



South Asia

Choose certainty.
Add value.

Verification and New Area Certification Report

of the Registered GS Project
“Afforestation with Hazelnut Plantations in Western Georgia”
GoldStandard Registry ID: GS3975
Monitoring Period 1: 01/01/2007 to 31/12/2016

(Performance Certification and New Area Certification)
Report No. 10512VV

08 December 2019

TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd.
Environmental Technology, Carbon Management Service
Solitaire, I.T.I. Road, Aundh, Pune- 411007, INDIA



Report No.	Date of first issue	Revision No.	Revision Date	Certificate No.
10512VV	08 Dec 2019	-	-	-

Subject: Performance and New Area Certification of an A/R GoldStandard Project	
Accredited TÜV SÜD Unit: TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd. Environmental Technology, Carbon Management Service Solitaire, I.T.I. Road, Aundh, Pune- 411007, INDIA	
Project Participant: Agrigeorgia LLC Medeas Str. 15 3800 Zugdidi Georgia	Project Site(s): The total project area of 3384,48 ha consists of various parcels covering in 2017 a total eligible planting area of 2844,29 ha located in the Samegrelo region in Georgia. The PDD includes information on geographic boundary. Digital boundary files are provided jointly with this report.
Project Title: Afforestation with Hazelnut Plantations in Western Georgia	
Applied Methodology / Version: A/R Requirements v 0.9 (road-map)	
Certifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial Certification (CarbonFix, Phase I) New Area Certification (CarbonFix, Phase II) Transition Report Carbonfix - GoldStandard New Area/Performance Certification: 	Final PD version: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date of issuance: 24 Sep 2010 Date of issuance: 17 Dec 2012 Date of issuance: 02 Dec 2013 Date of issuance: 13 Nov 2019
<p>Summary: TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd. has conducted the first Performance Certification (Verification) jointly with a New Area Certification of the registered GS project: " Afforestation with Hazelnut Plantations in Western Georgia ".</p> <p>The Management Units of the Project consist of afforestation of former degraded tea plantations with hazelnut tree varieties in plantations for hazelnut production in Georgia. In the actual round various adaptations were implemented, so were, for example, some areas added, others excluded. The actual size of the complete plantation is 3384,48 ha, including an eligible planning area of 2,844.29 ha (IRL 114). This means a slight reduction of the certified area from 2013 (2970 ha). Next to the hazelnut also poplar trees were included in this certification but mainly on already certified areas within the boundary of the hazelnut plantations.</p> <p>The results of the forest inventory conducted revealed a very high standard deviation and the required precision level of 20% could not be attained. Thus, only updated ex-ante calculations based on the results of the inventory were executed for this certification and no verified credits (VERs) are envisaged to be issued. The initial baseline calculation was also adapted to the value of 6.9 tCO₂/ha considering further studies. Hence, the total ex ante carbon calculation was adapted from 760,761 tCO₂ to 384,407 tCO₂, resulting in 307,526 tCO₂ after the reduction of 20 % buffer.</p> <p>The shortfall of credits from the last certification will be compensated by retiring existing validated CO₂-certificates that have not been sold. With this action there is no requirement re-gain the full amount of credits within 5 years.</p> <p>A document review, followed by a site visit was conducted to verify the information submitted by the project participant regarding the present verification period. Based on the assessment carried out, the verifier confirms the following:</p> <p>(a) the project is implemented as planned and described in the GS registered project document (PD); (b) the actual monitoring complies with the GS A/R Requirements version 0.9 and the CFS Forest Inventory Guideline.</p>	



(c) The monitoring system and equipment used for measuring GHG removals and emission reductions are reliably and appropriately. The project is generating GHG removals as a GS project.
 (d) that the GHG removals and emission are calculated without material misstatements.
 TÜV SÜD's opinion refers to the project's GHG removals and emissions reported, both determined using the valid and registered project's baseline, its monitoring plan and its associated documents. Based on the information we have seen and evaluated, we confirm that the project activity achieved the verified amount of reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that would not have occurred in the absence of the project activity.

Estimated total Planned Emission Reduction PERs including the 20% GS risk buffer:	384,407 t CO2-e
Calculated total Verified Emission Reduction VERs including the 20% GS risk buffer:	0 t CO2-e
Assessment Team Leader: Martin Seitz Assessment Team Members: Martin Seitz	Technical Reviewer: Eswar Murty, Dr. Dhanya Nambiar Certification Body responsible: Eswar Murty



Abbreviations

A/R	Aforestation and Reforestation
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CB	Certification Body
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CFS	CarbonFix Standard
CL	Clarification Request
ER	Emission reductions
FAR	Forward Action Request
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
GHG	Greenhouse Gas(es)
GIS	Geographic Information System
GPG	Good Practice Guidance
GS	GoldStandard
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRL	Information Reference List
LUF	Land Use & Forests
MP	Monitoring Plan
MU	Modelling Unit
PD	Project Document
PP	Project Participant
TÜV SÜD	TÜV SÜD South Asia
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change



Table of Contents	Page
1 Introduction	5
1.1 Objective	5
1.2 Scope.....	5
1.3 Level of assurance and Materiality	5
2 Methodology.....	6
2.1 Verification/New Area Certification Process	6
2.2 Appointment of the Team	6
2.3 Review of Documents	6
2.4 On-site Assessment and follow-up Interviews	7
2.5 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective and Forward Action Requests	7
2.6 Internal Quality Control.....	7
3 Certification Results	8
4 Certification Conclusion & Opinion	8
Annex 1 - List of Findings	9
(1) General Findings (1.1).....	10
(2) Key Project Information (2.1).....	10
(3) Do-No-Harm Assessment (3.1).....	15
(4) Local Stakeholder Consultations (3.2)	37
(5) Input & Grievance Mechanism (3.3)	42
(6) Sustainability Monitoring Plan (3.4).....	43
(7) Legal Rights (3.5).....	44
(8) Risk Register (3.6).....	46
(9) Additionality (4.1)	46
(10) Applicability (5.1)	48
(11) Calculation of CO2-certificates (5.3)	50
(12) Other Emissions (5.4).....	52
(13) Baseline (5.5).....	53
(14) Leakage (5.6)	55
(15) CO2-Fixation (5.7)	56
(16) Carbon Performance (6.1)	57
(17) Technical Procedure & Formatting (7.4).....	60
Annex 2 - Information Reference List	62



1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The Agrigeorgia LLC has commissioned an independent verification (Performance Certification including New Area Certification) by TÜV SÜD of its registered GS project: “Afforestation with Hazelnut Plantations in Western Georgia”.

The objective of the verification work is to comply with the requirements of the GoldStandard A/R.

TÜV SÜD has therefore assessed if:

- the project activity has been implemented as per the registered PD “Afforestation with Hazelnut Plantations in Western Georgia” 2010 and 2012, and that all physical features (newly established forest areas and required monitoring equipment/sample plots) of the project are in place,
- the actual PD (IRL 114, dated 13 Nov 2019) and other supporting documents provided are complete, verifiable and in accordance with applicable GoldStandard A/R requirements,
- the actual monitoring design and procedures comply with the monitoring and forestry inventory requirements of the GoldStandard.
-

1.2 Scope

The verification/new area certification scope encompasses an independent and objective review and ex-post determination of the monitored GHG removals and emissions by the Certifier. The verification/new area certification is based on the submitted monitoring report PD, the validated project design documents including its monitoring plan and validation report, the applied monitoring methodology, relevant decisions, clarifications and guidance from the GoldStandard and any other information and references relevant to the project activity’s resulting GHG removals. These documents are reviewed against the requirements of GoldStandard and related rules and guidance.

Based on the requirements of GoldStandard, TÜV SÜD has applied a rule-based approach for the verification of the project. The principles of accuracy, completeness, relevance, reliability and credibility were combined with a conservative approach to establish a traceable and transparent verification opinion.

The verification considers both quantitative and qualitative information on GHG removals and emission reductions.

The verification/new area certification is not meant to provide any consultancy towards the client. However, stated requests for clarifications, corrective and/or forward actions may provide input for improvement of the

1.3 Level of assurance and Materiality

The certification report expresses a conclusion with a limited level of assurance about whether the reported net anthropogenic GHG removals data is free from material misstatements. TÜV SÜD applied a materiality threshold with respect to omission or misstatements concerning reported quantities.

The audit team points out that based on the process and procedures conducted as part of this certification; there was no evidence that indicates that this GHG assertion

- a) is not materially correct and is not a fair representation of the GHG data and information presented, and



b) was not prepared in accordance with the GoldStandard.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Verification/New Area Certification Process

The verification/new area certification process is based on the approach depicted in the GoldStandard. Standard auditing techniques have been adopted for the verification/new area certification process. The audit team performs first a desk review, followed by an on-site visit, which results in the formation of a protocol that includes all the findings. The next step involves the evaluation of the findings through direct communication with the PPs and then finally the preparation of the verification/new area certification report. This report and other supporting documents then undergo an internal quality control by the CB “Environment and Energy” before submission to the GoldStandard.

2.2 Appointment of the Team

According to the technical scopes and experiences in the sectoral or national business environment, TÜV SÜD has composed an assessment team in accordance with the appointment rules of the TÜV SÜD certification body “Environment and Energy”.

The composition of an assessment team has to be approved by the Certification Body (CB) to assure that the required skills are covered by the team. The CB TÜV SÜD operates the following qualification levels for team members that are assigned by formal appointment rules:

1. Assessment Team Leader (ATL);
2. Validator/Verifier (V);
3. Trainee (T);
4. Technical Experts (TE).

It is required that the sectoral scope(s) and the technical area(s) (TA) linked to the methodology/ies and project have to be covered by the assessment team.

Assessment Team:

Name	Qualification	Scope	Technical Area	Host country experience	Onsite visit
Martin Seitz	ATL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (14.1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Martin Seitz	Verifier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (14.1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Technical Reviewer (s):

Name	Qualification	Scope	Technical area
Eswar Murty	TE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (14.1)
Dr Dhanya Nambiar	TE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (14.1)

2.3 Review of Documents

The first MR-PD for the performance-/new area certification was submitted to the audit team in December 2016. This PD version and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline were reviewed to verify the correctness, credibility, and interpretation of the presented information. As a further step of the certification process, information provided by the PP was cross-checked with information from other sources (if available). A complete list of all documents and proofs reviewed is attached as Annex 2 to this report.



2.4 On-site Assessment and follow-up Interviews

During on-site visit (03 Apr 2017 – 06 Apr 2017) TÜV SÜD performed a physical site inspection and interviewed project stakeholders to:

- confirm the implementation and operation of the project,
- review the data flow for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters,
- confirm the correct implementation of procedures for operations and data collection,
- cross-check the information provided in the MR PD documentation with other sources,
- check the monitoring equipment against the requirements of the PD and the approved methodology, including calibrations, maintenance, etc.,
- review the calculations and assumptions used to obtain the GHG data and ER,
- identify if the quality control and quality assurance procedures are in place to prevent or correct errors or omissions in the reported parameters.

A list of all persons interviewed is included in the IRL attached as Annex 2 to this report.

2.5 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective and Forward Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the verification process is to resolve any outstanding issues which require clarification for TÜV SÜD's positive conclusion of the achieved GHG removals and emission reduction. The findings raised as Forward Action Requests (FARs) (if any) indicated in previous reports (validation/verification) were discussed during this phase and, issues raised in the FARs were resolved, during communications between the PP and TÜV SÜD.

Concerns raised in the desk review, the on-site audit assessments and the follow up interviews and the responses provided for the raised concerns are documented in Annex 1 (verification protocol) to guarantee the transparency of the verification process.

A Corrective Action Request (CAR) is raised where TÜV SÜD identifies:

- non-conformities in monitoring and/or reporting with the monitoring plan and/or methodology;
- that the evidence provided is not sufficient to prove conformity;
- insufficient information in order to confirm a statement or data;
- mistakes in assumptions, data or calculations that impair the ER;
- FARs stated during validation that are not solved until the on-site visit.

A Forward Action Request is raised where TÜV SÜD identifies that monitoring and/or reporting require special attention or adjustments for the next verification period. Information or clarifications provided as a response to a CAR or FAR could also lead to a new request.

2.6 Internal Quality Control

As a final step of verification, the final documentation including the verification report and annexes have to undergo an internal quality control by the Certification Body (CB) "Environment and Energy", i.e. each report has to be finally approved either by the Head of the CB or the Deputy. In case one of these two persons is part of the assessment team, the approval can only be given by the person who is not a part of the assessment team. If the documents have been satisfactorily approved, the Request for Issuance is submitted to the GS along with the relevant documents.



3 CERTIFICATION RESULTS

The performance-/new area certification findings and results are detailed in Annex 1 of this report. Each GS criterion was assessed, as well as the correct implementation of the Monitoring Plan as per the registered PD, and the results of the monitoring

4 CERTIFICATION CONCLUSION & OPINION

TÜV SÜD performed a joint Performance-/New Area Certification of the registered GoldStandard project activity "Afforestation with Hazelnut Plantation in Western Georgia". The certification is based on the currently valid version 0.9 of the GS A/R Requirements.

The management Agrigeorgia LLL is responsible for the preparation of the GHG removals and emissions data and the reported GHG emission reductions on the basis set out within the project's registered PD.

The verifier confirms that:

- the project is implemented as planned and described in the project document approved and registered by the GS;
- the monitoring essential for measuring GHG removals by sinks and emission reduction is appropriate and in accordance with the A/R requirements and the CFS "Forest Inventory Guideline";
- the GHG removals and emissions are calculated without material misstatements;

Our opinion is based on the project's GHG removals and emissions reported, which have been both determined through the valid and registered project's baseline, its monitoring plan and its associated documents. Six Forward Action Requests and one Observation have been raised.

The forest inventory results revealed a very high standard deviation. The required precision level of 20% could not be attained. Thus, only ex-ante calculations have been executed for this performance certification and no verified credits (VERs) are envisaged to be issued.

Based on the information we have seen and evaluated, we confirm the following statement:

Reporting period: From 01 Jan 2007 to 31 Dec 2016

Verified emission reductions in this monitoring period:	0 t CO _{2e}
Planned emission reductions excluding 20 % Buffer:	307,526 t CO _{2e}

Baseline:	6.9 tCO _{2e}
Project emissions:	0 tCO _{2e}
Leakage:	0 tCO _{2e}

Pune, 08/12/2019

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Murty Eswar'.

Murty Eswar
Certification Body "Environment and Energy"
TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd.



ANNEX 1 - LIST OF FINDINGS

Project Title
Afforestation with Hazelnut Plantations in Western Georgia
Gold Standard ID
GS 3975
Type of Certification
<input type="checkbox"/> Initial Certification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Certification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Area Certification
<input type="checkbox"/> Annual Reporting
Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Partnership
<input type="checkbox"/> Dual Certification <input type="checkbox"/> Valid FSC Certificate Certificate Code:



(1) General Findings (1.1)

General Findings

Findings

Note, that CARs can only be closed by providing objective evidence (including reference) to the audit team that proves that the non-conformity is solved or that there is significant evidence that the management implements measures/commitments with the aim to solve the non-compliance.

Car closure may include a three-step approach with a root cause analysis, an implementation of a corrective action and preventive measures, to avoid future non-compliances.

Oral or written statements are in general not sufficient to close a CAR.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

(2) Key Project Information (2.1)

Key Project Information Project

A general description shall be provided which includes all of the following items:

- (a) Project activities
- (b) Organisations that are involved in the project (project participants)
- (c) Communities involved in the project
- (d) Location of the project area and the planting area
- (e) Size of the project area and the planting area
- (f) Risk of change to the project area (during the crediting period)
- (g) Risk of change to the project activities (during the crediting period)
- (h) Timeframe for the project activities
- (i) Number of (predicted) CO₂-certificates
- (j) Land-use history and current situation of the project area
- (k) Socio-economic history and current situation
- (l) Forest management applied (past and future)
- (m) Forest characteristics (including main tree species planted)
- (n) Main social impacts (risks and benefits)
- (o) Main environmental impacts (risks and benefits)
- (p) Financial structure



Findings

- (a) The Project activities are described in detail (IRL P1).
- Initial Certification 2010 CarbonFix Standard
 - New Area Certification / Performance Certification 2012 CarbonFix Standard
 - Gold Standard Transition 2012
 - Gold Standard Performance Certification 2017 (now)
- The area of the former project was 2148 ha (phase I) + 822 ha (phase II) = 2970 ha (IRL 06_03, 06_07)
- where Hazelnuts were planted and are yearly harvested.
- (b) No changes; Agrigeorgia LLC, Medeas Str. 15, 3800 Zugdidi/Georgia
- (c) No changes
- (d) No changes
- (e) Subject to revision
- (f) No changes
- (g) No changes
- (h) No change of the project lifetime. But, the crediting period of the project will be reduced from 50 to 30 years. The project developer does not see a need to have the crediting period for 50 years while the long-term carbon equilibrium is already reached by the year 30 and there is a negligible risk of reversals - due to the benefits from the sale of nuts.
- (i) The number of CO₂-certificates will be adapted: Last certification: validated credits (including buffer): 760'761. Now: 476'699.
- (j) No changes. The project is fully up and running.
- (k) The project provides permanent work to about 200 persons and up to an additional of 300 seasonal employees. This has been verified in interviews and document review during the onsite audit with the HR departments.
- (l) The silviculture system uses a 4-10 stem-plants from the beginning.
- (m) The focus of the species planted shifted towards Italian varieties due to higher yields. A detailed overview on the new species can be found in the "SOP Forest Inventory" (IRL-115).
- (n) No changes
- (o) No changes
- (p) No changes

CAR/FAR/OBS

Corrective Action Request 1

Clarify whether there is only a performance certification on the already certified areas or an additional new area certification. Provide respective information and reference as maps/shapefiles/excel-files on areas.

A final version of the SOP Forest inventory is required.

Provide clarification for figures in the PDD Template 2.1 – (a) Project activities- concerning the eligible planting area in the different phases (2010/2012/2017) and describe the changes. Explain the reduction from 2969 ha (Phase 1 and 2) 2844 ha.

Include the name of the Project Participant in the PDD (b).



Findings

Response by PP

Correct. As agreed during the on-site visit, this certification has been initially intended to be a "Performance Certification" as well as a "New Area Certification". Since the inventory showed a high heterogeneity of the sample plots within a defined stratum and the determined standard deviations were too high. The project developer decided not to aim for any ex-post certificates (VERs) but has instead updated the current growth model in order to validate its current amount of estimated ex-ante certificates.

The project area has been revised to 3,384.48 ha out of which 2,844.29 ha are eligible. Buffer zones, Nature Conservation Areas (NCA), channels, forests and buildings have been discounted from the project area to get the eligible area.

See the following documents:

- a) 17-08 Growth-model Hazelnut_revised
- b) 17-03_SOP_Forest_Inventory_Guideline.docx
- c) 20190309_STRATUM 1.1 CARBON PROJ_MAR - Onori - 621_mov.xlsx
- d) 20190309_Growth-model Poplars - CO2 Analysis.xlsx
- e) AGG_Carbon Updated 07.03.xlsx
- f) Revised Shapefiles

Project Participant has been included in template 2.1.

The eligible planting areas and CO2 certificates have been indicated for the different phases. (2010/2012/2017) in template 2.1. The area change in ha has been explained in template 2.1.

Response by Auditor

The Project Area had been slightly adapted in 2017. The PD including the key project information had been updated as follows:

Table 1.

[ha]	Chitatskari	Kibula	Abasha-Martvili	Gejeti	Tsalenjikha	TOTAL
Project area	718.49	716.32	1,044	573.77	332	3,384.48
Planted area (eligible area)	662.43	456.74	962.38	478.56	284.18	2,844.29
Buffer	9.24	18.62	24.88	8.99	12.48	74,21
NCA	26.71	11.25	11.29	-	10.08	59,33
Channel	14.95	8.42	33.47	24.77	3.93	85,55
Forest	-	221.16	11.60	60.88	20.88	314,52
Building	5.44	-	-	0.57	0.57	6,58

See also figures and Information below. Respective documentation, revised shapefiles and calculations, have been provided and verified (IRL 114, 118, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122). CAR closed.

Final Conclusion



Findings

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Shapefiles

Shapefiles and supporting documents as well as respective references shall be provided.

The following information shall be clearly defined by the use of shapefiles:

- (a) Project area
- (b) Planting areas
- (c) Eligible planting area
- (d) Modelling Units
- (e) Infrastructure (roads, houses, etc.)
- (f) Water bodies
- (g) Sites with special significance for indigenous people and local communities - resulting from the Local Stakeholder Consultation (LSC)
- (h) Where indigenous people and local communities are situated
- (i) Where indigenous people and local communities have legal rights, customary rights or sites with special cultural, ecological, economic, religious or spiritual significance

Findings

There are presently 5 major areas under the scope of this performance certification with a total eligible planting area of 2148 ha (phase I) + 822 ha (phase II) = 2970 ha. (IRL 06_03, 06_07)

These were validated in two phases, phase I in 2010 and phase II in 2012.

1. Chitaskari = Zugdidi	Mai 07	676	ha (phase I)
2. Akhali Khibula = Xobi	Sep 07	437	ha (phase I)
3. Gejeti = Senaki	Mai 08	337	ha (phase I)
4. Vediktari-Martvili = Sefieti+Veddikari onoria	Feb 09	698	ha (phase I)
5. Akhali Khibula II	Mrz 11	38	ha (phase II)
6. Gejeti II	Mai 11	148	ha (phase II)
7. Vediktari-Martvili II	Aug 11	339	ha (phase II)
8. Tsalenjikha	Mrz 12	286	ha (phase II)
9. Chitaskari II	Mrz 11	11	ha (phase II)

During the process of the Performance Certification in 2017 the areas were adapted, and actualised shapefiles were provided (IRL 121). The actual eligible planting area planted with trees is 2,844.29 ha. See figures in table 1 above.

CAR/FAR/OBS

See CAR 01

Final Conclusion



Findings

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Boundaries

Boundaries of the project area and the planting area shall be clearly distinguishable in the field

Findings

During the onsite visit, the audit team sustained that the boundaries are predominantly clearly distinguishable in the field due to the differing species composition and fencing.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)



(3) Do-No-Harm Assessment (3.1)

Social

Indigenous People and Local Communities

1. Sites with legal and customary rights of *indigenous people and local communities* shall be identified, known and respected by the workers.

Findings

The project has been established on private land that was legally acquired by Agrigeorgia from the Government of Georgia, where no customary rights are applicable. Uncontested land, CO2 and wood product rights have been checked in former certifications.
 Future risk of non-compliance: for the “do not harm assessment” the risk rating it is only indicated, in case it is medium of high and a “sustainable monitoring plan” is required.
 This was confirmed by the audit team in interviews held with stakeholders as the head of the Hazelnut Growers Association of Georgia employees, representatives of the municipality of Tsalenjikha, employees and workers on the plantation during onsite visit.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

2. Sites for special cultural, ecological, economic, religious or spiritual significance to the indigenous people and local communities shall be identified, known and respected by the workers.

Findings

Such sites don't exist on the project area.
 This was confirmed by the audit team in interviews held with stakeholders as the head of the Hazelnut Growers Association of Georgia employees, representatives of the municipality of Tsalenjikha, employees and workers on the plantation during onsite visit.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)



3. The transfer of control of any activities from indigenous people and local communities to the project owner shall be documented.

Findings

Not applicable.
 This was confirmed by the audit team in interviews held with stakeholders as the head of the Hazelnut Growers Association of Georgia employees, representatives of the municipality of Tsalenjikha, employees and workers on the plantation during onsite visit.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

4. The project shall not involve and shall not be complicit in the involuntary relocation of people.

Findings

Not applicable.
 This was confirmed by the audit team in interviews held with stakeholders as the head of the Hazelnut Growers Association of Georgia employees, representatives of the municipality of Tsalenjikha, employees and workers on the plantation during onsite visit.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

5. On sites with significant disputes, all operations should be stopped until the disputes are resolved.

Findings

Not applicable.
 This was confirmed by the audit team in interviews held with stakeholders as the head of the Hazelnut Growers Association of Georgia employees, representatives of the municipality of Tsalenjikha, employees and workers on the plantation during onsite visit.

CAR/FAR/OBS



Findings
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Working Conditions

6. Workers shall be able to establish and join labour organisations.

Findings
No restrictions identified. This was confirmed in interviews held with employees and workers on the plantation during onsite visit.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

7. Workers and labour organisations shall be generally satisfied with their working agreements.

Findings
Many people work since the beginning of the project at Agrigeorgia. The workers are in general satisfied with the working conditions. There are also no known complaints and suggestions. This was confirmed in interviews held with employees and workers on the plantation during onsite visit.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

8. Working agreements with all individual workers shall be documented and implemented.



Findings
<p>All workers have working agreements. The general database of the human resource department has been spot-checked by the auditor. Presently there are 250 permanent employees and between 500 – 2000 temporary workers, depending on the season. The workers are not employed by AgriGeorgia/Ferrero but by an outsourced company named BDO. The contract with the BDO company has been checked by the auditor and no negative impacts on the conditions of the contracts towards the employees could be detected. This has been verified in interviews held with workers and the head of the human resource department as well as with review of working agreements during the one site visit.</p>
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

9. There shall not be forced labour, as defined by the ILO Forced Labour Convention.

Findings
<p>There is no forced labour in the project. This was confirmed by the audit team during onsite visit by field observations and in interviews held with stakeholders as the head of the Hazelnut Growers Association of Georgia employees, representatives of the municipality of Tsalenjikha, employees and workers on the plantation.</p>
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

10. There shall not be child labour, as defined by the ILO Minimum Age Convention*.

Findings
<p>There is no child labour.</p>

* ILO Minimum Age Convention [Link](#)



Findings
This was confirmed by the audit team during onsite visit by field observations and in interviews held with stakeholders as the head of the Hazelnut Growers Association of Georgia employees, representatives of the municipality of Tsalenjikha, employees and workers on the plantation.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

11. If the host country did not ratify one or more of the 8 ILO Fundamental Conventions, the project owner shall provide a written affirmation to uphold them.

Findings
Checked in the GS-transition process.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

12. Copies of the 8 ILO Fundamental Conventions shall be available for workers.

Findings
Copies are available for the workers at the social building at each area. This has been verified by the auditor.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)



No Discrimination

13. The project owner shall not be involved, and shall not be complicit, in any form of:
- (a) sexual harassment, AND
 - (b) discrimination based on gender, race, religion, sexual orientation or any other basis.

Findings

No such harassment or discrimination has been identified. In case there is, it is addressed with immediate action.

Although, the project developer sees a “low” risk of future non-compliance, this point should be monitored

through the interviews of the auditor – in order to re-assess over time this aspect.

Future risk of non-compliance: Medium

There are also no known complaints and suggestions. This was confirmed by the audit team during onsite visit by field observations and in interviews held with stakeholders as male and female employees and workers on the plantation.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Anti-Corruption

14. The project owner shall not be involved and shall not be complicit in corruption. The project owner shall publicise a commitment not to offer or receive bribes in money or any other form of corruption. The project owner shall comply with anti-corruption legislation where this exists.

Findings

This was checked in the transition process.

No indication concerning involvement in corruption was found during onsite visit, field inspection, document review and interviews held.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)



Occupational Health & Safety

15. There shall be a 'Health & Safety Policy' that is documented, implemented and regularly updated. This policy shall include at a minimum:

- (a) provisions for first aid, AND
- (b) provisions for the safe transport of workers, AND
- (c) provisions for timely evacuation of workers to an adequately equipped medical facility in case of serious accident, AND
- (d) a health insurance scheme for workers who are impacted by workplace accidents AND if workers stay in camps for a longer period of time, measures shall to provided to ensure that conditions for accommodation and nutrition comply at least with those specified in the *ILO Code of Practice on Safety & Health in Forestry**.

Findings

All of the criteria above are part of the Standard Operational Procedures (SOP) for Work Safety and Health. The implementation of these SOPs is continuously monitored by the Field Safety Officer or Safety Manager.

Future risk of non-compliance: Medium

First aid rooms are established at all social buildings and a nurse is available at the headquarter for all, permanent and temporary workers. Health insurance for workplace accidents is included in the Contractual agreements with each worker. The audit team also verified the conditions concerning accident insurance with the outsourced company BDO. This was confirmed by the audit team during onsite visit by field observations and in interviews held with employees and workers on the plantation.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

16. An individual shall be appointed to have overall responsibility for 'Health & Safety' at the worksite.

Findings

Mrs. Ani Zhavania has been appointed as work safety coordinator. Her job description dated 31.10.2016 has been checked. The Standard Operational Procedures (SOP) for Work Safety and Health are presently adapted and implemented step by step. Overall there is still a demand for streamlined training application and adaptation of the SOPs but compared to the conditions found outside the Agrigeorgia company it shows that there is a commitment to implement a high standard in health and safety issues as well as in other fields.

* ILO Safety & Health in Forestry [Link](#) - criteria 226 to 229



Findings
This has been verified by interviews with the work safety coordinator and workers on the plantation and in the offices as well as with field observations made by the auditor during onsite visit.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

17. Workers shall have job-specific training and supervision to safely implement the project.

Findings
The different SOPs show that workers are well trained for the specific tasks they execute. Respective information and documentation have been checked and verified during the onsite visit in interviews and document review. These include among others: Health and safety training: May 2016 Firefighting: 10.12.2016 ILS and EU standards for employment and labour: 17/18.6.2016 Future risk of non-compliance: Medium
CAR/FAR/OBS
<p style="text-align: center;">Corrective Action Request 2</p> The SOPs provide detailed descriptions of the required tasks of the different duties. Trainings are already provided to the workers on the very different topics. This has been verified by the auditor by observations and interviews held with supervisors, permanent and temporary workers. Nevertheless, as the tasks carried out on the plantation (e.g. application of fertilizer, spraying of chemicals, welding in the workshop ...) are often quite challenging, the trainings require further structuring and clear documentation. CAR 2 closed.
<p style="text-align: center;">Forward Action Request 1</p> Respective information on structure and clear documentation of the trainings shall be presented to the audit team for verification during the next certification.
Response by PP
The PP will provide documentation during the next certification.
Final Conclusion



Findings
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR 01 <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

18. Workers shall have safe protective equipment, tools and machinery appropriate for their work.

Findings
Standard Operational Procedures (SOP) for Work Safety and Health have been implemented. This has been verified by interviews with the work safety coordinator and workers on the plantation and in the offices and workshops and warehouses (e.g. warehouse Chitaskari) as well as with field observations made by the auditor during onsite visit.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Environmental

Tree species

19. The genotypes of the tree species planted shall be well-adapted to the site.

Findings
It has been shown for 10 years, that the genotypes used are well-adapted to the site. There is a permanent supervision of the performance of the trees and the planting of the different varieties is adapted accordingly.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)



20. Exotic tree species shall not be used, unless direct experience, or scientific research, demonstrate that there is, or can be, no invasiveness and no adverse impacts.

Findings

The on-site experiences of the project show that there is no invasiveness and no adverse impacts by the tree species (*Corylus avellana*) used.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Habitat connectivity

21. Through a smart mosaic of the planting areas, buffer zones and infrastructure habitat connectivity for flora and fauna should be enhanced.

Findings

The habitat connectivity has been established in the beginning of the project. In general, this infrastructure was not changed. The buffer zones along the rivers and streams are part of the habitat connectivity. As discovered in some of the parcels visited, the buffers were not treated as nature conservation areas but more like plantation. The 15m buffer was not sustained. This was discovered in the following parcels: Citaskari: 76, 77, Akhali-Khibula: 83

According to the PDD I it was clarified as followed: “Buffers are established alongside natural waterways with a direct connection to another natural watercourse. Drainage channels, even if partly of natural watercourses, do not need a buffer when not connected to other natural watercourses and therefore do not fall under the CFS definition of rivers, streams or wetland.”

CAR/FAR/OBS

Corrective Action Request 3

Habitat connectivity by buffers as NCAs needs to be assured. 15 m buffers alongside the natural waterways with a direct connection to another natural watercourse shall be established, maintained and managed as Nature Conservation Area. Provide sufficient objective evidence that buffers will be implemented as required. A simple statement is not considered as sufficient.

Response by PP



Findings
The PP will implement the buffers according to the requirements until the next certification – to assure that biodiversity can be re-established along the water courses. See Buffer Renaturalization Plan (Document ‘Buffer_ReNaturalization_Plan.pdf’) with further details.
Auditors conclusion
<p>Forward Action Request 2</p> <p>The Buffer Re-Naturalization Plan (IR: 123) provides a description how the buffers strips alongside waterways shall be established and managed. However, it is still not sufficiently demonstrated and described how the habitat connectivity is enhanced by the identified buffer strips (e.g. how the buffers connect the NCAs etc...)</p> <p>Therefore, the implementation and design of the habitat connectivity elements in line with the standard requirements will be subject of detailed assessment at next certification.</p>
Final Conclusion
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

GMOs

22. Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) as defined by FSC shall not be used.

Findings
No GMOs are used.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Biodiversity

23. Minimum 10% of the project area shall be identified and managed to protect or enhance the biological diversity of native ecosystems. For this, the HCV approach should be followed.



Findings
Over 10 % of the project area are nature conservation areas. The performance certification includes 2947 ha and the new area 654 ha; this adds up to 3601 ha. This is the size of the eligible planting area. The 10 % are required on the project area.
CAR/FAR/OBS
<p>Corrective Action Request 4</p> <p>Provide objective evidence (shapefiles, maps, excel calculations) to proof that minimum 10 % of the Project Area including the new areas are managed to protect or enhance the biological diversity of native ecosystems. Use a HCV-approach as requested by the standard.</p>
Response of PP
The excel file 'AGG_Carbon Updated 07.03.xlsx'/worksheet 'Summary' indicates for the project as a whole NCA areas of 59.33 ha and Forest areas of 314.52 ha being in total 373.85 ha. This comprises of 11%, hence the 10% criterion is met. Shapefiles of NCA and Forest areas have been submitted to the auditor accordingly.
Auditors conclusion
<p>Forward Action Request 3</p> <p>The provided documents (IRL 118, 121) confirm the area of the NCAs > 10%. Nevertheless, it needs to be assured that the NCAs are managed to protect or enhance the biological diversity of native ecosystems. An HCV-approach as requested by the standard shall be considered.</p> <p>This will be subject of detailed assessment at next certification</p>
Final Conclusion
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

24. (a) Existing patches of trees or single solitary stems of *native tree species*^{*}, AND
 • (b) habitats of *endangered species*[†]
 shall always be *identified and managed* to protect or enhance the *biological diversity*³

Findings
This has been verified during onsite visit by field observations and document review (arial photographs, google earth) and found in compliance with the requirement.
CAR/FAR/OBS

^{*} Native tree species (Source: FSC) Species, subspecies, or lower taxon, occurring within its natural range (past or present) and dispersal potential (that is, within the range it occupies naturally or could occupy without direct or indirect introduction or care by humans.

[†] Endangered species All *endangered* and *critically endangered* species as defined by the IUCN Red List - www.IUCNredlist.org



Findings
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Erosion

25. To ensure healthy soils the following aspects shall be identified and appropriate measures shall be put in place to protect them: (a) soil types, AND (b) biota, AND (c) erosion, AND (d) compaction.

Findings
Soils types and biota have been analysed in detail and are treated professional for the purpose of the project. Erosion is not relevant to the project as projects sites have very little inclination. (d) For compaction: The compaction of soil through different machineries used is closely monitored by the field staff. Soil is an essential part for the plantations productivity. Thus, on critical areas soil samples are taken every second year. While in the beginning heavy tractors were used, the project has now switched to light weight tractors for fertilizer application, pruning and harvesting work. Compared to other forests where skid trail gaps are 20 m and wider, the compaction by vehicles in the high intensive managed plantation is probably higher. Future risk of non-compliance is rated: low
CAR/FAR/OBS
Corrective Action Request 5 Further research, information and monitoring is required to implement appropriate measures to protect the soil from compaction. Provide detailed objective evidence (timetable, financial means, contracts, human resource etc.) how it will be implemented.
Response of PP
The PP will implement soil compaction mitigation measures which are further described in the document 'action_AGRRED_CARBON_soil compaction.pdf'. Further, project developer aims to research and implement possibilities to improve soil quality via biochar technology (see document 'action_AGRRED_CARBON_biochar.pdf').
Final Conclusion
Forward Action Request 4



The PP provided an action plan for soil compaction mitigation (IRL 124). Nevertheless, as the mitigation measures have not been implemented completely yet, the implementation in line with the standard requirements will be subject of detailed assessment at next certification.

- Accepted
- Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

26. Ploughing on slopes with a gradient greater than 10% (5°) shall follow the land contour.

Findings

There are no slopes > 10 %. This has been verified by the auditor by document review and during field inspection. The respective section is missing in the PD.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Corrective Action Request 6
 Provide/include information on slopes/ploughing in the PD.

Response by PP

There are no slopes greater than 10% on the project information. Information was added in template 3.1 as item 25a.

Final Conclusion

Respective information has been provided in the PDD an found in compliance with the observations made during the onsite visit.
 CAR closed.

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Fertilizers

27. Fertilizers shall be avoided, or their use shall be minimised and justified.

Findings

Fertilizers are applied to the extend necessary. The application is based on the demand determined by the results of the soil samples. Fertilizer is expensive and can harm environment and people – it shall be subject to monitoring.
 Future risk of non-compliance: Medium.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Corrective Action Request 7



Findings
SOP on Use of Chemicals and on Plantation Management to be updated and implemented in line with the actual requirements. Include information on justification and minimalization of the impact of chemicals. Provide detailed objective evidence (timetable, financial means, contracts, human resource etc.) how it will be implemented.
Response by PP
The PP will implement a soil program that aims to research and implement possibilities to improve soil quality via biochar technology (see document 'action_AGRRED_CARBO _N _biochar.pdf'). Further, the project developer's management agreed to adopt alternative fertilizer distribution. The measures are further discussed in the document 'action_AGRRED_CARBO _N _alternative fertilizer.pdf'. Based on the experiences collected with these alternative fertilizers, the SOP for "Use of Chemicals" and "Plantation Management" will be adapted accordingly.
Final Conclusion
<p style="text-align: center;">Forward Action Request 5</p> <p>The PP provided an action plan for biochar and alternative fertilizer (IRL 125, 126). Nevertheless, as the described measures have not been completely implemented yet, the implementation in line with the adapted SOP on fertilizer use and standard requirements will be subject of detailed assessment at next certification.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

28. If the aerial application of fertilizer is used, then measures shall be put in place to prevent drift.

Findings
N/A
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Chemical pesticides

29. Chemical pesticides shall be avoided, or their use shall be minimised and justified.



Findings
Chemicals are only applied to the extent necessary. The application of chemicals is described in the SOP "Use of Chemicals". These SOPs outline how chemicals are applied in a responsible manner. Future risk of non-compliance: Medium.
CAR/FAR/OBS
See comments below in "30. Chemical pesticides shall be used in accordance with the FSC® Pesticides Policy."
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

30. Chemical pesticides shall be used in accordance with the FSC® Pesticides Policy.

Findings
There is not sufficient information provided that the use of pesticides is done in compliance to FSC® Pesticides Policy.
CAR/FAR/OBS
<p>Corrective Action Request 8</p> <p>Provide further information and sustain with evidence that the use of chemicals is in line with the FSC® Pesticides Policy.</p> <p>FSC policy in relation to the use of pesticides in FSC-certified forests and plantations aims to minimise the negative environmental and social impacts of pesticide use whilst promoting economically viable management.</p> <p>Key elements for implementation of these requirements include:</p> <p>a) The identification and avoidance of 'highly hazardous' pesticides;</p> <p>b) Promotion of 'non-chemical' methods of pest management as an element of an integrated pest management strategy;</p> <p>c) Appropriate use of the pesticides that are used.</p> <p>Provide detailed objective evidence (timetable, financial means, contracts, human resource etc.) how it will be implemented.</p>
Response by PP
The PP will implement a soil program that aims to research and implement possibilities to improve soil quality via biochar technology (see document 'action_AGRRED_CARBON_biochar.pdf'). Further, the project developer's management agreed to adopt alternative fertilizer distribution. The measures are further discussed in



Findings
<p>the document 'action_AGRRED_CARBON_alternative fertilizer.pdf'. Based on the experiences collected in this program the SOP for "Use of Chemicals" and "Plantation Management" will be adapted accordingly.</p>
Response by auditor
<p>The documents provided (IRL 89, 125, 126) relate to fertilizer but not to the use of pesticides according to the standard. Provide further information and sustain with evidence that the use of chemicals is in line with the FSC® Pesticides Policy. Provide further clarification in the PDD on the rating of the future risk of non-compliance considered as "Medium"</p>
Response by PP
<p>A list with pesticides used on the plantations has been provided (see excel file 'Identification of FSC substances list.xlsx'). Each of the pesticides has been checked with the FSC Pesticides Policy, published in May 2019. None of the FSC prohibited pesticides has been and will be used on the plantations. From the highly restricted list, some active ingredients are still in use but only under exceptional circumstances. See folder 'Sustainability Monitoring ID 8_FSC Pesticides Policy' for more information. The risk level rating has been kept as 'Medium' since chemical pesticides will continue to be used in accordance with FSC Pesticides Policy and the objective is to increasingly reduce the current volumes of Plant Protection Products and extend the current monitoring programs of Pest and Diseases to be more effective in the protection of the health of the plantation. The folders 'Pesticide Policy' and 'Sustainability Monitoring ID_13 Diseases' contains some documents which show AgriGeorgia efforts to reduce the applied quantity of pesticides (see e.g. <i>Integrated pest management strategy, Training course PPPs, Guidelines for a proper use of plant protection products, plant health assessment, Summary of action for bacterial diseases in Georgia</i>). See also the word document 'Pesticide Policy' (in folder 'Pesticide policy').</p>
Final Conclusion
<p>Respective information has been provided, checked and found in compliance with standard requirements. (IRL 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136)</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)</p>
<p>31. There shall be a 'Chemical Pesticides Policy' that is documented, implemented and regularly updated. This policy shall include at a minimum: (a) provisions for safe transport, storage, handling and application, AND (b) provisions for emergency situations.</p>



Findings
All chemicals are stored in special locked compartments of the warehouses. Personal is trained for the application of the chemicals. Personal protection equipment is available and used when chemicals are applied. Warehouse keeping is based on IT. The auditor cross checked the electronic warehouse system, and the storage of the chemicals in different locations in the plantation (e.g. Chitaskari). The observations were complemented by interviews held with store managers, plantation managers, agronomists, and workers. Future risk of non-compliance: Medium.
CAR/FAR/OBS
see CAR 8
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

32. In the case that chemical pesticides are used and two or more different chemical pesticides are equally effective, the least hazardous chemical pesticide shall be used.

Findings
The use of chemicals is described in the SOP "Use of Chemicals" Future risk of non-compliance: Medium.
CAR/FAR/OBS
See CAR 8
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Biological control agents

33. Biological control agents shall be avoided, or their use shall be minimised and justified.

Findings
No biological control agents are applied.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion



Findings
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Water resources

<p>34. On both sides of permanent or temporary water bodies (lakes, streams, rivers, wetlands, etc.) riparian buffer zones of 15 meters shall be implemented on each site. In these riparian buffer zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) only native tree species may be planted, AND (b) invasive species shall be removed, AND (c) all existing vegetation shall be kept, AND (d) no timber harvesting activities shall take place, AND (e) no use of fertilizer or chemical pesticides.
--

Findings
<p>Buffer strips along the water bodies have been established by the start of the project. They are part of the nature conservation area and no project activity is taking place on these areas. As discovered during onsite visit in various parcels of the plantation (Chitskari Parcel 76, 77, 82, Akhali Khibula 87, 83) the 15-meter buffer zones on both sides of water bodies were not implemented and managed according to the requirements. As in many parts of the plantation there are drainage channels implemented during the communist system and water bodies next to each other it is important to analyse, where buffer zones are required. During phase II this issue has been discussed in detail (see phase II certification report 2012).</p> <p>Future risk of non-compliance shall be considered as “High”, rather than “Medium”.</p>

CAR/FAR/OBS
<p>Corrective Action Request 9 Provide further information and objective evidence that the waterbodies affected are determined correctly and the buffer zones are implemented and managed according to the requirements.</p>

Response by PP
<p>The project developer has developed a buffer renaturalization plan (see document ‘Buffer_ReNaturalization_Plan.pdf’). An analysis with the aim of mapping the buffer strips and determining the level of intervention that will be performed in order to maintain the buffer strips has been carried out. The total area identified as riparian buffer strips has been documented in shapefiles and is deducted from the total area. Hence, it is ensured that riparian buffer strips do not claim carbon credits.</p>

Final Conclusion
<p>Forward Action Request 6</p>



Findings
<p>At the last onsite visit in 2017 the buffer strips were not established according to the standard requirements.</p> <p>Therefore, the implementation and management in line with the standard requirements will be subject of detailed assessment at next certification.</p> <p>In the meantime, the PP developed a Buffer Re-Naturalization Plan (IR: 123). It provides a description how the buffers strips alongside waterways shall be established and managed.</p> <p>Note: Contrary to the description in the Buffer Re-Naturalization Plan (IR: 123) the standard does not necessarily ask for “natural waterways” only.</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Accepted</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)</p>

35. The flows of water bodies shall not be blocked.

Findings
<p>Water bodies are not blocked by any activity of the project. This has been verified during onsite field inspection of the auditor in the areas of Chitaskari, Akhali Khibula, Gejeti and Martvili.</p>
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)</p>

36. The groundwater in and around the planting area shall not be negatively affected by the project.

Findings
<p>No negative effects of the groundwater by the project during last 10 years have been detected. Water from the wells are tested every year. No negative effects have been determined. This was confirmed by the audit team during field inspection by interviews with plantation managers, agronomists and stakeholders from surrounding communities.</p>
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion



Findings

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Waste

37. All sources of waste and waste products shall be identified and classified. Waste products include amongst others:
- (a) chemical wastes, AND
 - (b) containers, AND
 - (c) fuels and oils, AND
 - (d) human waste, AND
 - (e) rubbish (including metals, plastics, organic and paper products), AND
 - (f) abandoned buildings, machinery or equipment.

Findings

Appropriate evidence is given that waste products identified and classified in an appropriate way. Waste management at Agrigeorgia is still in progress. The different types of wastes are collected separately. One of the biggest posts of organic "waste" form the nutshells. These are collected and used as thermic energy. In other places like the workshop of Chitaskari is was observed that waste is collected separately like fuels and oils and machinery parts etc.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

38. Measures for waste products and their spillage shall be put in place for safe and environmentally appropriate:
- (a) collection, AND
 - (b) transport, AND
 - (c) storage, AND
 - (d) handling, AND
 - (e) disposal.

Findings

Appropriate evidence is given that Agrigeorgia continuously works on the appropriate handling of waste products. Collection, transport, storage and handling is managed in an appropriate way and the areas and places visited during onsite inspection and the



Findings
interviews held with affected stakeholders, employees and managers did not show any significant deviation. Nevertheless, the company faces difficulties with the final environmentally appropriate disposal of some of their waste product as there is no functioning waste management in Georgia. Contacts with the respective ministry have been established in order to work on more environmentally suitable solutions for the waste management.
CAR/FAR/OBS
<p>Corrective Action Request 10 Efforts for the safe and environmentally appropriate disposal shall be intensified and suitable solutions clearly documented. Clarify the risk rating for the waste management and sustain with respective evidence.</p>
Response by PP
The PP acts as role model for the entire region and tries its best since its establishment in 2007 to spread the message of environmental conscious behaviors even beyond the boundaries of the project area. In regard to the disposal of waste the PP is limited in its action to implement activities that go beyond its boundary borders. Waste disposal is within the responsibility of the individual municipality and environmental inappropriate disposal is forbidden by law. Within the project area, the PP complies to all laws and regulations of Georgia and takes care of its waste management in the most sustainable way possible in Georgia.
Final Conclusion
<p>Observation OBS 1 Waste management will be subject to next certification.</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Mangroves

- 90% of the planting area shall be planted with mangrove species.

Findings
N/A
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion



Findings
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

(4) Local Stakeholder Consultations (3.2)

Not applicable for performance certification but for New Area Certification

General findings
<p>There is no information provided on the stakeholder identification of the new areas. Process for New Area Certification For the New Area Certification, the project owner shall identify the stakeholders that are new to the projects due to its expansion. With these new stakeholders a LSC shall be conducted. For the documentation, the project owner shall use an empty template 'Local Stakeholder Consultation'.</p>
CAR/FAR/OBS
<p>Corrective Action Request 11 Provide respective information on the stakeholder identification of the new areas in the PD Template 3.2, as this section is required for New Area Certification. In case it is not relevant, mark it accordingly.</p>
Response by PP
<p style="color: green;">The new areas were added on ground neighboring the exiting project area. No additional stakeholders are being affected by the project activity through the expansion of the project.</p>
Final Conclusion
<p>The PDD part 3.2 has been provided. As confirmed during the onsite visit and in the shapefiles (IRL 121) the new areas added lay in the surrounding of the initially certified areas and do not include additional stakeholders than the ones identified during initial certification. During the onsite visit the audit team spoke to various stakeholders (IRL 1) among others the head of the "Hazelnut Growers Association GHGA", the Deputy Governor and the of the Municipality of Tsalenjikha, plantation managers and a variety of local workers. The plantation is widely known and accepted by the local population. It is one of the biggest employers in the area. During the interview's no significant negative comments were received.</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)



Design of physical meeting(s)

Agenda
Findings
See 3.2, General findings.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Response by PP
No additional stakeholders are being affected by the project activity through the expansion of the project.
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)



Invitation tracking table

Findings
See 3.2, General findings.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Response by PP
No additional stakeholders are being affected by the project activity through the expansion of the project.
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Participants' in physical meeting(s)

Findings
See 3.2, General findings.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Response by PP
No additional stakeholders are being affected by the project activity through the expansion of the project.
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Evaluation forms

Findings
See CAR 11
CAR/FAR/OBS



Findings
Response by PP
No additional stakeholders are being affected by the project activity through the expansion of the project.
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Outcome of consultation process

Findings
See 3.2, General findings.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Response by PP
No additional stakeholders are being affected by the project activity through the expansion of the project.
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Assessment of all comments

Findings
See 3.2, General findings.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Response by PP
No additional stakeholders are being affected by the project activity through the expansion of the project.
Final Conclusion



Findings
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Sustainable Development Assessment

Findings
See 3.2, General findings.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Response by PP
No additional stakeholders are being affected by the project activity through the expansion of the project.
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Sustainability Monitoring Plan

Findings
See 3.2, General findings.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Response by PP
No additional stakeholders are being affected by the project activity through the expansion of the project.
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Discussion on continuous Input and Grievance Mechanism



Findings
See 3.2, General findings.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Response by PP
No additional stakeholders are being affected by the project activity through the expansion of the project.
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Stakeholder feedback round

Findings
See 3.2, General findings.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Response by PP
No additional stakeholders are being affected by the project activity through the expansion of the project.
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

(5) Input & Grievance Mechanism (3.3)

Input & Grievances

Findings
Regular meetings are held in the different departments. There is also a suggestion box. Presently a feedback questionnaire is prepared for employees' survey. No inputs and grievances were noted within the last years. During an interview held with the members of the municipality of the community of Tsalendjikha it was mentioned, that there have been conflicts with property rights in the beginning of the project. But these were solved and



Findings
<p>there are no known present conflicts. The project provides employment possibilities and knowledge to the local population. A further expansion of the plantation is appreciated. The municipality asked for continued support for the maintenance of their communal roads. The administration does not see any negative side effects of the project in the area. This has been confirmed during the onsite audit by field observations and in interviews held with the general management, the human resource management, permanent and temporary employees and members of the Hazelnut Growers Association of Georgia, that represent about 600 hazelnut farmers. In general, the auditor experienced a positive, friendly and constructive atmosphere in the and around the company. It is a very important employer in the region and has by all means high standards compared to the countries general condition.</p>
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)</p>

(6) Sustainability Monitoring Plan (3.4)

Sustainable Monitoring Plan
Findings
<p>For 13 different indicators, a medium risk has been identified. Clear monitoring procedures including responsibilities etc. are missing.</p>
CAR/FAR/OBS
<p>Corrective Action Request 12 It is not part of the auditor to sign responsible for the documentation and/or monitoring. The audit team is crosschecking the compliance of implementation/documentation/monitoring with the indicators. Assure that responsibilities for the monitoring etc. are clear, adapt the PD template accordingly and provide the updated template.</p>
Response by PP
<p>The PP has updated the Monitoring Plan accordingly.</p>
Findings by the Audit Team
<p>In the different sections of the monitoring plan there are still many unclear monitoring requirements,</p>



Findings
<p>As an example, the Sustainability Monitoring ID 10 has been chosen:</p> <p>33. On both sides of permanent or temporary water bodies (lakes, streams, rivers, wetlands, etc.) riparian buffer zones of 15 meters shall be implemented on each site. In these riparian buffer zones:</p> <p>(a) only native tree species may be planted, AND (b) invasive species shall be removed, AND (c) all existing vegetation shall be kept, AND (d) no timber harvesting activities shall take place, AND (e) no use of fertilizer or chemical pesticides.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chosen parameter: No clearly identified indicators are chosen • Current situation of parameter: Why indicated with N/A? • Estimation of baseline situation of parameter: Why indicated with N/A? • Target of parameter: Why indicated with N/A? Buffers are not yet established. • How will it be monitored and documented: No clear description, how it is monitored and documented. • Who is responsible for monitoring and documentation: Project Owner Agrigerorgia LLC as overall responsible institution does not set a clear responsibility. A unique identifiable department/position/person etc. is missing. • When will it be monitored (duration and frequency): A monitoring frequency of every certification (5 years) does not necessarily meet the requirements of a responsible monitoring. In this special case for the establishment and maintenance of buffers 5 years seems definitely too long, as activities are planned and executed every year.
Response by PP
<p>The template 3.5 ‘Sustainability Monitoring Plan’ has been completely revised and updated (see attached) and supporting documentation for different indicators are provided in the different folders submitted to the auditor.</p>
Final Conclusion
<p>An updated monitoring plan has been provided. IRL 114, 3.5 - Template - Sustainability Monitoring Plan_mov_E.1_JT amendments SOPs and further detailed monitoring documents have been provided (IRL 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144)</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)</p>

(7) Legal Rights (3.5)



Secured Titles

1. For all project participants, the following information shall be provided:
 - (a) Name and contact details
 - (b) Each entity's legal registration number and documentation by the governing jurisdiction that proves that the entity is in good standing.
2. For the duration of the crediting period the project owner shall:
 - (a) Own the CO₂ user rights or carbon sequestration rights for the project area, AND
 - (b) Hold an uncontested legal land title for the project area, AND
 - (c) Own the rights for timber and non---timber forest products for the project area, AND
 - (d) Hold all necessary permits to implement the project (planting permits, infrastructure permits, harvesting permits, etc.), AND
 - (e) Participate in the financing of the project.

If the project owner does not meet all of the above requirements, the persons or legal entities that do meet those respective requirements shall endorse the expected project being undertaken by the project owner through an agreement that aligns with the duration of the crediting period.

Findings

No changes compared to initial and new area certification.

Project Participant is:

Agrigeorgia LLC
Medeas Str. 15
3800 Zugdidi
Georgia

Spot checks have been done by the auditor to verify that the new added areas are owned by Agrigeorgia including carbon rights and rights on timber and non-timber products. Specific permits for the establishment of the plantation are not required. In general, there are no changes to the conditions of phase I and II. The following parcels have been checked for ownership in the open online database of the cadastral authority of Georgia

(<https://maps.napr.gov.ge> IRL_116)

Chitaskari: Plot Nr. 39,

Akhali Khibula: Plot Nr. 116

Gejeti: Plot Nr: 57, 58, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90

Martvili: Plot Nr: 91,

Tsalenjica: Plot Nr: 169

CAR/FAR/OBS

Corrective Action Request 13

Provide contact data of the PP in the template.

Response by PP

The PP has updated the template "Legal rights" accordingly.



Findings
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

(8) Risk Register (3.6)

Risk Register
Findings
The updated risk register has been provided no significant high risks. Only one medium risk due to insects and pests has been detected, but the plantation management is aware and mitigation measures are implemented. Hence, descriptions provided are found in line with the requirements and have been verified by the auditor during onsite assessment by document review, field observations and interviews.
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

(9) Additionality (4.1)

Not applicable for performance certification but for new area certification.

Option of Additionality
Findings
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Option 1 – A/R CDM Tool <input type="checkbox"/> Option 2 – Positive List Option 1 – A/R CDM Tool Supporting document ID: ...
CAR/FAR/OBS
Corrective Action Request 14



Findings
Provide information and template for Additionality. See also comment on subitem 4.
Response by PP
The PP has provided the template "Additionality". The new areas added follow the same argumentation line.
Findings by the Audit Team
The PDD has been updated with the template for additionality (IRL 114).
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

Option 2 – Positive List – Part I

<p>2. The <u>project</u> shall meet all of the requirements (a), (b) and (c) in the list below and at least one of the requirements from (d) to (g) in order to be considered as additional under Option 2.</p> <p>(a) The <u>project</u> is located in a Less Developed Country (LDCs) or in a region with a recent <i>UNDP Human Development Indicator</i>* below 0.8.</p> <p>(b) The <u>project</u> shall have no intention of creating a forest for the commercial use of the timber or non-timber forest products.</p> <p>The <u>project</u> activities shall not be mandatory by any law or regulation, OR if it is mandatory, it shall demonstrate that these laws or regulations are systematically not enforced.</p>

Findings
N/A. The circumstances of the project have not changed since its beginning. See reference "2010 - PDD_Phase-I - AR CDM Additionality - certified TUV"
CAR/FAR/OBS
Final Conclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

* UNDP Human Development Indicator <http://hdr.undp.org/en/data/profiles/>



3. If the submission to the Pre-Feasibility Assessment was after the planting start, the project proponent shall demonstrate that
- (a) the revenues from CO2-certificates were seriously considered in the decision to implement the project, AND
 - (b) there was continuous interest in CO2-certificates for the project in parallel with its implementation.

Findings

N/A. The circumstances of the project have not changed since its beginning. See reference "2010 - PDD_Phase-I - AR CDM Additionality - certified TUV"

CAR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

4. The planting area shall not have been forest for at least 10 years prior to the planting start, OR
 In case the planting area was deforested in the 10 years prior to the planting start, evidence shall be provided which demonstrates that the deforestation was caused by force majeure.

Findings

See CAR 14: Information and reverences are required in the PDD to show that the new areas added meet the "no forest" requirement as described above.

AR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

(10) Applicability (5.1)

Not applicable for performance certification but for new area certification.



1. Areas shall not be on wetlands
2. Areas with organic soils shall not be drained or irrigated (except for irrigation for planting).
3. Soil disturbance (through ploughing, digging of pits, stump removals, infrastructure, etc.) on organic soils shall be in less than 10% of the area that is submitted to certification (not 10% of the entire project area).
4. The most likely scenario without the project (baseline scenario) shall be defined for the project area. This scenario shall not show any significant* increase of the Baseline biomass ('tree' and 'non-tree').

Findings

No changes for the new areas.

Descriptions provided are found in line with the requirements and have been verified by the auditor during onsite assessment by document review, field observations and interviews.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)

* Significant

Significant is defined to be more than 5% of the 'long-term CO₂-Fixation' - see chapter '5.7 CO₂-Fixation'.



(11) Calculation of CO2-certificates (5.3)

- The number of CO2-certificates is determined for every year (t) of the crediting period using the following formula.

CO2-- - certificates MU,t

= (CO2-Fixation MU,t - Baseline MU,t - Leakage MU,t - Other Emissions MU,t) * Eligible planting area MU

- For the calculation of the parameters CO2-Fixation, Baseline and Leakage, the following carbon pools shall be assessed:

Carbon Pools		Includes	CO2-Fixation	Baseline	Leakage
Tree biomass	Aboveground	Stem, branches, bark	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Belowground	Tree roots	Yes	Yes	Yes
Non-tree biomass	Aboveground	Grass, herbs, etc.	No	Yes	No
	Belowground	Roots of grass, herbs, etc.	No	Yes	No
Soil		Organic material	No	No	No
Harvested wood (timber & energy wood)		Furniture, construction material, etc.	No	No	No
Litter & Lying dead-wood		Leaves, small fallen branches, lying dead wood	No	No	No

Findings

Process for Performance Certification
 For the Performance Certification, the project owner shall meet the requirements by updating the numbers from the chapters '5.4 Other Emissions' and '5.7 CO2-Fixation' and in its ClimateProjects account. The system will create a 'MU Report' that the project owner shall submit to the Gold Standard Registry

CAR/FAR/OBS

Corrective Action Request 15

Provide template 5.7, MU report, Excel calculations
 Include information in the PDD for poplar.

Response by PP

The PP has provided the respective calculations. Main documents are:

5.7 - Template - CO2-Fixation
 Provides an overview

17-03_SOP_Forest_Inventory_Guideline



Findings

Provides insights on the forest inventory procedures

20190309_STRATUM 1.1 CARBON PROJ_ MAR - Onori - 621_mov.xlsx

Provides the analysis of a Growth-model of hazelnut trees – as well as the “net carbon calculation” of the areas until 2017 – including the results of the poplar trees planted.

17-08 Growth-model Hazelnut_revised

Describes the development of the growth-model for hazelnut trees.

20190309_Growth-model Poplars - CO2 Analysis.xlsx

Shows the poplar population and the CO2 fixation calculation for poplar trees

AGG_Carbon Updated 13.03.19.xlsx

Shows the project areas, eligible area, buffer area, areas for NCA, channels, forest and buildings.

The forestry inventory resulted in very high standard deviations and the results did not achieve the required precision. Thus, only ex-ante calculations have been executed for this certification and no verified credits (VERs) are envisaged to be issued.

Final Conclusion

As described above the project does not envisage to archive verified carbon credits due to the very high standard deviation resulted out of the forest inventory.

The calculation provided and supporting documents (IRL 117, 118, 119, 120, 122) have been checked and found in compliance with the standard requirements and good practice. Conservative values have been applied. Wood density was adapted to conservative value of 0,544.

Information for poplar has been included in template 5.7. (IRL 114).

- Accepted
 Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR)
 Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)



(12) Other Emissions (5.4)

1. Where existing 'tree' and 'non-tree' biomass of the Baseline is burned for the purpose of land preparation, an additional 10% of the Baseline shall be deducted. This is to account for the non-CO2 green-house-gas emissions (N2O and CH4) that are released during the burning process.
2. ~~0.005 tCO2 per kg of nitrogen (N) fertilizer shall be deducted. No differentiation is made between synthetic and organic fertilizer.~~ Not applicable; see Gold Standard Clarification ID1, dated 18 Nov 2013

Findings

N/A. No burning of biomass.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Final Conclusion

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)



(13) Baseline (5.5)

3. To determine the Baseline of the eligible planting area the land shall be
 - (a) stratified according to its vegetation types (grassland, bushland, etc.)
 - (b) for each of these strata, scientifically based local*, regional or national default values shall be found which state the biomass of these vegetation types.

Findings

The conservative approach (100% shrubland) from initial certification/validation resulted in a high baseline biomass compared to a mix of shrubland and grassland. (see excel calculations IRL 06_03, 06_07-initial certification).

At this verification/New area certification, the PP adapted the baseline calculation in comparison to initial certification taking into account further studies:

The following approach was used:

Total baseline (tCO₂/ha): new value: 6.9 tCO₂/ha (compared to 33 tCO₂/ha from initial certification).

A description is provided in the template.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Corrective Action Request 16

Provide further information in the PD/Template why the baseline was recalculated and what references were used. In the excel carbon calculation file a value of -7,58 tCO₂/ha is used.

Provide clarification, why for the calculation of the poplar the baseline is 0.

Response by PP

The templates baseline and the excel calculation has been updated. In the excel sheet the value was adapted to 6.9 (this was copy-paste mistake) and the argumentation and sources of the baseline are described in the template – as well as below (copy of baseline text).

Poplar are planted on the edges of hazelnut plantation areas. Since for hazelnut plantations areas baseline emissions have been already taken into account, it is not necessary to account them another time for poplar plantations. Otherwise, it would be double counting.

Final Conclusion

Updated calculations have been provided and checked for consistency.

Total baseline (tCO₂/ha): new value: 6.9 tCO₂/ha (compared to 33 tCO₂/ha from initial certification).

(IRL 119, 128)

* Local default values

Local default values are project area specific value generated through a 'tree' and 'non-tree' inventory on the project area.



Findings

- Accepted
- Accepted with (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)



(14) Leakage (5.6)

Describe the selection of your categories.

- (a) collection of wood (for firewood, charcoal, etc.)
- (b) timber harvesting
- (c) agriculture (crop cultivation, shrimp cultivation, etc.)
- (d) livestock

Findings

Leakage has been adapted to zero due to the fact that it can be considered as insignificant (1 tCO₂e/ha). This will allow to neglect this chapter in future certifications and lower transaction costs.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Corrective Action Request 17

Provide further clarification, why leakage is considered as insignificant and therefore can be neglected.

Response by PP

Gold Standard TAC accepted the "A/R CDM tool for testing significance" (see Email from 22/05/2018; document: Email 20180522_GS on leakage) Leakage was estimated at 1tCO₂/ha in 2010. By than the „AR CDM tool for testing significance“ was not yet accepted. By accepting the standard, the value of 1tCO₂/ha can be neglected and set to zero.

Final Conclusion

It was confirmed by the email of the GS secretariat sent on 22.05.2018 that the TAC approved the A/R CDM tool for testing significance (IRL 127)

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)



(15) CO₂-Fixation (5.7)

Forest Inventory / Present CO₂-Fixation

1. The growth-models of the MUs shall be confirmed/adjusted by the results of MU specific forest inventories
 -
2. For the forest inventories, the guidelines of the BioCarbon Fund or CarbonFix shall be followed.
 -
3. The process of a forest inventory shall be documented clearly and easy replicated.
 -
4. Forest inventories shall be repeated at minimum before every Performance Certification
 -
5. The number of sample plots of a forest inventory shall be sufficient to meet a MU precision with a maximum error of $\pm 20\%$ at a 90% confidence interval. Where the error is above 20%, the additional difference shall be deducted. Provide an overview for which MUs this requirement was relevant and describe the adaptation.

Findings

The crediting period has been adapted from 50 to 30 years.
Provide updated Template 5.7 incl.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Corrective Action Request 18

Provide updated template 5.7., forest inventory data, excel calculation and sustain the indicators 1 – 5 with objective evidence.

Response of PP

The forestry inventory results revealed a very high standard deviation and the required precision level of 20% could not be attained. Thus, only ex-ante calculations have been executed for this certification and no verified credits (VERs) are envisaged to be issued.

Final Conclusion

An updated template has been provided. As described no VERs shall be issued at this verification as the precision level does not meet the requirements yet.

- Accepted
 Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
 Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)



(16) Carbon Performance (6.1)

1. Describe the shortfalls of the project:
2. Describe how you propose to make the project compliant again, latest in 5 years:

At any time during a crediting period, the project owner shall ensure that the quantity of the validated and verified CO₂---certificates with respect to the project is less than or equal to the project's expected carbon stocks (validated CO₂---certificates) and actual carbon stocks (verified CO₂---certificates).

Incidents, or events, that effect compliance with requirement 1 shall be reported to The Gold Standard Secretariat. If they occur outside a certification process, the incidents or events shall be reported to The Gold Standard Secretariat no more than 30 days after their discovery. The template 'Carbon Performance' shall be used for this reporting.

If compliance with requirement 1 is not maintained, the project owner shall demonstrate to The Gold Standard Secretariat how the project will realistically recover appropriate levels of carbon stocks to comply with requirement 1.

The project owner shall use one or more of the following approaches:

- (a) retiring/locking of CO₂---certificates from the project which are not yet transferred or retired/locked
- (b) purchasing of CO₂---certificates from any other Gold Standard certified projects (these can also be from other project types such as renewable energy)
- (c) replanting of an appropriate planting area and recovery of the project carbon stocks overtime
- (d) planting of new areas to generate further CO₂---certificates.

During the period where the project owner is not in compliance with requirement 1, an equal number of CO₂---certificates from The Gold Standard Compliance Buffer will be put 'on---hold'.

Findings

No information provided.

CAR/FAR/OBS

Following PERs (Validated Carbon Credits) had been validated in Phase I (2010) and Phase II (2012):

phase	area	tCO ₂			
		total (incl. 20% buffer)	buffer (20%)	total NET (w/o project buffer)	
Ph-I 2010	hazelnut	2,148	550,272	165,082	385,190
Ph-II 2012	hazelnut	821	210,489	63,147	147,342
Sum 2012		2,969	760,761	152,152	608,609
Ph-III 2017	hazelnut	2,844	304,987	60,997	243,990



Findings					
Ph-III 2017	poplar	included	79,420	15,884	63,536
Sum 2017		2,844	384,407	76,881	307,526
<p>Corrective Action Request 19 Provide detailed information in the PDD about the Carbon Performance and shortfall including <u>figures</u> of all MUs involved.</p>					
Response of PP					
<p>PP response: Requested information has been provided in templates 2.1. and 6.1.</p> <p>The shortfall of credits from the last certification will be compensated by retiring existing validated CO2-certificates that have not been sold. With this action there is no requirement re-gain the full amount of credits within 5 years.</p>					
Final Conclusion					
<p>Information on Carbon Performance have been included in the PDD. No PERs will be issued in this new area certification.</p>					
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR) <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)</p>					

2. Reporting (7.2)e 'Annual Report' shall focus on information since the last 'Annual Report'. It shall include:

- (a) a summary (in English and local language) of the recent projects' activities
- (b) a clear statement (in English and local language) on how stakeholders can provide inputs/grievances

Submit the following documents together with this 'Annual report':

- (c) Filled-in template 'List of Input & Grievances', listing the input and grievances since the last 'Annual Report'
- (d) Updated 'Key Project Information'
- (e) List of stakeholders who will receive the 'Annual Report'
- (f) Most recent 'Certification Report'
- (g) Updated 'Project Participants & Secured Titles' (in case of any changes)

Findings
No annual report has been provided.
CAR/FAR/OBS
<p>Observation: Annual reports shall be provided to the GS-secretariat.</p>
Final Conclusion



Findings

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)



(17) Technical Procedure & Formatting (7.4)

1. The project owner shall create an account on The Gold Standard Registry - www.CDMGoldStandard.org/our-projects/project-registry
2. With this account project information can be submitted for the Pre-Feasibility Assessment and any certification.
3. All project information, except confidential information, shall be made publicly available through The Gold Standard Registry.
4. For the documentation of the project information templates are available at www.CDMGoldStandard.org/LUF AR-Requirements
5. Templates shall be filled out in green using a Calibri, size 10 font.
6. Red coloured comments in the template shall be deleted before document submission.
7. The project documents and supporting documents shall be submitted in
 - (a) English, OR
 - (b) a language that has been agreed upon by the project owner, The Gold Standard Secretariat and the auditor.
8. Figures above one thousand shall be formatted with a space (1'000'000), and decimals will be separated by a point (1.35).
9. Pictures, graphs, tables and supporting documents within project documentation shall be clearly marked with a unique ID.
10. Maps shall include the following information:
 - a) Name of the project
 - b) ID of the project
 - c) Legend
 - d) Printing date
 - e) Scale
 - f) Direction of North
 - g) GPS coordinate system (e.g. W65 84)
 - h) GPS grid
 - i) Infrastructure (roads, houses, etc.) and rivers
 - j) Information on the satellite or aerial picture (date, resolutions, data, source)

Findings

CAR/FAR/OBS

Corrective Action Request 20

Update the Project Documents according to the requirements 7.4

- Consider point 6.
- Assure, that all supporting documents are provided in a final clean version.

Response by PP

Shapefiles have been updated accordingly.
 The following shapefiles have been submitted:



Findings

- a) For all farms: Shapefiles for eligible areas, channels, buffer, buildings, forests, NCAs (see folder: 'Eligible-Forest-Nca-Buffer-Channel-Building For All Farms'). NOTE: A separate zip-file 'Channels For All Farms' have been submitted.
- b) Shapefiles for eligible areas, channels, buffer, buildings, forests, NCAs for each of the farms (folder: 'Eligible-Forest-Nca-Buffer-Building Divided Shape Files').

Final Conclusion

No further incompliances concerning Technical Procedure & Formatting requirements have been detected.

- Accepted
- Accepted with FAR (01-01 ID of the FAR)
- Not accepted with NCR (01-01 ID of the NCR)



ANNEX 2 - INFORMATION REFERENCE LIST

IRL No	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Additional Information (Relevance in CDM Context)																								
0.	Goldstandard Webpage	"Afforestation with Hazelnut Plantation in Western Georgia", project documentation accessed at																										
1.		<p>Onsite interview (03 Apr 2017 – 06 Apr 2017) carried out by TÜV SÜD: Validation Team: Martin Seitz</p> <p>Interviewed Persons:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Name</th> <th>Organisation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Andrea Castagna</td> <td>Op. Dep. Manager</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Frederico Grati</td> <td>MD Agrigeorgia (tel-conf)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Geza Toth</td> <td>Sustainability Proj. Development, (tel-conf)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Moriz Vorher</td> <td>Consultant</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>Gia Kuratskhelia</td> <td>Junior agronomist, Agrigeorgia</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>Gabriele Castelli</td> <td>Agronomist, Agrigeorgia</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>Zamir Zalia</td> <td>IT Assistant, Agrigeorgia</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The original list of participants is available (31 persons).</p>		Name	Organisation	1	Andrea Castagna	Op. Dep. Manager	2	Frederico Grati	MD Agrigeorgia (tel-conf)	3	Geza Toth	Sustainability Proj. Development, (tel-conf)	4	Moriz Vorher	Consultant	5	Gia Kuratskhelia	Junior agronomist, Agrigeorgia	6	Gabriele Castelli	Agronomist, Agrigeorgia	7	Zamir Zalia	IT Assistant, Agrigeorgia	Apr 2017	
	Name	Organisation																										
1	Andrea Castagna	Op. Dep. Manager																										
2	Frederico Grati	MD Agrigeorgia (tel-conf)																										
3	Geza Toth	Sustainability Proj. Development, (tel-conf)																										
4	Moriz Vorher	Consultant																										
5	Gia Kuratskhelia	Junior agronomist, Agrigeorgia																										
6	Gabriele Castelli	Agronomist, Agrigeorgia																										
7	Zamir Zalia	IT Assistant, Agrigeorgia																										
2.	Agrigeorgia	PDD – Afforestation with Hazelnut Plantation in Western Georgia	08 Jun 2010																									
3.	International Committee of	Farming through conflicts	Sep 2007	1 Eligibility																								



IRL No	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Additional Information (Relevance in CDM Context)
	the Red Cross (ICRC)			
4.	Get Carbon	Survey_Assessment_report	Dec 2009	1 Eligibility
5.	Michael C. Schäfer	Klimazonierung von Georgien/Wissenschaftliche Hausarbeit,	Oct 2003	1 Eligibility
6.	Maurizio Cortese	request_forest_definition_DNA/Letter	23 Apr 2009	1 Eligibility
7.	Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural Resources of Georgia	Third National Report of Georgia on The Implementation of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification	May 2006	1 Eligibility
8.		2003-2032 caucasus scenarios		1 Eligibility
9.	Agrigeorgia	Clarification request to DNA/Letter	2009	1 Eligibility
10.	Nana Shvangiradze	Survey Minutes Technical Summary		1 Eligibility
11.	Get Carbon	Survey presentation-English	28 Nov 2009	1 Eligibility
12.	Get Carbon	Survey presentation-Georgian	28 Nov 2009	1 Eligibility
13.	Get Carbon	Survey results 52 questionnaires		1 Eligibility
14.	Get Carbon	Survey STATS report		1 Eligibility
15.	Get Carbon	GIS report	Jan 2009	1 Eligibility
16.	Get Carbon	HAP shape files	Feb 2010	1 Eligibility



IRL No	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Additional Information (Relevance in CDM Context)
17.	Get Carbon	Aerial photos (_Akhali_Khibula_layout, _Chitaskari_layout, _Gejeti_layout, _Vediktari-Martvili_layout	05 Oct 2010	1 Eligibility
18.	Jani LTD	Report Mine removal	Jun 2009	2 Additionality
19.	Gov. of Georgia	Russian invasion of Georgia - Facts 2008	Dec 2008	2 Additionality
20.	ENVSEC	Poster Caucasus degradation		2 Additionality
21.	Renee Giovarelli David Bledsoe	FAO paper Land Reform	Oct 2001	2 Additionality
22.	The Economist	TheEconomist_1	Feb 2010	2 Additionality
23.	The Economist	TheEconomist_2	Feb 2010	2 Additionality
24.	Ivane Japaridze	Bank statement	10 May 2010	2 Additionality
25.	Agrigeorgia	Resume Planting Operations – excel sheet		3 Forest Management
26.	Agrigeorgia	Cadastral maps nursery		3 Forest Management
27.	Michele Pisetta	Agrigeorgia labor guiding principle		4 Environm. Aspects
28.	Michele Pisetta	Illegal activities		4 Environm. Aspects
29.	Agrigeorgia	Climate template		4 Environm. Aspects
30.		REC biodiversity fauna		4 Environm. Aspects
31.	EU	Work code template	Jun 1989	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
32.	Agrigeorgia	Labor Contract Sample	14 Apr 2010	5 Socio-econ. Aspects



IRL No	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Additional Information (Relevance in CDM Context)
33.	Georgian Agriculture Development Projects Coordination Center	Letter of intent-World Bank		5 Socio-econ. Aspects
34.	Maurizio Cortese	Letter of intent UN biomass pellets	23 Sep 2009	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
35.		Problem areas support activities		5 Socio-econ. Aspects
36.	Get Carbon	Stakeholder consultation AR	Apr 2010	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
37.	Della_Valle_et.al	DEFINITION OF ALLOMETRIC EQUATIONS FOR ESTIMATION OF CARBON STORED IN HAZELNUT PLANTATIONS	Jun 2010	6 CO2 Fixation
38.	Get Carbon	Hazel-GRO model		6 CO2 Fixation
39.	Get Carbon	Calculations		6 CO2 Fixation
40.	Bradshaw	Physiological aspects of corylus avellana associated with the French black truffle fungus Tuber melanosporum and the consequence for commercial production of black truffles in Western Australia	Jan 2005	6 CO2 Fixation
41.	Navarro-Blanco	Estimation of above-ground biomass in shrubland ecosystems of southern Spain	2006	6 CO2 Fixation
42.	www.teebuch.de	About tea		8 Baseline



IRL No	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Additional Information (Relevance in CDM Context)
43.	Dr. Turan Yuksek	Rize Correspondance	04 Feb 2010	8 Baseline
44.	Michele Pisetta	Tea height Agrigeorgia estimate		8 Baseline
45.	Moriz Vohrer	CFS clarification1	07 Apr 2010	9 Leakage
46.	Michele Pisetta	Grazing displacement	08 Mar 2010	9 Leakage
47.		Curtins cow-stocking rates	24 Nov 2009	9 Leakage
48.	Ferrero	ICS Manual	Dec 2005	11 Capacities
49.	Ferrero	Development handbook	2009	11 Capacities
50.	Michele Pisetta	Statement illegal activities		12 Land CO2 Tenure
51.	Michele Pisetta	Land tenure	11 Feb 2010	12 Land CO2 Tenure
52.	P. Leme, A. Assuncao	Relationship between the Above and Underground Parts of the Hazelnut Variety .‘Tonda Di Giffoni.’	2005	6 CO2 Fixation
53.	Agrigeorgia	MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON April 18th 2007	18 Apr 2007	2 Additionality
54.	Agrigeorgia	MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON December 22nd 2007	22 Dec 2007	2 Additionality
55.	Agrigeorgia	EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT - “AgriGeorgia”	01 Jul 2009	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
56.	Agrigeorgia	Health insurance agreement	01 Mar 2010	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
57.	Agrigeorgia	Personal Life and Personal Accident insurance	01 Mar 2010	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
58.	Ministry of Economic	Real Estate Sale and Purchase Agreement	25 Dec 2009	12 Land CO2 Tenure



IRL No	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Additional Information (Relevance in CDM Context)
	Development of Georgia			
59.	Ministry of Economic Development of Georgia	Real Estate Sale and Purchase Agreement	02 Dec 2008	12 Land CO2 Tenure
60.	Agrigeorgia	Timetable Project		2 Additionality
61.	Martin Seitz, Martin Schröder	Field Sheets	21 Jul 2010	
62.	Agrigeorgia	Service Agreement	30 Apr 2010	2 Additionality
63.	Agrigeorgia	List of permanent employees	21 Jul 2010	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
64.	Agrigeorgia	Minutes of coordination meeting - Monday meeting	19 Jul 2010	11 Capacities
65.	Levan Dadiani	CV of Levan Dadiani		11 Capacities
66.	Fabio Piretta	CV of Fabio Piretta		11 Capacities
67.	Ferrero Trading LUX	Minutes of "Board of Directors meeting"	08 Feb 2007	11 Capacities
68.	Get Carbon	Fire Management Plan	Jun 2010	11 Capacities
69.	National Agency of Public Registry Georgia	Cadastral Map of parcels	22 Jul 2010	12 Land CO2 Tenure



IRL No	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Additional Information (Relevance in CDM Context)
70.	Ministry of Agriculture of Georgia	Soil Maps 1:9.000/1:10.000		3 Forest Management
71.	Laboratorio regionale analisi terreni	Soil analysis	26 Apr 2007	3 Forest Management
72.	Agrigeorgia	Photo documentation	2009/2010	
73.	Alessandro Bocardo	IRR bus case SA Model Agrigeorgia EXCEL Sheet		2 Additionality
74.	IPCC	IPCC fourth assessment report		
75.	Moritz Vohrer CFS	Pre Validation Report	11 Jun 2010	
76.	Get Carbon	01_24_update_parcel_08.2010	24 Sep 2010	1 Eligibility
77.	Dr. Davit Gwianidze	04_07_Biodiversity_Study_revised_	Nov 2010	4 Environm. Aspects
78.	Get Carbon	HAP shapefiles revised	28 Sep 2010	1 Eligibility
79.	Ferrero Int. SA	Ferrero Board of Directors meeting, minutes - CONFIDENTIAL -	03 May 2007	2 Additionality
80.	Get Carbon	Aerial photos VAL 2(_Akhali_Khibula_layout_VAL2, _Chitaskari_layout_VAL2, _Gejeti_layout_VAL2, _Vediktari-Martvili_layout_VAL2)	30 Aug 2010	2 Additionality
81.	Dep. Governor of State	Regional Officers CP Declaration	30 Aug 2010	2 Additionality



IRL No	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Additional Information (Relevance in CDM Context)
82.	AgriGeorgia	Field Condition Assessment 4_11	26 Nov 2010	3 Forest Management
83.	Get Carbon	Maps – Buffer numbering – (Buffers_AK, Buffers_Chitaskari, Buffers_Gejeti_Vediktari-Martvili)	27 Nov 2010	3 Forest Management
84.	Get Carbon	03_08_SOP#2_Conservation_Area_VAL2-2	20 Aug 2010	3 Forest Management
85.	Get Carbon	03_07_SOP#1_Plantation_Management_VAL2	28 Aug 2010	3 Forest Management
86.	AgriGeorgia	HAP_PDD_VAL2	13 Dec 2010	
87.	AgriGeorgia	03_01_Resume_Planting_Operations_VAL2	04 Nov 2010	3 Forest Management
88.	AgriGeorgia	04_12_Fertilizer_Use_2009	26 Nov 2010	4 Environm. Aspects
89.	AgriGeorgia	03_09_SOP#3_Chemicals_signed.	24 Sep 2010	4 Environm. Aspects
90.	AgriGeorgia	05_07_SOP#4_Work_Safety_signed.	24 Sep 2010	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
91.	AgriGeorgia	05_11_Weekly_Minutes_30.08.2010	30 Aug 2010	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
92.	AgriGeorgia	05_07_SOP#8_Employment_VAL2	26 Nov 2010	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
93.	AgriGeorgia	04_12_Labor_Contract_Sample_Dec.2010-1	20 Dec 2010	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
94.	AgriGeorgia	Replacement of old contracts statement – in progress	21 Dec 2010	5 Socio-econ. Aspects



IRL No	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Additional Information (Relevance in CDM Context)
95.	AgriGeorgia	11_06_SOP#7_Stakeholder_signed.	24 Sep 2010	5 Socio-econ. Aspects
96.	Get Carbon	06_03_Calculations_revised	08 Oct 2010	6 CO ₂ - Fixation
97.	AgriGeorgia	09_04_SOP#5_Livestock_Assessment_VAL2	06 Oct 2010	9 Leakage
98.	Leme/Assunção	06_05_Assuncao_Leme_on_RTS_ratio	2005	6 CO ₂ - Fixation
99.	AgriGeorgia	11_05_SOP#6_Internal_Management	06 Oct 2010	11 Capacities
100.	AgriGeorgia	11_04_Fire_Management_Plan_revised	24 Sep 2010	11 Capacities
101.	AgriGeorgia	11_06_SOP#7_Stakeholder_signed.	24 Sep 2010	11 Capacities
102.	AgriGeorgia	11_07_SOP#9_Risk_Management_signed	24 Sep 2010	11 Capacities
103.	AgriGeorgia	11_08_SOP#10_Fire_Risk_signed.	24 Sep 2010	11 Capacities
104.	FERRERO	11_09_Financial_Figures_2007_2010	21 Sep 2010	11 Capacities
105.	FERRERO Trading Lux SA	11_10_Agrigeorgia_Charter	08 Feb 2007	11 Capacities
106.	AgriGeorgia	05_13_Risk_Assessment_Agrigeorgia	24 Sep 2010	11 Capacities
107.	The Ministry of Economic Development of Georgia	12-02_Purchase_and_Sale_02122008	02 Dec 2008	12 Land CO ₂ Tenure
108.	Cadaster	12_03_Cadastral_sheet_Chitaskari#8	31 May 2010	12 Land CO ₂ Tenure
109.	Cadaster	12_04_Land tenure contracts	21 May 2010	12 Land CO ₂ Tenure
110.	Get Carbon	Landsat Images 1987, 1989, 1991, 1998	Nov 2010	1 Eligibility



IRL No	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Additional Information (Relevance in CDM Context)
111.	National Bank of Georgia	02_14_Bank_Georgia_2007_AR	2007	2 Additionality
112.	National Bank of Georgia	02_15_Bank_Georgia_2007_MS	2007	2 Additionality
113.	The World Fact Book	02_11_Georgia_Indicators_2007	2007	2 Additionality
114.	AgriGeorgia	GS PD – Afforestation with Hazelnut Plantation in Western Georgia Performance Certification	13 Nov 2019	Certification 2017
115.	AgriGeorgia	List of parcels CARBON PROJECT	2017	Certification 2017
116	AgriGeorgia	SOP_Forest_Inventory	2017	Certification 2017
117	AgriGeorgia	17-03_SOP_Forest_Inventory _ Measurement_form	2017	Certification 2017
118	AgriGeorgia	Carbon Updated (Excel)	13 Mar 2019	Certification 2017
119	AgriGeorgia	Stratum 1.1 Carbon Proj_Mar	07 Aug 2019	Certification 2017
120	AgriGeorgia	Growth Model Poplars – CO2 Analysis	09 Mar 2019	Certification 2017
121	AgriGeorgia	Shapefiles	09 Mar 2019	Certification 2017
122	AgriGeorgia	Growth Model Hazelnut-revised	09 Mar 2019	Certification 2017
123	AgriGeorgia	Buffer_ReNaturalization_Plan	Mar 2019	Certification 2017
124	AgriGeorgia	action_AGRRED_CARBON_soil compaction	Feb 2019	Certification 2017
125	AgriGeorgia	action_AGRRED_CARBON_biochar	Mar 2019	Certification 2017
126	AgriGeorgia	action_AGRRED_CARBON_alternative fertilizer	Mar 2019	Certification 2017
127	GS-Secretariat	Email by GS-Secretariat	22 May 2018	Certification 2017
128	AgriGeorgia	Sustainable Studies for Hazelnut Protection	Nov 2019	Certification 2017



IRL No	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Title/Type of Document. Publication place	Issuance and/or submission date	Additional Information (Relevance in CDM Context)
129	AgriGeorgia	Chemicals warehouse	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
130	AgriGeorgia	Financial means PPPs	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
131	AgriGeorgia	Guidelines for the proper use of plant protection products	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
132	AgriGeorgia	Identification of FSC substances list	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
133	AgriGeorgia	Pesticide Policy	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
134	AgriGeorgia	PPPs Mechanical Application (drivers)	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
135	AgriGeorgia	Training course PPPs _List Signature	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
136	AgriGeorgia	Integrated pest management strategy	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
137	AgriGeorgia	Sustainability Monitoring ID 3_Health and Safety	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
138	AgriGeorgia	Sustainability Monitoring ID 5_biological diversity of native ecosystems	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
139	AgriGeorgia	Sustainability Monitoring ID 6_Fertilizers	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
140	AgriGeorgia	Sustainability Monitoring ID 7_PPPs	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
141	AgriGeorgia	Sustainability Monitoring ID 8_FSC Pesticides Policy	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
142	AgriGeorgia	Sustainability Monitoring ID 10_riparian buffer zones	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
143	AgriGeorgia	Sustainability Monitoring ID 12_Groundwater	Nov 2019	Certification 2017
144	AgriGeorgia	Sustainability Monitoring ID 13_Diseases	Nov 2019	Certification 2017