

PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

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

Review Type	CCB Validation & Verification
Project ID	1566
Project Name	REDD+ Project Resguardo Indígena Unificado - Selva de Matavén (RIU-SM)
Program(s)	CCB/VCS
Verification Period	01 January, 2018 – 31 December, 2019
Project Proponent	Asociación de Cabildos y Autoridades Tradicionales Indígenas de la Selva de Matavén – ACATISEMA MEDIAMOS F&M S.A.S. company
Methodology	VM0007, REDD Methodology Modules (REDD-MF), v1.4
Sectoral Scope(s)	14: AFOLU
VVB	Instituto Colombiano de Normas Técnicas y Certificación - ICONTEC
Assessment Criteria	<i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1</i>
Date of First Issue	16 June 2022
Assessment Conclusion	Closed
Date of Final Issue	9 September 2022

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS			
#	Description	Response	Status
1	<p>Local language summary: The VVB must request the project include the summary of benefits table from Section 1 of the project description in the local language summary. The project description summary does not currently include this table.</p> <p>Program rule: <i>CCB Program Rules, v3.1 Section 3.5.12</i></p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: The Project Proponents included the tables of Section 1 of the PDD-CCB at the beginning of the Summary of the PDD-CCB in local language (Spanish) as Section “RESUMEN DE BENEFICIOS DEL PROYECTO”, Subsections “Beneficios únicos del proyecto” and “Métricas de beneficios estandarizadas”.</p> <p>Verra Review: The Project proponent has included Table 1 from the PD in the Spanish PD summary. This change is sufficient to close this finding, no further changes are required.</p>	Closed
2	<p>Stakeholder identification: The VVB must request the project proponent update Section 2.1.6 of the project description to include an explanation of how they determined that the 6 ethnicities residing within the project area are the only groups that met the criteria for stakeholders. Additionally, the project proponent must include an explanation of how all subgroups within these ethnicities are impacted equally. Section 2.1.6 needs to detail the criteria and processes that the PP has used to determine what groups are identified as stakeholders in the project. If subgroups are impacted differently, they need to be broken out into separate stakeholder groups.</p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: The Project Proponents (PPs) presented in Section 2.1.6 of the PDD-CCB a differentiation of key/main stakeholders, secondary stakeholders and community groups, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key/Main: 315 indigenous communities that inhabit the territory of the RIU-SM. • Secondary: teachers, settlers, government institutions, NGOs and other neighboring indigenous communities. • Community groups: women, men, youth, traditional authorities and 6 ethnic groups. <p>The PPs have updated Section 2.1.6 of the PDD-CCB and now explain that the 6 ethnic groups mentioned in the finding correspond to a categorization that cuts across the key/main stakeholders, some</p>	Closed

<p>Program rule: <i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards,</i> v3.1, Section G1.5</p>	<p>secondary ones and the identified community groups, since all they are part of the group of indigenous communities of the RIU-SM.</p> <p>They also explain that for the identification of these stakeholders, the criteria indicated in the SBIA Manual - Part 1 were considered and that the processes applied consist of the analysis of information and documentation that was available and in the direct relations with the indigenous communities in workshops and socialization meetings, agreement and training from the first phases of the Project.</p> <p>The PPs explain how the impacts of the Project are expected to affect all communities and community groups in an equitable manner, based on the unity of the peoples of the indigenous reservation, in the organizational structure of ACATISEMA (which includes all levels of hierarchy of the indigenous authorities of the RIU-SM) and in the participation of members of the 6 ethnic groups in the different events that they carry out in the exercise of their governance.</p> <p>In addition, the PPs explain that the 6 ethnic groups are not the only groups taken into account in the stakeholder identification process in Section 1.6, but rather, according to the relationship they have with the RIU-SM, other groups were identified, such as government institutions (which determine, develop and implement policies for the protection of local communities and natural resources), NGOs (which provide or have provided services that contribute to achieving the objectives of the Project) and other indigenous communities neighboring the RIU-SM.</p> <p>On the other hand, in the Validation and Verification Reports - CCB issued by ICONTEC for the REDD+ Project RIU-SM, Section "2.4 Interviews", it is described how the stakeholders participated in the meetings held during the on-site visit carried out by the audit team as part of the validation and verification processes of the Project under the CCB standard, especially on the following days and places:</p>	
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 16, 2021 in the municipal seat of Cumaribo, with members of the indigenous communities from Zones 1 and 2 of the RIU-SM, officials of ACATISEMA and with government institutions, such as the Mayor's Office of Cumaribo and the Government of the department of Vichada. • September 21, 2021 in the city of Inírida with various members of the indigenous communities from Zones 3, 4, and 5 of the RIU-SM; ACATISEMA officials; representative of the CooMatavén Cooperative; representatives of government institutions, such as the Government of Guainía, the Corporation for the Sustainable Development of the North and East of the Amazon (CDA) and the National Learning Service (SENA); representatives of NGOs such as the RAMSAR Roundtable and the Association of Guaviare Indigenous Authorities (ASOCRIGUA). • September 15-20 in indigenous communities of Zones 3, 4 and 5 of the RIU-SM (Guaviare, Brazo de Amanavén and Orinoco rivers) and September 16-21 in indigenous communities of Zones 1 and 2 of the RIU-SM (Vichada river), with members of different ethnic groups, including women, men, youth, the elderly, traditional authorities, teachers and settlers. <p>Verra Review: The project proponent has included an explanation of how the project will have impacts across demographics and subgroups of the 6 ethnicities. They have also provided details on how dynamics between different stakeholder groups are taken into account. This change is sufficient to close the finding, no further changes are required.</p>	
3	<p>Financial sustainability: The VVB must request the project proponent explain in Section 2.1.14 of the project description how they plan to adjust the project activities to adapt to the decrease in expected carbon financing under the national FREL that</p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: The Project Proponents (PPs) presented in Section 2.5.7 of the PDD-CCB the impacts of the baseline adjustment due to the application of the Forest Reference Emission Level (FREL) in compliance with Resolution 1447/2018 (Article 41) that was imposed</p>	Closed

<p>is described in Section 2.5.7. The project proponent needs to demonstrate that the project will continue generating net climate, community, and biodiversity benefits even if the decrease in carbon revenue will force the project to scale down certain activities.</p> <p>Program rule: <i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1, Section G1.12</i></p>	<p>by the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS) on REDD+ Projects in Colombia, which translates directly into a reduction in financial resources, and they explained that they are still seeking a rapprochement with MADS to directly discuss reducing this impact, and through the Colombian Association of Carbon's Market Members (ASOCARBONO).</p> <p>Likewise, the PPs, in response to the validation CAR1, explained that <i>"...since the second semester of 2017 to date, budget executions have been carried out, which have been programmed and with exhaustive monitoring, it has been possible to achieve the fulfillment of investments in the reserve for 4 years (2018-2021) and they are counted with resources for the next 4 years (2022-2025)"</i> <i>"...financial planning for the execution of activities that has been developed by Mediamos since 2012-2017 (with its own resources), since the second semester of 2017, has allowed to develop the Project with relative tranquility compared to the possession of resources for years to come. This is how the Verification of the years 2013, 2014 and 2015 covered costs of the years 2017, 2018 and 2019 and the costs of the previous years (2013-2016); the verification of the years 2016 and 2017 covered costs of the years 2020, 2021 and part of 2022; and the verification of the years 2018 and 2019 is expected to cover the costs of the years 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025"</i></p> <p>The foregoing is related to the expansion of information that the PPs now present in Section 2.1.14 of the PDD-CCB, where they explain that since 2018 they already known the impact that the application of Resolution 1447/2018 would have on verification of emission reductions that the initiative would achieve in the scenario with Project (according the baseline already defined and validated) vs. the with FREL scenario and, therefore, on the certification of tradable carbon bonds, to which the PPs presented strategies such as preparing indigenous communities for a budget adjustment in the future, allocating resource reserves from periods already verified, and to be verified to finance the Project Activities until the year 2028, use VCUs that are released from the Verra Buffer account, and adjust the</p>	
---	--	--

		<p>budgets from 2028 to concentrate the resources in Activities that are fundamental to achieve the reduction of emissions, leaving installed capacity in other Activities to reduce their scope (and their financing) and alliances with from government institutions and NGOs, in order to continue carbon financing, generating net benefits for the Climate, Community and Biodiversity components.</p> <p>Verra Review: The project proponent has provided a detailed plan for reducing the cost of project implementation in the future. They have also shown efforts to relocate their budget if need be to ensure climate, community and biodiversity benefits are maintained throughout the project lifetime. These changes are sufficient to close the finding, no further changes are required.</p>	
4	<p>Biodiversity benefits: The VVB must request the project proponent update Section 5.2.2 of the project description to include mitigation measures necessary to adapt to the expected decrease in carbon financing.</p> <p>Rationale: Section 5.2.1 of the project description states that the biodiversity benefits of the project are defined based on the assumption that carbon financing will continue.</p> <p>Program rule: <i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1, Section B2.3</i></p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: The Project Proponents have updated Section 5.2.2 of the PDD-CCB explaining that the mitigation measures to adapt to the expected decrease in carbon financing and continue providing the positive net impacts on Biodiversity during the life cycle of the Project (as well as on Climate and Community components) are related to the adjustment in the scope of Project Activities (which was explained in Section 2.1.14 of the PDD-CCB), some management strategies to establish alliances with official entities and NGOs and, specifically, in special agreements with local communities for the protection of natural resources.</p> <p>Verra Review: The project proponent has included a detailed plan for adapting the project to decrease in carbon financing (see finding #2). Section 5.2.2 has been updated to include a reference to section 2.1.14 and further details on adaptations specific to ensuring biodiversity benefits are</p>	Closed

		maintained. These changes are sufficient to close the finding, no further changes are required.	
5	<p>Assessment description: The VVB must provide a description of the steps taken to assess how the project has met the given criteria. This finding applies to Sections 3.2.10, 3.3.26, 3.4.6, 3.5.2, 3.6.2, 3.6.9, 3.6.10 of the validation report.</p> <p>Program rule: CCB Program Rules, v3.1, Section 4.3.15</p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: ICONTEC complemented the information request in sections 3.2.10, 3.3.26, 3.4.6, 3.5.2, 3.6.2, 3.6.9, and 3.6.10 of the validation report.</p> <p>Verra Review: The above sections have been revised to include the steps taken by the assessment team to arrive at a conclusion. This change is sufficient to close this finding, no further changes are required.</p>	Closed
6	<p>Biodiversity mitigation measures: The VVB must request the project proponent clarify whether the mitigation measures in the first row of table 106 (Section 5.3.1) are intended to mitigate the impacts of both threats identified.</p> <p>Rationale: The first row of table 106 identifies two threats (internal and external threats) but the mitigation measures seem to only address the internal threats.</p> <p>Program rule: Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1, Section B3.2</p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: The Project Proponents have updated Table 106 (presented in Section 5.3.1 of the PDD-CCB) and clarified the mitigation measures in the first row, specifying them for each of the two threats identified, especially in relation to “<i>pressure from external actors, who can no longer enter the RIU-SM to subtract biodiversity resources, due to the control and surveillance that is carried out</i>”.</p> <p>Verra Review: Table 106 in section 5.3.1 has been updated to clearly identify the mitigation measures for each identified threat. These changes are sufficient to close the finding, no further changes are required.</p>	Closed

<p>7</p>	<p>Compliance with national laws: The VVB must request the project proponent clarify the project’s RENARE registration status. Section 2.5.7 of the project description states that overlap with the Visión Amazonía Program has prevented the project from moving forward with registration on the platform. However, a record for this project does exist on the RENARE website.</p> <p>Program rule: <i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1, Section G5.6</i></p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: The Project Proponents have updated Section 2.5.7 of the PDD-CCB to include a summary of the processes that have been developed to comply with the registration of the REDD+ Project RIU-SM in the platform of the National Registry of GHG Emissions Reduction (<i>Registro Nacional de Reducción de Emisiones de GEI - RENARE</i>), explaining the current status of its registration.</p> <p>Verra Review: Section 2.5.7 has been updated to include a detailed explanation of the steps the project has taken to comply with Resolution 1447/2018. Although the project has not fully completed registration, they have taken all reasonable steps to ensure compliance and are continuing to work with the government to resolve the issue. The project has also included an annex containing copies of the official communication between the project and the government. This explanation is sufficient to close the finding, no further changes are required.</p>	<p>Closed</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>Financial health: The VVB must update Section 3.3.18 of the validation report to confirm that they have considered the expected decrease in VCU issuances (described in section 2.5.7 of the project description) when assessing the financial health of the implementing organizations. If this has not been accounted for, the VVB must reassess this requirement and update section 3.3.18.</p> <p>Program rule:</p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: According to the request of Findings 3 and 4, the project proponents considered the expected decrease in VCU issuances and included strategies to mitigate this risk (See Findings 3 and 4). VVB included in section 3.3.18 of the validation report the conclusion corresponding to the evaluation held.</p> <p>Verra Review: Section 3.3.18 has been revised to include an assessment of the financial sustainability of the project, given the changes to the PD reflected in findings 3 and 4. This change is sufficient to close this finding, no further changes are required.</p>	<p>Closed</p>

	<p><i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1, Section G4.3</i></p>		
<p>9</p>	<p>Assessment conclusion: The VVB must update Section 3.3.25 of the validation report to include a positive or negative assessment conclusion. There is no conclusion in section 3.3.25 of the validation report that states whether the project has met the given requirement.</p> <p>Program rule: <i>CCB Program Rules, v3.1, Section 4.3.15</i></p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VB Response: ICONTEC included the conclusion in the validation report in section 3.3.25 of the validation report:</p> <p>In section 2.5.5 of the PD, project proponents identified illegal activities as making timber extraction, mining in rivers, hunting, fishing, and capturing animal species, and the project proposes an indigenous guard presence on the territory to reduce these threats.</p> <p>During the visit, the audit team interviewed the zone guards and they informed them that no illegal actions had been detected since the establishment of the monitoring mechanism. ICONTEC concludes that illegal activities are well identified and that appropriate measures have been taken.</p> <p>Verra Review: Section 3.3.25 has been revised to include a positive conclusion of the illegal activities identified by the project proponent. This change is sufficient to close this finding, no further changes are required.</p>	<p>Closed</p>

<p>10</p>	<p>Without-project GHG emissions: The VVB must revise Section 3.4.1 of the validation report to include a discussion of the assessment criteria, assumptions, rationale, and methodological choices used to assess the GHG emissions for the without-project scenario. This section does not currently does not follow the template instructions.</p> <p>Program rule: <i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1, Section CL1.1</i> <i>CCB Program Rules, v3.1, Section 4.3.15</i></p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: ICONTEC complemented section 3.4.1 of the validation report and include the conclusion. Likewise, this information was compared with the conclusion of the validation report of the PD previously validated under the VSC Standard.</p> <p>Verra Review: Section 3.4.1 has been revised to follow the template instructions. This change is sufficient to close this finding, no further changes are required.</p>	<p>Closed</p>
<p>11</p>	<p>Assessment conclusion: The VVB must update Section 4.4.1 of the verification report to include a positive or negative assessment conclusion. There is no conclusion in this section that states whether the project has met the given requirement.</p> <p>Program rule: <i>CCB Program Rules, v3.1, Section 4.3.15</i></p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: The audit team complemented the information in Section 4.4.1. The results were evaluated through the calculation tables in the sheets of Annex the Monitoring Plan /35.7/. The information was confirmed and corroborated with the Verification Report under the VCS Standard too. In addition, the parameters indicated in section 3.3 of the Monitoring Report/1/was confirmed through document evidence and by visiting some control points according to the audit plan description.</p> <p>According to the above, ICONTEC concludes that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the validated monitoring plan, which was verified under the VCS Standard. The quantification of GHG emission reductions and removals were determined using data and parameters, the models and equations contained in the methodology (VM007) applied by the project proponent and were crosschecked with the calculations presented in Annexes /35.7/.</p>	<p>Closed</p>

		<p>Verra Review: Section 4.4.1 has been revised to include positive conclusion of the net impact on the climate demonstrated by the project proponent. This change is sufficient to close this finding, no further changes are required.</p>	
12	<p>Biodiversity monitoring: The VVB must request the project proponent clarify how positive biodiversity impacts were monitored during this monitoring period, given that the three biodiversity variables listed in Section 5.3 will not be measured until 2022. Section 5.3 of the monitoring report does not include any results from biodiversity monitoring, but Section 5.1.1 states that the impact of the project was positive on biodiversity. Section 5.3 of the <i>CCB Monitoring Report Template, v3.0</i> requires the project report the monitoring results.</p> <p>The VVB must also update section 4.6.11 of the verification report.</p> <p>Program rule: <i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1, Section B4.1</i> <i>CCB Program Rules, v3.1, Section 3.5.5</i></p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: The Project Proponents (PPs) explain that for each of the three biodiversity variables listed in Section 5.3 of the Monitoring Report - CCB, the Monitoring Frequency was defined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For variable 1 Key attributes of areas hosting HCV 1.1 (floodwaters and floodplain) and HCV 1.2 (gallery forests), the Monitoring Frequency is: <i>“Plant cover Deforestation and habitat availability in the Project Area: Annual / biennial from 2013. Monitoring of vulnerable, endangered, and critically endangered flora and fauna: Five-year from 2022 (2027, 2032, 2037...)”</i>. • For variable 2 Key attributes of Helobiomes, Peinobiomes, Lithobiomes and Zonobiomes (HCV 2), the Monitoring Frequency is: <i>“Plant cover Deforestation and habitat availability in the Project Area: Annual / biennial since 2013. Monitoring of vulnerable, endangered, and critically endangered flora and fauna: Five-year from 2022 (2027, 2032, 2037 ...)”</i>. • For variable 3 Key attributes of Morichales (rare and threatened ecosystem) (HCV 3), the Monitoring Frequency is: <i>“Plant cover Deforestation and habitat availability in the Project Area: Annual / biennial since 2020. Monitoring of flora and fauna to indicate the conservation status and health of Morichales: Five-year from 2022 (2027, 2032, 2037 ...)”</i>. 	Closed

	<p>The PPs explain that, in this way, there are monitoring results for these 3 variables from 2013 (and 2020 for variable 3), indicating which are the references of the evidence (data in tables in the same CCB Monitoring Report), and other aspects to monitor from the year 2022.</p> <p>Biodiversity variables 1, 2 and 3 correspond to HCV 1, HCV 2 and HCV 3 respectively.</p> <p>HCV 1.1 and 1.2 correspond to overflows that are home to endangered species and floodplain forest that is home to endemic species, respectively. Although the results of monitoring these HCVs are found in Sections “5.1.1 Biodiversity Changes” and “5.1.4 High Conservation Values Protected” of the Monitoring Report - CCB, the PPs have included a Table 55 in the same report, where the monitoring that has been carried out since 2013 to the primary forest, floodable primary forest and secondary forest is illustrated.</p> <p>HCVs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 correspond to biome-type landscapes, analyzed from the biome transition tables. To illustrate the monitoring results of variable 2, the PPs have included Table 56 in the Monitoring Report - CCB.</p> <p>HCV 3.1 corresponds to rare and threatened ecosystems, for which the <i>morichales</i> were selected. The PPs indicate that Annex 14 of the Monitoring Report - CCB is presented as support for the evaluation follow-up of this HCV 3 <i>Morichales</i>. The monitoring began with the social mapping activities (talking maps) developed since 2020 with the participation of the 315 captains of the entire indigenous reservation. In these workshops, information has been obtained on the places where the populations of triggering species are established, the cultural use they give to plant and animal species, with these workshops it is observed that the representative fauna of the Selva Matavén remains and the areas of the forest where they take refuge and feed remains,</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>since this forest acts as a shelter for the faunal species of the territory, since it is where they have less pressure from human beings.</p> <p>The PPs mention that "Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits" (evaluating the Moriches, whose importance is related to being precursors of water, wetlands and the development of associated vegetation and fauna) and, given the results that have already been achieved to obtain the Gold Level in Biodiversity, the aspects that have been monitored since 2020 are taken into account for this Report (since they correspond to impacts generated by the implementation of the Sustainable Management Plan of Lands and Forests and the Project Activities that were developed during 2018-2019, and whose benefits were measured after its execution). They have begun the characterization of forest plant species and faunal groups such as freshwater fish (Annex 19 of Monitoring Report - CCB), land mammals and birds. Later studies of the composition and status of the populations will be expanded, monitoring will continue to identify critical points to be addressed and neutralized. It is proposed for the year 2023 to present the results of the studies carried out on fauna inventories.</p> <p>In concordance above, the information was supported by the Project Proponents in the Monitoring Report (2018–2019), and the results should be monitored in the next verification. The information above is complemented in Section 4.6.11 of Verification Report.</p> <p>Verra Review: The above explanation of monitoring frequency for 3 biodiversity variable is sufficient to close the findings, no further changes are required.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>13</p>	<p>Local language summary: The VVB must request the project include the summary of benefits table from Section 1 of the monitoring report in the monitoring report local language summary. The monitoring report summary does not currently include this information.</p> <p>Program rule: <i>CCB Program Rules, v3.1 Section 3.5.12</i></p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: The Project Proponents (PPs) included the tables in Section 1 of the Monitoring Report - CCB at the beginning of the Summary of the Monitoring Report - CCB in local language (Spanish) as Section “RESUMEN DE BENEFICIOS DEL PROYECTO”, Subsections “Beneficios únicos del proyecto” and “Métricas de beneficios estandarizadas”.</p> <p>In addition, the PPs included the results of the community monitoring in the Monitoring Report – CCB (Section “4.3.1 Community Monitoring Plan”) in the Summary of the Monitoring Report - CCB in local language (Spanish) as Section “Plan de monitoreo en comunidad”.</p> <p>The PPs report that the results of biodiversity monitoring are already included in the Summary of the Monitoring Report - CCB in local language (Spanish) as Section “Plan de monitoreo de biodiversidad”.</p> <p>Verra Review: The Project proponent has included Table 1 from the MR in the Spanish MR summary. This change is sufficient to close this finding, no further changes are required.</p>	<p>Closed</p>
<p>14</p>	<p>Free, prior and informed consent: In addition to the statements in Section 4.3.12 of the verification report, the VVB must also confirm that the project activities will not prejudice the outcome of an unresolved dispute relevant to the project, existing property rights are supported, project activities do not lead to the involuntary removal or relocation of property rights holders and do not force them to relocate activities important to their culture or livelihood, and actions have been taken, if necessary, to reduce illegal</p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: ICONTEC complemented section 4.3.12 with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The property rights are recognized, through the legal evidence (Annexes 1.11.5 and 1.11.8 of the validated PDD – VCS), as well as, in the agreement ACATISEMA-MEDIAMOS, it is explicit that the project doesn’t restrict the freedom of communities to access, transit, and obtain the benefits of food, recreation, research, and any other benefits that may arise from the protection, conservation, and recovery of forests and other natural resources of their territory. In interviews, the audit team confirmed this information. 	<p>Closed</p>

	<p>activities that could affect the project's impacts.</p> <p>Program rule: <i>Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, v3.1, Section G5.2</i> <i>CCB Program Rules, v3.1, Section 4.3.15</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In section 2.5.3 of the PDD /2/ and section 2.4.2 of the Monitoring Report, the project includes the procedure of Prior Consultation and Free, Prior, and Informed Consent. Similarly, indigenous authorities indicated that they had acquired all of the essential information to establish that the community was free to accept or refuse involvement in the project/9/. (Annex5: compliance safeguards.pdf). • The project activities do not result in involuntary expulsion or relocation or involuntary return of their property rights to their lands or territories and do not force them to relocate activities important to their culture or means. Instead, the activities project is related to the ethnic life plan, according to annexes /36.1/ and request to CAR1. • According to Section 2.4.4 of the Monitoring Report, Project Activity A.1.1 has controlled the territory to prevent illicit operations through indigenous guards. In interviews held with the indigenous guards, they mentioned that they have not evidenced illegal activities. • The project proponents detailed the methods to address any ongoing disagreement in Section 2.4.5 of the monitoring report. The audit team required the Project Proponents (FAR4) to analyze the success of the action plan to settle disputes raised by the project on the indigenous reservation at the next verification. <p>Verra Review: Section 4.3.12 has been updated to include the information required by the template. This change is sufficient to close this finding, no further changes are required.</p>	
--	--	--	--

<p>15</p>	<p>Climate net impact: The VVB must revise Section 4.4.1 of the verification report to include a discussion of the steps taken to verify that the climate impacts of the project are positive, and the total GHG emission reductions and removals are accurate and take into account negative offsite climate impacts (leakage) and non-CO2 sources. This section does not follow the template instructions.</p> <p>Program rule: <i>CCB Program Rules, v3.1, Section 4.3.15</i></p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: The audit team complemented the information in Section 4.4.1. The results were evaluated through the calculation tables in the sheets of Annex the Monitoring Plan /35.7/. The information was confirmed and corroborated with the Verification Report under the VCS Standard too. In addition, the parameters indicated in section 3.3 of the Monitoring Report/1/was confirmed through document evidence and by visiting some control points according to the audit plan description.</p> <p>According to the above, ICONTEC concludes that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the validated monitoring plan, which was verified under the VCS Standard. The quantification of GHG emission reductions and removals were determined using data and parameters, the models and equations contained in the methodology (VM007) applied by the project proponent and were crosschecked with the calculations presented in Annexes /35.7/.</p> <p>Verra Review: Section 4.4.1 has been revised to follow the template instructions. This change is sufficient to close this finding, no further changes are required.</p>	<p>Closed</p>
-----------	--	--	---------------

16	<p>Negative offsite biodiversity impacts: The VVB must complete Section 4.6.9 of the verification report. This section only contains the instructional text from the template.</p> <p>Program rule: <i>CCB Program Rules, v3.1, Section 4.3.15</i></p>	<p>Round 1:</p> <p>VVB Response: According to section 5.2.1 of the Monitoring Report, the project proponents demonstrated that the activities had no development negative offsite biodiversity impacts. Instead, the project had been helped to avoid negative impacts. The evidence documental and interviews with indigenous peoples and stakeholders, as well as the CDA, corroborated the information. This information was included in section 4.6.9. of the verification report.</p> <p>Verra Review: Section 4.6.9 has been revised to follow the template instructions. This change is sufficient to close this finding, no further changes are required.</p>	Closed
----	--	--	--------

MINOR FINDINGS		
#	Description	
1	<p>Footnote link: The link in footnote 16 does not work. VVB must request the project proponent edit the existing link or include any additional laws or regulations not included in footnote 15 in the body of section 2.3.16.</p>	The Project Proponents adjusted the link in footnote 16 in the PDD-CCB.