

VERIFICATION OF ADPML PORTEL-PARA REDD PROJECT

The logo for EPIC Sustainability features the company name in a bold, dark blue sans-serif font. To the right of the text is a green graphic element consisting of a thick, curved line that starts below the 'P' in 'Sustainability' and sweeps upwards and to the right, ending under the 'y'.

Document Prepared By: EPIC Sustainability

Project Title	ADPML Portel-Para REDD Project
Version	Version 1.2
Report ID	ESSPL/VCS/2018/050

Report Title	Verification of "ADPML Portel-Para REDD Project"
Client	Avoided Deforestation Project (Manaus) Limited ("ADPML")
Pages	33
Date of Issue	04/082020
Prepared By	EPIC Sustainability Services Pvt. Ltd
Contact	EPIC Sustainability Services Pvt. Ltd. No. 41, Anugraha, 1st Cross Road, Sundarnagar, Near BEL Circle, Gokula Extension, Bengaluru - 560 054, Karnataka State, India. Email: info@epicsustainability.com , epicsustainability@gmail.com Website: http://www.epicsustainability.com/
Approved By	Mr. G. Tanoj Kumar (Director)
Work Carried Out By	Dr. G.Vishnu (Lead Auditor)

Summary:

ADPML has appointed EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited to perform the second periodic verification of the emission reductions reported for the project titled “ADPML Portel-Para REDD Project” (Project ID: 981) for the period from 02-Jan-2012 to 31-Dec-2017 for the net reductions achieved by the project during this period. The verification was based on the validated project description (PD) corresponding validation report, first monitoring and verification reports and other supporting documents made available to the verification team by the client.

The Project *ADPML Portel-Para REDD Project* has established and integrated management system of forests and lands of the indigenous reserve, to ensure its sustainability and to mitigate threats of its conservation and recovery. The objective of avoiding deforestation and degradation in the territory of Portel Municipality, in a forest area of 1,23, 066 Ha comprising of 15 privately owned parcels or “Glebas” is achieved through the implementation of a REDD+ Project. The leakage management area is located within the Land of the Project and is entirely outside the project area. The location of the project is in northwest of Brazil, in the State of Para, micro region of Portel, municipality of Portel.

The verification team identified, through the verification process, 06 CARs. The client has taken actions and submitted to EPIC the revised monitoring report and supporting evidence. The verification team, through the verification process, confirmed that the emission reductions achieved by the project activity during the monitoring period are correctly calculated in the monitoring report, Version 1.3, dated 31st July 2020. Therefore, EPIC has proceeded to certify that the net emission reductions amounting to **95,82,742 tCO₂e** for the period from 02-Jan-2012 to 31-Dec 2017 are accurate, complete, consistent, transparent and free of material error or omission.

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	Verification Process	5
2.1	Method and Criteria	5
2.2	Document Review	6
2.3	Interviews	7
2.4	Site Inspections	8
2.5	Resolution of Findings	9
2.6	Eligibility for Validation Activities	9
3	Validation Findings	9
3.1	Participation under Other GHG Programs	9
3.2	Methodology Deviations	9
3.3	Project Description Deviations	9
3.4	Grouped Project	10
4	Verification Findings	10
4.1	Project Implementation Status	10
4.2	Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations	10
4.3	Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals	12
4.4	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis	12
5	Safeguards	12
5.1	No Net Harm	12
5.2	Local Stakeholder Consultation	13
6	Verification conclusion	14
7	List of documents reviewed	16
APPENDIX I: RESOLUTION OF findings		18
APPENDIX II: NON-PERMANENCE RISK ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST		19

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited (EPIC) has been contracted by ADPML to undertake the second periodic independent verification of the project activity titled “ADPML Portel-Para REDD Project” (Project ID: 981))” and the objective of the verification is as follows:

- To verify that the actual monitoring system and procedures are in full compliance with the system and procedures described in the monitoring plan of validated PD as well as with the applicable methodology;
- To verify the monitoring report with deviations are in compliance with monitoring plan and VCS rules
- To verify that the data reported were accurate, complete, consistent, transparent and free of material error or omission by checking the monitoring records and the emissions reduction calculation; and
- To verify and certify GHG emission reduction reported for the project for the period from **02-Jan-2012 to 31-Dec-2017**.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of the verification was the independent and objective review and ex-post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions from “ADPML Portel-Para REDD Project”. The verification of this project was based on the validated project description (PD), validation report, first monitoring and verification reports and supporting documents made available to the verification team. These documents were reviewed against the requirements of the VCS standard version 3.7, VCS guidelines, the CDM Modalities and Procedures, related rules and guidance, and the VCS Validation and Verification manual Version 3.2.

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

EPIC has performed the verification based on a risk based approach focusing mainly on the significant risks to meet the qualification criteria and the ability to generate VCUs. The work carried out by EPIC is free from any conflict of interest.s

1.3 Level of Assurance

In line with VCS requirements and as per ISO 14064-3:2006 para A.2.3.2, a reasonable level of assurance is defined for the verification of the project. This implies that based on the process and procedures conducted EPIC should state whether the information in the monitoring report is materially correct and is a fair representation of the actual project details, and is prepared in accordance with the VCS requirements and the applied methodology for information pertaining to GHG quantification, monitoring and reporting.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The ADPML Portel-Para REDD Project has established and integrated management system of forests and lands of the indigenous reserve, to ensure its sustainability and to mitigate threats of its conservation and recovery. The objective of avoiding deforestation and degradation, in the project forest area is achieved through the implementation of a REDD+ Project in the territory of Portel Municipality. The project originally comprised of 1,48,975 Ha in 18 privately owned parcels or “Glebas” in the Portel municipality which is now validated to an area of 1,23,066 Ha in 15 Glebas. The location of the project is in northwest of Brazil, in the State of Para, micro region of Portel, municipality of Portel.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Method and Criteria

The verification process consisted of the following phases:

- a document review of the project design documents, monitoring reports and preparation of verification protocol;
- on-site visit to the project activity and interviews with project developer and project consultant;
- resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of final verification report and opinion

The Verification was based on the guidance documents provided by VCS which included the following: VCS Standard version v3.7 Issued: 21 June 2017, Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use Requirements v3.6 Issued: 21 June 2017, VM0015 REDD Methodology Framework, and AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v3.2 and latest valid version of VCS verification template. The verification and sampling plan methodology was based on VCS guidance documents and ISO 14064-3:2006.

For this verification, the audit team has selected to visit only areas on a sampling basis from which emission removals for this verification are claimed. At each site, strata based sampling was followed across the different ages for the trees. Selected leakage areas in leakage belt were also visited. A risk based approach was used to select the samples to allow a review of members targeted to represent a wide geographic range of sites; sufficient to provide the necessary sample size and to meet a reasonable level of assurance.

During the validation and verification, non-fulfilment of the verification protocol criteria or identified risks to the fulfilment of project objectives were raised as either CAR or CR. Corrective Action Requests (CAR) were issued, where:

- mistakes had been made that directly impacted on the project results; or

- VCS requirements had not been met; or
- there was a risk that the project would not be accepted as a VCS project or that emission reductions will not be certified.

The Clarification Requests (CR) were issued where additional information was needed to clarify issues, and Forward Action Requests (FAR) for issues relating to project implementation that required review during the verification of the project activity. The IRs (Information Requests) are requested when additional information was required. The list of the findings are summarised in Appendix I.s

The following team members from EPIC were involved in verification process:

Name	Role	Components reviewed
Dr G Vishnu	Lead Auditor	Completeness check, desk review, onsite inspection, Interview with project representatives and stakeholders issuance of findings, report preparation.
Mr A. Prabu Das	Team member	Desk review, assistance in report preparation
Mr. Ewerton Nazareno	Host Country expert	Onsite inspection, Interview with project representatives and local stakeholders
Mr R. Vijaya Raghavan	Technical Review	Checking and verifying of information related to draft final report.

2.2 Document Review

The verification was performed primarily based on the review of the monitoring report and the supporting documentation. This process included:-

1. review of data and information presented to verify their completeness
2. review of the Project design, Monitoring Plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the monitored parameters and QA/QC requirements, and Internal SOPs.
3. an evaluation of data management and the QA/QC system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of ERs.

The VCS monitoring report, Version 01, was initially reviewed and further EPIC requested the PP to present the supporting evidences. Additional background information and documents related to the project performance were also reviewed by EPIC. Through the process of the verification, the revised monitoring report and the supporting documents were evaluated to confirm the actions taken by the PP to the CARs and CRs issued by EPIC. The documents reviewed by EPIC are listed in references section of this report. EPIC reviewed the final version (Version 1.3) of the monitoring report to confirm that all changes agreed had been incorporated. The entire list of documents reviewed is summarised in Section 7.0.

2.3 Interviews

After the review of the Project description and documents a site visit was carried out from 18th -19th April and 25th to 27th April 2018. During the site visit physical inspection of the project components followed by interviews with the on-site personnel was carried out to verify the project details. A follow-up meeting was also conducted with the project representatives. The following persons were interviewed.

Name Designation	Location of interview	Company	Interview Topics
Mr Michael Greene CEO	STA Office at Belem	Representing ADPML project top management	Project design, Project implementation, Procedures, Monitoring plan and Procedures
Mr Demerson (Head – Monitoring team)	STA Office at Belem	STA solutions	Monitoring plan and Procedures, Training details, field measurement
Raneiry Branco Forestry Engineer	STA Office at Belem	STA solutions	Monitoring, collation and QC of data
David Vale Forestry Engineer	STA Office at Belem	Subcontract	Monitoring, GIS mapping and analysis
Mr Dercky Martins	STA Office at Belem	STA solutions	Monitoring plan and Procedures, GIS mapping and analysis
Dr. Evelise Pires	STA Office at Belem	BLB Florestal Representação	Legal documents, land rights, community benefits. Social development
Mr Kevin Tremain	STA Office at Belem	Representing ADPML project	Developing monitoring report
Mr. Silvio da Silva	Portel Municipality	Subcontract	patrolling activities, community benefits
Mr Demerson (Head – Monitoring team)	San Jorge and Boavista I	STA solutions	Field measurements, Species identification, data entry
a) Domingus Lopes b) Ivanice Saldhana c) Claudio Ceasar d) Leonardo Aquino e) Marinilda Aquino f) Raimunda Barbosa g) Cristina Da Silva	Riberinhos community	Local stakeholders	Conservation practices followed, awareness of project policies, Benefits from project implementation.
Mr Demerson (Head – Monitoring team) Mr Vander	2 locations were visited in Leakage area	STA solutions	patrolling activities, community benefits

2.4 Site Inspections

The sampling criteria for the site inspections conducted were based on the project area as described in section 2.1. Out of the 15 land parcels 4 parcels were visited.

The on-site assessment which was conducted as a part of the verification activity involved:

1. *An assessment of the implementation and operation of the VCS project activity as per the registered PD*
2. *A review of information flows of the project design for generating, aggregating and reporting of the monitoring parameters*
3. *Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the Monitoring Plan*
4. *A cross-check between information provided in the MR and data from other sources*
5. *An assessment of the project boundaries and leakage management areas by visual inspection of selected locations.*
6. *Site visit to randomly selected number of inventory sampling plots which were part of the carbon stock inventory of this monitoring period which were re-measured by the project proponent's staff under observation from audit team.*
7. *A review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and ERs, and*
8. *An identification of QA/QC procedures in place to prevent, or identify and correct, any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters.*

After the review of the Project description and documents a site visit was carried out from 18th to 19th and 25th to 27th April 2018. During the site visit physical inspection of the project components followed by interviews with the on-site personnel was carried out to verify the project details. A follow-up meeting was also conducted with the project representatives.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the verification was to resolve the corrective action requests and clarifications and any other outstanding issues which needed to be clarified prior to EPIC positive conclusion on the monitoring report and the project design. During the verification process 06 CARs, were raised. FARs raised during the first verification was also addressed by the PP.

All the findings were resolved during this phase. In order to ensure the transparency of the validation process, the concerns raised and responses that were given are summarized in Appendix I of this report and documented in more detail. All the corrective actions have been incorporated into the revised documents.

Internal quality control

A Technical Reviewer is appointed to review the final draft verification report and the final verification report. The comments made by the Technical Reviewer are taken into consideration and incorporated in the final report. The final report (after resolutions of all findings) is then submitted to the Head – Operations for review and approval.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

No FARs are raised during this verification process.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

EPIC is accredited for validation and verification for the scopes 1 to 16 by CDM UNFCCC and as well as by the VCS board.

3. VALIDATION FINDINGS

No Validation activities were performed and is not applicable.

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

The project has not applied for other GHG programs such as CDM, GS, etc. The same is verified through the interview with the PP confirming that the project is not claiming any other environmental credits under any national and international crediting mechanisms and further confirmed by the declaration provided. The verification team also checked the international credits trading systems to assess double counting risks and the web links for the same have been listed in the section 7 of this report.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

No methodology deviations found in this monitoring period.

3.3 Project Description Deviations

Two project deviations are observed during this verification period:

- a) From the earlier validated and verified risk assessment score of 13.75, now the assessment score is revised to 11.75, based on the change in status of the project during the verification period. However this change does not impact the overall project design or implementation. The revised risk score was verified to be in accordance with the implemented project plan. There are no other project deviations during this verification period.
- b) The deviations for this period related to the removal of land parcels from the originally validated 18 land parcels. The legal documents for the land ownership for the 15 land parcels have been reviewed as valid and the removal of 3 land parcels – Bela Vista, Almerin and Vista Alegre has been verified. Further a written declaration from the PP based on third party legal opinion has also been provided for proof of ownership of the land parcels. This has resulted in a reduction of project area from originally validated 148975 Hectares to 123066 Hectares. The calculation of VERs and AFOLU analysis has also been updated to reflect the same.

3.4 Grouped Project

Not Applicable.

3.5 Validation of Safeguards

The information provided in the monitoring report submitted was verified for the no-net harm criteria and the ongoing local stakeholder consultations.

4. VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

The verification based on the onsite observation, found that there is no material discrepancies between the project implementation and the project description. The verification team checked the status of monitoring plan the completeness of monitoring system and found no discrepancies between the actual monitoring system and the monitoring plan set in the validated project description. The project has not applied for under any other GHG scheme and there will not be any double counting. The verification team was able to conclude the project has been implemented as described in the validated project description conform to the eligibility criteria.

4.2 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

The verification of all the data ex-ante and data ex-post (monitoring parameters) including data measurement, data transfer, data archiving, aggregation and calculation of baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage emissions are tabulated below.

Parameter	Source considered and value applied	Conclusion by the verification team
RRD Forest / Non-Forest cover benchmark Map	Based on satellite images and is fixed at the start of every baseline period and field verification of deforested areas if any.	The satellite images based on LANDSAT and field verification indicated the parameter is monitored to meet the requirements as per monitoring plan.
Project area forest cover benchmark map	Based on satellite images and is fixed at the start of every baseline period and field verification of deforested areas if any.	The satellite images based on LANDSAT and field verification indicated the parameter is monitored to meet the requirements as per monitoring plan.
Leakage belt forest cover benchmark map	Based on satellite images and is fixed at the start of every baseline period and field verification of deforested areas if any.	The satellite images based on LANDSAT and field verification indicated the parameter is monitored to meet the requirements as per monitoring plan.

Annual area of baseline deforestation in the reference region at year t	Calculated based on the results from future deforestation model using peer-reviewed software IDRISI Selva and field verification of deforested areas if any.	The excel sheet calculations were reviewed to be in line with the applied equations as per the validated PD. The calculations confirm to this verification period and there are no deviations.						
Annual area of baseline deforestation in the project area at year t	Calculated based on the results from future deforestation model using peer-reviewed software IDRISI Selva and field verification of deforested areas if any.	The excel sheet calculations were reviewed to be in line with the applied equations as per the validated PD. The calculations confirm to this verification period and there are no deviations.						
Annual area of baseline deforestation in the leakage belt at year t	Calculated based on the results from future deforestation model using peer-reviewed software IDRISI Selva and field verification of deforested areas if any.	The excel sheet calculations were reviewed to be in line with the applied equations as per the validated PD. The calculations confirm to this verification period and there are no deviations.						
LULC Change	Percentage of forest that change to non-forest final classes during the historical reference period and during this verification period, monitored by LANDSAT maps and field verification of deforested areas if any. Summarised in AFOLU analysis.	The AFOLU analysis submitted was reviewed to be in line with the requirements as per the validated PD.						
Displacement Leakage factor (DLF)	Value of zero applied as per VM0015 requirements	No deviation is observed from the validated PD.						
Percentage of the overlapping leakage belts area to be assigned to project	- Map of distance to selective logging from tertiary roads - Map of distance to rivers - Project area forest cover benchmark map	The maps submitted were reviewed to meet the requirements as per monitoring plan.						
Risk factor used to calculate VCS buffer credits	AFOLU Non-permanence Risk Tool V3.2 was applied to calculate the risk factor and risk assessment is submitted to VVB	The risk assessment was reviewed and the detailed assessment is attached as Annex 2 of this report. The value of 11.75% is used for this verification period.						
Ex ante estimated effectiveness index	Calculated value as follows: <table><tr><td>0.2</td><td>years 1 - 5</td></tr><tr><td>0.5</td><td>years 6 - 10</td></tr><tr><td>0.8</td><td>years 11 - 30</td></tr></table>	0.2	years 1 - 5	0.5	years 6 - 10	0.8	years 11 - 30	The excel sheet calculations were reviewed to be in line with the applied equations as per the validated PD. The calculations confirm to this verification period and there are no deviations.
0.2	years 1 - 5							
0.5	years 6 - 10							
0.8	years 11 - 30							

The PP submitted emission reduction calculations and other supporting calculations in excel sheets in a excel sheet. The excel sheets are clear, un-protected and easily viewable. The calculation in the excel sheet is verified and found be correct. The methods and formulae set out in the project description for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage are correctly followed in the monitoring report and ER calculation sheet.

All the values are provided in the MR and ER calculation sheet are cross verified with its sources and confirmed no manual transposition errors between data sets have occurred. Also the consistency of values within MR is checked and found to be OK.

Hence verification team conclude that the GHG emission reductions and removals have been quantified correctly in accordance with the project description and applied methodology.

4.3 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

The GHG removals for the project reporting period are based on forest inventory measurements and calculation procedures and factors that have been assessed by the verification team, as described in Section 4.2 of this report. The verification team has attained a reasonable level of assurance that these measurements and procedures, including the internal quality control measures such as check plots, were designed and have been implemented to the highest level of quality. The verification team interviewed personnel from the client relevant to the project and confirmed their qualifications and expertise. Further the QA/ QC procedures adopted by client for the monitoring of the GHG emission reductions were found to conform with the project design and monitoring plan which ensured a high degree of data reliability.

4.4 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

The verification team reviewed the Non-Permanence Risk Assessment provided at project validation. Though there has been no change regarding the overall status or applicability of any of the risk factors since project validation, including political factors, socio-economic factors, environmental factors, or factors relating to implementation of project activities, a revision of the risk assessment was undertaken during this verification due to which the non-permanence risk rating is revised to 11.75% from earlier applied value of 13.75%. The verification team therefore concludes that the risk rating is appropriate for the current reporting period. Please refer to the Non-permanence risk report version 02 uploaded along with the MR for a detailed description of the steps taken to assess the non-permanence risk rating determined by the project proponent. The verification team's assessment of the non-permanence risk rating is attached with this report as Appendix II.

5 SAFEGUARDS

5.1 No Net Harm

Section 2.4of the monitoring report describes the activities carried out during this verification period related to the community and environmental safeguards, within the constitutional and legal framework of the municipality. As observed during 2012 to 2017, project activities have continued to encourage the active participation of local stakeholders of the indigenous communities who live in the leakage management area.

The validation team has assessed that no significant environmental loss events are reported for the current monitoring period from the review of the patrolling activities and conservation measures implemented. Also as there are no communities living within the project area, the no-net harm criteria is applicable for communities which live in the leakage management area. As the project is already validated under CCB and verification is planned to be done, the audit team has considered the justification provided by PP that communities have only benefited during this verification period to be acceptable. The audit team has reviewed the documents supporting the outcome of the PRAs conducted as part of the ongoing local stakeholder consultation process to confirm the same.

Survey meetings were conducted and as capacity building exercise, cook stoves were distributed. Hence during this verification, the impact on community benefits was observed to be overall positive. The conclusion obtained is that the net benefit of the Project on climate community and biodiversity is maintained as positive, compared with the negative impact that would continue to occur in a scenario without Project.

As there is no net harm, therefore no mitigation is necessary as justified by the PP which is acceptable.

5.2 Local Stakeholder Consultations

Since the start date of the project in January 1st 2008 , direct communication has been maintained with the local communities about the various aspects of the project in line with requirements as per the validated PDD. For the current verification period, the workshops, awareness and training exercises conducted were considered as the project maintaining the community level dialogue and participation.

As observed during 2012 to 2017, project activities have continued to encourage the active participation of local stakeholders of the indigenous communities who live in the leakage management area. Though based on specific needs of the community, some changes were adopted for the implementation plan such as provision of wi-fi connection, overall no major updates were necessary. The validation team has reviewed photographs and documents of survey meetings to verify the information.

6 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited has been engaged by ADPML to perform the second periodic verification of the emission reductions reported for the project titled “ADPML Portel-Para REDD Project” (Project ID: 981) for the period from 02-Jan-2012 to 31-Dec-2017 for the net reductions achieved by the project. The verification was based on the validated project description (PD), corresponding validation report, monitoring report, emission reduction spread sheets and other supporting documents made available to EPIC verification team by the project participant.

The management of project proponents are responsible for the preparation and reporting of GHG emissions data, and the reported GHG emissions reduction on the basis set out within the project monitoring plan.

It is the responsibility of EPIC verification team to express an independent GHG verification opinion on the GHG emissions from the project for the monitoring period starting from 02-Jan-2012 to 31-Dec-2017 based on the net reductions achieved and on the calculation of GHG emission reductions from the project based on the verified emissions for the same period.

The verification was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the VCS Validation and Verification manual Version 3.2 and VCS Standard 3.7. As a result of the verification, the verification team confirms that for the reporting period:

- the project is implemented as described in the validated PD
- the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved monitoring methodology applied by the project activity
- The monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the validated PD
- the monitoring aspects (i.e. additional monitoring parameters, monitoring frequency and calibration frequency) were in place and functional, with the monitoring procedures in place for generating emission reduction operating appropriately and the calibration of all the equipment had been carried out accordingly, and
- the GHG emission reductions achieved were calculated correctly on the basis of approved monitoring methodology.

We have verified that the information included in the final monitoring report (Version 1.3, dated 31st July 2020) was correct and that the emission reductions achieved had been determined correctly. In our opinion, the GHG emission reductions for the period from 02-Jan-2012 to 31-Dec-2017 in the verified monitoring report for the project are fairly stated.

EPIC confirms that the GHG emission reductions were calculated without material misstatements for the whole monitoring period. Our opinion is based on the project’s GHG emissions and resulting GHG emission reductions reported, and, to the valid and validated project baseline and monitoring documents.

We confirm the following:

Verification period: From [02-January-2012] to [31-December-2017]

Year	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Risk rating %	Buffer pool (VCUs)	Tradable (VCUs)
2012*	17,96,561	11.75%	2,11,096	15,85,465
2013	17,96,561	11.75%	2,11,096	15,85,465
2014	17,97,375	11.75%	2,11,192	15,86,184
2015	17,97,375	11.75%	2,11,192	15,86,184
2016	17,97,375	11.75%	2,11,192	15,86,184
2017	18,73,385	11.75%	2,20,123	16,53,262

*the date starts from 2nd January 2012 subsequent date from first verification

Verified GHG emission reductions and removals in the above verification period:

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCUs after applying buffer
2012*	3,99,187	3,19,350	544	17,96,561	15,85,465
2013	3,99,187	3,19,350	544	17,96,561	15,85,465
2014	3,99,191	1,99,595	340	17,97,375	15,86,184
2015	3,99,191	1,99,595	340	17,97,375	15,86,184
2016	3,99,191	1,99,595	340	17,97,375	15,86,184
2017	3,99,211	1,99,606	340	18,73,385	16,53,262
Total				1,08,58,632	95,82,742

*the date starts from 2nd January 2012 subsequent date from first verification

Prepared and submitted by:



Dr G Vishnu (Lead Auditor)

7 LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

S.No.	Document details
1	VCS validated PDD for ADPML
2	VCS validation report for ADPML
3	VCS first MR for ADPML
4	VCS first verification report for ADPML
5	VCS Monitoring report for second verification version 1.1
6	VCS Monitoring report for second verification version 1.3
7	Non- permanence risk report for second verification version 01 and supporting documents
8	Non- permanence risk report for second verification version 2.0 and supporting documents
9	VCS Standard version v3.7 Issued: 21 June 2017
10	Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use Requirements v3.6 Issued: 21 June 2017
11	Non-Permanence Risk Report of second verification and "VCS Risk Report Calculation Tool".
12	Calculation tables VM 0015 – worksheets for baseline emissions
13	Calculation tables VMD 0015 – worksheets for project emissions
14	Calculation tables VMD 0015 – worksheets for leakage
15	Excel Worksheet for risk assessment
16	Calculation tables VMD 0015 – carbon stock change per hectare and emission calculation
17	Annex 1 : employment letters issued for this verification – appointment of new staff and declaration on work conditions from staff members
18	Annex 2: Conservation agreement for ADPML
19	Annex 3: CV of management, operational and consulting staff in ADPML
20	Annex 4: Adaptive management plan
21	Annex 5: Monitoring of sample plots: templates, guides and results of monitoring of

	some sample plots.
22	Annex 6: Evidence of land ownership for the 15 parcels of ADPML and carbon ownership
23	Annex 7: Third party legal opinion on title ownership
24	Written declaration from PP on the ownership of land parcels as per the project deviation
25	Annex 8: financial projection and estimates
26	Annex 9: Evidences for periodic patrolling activities (patrol logs) routes, maps, routes of surveillance and control results, fires warnings results, testimony from patrolling crew
27	Annex 10: community benefits – training and awareness programmes
28	Annex 11: Evidences about implementation of actions with regard to land titles – rose wood plot files
29	Annex 12: evidences for Cookstove distribution to communities
30	Annex 13: AFOLU deforestation model and GIS analysis on land use change
31	Annex 14: Legal opinion on certificate of land ownership
32	Annex 15: Declaration on the participation and generation of credits under other GHG programs
33	Photographs of meetings with community leaders
34	Record of survey and one to one meetings with community

WEB LINKS ACCESSED:

<https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/projsearch.html>

https://mer.markit.com/br-reg/public/index.jsp?name=ADPML%20Portel-Para%20REDD%20Project&entity=project&entity_domain=Markit,GoldStandard

APPENDIX I: RESOLUTION OF FINDINGS

ID	FINDINGS	RESPONSE BY PP	VVB OPINION
CAR 1	The Land ownership records pertaining to the project activity has not been submitted.	The land ownership records for the 5 parcels are submitted.	The submitted land records have been reviewed and there are no changes from the validation stage. CAR 1 Resolved
CAR 2	Sustainable development activities implemented during this monitoring period is not indicated in the MR	The section 2.1 of the MR tabulates the sustainable activities carried out during this period and evidence is submitted for the same.	The information in the revised MR and the evidences has been reviewed. CAR 2 Resolved
CAR 3	The risk assessment submitted does not provide valid reference for estimation of governance risk	The revised risk assessment (ver 3.2) performed using the VCS tool is submitted along with the worksheet	The revised risk assessment report submitted is reviewed to meet the requirements. CAR 03 Resolved
CAR 04	The details of the patrolling activities carried out for this monitoring period along with the evidences is not submitted.	The patrolling activities carried out along with the patrolling logs is submitted.	The submitted evidence is reviewed to meet the requirements. CAR 04 Resolved
CAR 05	The land use change analysis is not submitted	The AFOLU analysis is now submitted.	The AFOLU analysis has been reviewed and it is in line with the

			monitoring information as per the validated PD. Due to the verified project deviation related to the removal of land parcels the updated AFOLU analysis has been verified to reflect the same. CAR 05 Resolved
CAR 06	The declaration that the project has not applied under any other GHG mechanism and has not generated credits for this verification period under any other carbon crediting mechanism is not provided.	The declaration from the projects top management is now submitted to this effect	The declaration letter provided by the PP is reviewed and satisfies the requirement. CAR 06 Resolved
FAR DURING FIRST VERIFICATION	1. PP is encourage to assure that at the next Monitoring Report it clearly reports the vintages of VCUs generated during the monitoring period covered by the Monitoring Report 2. PP is encourage to update the Project Description in the original VCS PD to reflect the additional and new information which result from the approved deviations as part of this verification 3. PP is encourage to look at the current documentation and maps used by the project as these are generally very course and/or lacking useful information which could lead to the issuance of CLs and CARs.	1. The monitoring report submitted for this verification clearly indicates the generated VCUs according to vintages 2. During second verification deviations have been listed and supporting documents submitted to the VVB. 3. The monitoring plan is validated and is being implemented for this verification accordingly. The methodology does not infer to usage of specific mapping accuracy. However PP has used maps whatever is best available and up to date to confirm with the requirements. For this verification period, leakage	Based on replies from PP, review of evidences and discusson with the monitoring team, the FARs have been satisfactorily resolved.

	Improvements will also enable further efficiencies within the project management.	has been monitored using a 2018 Landsat TM image. Detailed AFOLU analysis along with maps have been submitted to the VVB.	
--	---	---	--

APPENDIX II: NON-PERMANENCE RISK ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Risk Factor	Risk Factor and/or Mitigation Description	Risk rating as per PP	Justification by PP	Method of verification
INTERNAL RISKS				
Project Management				
a)	Species planted (where applicable) associated with more than 25% of the stocks on which GHG credits have previously been issued are not native or proven to be adapted to the same or similar agro-ecological zone(s) in which the project is located.	NA	Not applicable	Not applicable as it is not A/R activity
b)	Ongoing enforcement to prevent encroachment by outside actors is required to protect more than 50% of stocks on which GHG	0	Patrolling activities were performed as per the monitoring plan	Based on Onsite inspection and interviews. Review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable.

	credits have previously been issued.			
c)	Management team does not include individuals with significant experience in all skills necessary to successfully undertake all project activities (i.e., any area of required experience is not covered by at least one individual with at least 5 years experience in the area).	0	The project team CVs have been submitted with requirements of at least 5 years experience.	Based on Onsite inspection and interviews. Review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable.
d)	Management team does not maintain a presence in the country or is located more than a day of travel from the project site, considering all parcels or polygons in the project area.	2	The management team does not have an office at Portel. In Belem office is functioning.	Based on Onsite inspection and interviews. The score assigned is acceptable.
e)	Mitigation: Management team includes individuals with significant experience in AFOLU project design and implementation, carbon accounting and reporting (e.g., individuals who have successfully managed projects through validation, verification and issuance of GHG credits) under the VCS	0	The development of MR for this period was done by Kanaka Management Services Private Limited (KMSPL), a consultant with considerable experience in carbon accounting, reporting and verification.	Onsite inspection and interviews. Review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable.

	Program or other approved GHG programs.			
f)	Mitigation: Adaptive management plan in place.	-2	The management team has developed an adaptative management plan and it is Presented to VVB.	Onsite inspection and interviews. Review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable.
Total Project Management [a + b + c + d + e + f]		0	Risk rating perceived is appropriate in this section considering all applicable criteria	Applicable as above
Financial Viability				
a)	Project cash flow breakeven point is greater than 10 years from the current risk assessment.	NA	Not applicable	Not applicable
b)	Project cash flow breakeven point is between 7 and up to 10 years from the current risk assessment	NA	Not applicable	Not applicable
c)	Project cash flow breakeven point between 4 and up to 7 years from the current risk assessment.	1	The breakeven point was between 4 th and 7 th years. The excel sheet for financial projections and accounting is submitted to VVB	Review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable.
d)	Project cash flow breakeven point is less than 4 years from the current risk	0	Not applicable	Not applicable

	assessment.			
e)	Project has secured less than 15% of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven	NA	NA	NA
f)	Project has secured 15% to less than 40% of funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven.	NA	NA	NA
g)	Project has secured 40% to less than 80% of funding needed to cover the total cash out required before the project reaches breakeven	1	This was fulfilled as described in the PD. The financial analysis is submitted	Review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable.
h)	Project has secured 80% or more of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven.	NA	NA	NA
i)	Mitigation: Project has available as callable financial resources at least	0	It is verified from the project financial plan that the project had available, as financial resources, at least 50% of the cash needed	Based on review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable.

	50% of total cash out before project reaches breakeven.		before breakeven threshold was reached.	
	Total Financial Viability (FV) [as applicable, ((a, b, c or d) + (e, f, g or h) + i)]	2	Risk rating perceived is appropriate in this section considering all applicable criteria	Applicable as above
Opportunity Cost				
a)	NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be at least 100% more than that associated with project activities; or where baseline activities are subsistence-driven, net positive community impacts are not demonstrated.	8	NPV analysis is submitted	There is no change from risk score from previous verification. Based on review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable.
b)	NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be between 50% and up to 100% more than from project activities.	NA	Not applicable	Not applicable

c)	NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be between 20% and up to 50% more than from project activities.	NA	Not applicable	Not applicable
d)	NPV from the most profitable alternative land use activity is expected to be between 20% more than and up to 20% less than from project activities; or where baseline activities are subsistence-driven, net positive community impacts are demonstrated.	NA	Not applicable	Not applicable
e)	NPV from project activities is expected to be between 20% and up to 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity.	NA	Not applicable	Not applicable

f)	NPV from project activities is expected to be at least 50% more profitable than the most profitable alternative land use activity.	NA	Not applicable	Not applicable
g)	Mitigation: Project proponent is a non-profit organization.	NA	The proponent is not a non-profit as verified from the documents submitted.	Review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable
h)	Mitigation: Project is protected by legally binding commitment (see Section 2.2.4) to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period.	0	The Project is protected by legally binding commitment from the landowner to protect the Project Area in perpetuity as indicated in Conservation agreement	Based on review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable
i)	Mitigation: Project is protected by legally binding commitment (see Section 2.2.4) to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over at least 100 years.	-8	The Project is protected by legally binding commitment from the landowner to protect the Project Area in perpetuity as indicated in Conservation agreement	There is no change from risk score from previous verification. Based on review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable.
	Total Opportunity Cost (OC) [as applicable, (a, b,	0	Risk rating perceived is appropriate in this	Applicable as above

	c, d, e or f) + (g or h)]		section considering all applicable criteria	
Project Longevity				
a)	Without legal agreement or requirement to continue the management practice.	0	The Project is protected by legally binding commitment from the landowner to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period	There is no change from risk score from previous verification. Based on review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable.
b)	With legal agreement or requirement to continue the management practice.	0	The Project is protected by legally binding commitment from the landowner to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period The deviations for this period related to the removal of land parcels from the originally validated 18 land parcels. The legal documents for the land ownership for the 15 land parcels have been reviewed as valid and the the removal of 3 land parcels – Bela Vista, Almerin and Vista Alegre has been verified. Further a written declaration from the PP based on third party legal opinion has also been provided for proof of ownership of the land parcels. This has resulted in a reduction of project area from originally validated 148975 Hectares to 123066 Hectares. The calculation of VERs and AFOLU analysis has also been updated to reflect the same.	There is no change from risk score from previous verification. Based on review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable.
c)	Total Project Longevity	0	Risk rating perceived is appropriate in this	Applicable as above

	(PL)		section considering all applicable criteria	
d)	Total Internal Risk (PM + FV + OC + PL)	0	Risk rating perceived is appropriate in this section considering all applicable criteria	Applicable as above
EXTERNAL RISKS				
Land Tenure and Resource Access/Impacts				
a)	Ownership and resource access/use rights are held by same entity(s).	0	Carbon is under control of the Project Proponent as indicated in carbon ownership documents	There is no change from risk score from previous verification. Based on review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable.
b)	Ownership and resource access/use rights are held by different entity(s) (e.g., land is government owned and the project proponent holds a lease or concession).	NA	Ownership and resource access/use rights are held by the same entity. Thus this factor doesn't apply	Based on Site visit , interviews and land ownership records. The score assigned is acceptable.
c)	In more than 5% of the project area, there exist disputes over land tenure or ownership.	NA	The Project's Boundary is legally owned private land as proved by the evidence on ownership	There is no change from risk score from previous verification. Based on review of documents submitted. The score assigned is acceptable.
d)	There exist disputes over access/use rights (or overlapping rights).	NA	The Project's Boundary is legally owned private land and hence this is not applicable.	There is no change from risk score from previous verification. Based on site visit and review of documents submitted. The score assigned is

				acceptable.
e)	WRC projects unable to demonstrate that potential upstream and sea impacts that could undermine issued credits in the next 10 years are irrelevant or expected to be insignificant, or that there is a plan in place for effectively mitigating such impacts.	NA	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
f)	Mitigation: Project area is protected by legally binding commitment (e.g., a conservation easement or protected area) to continue management practices that protect carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period.	-2	The Project is protected by legally binding commitment from the landowner to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period	Site visit , interviews and review of documents. The score assigned is acceptable as there is no change in status from the previous verification
g)	Mitigation: Where disputes over land tenure, ownership or access/use rights exist, documented evidence is provided that projects have implemented activities to resolve the disputes or clarify overlapping claims.	NA	The Project's Boundary is legally owned private land and hence this is not applicable.	Not applicable
	Total Land Tenure (LT) [as applicable, ((a or b) + c + d	0	Risk rating perceived is appropriate in this	Applicable as above

	+ e+ f + g)]		section considering all applicable criteria	
Community Engagement				
a)	Less than 50 percent of households living within the project area, who are reliant on the project area, have been consulted.	10	Community engagement is in process and the implementation during this verification with evidences are provided. However CCB verification is yet to be initiated.	Based on Site visit , interviews and review of documents. The score assigned is acceptable.
b)	Less than 20 percent of households living within 20 km of the project boundary outside the project area, and who are reliant on the project area, have been consulted.	0	Not applicable	Site visit , interviews and review of documents. The score assigned is acceptable.
c)	Mitigation: The project generates net positive impacts on the social and economic well being of the local communities who derive livelihoods from the project area	0	Not applicable	Site visit , interviews and review of documents. The score assigned is acceptable.
d)	Total Community Engagement (CE) [where applicable, (a+b+c)]	10	Risk rating perceived is appropriate in this section considering all applicable criteria	Applicable as above
Political risk				
a)	Governance score of less	NA	Not applicable	Not applicable

	than -0.79.			
b)	Governance score of -0.79 to less than -0.32.	NA	Not applicable	Not applicable
c)	Governance score of --0.32 to less than 0.19.	NA	Not applicable	Not applicable
d)	Governance score of -0.19 to less than 0.82.	2	Average score of all six indicators for the five most recent years (20012-2017) is -0.44 http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/?fileName=wgidataset_stata.zip	From the review of documents. The score assigned is acceptable.
e)	Governance score of 0.82 or higher.	NA	Not applicable	Not applicable
f)	Mitigation: Country is implementing REDD+ Readiness or other activities, as set out in this Section 2.3.3.	-2	Brazil has the following on-going initiatives for REDD+ as verified from document review: a) The country is receiving REDD+ Readiness funding from the FCPF, UN-REDD or other bilateral or multilateral donors b) The country is participating in the CCBA/CARE REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards Initiative c) The jurisdiction in which the project is located is participating in the Governors' Climate and Forest Taskforce d) The country has an established national FSC or PEFC standards body	From the review of documents the score assigned is acceptable. The score has been revised from 0 during previous verification, considering the justification by the PP which is appropriate.

			e) The country has an established DNA under the CDM and has at least one registered CDM A/R project"	
g)	Total Political (PC) [as applicable ((a, b, c, d or e) + f)]	0	Risk rating perceived is appropriate in this section considering all applicable criteria	Applicable as above
	Total External Risk (LT + CE + PC)	10	Risk rating perceived is appropriate in this section considering all applicable criteria	Applicable as above
NATURAL RISKS				
F	Fire	0.5	The fire risk significance is rated as Minor (5% to less than 25% loss of carbon stocks). For this verification no losses above this threshold were reported.	Site visit inspection and from the review of documents. The score assigned is acceptable.
PD	Pest and Disease Outbreaks	0	The risk due to Pest and Disease Outbreaks is rated as not applicable,	The score assigned is acceptable.
W	Extreme Weather	1	The extreme weather risk significance probability is once in 10 years. For this verification no losses were reported.	The score assigned is acceptable.
G	Geological Risk	0	The geological risk is rated as Minor (5% to less than 25% loss of carbon stocks). For this verification no losses were reported.	The score assigned is acceptable.
ON	Other Natural risk	0.25	The risk due to Global Phenomenon affecting the weather patterns are Insignificant (less	The score assigned is acceptable.

			than 5% loss of carbon stocks). For this verification no losses were reported.	
	Total Natural Risk (as applicable, F + PD + W + G + ON)	1.75	Risk rating perceived is appropriate in this section considering all applicable criteria. The applied mitigation scores to each of fire, pest, extreme weather and geological risk is acceptable.	Applicable as above

Risk Category	Risk rating	Requirements for risk rating
a) Internal risk	0	Note: - Overall risk rating shall be rounded up to the nearest whole percentage. - The minimum risk rating shall be 10, regardless of the risk rating calculated. - If the overall risk rating is over 60 then the project fails the entire risk analysis.
b) External risk	10	
c) Natural risk	1.75	
Overall Risk rating a) + b) + c)	11.75	
Total risk assessment buffer applicable	11.75%	VVB Assessment: The buffer applied reflects the risk rating as applicable to the project activity and meets the requirements of AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool.