



VERIFICATION REPORT FOR AFOGNAK FOREST CARBON PROJECT



Document Prepared by Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc.

Project Title	Afognak Forest Carbon Project
Version	1.2
Report ID	2023_RCE_VCS_7

Report Title	Verification Report for Afognak Forest Carbon Project
Client	ClimeCo
Pages	22
Date of Issue	21-December-2023
Prepared By	Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc.
Contact	743 Horizon Ct. Suite 385 Grand Junction, Colorado 81506 1-970-241-9298

	www.rubycanyonenv.com zach.eyler@tuvsud.com
Approved By	Bonny Crews
Work Carried Out By	Zach Eyer Christian Eggleton Tim Facemire

Summary:

The Afognak Forest Carbon Project covers 3,326.5 ha (8,219.7 acres) of adjacent or proximal parcels located on the North coast (Perenosa Bay/Delphin Bay area) of Afognak Island, Alaska. The Afognak Forest Carbon Project achieves net GHG emission reductions and removals through the avoidance of emissions due to logging in the baseline scenario. The Afognak properties were being managed for timber production by the previous managers, with existing or pending logging plans in place across these and adjacent properties owned by the previous owners. The project activities result in the reduction of greenhouse gases (GHG) including carbon dioxide (CO₂).

ClimeCo LLC (ClimeCo) contracted with Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc. (RCE) to perform the verification of emission reductions during this monitoring period from 1 January 2022 to 31 December 2022. ClimeCo has right to all GHG reductions resulting from the Project.

The purpose of the verification is to ensure that the Project Proponent implemented the project activity according to the monitoring plan, that the emission reduction assertion submitted by ClimeCo is materially correct and free of errors and omissions, and that the Project meets all criteria requirements. Specifically, RCE assessed the Project against the Approved VCS Methodology VM0012 Improved Forest Management – Logged to Protected Forest (IFM-LtPF) on Fee Simple Forested Properties – Version 1.2. (Methodology). RCE assessed the Project Monitoring Report, including the Project’s monitoring plan, based on the above criteria documents as well as relevant VCS criteria and guidance documents.

During the verification process, the verification team completed a desk review of the monitoring report and supporting documents to confirm that Project Proponents implemented the project activity as stated in the validated VCS Project Description (PD). This included a review of data and information control systems and interviews with key personnel. During the verification, RCE issued no Corrective Action Requests, no Non-material Findings, no Additional Documentation Requests and one Clarification Request (1) which are described in Appendix A. ClimeCo provided adequate responses to all requests. RCE did not find any significant uncertainties associated with the verification.

RCE concludes, to a reasonable level of assurance, that the Project’s GHG assertion of 32,675 metric tonnes of CO₂ equivalent emissions for the period of 1 January 2022 to 31 December 2022 is fairly stated.

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Objective.....	5
1.2	Scope and Criteria	5
1.3	Level of Assurance.....	5
1.4	Summary Description of the Project	6
2	Verification Process	6
2.1	Method and Criteria.....	6
2.2	Document Review	7
2.3	Interviews.....	8
2.4	Site Inspections.....	8
2.5	Resolution of Findings	8
2.5.1	Forward Action Requests	9
2.6	Eligibility for Validation Activities	9
3	Validation Findings	9
3.1	Participation under Other GHG Programs	9
3.2	Methodology Deviations.....	9
3.3	Project Description Deviations.....	9
3.4	Grouped Project	10
4	Verification Findings	10
4.1	Project Implementation Status	10
4.2	Safeguards	11
4.2.1	No Net Harm	11
4.2.2	Local Stakeholder Consultation	11
4.3	AFOLU-Specific Safeguards	12
4.4	Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations	12
4.5	Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals	13
4.6	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis.....	14
5	Verification conclusion	20
	APPENDIX X: Verification findings	22

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The objective of the verification is to ensure that the GHG emission assertion made by the Project is materially correct and that the data provided are accurate, complete, and transparent. Additionally, RCE ensured that the Project is in conformance with the criteria as stated in Section 1.2.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of the Project includes the boundary of the Project area which includes 8,219.7 acres of adjacent or proximal parcels located on the North coast (Perenosa Bay/Delphin Bay area) of Afognak Island, Alaska. The GHG included in the scope of the Project is CO₂.

RCE conducted the verification based upon the following criteria:

- Verified Carbon Standard Version 4.4 (17 January 2023);
- VCS Program Guide Version 4.3 (21 December 2022);
- Validation and Verification Manual Version 3.2 (October 19, 2016);
- VCS Methodology VM0012 Improved Forest Management – Logged to Protected Forest (IFM-LtPF) on Fee Simple Forested Properties – Version 1.2
- Re-Validated VCS Project Description v. 3.0, dated 26 November 2018;
- ISO 14064-3:2019 Greenhouse gases – Part 3: Specification with guidance for the validation and verification of greenhouse gas assertions.

Additionally, RCE reviewed the Project's monitoring period-specific Monitoring Report Version 1.0 dated 6 December 2023, including the monitoring plan, during verification activities.

1.3 Level of Assurance

RCE conducted the verification to a reasonable level of assurance.

The VCS Standard defines materiality as errors, omissions, or discrepancies resulting in misstatement of greater than five percent of the Project's GHG assertion. Additionally, RCE considered qualitative non-conformances with criteria requirements as material during the verification process.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The Project achieves net GHG emission reductions and removals through the avoidance of emissions due to logging in the baseline scenario. The Afognak properties were being managed for timber production by the previous managers, with existing or pending logging plans in place across these and adjacent properties owned by the previous owners.

The project scenario is conservation management, wherein the State of Alaska manages the properties for the purpose of wilderness and ecosystem protection and enhancement activities under the terms of the title transfer agreement and federal conservation easement. The project scenario retains the current native and naturally regenerating logged forests in perpetuity to retain and sequester carbon on the property. The project is currently being fully implemented as per the project design.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Method and Criteria

RCE used a risk-based approach to assess the Project against the VCS Program rules including the criteria defined in Section 1.2.

The verification process included the following independent and objective activities:

- RCE selected a verification team. The verification team was selected according to RCE's GHG Verification Policies & Procedures to ensure team members are qualified to perform validation activities pertaining to the Project. The validation team consisted of the following individuals:
 - o Lead Verifier: Zach Eyler
 - o Technical Experts: Christian Eggleton (Professional Forester, FRST Corp), Tim Facemire (FRST Corp)
 - o Independent Reviewer: Bonny Crews
- RCE completed a conflict-of-interest review to determine whether any potential conflicts exist with the project proponent. The assessment revealed no conflicts of interest.
- RCE held a verification kick-off meeting with ClimeCo to introduce the verification team, review the verification objectives, process, VCS requirements, confirm the schedule, and to request data and documents.

- RCE performed a strategic analysis and risk assessment of the received data and support documents to understand the scope and areas of potential risk in the GHG emission reductions.
- RCE developed a risk-based sampling plan based upon the strategic review and risk assessment. The verification plan and sampling plan were used throughout the verification and were revised as needed based upon additional risk assessments.
- The verification team did not complete a site visit for this verification. A site visit was completed on August 2-3, 2022 during the last verification. RCE conducted a detailed desktop review of submitted data and documents including source data, evidence for ongoing QA/QC procedures, and emission reduction calculations.
- RCE submitted corrective action requests, non-material findings, additional documentation requests, and clarification requests, as necessary, to ClimeCo throughout the verification.
- RCE's internal reviewer conducted a review of the verification sampling, verification findings, and Verification Report.
- RCE issued the final verification report and verification representation, and
- RCE held an exit meeting with ClimeCo.

2.2 Document Review

The verification consisted of a review of the Project's calculated emission reductions for the monitoring period, as well as a review of the Monitoring Report and other supporting data and documents to demonstrate compliance with the validated Project Description and the VCS Program rules. RCE reviewed the following documents and data:

- Validated Project Description
- Validation Report
- Monitoring Report version 1.0, dated 6 December 2023
- Leakage calculations
- FORECAST calculation outputs
- Non-permanence risk report
- Risk Report calculation tool
- Spatial data
- Carbon Plot SOP

- VCS Deed of Accession
- Quit Claim Deeds

2.3 Interviews

RCE held discussions with the following personnel during the verification:

- Greg Cesare, Director, ClimeCo
 - Greg is responsible for the high-level management of Project during the verification process.
- Brad Seely, Project Development, ClimeCo
 - Brad is the lead on project implementation, data analysis, emission reduction calculations and the Project Monitoring Report. He also led all responses to items noted in the list of findings.

These discussions included:

- Reviewing calculations and modeling
- List of findings review

Greg, and Brad possessed sufficient knowledge regarding the Project to sufficiently answer all issues and questions raised by the verification team. Brad has been working on the Project since its inception in 2006.

2.4 Site Inspections

There was no site visit for this monitoring period, as this Project has been previously validated, the project baseline has not been reassessed in this monitoring period, nor has a project description deviation been made which impacts the applicability of the methodology, additionality, or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario. A site visit was completed for the previous monitoring period on August 2-3, 2022 by Christian Eggleton and Tim Facemire of FRST to assess the quality of the most recent inventory. The 'Uncertainty Risk Discount Factor' generated from this site visit was maintained in the quantification of the current monitoring period, and there were no changes in Sentinel-2 satellite imagery to the entirety of the project area over the course of the monitoring period. Therefore, there was little risk of a material misstatement or nonconformity by the Project. The validated baseline and project emissions model is still valid and no project description deviation been made which impacts the applicability of the methodology, additionality, or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

During the verification process, RCE issued no corrective action requests, no non-material findings, no additional documentation requests and one clarification request (1). RCE documented these requests in the List of Findings. ClimeCo sufficiently addressed all material requests as documented in Appendix A.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

There were no forward action requests during the verification of the previous monitoring period nor during the verification of this monitoring period.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

RCE did not perform validation activities as part of the verification process.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

No validation activities took place during the verification of this monitoring period.

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

The Project does not participate in any other GHG offset programs.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

There is one methodology deviation that has been present during previous verifications and monitoring periods. It is not identified in the validated PD although it is appropriately documented in the Monitoring Report.

The deviation is related to activity-shifting leakage monitoring where the methodology requests a listing of all properties owned or controlled by the project proponents. The project proponent and other relevant parties do not undertake any commercial timber harvesting on properties they own or control and have no history of commercial timber operations on the project area or any other properties. Because of this there is no risk of activity-shifting leakage across their diverse land holdings. This deviation does not affect the calculation of emission reductions.

RCE concludes that the methodology deviation applied to the Project is valid.

3.3 Project Description Deviations

ClimeCo identified and appropriately justified two Project description deviations in the Monitoring Report. One deviation was identified and approved by a different verification body during previous monitoring periods while the other is a new deviation for this monitoring period.

The first deviation is an ongoing minor deviation related to the application of the LST model. In the PD the LST model was run for a period of 100 years using 5-year time steps to project the project and baseline scenarios. However, subsequent runs for use in the previous and current monitoring reports were conducted using a 30-year period with an annual time step. This was done to improve the annual accuracy of model output by removing averaging errors created when estimating annual values from the 5-year periods. A comparison of the output from the two model applications shows that there were only small differences due to averaging errors in the PD version. There are no other impacts for the calculation of emission reductions in the project. Moreover, an updated version of the PD (v3.0), prepared as part of a recent 10-yr baseline re-evaluation effective 2016, includes the output from the annual-timestep modelling.

The second deviation is related to an update to other entities involved in the project specified in the most recent PD (Afognak VCS Project Description Document - 2018 v3.0d.pdf). In this PD, and all prior documents, the Project Proponents were listed as the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation and Camco International Group, Inc. and the Implementing Partner was 3Greentree Ecosystem Services. In early 2022, the Project rights were sold to ClimeCo LLC. Thus, in the previous Monitoring Report for the 2019-2021 Verification Period (Afognak 2022 Monitoring Report v1.31 .pdf) the Project Proponent was updated to ClimeCo LLC. Lastly, in December of 2022, ClimeCo LLC purchased 3Greentree Ecosystem Services. Accordingly, the Implementing Partner was also updated to ClimeCo LLC.

RCE approves these deviations because they do not impact the applicability of the methodology, additionality, or appropriateness of the baseline scenario, and the Project remains in compliance with VCS rules.

3.4 Grouped Project

N/A, this is not a grouped project.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

The Project start date is 1 January 2006, as stated in the validated Project Description. The crediting period is for 35 years, beginning on 1 January 2006 and ending on 31 December 2035. RCE found that the Project was implemented in conformance with the validated Project Description except for the deviations noted above. RCE verified the methodology deviation noted above and confirmed that the Project continues to meet the requirements of the VCS Standard Version 4.3.

RCE confirmed that there was a change to the project proponent for this monitoring period. The new project proponent is ClimeCo LLC. Ownership interest in the Project was transferred from the previous proponent, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Inc. RCE confirmed the new ownership through a review of quit claim deeds. Additionally, the Project has not sought or received any other form of environmental credit.

The Project activities have been fully implemented as documented in the validated PD. The Project is conserving the project area by not logging as in the baseline scenario. Management practices are being applied to enhance the wilderness and ecosystem in the Project area.

In addition, RCE also confirmed that:

- The Project has not participated or been rejected under any other GHG programs during this monitoring period.
- The Project has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit nor has become eligible to do so since the previous verification.
- The Project's GHG emission reductions or removals have not been included in an emissions trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading.
- The Project did not note any sustainable development contributions in its Monitoring Report.
- RCE confirmed one previous methodology deviation (as noted in Section 3.2 of this report).

RCE and FRST confirmed that the Project met all monitoring requirements as outlined in the validated PD, monitoring Plan and methodology. RCE confirmed that the Monitoring Report was accurate and up to date.

4.2 Safeguards

4.2.1 No Net Harm

The verification team confirmed that the Project has no net harm by retaining fully functional natural ecosystems. The Project involved a private land sale at an appraised market value, thus there was no material net socio-economic impacts.

4.2.2 Local Stakeholder Consultation

The verification team confirmed that the Project conducted extensive local stakeholder consultations prior to and during the acquisitions of the project properties in previous monitoring periods. The northern end of Afognak Island where the project area is located is completely uninhabited, and access to the project area is only via boat or sea plane as roads and docks do not exist. As the Project area is now managed by the State of Alaska under a conservation easement preventing further developments, there are no ongoing or updated stakeholder consultations related to the Project or this monitoring period. Thus, there is no need to establish mechanisms for ongoing communication because there are no stakeholders to raise concerns.

4.3 AFOLU-Specific Safeguards

This Project was validated prior to this requirement being implemented in VCS and is exempt.

4.4 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

ClimeCo calculated the Project's emission reductions in accordance with the equations in the Methodology, validated PD and any approved deviations. RCE and FRST reviewed all data, parameters, inputs and calculations provided by ClimeCo for this monitoring period.

The Project data used to calculate the GHG emission reductions and removals includes per-plot tree and large woody debris measurements, resulting in quantification of above and below ground net change in carbon in live trees and above ground carbon in dead trees and LWD.

RCE and FRST completed a full recalculation of the emission reductions and removals for the monitoring period. This included:

- Reviewing the accuracy and consistency of spreadsheet formulas, conversions and data aggregation
- Reviewing whether the Project follows the methods and formulas outlined in the project description for baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage
- Reviewing default values used and their appropriateness
- Reviewing and confirming the updated project GIS stratification for both productive and non-productive areas

The Project data used to calculate monitoring period emission reductions for this monitoring period is from the previously validated and verified baseline and project projections which have remained unchanged since the initial validation. This was confirmed by checking previous monitoring period calculations and monitoring reports. The emission reductions and removals are updated with every inventory through the 'Risk Discount Factor' to account for variation and risk in relation to changing stocks versus the initial baseline/project model. The Risk Discount Factor was previously verified by RCE in the 2019-2021 monitoring period. During that previous verification and during this verification, FRST/RCE completed a full recalculation to assess manual transposition errors and the accuracy of the Project's emissions reductions. RCE and FRST also confirmed the appropriateness of any default values used in the monitoring report. RCE and FRST found the baseline emissions, project emissions, and GHG emission reduction calculations to be in conformance with the Methodology, validated PD and to be free of material misstatement. RCE and FRST also confirmed that the Risk Discount Factor (5.4%) was calculated correctly using the updated inventory and model error terms.

The method that was used to verify this respective monitoring period was to recalculate the proper implementation of the previously verified/calculated risk discount factor against the baseline/project model projections for 2022. There was also GIS analysis through Sentinel-2 satellite imagery within the monitoring period time frame to verify that there were no harvests or disturbances within the project area that would impact carbon stocks. As documented in the 'VCUs' tab of the 'Afognak RP17 Data Checks v1.0' the previously verified values for 2022 were properly incorporated into the active calculation accounting for the most recent field verified risk discount factor of 5.4%. Per the 'Materiality' tab, there was no discrepancy identified between the Project's and FRST/RCE calculations.

4.5 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

ClimeCo provided sufficient documentation and evidence, such as the Excel document 'Afognak plot data_UF Aug 2022v1.2' for the emission reduction calculations. RCE and FRST assessed the evidence provided and determined it was of sufficient quantity and quality. RCE and FRST also reviewed the Project's information control systems, data management processes, and data quality assurance procedures. RCE and FRST completed a variety of cross checks on the Project data including completing a full recalculation of emissions reduction and removals. RCE reviewed the Project's Monitoring Report, spatial data, project ownership documents, and emission reduction calculations to ensure that reported data was consistent across all documentation. RCE and FRST confirmed that the calibration frequency for monitoring equipment is not relevant for this Project. RCE verified that the Project Proponent ensures that project documents and records are secure and retrievable for at least two years after the crediting period.

RCE found the information provided to be transparently documented and in accordance with requirements of the Methodology and the validated PD. RCE concludes that the quantity and quality of the evidence used to determine the GHG reductions and removals was sufficient for the Project for this monitoring period.

4.6 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

The AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool was used by ClimeCo to assess overall project risk. RCE and FRST independently reviewed the Non-Permanence Risk Report provided with supporting documentation and confirmed that the Project adheres to the requirements set out in the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool. The evidence provided by ClimeCo to support the risk rating values was sufficient and RCE and FRST confirmed its quality to support the values. RCE and FRST confirmed the final score of 10%, requiring a 10% contribution to the buffer pool and conclude that the overall risk rating is appropriate.

Risk Factor	Specific Risk and Mitigation	Risk rating	VVB Assessment
Internal Risks			
Project Management	A) Planted Species: The project does not involve operational reforestation activities.	0	Confirmed. No operations on site.
	B) Ongoing Enforcement: The project area is monitored by the State of Alaska DNR staff along with adjacent state managed forests. No history of illegal activities exists in the region or project area. The remote access and limited infrastructure requirements are barriers to illegal encroachment.	0	Confirmed by GIS analysis.
	C) Management Team: The project management team possess the necessary experience related to all project activities.	0	Confirmed by review of CVs.
	D) Management Team Location: The original project owner has an ongoing conservation program in Alaska. ClimeCo have locations within one day's travel to the project site via commercial airline	0	Confirmed in previous monitoring period site visit and maintained via business records
	E) Mitigation: All project proponents and parties have significant experience developing and managing VCS AFOLU projects.	-2	Confirmed by review of CVs and previous experience with entities.
	F) Mitigation: Although the Alaska DNR does undertake adaptive management and other planning processes, these are more regional in nature and not claimed for this mitigation factor.	0	No operations on site.
Financial Viability	A) Project cash flow breakeven point is greater than 10 years from the current risk assessment.	0	N/A.

	N/A		
	B) Project cash flow breakeven point is greater than 7 and up to 10 years from the current risk assessment. N/A	0	N/A.
	C) Project cash flow breakeven point greater than 4 and up to 7 years from the current risk assessment. N/A	0	N/A.
	D) Project cash flow breakeven point is 4 years or less from the current risk assessment. Project achieved breakeven in less than 4 years.	0	Confirmed by review of source documents.
	E) Project has secured less than 15% of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven. N/A	0	N/A.
	F) Project has secured 15% to less than 40% of funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven. N/A	0	N/A.
	G) Project has secured 40% to less than 80% of funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven. N/A	0	N/A.
	H) Project has secured 80% or more of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven. Project has secured all necessary funding to achieve breakeven.	0	Confirmed by review of source documents and discussions.
	I) Mitigation: Project has available as callable financial resources at least 50% of total cash out before project reaches breakeven. All Project Proponents and parties to the Project have available callable financial resources as necessary to support the Project to breakeven and in the future.	-2	Confirmed by review of source documents and discussions.
Opportunity Cost	A) NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be at least 100% more than that associated with project activities; or where baseline activities are subsistence-driven, net positive community impacts are not demonstrated. N/A	0	N/A.
	B) NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be between 50% and up to 100% more than from project activities. N/A	0	N/A.

	C) NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be between 20% and up to 50% more than from project activities. N/A	0	N/A.
	D) NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be between 20% more than and up to 20% less than from project activities; or where baseline activities are subsistence-driven, net positive community impacts are demonstrated. N/A	0	N/A.
	E) NPV from project activities is expected to be between 20% and up to 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity. NPV from the project activities is expected to be between 20% and up to 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity.	-2	Confirmed by review of source documents and discussions.
	F) NPV from project activities is expected to be at least 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity. N/A	0	N/A.
	G) Mitigation: Project proponent is a non-profit organization. The original Project Proponent is a non-profit.	-2	Confirmed by review of source documents and discussions.
	H) Mitigation: Project is protected by legally binding commitment (see Section 2.2.4) to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period. N/A	0	N/A.
	I) Mitigation: Project is protected by legally binding commitment to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over at least 100 years. The Project area is protected by a legally binding perpetual Federal Conservation Easement over 100 years.	-8	Confirmed by review of source documents and discussions.
Project Longevity	A) Without legal agreement or requirement to continue the management practice. N/A B) With legal agreement or requirement to continue the management practice. The Project has a legally binding perpetual (i.e. >100 year) conservation easement.	0	N/A.
Total Internal Risk (PM + FV + OC + PL) Total may not be less than zero.		0	Total is less than 0, so default value is 0.

External Risks			
Land Tenure and Resource Access/Impacts	A) Ownership and resource access/use rights are held by same entity(s). N/A	0	N/A.
	B) Ownership and resource access/use rights are held by different entity(s) (e.g., land is government owned and the project proponent holds a lease or concession). The carbon proof of right and right of use are held by ClimeCo, while the surface rights are owned by the State of Alaska under a Federal Conservation Easement.	2	Confirmed by review of project documentation.
	C) In more than 5% of the project area, there exist disputes over land tenure or ownership. There are no disputes.	0	Confirmed, fully owned.
	D) There exist disputes over access/use rights (or overlapping rights) There are no disputes.	0	Confirmed, settled rights.
	E) WRC projects unable to demonstrate that potential upstream and sea impacts that could undermine issued credits in the next 10 years are irrelevant or expected to be insignificant, or that there is a plan in place for effectively mitigating such impacts. N/A	0	N/A.
	F) Mitigation: Project area is protected by legally binding commitment (e.g., a conservation easement or protected area) to continue management practices that protect carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period. The Project area is protected by a legally binding perpetual Federal Conservation Easement.	-2	Confirmed easement.
	G) Mitigation: Where disputes over land tenure, ownership or access/use rights exist, documented evidence is provided that projects have implemented activities to resolve the disputes or clarify overlapping claims. There are no disputes.	0	Confirmed, no disputes.
Community Engagement	A) Less than 50 percent of households living within the project area who are reliant on the project area, have been consulted. N/A	0	No population within project area.
	B) Less than 20 percent of households living within 20 km of the project boundary outside the project area, and who are reliant on the project area, have been consulted. N/A	0	No population reliant on project area.

	C) Mitigation: The project generates net positive impacts on the social and economic wellbeing of the local communities who derive livelihoods from the project area. N/A	0	No population derives livelihood from project area.
Political risk	A) Governance score of less than -0.79. N/A	0	N/A.
	B) Governance score of -0.79 to less than -0.32. N/A	0	N/A.
	C) Governance score of -0.32 to less than 0.19. N/A	0	N/A.
	D) Governance score of 0.19 to less than 0.82 N/A	0	N/A.
	E) Governance score of 0.82 or higher. Last 5-year average for U.S. is 1.16.	0	Confirmed, higher than 0.82.
	F) Mitigation: Country is implementing REDD+ Readiness or other activities, as set out in this Section 2.3.3. The U.S has established FSC standards.	-2	Confirmed, standards exist.
Total External Risk (LT + CE + PC) Total may not be less than zero.		0	Total is less than 0, so default value is 0.
Natural Risks			
Fire	Rating is justified through evidence and well documented.	0	Confirmed. Significance is 'major', but likelihood is 100 yrs or more.
Pest and Disease Outbreaks	Rating is justified through evidence and well documented.	1	Confirmed. Significance is 'major', likelihood is 50-100 yrs.
Extreme weather	Rating is justified through evidence and well documented.	1	Confirmed. Significance is 'major', likelihood is 50-100 yrs.
Geological	Rating is justified through evidence and well documented.	0	Confirmed. Significance is 'major', but likelihood is 100 yrs or more.

Other	None.	0	Confirmed. None.
Total Natural Risk (as applicable, F + PD + W + G + ON)		2	2
Risk Category		Rating	
Internal Risk		0	0 Confirmed.
External Risk		0	0 Confirmed.
Natural Risk		2	2 Confirmed.
Overall Risk Rating (a + b + c)		10	10 is Minimum.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc. conducted the verification of the 872 Afognak Forest Carbon Project according to the requirements found in ISO 14064-3:2019. The objective of this verification was to ensure that the GHG statement is materially correct and conforms to all relevant criteria. The GHG statement is the responsibility of ClimeCo. A summary of the GHG statement is as follows:

- GHG-related activity: Afognak Forest Carbon Project
- GHG statement: 1/1/2022 – 12/31/2022
- Criteria:
 - Verified Carbon Standard Version 4.3 (22 June 2022);
 - Validation and Verification Manual Version 3.2 (October 19, 2016);
 - VCS Methodology VM0012 Improved Forest Management – Logged to Protected Forest (IFM-LtPF) on Fee Simple Forested Properties – Version 1.2
 - Re-Validated VCS Project Description v. 3.0, dated 26 November 2018;
 - The data and information supporting the GHG statement were historical in nature.
 - RCE has ensured the Afognak Forest Carbon Project's effective use of controls related to the GHG statement. RCE concludes that there is sufficient and appropriate evidence to support the Afognak Forest Carbon Project's GHG statement and is issuing an unmodified Opinion.

RCE confirms that there is no evidence that the GHG statement has not been prepared:

- Without] material discrepancy,
- In accordance with all applicable criteria, and
- Verified to a reasonable level of assurance.

The verified GHG statement is summarized below.

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Uncertainty Risk Discount (tCO ₂ e)	Buffer pool allocation	VCUs eligible for issuance
2022	23,907	8,768	0	32,675	1,764	3,267	45,132
Total	23,907	8,768	0	32,675	1,764	3,267	45,132

Note: Totals might not sum due to rounding

Lead Verifier Signature



Zach Eyler

Internal Reviewer Signature



Bonny Crews

6 APPENDIX A: VERIFICATION FINDINGS

Corrective Action Request (CAR), Non-Material Finding (NMF), Additional Documentation Request (ADR), or Clarification Request (CR) #	Finding and Date	Section of Protocol/ Methodology/ Program Document	Project Developer Response and Date	RCE response and Date	Open or Closed
CAR 1					
NMF 1					
ADR 1					
CR 1	Have there been any changes to acreage or stratification since the last RP? The provided shapefile is the same as the previous RP.	9.3	There have been no updates made to the spatial inventory that was established in the Afognak PDD (v.2.3); therefore, no changes were made to acreage or stratification of land area since the last RP. The provided shapefile is the same as the previous RP.	Thank you for the confirmation, this item may be closed.	Closed