



Industrie Service

Choose certainty.
Add value.

CCB - Validation Report

Sujiang Forestry Farm
Small-scale Reforestation for
Landscape Restoration
(Tengchong, Provinz Yunnan, China)
REPORT NO. 895209 - CCBA

2007, January 30

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
Carbon Management Service
Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich – GERMANY

Report No.	Date of first issue	Revision No.	Date of this revision	Certificate No.
895209	2007-1-30	-	-	-

Subject: Validation of a CCBA Project	
Accredited TÜV SÜD Unit: TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH Certification Body "climate and energy" Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich Federal Republic of Germany	TÜV SÜD Contract Partner: Jiangsu TÜV Product Service Ltd. Unit 918, Landmark Tower 2, No 8; Dongshuan North Road, Beijing 100004 P.R. of China
Client: Conservation International (CI) 2011 Crystal Drive Suite 500 Arlington, VA 22202 U.S.A	Project Site(s): Tengchong County Province of Yunnan P.R. of China.
Project Title: Small-scale Reforestation for Landscape Restoration	
Applied Methodology / Version: AR-AMS0001 version 02	Scope(s): 1
First PDD Version: Date of issuance: 2006-10-18 Version No.: 1 Starting Date of GSP 2006-11-28	Final PDD version: Date of issuance: 2007-01-19 Version No.: 2
Estimated Annual Emission Reduction:	5,585 tons CO _{2e}
Assessment Team Leader: Werner Betzenbichler	Further Assessment Team Members: Martin Schröder Dr. Ulrich Apel
Summary of the Validation Opinion:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant CCB requirements..	
<input type="checkbox"/> The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have not provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all relevant CCB criteria.	

Abbreviations

CCB (A)	Climate Community and Biodiversity (Alliance)
ACM	Approved Consolidated Methodology
AM	Approved Methodology
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CR	Clarification Request
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EB	Executive Board
EIA / EA	Environmental Impact Assessment / Environmental Assessment
ER	Emission reduction
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
GSP	Global Stakeholder Process
KP	Kyoto Protocol
MP	Monitoring Plan
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
TÜV SÜD	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
tCER / ICER	temporary CER; long-term CER
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVM	Validation and Verification Manual

Table of Contents		Page
1	INTRODUCTION	4
1.1	Objective	4
1.2	Scope	4
2	METHODOLOGY	6
2.1	Appointment of the Assessment Team	8
2.2	Review of Documents	9
2.3	Follow-up Interviews	9
2.4	Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests	10
2.5	Internal Quality Control	10
3	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	11
4	COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS	13
5	VALIDATION OPINION	14

Annex 1: Validation Protocol

Annex 2: Information Reference List

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The validation objective is an independent assessment by a Third Party of the proposed project activity against all defined criteria as defined by the Climate Biodiversity and Community Alliance.

In line with the framework for the validation of a CDM project, corresponding tasks are carried by an Independent Operational Entity (DOE). TÜV SÜD is a DOE that is accredited by UNFCCC to validate AR-CDM projects.

Validation will finally result in a conclusion by the executing DOE whether a project activity is complying with the CCB standards and whether this project should be submitted for registration with CCBA. The ultimate decision on the registration of a proposed project activity rests with CCBA .

The project activity discussed by this validation report has been submitted under the project title:
Small-scale Reforestation for Landscape Restoration (Tengchong, Provinz Yunnan, China).

1.2 Scope

The scope of any CCB assessment is defined by the underlying legislation, regulation and guidance given by relevant entities or authorities.

For any CCB project activity the scope is set by:

- CCB standards, in their most recent version, as published at www.climate-standards.org
- Technical and methodological guidelines and information on best practice
- Internal and national standards on monitoring and QA/QC
- The sectorial framework of the project (technical scope)

In case of a CCB project that is also designed to comply with the requirement of an AR-CDM project the scope includes furthermore the following:

- The Kyoto Protocol, in particular § 12
- Decision 2/CMP1 and Decision 3/CMP.1 (Marrakech Accords)
- Further COP/MOP decisions with reference to the CDM (e.g. decisions of CMP.1 and CMP.2)
- Decisions by the EB published under <http://cdm.unfccc.int>
- Specific guidance by the EB published under <http://cdm.unfccc.int>
- Guidelines for Completing the Project Design Document (CDM-PDD), and the Proposed New Baseline and Monitoring Methodology (CDM-NM)
- The applied approved methodology

The validation is not meant to provide any consulting towards the client. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.



Once TÜV SÜD receives a first PDD version, it is made publicly available on the internet at CCBA's webpage for starting a 21 day global stakeholder consultation process (GSP). In case of any request a PDD might be revised (under certain conditions the GSP will be repeated) and the final PDD will form the basis for the final evaluation as presented by this report. Information on the first and on the final PDD version is presented at page 1.

The only purpose of a CCB validation is to indicate compliance with the CCBA standards and to use the corresponding reports during the registration process with CCBA. Hence, TÜV SÜD can not be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the validation opinion..

2 METHODOLOGY

The project assessment aims at being a risk based approach and is based on the methodology developed in the Validation and Verification Manual (for further information see www.vvmanual.info), an initiative of Designated and Applicant Entities, which aims to harmonize the approach and quality of all such assessments.

In order to ensure transparency, a validation protocol was customised for the project. TÜV SÜD developed specific checklists and a protocol based on the templates presented by the Validation and Verification Manual. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), the discussion of each criterion by the assessment team and the results from validating the identified criteria. The validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organises, details and clarifies the requirements that a CCB project is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent validation process where the validator will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

The validation protocol consists of several tables. The different columns in these tables are described in the figure below.

The completed validation protocol is enclosed in Annex 1 to this report.

Validation Protocol Table 1: CCB - Conformity of Project Activity				
Checklist Topic / Question	Reference	Comments	Conclusion on PDD in GSP	Final Conclusion
<i>The checklist is organised according to the sections of the CCBA standards. Each section is then further subdivided. The lowest level constitutes a checklist question / criterion.</i>	<i>Gives reference to documents where the answer to the checklist question or item is found - in case the comment refers to documents other than the PDD or the applied methodology..</i>	<i>The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist question and/or the conformance to the question. It is further used to explain the conclusions reached. In some cases sub-checklist are applied indicating yes/no decisions on the compliance with the stated criterion. Any Request has to be substantiated within this column</i>	<i>Conclusions are presented based on the assessment of the first PDD version. This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (☑), or a Corrective Action Request (CAR) due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below). Clarification Request (CR) is used when the validation team has identified a need for further clarification.</i>	<i>Conclusions are presented in the same manner based on the assessment of the final PDD and other background documentation version.</i>

Validation Protocol Table 2: CCB - Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests			
Clarifications and corrective action requests	Ref. to table 1	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<i>If the conclusions from table 1 are either a Corrective Action Request or a Clarification Request, these should be listed in this section.</i>	<i>Reference to the checklist question number in Table 1 where the Corrective Action Request or Clarification Request is explained.</i>	<i>The responses given by the client or other project participants during the communications with the validation team should be summarised in this section.</i>	<i>This section should summarise the validation team's responses and final conclusions. The conclusions should also be included in Table 1, under "Final PDD".</i>

In case that the CCBA project activity undergoes simultaneously a CDM validation, the corresponding CDM validation protocol will be attached in order to provide the complete and consistent set of considered criteria.

In these cases, the content of Annex 1 will be structured as follows:

- Validation Protocol Table 1a): **CCB** - Conformity of Project Activity
- Validation Protocol Table 1b): **CDM** - Conformity of Project Activity
- Validation Protocol Table 2a): **CCB** - Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests
- Validation Protocol Table 2b): **CDM** - Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

In case of a denial of the project activity more detailed information on this decision will be presented in table 3.

Validation Protocol Table 3: Unresolved Corrective Action and Clarification Requests		
Clarifications and corrective action requests	Id. of CAR/CR 1	Explanation of the Conclusion for Denial
<i>If the final conclusions from table 2 results in a denial the referenced request should be listed in this section.</i>	<i>Identifier of the Request.</i>	<i>This section should present a detail explanation, why the project is finally considered not to be in compliance with a criterion.</i>

2.1 Appointment of the Assessment Team

According to the technical scopes and experiences in the sectoral or national environment TÜV SÜD has composed a project team in accordance with the appointment rules of the TÜV SÜD certification body “climate and energy”. The composition of an assessment team has to be approved by the Certification Body ensuring that the required skills are covered by the team. The Certification Body TÜV SÜD operates four qualification levels for team members that are assigned by formal appointment rules:

- Assessment Team Leader (ATL)
- Greenhouse Gas Auditor (GHG-A)
- Greenhouse Gas Auditor Trainee (T)
- Experts (E)

It is required that the sectoral scope linked to the methodology has to be covered by the assessment team.

The validation team was consisting of the following experts (the responsible Assessment Team Leader in written in bold letters):

Name	Qualification	Coverage of technical scope	Coverage of sectoral expertise	Host country experience
Werner Betzenbichler	ATL			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Martin Schröder	GHG-A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Dr. Ulrich Apel	E		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Werner Betzenbichler is head of the department Carbon Management Service of TÜV SÜD, Head of the “Certification Body for Climate and Energy” and expert for conventional energy generation, renewable energy, energy expansion planning and familiar with the recent version of CDM and JI criteria as necessary for the implementation of Art. 6 and Art. 12 of the KP. Since 2000 he has been working in the international climate change and emission trading business as a verifier.

Martin Schröder is appointed as GHG-Auditor by the certification body "climate and energy". He holds a masters degree in tropical forest science. Within TÜV SÜD he is responsible for the validation and verification of forestry based greenhouse gas mitigation projects. He passed successfully internal training schemes in the field of auditing. Before entering the company, he worked on development projects in the Amazon Region and managed voluntary carbon offset projects.

Dr. Ulrich Apel is a forestry expert with long term experience in different natural resource projects in South-East Asia and China. He holds a PhD title obtained in the field of international forestry. Based since several years in China, he currently works as a consultant with a focus on reforestation projects. In this context he provided expertise on the national framework and experiences of reforestation projects.

2.2 Review of Documents

The first PDD version submitted by the client and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline were reviewed as initial step of the validation process.

A complete list of all documents and proofs reviewed is attached as annex 2 to this report.

2.3 Follow-up Interviews and visited sites

In the period of Dec. 9 to 14, 2006 TÜV SÜD performed interviews on-site with project stakeholders to confirm selected information. The table below provides a list of all persons interviewed in the context of this on-site visit.

Name	Organisation
Litun Li	Sujiang Forestry Farm (Director)
Songhui Li	Sujiang Forestry Farm
Zixiang Zhang	County Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Forest Management Branch, Tengchong Office
Bizhong Li	County Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Natural Resource Management Branch, Qushi station of Tengchong office,
Chengbo Duan	County Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Tengchong Natural Resource Management Branch
Tianshuang Zheng	Municipal Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Carbon sequestration office.
Tiancan Wang	Galoligonshan Nature Reserve, Tengchong office
Xiangqun Lin	Yunnan forestry college
Zeyuan Xia	Provincial Carbon Sequestration Office (Yunnan)
Tao Liu	Provincial Carbon Sequestration Office (Yunnan)
Tengwei Su	Provincial Carbon Sequestration Office (Yunnan)
Jian Ma	The Nature Conservancy, China
Shawn Shuang Zhang	Conservation International, FCCB project, China
Rong Zhou	Conservation International, FCCB project, China
Xiaoquan Zhang	China Forestry & Technology Institute (National Consultant)
N.N.	Several inhabitants of Pingdi village

In the context of the onsite visit, project sites due to be reforested have been visited within the area of the Pingdi and the Shangjie (Haoziba) village committee. These sites have been picked by the auditor in order to revise a selection of smaller as well of larger discrete reforestation sites.

2.4 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the validation is to resolve the requests for corrective actions and clarifications and any other outstanding issues which needed to be clarified for TÜV SÜD's positive conclusion on the project design. The Corrective Action Requests and Clarification Requests raised by TÜV SÜD were resolved during communication between the client and TÜV SÜD.

To guarantee the transparency of the validation process, the concerns raised and responses that have been given are summarised in chapter 3 below and documented in more detail in the validation protocol in annex 1.

2.5 Internal Quality Control

As final step of a validation the validation report and the protocol have to undergo an internal quality control procedure by the Certification Body "climate and energy", i.e. each report has to be approved either by the Head of the certification body or his Deputy. In case one of these two persons is part of the assessment team approval can only be given by the other one.

In the current case, quality control has been further more supported by Dr. Hubertus Schmidtke, forestry consultant on behalf of TÜV SÜD.

It rests at the decision of TÜV SÜD's Certification Body whether a project will be submitted for registration with CCBA.

3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

As informed above all findings are summarized in table 2 of the attached validation protocol. In total the assessment team expressed 13 Clarification Requests (4 specific to CCBA + 9 CDM) and 10 Corrective Action Requests.

Most Requests for Corrective Action were related to some inconsistencies on figures in the PDD as well as spreadsheet based calculations delivering the result on the GHG removals. These inconsistencies have been resolved in the final versions of the submitted documents. The given estimation is reproducible and substantiated by verified data and assumptions.

Key Requests for Clarification were related to the work and cost load to be expected by the project host, the relevance of previous reforestation activities carried out by the project host in the context of project additionality, the considered reference data on tree growth under the project scenario and its conservativeness, and the potential existence of leakage due to the shift of activities formerly located on the project sites. In regard to those CCBA requirements that go beyond CDM demands, it was requested, among others, that further information on conflict management procedures within the project is provided.

In regard to these Requests for Clarification further information and additional documents have been requested whenever the submitted documents did not allow a judgement of corresponding criteria. Based on this additional information all Requests for Clarification have been answered sufficiently.

Attention is drawn to the fact that aspects in regard to the monitoring of biodiversity and community parameters are considered to be in their initial stage of development. The latter however is deemed acceptable taking into account relevant indications and requirements by the CCBA standards.

The following table resumes the compliance of the different sections of the CCBA standards:

CCBA scorecard

Project title Small-scale Reforestation for Landscape Restoration

Audit No. Validation / 895209

Date 30. Jan 07



Industrie Service

General Section		Required	Extra score	Conclusion
	Baseline Projections	x		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Project Design and Goals	x		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Management Capacities	x		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Land Tenure	x		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Legal Status	x		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Adaptave Management for Sustainability		1	1
	Knowledge Dissemination		1	1

Climate Section

	Net Positive Climate Impacts	x		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Offsite Climate Impacts - Leakage	x		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Climate Impact Monitoring	x		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Adapting to Climate Change and Climate Variability		1	1
	Carbon Benefits withheld from regulatory markets		1	0

Community Section

	Net Positive Community Impacts	x		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Offsite Community Impacts	x		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Community Impact Monitoring	x		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Capacity Building		1	1
	Best Practices in Community Involvement		1	1

Biodiversity Section

	Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts	x		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Offsite Biodiversty Impacts	x		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Biodiversity Impact Monitoring	x		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Native Species Use		1	1
	Water and Soil Enhancement		1	1

Complying with the 15 mandatory criteria, the project receives the status "approved". For the silver standard, approved projects need to receive at least one additional point from three different sections (general, climate, community, biodiversity). For a gold evaluation, six extra points have to be made with at least one point from each of the four sections.

Final conclusion on CCBA status:	
Approved	
Silver	
Gold	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS

The project documents have been published on the CCBA websites. Comments by stakeholders were invited during a period of 21 days.

The following table presents all key information on this process:

webpage: http://www.climate-standards.org/projects/index.html	
Starting date of the global stakeholder consultation process: 2006-11-28	
Comment submitted by: -	Issues raised: -
Response by TÜV SÜD: -	

5 VALIDATION OPINION

TÜV SÜD has performed a validation of the following proposed CDM project activity:

Small-scale Reforestation for Landscape Restoration (Tengchong, Provinz Yunnan, China)

The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria.

In our opinion, the project meets all relevant CCBA requirements. According to the scorecard approach introduced by CCBA, TÜV SÜD considers the project to comply with GOLD status.

An analysis as provided by the applied methodology demonstrates that the proposed project activity is not a likely baseline scenario. Emission reductions attributable to the project are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity.

Given that the project is implemented as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated amount of 167,547 tCO_{2-e} in GHG removals over the defined crediting period of 30 years, which equals an average GHG removal of 5,585 tCO_{2-e} per year.

The validation is based on the information made available to us and the engagement conditions detailed in this report. The validation has been performed using a risk based approach as described above. The only purpose of this report is its use during the registration process as part of the CDM project cycle. Hence, TÜV SÜD can not be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the validation opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

Munich, 2007-01-30



Certification Body "climate and energy"
TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH

Munich, 2007-01-30



Assessment Team Leader

Validation of the CDM Project:
Small-scale Reforestation for Landscape Restoration (Tengchong,
Provinz Yunnan, China)



Industrie Service

Annex 1: Validation Protocol



Table 1 a: CCBA checklist

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
G. General Section					
G.1. Original Conditions at Project Site					
G.1.1. Are the location of the project and the basic physical parameters (e.g. soil, geology, climate) clearly described?	1,2,14,15	DR, I	The project location is clearly described in the PDD and secondary information on boundaries is provided through a GIS system. A description of the physical parameters is provided in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.2. Is sufficient information provided concerning types and condition of the vegetation?	1,2,5	DR, I	The information concerning current vegetation type provided in baseline study and PDD is considered sufficient.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.3. Are the current carbon stocks properly explained, e. g. by using approved methodologies for the CDM or from the IPCC Good Practice Guidance?	1,2,5	DR, I	Different strata are subdivided and estimated in the baseline study. Variation within strata is considered high, but stock estimates are not relevant for further estimates according to the applied SSC methodology (AR-AMS0001).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.4. Are the communities in and around the project area adequately illustrated including basic socio-economic information? This should be done using appropriate methodologies such as the livelihoods framework.	1,2,9	DR, I	The communities are clearly indicated and socio-economic characteristics such as mean annual income are included to table E.1 of the PDD. The Yunnan forestry college elaborated a Socioeconomic Assessment that includes corresponding background information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.5. Is the current land use as well as the land tenure at the project site clarified?	1,2	DR, I	The land tenure and land use is clearly indi-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			cated, e.g. in table A.6 of the PDD.		
G.1.6. Are the current biodiversity conditions and threats characterized (using e. g. a key species habitat analysis or a connectivity analysis)?	1,2,5	DR, I	In the context of the baseline study the current biodiversity profile was estimated for the vegetation in the project boundary. Among others, further expansion of the invasive species Eupatorium sp. is intended to be reduced by the reforestation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.7. Is substantial and appropriate reference material for question G.1.6. provided?	1,2,5	DR, I	Yes, sufficient material on G.1.6 was presented.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.8. Are species that belong to the IUCN Red List and / or on a nationally recognized list (the latter if available) found within the project boundary? Is a list available? (also B1)	1,2,5	DR, I	No endangered species were found within the project boundary, as indicated in A.4.1.5 of the PDD. The records are considered sufficient.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.2. Baseline Projections					
G.2.1. Is the most likely land-use scenario in the absence of the project activity plausibly identified and described in detail?	1,2,5	DR, I	The most-likely land use scenario is the continuation of the current land use, among others this is line with the applied CDM methodology AR-AMS0001.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.2.2. Is sufficient information and evidence on G.2.1. delivered?	1,2,5	DR, I	Additional to the information presented in the PDD the baseline scenario has been confirmed through stakeholder interviews in the context of the onsite visits.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.2.3. Do existing laws and regulations require the project activity to be undertaken anyway?	1,2	DR, I	No legal requirements require the implementation of the reforestation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.2.4. Are future carbon stock changes under the scenario in G.2.1. properly anticipated?	1,2 4,19	DR, I	The carbon stock changes under the baseline scenario are correctly anticipated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
The timeframe for this should be either the project's lifetime or its accounting time.			<p>As current land use (grass- and cropland) would be continued, the baseline is set to zero as no change in the included pools (below and above ground acc. to ASM0001) is anticipated, with exception to individual "spotted trees" in grassland / cropland strata. Their future carbon sequestration has been considered in the baseline calculation. Corresponding calculations have been revised.</p> <p>Under the baseline scenario, the individual trees will not lead to a forest above the national forest threshold due to the ongoing grazing and cropland management.</p>		
G.2.5. Are proofs available evidencing that non-CO ₂ GHGs such as CH ₄ or N ₂ O account for more than 15% of the baseline GHG fluxes at the project site (in terms of CO ₂ equivalents)? If so, are these emissions estimated appropriately?	1,2 4,19	DR, I	<p>The N₂O emissions are estimated to be below the defined threshold.</p> <p>The consistency of the indicated formula was revised in the context of CR 8 of the CDM validation.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.2.6. Does the baseline scenario describe the effects on the local community in the project area?	1,2, 5,9	DR, I	<p>The estimates on the general current socio-economic status describes how the current land use contributes to the livelihoods.</p> <p>Currently the local community uses the land partially for grazing as well as cropland (apart of barren land), which contributes to the landholders income. The incentives offered favor the land use change to forestry.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.2.7. Does the baseline scenario describe the effects on biodiversity in the project area in a sufficient manner?	1,2, 5	DR, I	<p>As indicated in G1.6, the baseline study considers the current biodiversity status. This is acceptable as the baseline is equal</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			to the continuation of the current land use.		
G.2.8. Does the baseline scenario describe the effects on the water and soil resources in the project area?	1,2,5	DR, I	No explicit consideration to water and soil resources of the baseline / current land use is included. However, it is indicated that current land use is product of previous deforestation campaigns and degradation processes. Hence, a reversal of degradation processes is considered positive, also for soil and water resources. Compare B.5.2 of this table.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.3. Project Design & Goals					
G.3.1. Are the scope of the project and a summary of the major climate, community and biodiversity goals demonstrated?	1, 2	DR, I	Section A of the PDD contains a summary on the climate, community and biodiversity goals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.3.2. Is each major project activity (if more than one) and its relevance towards achieving the project's goal described?	1,2,18	DR, I	Yes. The project activity is sufficiently described in the PDD. Major project activity is the installation and the initial maintenance of reforestations with native tree species on 476 ha. Details on how the work load is going to be managed was indicated in response to Clarification Request 2 of the CDM validation. Furthermore, the NGO consortium (Conservation International and The Nature Conservancy) maintains a software based project work plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.3.3. Is the project location clearly described including a	1,2,	DR,	The location is clearly described. Coordi-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
map with the major activities and georeferenced boundaries?	14, 15	I	nates of villages are provided. The project boundaries are included to overview maps presented in section A of the PDD. All detailed information is included to a GIS system that has been revised onsite.		
G.3.4. Is the project's timeframe clearly characterized?	1,2	DR, I	Yes, the project timeframe is 30 years. In the context of Corrective Action Request 3 of the CDM validation the date for the start of the crediting period was revised.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.3.5. Is a rationale provided for fixing the project's lifetime?	1,2	DR, I	The project lifetime is chosen in line with the crediting period.		
G.3.6. If applicable, is a reason delivered for the lifetime differing from the accounting period for carbon credits?	-	-	N.A.	-	-
G.3.7. Are likely risks to climate, community and biodiversity benefits outlined?	1,2	DR, I	Risks have been outlined in the section D and E of the PDD. The main risk in regard to climate (and community) benefits is the reversal of the project effects through fire.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.3.8. Are measures planned and explained against these identified risks (G.3.7.)?	1,2	DR, I	The identified countermeasures and adaptations in project design are considered adequate. Section D includes indications how corresponding risks are reduced. In the context of Clarification Request 6 of the CDM validation the responsibilities and specific measures to confront the fire risk have been explained with further detail.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
G.3.9. Have the local stakeholders been well defined, including documents on this definition?	1,2,9	DR, I	The stakeholders were identified in the context of the socio-economic impact assessment provided by the Yunnan forestry college. Results are furthermore included to the section F of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.3.10. Is transparency secured? The latter shall include aspects such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project documents publicly available at or near the project site. - Local stakeholders informed how the documents can be accessed. - Key documents made available in local or regional languages - Sustained reasoning for confidential information withhold. 	1,2,9,10	DR, I	Yes. Transparency is considered to be assured. Section F of the PDD and the minutes on the participatory events indicate the steps taken to inform and promote the project among the local farmers. It is indicated how these activities have impacted the project design. The information on the project is in hands of the Forestry Farm, which has its office in the project region. All key documents are available in Chinese, which is understood by the local population.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.4. Management Capacity					
G.4.1. Does the management team have enough experience with regard to land management projects? Is documentation on this issue available?	1,2,18	DR, I	The team of the forestry farm has sufficient experience with similar reforestations. Up to recent years similar activities were regular part of their activity profile. This has been confirmed by onsite interviews with the forestry farm staff and some older reforestations seen onsite.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.4.2. If relevant skills are lacking, will appropriate partners implement the project?	1,2	DR, I	In general, the available management skills are considered sufficient. Capacity building to comply with the specific demands of a CDM project is included to the scheduled	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			activities. In regard to monitoring, support is going to be provided by the Tengchong county office of the forest administration as well as the NGO consortium (incl. GIS).		
G.4.3. Is the management capacity adequate for the scale of the project?	1,2	DR, I	Yes, the existent management capacity is considered adequate. The forestry farm disposes of the necessary logistics. In the communities the "Forestry Guards" are going to coordinate the planting with the landholders. The forestry farm staff highlighted its wish to receive further capacity building in computer and GIS management.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.4.4. Are key technical skills necessary for a successful implementation documented and are members of the management team or project partners identified who possess appropriate skills?	1,2	DR, I	In regard to the reforestation skills have been confirmed, see G.4.1. Special technical skills are provided by the NGO consortium and offices of the public forest administration (Tengchong forest administration - Nat. Resource Branch, Carbon Sequestration office)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.4.5. Is the financial health of the implementing organization(s) documented?	1,2	DR, I	The general budget of the forestry farm is sustained by wood/timber merchandising. Financial health of the forestry farm is furthermore indicated by long-term experience (1985), project track record, installations and staff (34).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
G.5. Land Tenure					
G.5.1. Is it guaranteed that the project will not encroach unwontedly on private property, community property, or government property?	1,2	DR, I	The project sites and their tenure are clearly defined.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.5.2. Is no relocation of people occurring or, if the case, is any relocation necessary 100% voluntary and helping to resolve tenure problems in the area?	1,2	DR, I	No relocation of people is foreseen.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.5.3. Is "in-migration" from surrounding areas likely to take place? If relevant, is the project's response appropriate?	1,2	DR, I	In-migration is not considered likely, among others due to the small size of the reforestation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.6. Legal Status					
G.6.1. Does the project activity oppose any law?	1,2, 13,8	DR, I	The project is considered not to oppose any law. It has been confirmed that no EIA is requested. Nonetheless a corresponding official assessment was carried out, and no negative impacts were identified. A reforestation does not need a special permit by the forest administration.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.6.2. Are all documents available evidencing that the project has or expects to obtain all approvals necessary from the relevant authorities?	1,2, 13,8	DR, I	Yes, sufficient documentation is available. For CDM validation, a Letter of Approval by the DNA has been requested.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.7. Adaptive Management for Sustainability (optional)					
G.7.1. Is it demonstrated that management actions and monitoring programs are designed to generate reliable feedback that is used to improve the project's	1,2, 12	DR, I	It is considered that the management structure will allow adaptive procedures. A project board has been set up. The official insti-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
outcome?			<p>tutions such as Forest Administration and their branches have declared to participate.</p> <p>It was indicated that the monitoring results will be used to improve project procedures.</p> <p><i>At validation stage, the assessment is limited to the revision of the intended structures and procedures yet to be finally installed (comment in regard to entire section G.7)</i></p>		
<p>G.7.2. Does a management plan exist for documenting decisions, actions and outcomes and is this information shared with others within the project team? This should secure that experience is transferred rather than lost when individuals leave the project.</p>	1,2, 12	DR, I	<p>It was indicated that corresponding management procedures will be installed. The board meetings and their outcomes are / will be documented correspondingly.</p> <p>The NGO consortium stated that it is targeted to process and document lessons learned.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>G.7.3. Is the project design flexible enough to accommodate potential changes? Are processes defined or in place to adjust project activities as needed?</p>	1,2, 12	DR, I	<p>It is considered that the project design will be flexible enough.</p> <p>Clarification Request 4 of the CDM validation provided further details on the how the project management and the calculation of the GHG removals is going to be carried out, if one of the land holders with contract decides to finalize the contractual relation early.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>G.7.4. Are proofs available for an initial commitment towards long-term sustainability (beyond the end of initial financing)?</p>	1,2, 12	DR, I	<p>A key contribution to long term sustainability is the fact that with exception to carbon credits all benefits generated by this long-</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			term project (30 years; especially wood / timber) remain in the hands of the land holders (mostly individual families or communities). Wood can be harvested at various stages in project implementation and hence will generate benefits at different project stages.		
G.7.5. Referring to G.7.4.: Is a new project planned building on the outcomes of the initial one?	1,2, 12	DR, I	See G.7.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.7.6. Referring to G.7.4.: Are payments for ecosystem services secured on a long-term scale?	1,2, 12	DR, I	See G.7.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.7.7. Referring to G.7.4.: Are micro-enterprises promoted?	1,2, 12	DR, I	See G.7.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.7.8. Referring to G.7.4.: Are alliances established with organizations or companies securing the continuation of sustainable land management?	1,2, 12	DR, I	See G.7.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.7.9. Referring to G.7.4.: Other indicators for long term commitments.	1,2, 12	DR, I	See G.7.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.8. Knowledge Dissemination (optional)					
G.8.1. Are relevant or applicable lessons learnt documented sufficiently?	1,2	DR, I	It is considered likely that sufficient lessons learned will be documented. Different activities are scheduled. The NGO consortium supporting the Forestry Farm targets to process and document lessons learned in the context of the related FCCB project implemented by CI. On a regional level, the CDM / CCBA project will provide experiences for the Carbon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			Sequestration Office of the Forest Administration at county and provincial level. <i>At validation stage, the assessment is limited to the revision of the intended actions yet to be taken (comment in regard to entire section G.8)</i>		
G.8.2. Is it described how the generated lessons learned (G.8.1.) are disseminated in order to encourage replication of successful practices?	1,2	DR, I	The NGO consortium indicated that publications and internet presentations will be used, in regard to the dissemination of general project experiences. The local communities will be revisited in the implementation phase as well as in the context of monitoring. An (informal) experience exchange in this context is intended and considered likely by the auditor.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.8.3. Referring to G.8.2.: Will research be undertaken and results disseminated that have widespread application?	1,2	DR, I	See 8.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.8.4. Referring to G.8.2.: Are training workshops for community members from other locales planned?	1,2, 9,10	DR, I	Currently no additional workshops are planned for other areas. This is deemed acceptable in the context of a small scale project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.8.5. Referring to G.8.2.: Will "farmer to farmer" knowledge-transfer activities be conducted?	1,2	DR, I	No steered process of farmer to farmer knowledge transfer is planned currently. However, the implementation will incorporate communities / numerous farmers. This is deemed acceptable in the context of	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			a small scale project.		
G.8.6. Referring to G.8.2.: Will the project result be linked to regional databases, if existent?	1,2	DR, I	Conservation International has indicated that several similar activities / projects are pursued in the region, which are going to be linked to this project activity.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.8.7. Referring to G.8.2.: Is any cooperation with academic, corporate, governmental or non-governmental organizations planned?	1,2	DR, I	Cooperation with several stakeholders is included to the regular project design. Key cooperation partners of the participant are the Forestry administration and the NGO consortium.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.8.8. Referring to G.8.2.: Are other forms applied to disseminate the lessons learned?	-	-	N.A.	-	-
CL. Climate Section					
CL.1. Net Positive Climate Impacts					
CL.1.1. Is the methodology used to estimate the net change in carbon stocks developed by IPCC GPG or approved by the CDM Executive Board?	1,2, 4,19	DR, I	Yes, the used AR-ASM0001 methodology is an approved methodology. In the context of Corrective Action Request 4 of the CDM validation adaptations to version 02 of the methodology were carried out.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CL.1.2. Are the assumptions about how the project activities will alter carbon stocks over the duration of the project or the project accounting period clearly defined and defensible?	1,2, 4,19	DR, I	Yes, the assumptions included to the project scenario are clearly defined. The reforestation measures are clearly outlined. Corresponding calculations based on excel spreadsheets are transparent.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CL.1.3. Are the assumptions about how the project activities will alter non-CO ₂ GHG emissions over the dura-	1,2,	DR, I	No non-CO ₂ GHG will be emitted in the context of the project. N ₂ O emissions from fertil-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
tion of the project or the project accounting period clearly defined and defensible?	4,19		izer have been estimated and are negligible.		
CL.1.4. If the non-CO ₂ gases CH ₄ and N ₂ O are likely to account for more than 15% (in terms of CO ₂ equivalents) of the project's overall GHG impact, are these to gases factored into the net change calculations?	-	-	N.A.	-	-
CL.1.5. Does the project clearly demonstrate that the net climate impact of the project (including changes in carbon stocks and non-CO ₂ gases where appropriate) will give a positive result in terms of overall GHG benefits delivered?	1,2, 4,19	DR, I	Yes, the net climate impact is clearly demonstrated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CL.2. Offsite Climate Impacts ("Leakage")					
CL.2.1. Are the potential offsite decreases in carbon stocks (increases in emissions or decreases in sequestration) due to project activities properly estimated?	1,2, 4,19	DR, I	As only potential sources of leakage it has been identified that the displacement of agriculture or grazing on some fractions of the project area might cause GHG emissions outside the project boundary. The thresholds for considering leakage as provided by AR-AMS0001 (main produce and displacement) are considered. In the context of Clarification Request 9 of the CDM validation credible arguments were provided that the displacement of current grazing/agricultural activities does not cause relevant leakage.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CL.2.2. Are mitigation efforts referring to these negative offsite impacts documented?	1,2, 18	DR, I	Some mitigation effort in regard to the displacement of grazing are foreseen. In the detected case with potential leakage (Haoziba community) the related FCCB pro-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			ject of CI will work with the provincial poverty alleviation bureau to set up a small community based project. The purpose of the project is going to enclose the livestock and teach the local people how to use innovative method to feed them.		
CL.2.3. Is the extent to which such impacts will be reduced adequately estimated?	-	-	N.a.	-	-
CL.2.4. Are likely project-related unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts subtracted from the climate benefits claimed by the project? The total net effect (net increase in onsite carbon stocks minus negative offsite climate impacts) has to be positive.	1,2, 18	DR, I	Leakage parameters are considered negligible in line with the applied CDM methodology. Leakage is therefore not quantified or considered for the calculation of net effects of this SSC project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CL.3. Climate Impact Monitoring					
CL.3.1. Is an <u>initial</u> monitoring plan in place? <i>The CCB Standards accept at this stage of the project development that some of the plan details are not fully defined, especially if a small-scale project.</i>	1,2, 6	DR, I	Yes. A monitoring plan has been developed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CL.3.2. Are the corresponding measurements and the sampling strategy (including the monitoring frequency) stated?	1,2, 6	DR, I	Yes. The monitoring concept is clearly indicated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CL.3.3. Are all potential pools (aboveground biomass, litter, dead wood, belowground biomass and soil carbon) included? Any pool expected to decrease as a result of the project activities must be included.	1,2, 5, 6, 4,19	DR, I	The monitoring plan includes all relevant pools and an appropriate methodological approach as foreseen by AR-ASM0001. According to AR-ASM0001 below and aboveground biomass is considered for baseline carbon estimates. Not included pools (soil carbon, litter, etc) are considered not to decrease, which is sustained to be	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			conservative by the project's baseline study. Baseline carbon stock changes are set zero. The baseline is not monitored. For the project scenario it is focused on the monitoring of the above ground biomass. Below ground carbon is estimated via defaults.		
CL.3.4. Are non-CO ₂ gases part of the monitoring plan? <i>(Only applicable if these gases account for more than 15% of the project's net GHG impact)</i>	1,2, 5, 6 4,19	DR, I	No relevant non-CO ₂ emissions have been identified.	-	-
CL.4. Adapting to Climate Change and Climate Variability (optional)					
CL.4.1. Are likely regional climate change and climate variability impacts adequately identified using available studies (e.g. in studies)?	1,2	DR, I	<u>CCBA Clarification Request 1:</u> Information is requested on the estimated changes in climate and climate variability.	CCBA CR1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CL.4.2. Are these potential impacts anticipated by the project (design) and will appropriate measures to minimize the negative consequences be taken?	1,2	DR, I	The chosen native tree species are considered adequate in regard to their resistance towards the hotter climate with more extreme weather events.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CL.5. Carbon Benefits Withheld from Regulatory Markets (optional)					
CL.5.1. Will the project proponents not sell at least 10% of the total carbon benefits (including e.g. avoided deforestation) generated by the project into regulated GHG markets (Kyoto or other regulated markets)? Projects are allowed to sell these carbon benefits in a voluntary market or retire them.	1,2	DR, I	<u>CCBA Clarification Request 2:</u> Information is requested if 10 % of the total carbon benefits are to be withheld	CCBA CR2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
CM. Community Section					
CM.1. Net Positive Community Impacts					
CM.1.1. Were appropriate methodologies (e.g. livelihoods framework) used to estimate the net benefits to communities resulting from planned project activities?	1,2,5,8,9	DR, I	<p>The methodologies applied for the project design (e.g. questionnaires and interviews) are considered adequate and with a focus on community benefits. The strongest community benefit of the reforestations consists in the use and / or merchandising of wood and timber, which is produced on marginal lands.</p> <p>Future project monitoring will cover socio-economic aspects (CM.3).</p> <p><i>At validation stage, the possibility to estimate the net benefits is limited – as this usually requires an ex-post approach. Comment valid for entire section CM.1.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.1.2. Are changes in the community wellbeing included in the net benefits? Are the corresponding assumptions about how social and economic wellbeing will be altered over time clearly defined and defensible?	1,2,8,9	DR, I	<p>Wood and timber will contribute to community well being.</p> <p>As participation is voluntary and the lands to be reforested marginal, negative impacts due to reduced availability of land die agricultural lands are considered negligible. Furthermore it was indicated that pressure on land is reducing due to migration. Compare also C3.1.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.1.3. Is the net community benefit positive (“with pro-	1,2,	DR,	Given the project conditions and the pro-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
ject” scenario compared to baseline scenario of social and economic wellbeing)?	8,9	I	vided information, it is estimated that the net project benefits are likely to be positive.		
CM.1.4. Is the local stakeholder participation documented in the project’s planning, also including potential dialogues? In cases where it is unclear whether a project will be implemented or not, it is acceptable to start with a preliminary community consultation, provided there are plans for a full engagement once the project is funded.	1,2, 8,9	DR, I	The PDD clearly indicates the community involvement in the elaboration stage. Key elements have been questionnaires and surveys – e.g. with the village leaders and regular community members.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.1.5. If the project occurs in an area with significant local stakeholders, is a diversity of stakeholders engaged including appropriate subgroups, underrepresented groups and women living in the project vicinity?	1,2, 8,9	DR, I	The project areas are only partially located close to the villages and corresponding stakeholders. However, in the context of the elaborated social studies, the selection of interview partners, the prolonged visits to all related communities, and the methodological approach taken indicate that different stakeholder views have been considered.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.1.6. Did the stakeholders have the chance to raise concerns about potential negative impacts, to express desired outcomes and to provide input on the project design before the project design was finalized? Has the project proposal been revised or will it be revised based on the input of accordingly?	1,2, 8,9	DR, I	E.g. during interviews or other participators events (see PDD) it was possible for the stakeholders to raise concerns or provide input. The project design was adapted according to identified needs and demands.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.1.7. Is a clear process defined for dealing with unresolved conflicts and grievances that arise during the planning and implementation?	1,2, 8,9	DR, I	<u>Clarification Request 3:</u> The procedures that have been defined in order to deal with unresolved conflicts among stakeholders need to be defined.	CCBA CR3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
CM.1.8. Did the project design include a process for hearing, responding to and resolving community grievances within a reasonable time period? Has the grievance process been publicized to local stakeholders?	1,2, 8,9	DR, I	The project design covered more than one year. Several activities have been carried out, e.g. stakeholder process, in which the community members were heard.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.1.9. Have attempts been undertaken to resolve all reasonable grievances raised and have written response to grievances been provided within 30 days?	1,2, 8,9	DR, I	No grievances have been identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.1.10. Have the grievances and the project responses been documented?	-	-	N.a.	-	-
CM.2. Offsite Community Impacts					
CM.2.1. Have any potential negative offsite community impacts been identified that the project is likely to cause?	1,2, 8,9	DR, I	No negative offsite impacts have been identified. See also CM1.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.2.2. Are the mitigation efforts concerning these negative social and economic impacts properly described?	-	-	N.a.	-	-
CM.2.3. Is the net social and economic effect of the project positive when comparing the social and economic benefits within the project boundaries with likely unmitigated negative offsite impacts?	1,2, 8,9	DR, I	Yes, the net social and economic benefits are positive.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.3. Community Impact Monitoring					
CM.3.1. Is an (initial) plan available for how community variables to be monitored are selected? Potential variables include income, health, roads, schools, food security, education and inequality. <i>The CCB Standards accept if at this stage of the project development some of the monitoring plan details are not fully defined, especially if the project is a</i>	1,2, 5	DR, I	The provided documentation is considered sufficient for an Initial Plan. The Monitoring Plan includes socio-economic criteria. Among others it is scheduled to monitor the benefits and the income provided by the reforestation. The indica-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<i>small-scale project.</i>			<p>tions are considered sufficient for an initial plan.</p> <p><i>Community Impact monitoring is considered to require further adaptation (at a later stage), especially considering the diffuse benefits of a small scale reforestation with native species among numerous communities. The Plan needs to make sure that the chosen criteria / variables are measurable (either in a qualitative or quantitative manner).</i></p>		
CM.3.2. Is the monitoring frequency clarified?	1,2,5	DR, I	The monitoring frequency is 5 years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.3.3. Are community variables at risk of being negatively impacted by the project activities included in the monitoring plan?	1,2,5	DR, I	<p>Currently no variables are incorporated to the Monitoring Plan and its initial Community Impact section that are already defined to be clearly at risk to be negatively impacted by the project.</p> <p>The latter is deemed acceptable as the abundant (social and ecologic) assessments carried out in advance of this small scale project have not identified negative impacts for this small scale project.</p> <p>Corresponding aspects should be considered in the further perfection of the monitoring plan.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
CM.4. Capacity Building (optional)					
CM.4.1. Is the capacity building structured in a way that the needs of communities (not only of the project) are met?	1,2	DR, I	The foreseen capacity building activities focus primarily on the successful implementation of the project. E.g. the staff of the Forestry Farm will carry out capacity building for community members, so that they can successfully carry out planting activities. However, as the project benefits (wood) are mostly directed to the community, the latter is deemed to (also) contribute to the satisfaction of a key community need.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.4.2. Is the capacity building targeted to a wide range of groups, not just elites?	1,2	DR, I	Capacity building covers a wide range of aspects and a variety of stakeholders (Items: Planting, GIS, monitoring; Stakeholder: community members, forestry farm employees).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.4.3. Is the capacity building targeted to increase the participation of women?	1,2	DR, I	The capacity building is not explicitly focusing on the participation of women. It was indicated that an equitable approach will be taken, if this is in line with the contents of capacity building.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.4.4. Is the capacity building aimed to increase the community participation in the project implementation?	1,2	DR, I	The capacity building is considered likely to increase the participation in the project, as it favors general identification of the community members with the project goals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.5. Best Practices in Community Involvement (optional)					
CM.5.1. Was the project developed with a strong knowledge of local customs? Is the project compatible with local customs?	1,2	DR, I	Yes. Studies on social structure have been carried out. The development phase is considered to have been comprehensive and	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			close to the community demands.		
CM.5.2. Will local stakeholders fill all employment positions (including management) if the job requirements are fulfilled?	1,2	DR, I	Yes. Partially planting activities will be contracted to local personnel. It is not foreseen that additional management staff will be contracted.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.5.3. Is the manner explained by which local stakeholders are selected for positions? Do traditionally underrepresented stakeholders and women get a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained?	1,2	DR, I	It was indicated onsite that local personnel for planting will be contracted in coordination with the village representatives.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.5.4. Are workers informed about their rights by the project proponents?	1,2	DR, I	It was indicated that a written contract according to Chinese requirements will be signed in the context of any contracting of work force. It is scheduled to inform workers on their rights.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.5.5. Does the project comply with international rules on worker rights?	1,2	DR, I	The local project staff has limited understanding of international requirements on workers rights. China has ratified international Conventions on International Labour Standards only partially http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/english/newratframeE.htm . However, it was indicated that the compliance of national regulations will be revised onsite for partial contraction of workforce (for planting). It was stated that safety insurance is going to be paid. The auditor deems such a procedure to be in line with key requirements of international	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			labour standards (http://www.ilo.org/public/english/standards/norm/subject/index.htm). The latter estimate also considers the small scale of the project, and the limited dimension of possible contracting.		
CM.5.6. Are situations and occupations that pose a substantial risk to worker safety comprehensively assessed?	1,2	DR, I	No specific risk assessment has been carried out or workers The latter is deemed acceptable, considering the scale of the project and the dimension of possible contracting. In the context of any contracting, the contractor will pay an accident insurance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.5.7. Is a plan in place to inform workers of potential risks and to explain how to minimize such risks?	1,2	DR, I	See 5.6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CM.5.8. Are risks being minimized using best work practices, where worker safety cannot be guaranteed?	1,2	DR, I	See 5.6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B. Biodiversity Section					
B.1. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts					
B.1.1. Are the methodologies (e.g. key species habitat analysis, connectivity analysis) used to estimate the changes in biodiversity resulting from planned project activities appropriate?	1,2,5	DR, I	The pre-project biodiversity status has been assessed in the context of the baseline study. Plots were used for vegetation assessments. No endangered species have been found on the degraded sites. The tree species to be planted are autochthonous. Changes are going to be estimated via monitoring (section B.3). The applied approach is considered appropriate for this project scale and the	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			site characteristics.		
B.1.2. Referring to B.1.1: Are the assumptions for this estimate clearly defined and defensible?	1,2,5	DR, I	Yes. E.g. the relevant lists of endangered species.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.3. Referring to B.1.1: Is the net biodiversity benefit positive ("with project" scenario compared to baseline biodiversity scenario)?	1,2,5	DR, I	Yes, The net biodiversity impact can be expected to be positive.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.4. Are possible adverse effects of non-native species on the area's environment described (including impacts on native species and disease introduction or facilitation)?	1,2,5	DR, I	N.a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.5. If the impacts of B.1.4. are substantial, is the necessity of using non-native species over native species justified?	1,2,5	DR, I	N.a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.6. Is a list of threatened species available (G.1.8)? Is documentation available showing that the project activities will not be detrimental in any way to these species?	1,2,5	DR, I	See B.1.6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.7. Are all species to be used by the project identified? Will no known invasive species be used?	1,2,5	DR, I	All species to be planted are identified in the PDD. No invasive species will be used.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.8. Is it guaranteed that no genetically modified organisms will be used to generate carbon credits?	1,2,5	DR, I	No GMOs are considered to be used. The seedlings of native trees are going to be obtained from local nurseries.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2. Offsite Biodiversity Impacts					
B.2.1. Are potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts that the project is likely to cause identified?	1,2,8,13	DR, I	No potential negative impacts on offsite biodiversity have been identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.2. Are the mitigation efforts concerning these negative biodiversity impacts properly described?	1,2,8,13	DR, I	N.a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.3. Is the net biodiversity effect of the project positive	1,2,	DR,	Yes. The net biodiversity effect is consid-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
when comparing the biodiversity benefits within the project boundaries with likely unmitigated negative offsite impacts?	8,13	I	ered to be positive.		
B.3. Biodiversity Impact Monitoring					
<p>B.3.1. Is a plan available for how biodiversity variables to be monitored are selected? Potential variables include species abundance and diversity, landscape connectivity, forest fragmentation, habitat area and diversity.</p> <p><i>The CCB Standards accept if at this stage of the project development some of the monitoring plan details are not fully defined, especially if the project is a small-scale project.</i></p>	1,2,5	DR, I	<p>The documentation on an Initial plan is considered sufficient. The monitoring of biodiversity variables (Flora) is going to be connected to regular carbon monitoring. Furthermore, CI indicated that the project sites are intended to be incorporated to a research project on wild birds.</p> <p>The requirements of an Initial Plan are considered to be fulfilled.</p> <p><i>Biodiversity Impact monitoring is considered to require further adaptation at a later stage. The project participant is advised to follow the indications of CCBA and other relevant institutions on the issue.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.3.2. Is the monitoring frequency clarified?	1,2,5	DR, I	The monitoring frequency is 5 years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.3.3. Are biodiversity variables at risk of being negatively impacted by the project activities included in the monitoring plan?	1,2,5	DR, I	<p>Currently no variables are incorporated to the Monitoring Plan and its initial Biodiversity Impact section that are clearly at risk to be negatively impacted by the project.</p> <p>The latter is deemed acceptable as the abundant (ecologic) assessments carried out in advance have not identified negative impacts for this small scale project.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref. No	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.4. Native Species Use (optional)					
B.4.1. Is it proven that the project will only use species being native to the region? ...OR...	1,2,5	DR, I	Only native species native to the region will be used.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.4.2. If non-native species are planned to occur, is their use justified by being superior to native species for generating concrete biodiversity benefits (e. g. for rehabilitating degraded areas unlikely to support natives or for producing fuel wood that reduces logging pressure on intact ecosystems)?	1,2,5	DR, I	N.a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.5. Water and Soil Enhancement (optional)					
B.5.1. Are project activities that are likely to enhance water and soil resources identified?	1,2,8,13	DR, I	The reforestation with native tree species is considered to enhance water and soil resources. In regard to soils, the reforestation is considered likely to reverse degradation processes. In regard to water: The benefits of improved water retention are likely to be more substantial than any potentially reduced input to the groundwater.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.5.2. Is it credibly demonstrated that these activities are likely to improve water and soil resources compared to the baseline?	1,2,8,13	DR, I	<u>CCBA Clarification Request 4 :</u> Provide evidence that underlines the positive impact of reforestations with native species on soil and water.	CCBA CR4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.5.3. Do justifiable assumptions about cause and effect as well as relevant studies support the statements in B.5.2.?	1,2,8,13	DR, I	See B.5.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Table 1 b: CDM Requirements Checklist

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A. General Description of Project Activity					
A.1. Project Type					
A.1.1. Does the project comply with one of the project types of A/R CDM project activities defined?	1,2	DR, I	Yes. The project is considered an afforestation/reforestation activity. Partially the areas might even comply with the afforestation definition (deforestation as early as 1958). However, land eligibility is proven based on the reforestation definition.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.1.2. Does the project fulfil the definition of afforestation or reforestation?	1,2, 11, 14, 15	DR, I	<p>The project fulfils corresponding definitions.</p> <p>Land eligibility has been proven based on a procedure (Annex 16 of EB 22), that was put on hold by COP/MOP 2. However, the chosen approach also serves to demonstrate compliance with the Appendix A of the AR-AMS0001 as well as the requirements declared valid of the Annex to Decision 16/CMP.1.</p> <p>That the areas did not contain forest on 31. Dec.1989 was shown by the use of a Landsat image classification, GPS data and the use of survey / interview information.</p> <p>In regard to historic land use, the Landsat data was backed with interview results</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			(carried out by Yunnan forestry college) in order to compensate limited geographic resolution of images (for the identification of forest parcels as small as 670 m ²)		
A.2. Project Boundaries and Components					
A.2.1. Are the project's spatial (geographical) boundaries clearly defined?	1,2, 11, 14, 15	DR, I	For boundary definition in the mountainous project region the use of GPS field data was complemented with high resolution satellite data. Corresponding information is stored in a GIS system, currently managed by the supporting NGO consortium of Conservation International (CI) and The Nature Conservancy (TNC).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.2.2. Are the project's system boundaries clearly defined?	1,2	DR, I	Yes, the system boundaries are clearly defined by focussing on the reforestation of several discrete areas (tables A.5-A.7 in PDD) totalling 476 ha.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.1.2.1 Are the varieties and species selected clearly defined?	1,2,3	DR, I	The selected species are clearly defined by Latin Genus and species name. All species are native to Yunnan and Tengchong.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.1.2.2 Are the greenhouse gases whose emissions will be part of the project specified?	1,2	DR, I	The N ₂ O emissions from the use of fertilizer /leakage are considered negligible. CO ₂ emissions from transport are requested to be clarified under section E.3.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.1.2.3 Have the carbon pools been properly and in a correct manner selected?	1,2	DR, I	The carbon pools have been selected according to the used methodology.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3. Technology to be employed					
A.3.1. Does the project design reflect current good practices?	1,2	DR, I	<p><u>Project design:</u> The project design has been carefully developed and the subsequent implementation is planned. Several background studies document these procedures. The involved institutions are considered stable showing clear project ownership.</p> <p>The project design itself is rather demanding as several project stakeholders need to interact for a successful implementation, especially the forestry farm and the numerous communities and land holders. Furthermore the expertise accumulated within the advising NGOs needs to be forwarded to other relevant players.</p> <p><u>Planting techniques:</u> The technology to be applied represents good / above average practice. Container planting is scheduled. The necessary seedlings are going to be produced to a smaller extent in the nursery bellowing to</p>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>the hosting forestry farm; a majority is going to be bought from several external nurseries present in the region.</p> <p>It has been indicated to the auditors that state controlled seed sources are going to be used as basis for plant production.</p> <p>On a regional level, reforestation experience with the scheduled plant species exist since 1989.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request 2:</u></p> <p>Detailed information is requested on how it is going to be dealt with the upcoming workload (e.g. 100 days / ha) and costs of initial planting and maintenance, and how corresponding tasks and costs are going to be covered (by the forestry farm).</p> <p>Indications, if financial incentives for participating households (labour subsidies) will be provided should be submitted to the auditor.</p>	CR 2	
<p>A.3.2. Does the project use state of the art technology or would the technology result in a significantly better performance than any commonly used technologies in the host country?</p>	1,2	DR, I	<p>Yes, block planting, mixed stands, use of native species, container seedlings, (and incorporation of spontaneously appearing natural regeneration) represent state of the art in planting technology.</p> <p>The use of technology (GPS, GIS), as</p>	☑	☑



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			promoted by supporting NGOs, constitutes an innovative element that is likely to benefit regional forest stakeholders, especially the public forest administration.		
A.3.3. Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other technologies within the project period?	1,2	DR, I	Even considering the long term period of project implementation (30 years,) no major risk of technology substitution has been identified. In the mountainous project regions planting technology is considered unlikely to change from manual procedures.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3.4. Does the project result in a transfer of technology to the host country?	1,2	DR, I	No particular transfer of technology will occur. Technological capacities present within the country will be mobilized and applied locally.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3.5. Does the PDD contain a correct description of the present environmental conditions of the area including a description climate, hydrology, soils, ecosystems and the possible presence of rare and endangered species and their habitats?	1,2	DR, I	Yes, the PDD does contain the respective information following the structure prescribed in the guidelines for completing AR SSC PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3.6. Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to work as presumed during the project period? Does the project make provisions for meeting training and maintenance needs?	1,2	DR, I	As indicated in the PDD and during the onsite visit, the project foresees training provided by the assisting NGOs in regard to technical capacities. The County Forestry Bureau will assist and supervise monitoring activities carried out with by the forestry farm. The forestry farm representatives have indicated to provide assistance to the land	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			holders and personal to be contracted in regard to planting. Especially for the latter case, supervision and quality control by forestry farm personnel is considered important.		
A.4. Project participants					
A.4.1. Are the project participants clearly defined?	1,2	DR, I	The forestry farm as a private entity is clearly identified as participant.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.5. Contribution to Sustainable Development					
A.5.1. Is the project in line with relevant legislation and plans in the host country?	1,2, 8, 13	DR, I	The project is considered to be in line with national legislation. However, the letter of approval remains to be submitted. No permit is needed for reforestation projects of the size at stake. Nonetheless, environmental impact assessments have been approved.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.5.2. Is the project in line with host-country specific CDM requirements?	1,2	DR, I	The project is considered in line with CDM requirements once the letter of approval is submitted. See OI 1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.5.3. Is the project in line with sustainable development policies of the host country?	1,2,8	DR, I	The project is considered in line with regional development strategies. Reforestation is furthermore a declared national goal of the Chinese government.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.5.4. Will the project create other environmental or social benefits than GHG emission removals?	1,2,8	DR, I	The choice of native species underlines the targeted environmental and biodiversity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			benefits of the projects. Soil degradation processes are likely to be reversed. Social impacts are expected form additional income due to the reforestation of marginal lands.		
A.6. Land Use and Land Rights					
A.6.1. Does the project consider and describe the current legal title to the land?	1,2,7	DR, I	Table A6 of the PDD describes land use rights: It is divided between farmers and collective land as well as land of the forestry farm. Framers have a long term contract to use the state owned land which allows them to directly receive corresponding benefits. In the case of collectively possessed land the village committee will assure that the participating families will receive a share from the benefits of wood.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.6.2. Is the current land tenure and land use properly described?	1,2	DR, I	Yes. The current land tenure and land use is properly described.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.6.3. Has it been made clear who has the right to access the sequestered carbon?	1,2	DR, I	Yes. The participating land holders have declared their interest to participate in pre-project assessments; based on this a contract between the project participant and the land holders has been drafted. The contracts are due to be signed when the project is registered.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.7. Non Permanence					
A.7.1. Has an approach regarding the issue of non permanence been selected?	1,2	DR, I	Yes. The approach of tCER has been chosen.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.7.2. Is the approach applied in a correct manner?	1,2	DR, I	Yes. The approach is applied correctly.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B. Project Baseline					
B.1. Baseline Methodology					
B.1.1. Is the baseline methodology previously approved by the CDM Methodology Panel?	1,2	DR, I	AR-AMS 0001 Version 02 is an approved methodology. <u>Corrective Action Request 1:</u> The Version Number and the reference remain to be modified in the PDD (section B.1.) and revise consistency of explanations on formula B.1. with methodology.	CAR 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.2. Is the baseline methodology the one deemed most applicable for this project and is the appropriateness justified?	1,2	DR, I	Yes. AR-AMS 0001 is currently the only AR SSC methodology available.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2. Baseline Determination					
B.2.1. Is the application of the methodology and the	1,2,5	DR,	The application of the methodology and the	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
discussion and determination of the chosen baseline transparent?		I	chosen baseline is transparent and in line with the methodology (most likely land use scenario is considered to be the land use prior to the project activity).		
B.2.2. Has the baseline been determined using conservative assumptions where possible?	1,2,5,16	DR, I	<p>The baseline is considered to use conservative assumptions. Continued growth of present individual /spotted trees (different species and diameters) in baseline strata (cropland, grassland) has been estimated roughly but conservative (elevated BEF used in baseline estimates).</p> <p>It is considered credible that no natural forests would have evolved in the context of these singular trees while current land use, especially grazing, is maintained. No natural regeneration was detected on sites, neither in the context of the baseline study nor during the auditor's onsite visits.</p> <p>The baseline study contains further details on the approach taken. Among others, the number of necessary plots was estimated, the architecture of plots defined, and SOPs were developed, that might be applied for further monitoring.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.3. Has the baseline been established on a project-specific basis?	1,2,5	DR, I	Yes. The baseline was elaborated specifically for the project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.4. Does the baseline scenario sufficiently take into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies, macro-economic trends and political	1,2,5	DR, I	The baseline does not consider (regional or local) reforestation rates. During the onsite visit it has been reasoned by the project		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
aspirations?			<p>participant that the average non-CDM reforestation rate of the last decade as implemented by the forestry farm (around 50 ha/y) can not be maintained, e.g. due to changes in external financing.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request 3:</u></p> <p>It should be explained in further detail (in section B.3.1 of the PDD), why the current CDM reforestation is not to be considered part of the forestry farm's regular reforestation activities.</p>	CR 3	
B.2.5. Is the baseline determination compatible with the available data?	1,2,5	DR, I	Yes. The baseline determination is considered plausible.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.6. Does the selected baseline represent the most likely scenario among other possible and/or discussed scenarios?	1,2,5	DR, I	Yes, the baseline represents the most likely scenario (and the one in line with the SCC methodology)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.7. Is it demonstrated/justified that the project activity itself is not a likely baseline scenario?	1,2,5	DR, I	<p>The argumentation given in the PDD indicates that the project activity itself is not the baseline scenario.</p> <p>The additionality test according to the requirements of the Annex of AR-AMS0001 has been carried out. It was dealt with a variety of barriers, described from a viewpoint of the local population. The main barrier for the forestry farm verified during the onsite audit is financing. The PDD should be adapted in this aspect.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request 2:</u></p>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			More detailed information should be included to the PDD on the barriers that are actually faced by the implementing forestry farm, especially in regard to finances.	CAR2	
B.2.8. Have the major risks to the baseline been identified?	1,2,5	DR, I	A risk assessment is not considered necessary in the context of a AR SSC project and with a single crediting period.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.9. Is all literature and sources clearly referenced?	1,2,5	DR, I	Yes, the sources are sufficiently referenced.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C. Duration of the Project/ Crediting Period					
C.1.1. Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?	1,2	DR, I	<u>Corrective Action Request 3:</u> The date for the start of the crediting period needs to be revised. (section A.4.11.1 and A4.10.3.2 of PDD)	CAR 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.1.2. Is the assumed crediting time clearly defined and reasonable? (renewable crediting period of max. two x 20 years or fixed crediting period of max. 30 years)?	1,2	DR, I	Yes, a fixed crediting period of 30 years is chosen which is in line with the requirements.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D. Monitoring Plan					
D.1. Monitoring Methodology					
D.1.1. Is the monitoring methodology previously approved by the CDM Methodology Panel?	1,2,6	DR, I	It is highlighted that in the context of AR-SSC projects a Monitoring Plan separate to		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>the PDD is not required. Nonetheless, the project host has prepared such a document.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 1:</u> Documentation should be submitted to demonstrate that the chosen verification schedule will not lead to systematically elevated levels of emission reductions. The time schedule for verification should be indicated in the PDD.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request 4:</u> The methodology AR-AMS0001 has been approved previously. (Minor) Changes of the formulae and parameter explanations presented in the revised version 02 need to be brought to consistency with the PDD (e.g. section C.1.1 and C.3).</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request 5:</u> Consistency and completeness of table B4.1.1.1 of the PDD with the requirements of table 1 of the methodology remains to be assured.</p>	<p>CR1</p> <p>CAR 4</p> <p>CAR 5</p>	
D.1.2. Is the monitoring methodology applicable for this project and is the appropriateness justified?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes, the methodology is applicable and considered appropriate, as justified in PDD:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.3. Does the monitoring methodology reflect good monitoring and reporting practices?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes, the sample plot method is widely used and accepted.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.4. Does the monitoring methodology take into account uncertainties by appropriate choice of	1,2,6	DR, I	Considering uncertainties and targeted precision levels, the estimated number of	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
monitoring methods (e.g number of samples) to achieve reliable estimates of the net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks?			sample plots was indicated with about 125. On the operational level this is considered a large number for a small-scale project.		
D.1.5. Is the discussion and selection of the monitoring methodology transparent?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes. Applicability was discussed jointly with baseline monitoring (section B.2. of PDD).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.6. Are carbon pools monitored by collecting transparent and verifiable information to demonstrate that any choice made regarding carbon pools does not lead to an increase of the net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes, the monitoring information provided by the PDD and the monitoring plan provide the information on the monitoring of the required and relevant pools.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.7. Does the monitoring plan include provisions for a periodic calculation of the net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks?	1,2,6	DR, I	The indications on monitoring included to the PDD and the monitoring plan foresee a monitoring frequency of 5 years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.8. Does the monitoring plan include provisions for the monitoring of changes in circumstances within the project boundary that affect legal title to the land or right of access to the carbon pools?	1,2,6	DR, I	The monitoring plan foresees the monitoring of the project boundaries. <u>Clarification Request 4:</u> It general terms remains to be clarified / indicated, how the project management and the calculation of the GHG removals is going to be carried out, if one of the land holders with contract decides to finalize the contractual relation early.	CR 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.2. Monitoring of Actual Net GHG Removals by Sinks					
D.2.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimation or measuring the actual net greenhouse gas removals by sinks during the crediting period?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes, the PDD and the Monitoring Plan includes the relevant indications on data storage.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.2.2. Does the monitoring plan specify techniques and methods for sampling and measuring individual carbon pools included in the actual net greenhouse gas removals by sinks?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes, the PDD and the Monitoring Plan specifies the relevant indications on sampling and measuring. <u>Clarification Request 5:</u> It remains to be clarified if the monitoring plan foresees that the same strata are used for the estimation of the actual GHG removals as for baseline (compare item 39 of AR-ASM0001). In this context, consistency in the PDD needs to be assured.	CR 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.2.3. Do these techniques and methods reflect accepted principles and criteria for forest inventory?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes, the monitoring techniques reflect accepted principles and criteria of forest inventories.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.2.4. Are the choices of monitoring parameters reasonable?	1,2,6	DR, I	<u>Corrective Action Request 6:</u> The parameters to be monitored / data to be collected as presented in B.4.1.1.1 of the PDD need to be revised (consistency with Table 1 of AR-ASM001) and checked for completeness.	CAR 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.2.5. Will it be possible to monitor / measure the specified parameters?	1,2,6	DR, I	It is considered feasible to measure the specified parameters.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			Nonetheless, the implementation of the monitoring scheme is considered a challenge for the capacities of the forestry farm and the supporting entities, such as Forestry Bureau and the NGO consortium.		
D.2.6. Will the parameters give opportunity for real measurements of achieved GHG removals?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes. Main parameters to be measured directly are tree height and diameters (DBH). Other parameters are calculated with a series of factors, as indicated by the methodology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.2.7. Will the parameters enable comparison of project data and performance over time?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes, further comparison of parameters is considered to be possible.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3. Monitoring of Leakage					
D.3.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for determining leakage?	1,2,6	DR, I	As indicated by the PDD and in line with the methodology the percentage of families and households displaced and the percentage of the main produce displaced will be monitored.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.2. Have relevant parameters for leakage monitoring been included?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes, corresponding parameters are included to the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.3. Will it be possible to monitor the specified GHG leakage indicators?	1,2,6	DR, I	The monitoring will be carried out based on surveys, which is considered work intensive but feasible.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.4. Monitoring of Baseline Net GHG Removals by Sinks					
D.4.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the	-	-	Not applicable. No monitoring of baseline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for determining baseline net greenhouse gas removals by sinks during the crediting period?			foreseen / necessary.		
D.4.2. Is the choice of baseline indicators, in particular for baseline emissions, reasonable?	-	-	See D.4.1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.4.3. In case the project uses control plots for baseline determination: Are methods and techniques for measuring individual carbon pools and greenhouse gas sources specified?	-	-	See D.4.1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.4.4. Will it be possible to monitor the specified baseline indicators?	-	-	See D.4.1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.5. Monitoring of Sustainable Development Indicators/ Environmental Impacts					
D.5.1. Does the monitoring plan provide the collection and archiving of relevant data concerning environmental, social and economic impacts?	1,2,6	DR, I	It is highlighted that the elaborated Monitoring Plan is more detailed and ambitious than the requirements of a SSC AR-CDM project. Although not required, the developed monitoring plan does foresee the monitoring of biodiversity aspects (vegetation within monitoring plots and birds as indicator) as well as socio-economic aspects (income from project among community members).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.5.2. Does the monitoring plan provide provisions for the collection and archiving of planned monitoring and remedial measures?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes. Monitoring frequency and the modalities of archiving are indicated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.5.3. Is the choice of indicators for sustainability development (social, environmental, economic) reasonable?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes. In the field of socio-economic indicators it is considered difficult to directly relate changes over longer times (such as income) to the impact of the AR project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.5.4. Will it be possible to monitor the specified sustainable development indicators?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes. See D:5.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.5.5. Are the sustainable development indicators in line with stated national priorities in the Host Country?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes. The SD indicators are considered in line with national politics.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6. Project Management Planning	1,2,6	DR, I			
D.6.1. Is the authority and responsibility of project management clearly described?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes, the responsibility of the project management is held by Sujiang Forestry Farm. The general set up is outlined in chapter B.4.3 of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.2. Is the authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting clearly described?	1,2,6	DR, I	Yes. The regional forest authority is the County Forestry Bureau, which will also supervise and assist the project monitoring, carried out by the Forestry Farm.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.3. Are procedures identified for training of monitoring personnel?	1,2,6	DR, I	The necessary capacities are considered available within the involved institutions. Beyond the indications of D.6.2, the NGO consortium (CI/TNC) has indicated to provide technical assistance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.4. Are procedures identified for emergency	1,2,6	DR,	Forest fires are considered the most		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
preparedness for cases where emergencies can cause unintended emissions?		I	relevant risk. On a regional level however, areas rates affected by forest fire are relatively small. Section D of PDD indicates planned measured in regard to this risk. <u>Clarification Request 6:</u> Responsibilities and specific measures to confront the fire risk should be explained with further detail in the PDD.	CR 6	
D.6.5. Are procedures identified for calibration of monitoring equipment?	1,2,6	DR, I	No specific calibration is considered necessary for technical equipments such as GPS and laser distance measurer. Other basic forest inventory equipment such as callipers usually does not require specific calibration.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.6. Are procedures identified for maintenance of monitoring equipment and installations?	1,2,6	DR, I	See D.6.5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.7. Are procedures identified for monitoring, measurements and reporting?	1,2,6	DR, I	Corresponding responsibilities have been clearly indicated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.8. Are procedures identified for day-to-day records handling (including what records to keep, storage area of records and how to process performance documentation)	1,2,6	DR, I	Corresponding responsibilities have been clearly indicated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.6.9. Are procedures identified for dealing with possible monitoring data adjustments and uncertainties?	1,2,6	DR, I	The PDD and the Monitoring Plan includes implications on the level of certainty to be achieved. Beyond that, no specific procedures on data adjustment and uncertainties are considered necessary for a SSC-AR CDM project. See also Clarification Request on potential early contract finalisation (D.1.6).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.10. Are procedures identified for review of reported results/data?	1,2,6 +sop	DR, I	Yes. QA/QC procedures are indicated in chapter B4.2 of the PDD and the project's standard operation procedures.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.11. Are procedures identified for internal audits of GHG project compliance with operational requirements where applicable?	1,2,6	DR, I	Same as D.6.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.12. Are procedures identified for project performance reviews before data is submitted for verification, internally or externally?	1,2,6	DR, I	Same as D.6.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.13. Are procedures identified for corrective actions in order to provide for more accurate future monitoring and reporting?	1,2,6	DR, I	Same as D.6.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>E. Calculation of GHG Emissions by Sources and Removals by Sinks</i>					
E.1. Estimated Actual Net GHG Removals by Sinks					
E.1.1. Are all aspects related to direct and indirect GHG emissions and removals captured in the project design?	1,2, 4,5	DR, I	All main flows of GHG emissions have been considered. The aspect of relevance of emissions from transport are addressed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			under leakage (E.2)		
E.1.2. Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	1,2,4,5	DR, I	The corresponding calculations are compiled in an excel spreadsheet. <u>Corrective Action Request 7:</u> In the PDD (section A.4.11.1 and C.2-C.5) consistency needs to be assured with the results of the excel calculations.	CAR 7	
E.1.3. Have conservative assumptions been used to calculate project GHG emissions and removals?	1,2,4	DR, I	Regional Yield tables and publication data has served for growth curves / input data to GHG removal calculations. <u>Clarification Request 7:</u> It should be clarified why the use of general inventory data is estimated to be conservative – considering that the planted areas are marginal land with site qualities that are potentially below average quality.	CR 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.4. Are uncertainties in the GHG emissions and removals estimates properly addressed in the documentation?	1,2,4,5	DR, I	Uncertainties are addressed through Monitoring Plan and operating procedures.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.5. Have all relevant greenhouse gases and source categories listed in Kyoto Protocol Annex A been evaluated?	1,2,4,5	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
E.2. Leakage					
E.2.1. Are potential leakage effects beyond the chosen project boundaries properly identified?	1,2,4,5	DR, I	<p>Currently, the actual calculation on the relevance of project leakage is limited to emissions from the use of fertilizers. Leakage from the displacement of activities and main produce are set zero, which is considered feasible according to the requirements of the methodology.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request 8:</u> The regard to the used formula for N₂O emissions the formula needs to be revised and consistency with the given reference assured (IPCC guidelines agriculture). If there is a change in formula (C.11-12) calculations need to be adapted. It is recognised that N₂O emission are likely to remain negligible (under 10% threshold of net GHG removals).</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request 8:</u> Furthermore the threshold for N₂O emissions is indicated incorrectly in section C4 of the PDD (with 20%)</p> <p><u>Clarification Request 9:</u> Evidence remains to be provided that in those parts of the project areas that are not</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CR 8</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CAR 8</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CR 9</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>abandoned land (grass/cropland), current grazing/agricultural activities do or do not cause relevant leakage when shifted to areas outside the project boundary.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request 9:</u></p> <p>Furthermore, emissions / leakage from the transport of seedlings, labour, fertilizer, wood and other products should be briefly quantified and potentially considered as leakage.</p>	CAR 9	
E.2.2. Have these leakage effects been properly accounted for in calculations?	1,2,5	DR, I	Beyond the identified needs for clarification, the leakage effects have been properly accounted.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.2.3. Does the methodology for calculating leakage comply with existing good practice?	1,2,5	DR, I	Yes. The calculations are considered to comply with good practice.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.2.4. Are the calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	1,2,5	DR, I	Yes. Documentation is considered transparent.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.2.5. Have conservative assumptions been used when calculating leakage?	1,2,5	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.2.6. Are uncertainties in the leakage estimates properly addressed?	1,2,5	DR, I	Currently leakage is set zero in calculations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.3. Estimated Baseline Net GHG Removals by Sinks					
E.3.1. Have the most relevant and likely operational characteristics and baseline indicators been chosen as reference for baseline emissions?	1,2,4 ,5	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.3.2. Are the baseline boundaries clearly defined and	1,2,4	DR, I	Yes. The boundaries are clearly defined and	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
do they sufficiently cover sources and sinks for baseline emissions/removals?	,5		all sources and sinks are considered to have been covered.		
E.3.3. Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	1,2,4,5	DR, I	Yes. The calculations are considered complete.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.3.4. Have conservative assumptions been used when calculating baseline emissions?	1,2,4,5	DR, I	Yes. Conservative assumptions are considered.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.3.5. Are uncertainties in the GHG emission estimates properly addressed in the documentation?	1,2,4,5	DR, I	In the baseline calculation the net changes are set zero with exception of strata with spotted trees. The used approach to calculate removals from individual trees is considered broad but acceptable in regard to uncertainties.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.3.6. Have the project baseline(s) and the project emissions/removals been determined using the same appropriate methodology and conservative assumptions?	1,2,4,5	DR, I	Yes, a consistent methodology use is shown through calculations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.4. Estimated Net Anthropogenic GHG Removals by Sinks					
E.4.1. Will the project result in net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks?	1,2,4,5,	DR, I	Yes. The project is considered to result in net GHG removals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F. Environmental Impacts					
F.1.1. Has an analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity been sufficiently described?	1,2,5,8,	DR, I	Yes. The environmental impacts have been described sufficiently, in the PDD and also the Environmental Impact Assessment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	13				
F.1.2. Does this impact analysis include impacts on biodiversity and natural ecosystems (e.g. hydrology, soils, pests) as well as impacts outside the project boundary?	1,2, 5,8, 13	DR, I	Yes, impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems are included. In regard to impacts outside the project area, no negative impacts are considered to be caused.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.3. Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and if yes, is an EIA attached and approved?	1,2, 5,8, 13	DR, I	There is no requirement for an EIA of this AR-SSC project. Nonetheless an assessment has been carried out and concluded positively.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.4. Are environmental impacts considered either significant by the project participants or the host Party? Has subsequently an EIA taken place?	1,2, 5,8, 13	DR, I	No negative impacts have been identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.5. Will the project create any adverse environmental effects?	1,2, 5,8, 13	DR, I	No adverse environmental effects are considered to be caused by the project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.6. Are transboundary environmental impacts considered in the analysis?	1,2, 5,8, 13	DR, I	See F.1.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.7. Have identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design? What are the planned monitoring and remedial measures?	1,2, 5,8, 13	DR, I	See F.1.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.8. Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country?	1,2, 5,8,	DR, I	Yes. A Letter of no-objection has been issued by the regional Environmental	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	13		Protection Bureau. The letter of approval yet to be submitted will provide further evidence on legal compliance (see OI 1)		
G. Socio-Economic Impacts					
G.1.1. Has an analysis of the socio-economic impacts of the project activity been sufficiently described?	1,2,9	DR, I	Socio-economic impacts are addressed in section E of the PDD. Furthermore and in addition to AR-SSC requirements an abundant Social Impact Analysis has been carried out. Results have been compiled in a corresponding study. <u>Corrective Action Request 10:</u> The number of impacted persons and households needs to be revised and consistency assured.	CAR 10	
G.1.2. Does this impact analysis include impacts on socio-economic impacts (e.g. local communities, land tenure, food production) inside as well as outside the project boundary?	1,2,9	DR, I	Yes. All relevant aspects are included.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
G.1.3. Are there any Host Party requirements for an Socio-Economic Impact Assessment, and if yes, is such an assessment attached and approved?	1,2,9	DR, I	A SIA is not required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
G.1.4. Are socio-economic impacts considered either significant by the project participants or the host Party? Has subsequently an Socio-Economic Impact Assessment taken place?	1,2,9	DR, I	No negative impacts are considered significant. As the SSC-AR project will result in an average plot size of < 1ha per participating farm household, socio-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			economic impacts might not be very substantial on the individual family		
G.1.5. Will the project create any adverse socio-economic effects?	1,2,9	DR, I	The project is not considered to create adverse socio-economic effects.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.6. Are transboundary socio-economic effects considered in the analysis?	1,2,9	DR, I	The impacts on the population of the local villages are considered (beyond boundaries of planting sites but within system boundaries).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.7. Have identified socio-economic effects been addressed in the project design? What are the planned monitoring and remedial measures?	1,2,9	DR, I	No relevant impacts have been identified that require an adaptation of the project design.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.8. Does the project comply with legislation in the host country?	1,2,9	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H. Stakeholder Comments					
H.1.1. Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	1,2,9,10	DR, I	Yes. Relevant stakeholders have been consulted.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H.1.2. Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?	1,2,9,10	DR, I	Consultation has focussed on onsite visits and surveys. Further details on modalities and media of consultation are provided in section F.2 of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H.1.3. Has sufficient time been given to stakeholders to comment on the project design?	1,2,9,10	DR, I	No such requirements are defined for small scale reforestations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H.1.4. If a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, has the stakeholder consultation process been carried	1,2,9,10	DR, I	Not applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
out in accordance with such regulations/laws?					
H.1.5. Is a summary of the stakeholder comments received provided?	1,2,9,10	DR, I	Yes. Section F.1 of the PDD provides such a summary.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H.1.6. Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	1,2,9,10	DR, I	Yes. Among others the selection of tree species occurred in line with questionnaire results.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Table 3 a: CCBA responses to CAR and CR

Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<p>CCBA Clarification Request 1: Information is requested on the estimated changes in climate and climate variability.</p>	<p>Figures and related text have been added in the PDD new version.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>CCBA Clarification Request 2: Information is requested if 10 % of the total carbon benefits are to be withhold</p>	<p>If it is the most necessary in order to receive one extra point for the golden status, the project team would take withhold the 10%; otherwise the project team does not want the 10% deduction.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gold status is achieved without withholding 10%</p>
<p>CCBA Clarification Request 3: The procedures that have been defined in order to deal with unresolved conflicts among stakeholders need to be defined.</p>	<p>In regard to internal conflicts among stakeholders, one supplement explanation has been added in the contract. A background procedural document has been provided.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The documentation covers the indicated aspect.</p>
<p>CCBA Clarification Request 4 : Provide evidence that underlines the impact of reforestations with native species on soil and water.</p>	<p>Relevant literature sources that underline positive impacts under similar ecologic conditions:</p> <p>1 Andreas Klumpp, Gabriele Klumpp, et al, Fluoride impact on native tree species of the atlantic forest near Cubatão, Brazil, Water, Air, & Soil Pollution, 01-02-1996, Volume - Volume 87:57-71</p> <p>2 Clifford E. Ahlgren, Phenological Observations of Nineteen Native Tree Species in Northeastern Minnesota, Ecology, Vol. 38, No. 4 (Oct., 1957), pp. 622-628</p> <p>3 R.A. Pedraza, G. Williams-Linera, Evaluation of native tree species for the rehabilitation of deforested areas in a Mexican cloud forest, New Forests, 2003, 1(26): 83-99</p> <p>4 Sandra L. Anagnostakis, The Effect of Multiple Importations of Pests</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>



Industrie Service

Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
	<p>and Pathogens on a Native Tree, Biological Invasions, 2001, 3(3): 245-254</p> <p>5 Florencia Montagnini, Deniela Crusack, Bryan Petit, Markku Kanninen, Environmental services of native tree plantations and Agroforestry systems in central America, http://www.haworthpress.com/web/JSF, 2005</p> <p>6 HUANG Yang-xian, Dominant position of indigenous tree species, Protection Forest Science and Technology], 2005,05.</p> <p>7 You Haimei, et al, Theory and practices for forest vegetation restoration: Native forest with native tree-introduction for the Miyawaki's method for reconstruction of "Environmental protection Forest", Acta Phytocologica Sinica,2002, z1.</p>	



Table 3 b: CDM responses to CAR and CR

Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<p><u>Clarification Request No. 1:</u> Documentation should be submitted to demonstrate that the chosen verification schedule will not lead to systematically elevated levels of emission reductions. The time schedule for verification should be indicated in the PDD.</p>	Table 1	Text has been added in Section B.4.e to indicate the monitoring and verification times that are not coincided with the peak of carbon stock in the carbon pools selected.	☑
<p><u>Clarification Request 2:</u> Detailed information is requested on how it is going to be dealt with the upcoming workload (e.g. 100 days / ha) and costs of initial planting and maintenance, and how corresponding tasks and costs are going to be covered (by the forestry farm). Indications, if financial incentives for participating households (labour subsidies) will be provided should be submitted to the auditor.</p>	Table 2, A.3.1.	<p>The related information has been sent to the auditor in separate background document.</p> <p>Text has been added in the final PDD version.</p>	☑
<p><u>Clarification Request 3:</u> It should be explained in further detail (in</p>	Table 2, B.2.4	One bullet has been added below the second bullet under the Section B.3.1	☑



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
section B.3.1 of the PDD), why the current CDM reforestation is not to be considered part of the forestry farm's regular reforestation activities.			
<p><u>Clarification Request 4:</u></p> <p>It general terms remains to be clarified / indicated, how the project management and the calculation of the GHG removals is going to be carried out, if one of the land holders with contract decides to finalize the contractual relation early.</p>	Table 2, D.1.8	<p>Corresponding supplement items were added in the contract.</p> <p>If one family / group of village people doesn't want to be involved in this project anymore, he can rent his land to villagers in same village to implement the project, in return, he can get paid by the rental of 600RMB/ha. And if no village people want to accept the transfer, the forestry farm will take advantage, and the land holder still can get paid by rental from forestry farm. If nobody wantsto take advantage, the project activity in the land will stop and the relevant area will be deducted from the total project size as well as the carbon credits.</p>	☑
<p><u>Clarification Request 5:</u></p> <p>It remains to be clarified if the monitoring plan foresees that the same strata are used for the estimation of the actual GHG removals as for baseline (compare item 39 of AR-ASM0001). In this context, consistency in the PDD needs to be assured.</p>	Table 2, D.2.2	<p>The Monitoring plan that is separated from PDD has been revised to elaborate the stratification for monitoring purpose. The baseline strata will be further stratified to sub-strata in terms of tree species planted for monitoring.</p>	☑
<p><u>Clarification Request 6:</u></p> <p>Responsibilities and specific measures to confront the fire risk should be explained with further detail in the PDD.</p>	Table 2, D.6.4	<p>Text has been added in PDD Section D to address this issue.</p>	☑



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<p><u>Clarification Request 7:</u> It should be clarified why the use of general inventory data is estimated to be conservative – considering that the planted areas are marginal land with site qualities that are potentially below average quality.</p>	<p>Table 2, E.1.3</p>	<p>Yes, the general inventory data represent the mean growth rate of forests. However, on one hand, the inventory data are the mean growth of plantation and natural forests, and the natural forests usually grow slower than plantations. On the other hand, both existing natural forests and plantations are less intensively managed, while the forested to be established will be intensively managed, hence their growth rate will be higher than existing forests. Therefore using the general inventory data can be considered as a conservative estimate, at least not overestimated in the context of degraded lands.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><u>Clarification Request 8:</u> The regard to the used formula for N₂O emissions the formula needs to be revised and consistency with the given reference assured (IPCC guidelines agriculture). If there is a change in formula (C.11-12) calculations need to be adapted. It is recognised that N₂O emission are likely to remain negligible (under 10% threshold of net GHG removals).</p>	<p>Table 2, E.2.1</p>	<p>Yes, the formula in IPCC 2006 Guidelines are more complex. However when using them to our project case, the actual equation is same. As of equation 11.2, $F_{ON}=0$ (no compound fertilizer), $F_{CR}=0$ (no crop residue), $F_{SOM}=0$ (fertilizing will not cause soil C emission and the SSC AR methodology does not account for soil SOM change)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><u>Clarification Request 9:</u> Evidence remains to be provided that in those parts of the project areas that are not abandoned land (grass/cropland), current grazing/agricultural activities do or do not cause relevant leakage when shifted to areas</p>	<p>Table 2, E.2.1</p>	<p>See revised text in bullet 4 under Section B.2</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
outside the project boundary.			
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 1:</u> The Version Number and the reference remain to be modified in the PDD (section B.1.), and revise consistency of explanations on formula B.1. with methodology.</p>	Table 2, B.1.1	Revised as requested.	☑
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 2:</u> More detailed information should be included to the PDD on the barriers that are actually faced by the implementing forestry farm, especially in regard to finances.</p>	Table 2, B.2.7	Text revised in PDD Section B.2 concerning the barriers faced by the forestry farm.	☑
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 3:</u> The date for the start of the crediting period needs to be revised. (section A.4.11.1 and A4.10.3.2 of PDD)</p>	Table 2, C.1.1	Text revised	☑
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 4:</u> The methodology AR-AMS0001 has been approved previously. (Minor) Changes of the formulae and parameter explanations presented in the revised version 02 need to be brought to consistency with the PDD (e.g. section C.1.1 and C.3).</p>	Table 2, D.1.1	Checked and revised.	☑



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 5:</u> Consistency and completeness of table B4.1.1.1 of the PDD with the requirements of table 1 of the methodology remains to be assured.</p>	Table 2, D.2.4	Table updated based on table 1 of the SSC-AR methodology	☑
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 6:</u> The parameters to be monitored / data to be collected as presented in B.4.1.1.1 of the PDD need to be revised (consistency with Table 1 of AR-ASM001) and checked for completeness.</p>	Table 2, E.1.2	Table updated based on table 1 of the SSC-AR methodology	☑
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 7:</u> In the PDD (section A.4.11.1 and C.2-C.5) consistency needs to be assured with the results of the excel calculations.</p>	Table 2, E.2.1	Data checked and revised	☑
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 8:</u> Furthermore the threshold for N₂O emissions is indicated incorrectly in section C4 of the PDD (with 20%)</p>	Table 2, E.2.1	Checked and revised.	☑
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 9:</u> Furthermore, emissions / leakage from the transport of seedlings, labour, fertilizer, wood and other products should be briefly quantified and potentially considered as leakage.</p>	Table 2, E.2.1	Calculated to be 9.15 t CO ₂ -e for the crediting period. Text added in PDD and spreadsheet added.	☑



Industrie Service


Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<u>Corrective Action Request 10:</u> The number of impacted persons and households needs to be revised and consistency assured.	Table 2, G.1.1	Numbers have been checked and modified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Validation of the CDM Project:
Small-scale Reforestation for Landscape Restoration (Tengchong,
Provinz Yunnan, China)




Industrie Service

Annex 2: Information Reference List

Final Report	2007-01-30	Validation of the “Small-scale Reforestation for Landscape Restoration”, Tengchong, China Information Reference List	Page 1 of 2	 Industrie Service
--------------	------------	---	-------------	--

Reference No.	Document or Type of Information																														
1.	<p>On-site interviews at the offices and the project site of the “Small-scale Reforestation for Landscape Restoration”, Tengchong, Province of Yunnan, China by auditing team of TÜV SÜD, performed between December 9–13, 2006:</p> <p>Validation team on site: Martin Schröder TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH Dr. Ulrich Apel Expert for Chinese forestry on behalf of TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH</p> <p>Interviewed persons:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Litun Li</td> <td>Sujiang Forestry Farm (Director)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Songhui Li</td> <td>Sujiang Forestry Farm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zixiang Zhang</td> <td>County Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Forest Management Branch, Tengchong Office</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bizhong Li</td> <td>County Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Natural Resource Management Branch, Qushi station of Tengchong office,</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chengbo Duan</td> <td>County Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Tengchong Natural Resource Management Branch</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tianshuang Zheng</td> <td>Municipal Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Carbon sequestration office.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tiancan Wang</td> <td>Galoligonshan Nature Reserve, Tengchong office</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Xiangqun Lin</td> <td>Yunnan forestry college</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zeyuan Xia</td> <td>Provincial Carbon Sequestration Office (Yunnan)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tao Liu</td> <td>Provincial Carbon Sequestration Office (Yunnan)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tengwei Su</td> <td>Provincial Carbon Sequestration Office (Yunnan)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jian Ma</td> <td>The Nature Conservancy, China</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shawn Shuang Zhang</td> <td>Conservation International, FCCB project, China</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rong Zhou</td> <td>Conservation International, FCCB project, China</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Xiaoquan Zhang</td> <td>China Forestry & Technology Institute (National Consultant)</td> </tr> </table>	Litun Li	Sujiang Forestry Farm (Director)	Songhui Li	Sujiang Forestry Farm	Zixiang Zhang	County Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Forest Management Branch, Tengchong Office	Bizhong Li	County Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Natural Resource Management Branch, Qushi station of Tengchong office,	Chengbo Duan	County Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Tengchong Natural Resource Management Branch	Tianshuang Zheng	Municipal Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Carbon sequestration office.	Tiancan Wang	Galoligonshan Nature Reserve, Tengchong office	Xiangqun Lin	Yunnan forestry college	Zeyuan Xia	Provincial Carbon Sequestration Office (Yunnan)	Tao Liu	Provincial Carbon Sequestration Office (Yunnan)	Tengwei Su	Provincial Carbon Sequestration Office (Yunnan)	Jian Ma	The Nature Conservancy, China	Shawn Shuang Zhang	Conservation International, FCCB project, China	Rong Zhou	Conservation International, FCCB project, China	Xiaoquan Zhang	China Forestry & Technology Institute (National Consultant)
Litun Li	Sujiang Forestry Farm (Director)																														
Songhui Li	Sujiang Forestry Farm																														
Zixiang Zhang	County Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Forest Management Branch, Tengchong Office																														
Bizhong Li	County Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Natural Resource Management Branch, Qushi station of Tengchong office,																														
Chengbo Duan	County Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Tengchong Natural Resource Management Branch																														
Tianshuang Zheng	Municipal Forestry Bureau (of Yunnan Forest Administration), Carbon sequestration office.																														
Tiancan Wang	Galoligonshan Nature Reserve, Tengchong office																														
Xiangqun Lin	Yunnan forestry college																														
Zeyuan Xia	Provincial Carbon Sequestration Office (Yunnan)																														
Tao Liu	Provincial Carbon Sequestration Office (Yunnan)																														
Tengwei Su	Provincial Carbon Sequestration Office (Yunnan)																														
Jian Ma	The Nature Conservancy, China																														
Shawn Shuang Zhang	Conservation International, FCCB project, China																														
Rong Zhou	Conservation International, FCCB project, China																														
Xiaoquan Zhang	China Forestry & Technology Institute (National Consultant)																														

Final Report	2007-01-30	Validation of the "Small-scale Reforestation for Landscape Restoration", Tengchong, China Information Reference List	Page 2 of 2	
--------------	------------	---	----------------	---

Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
	N.N. Several inhabitants of Pingdi village
2.	Project Design Document, version 1.0 (GSP version), dated 25.8.2006, submitted 24.11.2006
3.	Letter / table provided in response to the results of the initial desk review, submitted, 19.10.2006
4.	Excel spreadsheet with ex-ante estimates on expected carbon stock changes, 2 nd version submitted 11.12.2006
5.	Baseline Study, English, revised / submitted on 13.12.2006
6.	Monitoring Plan, Chinese, revised / submitted on 13.12.2006
7.	Draft version of contract between forestry farm and landholder, revised / submitted 13.12.2006, 2 nd version submitted 29.1.2007
8.	Environmental Impact Assessment Form, 3 pages, dated 1.12.2006
9.	Social Assessment Report, Chinese, as compiled by Yunnan Forestry College, revised/ submitted on 13.12.2006
10.	Minutes on dates and sites of stakeholder events, revised/ submitted on 13.12.2006
11.	Form used for the interviews of local landholders on historic land use (in the context of PRA), revised 13.12.2006
12.	Declaration on the Establishment of the Project Leading Group signed by Forest Administration, dated 8.4.2005
13.	Letter of endorsement in regard to environmental impacts, Environmental Protection Bureau, dated 5.12.2006
14.	Revision of GIS system and other geographic data, carried out on-site on 13.12.2006
15.	GPS control coordinates of project sites, as gathered by auditor on-site, 10-13.12.2006
16.	Standard Operation Procedures, provided on 9.1.2006
17.	Letter of endorsement in regard to socio-economic impacts, Environmental Protection Bureau, without date (original), submitted 13.12.2006
18.	Statement on the handling of project workload and further background on possible leakage, submitted on 9.1.2006
19.	Excel spreadsheet with ex-ante estimates on expected carbon stock changes, 3 rd version, submitted 29.1.2007
20.	Letter by Forestry Farm on community involvement, submitted 9.1.2006
21.	Procedures on potential conflict management within regular project management, submitted 29.1.2007