

VCS Project Verification Report - Bull Run Overseas Forest Carbon Project: Phase 1



PROJECT NUMBER VO11048.00

Project Title	Bull Run Overseas Forest Carbon Project: Phase 1
Version	V1-6; Dated 14 March 2012
Report ID	VO11048.00

Report Title	Project Verification Report - Bull Run Overseas Forest Carbon Project: Phase 1
Client	Jeff Waldon – Chief Technical Officer (jeffwaldon@forestcarbonoffsets.net) / 540- 230-2854 George Headley – Bull Run Overseas Ltd. (headley@pobox.com / 608-661-0616)
Pages	14
Date of Issue	15 March 2012
Prepared By	Environmental Services, Inc. Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division
Contact	7220 Financial Way, Suite 100 Jacksonville, Florida 32256 – USA Phone 904-470-2200 Fax: 904-470-2112 www.esicarbon.com
Approved By	Shawn McMahon – Lead Validator and Janice McMahon – Regional Technical Manager
Work Carried Out By	Shawn McMahon – Lead, Caitlin Sellers – Team Member, Stewart McMorrow – Trainee, and Janice McMahon – QA/QC

Summary:

Environmental Services, Inc., (ESI) was contracted by the Project Proponents to conduct the project verification of the Bull Run Overseas Forest Carbon Project: Phase 1 on 29 July 2011.

The goal of the Bull Run Overseas Forest Carbon Project: Phase 1 is to protect the property as a carbon sink, maintain the biodiversity values of the property, and enhance the local economic environment with sustainable livelihoods. The climate objective is to avoid emissions from deforestation during the project timeframe. The project area is slated for conversion to coffee agriculture.

The project consists of protection of the property through 2038 through patrols and placing a restriction on the property deeds for the life of the project. Bull Run Overseas Ltd. (BRO) owns the property. Forest Carbon Offsets LLC (FCO) is an agent of BRO to develop the carbon finance project. Conservation Management Institute at Virginia Tech (CMI) is a subcontractor hired to conduct technical analysis on behalf of FCO.

The major project activities for Phase I are control access to the site through regular patrols; place a deed restriction on the property; and monitor results.

The verification objective was to assess the likelihood that implementation of the project would result in the greenhouse gas emission removal enhancement as stated by the project proponent in the PD and to ensure that the project complies with VCS Standard (v3.2, 1 February 2012) criteria. The methodology employed in the verification process was derived from all items in our verification process. This included utilizing VCS documents and ISO 14064-3 to develop and implement a sampling plan.

The scope of the verification included the GHG project and baseline scenarios; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHG's; and time periods covered. The geographic verification scope was defined by the project boundary, the carbon reservoir types, management activities, growth and yield models, inventory program, and contract periods.

The verification criteria followed the guidance documents provided by VCS and included the following: VCS Program Guide (1 February 2012, v3.2), VCS Standard (1 February 2012, v3.2), Program Definitions (1 February 2012, v3.2), Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Requirements (1 February 2012, v3.1), AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (1 February 2012, v3.1), Approved VCS Tool VT0001 Version 1.0 "Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in VCS AFOLU Project Activities" (21 May 2010), and Approved VCS Methodology VM0007 Version 1.1, 7 September 2011 REDD Methodology Module REDD Methodology Framework (REDD-MF), Sectoral Scope 14.

A summary of all verification findings is included in Attachment B.

ESI confirms all verification activities including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance and the Project Description (PD) adherence to the VCS Standard (v3.2, 1 February 2012) as documented in this report are complete and concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that the Bull Run Overseas Forest Carbon Project: Phase 1 (PD date 14 March 2012), meets the requirements of VCS Standard.

The GHG assertion provided by the Project proponent and verified by ESI has resulted in the GHG emission reduction or removal of 316,958 tCO₂ equivalents by the project during the verification period/reporting period (1 January 2009 – 31 December 2010). This is calculated based on a total of 338,573 tCO₂ equivalents sequestered as of the date of monitoring/verification less the uncertainty deduction (6.4%). As permitted by the methodology, emissions are reported as zero. The 316,958 tCO₂ equivalents do not include the 23% buffer withholding.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Objective	4
1.2	Scope and Criteria	4
1.3	Level of Assurance.....	5
1.4	Summary Description of the Project	5
2	Validation Process, Findings and Conclusion.....	5
2.1	Validation Process	5
2.2	Validation Findings.....	6
2.2.1	Gap Validation.....	6
2.2.2	Methodology Deviations.....	6
2.2.3	New Project Activity Instances.....	6
2.3	Validation Conclusion.....	6
3	Verification Process	6
3.1	Method and Criteria.....	6
3.2	Document Review	7
3.3	Interviews	8
3.4	Site Inspections.....	8
3.5	Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy	8
4	VERIFICATION Findings	9
4.1	Project Implementation Status	9
4.2	Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations	9
4.3	Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals	9
4.4	Management and Operational System	10
5	Verification conclusion	10
6	APPENDIX A	11
7	APPENDIX B	13

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The verification objective included an assessment of compliance with the VCS Standard (v3.2, 1 February 2012) and the validated PD, and the likelihood that implementation of the planned GHG project will result in the GHG emission removal enhancements as stated by the project proponent (ISO 14064-3:2006). This verification assessed the GHG emission removals through an AFOLU project, specifically Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation. (REDD).

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of the verification included the GHG project and baseline scenarios; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHG's; and time periods. The geographic verification scope was defined by the project boundary, which included the carbon reservoir types, management activities, growth and yield models, inventory program, and contract periods. The scope of the Bull Run Overseas Forest Carbon Project: Phase I verification project was outlined by the project developer within the Project Description dated 14 March 2012 and is re-defined as follows for the GHG project:

Baseline Scenario	Avoided conversion (coffee plantations)
Activities/Technologies/Processes	Reduced emissions from deforestation and degradation (REDD); forest/biodiversity protections.
Sources/sinks/Reservoirs	Sinks: above- ground and below-ground biomass Sources: biomass burning, combustion, use of fertilizers
GHG Type	Carbon dioxide (with potential emissions for CH ₄ and N ₂ O)
Time Period	Project start date: 1 January 2009 Project crediting period: 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2038 Verification Period: 1 January 2009 – 31 December 2010
Project Boundary	Project Location- Cayo District, Belize 23.5 km east-southeast of San Ignacio, Belize. The Project boundary encompasses 4,650 ha of which 666.3 ha are available and suitable for conversion to agricultural uses in the absence of finance from a carbon trade scheme under this project document. Of the 666.3 ha slated for conversion to coffee, 567.3 ha are classified as broadleaf forest and included in the calculations for avoided emissions from conversion.

The verification criteria followed the verification guidance provided by VCS and included the following:

- VCS Program Guide (1 Feb 2012)
- VCS Standard (1 Feb 2012, v3.2)
- Program Definitions (1 February 2012, v3.2)
- Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Requirements (1 Feb 2012, v3.1)
- AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool 1 Feb 2012, v3.1)
- VCS Methodology VM0007 Version 1.1, (7 September 2011) REDD Methodology Module REDD Methodology Framework (REDD-MF)
- Approved VCS Tool VT0001 Version 1.0 “Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in VCS AFOLU Project Activities” (21 May 2010)
- VCS Module LK-ASP of VCS Methodology VMD0009 (3 December 2010)

1.3 Level of Assurance

The level of assurance was used to determine the depth of detail that the verifier placed in the verification sampling plan to determine if there were any errors, omissions, or misrepresentations (ISO 14064-3:2006). ESI assessed the project (general principles, data, sampling descriptions, documentation, calculations, etc.) to provide reasonable assurance to meet the Project Level requirements of the VCS Program. The evidence used to achieve a reasonable level of assurance is specified in the following sections.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The goal of the project is to protect the property as a carbon sink, maintain the biodiversity values of the property, and enhance the local economic environment with sustainable livelihoods. The climate objective is to avoid emissions from deforestation during the project timeframe. The project area was slated for conversion to coffee agriculture.

The project consists of protection of the property through 2038 through patrols and placing a restriction on the property deeds for the life of the project. Bull Run Overseas Ltd. (BRO) owns the property. Forest Carbon Offsets LLC (FCO) is an agent of BRO to develop the carbon finance project. Conservation Management Institute at Virginia Tech (CMI) is a subcontractor hired to conduct technical analysis on behalf of FCO.

The major project activities for Phase I are control access to the site through regular patrols; place a deed restriction on the property; and monitor results.

2 VALIDATION PROCESS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

2.1 Validation Process

Please refer to the VCS Validation Report dated 15 March 2012 prepared by ESI and submitted to VCSA.

2.2 Validation Findings

2.2.1 Gap Validation

Not Applicable

2.2.2 Methodology Deviations

The project and project monitoring plan meet all of the requirements of the methodology and does not deviate from the baseline scenario, additionality determination or inclusion of project GHG sources, sinks and reservoirs.

2.2.3 New Project Activity Instances

This is the first validation of the project and is not a grouped project.

2.3 Validation Conclusion

ESI confirmed all validation activities including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance and the PD adhere to the VCS Standard (v3.2, 1 February 2012) as documented in ESI's validation report (dated 15 March 2012) are complete and concluded without any qualifications or limiting conditions that the PD Bull Run Overseas Forest Carbon Project: Phase 1 dated 14 March 2012 met the requirements of the VCS Standard (v3.2, Feb 2012).

3 VERIFICATION PROCESS

3.1 Method and Criteria

The verification process closely followed the process outlined in the documents above and ESI's procedures for VCS verifications outlined within our Management System Manual. The sampling methodology is derived from all items in our verification process stated above, which utilized the VCS guidance documents, selected methodology (VM0007), and ISO 14064-3. Sample size and techniques were based on the project parameters and best professional judgment. Plots selected for detailed review (plot checks) were at the discretion of the verifier and were selected through a risk-based assessment to determine:

- 1) the plots with the greatest volume, and accordingly the highest potential for impact on the project
- 2) the plots which appear to fall within the riparian zones as the PD states that these areas are removed from the project and protected by a 1-chain buffer, and
- 3) plots in close proximity to the boundaries to facilitate boundary confirmation.

For the field verification, the sample size for the plot verification was 7 plots of the 22 available plots or 32%. Of the 22 plots available to sample, ESI sampled the following plots: 101 (riparian), 109 (riparian), 111, 114 (riparian), 115, 121, 125.

These plots were selected to provide the necessary sample size to meet a reasonable level of assurance; as directed by the professional judgment of the Lead Verifier. Direct field measurement occurred at each plot identified and mimicked the monitoring/inventory design conducted by the project proponent.

The verification criteria followed the guidance documents provided by VCS and included the following:

- VCS Program Guide (1 Feb 2012 v3.2)
- VCS Standard (1 Feb 2012, v3.2)
- Program Definitions (1 February 2012 v 3.2)
- Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Requirements (1 Feb 2012, v3.1)
- AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool 1 Feb 2012, v3.1)
- VCS Methodology VM0007 Version 1.1, (7 September 2011) REDD Methodology Module REDD Methodology Framework (REDD-MF)
- Approved VCS Tool VT0001 Version 1.0 “Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in VCS AFOLU Project Activities” (21 May 2010)
- VCS Module LK-ASP of VCS Methodology VMD0009 (3 December 2010)
- VCS Module VMD0001 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of carbon stocks in the above- and belowground biomass in live tree and non-tree pools (CP-AB) (3 December 2010)
- VCS Module VMD0006 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of baseline carbon stock changes and greenhouse gas emissions from planned deforestation (BL-PL)
- VCS Module VMD0007 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of baseline carbon stock changes and greenhouse gas emissions from unplanned deforestation (BL-UP)
- VCS Module VMD0015 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Methods for monitoring of greenhouse gas emissions and removals (M-MON) (3 December 2010)
- VCS Module VMD0017 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of uncertainty for REDD project activities (X-UNC) (3 December 2010)
- VCS Module VMD0013 Version 1.0 REDD Methodological Module: Estimation of greenhouse gas emissions from biomass burning (E-BB)
- CDM A/R Methodological tool “Estimation of direct nitrous oxide emission from nitrogen fertilization” (Version 01) (27 July 2007).

3.2 Document Review

A detailed review of all project documentation was conducted to ensure consistency with, and identify any deviation from, VCS program requirements, the methodology (VM0007) and the PD. Initial review focused on the validated PD and monitoring report and included an examination of the project details, implementation status, data and parameters, and quantification of GHG emission reductions and removals. Documents reviewed include land ownership documentation, property boundaries, maps and aerials, data from monitoring, biomass and carbon calculation spreadsheets, and responses to corrective action/clarification requests.

The verification included a review of the validated Project Description (PD) and Monitoring Report, relative to the field conditions observed and interviews with project management staff.

AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (1 February 2012 v3.1) was used by the project proponent to assess overall project risk. Overall risk rating was calculated at 23%. The information in this report was evaluated by verifiers and found to have been conducted appropriately and in compliance with VCS Standards v3.2. No discrepancies were found in the evaluation of the elements of the Risk Analysis.

For a complete list of project documents reviewed during this project verification, please see Appendix A.

3.3 Interviews

Interviews were conducted at multiple levels of the Bull Run project to assess understanding of program requirements and to determine if baseline monitoring was conducted appropriately. Interviews included discussions with Bull Run senior management, field managers, staff and local stakeholders affected by the project. The following is a list of the main interviewees:

- George Headley – BRO, Project Proponent
- Jeff Waldon – FCO, Project Consultant
- Peter Gunther – BRO, Site Manager
- Solomon Tzib – BRO Staff
- Tulio Mas – BRO Staff
- Patricia Tzib – BRO Staff
- Jose Gelvez – BRO Staff
- Aninias Tzib – BRO Staff
- Javier Bull – BRO Staff
- Esaura Tzib – BRO Staff

3.4 Site Inspections

Site inspections occurred on 14-17 July 2011 and 19-21 December 2011. During the site inspections, ESI assessed the following items:

- project and stand boundaries;
- pre-project conditions, as evidenced by condition of adjacent or nearby non-project areas, by evidence of site-preparation activities;
- current project conditions, including reported tree species, reported growth characteristics (diameter, or similar), reported biomass volume, and implementation of management plan/monitoring (historical and current)
- conversion plan / pilot project coffee bean operation
- project support and community involvement

For specifics on the sampling method for the field visit and the plots visited please see section 3.1 above.

3.5 Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy

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

During the course of the verification 3 non-conformity reports (NCR's) and clarification requests (CL's) were identified. All NCRs/CLs were addressed satisfactorily by the project proponent during the project verification process. No material discrepancies were identified. The NCRs/CLs provided necessary clarity to ensure the project was in compliance with the VCS Standard requirements for GHG projects. For a complete list of all NCRs/CLs and their resolutions, please see Appendix B.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

The project activities as described in the validated PD have been fully implemented. No material discrepancies were identified between the project and the project description with regard to project activities.

The monitoring plan as described in the validated PD has been fully implemented and is complete. No material discrepancies were identified between the project and the project description with regard to monitoring.

As this is the initial verification conducted concurrent with the initial validation, there are no remaining issues from the previous validation/verification.

4.2 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations

ESI conducted an intensive review all input data, parameters, spreadsheet formulas and connections, conversions, aggregations and pooling, statistics and resulting uncertainties and output data to ensure consistency with the VCS standard, the project PD and the methodology. Further, ESI reproduced calculations for selected samples to ensure accuracy of the results. All data, conversion factors, formulas, and calculations were provided by the project proponent in spreadsheet format to ensure all formulas were accessible for review. The project proponent also provided a step-by-step overview of calculations to ensure ESI understood the approach and could confirm its consistency with the methodology and PD.

ESI also conducted a comprehensive assessment of all data collection and storage procedures and confirmed that all opportunities for error in transposition between data were minimized.

Uncertainty was assessed as required (6.4%). ESI recalculated the statistics independently to confirm the accuracy of the reported precision.

Field data collection utilized appropriate principles of forestry data collection, including appropriate tools and methods. Collected data was handled appropriately, including a structured process for quality check. Analysis of collected data used appropriate formulas, conversions, and parameters, supported by scientific literature. Where ranges of parameters exist, or other types of formulaic uncertainty, appropriately conservative values were used in data analysis.

4.3 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals

During ESI's verification the evidence provided by the project proponent was appropriate and more than sufficient in both quantity and quality to support the determination of GHG emission removals reported by the project. Throughout the verification, Forest Carbon Offsets demonstrated a strong commitment toward conservativeness and took all measures appropriate to ensure the reliability, consistency and accuracy of all evidence provided. The quality and reliability of the internal evidence was demonstrated through assessment of their data collection and storage procedures. The quality and reliability of external and documented evidence was demonstrated through their use of recognized and accepted sources for data, parameters and supporting research. Oral evidence was confirmed through interviews with Bull Run O and FCO staff. Those interviewed included:

- George Headley – BRO, Project Proponent
- Jeff Waldon – FCO, Project Consultant
- Peter Gunther – BRO, Site Manager
- Solomon Tzib – BRO Staff

- Tulio Mas – BRO Staff
- Patricia Tzib – BRO Staff
- Jose Gelvez – BRO Staff
- Aninias Tzib – BRO Staff
- Javier Bull – BRO Staff
- Esaura Tzib – BRO Staff

4.4 Management and Operational System

The management system employed by Forest Carbon Offsets utilizes appropriate field measurement methods (systematic, appropriate measurement tools and techniques), high quality data collection and management techniques (clearly identified responsibilities for data accuracy; appropriate data quality control), and data analysis. Staff is thoroughly familiar with their responsibilities and was confirmed to be appropriately trained for these responsibilities. Accordingly, in the process of the verification, ESI confirmed the suitability and appropriateness of Forest Carbon Offsets management system for monitoring and reporting.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

After review of all project information, procedures, calculations, and supporting documentation and selected site visits, ESI confirms that the monitoring conducted by Forest Carbon Offsets, along with the supporting monitoring report, are accurate and consistent with all aforementioned VCS criteria, the validated PD, and the selected methodology. ESI confirms that the Bull Run Overseas Forest Carbon Project: Phase 1 has been implemented in accordance with the validated PD (dated 14 March 2012).

ESI confirms all verification activities, including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance, monitoring and project documentation adherence to the VCS Standard v3.2, as documented in this report are complete. ESI concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that the Bull Run Overseas Forest Carbon Project: Phase 1 meets the requirements of the VCS Standard (v 3.2).

The GHG assertion provided by FCO and verified by ESI has resulted in the GHG emission reduction or removal of 316,958 tCO₂ equivalents by the project during the verification period/reporting period (1 January 2009 – 31 December 2010). This is calculated based on a total of 338,573 tCO₂ equivalents sequestered as of the date of monitoring/verification less the uncertainty deduction (6.4%). As permitted by the methodology, emissions are reported as zero. The 316,958 tCO₂ equivalents do not include the 23% buffer withholding.

GHG Emission Reductions or Removals	tCO ₂ e
Baseline Emissions	2009:169,011 2010:169-562 Total: 338,573 tCO ₂ e
Project Emissions	0 tCO ₂ e
Leakage	0 tCO ₂ e
Net GHG emission reductions or removals	2009: 158,221 2010: 158,737 Total: 316,958 tCO₂e

6 APPENDIX A

The following is a listing of the project documents reviewed during this project verification:

- o Received on 07-21-2011
 - BRO VCS Carbon Database 2011 ver 2.xlsx
 - BRO VCS PDD Phase I Version 2.docx
- o Received on 07-25-2011
 - VCS_FCO_BC_Verification_Report_Final_Signed_072111.pdf
 - VCS_RPT_FCO_BC_Validation_RPT_Final_Signed_062411.pdf
- o Received on 8-12-2011
 - 20110424_coffee_plan.pdf
- o Received on 9-13-2011
 - 20100423_TCT_V54F149.pdf
 - 2009_50000_fairweather.pdf
 - 20100423_TCT_V54F147.pdf
 - 20100423_TCT_V54F148.pdf
- o Received on 9-15-2011
 - ROUND 1 NCRs JLW Response.xlsx
 - 20110424_coffee_plan_final.pdf
 - BRO VCS Carbon Database 2011 ver 2.xlsx
 - BRO Monitoring Report 2011 ver 1-0.docx
 - BRO VCS PDD Phase I Version 1-0.docx
- o Received on 9-21-2011
 - nc_2000_Haack_004.pdf
 - Nitrogen Application in Nicaragua coffee.pdf
 - 1Bull_Run_Execution Copy Agency Agreement.DOC
 - Financial Model.xlsx
 - BRO Financial Plan for Financial Additionality Analysis.xlsx
 - BRO VCS PDD Phase I Version 1-1.docx
 - cdm_methodology-mpr_belize.pdf
 - Central American Pine Assessment.pdf
 - coffee fertilizer el salvador.pdf
 - Community Analysis BRO.docx
- o Received on 9-30-2011
 - BRO VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report Template, v3.0_0 2009-2010.docx
- o Received on 10-5-2011
 - BRO VCS PDD Phase I Version 1-2.docx
 - Bull_Run_GIS_NAD27.mdb
 - BRO VCS Carbon Database 2011 ver 3.xlsx
 - Bull_Run_Validation_Hardwood_Pine.kmz
 - Bull_Run_Validation_Error_Matrix.xlsx
- o Received on 10-6-2011
 - ROUND 1 NCRs JLW Response.xlsx
- o Received on 10-24-2011
 - DSC_0001.JPG
 - ROUND 2 NCRs JLW Response.xlsx
 - 20100518_corp_structure.pdf
 - BRO VCS Carbon Database 2011 ver 4 .xlsx
 - BRO Financial Plan for Financial Additionality Analysis ver 2.xlsx
 - BRO VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report Template, v3.0_0 2009-2010 ver 2.docx
 - BRO VCS PDD Phase I Version 2.docx
 - Bull_Run_Validation_Hardwood_Pine_Labels_3.kmz
- o Received on 11-15-2011
 - Copy of ROUND 3 NCRs JLW.xlsx
 - 2011_bro_capital_activity2.pdf
 - BRO VCS Carbon Database 2011 ver 4.xlsx

- BRO Monitoring Report 2011 ver 1-3.docx
- BRO VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report Template, v3.0_0 2009-2010 ver 2.docx
- BRO VCS PDD Phase I Version Final.docx
- BULL RUN_VCS VER_ROUND 1 NCRs JLW.xlsx
- Bull_Run_Centroids.zip
- Bull_Run_Validation_Error_Matrix.xlsx
- o Received on 11-28-2011
 - BRO VCS PDD Phase I Version Final.docx
- o Received on 11-29-2011
 - 20100423_TCT_V54F149 Parcel 7.pdf
 - 20100423_TCT_V54F149 Parcel 7.pdf - Shortcut.Ink
 - Bull_Run_GIS_NAD27_Shapefile.zip
 - 2009_50000_fairweather.pdf
 - 2009_50000_fairweather.pdf - Shortcut.Ink
 - 2010_title_31680.pdf
 - 2010_title_31680.pdf - Shortcut.Ink
 - 20000928_gob_fiat904.pdf
 - 20000928_gob_fiat904.pdf - Shortcut.Ink
 - 20000928_gob_fiat905.pdf
 - 20000928_gob_fiat905.pdf - Shortcut.Ink
 - 20000928_gob_fiat906.pdf
 - 20000928_gob_fiat906.pdf - Shortcut.Ink
 - 20100117 Title Summary Table.xls
 - 20100117 Title Summary Table.xls - Shortcut.Ink
 - 20100423_TCT_V54F147 Parcel 4.pdf
 - 20100423_TCT_V54F147 Parcel 4.pdf - Shortcut.Ink
 - 20100423_TCT_V54F148 Parcel 6.pdf
 - 20100423_TCT_V54F148 Parcel 6.pdf - Shortcut.Ink
- o Received on 12-5-2011
 - 20111205_esi_lands.pdf
 - BAPPA membership.kmz
- o Received on 12-6-2011
 - BRO Monitoring Report 2011 ver 1-3.docx
 - BRO VCS PDD Phase I Version Final.docx
- o Received on 12-7-2011
 - BRO VCS PDD Phase I Version Final.docx
- o Received on 12-12-2011
 - BRO VCS PDD Phase I Version 1-4 Final.docx
- o Received on 1-17-2012
 - 20111204_deed_restriction.docx
- o Received on 2-24-2012
 - BRO VCS PDD Phase I Version 1-5 Final.docx
- o Received on 3-2-2012
 - incumbrance-eastpoint-tctvol54folio149.pdf
 - incumbrance-eastpoint-fiatgrant904-2000.pdf
 - schedulestoincumbrances-pinetree&eastpoint&mpr.pdf
 - receipt-landtitlesunit.pdf
 - Incumbrance-pinetree-tctvol54Folio148.pdf
 - incumbrance-pinetree-fiatgrant906-2000.pdf
 - incumbrance-pinetree-fiatgrant905-2000.pdf
 - incumbrance-MPR-tctvol54folio47.pdf
- o Received on 3-12-2012
 - BRO VCS PDD Phase I Version 1-5 Final.docx
- o Received on 3-14-12
 - BRO VCS PDD Phase I Version 1-6 Final.docx

7 APPENDIX B

Environmental Services, Inc.
Forest Carbon Offsets - Bull Run - VSC Version 3 - Verification
Final Summary Non-Conformity Reports/Clarifications

12 March 2012

Item Number	VCS Standard 3.1 Requirements (15 July 2011)	Applicability to the Project (Y or N/A)	Requirement Met (Y, N, or N/A)	Location in PD or Supporting Documents	CAR/CL/OFI	Response from Client	CAR/CL/OFI	Response from Client	CAR/CL/OFI
3.17.3 Monitoring Report									
1	1) A summary of the project details.	Y	Y	Monitoring Report, Page 4	Please correct the incorrect area (4,650 ha total project boundary, of which 660 are available...) used in Section 1.7 of the Monitoring Report - the PDD states 4,662 ha of which 666.3 are available, which are the same totals in the carbon database and GIS files.	See attached revised monitoring report.	NCR addressed.		
2	3) The data and parameters (both available at validation and monitored) and a description of the monitoring plan.	Y	Y	Monitoring Report	Please ensure any changes made to the PDD during the validation process are made in the final version of the Monitoring Report (i.e., Monitoring Equipment, Description of the Monitoring Plan, etc.). One example of changes that were not made is in the parameter CAB,tree,i,.	See attached revised monitoring report. Error detected in PDD as well and sent under validation NCR response.	Please confirm that the Monitoring Report has been updated to reflect the recent changes in the PDD (v3.1 and next version based on validation requests)	Versions have been updated. NCR addressed.	
Item Number	VCS AFOLU Requirements (REDD) 3.0	Applicability to the Project (Y or N/A)	Requirement Met (Y or N)	Location in PD or Supporting Documents	CAR/CL/OFI	Response from Client			
3	4.6.15 - 2) AUDD: The potential for leakage shall be identified and the project shall address (and describe in the project description) the socio-economic factors that drive deforestation and/or degradation. Leakage shall be calculated by monitoring forested areas surrounding the project and other forested areas within the country susceptible to leakage from project activities.	Y	N	Pages 9 & 19	It is clearly stated in the PDD that "Following the methodology, leakage monitoring is focused on lands owned by the project proponent in Belize. These lands have been monitored and no deforestation has taken place." What evidence, other than the word of the landowner, was used to confirm if leakage took place?	Through evaluation of remote sensing data and ground observations by field workers, no deforestation was found. The only exception is the small area devoted to the coffee trials. That area is included in the project (although conservatively excluded from the calculations).	After further research, ESI understands that a title search in Belize to prove that all lands owned by the landowner were assessed, would be infeasible due to the paper system utilized in Belize. In order to provide us with enough evidence to be "reasonably" assured, please provide us an attestation from the landowner with a parcel map attached stating that these are the only properties owned in Belize.	Provided attestation from landowner including parcel maps.	NCR addressed.