

PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

This project review report includes findings raised during Verra’s review of the project specified below. The VVB must address the findings before the project request can be considered for approval by Verra. The project review report will be made publicly available on the Verra Registry. Confidential information may be provided in separate attachments.

Project ID	2471
Project Name	Agroforestry and Reforestation with small-scale farmers in Uganda
Review Type	Registration & Verification Approval
Program(s)	VCS Program
Verification Period	13 April 2016 – 31 December 2021
Project Proponent	PUR Development Pte. Ltd. hereinafter referred to as ‘PUR Projet’
Methodology	AR AMS0007: A/R Small scale Methodology Afforestation and reforestation project activities implemented on lands other than wetlands, v3.1
VVB	AENOR Internacional S.A.U.
Assessment Criteria	VCS Standard, v4.2
Date of First Issue	09 Dec 2022
Date of Second Issue	07 Mar 2023
Review Conclusion	Approved
Date of Final Issue	26 July 2023

FINDINGS

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
1	Missing information to assess the completeness of eligibility criteria for new project activity instance		
	<p><u>Issue</u> In Section 1.4 of the PD, it is unclear if the eligibility criteria encompass all the eligibility criteria listed in Section 3.5.15 of the <i>VCS Standard, v4.3</i></p> <p><u>Action Required</u> 1. Section 1.4 of the PD must be updated such that the eligibility criteria for new project activity instances are expanded or clarified to cover all the set of 5 criteria listed in Section 3.5.15 of the <i>VCS Standard, v4.3</i> 2. The VVB must validate the updated PD and update section 3.1 of the v/v report as needed.</p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>VCS Standard, v4.3, Section 3.5.15</i></p> <p><u>Background</u> For example, it is unclear if new activity instances must meet one of the baseline scenarios described in Section 3.4 of the PD or if they must use one of the proposed reforestation models.</p>	<p>Round 1</p> <p><u>VVB Response</u> Section 1.4 of the PD have been updated, also section 3.1 of the V/V report have been updated as well.</p> <p><u>Verra Response</u> The PD was updated to indicate that new instances must match the baseline scenarios and planting models described.</p>	Closed
2	Lack of clarity and details on VVB's assessment of conditions prior to project initiation		
	<p><u>Issue</u> In Section 3.1 of the joint VVR, it is unclear what GIS and remote audit data have been used and how to confirm that lands where the project takes place are degraded, expected to remain degraded or to continue to degrade in the absence of</p>	<p>Round 1</p> <p><u>VVB Response</u> Section 3.1 of the VVR has been reinforced to explained how this issue was verified.</p>	Closed

<p>the project.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <p>1. The VVB must describe what information gathered from GIS data and remote audit led to a reasonable level of assurance regarding conditions prior to project initiation.</p> <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u></p> <p>VCS Validation Verification Manual, v3.2</p>	<p><u>Verra Response</u></p> <p>It remains unclear how the VVB determined the soil characteristics of the project area from satellite imagery.</p>	
	<p><u>Action Required:</u></p> <p>1. The VVB must update Section 3.1 of the VVR to describe what peer-reviewed method was used to assess soil characteristics from satellite imagery. The method should include the data sources used to build a correlation between remotely sense images and on-the-ground soil conditions in the project area.</p>	
	<p>Round 2</p>	
	<p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <p>Section 3.1 of the VVR was updated to account for the different types of pre-project land-uses (not only degraded land), along with the assessment of the on-the-ground conditions through more robust methods.</p>	
	<p><u>Verra Response</u></p> <p>The VVB removed their assessment of soil characteristics, and instead, describe a cross check of questionnaires, geo-referenced images, contracts, and Global Forest Watch data to conclude that the pre-project conditions described in the PD are accurate.</p>	

3	Insufficient references to 'evidence', 'records', 'sources', "information provided'		
	Round 1		Closed
<p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>Throughout the v/v report, the VVB states they reviewed</p>	<p><u>VVB Response</u></p>		

<p>'evidence', 'records', 'sources', or 'information provided' to reach their conclusion; however, they do not include specific references to documents listed in Appendix 1.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All evidence reviewed during the v/v must be listed in Appendix 1 The VVB must update the following sections of v/v report to specify which evidence listed in Appendix 1 was reviewed to reach their conclusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Section 3.1 – Compliance with laws *Section 3.1 - SDG Contributions *Section 3.4.2 – Project not on wetlands *Section 3.4.4 – Baseline *Section 3.4.5 – Additionality *Section 3.4.6 – Cite the 'scientific literature' against which default values were checked *Section 3.4.6 – Net GHG ERRs *Section 3.5 – Describe what evidence was checked to validate each risk in the NPRR <p><u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>VCS Joint V/V Template, v4.0</i> <i>VCS Validation Verification Manual, v3.2</i></p>	<p>The following sections have been updated in the VVR: section 3.1, section 3.4.2, section 3.4.4, 3.4.5 – Additionality, section 3.4.5, section 3.4.6, section 3.5</p> <p><u>Verra Response</u> The finding cannot be closed based on the following two issues:</p> <p>Section 3.4.4 – Historical Land Use</p> <p>The VVB has not described how they assessed the historical land use of the project area. The VVB verified the management plan of the PP that includes an assessment of the historical land use of a parcel before inclusion in the project; however, the VVB has not provided as assessment of the same.</p> <p>Action Required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The VVB must assess the historical land use of an appropriate sample of the project area to validate the PPs conclusions. The VVB must describe in detail the steps taken to assess the historical land use of the project area in Section 3.4.4 of the VVR. <p>Section 3.4.6 - Allometric equations:</p> <p>The source of the allometric equations used for quantifying biomass is not described in the PD and not assessed by the VVB.</p> <p><u>Action Required:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The VVB must ensure Section 5.2 of the PD includes the source of the allometric equations used to quantify MAI The VVB must assess and describe if the sources of the allometric equations meet the requirements of paragraph 6 and 7 of <i>AR-Tool 14, v4.2</i> The VVB must update Section 3.4.6 of the VVR 	
--	---	--

	accordingly	
	Round 2	
	<u>VVB Response</u>	
	Section 3.4.4 – Historical Land Use	
	Section 3.4.4 of the VVR was updated to expand on the assessment of the historical land use.	
	Section 3.4.6 - Allometric equations:	
	Section 5.2 of the PD was updated, and Section 3.4.6 of the VVR was updated accordingly to confirm the allometric equations meet the requirements of paragraph 6 and 7 of <i>AR-Tool 14, v4.2</i> .	
	<u>Verra Response</u>	
	The VVB describes a robust series of information cross checks to verify the historical land use.	
	The PD includes a relevant citation for the allometric equations and assessed the equations accordingly.	

4	Insufficient evidence to demonstrate that displaced cattle were moved to existing grazing areas		
	<u>Issue</u>	Round 1	
	In Section 3.4.6 of the VVR, it is unclear what evidence was presented and assessed to ensure displaced cattle are moved to existing grazing areas, thereby establishing that leakage is 0.	<u>VVB Response</u>	
	<u>Action Required</u>	AENOR has checked through the database, there are only 2 out of 1050 parcels in this situation. The pictures of these 2 parcels categorized as pasture/prairie in the database were checked.	Closed
	1. The VVB must describe how the location of displaced cattle is documented and what evidence was assessed to verify that cattle are displaced to existing pasture.	Section 3.4.6 of the VVR has been updated with this information.	
	<u>Program Rule(s)</u>	<u>Verra Response</u>	

	VCS Validation Verification Manual, v3.2	The project data shows only 0.4 ha is categorized as pasture for which cattle could be displaced.	
--	--	---	--

5 Inconsistent description of planting regimes in the MR			
	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>Table 2 in the MR describes land planted using the M1 and M2 planting regimes; however, it seems evident that some planting using the M3 model also occurred.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The VVB must clarify why Table 2 does not include the M3 planting regime 	<p>Round 1</p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <p>In table 2 in the MR, M1 and M2 refer to Monitoring 1 and Monitoring 2 but it is not referred to planting models (Model 1 and Model 2).</p> <p><u>Verra Response</u></p> <p>The VVB clarified that M1 and M2 refer to monitoring not planting models.</p>	Closed

6 Unclear calculation of baseline and project emissions			
	<p><u>Issue</u></p> <p>It is hard to follow how baseline and project emissions were calculated in the MR. For example, the GHG removals in Table 9 differ from those in the final ERR table under section 5.4.</p> <p>Additionally, per table 9 and the table under section 5.4 of the MR, it is unclear why the baseline removals were 0 in 2016.</p> <p><u>Action Required</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The VVB must ensure the MR reports consistent baseline ERR estimates across all sections and tables The GHG ERRs calculation spreadsheet must be shared with Verra to facilitate the review of calculations. The VVB must assess the revised PD and update the table in section 5 of the v/v as needed. 	<p>Round 1</p> <p><u>VVB Response</u></p> <p>Table 9 of the MR shows the GHG removals of trees planted. Table 10 shows the baseline of the project scenario GHG removals which include biomass lost due to change of land use. The sum of Table 9 (GHG removals in planted trees) and table 10 (GHG removal in baseline sinks of the project scenario) = GHG removal by sinks (Cactual (t)). The result that can be observed in the final ERR table under the section 5.4 is the Annual net removals by sinks ΔC_{actual} (t). This calculation can be seen in the ex-ante excel file sheet 1_GHG Credits</p> <p>In order to be conservative, the PP considers in the project scenario that GHG removals in the baseline (including land use change) and GHG removals from planted trees will occur after one</p>	Closed

	<u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>VCS Monitoring Report, v4.1, Sections 5.1 and 5.4</i>	year of planting, which is why it is 0 in the first year (2016).	
		<u>Verra Response</u> The VVB clarifies the calculation tables and the ERR sheet was provided.	