVB provides a more detailed description for how local capacity has been built within the communities. Site visit observations and interviews substantiated the longevity of many of the field technical staff and continued involvement in project activities by past local leaders as well as the current local leaders.</p> <p>An Opportunity for Improvement (OFI) was noted for including the study referenced in MR Section 2.4.3 (Rodriguez et al. 2018) to the list of References Cited in Appendix 3 of the MR. An OFI does not require action by the project proponent to close out the finding. Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	11 March 2022

<b>Indicator G4.4</b> - Show that people from the communities will be given an equal opportunity to fill all employment positions (including management) if the job requirements are met. Project proponents must explain how employees will be selected for positions and where relevant, must indicate how local community members, including women and other potentially underrepresented groups, will be given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained.	<p>The validated PD states that CIMA does not discriminate on any basis during the hiring process. Section 2.4.3 of the MR contains a table with the PNCAZ project staff and the number of women employed. Management activities are led from the field offices throughout the project area which allows individuals from a greater area to be involved with the project.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 2.4.3 of the MR, Section 1.3.2 of the PD; site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	Site visit observations and interviews substantiate the advertising of open job positions and recruitment efforts from within the local communities of the

	<p>project zone. Employees and community leaders interviewed by the VVB were consistent in expressing belief that the hiring process was open and fair.</p> <p>Table 2.1 of the MR identifies the number of CIMA employees and park guards who are women. Site visit observations and interviews substantiate the hiring of women into project roles, including management positions. Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<p><b>Indicator G4.5</b> - Submit a list of all relevant laws and regulations covering worker’s rights in the host country. Describe how the project will inform workers about their rights. Provide assurance that the project meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering worker rights and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.</p>	<p>Laws and regulations relevant to the project are listed and described in section 1.11 of the validated PD. Section 2.4.4 of the MR lists the laws and regulations relevant to worker’s rights:</p> <p>Ley N°30222 Ley N°29783 Ley de Seguridad y Salud en el trabajo Decreto Supremo N° 007-2012-TR Reglamento de Ley N°29783</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 1.11.1 of PD, Section 2.4.4 of MR; supplemental document Reglamento Interno de Trabajo (CIMA, Oct 2008); site visit interviews with CIMA
Findings:	<p>The MR does not provide a full description for how the project informs workers about their rights and does not provide a clear assurance that the project has met or exceeded each of the relevant labor laws and regulations. The MR does not document in Section 2.4.4 how compliance was achieved or describe activities and/or processes implemented to inform workers of their rights. It is unclear from the MR how the project informs workers about their rights. The verification team was unable to find where a demonstration of compliance with the relevant laws was provided.</p> <p>Site visit observations documented the posting of workers rights information in CIMA offices and ranger stations. Site visit interviews substantiate that there is a CIMA employee responsible for ensuring the project is in compliance with labor laws.</p>

Clarification Request:	Please clarify within the MR as appropriate how workers are informed about their rights and provide a demonstration of compliance with the laws listed above.
Date Issued:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Besides the laws and regulations listed in the MR, we attach the following HR documents. This information has also been added to the MR section 2.4.4. 1. Institutional policy on human rights 2. HSE policy 3. Sexual harassment prevention policy 4. Internal regulation on security and safe at work CIMA has an HR responsible since 2021. (25 February 2022)
Evidence Used to Close CL:	The VVB confirmed clarification was added to MR Section 2.4.4 that identifies specific internal, institutional documents that include information on how workers are informed of their rights. The VVB substantiated during site visit interviews and observations that workers are informed of their rights at hiring and through availability of relevant documents and notifications. The support documents supplied by the project proponent for VVB review also provide descriptions for the processes by which compliance with the referenced labor laws are achieved and documented. These documents also identify who is responsible for ensuring compliance. The MR identifies an HR added in 2021, who the VVB confirmed during interviews is now responsible for monitoring and ensuring compliance. Item closed.
Date Closed:	11 March 2022

<b>Indicator G4.6</b> - Comprehensively assess situations and occupations that pose a substantial risk to worker safety. A plan must be in place to inform workers of risks and to explain how to minimize such risks. Where worker safety cannot be guaranteed, project proponents must show how the risks will be minimized using best work practices.	Section 1.3.2 of the PD states that CIMA promotes the safety of its employees through security protocols and training and by providing appropriate commitment. Park guards use a radio reporting system to ensure guards are safe and to identify any new threats or risks.  Section 2.4.5 of the MR states that CIMA has a Safety and Health Management System at Work document which states that promoting the physical integrity and occupational health of workers is a priority for CIMA.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 1.3.2 of PD, Section 2.4.5 of MR; site visit observations and interviews

Findings:	The VVB substantiated copies of CIMA’s Safety and Health Management System at Work were available in CIMA offices visited. Interviews substantiated that CIMA employees and SERNANP park guards for the project were informed of potential risks and how to minimize these risks as part of the employment process. Site observations substantiated park guards were provided with relevant and appropriate safety materials, including antivenom kits that were required to be carried with them while on patrols. The VVB determined that the project is undertaking appropriate health and safety measures relevant to identified risks. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator G4.7</b> - Document the financial health of the implementing organization(s) to demonstrate that financial resources budgeted will be adequate to implement the project.	Section 2.4.6 of the MR gives an overview of the financial health of CIMA as well as funding sources for 2018-2020.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 2.4.6 of the MR
Findings:	The MR states that a current financial spreadsheet that has been audited will be provided to the verification team, however this spreadsheet could not be found among the documents provided.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please provide documents to meet the requirement stated above to demonstrate the financial health of the implementing organization.
Date Issued:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Attached are the 2018 and 2019 audits, and also a spreadsheet summing up 2020’s financial status. Besides, a summary report for the carbon credit sales up to December 2021 has recently been finished and is also attached. This information has also being complemented in the corrected MR section 2.4.6 and commented in the Non-Permanence Risk Report. (25 February 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The VVB has reviewed the supporting financial documents provided by the project proponent. The audits provided to the VVB for review were completed by Baker Tilly International which attested the audits they completed were conducted in accordance with International Auditing Standards approved for application in Peru, by the Board of Deans of Colleges of Public Accountants of Peru.

	<p>Those standards require that the financial auditor comply with ethical requirements and plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement. Review of the other supporting financial documents substantiates the financial health of CIMA based on recent and anticipated sales of carbon credits from the project and show that financial resources budgeted will be adequate to continue implementing the project.</p> <p>Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	11 March 2022

### G5 Legal Status and Property Rights

<p><b>Indicator G5.1</b> - Submit a list of all relevant national and local laws and regulations in the host country and all applicable international treaties and agreements. Provide assurance that the project will comply with these and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.</p>	<p>Relevant laws are listed in section 1.11 of the PD, which states that CIMA is committed to meeting or exceeding any regulation, standard, treaty, or international agreement that may cover its activities.</p> <p>Section 1.5.1 of the MR lists relevant regulations and laws have changed from the validated PD, and restates that CIMA is committed to meeting or exceeding any regulation, standard, treaty, or international agreement that may cover its activities.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 1.11 of PD, Section 2.5.1 of MR; site visit interviews and observations
Findings:	<p>The MR identifies relevant national and local laws and regulations that have changed since the PD, but none of these changes have occurred since the last verification period. The MR states that the only regulation that affects the project area is the regulation establishing the national park. Since the project exists to enforce these regulations, it is therefore in compliance with them. Site visit observations and interviews substantiate the close relationship and communication with SERNANP, the government agency responsible for administration of national parks. No compliance concerns were identified during interviews with SERNANP.</p> <p>Item closed</p>
Date closed:	24 January 2022
<p><b>Indicator G5.2</b> - Document that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, including the</p>	<p>This item was closed at validation and does not need to be reopened during this verification.</p>

established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the communities.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 1.10.4 of validated PD
Findings:	This indicator is a validation item addressed by the PD and is not required to be addressed again by the MR. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator G5.3</b> - Demonstrate with documented consultations and agreements that the project will not encroach uninvited on private property, community property, or government property and has obtained the free, prior, and informed consent of those whose rights will be affected by the project.	Section 1.10.4 of the validated PD identifies the land within the project area as a national park owned by the national government of Peru. The PD describes the consultation with Kakataibo tribal leaders in the project zone about the creation of the intangible zone associated with a possibly uncontacted group of Kakataibo residing in or near the park. The MR provides documentation for the legal requirements to prevent attempts to locate this uncontacted group. The PD identifies other coordination and consultations to ensure FPIC from those whose property rights will be or are affected by the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 1.10.4, MR Section 2.5.2, site visit interviews
Findings:	Site visit interviews with the Chambira indigenous community identified a concern this community has identified in the recent marking of park boundaries that conflict with their understanding of their community lands. The Chambira community interviewees identified the boundary marking occurred in 2018 but interviews with CIMA staff identified this as a concern only recently brought to their attention.
Clarification Request (CL):	Please provide clarification as appropriate on the status of the boundary concern between the project area (Park) and Chambira indigenous community. Please provide appropriate support documentation to demonstrate that the project will not be encroaching uninvited onto Chambira indigenous community lands.
Date Issued:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The case with Chambira Native Community is dealt with in the MR section 2.3.4 and section 2.5.2. This issue is also addressed in the Non-permanence Risk Report, section Land Tenure and Resource Access. and supporting documentation is attached (see

	<p>Appendices G5.3-G5.4), including a very recent meeting. (25 February 2022)</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Close CL:</p>	<p>The VVB confirmed MR Sections 2.3.4 and 2.5.2 have been revised to address the potential boundary conflict identified by the Chambira native community during the VVB site visit. The project proponent provided additional supporting documentation to demonstrate the project proponent has initiated efforts since the VVB site visit to meet with the Chambira native community to work towards resolution of this concern.</p> <p>Based on discussions with CIMA and SERNANP, review of the descriptions added to the MR regarding events leading up to the potential boundary dispute, and interviews with leaders and members of the Chambira native community during the site visit, the VVB has concluded the project appropriately obtained FPIC at the onset of the project and that the current potential boundary dispute is based on results from titling of community territory undertaken in 2018. Because this disputed boundary concern had not apparently been formally elevated to a grievance or conflict with the project during the monitoring period under verification, and because this disputed boundary concern had apparently only recently been brought to the attention of the project proponent, and because the project proponent has provided documentation that the project proponent has initiated efforts since the VVB site visit to meet with the Chambira native community to resolve this disputed boundary concern, the VVB has determined that during the time period under verification the project was still operating under the free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) initially obtained from the community.</p> <p>The VVB intends to issue a Forward Action Request (FAR) for the VVB for the next verification period to assess the status for the resolution of the question regarding the correct legal boundary between the Park and community lands of the Chambira native community. The FAR will request the next VVB verify this potential boundary conflict has been resolved or is in the process of being resolved, and that continued Chambira native community involvement</p>

	with the project has been made with full consideration to the concepts of FPIC. In the case of boundary resolution resulting in Park boundary adjustments in favor of the Chambira native community lands, the FAR will request that the VVB determine if the project proponent has demonstrated with documented consultations and agreements that the project does not encroach uninvited on community property and the project continues to have the free, prior, and informed consent of the community whose rights would be affected by the project. Item closed.
Date Closed:	11 March 2022

<b>Indicator G5.4</b> - Demonstrate that the project does not require the involuntary relocation of people or of the activities important for the livelihoods and culture of the communities. If any relocation of habitation or activities is undertaken within the terms of an agreement, the project proponents must demonstrate that the agreement was made with the free, prior, and informed consent of those concerned and includes provisions for just and fair compensation.	The MR describes the privately-held parcels within the Park boundaries but is clear in stating these are not included in the project area and CIMA is not claiming credit for these areas. The MR also describes how the project respects property rights within the project zone.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 1.10.4, MR Section 2.5.3, site visit interviews
Findings:	Full review of compliance with this indicator requires resolution of findings for Indicator G5.3.
Clarification Request (CL):	Please clarify, as appropriate, following resolution of findings for Indicator G5.3 that the requirements of Indicator G5.4 are met by the project.
Date Issued:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	The case with Chambira Native Community is dealt with in the MR section 2.3.4 and section 2.5.2. This issue is also addressed in the Non-permanence Risk Report, section Land Tenure and Resource Access. and supporting documentation is attached (see Appendix G5.3-G5.4), including a very recent meeting. (25 February 2022)
Evidence Used to Close CL:	Based on review of supplemental information provided by the project proponent and based on site

	<p>visit interviews with leaders of the Chambira native community, the VVB has concluded the lands likely involved in the potential boundary dispute are uninhabited and regardless of the outcome of the potential boundary dispute are available for subsistence hunting and other non-timber forest uses by the Chambira native community. The Chambira native community leaders did not identify the disputed area as an area where timber harvesting is an activity presently undertaken by the Chambira native community, but identified it as an area important for watershed protection.</p> <p>The VVB intends to issue a Forward Action Request (FAR) for the VVB for the next verification period to assess the status for the resolution of the question regarding the correct legal boundary between the Park and community lands of the Chambira native community. In the case of boundary resolution resulting in Park boundary adjustments in favor of the Chambira native community lands, the FAR will request that the VVB determine if project requires relocation of activities important for the livelihoods and culture of the community, and if so, whether any relocation of habitation or activities is undertaken within the terms of an agreement. The FAR will also request the next VVB to determine as appropriate whether the project proponents have demonstrated that the agreement was made with the free, prior, and informed consent of those concerned and includes provisions for just and fair compensation.</p> <p>Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	11 March 2022

<p><b>Indicator G5.5</b> - Identify any illegal activities that could affect the project's climate, community or biodiversity impacts (e.g., logging) taking place in the project zone and describe how the project will help to reduce these activities so that project benefits are not derived from illegal activities.</p>	<p>Illegal activities that occur in the project area and buffer zone identified in the PD include logging, hunting, and mining. While the park guards are not authorized to enforce regulations within the buffer zone, they immediately report incidents to local authorities.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 1.8.1 of PD, Section 2.5.4 of MR

Findings:	The MR does not provide details about illegal activities that may have been identified during the monitoring period and how the project is helping to reduce these activities. Site visit interviews identified illegal activities that may have occurred during the monitoring period including illegal clearing for new religious-based community in the western part of the project area, and hunting activities undertaken without proper registration at park guard stations.
Clarification Request (CL):	Please clarify if there were illegal activities identified during the monitoring period and how the project is helping to reduce these activities.
Date Evaluated:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	There may have been a misunderstanding about this case. We did speak in the opening meeting on 3.Dec.21 at CIMA's office about the deforestation event in the current monitoring period in the Shanshuico-Ipururo sector, which is mentioned in G3.10 and dealt with in the MR section 5.3.2. We also mentioned that currently religious based groups (Mennonites) are a large deforestation source in the Peruvian Amazon. There is a new indication in MR section 2.5.4 about the deforestation event. (25 February 2022)
Evidence Used to Close CL:	The VVB acknowledges the misunderstanding that may have occurred regarding the agent of the deforestation incident discussed during the site visit. The VVB confirmed MR Section 2.5.4 has been revised to provide clarification for an instance of illegal deforestation in the project zone during the monitoring period and that increased ranger patrols were identified as the measure the project undertook to help reduce these types of illegal activities. The VVB confirmed that MR Section 5.3.2 also contains the explanation over what is considered "illegal" hunting versus an infraction of policies governing allowable subsistence hunting. Item closed.
Date Closed:	11 March 2022
<b>Indicator G5.6</b> - Demonstrate that the project proponents have clear, uncontested title to the carbon rights, or provide legal documentation demonstrating that the project is	This item was successfully demonstrated during validation and does not need to be reopened during verification.

undertaken on behalf of the carbon owners with their full consent. Where local or national conditions preclude clear title to the carbon rights at the time of validation against the Standards, the project proponents must provide evidence that their ownership of carbon rights is likely to be established before they enter into any transactions concerning the project's carbon assets.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 1.12.1
Findings:	This indicator is a validation item addressed by the PD and is not required to be addressed again by the MR. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

### CL1 Net Positive Climate Impacts

<b>Indicator CL1.1</b> - Estimate the net change in carbon stocks due to the project activities using the methods of calculation, formulae and default values of the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU or using a more robust and detailed methodology. The net change is equal to carbon stock changes <i>with</i> the project minus carbon stock changes <i>without</i> the project (the latter having been estimated in G2). This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about how project activities will alter GHG emissions of carbon stocks over the duration of the project or the project GHG accounting period.	Pending successful VCS verification.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	See VCS verification
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	
Date Evaluated:	
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	
Date Closed:	

<b>Indicator CL1.2</b> - Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO <sub>2</sub> GHG emissions such as CH <sub>4</sub> and N <sub>2</sub> O in the <i>with</i> and <i>without</i> project scenarios if those gases are likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO <sub>2</sub> -equivalent) of the project's overall GHG emissions reductions or removals over each monitoring period.	Pending successful VCS verification.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	See VCS verification
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	
Date Evaluated:	
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	
Date Closed:	

<b>Indicator CL1.3</b> - Estimate any other GHG emissions resulting from project activities. Emissions sources include, but are not limited to, emissions from biomass burning during site preparation, emissions from fossil fuel combustion, direct emissions from the use of synthetic fertilizers, and emissions from the decomposition of N-fixing species.	Pending successful VCS verification.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	See VCS verification
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	
Date Evaluated:	
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	
Date Closed:	

<b>Indicator CL1.4</b> - Demonstrate that the net climate impact of the project is positive. The net climate impact of the project is the net change in carbon	Pending successful VCS verification.
--	--------------------------------------

stocks plus net change in non-CO <sub>2</sub> GHGs where appropriate minus any other GHG emissions resulting from project activities minus any likely project-related unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts (see CL2.3).	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	See VCS verification
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	
Date Evaluated:	
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	
Date Closed:	

<b>Indicator CL1.5</b> - Specify how double counting of GHG emissions reductions or removals will be avoided, particularly for offsets sold on the voluntary market and generated in a country with an emissions cap.	Pending successful VCS verification.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	See VCS verification
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	
Date Evaluated:	
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	
Date Closed:	

## CL2 Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”)

<b>Indicator CL2.1</b> - Determine the types of leakage that are expected and estimate potential offsite increases in GHGs (increases in emissions or decreases in sequestration) due to project activities. Where relevant, define and justify where leakage is most likely to take place.	Pending successful VCS verification.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	See VCS verification
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	

Date Evaluated:	
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	
Date Closed:	

<b>Indicator CL2.2</b> - Document how any leakage will be mitigated and estimate the extent to which such impacts will be reduced by these mitigation activities.	Pending successful VCS verification.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	See VCS verification
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	
Date Evaluated:	
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	
Date Closed:	

<b>Indicator CL2.3</b> - Subtract any likely project-related unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts from the climate benefits being claimed by the project and demonstrate that this has been included in the evaluation of net climate impact of the project (as calculated in CL1.4).	Pending successful VCS verification.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	See VCS verification
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	
Date Evaluated:	
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	
Date Closed:	

<b>Indicator CL2.4</b> - Non-CO <sub>2</sub> gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO <sub>2</sub> -equivalent) of the net change calculations (above) of the project's	Pending successful VCS verification.
---	--------------------------------------

overall off-site GHG emissions reductions or removals over each monitoring period.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	See VCS verification
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	
Date Evaluated:	
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	
Date Closed:	

### CL3 Climate Impact Monitoring

<p><b>Indicator CL3.1</b> - Develop an initial plan for selecting carbon pools and non-CO<sub>2</sub> GHGs to be monitored, and determine the frequency of monitoring. Potential pools include aboveground biomass, litter, dead wood, belowground biomass, wood products, soil carbon and peat. Pools to monitor must include any pools expected to decrease as a result of project activities, including those in the region outside the project boundaries resulting from all types of leakage identified in CL2. A plan must be in place to continue leakage monitoring for at least five years after all activity displacement or other leakage causing activity has taken place. Individual GHG sources may be considered ‘insignificant’ and do not have to be accounted for if together such omitted decreases in carbon pools and increases in GHG emissions amount to less than 5% of the total CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent benefits generated by the project. Non-CO<sub>2</sub> gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent) of the project’s overall GHG impact over each monitoring period. Direct field measurements using scientifically</p>	<p>Pending successful VCS verification.</p>
---	---

robust sampling must be used to measure more significant elements of the project's carbon stocks. Other data must be suitable to the project site and specific forest type.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	See VCS verification
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	
Date Evaluated:	
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	
Date Closed:	

<b>Indicator CL3.2</b> - Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.	Pending successful VCS verification.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	
Findings:	See VCS verification
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	
Date Evaluated:	
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	
Date Closed:	

### CM1 Net Positive Community Impacts

<b>Indicator CM1.1</b> - Use appropriate methodologies to estimate the impacts on communities, including all constituent socio-economic or cultural groups such as indigenous peoples (defined in G1), resulting from planned project activities.	The expected impacts on the community outlined in Table 6.1 of the validated PD include increased income, technical assistance with financial management, increased land-tenure security (Zonification Ecologica y Economica ZEE), increased empowerment to protect local ways-of-life through quality of life plans, increased environmental
---	---

<p>A credible estimate of impacts must include changes in community well-being due to project activities and an evaluation of the impacts by the affected groups.</p> <p>This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about how project activities will alter social and economic well-being, including potential impacts of changes in natural resources and ecosystem services identified as important by the communities (including water and soil resources), over the duration of the project.</p> <p>The ‘with project’ scenario must then be compared with the ‘without project’ scenario of social and economic well-being in the absence of the project (completed in G2).</p> <p>The difference (i.e., the community benefit) must be positive for all community groups.</p>	<p>awareness, and increased environmental protection through the Oversight Committee.</p> <p>Section 4.1.2 of the MR compares the baseline conditions for natural capital, social capital, human capital, and physical capital with the conditions in the current monitoring period. Table 4.2 shows the comparative results. 5 new Quality Life Plans were developed, priorities identified in completed Quality Life Plans were reached, community organizations were created.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Section 6.1 of PD; Section 4.1.2 of MR; Quality of Life Plans; site visit interviews and observations</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Instructions for Indicator CM1.1 within Section 4.1.1 of the Monitoring Report template require that impacts must include all those identified in the CCB project description and any other unplanned impacts, and further require the project proponent to explain and justify key assumptions, rationale and methodological choices and to provide all relevant references. The PD identifies two community groups – the Communities East of PNCAZ and the Communities West of PNCAZ. MR Section 4.1.1 does not describe impacts separately for these two community groups.</p> <p>Instructions for Indicator CM1.1 within Section 4.1.2 of the Monitoring Report template require the project proponent to demonstrate that the net well-being impacts of the project are positive for all identified community groups compared with their well-being conditions under the without-project land use scenario. The MR provides a general statement to this effect but does not provide a clear demonstration of specifics for each community group.</p>

	<p>The new Quality of Life Plans (QLPs) that were developed during the monitoring period were provided to the verification team. Site visits were made by the VVB to several communities to interview community leaders and members about the impact the project's facilitation of QLP development and support with other project activities has had on the communities. The VVB also selected several activities supported by the project and/or undertaken by the communities as part of their QLP implementation. Site visit observations and interviews substantiate the widespread belief in the communities that the project has had a net positive impact in the communities in the Project Zone that have implemented improved land use and land security through zoning plans, and overall improvement in quality of life through implementation of priorities identified by the communities in their respective QLPs.</p>
<p>Non-conformance Request (NCR):</p>	<p>Please provide clarification as appropriate to address reporting for community groups in MR Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2.</p>
<p>Date Evaluated:</p>	<p>24 January 2022</p>
<p>Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:</p>	<p>The PD differentiates in section 1.10, regarding CCB indicator G1 between the community groups located to the west and east from the park, yet in section 6.1, table 6.1, no differentiated impacts are defined. Furthermore, the participatory approach is well-founded in CIMA's FOCAL model, which is the framework for the Quality of Life Plans, therefore the priorities tackled are exactly what the communities define. In this sense, no previous MR has differentiated impacts for the communities western (Huallaga river basin, right bank) and eastern (Ucayali river basin, left bank) of the park.</p> <p>The only clarification is that the specific activities implemented in both areas, which correspond to the communities' groups, may be different (e.g. supporting coffee or cacao in the west vs. supporting forestry in the east), and this is a result of the landscape (more deforestation in the west and larger forested stands in the east). However, the expected results are the same.</p> <p>(25 February 2022)</p>

<p>Findings Round 2:</p>	<p>The VVB acknowledges the response provided by the project proponent to address the nonconformance identified by the VVB. The VVB has determined a nonconformance still exists within the corresponding sections of the MR addressing Indicator CM1.1.</p> <p>Based on instructions for MR template Section 4.1.1 and Section 4.1.2, and requirements by Verra for the VVB as part of the verification, there are three main concerns identified by the VVB within these MR sections for addressing conformance with reporting requirements for Indicator CM1.1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) In MR Section 4.1.1, the project proponent is required to describe all the impacts on each community group (identified in the validated CCB project description in conformance with G1) resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The VVB confirmed MR Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 have been revised to provide an explanation why the two community groups defined in the PD were not differentiated by the project proponent in reporting for these MR sections.</li> <li>• The VVB has concluded that based on the explanation provided by the project proponent that impacts are addressed by each community engaged by the project, and in light of the understanding that impacts for the defined community groups do not appear to have been differentiated in the four previous monitoring reports or addressed by the corresponding verification reports, that the justification for not reporting impacts separately in the present MR is sufficient to address the requirement for reporting for each identified community.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2) In MR Section 4.1.1, impacts must include all those identified in the CCB project description and any other unplanned impacts. The project proponent is also required to explain and justify key assumptions, rationale and methodological choices, and to provide all relevant references. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The VVB confirmed MR Section 4.1.1. contains information about positive impacts as a result of project activities during this monitoring period for the indigenous</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
--------------------------	---

	<p>community believed to live in self-isolation within the project zone. The VVB concludes the positive impacts are consistent with the impacts identified in PD Section 6.1 for this community, and further concludes the MR appropriately explains and justifies key assumptions, rationale, and methodological choices to reach the conclusions presented in the MR for impacts to this community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The VVB did not find information in MR Section 4.1.1 that addresses each of the project impacts identified in PD Section 6.1 for communities in the project zone. Information for some of the impacts identified in PD 6.1 is presented in Table 4.2, which presents numerical results for indicators identified for monitoring in PD Section 6.2, which covers monitoring and reporting requirements associated with Indicators CM3.1, CM3.2, and CM3.3.</li> </ul> <p>3) In MR Section 4.1.2, the project proponent is required to demonstrate that the net well-being impacts of the project are positive for all identified community groups compared with their well-being conditions under the without-project land use scenario.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MR Section 4.1.2 contains a general statement regarding the project being “expected to result in a net positive impact in the communities in the buffer zone of the PNCAZ by improving land use and land security, and overall quality of life”, and further stating that this “trend will continue with the project”. However, MR Section 4.1.2 does not provide a clear narrative to demonstrate the impacts of the project are positive for all identified community groups, or for all communities in the project zone.</li> <li>• MR Section 4.1.2 provides a table that presents numeric results illustrating accomplishments over several monitoring periods for several indicators, including some of the ones for impacts identified in PD Section 6.1. Table 4.2 does not provide a discussion for other communities within the project zone not yet covered by project activities listed in the table. For example, MR Section 4.3.2 identifies a</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>potential negative impact for communities CIMA is not working with, but MR Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 do not address well-being impacts for these communities.</p>
<p>Non-conformance Request (NCR):</p>	<p>Please provide information in conformance with MR template instructions for Section 4.1.1 for all impacts identified in PD Section 6.1 along with any other impacts identified in the PD that resulted from project activities during this monitoring period. Please confirm whether there were any other unplanned impacts from project activities that should be reported.</p> <p>Please provide an appropriate demonstration within MR Section 4.1.2 that the net well-being impacts of the project are positive for all identified community groups compared with their well-being conditions under the without-project land use scenario in line with all elements described in Indicator CM1.1.</p>
<p>Date Evaluated:</p>	<p>11 March 2022</p>
<p>Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:</p>	<p>MR has been updated including the community impacts identified in PD section 6.1 (MR section 4.1.1) and either commented or referenced to a part in the MR, where these topics are covered.</p> <p>Section 4.1.2 of the MR now includes the community groups identified in PD section 6.1: human communities in the project area, in the project zone (including the ones who do and do not work with CIMA, and the human communities off-site).</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Close NCR:</p>	<p>The VVB reviewed Section 4.1.1 of the MR and confirmed it has been updated to include all impacts identified in PD Section 6.1 that resulted from project activities during this monitoring period. The VVB confirmed the referenced impacts as having occurred through review of other sections of the MR, review of supplemental documentation, and through site visit interviews and observations.</p> <p>The VVB reviewed Section 4.1.2 of the MR and confirmed it has been updated to include the community groups identified in Section 6.1 of the PD. The VVB reviewed the justifications for the net-positive well-being impacts of identified community groups and determined them to be appropriate. The provided justifications are substantiated by previously identified site visit observations and interviews that</p>

	identified widespread belief in the communities that the project has had a net-positive impact on their well-being. Item closed.
Date Closed:	3 May 2022

<b>Indicator CM1.2</b> - Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.4-6 will be negatively affected by the project.	The HCVs related to community well-being identified by the project include HCV 5 and 6: the forests provide essential fuel, food, fodder, medicines, building materials for communities, and forests are critical for indigenous people’s cultural identity.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD table 1.4 in section 1.10.7; MR section 4.1.3
Findings:	Section 4.1.3 of the MR describes how these landscapes are being protected and generating ecosystem services for the well-being of the community. Benefits to the community include fresh water from streams originating in the park, protected area for game species, disease regulation, pollination, sense of place for indigenous peoples, recreation, and ecotourism. The MR does not document any negative impacts on the HCVs as a result of project activities.  Site visit observations and interviews with park guards and community members substantiate that the project has not had a negative impact on community-related HCVs identified in the PD. Item closed.
Date Closed:	22 January 2022

**CM2 Offsite Stakeholder Impacts**

<b>Indicator CM2.1</b> - Identify any potential negative offsite stakeholder impacts that the project activities are likely to cause.	Section 6.1.3 of the validated PD states that there are no expected impacts, positive or negative, on communities outside the project zone. Future additional REDD projects could have indirect positive benefits for offsite communities if similar project activities were implemented in their areas.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD section 6.1.3
Findings:	The validated PD states that there are no expected impacts on offsite communities. This indicator is a validation item addressed by the PD and is not required to be addressed again by the MR. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator CM2.2</b> - Describe how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite social and economic impacts.	Section 4.2.1 of the MR states that no negative impacts on offsite stakeholders have occurred and none are expected, and so no mitigation plans are required.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 4.2.1, PD Section 6.1.2; site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	Consistent with the expectation stated in the PD, the MR states that no negative impacts on offsite stakeholders have occurred and none are expected. The Huallaga and Ucayali Rivers, which form the border for a large portion of the project zone, are identified as providing natural barriers to potential offsite impacts. Site visit observations and interviews regarding project impacts did not identify any negative offsite social or economic impacts that would require mitigation. Item closed
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator CM2.3</b> - Demonstrate that the project is not likely to result in net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups.	There are no other stakeholder groups identified in the validated PD. Project activities will ensure the continuation of ecosystem services provided to the communities around the project area, even those that CIMA does not work with directly.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR section 4.2.2, PD Section 6.1, site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	The MR does not identify any expected negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups. Based on information presented in the PD, site visit observations, and site visit interviews that did not identify negative impacts to offsite stakeholders, the VVB concurs that the project is not likely to result in net negative impacts on the well being of other stakeholder groups. Item closed
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

### CM3 Community Impact Monitoring

<b>Indicator CM3.1</b> - Develop an initial plan for selecting community variables to be monitored and the frequency of monitoring and reporting to ensure that monitoring variables are directly linked to the project's	The monitoring of social impacts for the buffer zone communities is based on the theory of change laid out in the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework approach as well as the Review of Outcomes to Impact approach. Impact is measured using the Index of Conservation Compatibility (ICC), which has six
---	--

<p>community development objectives and to anticipated impacts (positive and negative).</p>	<p>chains that impacts can move up to eventually reach sustainability. The indicators measured by CIMA are divided into five capital components that constitute “quality of life,” namely natural, social, human, physical, and economic.</p> <p>Table 6.2 in the validated PD includes the variable, indicator, data collection method, data source, and frequency for the social monitoring indicators. In the MR, Table 4.2 shows the indicators and the project conditions for the implementation period.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>PD section 6.2; MR section 4.3.2</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>The PD states that community monitoring will be collected through use of the Mapeo de Usos y Fortalezas (MUF), real-time monitoring, and technical assistance partnerships. The VVB was unable to verify that community monitoring and reporting was conducted through all three identified methods in accordance with the frequency identified in the PD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PD identifies frequency of conducting a new MUF as every 3 years. The MR states the last MUF was conducted in 2016 but due to COVID-19 restrictions established by the Peruvian government, the MUF was postponed to 2021 and possibly to 2022. The VVB notes that the MR presents results from the MUF conducted in 2016.</li> <li>• The MR notes that the real-time monitoring data is analyzed and synthesized quarterly. Documentation for these quarterly monitoring reports has not been reviewed by the VVB.</li> <li>• The MR describes monitoring experience gained through projects with technical assistance partners and describes several research efforts on communities conducted by various entities.</li> </ul>
<p>Non-conformance Request (NCR):</p>	<p>Please provide verifiable evidence as appropriate to demonstrate how or whether community monitoring was carried out during the monitoring period in accordance with the PD.</p>
<p>Date Evaluated:</p>	<p>24 January 2022</p>

<p>Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:</p>	<p>The MR presented the 2016 MUF as that was the most recent thoroughly study up to date and the next mapping was delayed due to COVID pandemic.</p> <p>Real time monitoring means the field work performed by the technicians in the four sectors. It responds to the specific moments of the assistance and is reported quarterly in a concise manner. Nevertheless, the quarterly reports do not necessarily show all the work that is put behind by the field team. The parameters defined in Table 6.2 of the PD, are reported in Table 4.2 of the MR.</p> <p>Regarding technical assistance partnerships, the MR indicated the coffee and cacao projects. A summary of the achievements of the coffee project is attached (Annex CM3.1). (25 February 2022)</p>
<p>Findings Round 2:</p>	<p>The VVB acknowledges the response provided by the project proponent and the support document provided for CAFE that illustrates the type of monitoring information provided through technical assistance partnerships.</p> <p>Based on instructions for MR template Section 4.3.2 applicable to Indicator CM3.1, the project proponent is required to present the results of the community monitoring impact monitoring, and the instructions identify what the results “should” include, but not what “must” be included. Based on the information provided by the project proponent, monitoring results presented in the MR, site visit interviews with project staff and community leaders, the VVB has determined the project proponent has satisfied the requirement to present the results of the community impact monitoring that was undertaken by the project proponent during this monitoring period. The VVB does note that the results of the community monitoring that was reported as undertaken is presented in MR Section 4.1.2 not in MR Section 4.3.2.</p> <p>However, the VVB has determined a nonconformance still exists regarding how the project proponent addressed Indicator CM3.1. The VVB is required as part of the verification to verify the community impact</p>

	<p>monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the project’s validated design, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities, community groups, other stakeholders, and HCVs related to community well-being identified in the monitoring plan.</li> <li>• Community variables monitored.</li> <li>• The dates, frequency and sampling methods used are in accordance with the validated project design.</li> <li>• The results of monitoring.</li> </ul> <p>Further, the VVB is required to provide and justify an overall assessment as to whether the community monitoring plan was carried out in accordance with the validated project design.</p> <p>Based on review of results of the community monitoring reported in MR Section 4.3.2, review of the additional information provided by the project proponent, and site visit interviews with project staff and community leaders, the VVB has concluded the community monitoring plan was not carried out in accordance to the validated project design. Table 6.2 of the PD specifies the indicators to be monitored for the community monitoring variables identified, specifies the data collection method, specifies the data source, and specifies the frequency of monitoring. Specifically, the MUF is identified as the data collection method to be used every three years to assess several of the indicators. The MR states that the MUF was not conducted due to Covid-19 restrictions and the MR present the results of the previous MUF conducted in 2016.</p> <p>The VVB reviewed MR Section 2.2.3 covering minor changes to project description per CCB Rules 3.5.6, and MR Section 2.2.4 covering project description deviations per CCB Rules 3.5.7 - 3.5.10. The project proponent has not provided information in the appropriate section to justify for VVB consideration whether not conducting community monitoring in accordance with the validated PD should be considered a minor change or a project description deviation.</p>
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	The nonconformance was noted by the project proponent not addressing changes or deviations to the

	<p>validated project design as determined appropriate based on community monitoring not conducted during this monitoring period in accordance with the validated PD.</p> <p>The VVB also requests clarification from the project proponent why the results of community monitoring are presented in MR Section 4.1.2 rather than MR Section 4.3.2 in accordance with instructions in the MR template.</p>
Date Evaluated:	11 March 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	<p>Section 2.2.3 has been included in the MR following recommendation of VVB and CCB Rules 3.5.6.</p> <p>Table 4.2 containing monitoring results has been placed under section 4.3.2 following MR template instructions and the recommendations of the VVB.</p>
Findings Round 3:	<p>The VVB reviewed Section 2.2.3 of the updated MR and confirmed two minor changes were added by the project proponent to the Project Description to address inconsistencies in monitoring identified as required by the PD as compared to monitoring that occurred during this monitoring period.</p> <p>The VVB reviewed the first minor change identified by the project proponent and determined that it was provided in response to the request for clarification by the VVB for Indicator CM3.1. The VVB determined that although the revised MR text acknowledges a discrepancy in monitoring, the text does not clearly identify the specific discrepancy or discrepancies in monitoring during this monitoring period.</p> <p>The VVB determined that Table 4.2 has been appropriately placed under Section 4.3.2 of the MR, in line with MR template instructions and to satisfy the request for clarification from the VVB.</p>
Clarification Request (CL)	<p>Please provide clarification in the appropriate section of the MR to more clearly describe the discrepancy or discrepancies for community variables not monitored during this verification period in accordance with the monitoring plan in the validated PD. Please clarify why the described discrepancy or discrepancies should be considered a minor change to project description as opposed to project description deviation.</p>

Date Issued:	3 May 2022
Project Proponent Response/Action and Date:	In section 2.2.3, we provide clarification on how the community monitoring variables have been monitored; all variables specified in Table 6.2 of the PD are reported on for the current monitoring period, and were monitored through either the quarterly and annual reports issued from field activities or through technical assistance. A table summarizing the data collection methods for the current monitoring period is provided in 2.2.3. There are no indications that this deviation in data collection procedures would materially impact the monitoring outcome. (24 June 2022)
Evidence Used to Close CL:	The VVB concurs with the overall conclusion regarding monitoring provided in the response and in Section 2.2.3. Site visit interviews and review of supporting documentation supports the conclusion that monitoring and reporting of community well-being covered the project's community development objectives and overall impacts (positive and negative). The VVB did not identify additional information that would have been identified through the MUF that would have a material impact on the overall positive community impacts reported. Item closed.
Date Closed:	27 June 2022

<b>Indicator CM3.2</b> - Develop an initial plan for how they will assess the effectiveness of measures used to maintain or enhance High Conservation Values related to community well-being (G1.8.4-6) present in the project zone.	The initial plan for monitoring HCVs related to community well-being were outlined in the validated PD Section 6.2. Project activities will ensure the continuation of the ecosystem services provided to the communities in the area.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 6.2 of PD; MR Section 4.3.2
Findings:	Instructions for Indicator CM3.2 within Section 4.3.2 of the Monitoring Report template are to present the results of the community impact monitoring which should include HCVs related to community well-being identified in the monitoring plan. Section 4.3.2 does not present results of community impact monitoring for community-related HCVs.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please provide verifiable evidence as appropriate to demonstrate how or whether monitoring for

	community-related HCVs was carried out during the monitoring period in accordance with the PD.
Date Evaluated:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	<p>CIMA’s FOCAL model is a participatory and holistic approach, and allows for space where HCV 4, 5 and 6 can be tackled, being this space the natural and cultural capitals of the Quality Life Plans in particular. Many of the communities that possess and employ a Quality Life Plan for their development have recognised natural and cultural priorities with a direct link to the HCVs 4, 5 and 6, such as the preservation of cultural identity, which especially in non-migrant populations, includes many times natural elements. Another example is the regulation and maintenance of hunt and fish, or the preservation of forest areas, higher parts of watersheds and soil preservation. Nevertheless, more immediate needs have been mostly preferred to nature and culture. Yet, examples of specific work related to ecosystem services (HCV 4), community needs (HCV 5) and cultural values (HCV 6), are mentioned below and are included in the MR section 4.1.3. Some of these are tackled by CIMA and its connections, and some of them respond directly to the Quality Life Plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HCV 4: Vergaray, J. (2020), for his engineering thesis, identified a strong correlation between the decrease in forest cover from 1999 to 2018 and the increase in river flow, and the danger of floods, in the Ponaza river basin. The Ponaza river basin is one of the most affected by deforestation in the Buffer Zone, and its headwaters border the PNCAZ. These findings are applicable to other basins whose headwaters are within the PNCAZ and therefore better conserved.</li> <li>- HCV 4 and 5: CIMA started a restoration pilot in the Ponaza river basin in 2018 with two projects financed by FERI and FONDAM, which are implemented in three communities (Lejía, San Juan, Chambira). For these communities, restoration is a priority and it is aimed that they not only restore the ecological function of these areas, but also serve as source of income.</li> <li>- HCV 4: the map in section 4.1.3 was elaborated by CIMA shows watersheds and associated deforestation. This information, combined with Vergaray’s work, allows for planning for watershed conservation.</li> </ul>

	<p>- HVC 4: Part of Charles Howe’s work, a former Peace Corps volunteer, about pollination, that dates from previous monitoring period had not been presented. It characterized the pollination service by wild bees in the Alto Ponaza sub-basin using the “InVEST: Pollinator Abundance” model and estimated the value of the coffee pollination service in the villages of Paraiso and Alto Ponaza in S/. 192,000 per year (Approx. USD 52,380 to march 2021 exchange rate).</p> <p>- HCV 5: hunting and fishing is monitored by the rangers, systematized and used by CIMA to produce reports, as has been previously explained. This is a food source for communities established in the buffer zone, where the park acts as source for game and fish species. Individuals from healthy populations in the park migrate into the buffer zone where they become available to local hunters and fishers. In the current monitoring period almost 6,500 kg of bushmeat and more than 2,700 kg of fish were registered by the rangers as direct benefit to communities (see table in section 4.1.3, provisioning services for detail). Further and better analysis for 2020’s wildlife report, which was after the first version of this MR (Appendix CM3.2, B3.2) estimated an approx. of ca. S/. 40,000 of bushmeat and fish valuation as a direct benefit for communities.</p> <p>- HCV 6: over this monitoring period the work to promote the Kakataibo indigenous reservation has continued and we believe it is close to be achieved.</p> <p>- HCV 6: In the Tarapoto sector, along 2020, conversations were made with a tourism operator willing to develop a route from Tarapoto to the “Mirador de Chambirillo”. This would also enhance the infrastructure of the nearby control post.</p> <p>In the Aguaytía sector, CIMA has been working with the native community of Yamino to improve their capacities to provide tourism services, as well as canalizing funds they used to build bungalows for visitors and to improve the community’s tourism infrastructure (dining hall, signals in the community and along an interpretative trail). Additionally, thanks to an alliance with a private company, the artisans were able to sell a batch of 500 hand-crafted pieces.</p> <p>Finally, in the Tocache sector, in 2020, CIMA prepared touristic cards of three different attractions (caves and waterfalls) and shared them with potential</p>
--	--

	<p>partners to promote tourism in the area. The map below indicates all the potential attractions the buffer zone has to offer and CIMA realizes this job has to be especially promoted in the western region of the park. (25 February 2022)</p>
<p>Findings Round 2:</p>	<p>The VVB acknowledges the response provided by the project proponent and acknowledges some of this information had been provided in MR Section 4.1.3 to demonstrate in response to requirements of Indicator CM1.2 that no High Conservation Values identified for HCVs 4-6 for Indicator G1.8 were negatively affected by the project.</p> <p>The VVB has determined the validated PD does not clearly identify how community-related HCVs are to be monitored as part of community monitoring plan, but PD Section 1.10.7 identifies the following community-related HCVs for the project:</p> <p>HCV 4: Areas that provide basic ecosystem services in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.1 Forests critical to water catchments</li> <li>4.2 Forests critical to erosion control</li> </ul> <p>HCV 5: Areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.0 Forests critical to subsistence needs</li> </ul> <p>HCV 6: Areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.0 Forests critical to communities' cultural identity</li> </ul> <p>These HCVs appear to fall under the "Natural Capital" variable of the community monitoring plan, which requires annual monitoring through quarterly summaries of field staff reports and MUF for monitoring number of hectares under community-generated management or used according to land-use plans.</p> <p>Based on instructions for MR template Section 4.3.2 applicable to Indicator CM3.2, the project proponent is required to present the results of the community monitoring impact monitoring, and the instructions identify what the results "should" include, but not</p>

what “must” be included. Based on the information provided by the project proponent, monitoring results presented in the MR, site visit interviews with project staff and community leaders, the VVB has determined the project proponent has satisfied the requirement to present the results of the community impact monitoring that was undertaken by the project proponent during this monitoring period. The VVB does note that the results of monitoring that was reported as undertaken that would cover these HCVs is presented in MR Section 4.1.2 not in MR Section 4.3.2.

However, the VVB has determined a nonconformance still exists regarding how the project proponent addressed Indicator CM3.2. The VVB is required as part of the verification to verify the community impact monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the project’s validated design, including:

- Communities, community groups, other stakeholders, and HCVs related to community well-being identified in the monitoring plan.
- Community variables monitored.
- The dates, frequency and sampling methods used are in accordance with the validated project design.
- The results of monitoring.

Further, the VVB is required to provide and justify an overall assessment as to whether the community monitoring plan was carried out in accordance to the validated project design.

Based on review of results of the community monitoring reported in MR Section 4.3.2, review of the additional information provided by the project proponent, and site visit interviews with project staff and community leaders, the VVB has concluded the community monitoring plan that would have included monitoring for the community-related HCVs was not carried out in accordance to the validated project design. Table 6.2 of the PD specifies the indicators to be monitored for the community monitoring variables identified, specifies the data collection method, specifies the data source, and specifies the frequency of monitoring. Specifically, the MUF is identified as the data collection method to be used every three years

	<p>to more thoroughly evaluate the number of hectares under community-generated management or used according to land-use plans.</p> <p>The VVB reviewed MR Section 2.2.3 covering minor changes to project description per CCB Rules 3.5.6, and MR Section 2.2.4 covering project description deviations per CCB Rules 3.5.7 - 3.5.10. The project proponent has not provided information in the appropriate section to justify for VVB consideration whether not conducting community monitoring in accordance to the validated PD should be considered a minor change or a project description deviation.</p>
Non-conformance Request (NCR)	<p>The nonconformance was noted for the project proponent not addressing changes or deviations to the validated project design as determined appropriate based on not conducting community monitoring for community-related HCVs in accordance to the validated PD.</p> <p>The VVB also requests clarification from the project proponent why the results of community-related HCV monitoring are presented in MR Section 4.1.2 rather than MR Section 4.3.2 in accordance with instructions in the MR template.</p>
Date Evaluated:	11 March 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	<p>Table 4.2 containing variables for community monitoring, including the natural capital which relates to HCVs, has been placed in section 4.3.2 following recommendation of the VVB and the instructions template.</p> <p>An additional commentary is included in section 2.2.3 regarding monitoring of community related HCVs.</p>
Findings Round 3:	<p>The VVB determined that Table 4.2 has been appropriately placed under Section 4.3.2 of the MR, in line with MR template instructions and to satisfy the request for clarification from the VVB.</p> <p>The VVB reviewed Section 2.2.3 of the updated MR and confirmed two minor changes were added by the project proponent to the Project Description to address inconsistencies in monitoring identified as required by the PD as compared to monitoring that occurred during this monitoring period.</p>

	<p>The VVB reviewed the second minor change identified by the project proponent and determined that it was provided in response to the request for clarification by the VVB for Indicator CM3.2. The VVB determined that although the revised MR text acknowledges a discrepancy in monitoring, the text does not clearly identify the specific discrepancy or discrepancies in monitoring for community-related HCVs during this monitoring period.</p>
<p>Clarification Request (CL):</p>	<p>Please provide clarification in the appropriate section of the MR to more clearly describe the discrepancy or discrepancies for community-related HCV variables not monitored during this verification period in accordance with the monitoring plan in the validated PD. Please clarify why the described discrepancy or discrepancies should be considered a minor change to project description as opposed to project description deviation.</p>
<p>Date Issued:</p>	<p>3 May 2022</p>
<p>Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:</p>	<p>In section 2.2.3, a paragraph explaining how each of the HCV (4-6) related to community variables has been added, highlighting that no discrepancies exist with the PD:</p> <p>Regarding HCV, <b>HCV 4</b> on areas that provide basic ecosystem services in critical situations (eg. Watersheds protection, erosion control) is monitored through QLP implementation in natural aspects, However, forest critical to water catchment in the project area (i.e.: inside the Park) remains unchanged, thus the condition has not changed. <b>HCV 5</b>, on “areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health), such as food, fuel, etc., has been monitored through the register for hunting and fishing in the park and the report on firewood consumption. <b>HCV 6</b> on areas critical local communities’ cultural identity is reported on relationship to the establishment of the Kakataibo territorial community.</p> <p>As above, there are no indications that the adjusted data collection approach would materially impact the monitoring outcome. (24 June 2022)</p>

Evidence Used to CL:	The VVB concurs with the overall conclusion regarding monitoring provided in the response and in Section 2.2.3. Site visit interviews and review of supporting documentation supports the conclusion that monitoring and reporting of the effectiveness of measures used to maintain or enhance HCVs related to community well-being present in the project zone. The VVB did not identify additional information that would have been identified through the MUF that would have a material impact on the overall impacts on community-related HCVs reported. Item closed.
Date Closed:	27 June 2022

<b>Indicator CM3.3</b> - Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.	A full monitoring plan was created and validated during previous verifications and is included in Section 4.3 of the PD.  Section 4.3.3 of the MR includes information about the dissemination of the monitoring plan and results.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections 4.3 and 7.1.3 of PD; Section 4.3.3 of MR.
Findings:	Instructions for Indicator CM3.3 within Section 4.3.3 of the Monitoring Report template include the requirement to describe how results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan have been disseminated and made publicly available on the internet and to describe how summaries (at least) of the results have been communicated to the communities and other stakeholders. The MR states that the tools and strategies used by CIMA for park and project management are made available on CIMA's web page and that the tools have been explained to local populations during training and awareness-raising sessions as well as distributed in print. The MR does not identify whether community monitoring results have been disseminated in accordance with the requirements for this indicator.
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please provide verifiable evidence as appropriate to demonstrate how or whether dissemination of monitoring results was carried out in accordance with the PD.

Date Evaluated:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	As defined in the PD section 7.1.3, the public comment period and a summary of the achievements in this period, was delivered via letters, which are included as appendices (Attachment CM3.3 - Letters). See MR section 4.3.3. In addition to this, a strategy that is being contemplated for the next monitoring period is to include REDD+ components and results dissemination within the Non-Formal Environmental Education, which makes part of the FOCAL model. (25 February 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The VVB has reviewed the supporting documentation provided by the project proponent, including copies of transmittal letters to several community leaders that included the summary of monitoring report results prepared by the project proponent. The supporting documentation substantiates the monitoring results were widely disseminated in accordance with the monitoring plan identified in the validated PD. The VVB confirmed the MR has been revised to provide additional clarification about dissemination of monitoring results. Item closed.
Date Closed:	11 March 2022

## B1 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts

<b>Indicator B1.1</b> - Use appropriate methodologies to estimate changes in biodiversity as a result of the project in the project zone and in the project lifetime. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions. The 'with project' scenario should then be compared with the baseline 'without project' biodiversity scenario completed in G2. The difference (i.e., the net biodiversity benefit) must be positive.	Section 5.1.2 of the validated PD outlines the biodiversity impacts in the project area. It is expected that all impacts on biodiversity as a result of project activities will be positive. Impacts without the project scenario were assessed using four variables: reversibility, severity, scale, and order. Impacts are shown in tables 5.3 and 5.4 of the PD.  Table 5.1 of the MR compares the quantitative results of the indicators to the baseline conditions from the PD.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section 5.1.2 of PD; Section 5.1.1 of MR; site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	Results reported in the MR show that the project has had a net positive impact on biodiversity by the documented reduction in number of violations

	<p>recorded in the PNCAZ in 2017-2018 and 2019-2020 compared to baseline reporting (2008), natural forest restoration that has occurred in disturbed areas, and through the continued, documented presence of key indicator species. Site visit interviews substantiate that without the project illegal clearing would likely have occurred and unregulated illegal hunting would likely have a negative impact on key species.</p> <p>Based on the evidence reviewed and site interviews conducted, the VVB concurs that biodiversity has been maintained or improved under the with-project scenario during this monitoring period.</p> <p>Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<p><b>Indicator B1.2</b> - Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.1-3 will be negatively affected by the project.</p>	<p>The MR states that forest cover remained about the same since 2008 and that hunting in the PNCAZ is allowed for subsistence only, is limited to approximately 5.09% of the PNCAZ area.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.1, MR Section addressing Indicator B1.2, site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	<p>The MR states that the project has maintained the HCVs relating to biodiversity. Site visit interviews with CIMA staff and park guards and review of park guard records substantiate the protections provided to the project area (PNCAZ) and monitoring of the subsistence hunting allowed within limited areas of the project area (PNCAZ). Site visit interviews determined that IUCN-listed threatened species are not allowed to be hunted within the project area (PNCAZ), which was substantiated by review of records at two park guard stations. Based on interviews and review of evidence provided, the VVB concurs no HCV related to biodiversity will be negatively affected by the project.</p> <p>Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<p><b>Indicator B1.3</b> - Identify all species to be used by the project and show that no known invasive species will be introduced into any area affected by the project and that the population of any invasive species will not increase as a result of the project.</p>	<p>Section 5.1.1 of the PD states that there are no species used for project activities. The species in the park are native, and no invasive, non-native, or genetically modified species will be used or introduced into the park.</p>
--	---

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.1.1, MR Section addressing Indicator B1.3, site visit interviews
Findings:	<p>Section 5.2.3 of the MR states that there are still no invasive or exotic species used in project activities, and that incidents where exotic species were used by those not associated with the project decreased, which is understood to reflect the Project Zone outside the Park.</p> <p>Site visit observations and interviews identified the possible use of kudzu as a management tool in cacao operations in the project zone. Kudzu (<i>Pueraria montana</i> var. <i>lobata</i>) is on IUCN’s list of “100 of the World’s Worst Invasive Alien Species”.</p>
Clarification Request (CL):	Please provide clarification on the use of kudzu in association with cacao or other agricultural operations in the project zone, and please provide clarification whether technical training or support by the project technical or field staff encourages or supports use of kudzu in the project zone.
Date Evaluated:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	<p>We crosschecked with the technicians in the Aspuzana valley and also with the Institutional Development Direction, who jointly designed the assistance programme with Bioversity: kudzu is not encouraged for being an invasive species and also it is not wanted by the farmers as it tends to cover the cacao plants; they mention the plant is too aggressive. The fact of having found kudzu during the visit might be in an old plot, where kudzu was already present before the farmer settled himself. Bear in mind that the plot visited in the valley belonged to a farmer that had moved in a year ago and plants were already present before.</p> <p>(25 February 2022)</p>
Evidence Used to Close CL:	The VVB acknowledges the response provided by the project proponent and further acknowledges that a misunderstanding occurred over the legume species observed during the site visit. An online review of agricultural practices and use of kudzu in Peru identified the widespread use of <i>Pueraria phaseoloides</i> , in cacao plantations in Peru to fix nitrogen and to provide ground cover. This species is commonly referred to as “tropical kudzu”, but is not the same species as the related <i>Pueraria montana</i> var. <i>lobata</i> , which is also known as “kudzu”.

	<p>A review by the VVB of the Global Invasive Species Database (<a href="http://www.issg.org/database/welcome">http://www.issg.org/database/welcome</a>) substantiated <i>Pueraria phaseoloides</i> (tropical kudzu) is not listed as an invasive species. <i>Pueraria montana</i> var. <i>lobata</i> (kudzu) is the species listed as an invasive species by the Global Invasive Species Database.</p> <p>The VVB concludes based on additional information provided by the project proponent and as substantiated through review of additional documents available online, site interviews and observations, and review of photographs taken during the site visit, that <i>Pueraria phaseoloides</i> (tropical kudzu), rather than <i>Pueraria montana</i> var. <i>lobata</i> (kudzu), is likely the legume observed during the site visit, that project staff do not advocate for the use of the invasive kudzu species during technical training or support for farmers, and that populations of invasive species will not increase as a result of the project.</p> <p>Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	11 March 2022

<p><b>Indicator B1.4</b> - Describe possible adverse effects of non-native species used by the project on the region's environment, including impacts on native species and disease introduction or facilitation. Project proponents must justify any use of non-native species over native species</p>	<p>The MR states that assessing impact of non-native species is not applicable to the project.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.1.1, MR Section covering Indicator B1.4, site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	This indicator cannot be fully evaluated until the findings for Indicator B1.3 are resolved regarding the status of the use of kudzu on agricultural operations that may be associated with project activities in the project zone outside the project area.
Clarification Request (CL):	Please provide clarification within the MR as appropriate following resolution of findings for Indicator B1.3.
Date Evaluated:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Not applicable. The kudzu issue was explained in the previous indicator. (25 February 2022)

Evidence Used to Close CL:	The VVB concludes based on additional information provided by the project proponent and as substantiated through review of additional documents available online, site interviews and observations, and review of photographs taken during the site visit, that <i>Pueraria phaseoloides</i> (tropical kudzu), rather than <i>Pueraria montana</i> var. <i>lobata</i> (kudzu), is likely the legume observed during the site visit, and that project staff do not advocate for the use of the invasive kudzu species during technical training or support for farmers. Item closed.
Date Closed:	11 March 2022

<b>Indicator B1.5</b> - Guarantee that no GMOs will be used to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals.	The PD and MR both state no GMOs will be used and were not used, respectively, in project activities.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.1.1, MR Section covering Indicator B1.5, site visit interviews
Findings:	Site visit interviews with CIMA staff substantiate no GMOs are being used to generate GHG emission reductions or removals.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

## B2 Offsite Biodiversity Impacts

<b>Indicator B2.1</b> - Identify potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts that the project is likely to cause.	The validated PD states that there are no negative impacts expected on offsite biodiversity.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.1.2, MR Section 5.3.1
Findings:	Consistent with the expectation stated in the PD, the MR states that no negative impacts on offsite are expected. This indicator is a validation item addressed by the PD and is not required to be addressed again by the MR. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator B2.2</b> - Document how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite biodiversity impacts.	The PD and MR both state that because no negative impacts for offsite biodiversity are expected, no mitigation plans are required.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.1.2, MR Section 5.3.1, site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	Site visit observations and interviews substantiate that no negative impacts are likely to occur outside the

	project zone as a result of the project, and therefore no mitigation would be required by the project. Item closed.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022
<b>Indicator B2.3</b> - Evaluate likely unmitigated negative offsite biodiversity impacts against the biodiversity benefits of the project within the project boundaries. Justify and demonstrate that the net effect of the project on biodiversity is positive.	The MR states that protection of species in the project area (PNCAZ) will likely result in greater numbers of the species in the buffer zone (project zone outside the project area), particularly for overhunted species.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.1.2, MR Section on Net Offsite Biodiversity Benefits, site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	Instructions for Indicator B2.3 within Section 5.3.2 of the Monitoring Report Template require the project proponent to describe the evaluation of unmitigated negative offsite biodiversity impacts and compare them with the project's biodiversity benefits within the project zone, and to justify and demonstrate that the net effect of the project on biodiversity is positive.  MR Section 5.3.2 presents a discussion on the likely positive impacts of the project within the buffer zone (project zone outside the project area) but does not clearly make the comparisons or demonstrations required.
Clarification Request (CL):	Please provide clarification within MR Section 5.2.2 to satisfy the requirements of Indicator B2.3.
Date Evaluated:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	There are none negative unmitigated offsite biodiversity impacts resulting from the project's area stricter protection, which is the greatest benefit. On the contrary, protection of species in the park will likely result in greater numbers of animals in the buffer zone as well, which in turn is a net positive effect on biodiversity.  The biodiversity monitoring results are referenced in the corrected MR version, which show an increase and stabilization of the biodiversity index. On the other hand, in the recently attached 2020's wildlife report, the index of prey/hunter shows an increase, indicating a net positive effect on biodiversity.  (25 February 2022)

Evidence Used to Close CL:	<p>The VVB has confirmed MR Section 5.2.2 has been revised to state there are no unmitigated offsite biodiversity impacts resulting from the project area's stricter protection. The VVB has confirmed MR Section 5.2.2 has been revised to provide additional and reference for documentation to support the conclusion made for positive biodiversity impacts resulting from the project. MR Section 5.2.2 has been revised to provide the overall conclusion for the project providing net offsite biodiversity benefits in conformance to instructions for MR template Section 5.2.2 covering Indicator B2.3. Review of information and clarification provided by the project proponent, and site observations and interviews, substantiates there are no expected negative impacts on biodiversity outside the project zone due to the project and that the project will have net positive biodiversity impacts.</p> <p>The VVB further acknowledges the first line of the original findings should have referred to MR Template Section 5.2.2 rather than 5.3.2. The VVB confirmed the MR has been revised to adjust section numbers to align with the MR template.</p> <p>Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	11 March 2022

### B3 Biodiversity Impact Monitoring

<p><b>Indicator B3.1</b> - Develop an initial plan for selecting biodiversity variables to be monitored and the frequency of monitoring and reporting to ensure that monitoring variables are directly linked to the project's biodiversity objectives and to anticipated impacts (positive and negative).</p>	<p>The PD identifies the components for monitoring biodiversity variables.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	<p>PD Section 5.2, MR section on Biodiversity Monitoring Results, site visit observations and interviews</p>
Findings:	<p>Site visit interviews with CIMA staff and park guards, along with review of representative reports at two park guard stations, substantiate monitoring and recordation of violations within the project area</p>

	<p>(PNCAZ), and substantiate the low number of violations reported during this monitoring period. Site visit interviews with CIMA staff and park guards, along with review of representative reports at two park guard stations substantiate monitoring and recordation of key indicator species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An opportunity for improvement was noted for providing more training to park guards on species identification along with identification resources as appropriate to enable them to distinguish among closely related species for reporting purposes. An opportunity for improvement does not require project proponent response or action to close out the finding, but non-conformance and clarification requests do require response.</li> </ul> <p>Instructions for Indicator B3.1 within Section 5.3.2 of the Monitoring Report Template require the project proponent to present the results of the biodiversity impact monitoring which should include all biodiversity variables identified in the monitoring plan; dates, frequency, locations, sampling methods used and other information regarding the monitoring process; and results and evaluation of monitoring.</p> <p>MR Section 5.3.2 does not present the results for the biodiversity monitoring components identified for monitoring in the PD.</p>
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please provide the results of the biodiversity monitoring as appropriate to satisfy the requirements of Indicator B3.1 instructions for this indicator in the Monitoring Report template for Section 5.3.2.
Date Evaluated:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Biodiversity monitoring results, according to variables and indicators defined in PD section 5.2 have been correctly placed in MR section 5.3.2 to satisfy the requirements of CCB indicator B3.1. (25 February 2022)
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	The VVB confirmed MR Section 5.3.2 has been revised to provide biodiversity monitoring results in conformance to instructions for MR template Section 5.3.2 covering Indicator B3.1. Monitoring results are provided for each of the indicators and in general conformance with collection methods, data sources, and frequency identified in the validated PD. MR

	<p>Section 5.3.2 has also been revised to provide additional information on biodiversity monitoring results from complementary methods that were undertaken in addition to the methods identified in the validated PD. Based on review of documentation provided by the project proponent, documents made available for review during the site visit, and site visit interviews, the VVB concludes the biodiversity monitoring was carried out and reported in accordance with the project's validated design.</p> <p>Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	11 March 2022
<b>Indicator B3.2</b> - Develop an initial plan for assessing the effectiveness of measures used to maintain or enhance High Conservation Values related to globally, regionally or nationally significant biodiversity (G1.8.1-3) present in the project zone.	The MR presents summaries for academic research conducted or published on topics associated with biodiversity within the project zone, including the project area during the monitoring period
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Section 5.2, MR section on Biodiversity Monitoring Results, site visit observations and interviews
Findings:	<p>Instructions for Indicator B3.2 within Section 5.3.2 of the Monitoring Report Template require the project proponent to present the results of the biodiversity impact monitoring which should include all HCV biodiversity variables identified in the monitoring plan; dates, frequency, locations, sampling methods used and other information regarding the monitoring process; and results and evaluation of monitoring.</p> <p>MR Section 5.3.2 does not present the results for the HCV biodiversity monitoring components identified for monitoring in the PD.</p>
Non-conformance Request (NCR):	Please provide the results of the HCV biodiversity monitoring as appropriate to satisfy the requirements of Indicator B3.1 instructions for this indicator in the Monitoring Report template for Section 5.3.2.
Date Evaluated:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	HCVs are defined for the PNCAZ REDD+ project in the PD section 1.10.7 and its monitoring in section 5.2. This same section argues that "the park is essentially intact and sufficiently large to support basic ecological processes, the project's primary biodiversity objective is to prevent the park's effective size from decreasing.

	<p>All biodiversity in the park will benefit given that this is a conservation project and the High Conservation Values relating to biodiversity will be maintained". With the correction of MR section 5.3.2, the requirements of CCB indicator B3.2 are satisfied. (25 February 2022)</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Close NCR:</p>	<p>The VVB acknowledges the project proponent's response. PD Section 1.10.7 identifies the following general biodiversity-related HCVs for the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HCV 1: Areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 Protected areas</li> <li>1.2 Threatened and endangered species</li> <li>1.3 Endemic species</li> <li>1.4 Critical temporal use</li> </ul> </li> <li>HCV 2: Globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape-level areas where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.0 Large landscape-level areas</li> </ul> </li> <li>HCV 3: Areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.0 Rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The VVB confirmed MR Section 5.3.2 has been revised to provide biodiversity monitoring results in conformance to instructions for MR template Section 5.3.2 covering Indicator B3.2. The Biodiversity Monitoring Plan presented in Section 5.2 of the validated PD was a validation item that has not changed and was determined at the time of validation as adequate to satisfy monitoring requirements for biodiversity-related HCVs.</p> <p>The VVB confirmed MR Section 5.3.2 has been revised to provide monitoring results for each of the indicators and in general conformance with collection methods, data sources, and frequency identified in the validated PD. MR Section 5.3.2 has also been revised to provide additional information on biodiversity monitoring results from complementary methods that were undertaken in addition to the methods identified in the validated PD. Based on review of documentation provided by the project proponent,</p>

	documents made available for review during the site visit, and site visit interviews, the VVB concludes the biodiversity monitoring was carried out and reported in accordance with the project's validated design.
	Item closed.
Date Closed:	11 March 2022

<b>Indicator B3.3</b> - Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.	The MR states that the biodiversity monitoring plan and its implementation remained unchanged from description in the validated PDD. The MR provides descriptions of workshops and scientific presentations undertaken during the monitoring period, and provides links to some social media activities associated with the project and biodiversity topics.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Sections 1.8, 5.2, and 7.1.3; MR Sections on Biodiversity Monitoring Plan and Results Dissemination; site visit interviews, review of Verra and CIMA websites
Findings:	Instructions for Indicator B3.3 within Section 5.3.3 of the Monitoring Report template include the requirement to describe how results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan have been disseminated and made publicly available on the internet and to describe how summaries (at least) of the results have been communicated to the communities and other stakeholders. The MR states that monitoring results and procedures have been disseminated to communities and other stakeholders in culturally appropriate formats. Based on the findings for B3.1 and B3.2, the MR is not clear on whether appropriate biodiversity monitoring results have been prepared for dissemination. The MR does not clearly describe how biodiversity monitoring results have been disseminated in accordance with the requirements for this indicator.
Clarification Request (NCR):	Please provide verifiable evidence as appropriate to demonstrate how or whether dissemination of monitoring results was carried out in accordance with the PD.
Date Evaluated:	24 January 2022
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date:	Dissemination of Biodiversity Monitoring has been done in the same way as Community Monitoring

	<p>Results Dissemination. Relevant information was included in letters as stated in CM3.3 and distributed among different stakeholders in the project's buffer zone, with a special emphasis in municipalities. This correction, which is also included in MR section 5.3.3 satisfies the requirements of CCB indicator B3.3. (25 February 2022)</p>
Evidence Used to Close NCR:	<p>The VVB has reviewed the supporting documentation provided by the project proponent, including copies of transmittal letters to several community leaders that included the summary of monitoring report results prepared by the project proponent. The supporting documentation substantiates the monitoring results were widely disseminated in accordance with the monitoring plan identified in the validated PD. The VVB confirmed the MR has been revised to provide additional clarification about dissemination of monitoring results. Item closed.</p>
Date Closed:	11 March 2022

## Gold Level Section

### GL1 Climate Change Adaptation Benefits

<b>Indicator GL1.1</b> - Identify likely regional climate change and climate variability scenarios and impacts, using available studies, and identify potential changes in the local land-use scenario due to these climate change scenarios in the absence of the project.	MR Section 3.3 states climate change adaptation benefits are not applicable to this project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 3.3
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for climate change adaptation benefits.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator GL1.2</b> - Identify any risks to the project's climate, community and biodiversity benefits resulting from likely climate change and climate variability impacts and explain how these risks will be mitigated.	MR Section 3.3 states climate change adaptation benefits are not applicable to this project.
---	--

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 3.3
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for climate change adaptation benefits.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator GL1.3</b> - Demonstrate that current or anticipated climate changes are having or are likely to have an impact on the well-being of communities <i>and/or</i> the conservation status of biodiversity in the project zone and surrounding regions.	MR Section 3.3 states climate change adaptation benefits are not applicable to this project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 3.3
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for climate change adaptation benefits.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator GL1.4</b> - Demonstrate that the project activities will assist communities <i>and/or</i> biodiversity to adapt to the probable impacts of climate change.	MR Section 3.3 states climate change adaptation benefits are not applicable to this project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 3.3
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for climate change adaptation benefits.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

## GL2 Exceptional Community Benefits

<b>Indicator GL2.1</b> - Demonstrate that the project zone is in a low human development country OR in an administrative area of a medium or high human development country in which at least 50% of the population of that area is below the national poverty line.	MR Section 4.4 states exceptional community benefits are not applicable to this project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 4.4

Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator GL2.2</b> - Demonstrate that at least 50% of households within the lowest category of well-being (e.g., poorest quartile) of the community are likely to benefit substantially from the project.	MR Section 4.4 states exceptional community benefits are not applicable to this project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 4.4
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator GL2.3</b> - Demonstrate that any barriers or risks that might prevent benefits going to poorer households have been identified and addressed in order to increase the probable flow of benefits to poorer households.	MR Section 4.4 states exceptional community benefits are not applicable to this project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 4.4
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator GL2.4</b> - Demonstrate that measures have been taken to identify any poorer and more vulnerable households and individuals whose well-being or poverty may be negatively affected by the project, and that the project design includes measures to avoid any such impacts. Where negative impacts are unavoidable, demonstrate that they will be effectively mitigated.	MR Section 4.4 states exceptional community benefits are not applicable to this project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 4.4

Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

<b>Indicator GL2.5</b> - Demonstrate that community impact monitoring will be able to identify positive and negative impacts on poorer and more vulnerable groups. The social impact monitoring must take a differentiated approach that can identify positive and negative impacts on poorer households and individuals and other disadvantaged groups, including women.	MR Section 4.4 states exceptional community benefits are not applicable to this project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	MR Section 4.4
Findings:	Not applicable, the Project is not seeking to be validated to the Gold Level for exceptional community benefits.
Date Closed:	24 January 2022

### GL3 Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits

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

<b>Indicator GL3.1 – Vulnerability</b> Regular occurrence of a globally threatened species (according to the IUCN Red List) at the site:  1.1 - Critically Endangered (CR) and Endangered (EN) species - presence of at least a single individual; or  1.2 - Vulnerable species (VU) - presence of at least 30 individuals or 10 pairs.	The PD provides a list of species designated as critically endangered, endangered, or vulnerable documented within the project area during biological inventory work.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	PD Sections 1.10.5 and 1.10.6
Findings:	This indicator is a validation item addressed by the PD and is not required to be addressed again by the MR. Item closed.
Date Closed:	22 January 2022

**OR**

<p><b>Indicator GL3.2 – Irreplaceability</b></p> <p>A minimum proportion of a species’ global population present at the site at any stage of the species’ lifecycle according to the following thresholds:</p> <p>2.1 - Restricted-range species - species with a global range less than 50,000 km<sup>2</sup> and 5% of global population at the site; or</p> <p>2.2 - Species with large but clumped distributions - 5% of the global population at the site; or</p> <p>2.3 - Globally significant congregations - 1% of the global population seasonally at the site; or</p> <p>2.4 - Globally significant source populations - 1% of the global population at the site.</p>	<p>The PD identifies several endemic species with known ranges restricted to the project area.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>PD Sections 1.10.5 and 1.10.6</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>This indicator is a validation item addressed by the PD and is not required to be addressed again by the MR. Item closed.</p>
<p>Date Closed:</p>	<p>24 January 2022</p>