Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (Second Edition – December 2008)

Project Validation Report:

RUSSAS PROJECT – A TROPICAL FOREST CONSERTAION PROJECT IN ACRE, BRAZIL
Version: 19 March 2014

Validation Report Date: 19 March 2014

Validation Conducted by:

Environmental Services, Inc.
Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division
Corporate Offices at:
7220 Financial Way, Suite 100
Jacksonville, Florida 32256
Phone: 904-470-2200; Fax: 904-470-2112

Project No. VO13023.00

ANSI ACCREDITED PROGRAM
GREENHOUSE GAS
VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION
0800

Table of Contents

The Russas Project
A Tropical Forest Conservation Project in Acre, Brazil
Project Validation Report

Introduction

This report presents the findings of an audit conducted by Environmental Services, Inc., (ESI), to validate that the claims made by CarbonCo, LLC conform to the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (Second Edition- December 2008). ESI is accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) under ISO 14065:2007 for greenhouse gas validation and verifications bodies and is approved by the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) to perform such validations.

Contact Information

Client Name Address Phone Website	CarbonCo, LLC 3 Bethesda Metro Center, Suite 700 Bethesda, Maryland 20814 Phone: 240-247-0630
Contact Name Address Phone	Brian McFarland 3 Bethesda Metro Center, Suite 700 Bethesda, Maryland 20814 240-247-0630
3rd Party Auditors	Environmental Services, Inc.
Lead Validator	Shawn McMahon (smcmahon@esinc.cc / 330-833-9941)
Validation Team	Caitlin Sellers – Validation Team Member (csellers@esinc.cc / 772-834-8571) Stewart McMorrow – Validation Team Member (smcmorrow@esinc.cc / 530-412-1221) Richard Scharf – Validation Team Member (rscharf@esinc.cc / 252-402-7354) Jonathan Pomp – Validation Team Member (jpomp@esinc.cc /304-642-1277) Guy Pinjuv – Validation Team Member (gpinjuv@esinc.cc) Matthew Perkowski – Validation Team member (mperkowski@esinc.cc / 301-332-0771) Janice McMahon – QA/QC (jmcmahon@esinc.cc / 330-833-9941)

Validation Details

Validation Standard	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (Second Edition – December 2008)
Validation Criteria	The criteria will follow the validation guidance documents provided by CCBA located at www.climate-standards.org. These documents include the following: a) *Project Design Standards (Second Edition, December 2008)* b) *Rules for the Use of the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards, December 2013.*
Level of Assurance	The level of assurance was used to determine the depth of detail that the validator placed in the validation plan to determine if there were any errors, omissions, or misrepresentations (ISO 14064-3:2006). ESI selected samples of data and information to be validated, to provide *reasonable assurance*.
Validation Scope	The scope of the validation included the review of all project documentation provided by the project developer and the appropriate level of fact finding by the validator during the on-site visit. The validator used evidence such as, but not limited to, interviews with stakeholders and project proponents, review of supporting records and reports.

Validation Date(s)	05 August 2013 (opening meeting) – 19 March 2014 (receipt of final PDD)
Materiality	Materiality is a concept that errors, omissions and misrepresentations could affect the project design assertions and influence the intended users. CCB does not specifically outline a materiality threshold, but ESI used a 5% threshold for evidence. However, for PDD validations, the specific level of materiality does not apply. The materiality of a CCBA validation is based on an evaluation of whether or not the proposed project design (PDD) is consistent with the CCB Project Design Standards criteria (Second Edition). If a non-conformance is discovered, the project developer is given the opportunity to correct the non-conformance to the PDD within a reasonable timeframe (within 30 days). If the non-conformance is corrected, the level of assurance has been met, the project design is recommended for validation approval. If the non-conformance cannot be met, the project design will not be validated. For this project, all non-conformances were corrected, so the project design is herewith validated.
Site Visits	19 August – 24 August 2013
Final Documents from Client	• The Russas Project, A Tropical Forest Conservation Project in Acre, Brazil CCB PDD [Version: -3/19/2014] Please see Appendix A for a complete list of documents received/reviewed during this validation.
Public Comment Period on CCBA Number of Comments Received	18 July – 17 August 2013 – Project listing on CCB website for public comment 1

Project Description

The Russas Project is a Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD+) project on 41,976 hectares of privately owned land in the State of Acre, Brazil.

The project will preserve forest, inventory and monitor the forest and wildlife, and identify and address the drivers of deforestation in the area. The project proponents seek to generate sustainable economic activities and social projects that will take pressure off the forest that is leading to habitat and biodiversity loss.

Executive Summary of Validation Results

	Criterion	Required/ Optional	Conformance Y/N or N/A
G1	Original Conditions in the Project Area	Required	Y
G2	Baseline Projections	Required	Y
G3	Project Design and Goals	Required	Y
G4	Management Capacity and Best Practices	Required	Y
G5	Legal Status and Property Rights	Required	Y
CL1	Net Positive Climate Impacts	Required	Confirmed through VCS validation
CL2	Offsite Climate Impacts ("Leakage")	Required	Confirmed through VCS validation
CL3	Climate Impact Monitoring	Required	Confirmed through VCS validation
CM1	Net Positive Community Impacts	Required	Y
CM2	Offsite Stakeholder Impacts	Required	Y
CM3	Community Impact Monitoring	Required	Y
B1	Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts	Required	Y
B2	Offsite Biodiversity Impacts	Required	Y
B3	Biodiversity Impact Monitoring	Required	Y
GL1	Climate Change Adaptation Benefits	Optional	N/A
GL2	Exceptional Community Benefits	Optional	Y
GL3	Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits	Optional	N/A

Validation Findings

G1 Original Conditions in the Project Area

Indicator G1.1 – The location of the project and basic physical parameters (e.g. soil, geology, climate).	The PDD discusses the Amazon Basin in general, and provides a map of the northern 2/3rds of South America, with the Amazon Basin depicted in green. Next, the exact location of the project is mentioned, by state, and its proximity to the Valparaiso and Jurua rivers, 40 miles south of Cruzeiro do Sul. A general soil map and an elevation map of Acre State are provided, with the project boundaries depicted. General climate information is provided. A color coded map of South America's Koppen classification is included, but without showing the location of the

	project area.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.1 of the PDD.
Findings:	The general map of South America offers the reader nothing in terms of locating the project area. Neither Acre State, the Valparaiso and Jurua Rivers nor the town of Cruzeiro do Sul, the only location information provided, is depicted on the map. The soils and elevation maps also do not show the location Acre State within Brazil.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide maps that allow the reader to locate the project area within the country of Brazil.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	On 8 October 2013, two additional maps were added to the Russas CCBS PDD to show the State of Acre and then specifically where the Russas Project is located. To clarify, the soil and elevation maps are of the entire state of Acre with an overlay of the Russas property boundaries.
Evidence used to close NCR	The additional maps and the outline of the project area on the soil map provide a wealth of information at a glance and adequately address this indicator.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator G1.2 – The types and condition of vegetation within the project area.	The PDD mentions the 5 forest types in Acre State, and provides a vegetation map of the state, with an outline of the project area overlain. Another map that might be a blowup of the project area from the state-wide map is provided, showing 5 areas differentiated by color. The legends of both maps use abbreviations or acronyms that are not explained.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.1 of the PDD
Findings:	Forest types are mentioned, but not described. Condition of the forest in the project area is not described. The abbreviations or acronyms used in map legends are not explained.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please fully describe the forest types, the conditions of the forest in the project area, and explain legend abbreviations for the vegetation maps.
Date issued	7 October 2013

Project proponent response/actions and date	The forest types and conditions of the forest are now described in the Russas Project's CCBS PDD and the legend abbreviations are now explained. (October 8, 2013)
Findings:	Forest types are more fully explained in section G1.1 now. No comment on the conditions of the forest (prime, degraded, first growth, second growth, etc.).
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please describe the conditions of the forest within the project area.
Date issued:	13 December 2013
Evidence used to close NCR	The 15 January 2014 version of the PDD describes the condition of the forests as primary tropical forests. Locations where the communities live are either non-forest or secondary forest.
Date closed	23 January 2014
Indicator G1.3 – The boundaries of the project area and the project zone.	A map depicting the project area and project zone is provided (map 5). The project area is the land owned by ISRC Investments, and the project zone is said to include the project area and the project's leakage belt.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.1 of the PDD, map 5 in that section.
Findings:	The project zone, aside from the project area, appears to be a buffer or setback line from the project area boundary, except in the case of the southwestern boundary, which runs along the banks of an unnamed river. This river, according to other maps, is apparently the Valparaiso.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Indicator G1.3 is mostly satisfied, except some explanation as to how the buffer or setback distance was determined. Opportunity for Improvement: Label the rivers on the maps, and indicate that the neighboring Valparaiso lands are part of a similar project.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	The rivers on Map 5 are now labeled and a sentence was added to the Russas Project's CCBS PDD to indicate the adjacent Valparaiso property is part of a similar project. (October 8, 2013)
Evidence used to close NCR	The mention of the neighboring Valparaiso project explains the lack of the project zone on that side of the project area. Labelled rivers allow easier

	orientation.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator G1.4 - Current carbon stocks within the project area(s), using stratification by land-use or vegetation type and methods of carbon calculation (such as biomass plots, formulae, default values) from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's 2006 Guidelines for National GHG Inventories for Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use[5] (IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU) or a more robust and detailed methodology.	Using methodology VM0007, Current carbon stocks were determined using plot measurements of live above and below ground biomass, as well as standing and lying dead. Bamboo and lianas were excluded. The project area was stratified with the Acre State vegetation map. Total biomass inventory was reported as 120 t C/ha across the project area. Reader is referred to the VCS PDD to find more information.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.2 of the PDD.
Findings:	Values for different strata not provided.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please include carbon stocks of individual strata.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	The carbon stocks of the five individual strata were added to Figure 1 on 8 October 2013.
Evidence used to close NCR	Figure 1 now includes total carbon stocks by strata.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator G1.5 - A description of communities located in the project zone, including basic socio-economic and cultural information that describes the social, economic and cultural diversity within communities (wealth, gender, age, ethnicity etc.), identifies specific groups such as Indigenous Peoples[8] and describes any community characteristics.	The PDD states that there are 733,559 residents of Acre, with about 78,507 in Cruzeiro do Sul and 9,176 in Porto Walter, neighboring the project. Some additional demographics for these municipalities are provided, including urban vs. rural, sex, age groups literacy rates, sanitation adequacy and income. (Neither of these municipalities are within the project zone.) These data are from a 2010 census. A participatory rural assessment was also used to characterize the people within the project zone. No direct questions with regard to income were apparently asked. No indigenous populations exist in the project zone.

	Most residents are subsistence farmers, some communities practice ranching. Hunting and fishing supplements diets. Most collect fuel wood from project area and zone forests.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.3 of the PDD
Findings:	No information on ethnicity, aside from no indigenous peoples living within the project area or zone.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Indicator G1.5 has been largely addressed, but please properly number sections in the PDD, and an explanation regarding the local population's ethnicity, or lack of specific ethnicity, is missing.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	Although the CCBS does not require a specific format, the CCBS PDD has been renumbered for ESI. Additional characteristics of the local populations' ethnicity were added to the CCBS PDD on October 17, 2013.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please clarify how ethnicity was determined. Was the question asked during the PRA or other interviews, or is it based on assumptions/literature about the historical derivation of the rubber tappers?
Date issued	13 December 2013
Evidence used to close NCR	The 15 January 2014 version of the PDD includes the following footnote: This information on ethnicity was provided by Ilderlei Souza Rodrigues Cordeiro (owner of Russas Project) and Marmude Dene DeCarvalho (local project manager) based off their knowledge and conversations with the local communities.
Date closed:	23 January 2014

Indicator G1.6 - A description of current land use and customary and legal property rights including community property in the project zone, identifying any ongoing or unresolved conflicts or disputes and	The PDD describes the general land ownership, land use and management in the state of Acre, and provides a map with an overlay of the project boundaries. The PDD states the project area is private land, the map depicts it as public land.

identifying and describing any disputes over land tenure that were resolved during the last ten years (see also G5).	The PDD goes on to list the pertinent land ownership laws, and usucaption (squatters' rights) laws, explaining how they pertain to the project area. There have been no land tenure disputes during the last ten years. Current land use in the project zone is subsistence agriculture and a little cattle ranching. Larger scale cattle ranches predominate along the main roads in Acre.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.3 of the PDD.
Findings:	Indicator G1.6 has been largely addressed, but there is an apparent discrepancy between the text and Map 6: Land Tenure in Acre State.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Address the apparent discrepancy between the map depicting the project area as public lands and the text of the PDD describing the project area as private land.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	The map was produced in error and the public lands layer is outdated. The outdated public lands layer did not recognize geo-referenced and registered private lands as of 2012. The map has been removed from the CCBS PDD. Landownership documentation demonstrating private ownership was supplied to ESI. (October 10, 2013)
Evidence used to close NCR	Outdated map has been removed, and the explanation is reasonable.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator G1.7 - A description of current biodiversity within the project zone (diversity of species and ecosystems) and threats to that biodiversity, using appropriate methodologies, substantiated where possible with appropriate reference material.	The PDD explains that the Amazon Rainforest is the largest contiguous rainforest in the world, and recites statistics regarding the rainforest as a whole. Threats to the rainforest as a whole include infrastructure projects, cattle ranching and encroachment of subsistence and commercial as well as subsistence agriculture. In Acre, the majority of deforestation occurs along roads and rivers, and the main driver is cattle ranching. In the project area, subsistence agriculture

	and cattle breeding are the problems. The paving of the road "Ramal 3" near the project zone will bring in larger operations. The PDD refers to regional WWF studies in this part of the Amazon that found 300 species of trees per hectare. The area is described as the basin's center of diversity for palms. A myriad of rare and endemic species are cited. The PDD points to a WWF study, which in turn refer to papers by Daly & Mitchell and Henderson.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.4 of the PDD
Findings:	No citations for Daly & Mitchell, Henderson papers.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	No attempt has been made to show that regional studies reflect the biodiversity in the project area. All papers cited within the PDD should be included in the references section.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	All papers, including papers cited by WWF, are now included in the reference section. The following statement has also been added to the CCBS PDD: "Based off firsthand observations and conversations with local biodiversity experts – such as S.O.S Amazônia and the Secretary of Environmental Affairs for the Municipality of Cruzeiro do Sul – these regional studies accurately reflect the biodiversity within the Russas Project." (October 8, 2013)
Evidence used to close NCR	Additional information tying the referenced papers to the project area and the inclusion of the citations satisfy the requirements of this indicator.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator G1.8 - An evaluation of whether the project zone includes any of the following High Conservation Values (HCVs) and a description of the qualifying attributes. **Indicator 8.1** - Globally, regionally	The PDD states the project zone includes the following HCVs: • Threatened, vulnerable and endangered species; • Possibly endemic species, but not presently known;

or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values: a. protected areas b. threatened species c. endemic species d. areas that support significant concentrations of a species during any time in their lifecycle (e.g. migrations, feeding grounds, breeding areas). **Indicator 8.2** - Globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape-level areas where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance. I**ndicator 8.3** Threatened or rare ecosystems. Indicator 8.4 - Areas that provide critical ecosystem services (e.g., hydrological services, erosion control, fire control). **Indicator 8.5** - Areas that are fundamental for meeting the basic needs of local communities (e.g., for essential food, fuel, fodder, medicines or building materials without readily available alternatives). **Indicator 8.6** - Areas that are critical for the traditional cultural identity of communities (e.g., areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in collaboration with the communities).	• Threatened and rare ecosystems; • Critical ecosystem services, including hydrological services; • Meeting basic needs of local communities. The PDD cites IUCN list of threatened/endangered species for the area. The PDD cites that the WWF states there are 42 endemic species in the Southwestern Amazon, and includes a list. The PDD states that rainforest only amounts to about 2% of Earth's surface, and mentions that "31 million football fields of rainforest" are lost each year. Acre and therefore the project area is tropical rainforest, according to the FAO. Critical ecosystem services cited include erosion control, water cycling, O_2 production, nutrient cycling and soil quality, pollination and seed dispersal, medicinal plants, foods, and habitat. They also cite the rivers as important means of transportation. Local communities typically fish the waters and also rely on the water for drinking and cooking. Wild fruits and nuts are also harvested. Several birds, mammals and reptiles are also used as food sources. Fuel and construction wood collection is also important.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.4 of the PDD.

Findings:	While it would not be surprising to discover that many of the wildlife-related HCVs described do exist in the project zone, no specific studies identify the project lands as possessing these HCVs. No study identifies the species makeup of the lands, showing they are indeed parts of largely intact rainforest. In summary, the project zone likely includes: • G1.8.1 – but not demonstrated • G1.8.3 - needs positive statement that the rainforest in considered a threatened or rare ecosystem • G1.8.4 – hydrological services • G1.8.5 – meets basic needs of local communities.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please supply site specific information on the species of concern that exist in the project area/zone. Please supply a statement from a scientific body claiming that the Amazon rainforest is classified as a threatened or rare ecosystem. Please exclude ubiquitous ecosystem services, like O_2 production and nutrient cycling.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	Local biodiversity studies, including site specific information, have been added to the CCBS PDD. Ubiquitous ecosystem services, like O_2 production and nutrient cycling, were removed. A statement from WWF's ecoregions stating Southwestern Amazon Moist Forest is a rare ecosystem was also added to the CCBS PDD on November 8, 2013.
Evidence used to close NCR	Addition of local studies and expert opinions to the updated PDD, section G1.7-8 tie the HCVs described to the project area.
Date closed	13 December 2013

G2 Baseline Projections

Indicator G2.1 - Describe the most likely land-use scenario in the absence of the project following IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU or a more robust and detailed methodology,	The PDD states that VM0007 was used to determine the without project scenario, and that the project area would continue to experience unplanned, frontier deforestation. A map depicting areas deforested in Acre, by year is provided, without attribution.

describing the range of potential land use scenarios and the associated drivers of GHG emissions and justifying why the land-use scenario selected is most likely.	The reader is told to figure out how this determination was made by reading unspecified parts of the VCS project description.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G2.1 of the PDD.
Findings:	The PDD does not present a range of land use scenarios, and just declares that continued unplanned deforestation will occur.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please address indicator G2.1 within this document. Please cite the source of data used in maps.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	Three land-use scenarios are now explained in the CCBS PDD and the specific section of the VCS PD is now provided. The maps were created by TerraCarbon and utilized 2012 data from the State of Acre's Climate Change Institute. The credits for all maps in the CCBS PDD were updated on October 10, 2013.
Evidence used to close NCR	The updated PDD now includes other potential land use scenarios. It is very likely that in the absence of the project, unplanned deforestation or planned deforestation would occur.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator G2. 2 - Document that project benefits would not have occurred in the absence of the project, explaining how existing laws or regulations would likely affect land use and justifying that the benefits being claimed by the project are truly 'additional' and would be unlikely to occur without the project.	The PDD reiterates that lands along paved roads are rapidly being converted from primary forest to cattle pasture, as the roads increase market access. Nearby roads are in the process of being paved, which will raise property values and pressure to use the land for its highest economic use. The landowner (Ilderlei Souza Rodrigues Cordeiro) purchased the land from a rubber tapping company for wood management and cattle ranching, in 2004. If the planned conversion did not take place, it would likely be deforested through unplanned frontier deforestation. The reader is referred to the VCS project description

	to seek further, unspecified information regarding this topic
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G2.1 of the PDD, section 2.5 of the VCS PD, site visit
Findings:	Cost analysis and statement from Acre Lawyers Association in VCS PDD lend evidence to PDD statements.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please properly number sections in accordance with CCB convention. Please include the full response to indicator G2.2 within the CCB PDD. Please include information regarding deforestation rates in Acre and similar states.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	Although the CCBS does not require a specific format, the CCBS PDD has been renumbered. Deforestation rates for Brazil, along with Acre and nearby states, were added to the CCBS PDD on October 11, 2013.
Evidence used to close NCR	Rates of unplanned and planned deforestation in Acre and other Amazon Basin states show that existing laws and regulations do little, if anything, to stop deforestation.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator G2.3 - Calculate the estimated carbon stock changes associated with the 'without project' reference scenario described above. This requires estimation of carbon stocks for each of the land-use classes of concern and a definition of the carbon pools included, among the classes defined in the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU. The timeframe for this analysis can be either the project lifetime (see G3) or the project GHG accounting period, whichever is more appropriate. Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO_2 GHG emissions such as CH_4 and N_2O in the 'without project' scenario. Non-CO_2	Full validation of the climate benefits of this project has occurred simultaneously and all estimates of carbon stock changes are contained in the validated project description. The GHG assertion provided by CarbonCo and validated by ESI will result in the GHG emissions reduction or removal of 1,201,474 tCO2 equivalents by the project during the 10 year initial reporting period (2012 - 2021). This figure is the result of a total net forest carbon sequestration (t CO_2) of 1,645,928, buffer pool contribution of 164,593 and estimated leakage of 279,861. Only the initial 10 year baseline period was validated at this time, given that the baseline will be renewed at year 11.

gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of CO_2-equivalent) of the project's overall GHG impact over each monitoring period. Projects whose activities are designed to avoid GHG emissions (such as those reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), avoiding conversion of non-forest land, or certain improved forest management projects) must include an analysis of the relevant drivers and rates of deforestation and/or degradation and a description and justification of the approaches, assumptions and data used to perform this analysis. Regional-level estimates can be used at the project's planning stage as long as there is a commitment to evaluate locally-specific carbon stocks and to develop a project-specific spatial analysis of deforestation and/or degradation using an appropriately robust and detailed carbon accounting methodology before the start of the project.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Validated VCS project description.

Indicator G2.4 - Describe how the 'without project' reference scenario would affect communities in the project zone, including the impact of likely changes in water, soil and other locally important ecosystem services.	The PDD cites the planned social projects that will not occur in the without project scenario. The local communities would be vulnerable without secure legal title to the lands they work, and could be moved to another patch of undeveloped forest or to a nearby town, in absence of the project. Unplanned deforestation would lead to continued erosion, flooding, fish and wildlife habitat destruction and lower land productivity.

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G2.3 of the PDD. Site visit.
Findings:	Projections of the without project scenario are reasonable in light of local history and land use patterns.

Indicator G2.5 - Describe how the 'without project' reference scenario would affect biodiversity in the project zone (e.g., habitat availability, landscape connectivity and threatened species).	Continued unplanned deforestation for cattle ranching and agriculture will reduce habitat for all but domestic species and those that thrive on transitional environments. Landscape connectivity will be reduced. There are many threatened species potentially on project lands that would suffer.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G2.4 of the PDD. Site visit.
Findings:	PDD's claims regarding the effects of unplanned deforestation for subsistence agriculture purposes are well documented throughout the world, including habitat loss and fragmentation. Species currently under low levels of risk may be moved to more threatened status. The indicator has been well addressed.

G3 Project Design and Goals

Indicator G3.1 - Provide a summary of the project's major climate, community and biodiversity objectives.	The project goal is to provide sustainable economic opportunity to local communities and implement social projects while "mitigating" deforestation and protecting habitat. The intent is to protect forest and habitat via the carbon project, and use proceeds from sales of VCUs to manage the land and provide funding for the social projects. Sustainable economic opportunities will be provided by giving land title to communities who choose to participate in the project and by offering lessons in appropriate modern agricultural techniques. Another social benefit is the medical center and nurse.

	The land title and agricultural instruction aspects also address some of the drivers of deforestation
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.1 of the PDD.
Findings:	The project proponents addressed the indicator by providing a detailed summary of the project's major goals.

Indicator G3.2 - Describe each project activity with expected climate, community and biodiversity impacts and its relevance to achieving the project's objectives.	The PDD explains the project activities under the heading of each project objective. For the major climate objective of reducing deforestation-related GHG emissions, the project proponents: • undertook a forest carbon inventory • developed a regional land-use deforestation model • are in the process of addressing underlying deforestation drivers, especially offering agricultural training opportunities. • Develop a deforestation monitoring plan. The major community objective is to generate sustainable economic activity and implement social projects. The project proponents: • held project awareness meetings • met to discuss project design • met and will continue to meet to discuss/design social projects for the community • will develop a community monitoring plan • will monitor community impacts The biodiversity objective is to preserve the biodiversity that exists in the project area by generating sustainable economic opportunities and social projects that will address the underlying causes of deforestation. The project proponents conducted a rapid assessment of the biodiversity and will develop a biodiversity monitoring plan for the project lands.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.2 of the PDD.

Findings:	This indicator was addressed with an explanation of project activities and their intended outcomes. Expectations from stated project activities are reasonable.

Indicator G3.3 - Provide a map identifying the project location and boundaries of the project area(s), where the project activities will occur, of the project zone and of additional surrounding locations that are predicted to be impacted by project activities (e.g. through leakage).	The PDD provides a Google Earth image with the project boundaries (both Russas and Valparaiso) superimposed. In addition, a map of the project area and surrounding project zone is provided. The project zone appears to be a buffer around the project of about 6,000 meters width. The latitude and longitude tick marks are provided on the map. The Valparaiso Project is not depicted on the second map.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.3 of the PDD.
Findings:	This indicator was addressed with Maps 10 and 11, depicting project area and zone boundaries, where project impacts are expected.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Opportunity for improvement: including the Valparaiso project area on the second map would explain to the reader why the project zone buffer does not extend along the northeastern border of the property.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	Duly noted, the following was added to the CCBS PDD on 8 October 2013: “It is important to note that the property located on the opposite side of the Valparaiso River and adjacent to the Russas Project is also being developed by the Project Proponents as a REDD+, forest conservation project. This project is known as the Valparaiso Project and this is the reason the Russas Project’s leakage belt does not extend along the northeastern border of the property.”
Evidence used to close NCR:	No action was required, but addition of the text mentioned above provides the reader with a quick explanation for the perceived gap in the project zone area.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator G3.4 - Define the project lifetime and GHG accounting period and explain and justify any differences between them. Define an implementation schedule, indicating key dates and milestones in the project's development.	The project start date is 17 March 2011, and the accounting period runs for 30 years, from 17 March 2013 – 16 March 2041. The PDD also refers to a 60-year project lifetime, followed by two renewable 25 year terms, for a total of 110 years. The difference is said to be from the project proponent's commitment to maintain forest cover long after the crediting period is over. An approximate implementation schedule is provided.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.4 of the PDD.
Findings:	While the carbon accounting period and the length of the project are not the same, the project proponent addresses this indicator explaining that the intent is to continue the project activities beyond the crediting period.

Indicator G3.5 - Identify likely natural and human-induced risks to the expected climate, community and biodiversity benefits during the project lifetime and outline measures adopted to mitigate these risks.	The PDD characterizes risks by source, including natural risks, anthropogenic risks and project risks. Natural risks include: • poor seedling/sapling survival o Since reforestation is not a major climate objective, and since growth of planted trees will not be included in generation of credits, the risk is small. • drought & flooding o Flooding should not be a problem for this wetland/riverine ecosystem. No mention is made of mitigating the effects of drought. • severe weather o Acre has not been historically subject to tropical storms, monsoons or tornadoes, • forest fire o The high rainfall of the area is mentioned, and the reader is told to

	see the VCS Non-Permanence Risk Assessment for more. • diseases, invasive species and pests. o Project proponents will monitor for invasive species, and guard against native species that can become invasive elsewhere, from being exported. Anthropogenic risks include: • Illegal logging • Illegal hunting of endangered fauna • Illegal collection of endangered flora • Human-induced fires. Monitoring is expected to be able to identify illegal logging/hunting/collecting. Project risks include: • fixed plots per family are given, but family increases in size. o Improved ag techniques and job creation should reduce dependency on land. • increasing income results in increased violence and drug/alcohol abuse. o Strong religious belief and institutions, along with law enforcement should be sufficient to take care of this problem. • influx of money risks mismanagement, corruption and "elite capture." o Project proponent will "try to always include all the communities." Ag classes and the clinic will be available to all. Basic necessities survey will monitor distribution of benefits, inequality and poverty. • increased in-migration, land speculation cause increase in competition and conflict between communities. o Ag training and access to the clinic will be offered to surrounding communities, as well, to counter in-

	migration. o Deforestation monitoring will quickly identify in-migration. A census of all currently living on the project lands has been taken. • State might not hold up its mission of providing agricultural extension. o A leading institution is unlikely to fail. • Too much of one crop can cause falling prices. o Production is low, and unlikely to increase to such an extent. o Crop diversification will provide additional assurance. • Failure to deliver on social projects/programs. o Project proponent will seek alternative funding if carbon prices fall. • Law enforcement agencies unable to stop illegal deforestation, if services are requested. o Project proponent has already spoken to law enforcement, who told him that preventing deforestation is one of their missions.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.5 of the PDD. Site visit.
Findings:	Drought is mentioned as a risk, but not addressed. Remedy for risk of "elite capture" is weak.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please include a measure to counter all risks identified (e.g., drought). While the good intention of the project proponents, to avoid elite capture, is applauded, they do not constitute a strong safeguard against the risk. Please speak to what policies are in place to address unfair benefit distribution if it is detected by monitoring? High yearly rainfall in an area does not constitute fire prevention without additional explanation. If fire has historically not been a risk to forest resources in the area, please state this.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	Section G3.5 was modified on October 29, 2013. The following sentence was added: "Drought does

	not have a direct effect on existing forest carbon stocks, but instead can increase the severity of forest fires and hence is covered below in the section on fire risk." Fire historically has not been a problem in the Project Area. The VCS Non-Permanence Risk Assessment statement on fire was added to the CCBS PDD. The Project Proponents discussed elite capture and additional information was also added to the CCBS PDD to outline the policies to mitigate elite capture.
Evidence used to close NCR	The drought risk is now part of the fire risk. Information is now provided explaining that fire is not a big risk in large, intact forest areas, like the project area, in this region. Additional, more specific safeguards against elite capture are discussed.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator G3.6 - Demonstrate that the project design includes specific measures to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes identified in G1 consistent with the precautionary principle.	The project's main goal of preserving the natural forest will necessarily have the effect of preserving or enhancing HCVs The project design integrates preservation of HCVs as a main objective. Additional conservation measures will be added as project-area specific information comes in. Monitoring of deforestation and community impacts will advise action to mitigate habitat losses.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.6 of the PDD, the very nature of the project.
Findings:	The PDD addresses this indicator by explaining that the HCVs of this project depend on maintaining the natural forest, which is the main objective.

Indicator G3.7 - Describe the measures that will be taken to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.	The PDD mentions the longevity of the Tri-Party Agreement (60 years), the creation of I.S.R.C Investments to ensure management of project beyond PP's lifetime, the long reach of the social projects, the lasting effect of education and outreach, and the legalization of community land tenure.

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.6 of the PDD.
Findings:	Sufficient measures (Tri-Party Agreement, ISRC and social/education efforts) are in place to ensure project benefits will last beyond project lifetime.

Indicator G3.8 - Document and defend how communities and other stakeholders potentially affected by the project activities have been identified and have been involved in project design through effective consultation, particularly with a view to optimizing community and stakeholder benefits, respecting local customs and values and maintaining high conservation values. Project developers must document stakeholder dialogues and indicate if and how the project proposal was revised based on such input. A plan must be developed to continue communication and consultation between project managers and all community groups about the project and its impacts to facilitate adaptive management throughout the life of the project.	The PDD lays out the process for stakeholder identification. A list of the most important stakeholders is provided, but it appears to be a mixture of both primary and secondary stakeholders of widely varying importance. It appears likely that they are listed in order of importance to project goals, and include the project proponent (Ilderlei) and communities living within the project boundaries as #1 and #2, respectively. The list also includes the ESI auditors, VCS, CCBA and the State of California. Meetings for project proponents and consultants occurred in March 2011, and so did initial community meetings. Many additional meetings with community, government and academic entities were held through May 2013, and activities summarized.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.7 of the PDD. [Note: Numbering sections in the same manner as CCBA's indicators will speed document review.]
Findings:	The indicator is addressed by explaining the process of identifying stakeholders and listing them, and also providing some detail on meetings between the project proponents and other stakeholders.

Indicator G3.9 - Describe what specific steps have been taken, and communications methods used, to publicize the CCBA public comment period to communities and other stakeholders and to facilitate their submission of comments to CCBA.	Documents will be made available in English and Portuguese. The documents will be announced in "an appropriate manner" to overcome illiteracy. The Portuguese version was left "at the Russas Project." Documents will be posted on the CCBA and Carbonfund.org website. Specific stakeholders will

Project proponents must play an active role in distributing key project documents to affected communities and stakeholders and hold widely publicized information meetings in relevant local or regional languages.	receive a delivered copy. Manoel will announce the comment period on the radio.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.7 of the PDD.
Findings:	The PDD describes the distribution of documents in the future tense.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide evidence that the document/information distribution has occurred.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	A copy of Carbonfund.org's newsletter announcement of Public Comment Period, a copy of Brian McFarland's email blast, a copy of Ilderlei Cordeiro's email blast, and a copy of the Public Comment Period announcement in the Jurua Tribunal were provided to ESI via DropBox. (October 17, 2013)
Evidence used to close NCR	The above mentioned documentation was provided as evidence the document and information was disseminated.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator G3.10 - Formalize a clear process for handling unresolved conflicts and grievances that arise during project planning and implementation. The project design must include a process for hearing, responding to and resolving community and other stakeholder grievances within a reasonable time period. This grievance process must be publicized to communities and other stakeholders and must be managed by a third party or mediator to prevent any conflict of interest. Project management must attempt to resolve all reasonable grievances raised, and provide a written response to grievances within 30 days.	A process to resolve such conflicts is outlined, and the State of Acre's Climate Change Institute's ombudsman will act as the 3rd party mediator.

Grievances and project responses must be documented.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.7 of the PDD.
Findings:	The project proponent addresses this indicator by laying out a grievance process, including naming a mediator, if required.

Indicator G3.11 - Demonstrate that financial mechanisms adopted, including projected revenues from emissions reductions and other sources, are likely to provide an adequate flow of funds for project implementation and to achieve the anticipated climate, community and biodiversity benefits.	The PDD states that Carbonfund.org has funded many such projects. A pro forma for the initial 30 year crediting period was developed.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G3.9 of the PDD.
Findings:	Pro forma not provided.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please show that projected revenues are likely to fund the project.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	The Pro Forma was provided in August 2013 and was again provided in October 2013.
Evidence used to close NCR:	The pro forma demonstrates that there should be an adequate flow of funds to implement the project.
Date issued	11 December 2013

G4 Management Capacity and Best Practices

Indicator G4.1 - Identify a single project proponent which is responsible for the project's design and implementation. If multiple organizations or individuals are involved in the project's development and implementation the governance structure, roles and responsibilities of each of the organizations or individuals involved must also be described.	The PDD identifies three project proponents, apparently at equal levels: • Freitas International Group • I.S.R.C • CarbonCo. I.S.R.C. is most responsible for project implementation and on-site management. CarbonCo acts as a technical and funding resource for design and implementation. Freitas International acts as a liaison between CarbonCo, landowners and community members. More detail is provided in the

	PDD. Names of individuals and their contact information is provided.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G4.1 of the PDD.
Findings:	This indicator was addressed by detailing the duties of each project proponent, and providing names and contact information for their representatives.

Indicator G4.2 - Document key technical skills that will be required to implement the project successfully, including community engagement, biodiversity assessment and carbon measurement and monitoring skills. Document the management team's expertise and prior experience implementing land management projects at the scale of this project. If relevant experience is lacking, the proponents must either demonstrate how other organizations will be partnered with to support the project or have a recruitment strategy to fill the gaps.	The PDD lists the following technical skills as being required: • Stakeholder ID and community engagement • Biodiversity assessment and monitoring • Carbon Stock measurement and monitoring • Regional deforestation and land-use modeling • project management • Local knowledge and fluency in Portuguese. The expertise/experience of the management team is explained, as well as that of the of project workers and technical contractors
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G4.2 of the PDD.
Findings:	The project proponents address this indicator by mentioning the general technical skills required for the project and detailing the backgrounds and expertise of the people who will carry them out.

Indicator G4.3 - Include a plan to provide orientation and training for the project's employees and relevant people from the communities with an objective of building locally useful skills and knowledge to increase local participation in project implementation. These capacity building efforts should target a wide range of people in the communities,	The PDD lists orientation meetings for community members and training sessions for TECMAN staff. Agricultural training for community members is described in the PDD in the future tense, but training was scheduled to begin in June. Training for biodiversity monitoring will be carried out by S.O.S. Amazonia and Environmental Affairs for the City of Cruzeiro do Sul.

including minority and underrepresented groups. Identify how training will be passed on to new workers when there is staff turnover, so that local capacity will not be lost.	S.O.S. Amazonia will be used to train new workers when there is staff turnover.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G4.3 of the PDD. Interviews during site visit.
Findings:	The project proponents address this indicator by stating the training that has been done or will be done, and identifying those who will carry out the training.

Indicator G4.4 - Show that people from the communities will be given an equal opportunity to fill all employment positions (including management) if the job requirements are met. Project proponents must explain how employees will be selected for positions and where relevant, must indicate how local community members, including women and other potentially underrepresented groups, will be given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained.	The PDD explains that communities will be given an equal opportunity to fill positions. Local guides, providers of transportation, food and lodging and the project manager are from the local community. Several other positions will also soon be filled, most likely by locals. Positions will be announced at monthly community meetings and by word of mouth. Those wishing to apply will contact ISRC or the project manager directly. ISRC will interview all applicants, including women and underrepresented groups, and hire the best qualified. In the case of equally qualified applicants, members of underrepresented groups will be selected.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G4.4 of the PDD. Interviews during site visit.
Findings:	The project proponents demonstrate their dedication to hiring locally in this section, and other places throughout the PDD. In addition, they state that underrepresented groups will receive consideration over others when job applicants of similar qualifications compete for one position.

Indicator G4.5 - Submit a list of all relevant laws and regulations covering worker's rights in the host country. Describe how the project will inform workers about their rights. Provide assurance that the project meets or exceeds all	The PDD lists part of the Brazilian Constitution, which addresses wages, working hours, guidance on leave, collective bargaining and discrimination. Also, two additional labor laws are listed as affecting work hours, employment of minors and women, minimum wage, safety, penalties for non-compliance, judicial processes for addressing issues, and extending rights

applicable laws and/or regulations covering worker rights and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.	to rural workers. Agreements between project proponents and contractors stipulate abidance of these laws. CarbonCo's employee handbook informs employees of their rights. ISRC presents a letter to employees, informing them of their rights.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G4.5 of the PDD. Interviews during site visit.
Findings:	The indicator is addressed by the provision of a list of labor related laws, and an explanation of how workers will be informed of their rights.

Indicator G4.6 - Comprehensively assess situations and occupations that pose a substantial risk to worker safety. A plan must be in place to inform workers of risks and to explain how to minimize such risks. Where worker safety cannot be guaranteed, project proponents must show how the risks will be minimized using best work practices.	The PDD lists: Drowning Heat exhaustion Getting lost Venomous snakes Tropical diseases As worker risks. Common sense solutions are presented to mitigate these risks.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G4.6 of the PDD. Site visit.
Findings:	This indicator was addressed by providing a list of risks to workers, and how each will be mitigated.

Indicator G4.7 - Document the financial health of the implementing organization(s) to demonstrate that financial resources budgeted will be adequate to implement the project.	The PDD states that the Project proponents have extensive experience and know what it takes to manage a project. IRS form 990 is available for a number of years on the GuideStar website, for a fee.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G4.7 of the PDD, link to GuideStar website.
Findings:	GuideStar indicates Carbonfund.org was quite solvent in 2008. No more recent information was made available. No information regarding the project budget.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please demonstrate that Carbonfund.org has sufficient financial resources to implement this project, based on the estimated costs of the project.

Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	A Pro Forma was provided in August 2013 that demonstrated the project budget. Carbonfund.org's 990s for 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 are freely available on its website (See here: http://carbonfund.org/about). Additionally, a letter of support from CarbonCo's Chief Financial Officer, a signed VERPA, and a bank statement from CarbonCo were provided to ESI via DropBox on October 17, 2013.
Evidence used to close NCR	Pro Forma, 990 forms, the letter of support, CarbonCo's bank statement and the emissions reductions purchase agreement demonstrate that sufficient funds are budgeted and will be available to implement the project.
Date closed	13 December 2013

G5 Legal Status and Property Rights

Indicator G5.1 - Submit a list of all relevant national and local laws and regulations in the host country and all applicable international treaties and agreements. Provide assurance that the project will comply with these and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.	The PDD lists international agreements that are pertinent to the project, and national laws and regulations. Detail regarding the way each law affects the project and the way the project proponents comply is included. The same is done for two laws in the State of Acre, regarding payment for ecosystem services and the forestry law.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G5.1 of the PDD.
Findings:	Indicator G5.1 has been addressed by providing a list of relevant laws and the detail that explains the relevance of each to the project and project activities.

Indicator G5.2 - Document that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, including the established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the communities.	The PDD states that the land is owned by ISRC, a project proponent, and has approval from the local communities, as shown by the Tri-Party agreement. The project also has letters of support from the president of the Climate Change Institute of Acre and the president of the legislature of Cruzeiro do Sul.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	section G5.2 of the PDD.
Findings:	No agreements or letters provided.

Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide the agreements mentioned in the response to G5.2.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	The letters of support and Tri-Party Agreement were provided to ESI in August 2013 and were resent to ESI in October 2013.
Evidence used to close NCR	Copies of letters and agreements received.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator G5.3 - Demonstrate with documented consultations and agreements that the project will not encroach uninvited on private property, community property, or government property and has obtained the free, prior, and informed consent of those whose rights will be affected by the project.	The PDD states that the project will not encroach uninvited on private or government property. Communities that have already encroached on the project proponent's property will receive title to land that has been cleared of forest and has been worked. FPIC was provided through face-to-face meetings. Lands are being transferred to those who work it, regardless of whether they join the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G5.2 of the PDD, general nature of one of the main project activities (giving legal title of land to those who work it).
Findings:	The project proponents address this indicator by stating they will not encroach on the property or rights of other. Part of the project involves granting more rights, in the form of property, to the local community members.

Indicator G5.4 - Demonstrate that the project does not require the involuntary relocation of people or of the activities important for the livelihoods and culture of the communities. If any relocation of habitation or activities is undertaken within the terms of an agreement, the project proponents must demonstrate that the agreement was made with the free, prior, and informed consent of those concerned and includes provisions for just and fair compensation.	The PDD states that no involuntary relocation of people or activities related to the communities livelihoods and culture will occur. One of the main project activities is to ensure that communities gain legal title to the lands they have cleared, worked and live on.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G5.3, one of the main project activities.

Findings:	This indicator is demonstrated by the project proponents' statement and one of the main project activities: granting land to those who already live on it.

Indicator G5.5 - Identify any illegal activities that could affect the project's climate, community or biodiversity impacts (e.g., logging) taking place in the project zone and describe how the project will help to reduce these activities so that project benefits are not derived from illegal activities.	The PDD identifies three illegal activities that could potentially affect project benefits: • Illegal hunting, fishing or collecting of endangered species • Illegal logging • Cultivation, transport or distribution of illegal drugs. Forest, biodiversity and community monitoring should detect illegal activities. None of the activities will be allowed, and the appropriate authorities will be notified if there appears to be a violation.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G5.4 of the PDD.
Findings:	This indicator was addressed with the list of detrimental illegal activities and the monitoring that will detect them.

Indicator G5.6 - Demonstrate that the project proponents have clear, uncontested title to the carbon rights, or provide legal documentation demonstrating that the project is undertaken on behalf of the carbon owners with their full consent. Where local or national conditions preclude clear title to the carbon rights at the time of validation against the Standards, the project proponents must provide evidence that their ownership of carbon rights is likely to be established before they enter into any transactions concerning the project's carbon assets.	The PDD states the project proponents have clear, uncontested title to property and carbon rights. A title search or the Brazilian equivalent was done, and supposedly provide to the auditors.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G5.5 of the PDD.

Findings:	No title documentation provided.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide the title documentation described in the PDD.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	The title documentation was provided to ESI in August 2013 and was resent to ESI in October 2013.
Clarification Request (CL) to address non-conformance:	Please provide an English language version of the title documentation. Though the CCB allows for documents to be provided in locally appropriate languages (page 16 of the CCB Standards Rules) under the joint validation the project the VCS does require supporting documentation in English. This would greatly facilitate the validation process. Alternatively, if it is preferred we can contract our Portuguese translator to do the review.
Date issued	13 October 2013
Evidence used to close NCR	The project developer has provided a translation of the Certidao De Inteiro Teor (document file is named /eyaA Project Certidao de Ineiro Teor (Original and Translated).pdf), translated by a certified translation professional. It translates to Certificate of Land Registry. The certificates describe "125 roads of rubber plantation at Russas," another 23 roads of rubber plantation, all owned by the heirs of Alfredo Said. Several loans on the property were made, and later the loans were satisfied. For each, a "Clearance Certificate Burden" was made for the present owner, Mr. Ilderlei Souz Rodrigues Cordeiro. A translation of the Memorial Descrito (document file is named Russas Project's Memorial Descritivo (Original and Translated).pdf), which includes survey descriptions of a 65,390.0000 ha. tract Plotting some of the lat./long. positions indicate that it describes the Russas property.
Findings	The certification of full rights document (Russas Project Landownership Documentation.pdf) has been provided by the project proponents and page 19 correctly identifies Ilderlei Souza Rodrigues Cordeiro (dated 2012) as the owner. The property appears to have been properly geo-referenced and any boundary disputes resolved. Finding closed.

CL1 Net Positive Climate Impacts

Indicator CL1.1 - Estimate the net change in carbon stocks due to the project activities using the methods of calculation, formulae and default values of the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU or using a more robust and detailed methodology. The net change is equal to carbon stock changes *with* the project minus carbon stock changes *without* the project (the latter having been estimated in G2). This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defendable assumptions about how project activities will alter GHG emissions of carbon stocks over the duration of the project or the project GHG accounting period.	The project was successfully validated against: Project Scope 14: Agriculture, Forest and other Land Use (AFOLU) Project Category: Reduction Emission from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) Type of Activity: Avoided Unplanned Deforestation (AUDD) This project is being registered under the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) as a Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) project and has been developed in compliance with the Verified Carbon Standard[1], Version 3.3 and VCS AFOLU Requirements[2]. The project will reduce emissions from unplanned frontier deforestation. Full validation of the climate benefits of this project has occurred simultaneously and all estimates of carbon stock changes are contained in the validated project description. The GHG assertion provided by CarbonCo and validated by ESI will result in the GHG emissions reduction or removal of 1,201,474 tCO2 equivalents by the project during the 10 year initial reporting period (2012 - 2021). This figure is the result of a total net forest carbon sequestration (t CO_2) of 1,645,928, buffer pool contribution of 164,593 and estimated leakage of 279,861. Only the initial 10 year baseline period was validated at this time, given that the baseline will be renewed at year 11.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Validated VCS project description and the CCB project description.
Findings:	Project was successfully validated for climate benefits under VCS.

Indicator CL1.2 - Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO_2 GHG emissions such as CH_4 and N_2O in the *with* and *without* project	The project estimates changes in emissions of non-CO2 GHG emissions such as CH4 and N2O in the *with* and *without* project scenarios estimated in conformance with the VCS modular REDD

[1] VCS. 2012 VCS Standard. Version 3.3, 04 October 2012. Verified Carbon Standard, Washington, D.C.
[2] VCS. 2012 Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Requirements. Version 3.3, 04 October 2012. Verified Carbon Standard, Washington, D.C.

scenarios if those gases are likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO_2-equivalent) of the project's overall GHG emissions reductions or removals over each monitoring period.	methodology VM0007. These sources and methods for estimation have been successfully validated.
Findings:	Project was successfully validated for climate benefits under VCS.

Indicator CL1.3 - Estimate any other GHG emissions resulting from project activities. Emissions sources include, but are not limited to, emissions from biomass burning during site preparation, emissions from fossil fuel combustion, direct emissions from the use of synthetic fertilizers, and emissions from the decomposition of N-fixing species.	The project estimates changes in emissions of non-CO2 GHG emissions such as CH4 and N2O from biomass burning in the *with* and *without* project scenarios estimated in conformance with the VCS modular REDD methodology VM0007. These sources and methods for estimation have been successfully validated.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Validated VCS project description and the CCB project description.
Findings:	Project was successfully validated for climate benefits under VCS.

Indicator CL1.4 - Demonstrate that the net climate impact of the project is positive. The net climate impact of the project is the net change in carbon stocks plus net change in non-CO_2 GHGs where appropriate minus any other GHG emissions resulting from project activities minus any likely project-related unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts (see CL2.3).	Full validation of the climate benefits of this project has occurred simultaneously and all estimates of carbon stock changes are contained in the validated project description. The GHG assertion provided by CarbonCo and validated by ESI will result in the GHG emissions reduction or removal of 1,201,474 tCO2 equivalents by the project during the 10 year initial reporting period (2012 - 2021). This figure is the result of a total net forest carbon sequestration (t CO_2) of 1,645,928, buffer pool contribution of 164,593 and estimated leakage of 279,861. Only the initial 10 year baseline period was validated at this time, given that the baseline will be renewed at year 11.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Validated VCS project description and the CCB project description.
Findings:	Project was successfully validated for climate benefits under VCS.

Indicator CL1.5 - Specify how double counting of GHG emissions reductions or removals will be avoided, particularly for offsets sold on the voluntary market and generated in a country with an emissions cap.	The project is being registered with VCS to ensure avoidance of double counting.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CL1.5 of the PDD, VCS project submission documents.
Findings:	The project proponents address this indicator by registering the project and its credits with VCS.

CL2 Offsite Climate Impacts ("Leakage")

Indicator CL2.1 - Determine the types of leakage that are expected and estimate potential offsite increases in GHGs (increases in emissions or decreases in sequestration) due to project activities. Where relevant, define and justify where leakage is most likely to take place.	Leakage emissions from unplanned deforestation displacement were appropriately determined from the module LK-ASU. Parameters and values used to calculate the annual ex-ante GHG emissions in the leakage were individually checked for correctness and found to be accurate. The validation team found that the leakage factor used to estimate displacement from the project area to the leakage belt was reasonable.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Validation of the project description and all associated calculations, parameters and personal observations while on the site visit.
Findings:	Project was successfully validated for climate benefits under VCS.

Indicator CL2.2 - Document how any leakage will be mitigated and estimate the extent to which such impacts will be reduced by these mitigation activities.	The PDD lists the following activities as leakage mitigation: working in unison with the Valparaiso project. Payment for Ecosystem Services Scheme. Agricultural extension classes offered to residents of the leakage belt. Landowner will monitor leakage in the form of illegal deforestation.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CL2.2 of the PDD.
Findings:	Without a determination of the types of leakage that are expected, it is not possible to determine if these

	mitigation activities can be expected to be effective.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please address leakage mitigation in terms of the leakage that might be expected from the project.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	The only type of leakage expected from the Russas Project is activity-shifting leakage. No market leakage is expected. The CCBS PDD was updated on October 10, 2013 to specify the type of leakage.
Evidence used to close NCR	Leakage has been identified as activity shifting leakage. Mitigation activities will likely have a beneficial effect in reducing it.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator CL2.3 - Subtract any likely project-related unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts from the climate benefits being claimed by the project and demonstrate that this has been included in the evaluation of net climate impact of the project (as calculated in CL1.4).	The Project states it will subtract any likely project-related and unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts, should they be identified.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Validated VCS project description and the CCB project description.
Findings:	Project has demonstrated that it has included this element in its evaluation of the net climate impacts.

Indicator CL2.4 - Non-CO_2 gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO_2-equivalent) of the net change calculations (above) of the project's overall off-site GHG emissions reductions or removals over each monitoring period.	The Project states that it will account for any non-CO2 GHG emissions (e.g., methane or nitrous oxides) if they are likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO2e) of the net change calculations.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Validated VCS project description and the CCB project description.
Findings:	Project has demonstrated that it has included this element in its evaluation of the net climate impacts.

CL3 Climate Impact Monitoring

Indicator CL3.1 - Develop an initial	The PDD states that a full monitoring plan has been

plan for selecting carbon pools and non-CO_2 GHGs to be monitored, and determine the frequency of monitoring. Potential pools include aboveground biomass, litter, dead wood, belowground biomass, wood products, soil carbon and peat. Pools to monitor must include any pools expected to decrease as a result of project activities, including those in the region outside the project boundaries resulting from all types of leakage identified in CL2. A plan must be in place to continue leakage monitoring for at least five years after all activity displacement or other leakage causing activity has taken place. Individual GHG sources may be considered 'insignificant' and do not have to be accounted for if together such omitted decreases in carbon pools and increases in GHG emissions amount to less than 5% of the total CO_2-equivalent benefits generated by the project. Non-CO_2 gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of CO_2-equivalent) of the project's overall GHG impact over each monitoring period. Direct field measurements using scientifically robust sampling must be used to measure more significant elements of the project's carbon stocks. Other data must be suitable to the project site and specific forest type.	devised, and can be found in the VCS project description document.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CL3.1 of the PDD, Section 4.3 of the VCS PDD.
Findings:	This indicator was addressed with a monitoring plan. And with the validation of the VCS project description.

Indicator CL3.2 - Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.	The PDD states a full monitoring plan has been written and can be found in the VCS PDD.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CL3.2 of the PDD, Section 4.5 of the VCS PDD
Findings:	The project proponents addressed this indicator by developing a monitoring plan.

CM1 Net Positive Community Impacts

Indicator CM1.1 - Use appropriate methodologies to estimate the impacts on communities, including all constituent socio-economic or cultural groups such as indigenous peoples (defined in G1), resulting from planned project activities. A credible estimate of impacts must include changes in community well-being due to project activities and an evaluation of the impacts by the affected groups. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defendable assumptions about how project activities will alter social and economic well-being, including potential impacts of changes in natural resources and ecosystem services identified as important by the communities (including water and soil resources), over the duration of the project. The 'with project' scenario must then be compared with the 'without project' scenario of social and economic well-being in the	Using a participatory rural assessment and basic needs survey, the project proponents characterized the local community stakeholders. The greatest impact on communities will be the continued degradation of the surrounding forest in the without project scenario, which will gradually have a greater and greater impact on life, reducing ecosystem services provided. The with project scenario improves community well-being and prolongs full ecosystem services. It is assumed that local communities will be able to continue their subsistence agricultural lifestyle in the without project scenario, but slowly degrading over time.

absence of the project (completed in G2). The difference (i.e., the community benefit) must be positive for all community groups.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CM1.1 of the PDD.
Findings:	Project proponents addressed this indicator using assessments and surveys from the communities and realistically state the impacts, but the final conclusions could be made more clearly.

Indicator CM1.2 - Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.4-6 will be negatively affected by the project.	The HCVs related to the communities include food from hunting and fishing, medicines, and supplying building materials. Conservation practices will not negatively affect fishing or hunting, and medicinal plants will be preserved. A health clinic will also be supplied. The project may negatively affect the supply of building materials, but the PDD states that little timber is used in repairing homes.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CM1.2 of the PDD.
Findings:	The PDD indicates that the extraction of building materials may be affected.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	If building material supply is an HCV for the communities, it is not to be negatively affected by the project. Please address.
Date issued	7 October 2013.
Project proponent response/actions and date	The following was added to the CCBS PDD on October 17, 2013: Although the Project seeks to eliminate deforestation – which might negatively impact the communities' access to building materials – the communities use relatively little timber to repair their houses. To mitigate this potential negative impact, the communities will be allowed to continue extracting timber to repair their houses and over time, the Project will promote replanting hardwood species that can be specifically used by the communities for housing.
Evidence used to close NCR	The addition of the above mentioned strategy for maintaining a local source of building materials for the communities fully addresses preservation of

	community HCVs.
Date closed	13 December 2013

CM2 Offsite Stakeholder Impacts

Indicator CM2.1 - Identify any potential negative offsite stakeholder impacts that the project activities are likely to cause.	The following offsite stakeholder impacts were identified: • Increased cost of land if carbon projects increase property values. • Decrease in land values if project prevents adjacent properties from accessing markets. • In migration to project zone. • Out-migration from project zone to adjacent primary forests. • Project does not eliminate deforestation, communities continue to expand. • Wealth leads to jealousy, conflict, illicit activity, etc.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CM2.1 of the PDD.
Findings:	The project proponents address this indicator thoroughly, though the project is unlikely to have negative offsite stakeholder impacts.

Indicator CM2.2 - Describe how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite social and economic impacts.	It is unlikely that the project will cause an unwanted increase in property values, compared to the paving of nearby roads. However, project proponents are prepared to expand conservation efforts to willing nearby landowners so that they can reap such rewards, as well. Reducing market access by not allowing roads to be built across conservation lands have many significant climate, community and biodiversity benefits that outweigh rerouting a road. Acre State has an incentive system to reduce in-migration. In addition, deforestation monitoring will identify the problem, if it occurs. Out-migration from the project area into surrounding forests will be mitigated by implementing social projects and programs.

	Community benefits will be monitored and many of the social benefits, like schools and the medical clinic, will be available to people outside the project area. This should monitor and deal with societal ills and petty jealousies that might arise from increased wealth generated by the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CM2.2 of the PDD.
Findings:	Negative impacts are generally slight or with a low risk of occurrence. Mitigation measures appear adequate.

Indicator CM2.3 - Demonstrate that the project is not likely to result in net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups.	The PDD states the project will have a net positive effect on stakeholders' well-being, citing: • Health/dental clinic, open to project participants and offsite communities; • Agricultural extension training; • Increased knowledge for future REDD+ projects in Acre. • Sharing of knowledge, BMPs and other lessons learned with stakeholders, including the state of Acre. Other stakeholder benefits mentioned throughout the PDD include land title to the communities and the maintenance of ecosystem services.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CM2.3 of the PDD, myriad parts of the PDD, describing project activities and benefits.
Findings:	Benefits outweigh the relatively minor and low risk negative impacts the project might cause.

CM3 Community Impact Monitoring

Indicator CM3.1 - Develop an initial plan for selecting community variables to be monitored and the frequency of monitoring and reporting to ensure that monitoring variables are directly linked to the project's community development objectives and to anticipated impacts (positive and	The PDD states that an initial monitoring plan has been designed, and it involves regular communications between ISRC and the communities. Monitoring of "outside" stakeholders involved informal conversations and reviewing census data.

negative).	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CM3.1 of the PDD.
Findings:	The monitoring plan lacks variables to be monitored and the frequency at which they should be monitored.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please include a monitoring plan with variables to be monitored and a monitoring schedule.
Date issued	7 October 2013.
Project proponent response/actions and date	The following was added on October 31, 2013 to section CM3.1 of the CCBS PDD: "From these conversations and based off Carbon Securities and CarbonCo's experience at the Purus Project, it was determined that a Basic Necessity Survey (BNS), Participatory Rural Assessment (PRA) and the Theory of Change would be the three best tools to monitor community net benefits and the communities' High Conservation Values. The BNS and PRA shall be administered every two years, with the initial surveys conducted from March to May 2013. The specific variables to be annually monitored are the indicators of the Theory of Change (activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts), while the access to Basic Necessities, along with the value of owned assets, value of owned assets per capita, poverty score and poverty index, inequality of owned assets and inequality of owned assets per capita will be monitored every two years. Please see the full monitoring plan below for additional details."
Evidence used to close NCR	The updated version of the PDD now includes a monitoring plan with variables to be monitored. Monitoring frequency will be every two years.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator CM3.2 - Develop an initial plan for how they will assess the effectiveness of measures used to maintain or enhance High Conservation Values related to community well-being (G1.8.4-6) present in the project zone.	The PDD states that the PRA and BNS were designed to measure community HCVs.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CM1.1 and CM3.2 of the PDD
Findings:	The community-based HCVs mentioned in G1.8

	include food sources, medicines, building materials and hydrological services. It is not evident how the PRA measures the use of food or medicinal plant sources in the forest through the years, and the distance traveled to collect building materials may not be the best measure of that factor. It is also not evident how hydrological services are measured.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please specifically explain the way the assessment and the needs survey monitor the hydrological services, foods, medicines and building materials provided by the project lands.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	Additional information was added to section CM3.2 of the CCBS PDD on October 31, 2013 to clarify how the BNS and PRA monitor hydrological services, food, medicines and building materials.
Evidence used to close NCR	The updated version of the PDD states that the PRA will now include questions regarding trends in the availability of foods, medicinal plants and building materials. The specific hydrological services provided by the rivers (drinking water, access to fisheries, transportation) will also be directly addressed in the PRA.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator CM3.3 - Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.	The PDD indicates that the plan is for the PRA and BNS to be repeated every two years, but there will also be plenty of contact with the communities aside from that. The PDD goes on to mention a series of indicators to be monitored, some of which have little to do with the well-being of the communities. The PDD also states that a number of questions that were not on the PRA will be in future assessments. (For example, monitoring whether people received benefit payments.)
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section CM3.3, section CM1.1 of the PDD.
Findings:	It appears that the project proponent is dedicated to community monitoring, however the description of the monitoring plan makes it sound as if it is incomplete. The PDD describes it as already being in

	existence.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please state a commitment to developing a full monitoring plan, or provide the plan that has already been designed, mentioned in the PDD.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	The Project Proponents have a full community monitoring plan and section CM3.3 was revised on October 31, 2013 to remove the ambiguity.
Evidence used to close NCR	The full monitoring plan is provided in section CM3.3.
Date closed	13 December 2013

B1 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts

Indicator B1.1 - Use appropriate methodologies to estimate changes in biodiversity as a result of the project in the project zone and in the project lifetime. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defendable assumptions. The 'with project' scenario should then be compared with the baseline 'without project' biodiversity scenario completed in G2. The difference (i.e., the net biodiversity benefit) must be positive.	The PDD states the project uses the VCS VM0007 methodology to monitor changes in forest cover, and island biogeography methodology to estimate changes in biodiversity. The without project scenario of continued unplanned deforestation would result in less tree cover, less habitat availability and most likely a reduction in species abundance and diversity. The with-project scenario maintains current forest cover and replanting degraded areas, maintaining water cycling and filtration, maintaining nutrient cycling and soil quality, providing foodstuffs to community and wildlife, and providing habitat for a diversity of flora and fauna. No negative impacts are expected.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B1.1 of the PDD, common sense.
Findings:	The project proponents address this indicator by explaining that the with-project scenario is likely to maintain the area's already high biodiversity, while the without-project scenario is almost certain to degrade it.

Indicator B1.2 - Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.1-3 will be negatively affected by the project.	HCVs identified in G1.8 are all present due to the relatively untouched nature of the rainforest on these lands. The project seeks to maintain the forest in its present state, and reduce pressures for land use

	change, and the success of this can be determined by analyzing aerial imagery.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B1.2 of the PDD, the nature and goals of the project activities
Findings:	The project proponents address this indicator by explaining that protection of the forest from degradation also protects biodiversity-related HCVs.

Indicator B1.3 - Identify all species to be used by the project and show that no known invasive species will be introduced into any area affected by the project and that the population of any invasive species will not increase as a result of the project.	The project is a conservation project. A few communities plant locally sourced seeds, but this will not be in areas included for GHG quantification. Invasive species will be monitored.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B1.3 of the PDD.
Findings:	If planting activities are project activities, the species being planted must be provided here.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please state whether forest replanting is a project activity, and if so, supply the list of species that will be used.
Date issued	7 October 2013.
Project proponent response/actions and date	Forest replanting is not a formal project activity. However, there will be some reforestation. A list of the locally sourced species was added to the CCBS PDD on October 17, 2013.
Evidence used to close NCR	The revised PDD provides this list of species to be used in replanting: • Angelim (Hymenolobium sp.) • Cedro-rosa (Cedrella odorata) and Cerejeira (Amburana acreana) • Garapeira (Apuleia molaris and Apuleia leiocarpa) • Itauba (Mezilaurus itauba) • Jacareuba (Calophyllum Brasiliense) • Mulateir (Calicophylun spruceanun) None of these species appear in the ISSG's invasive species database for Brazil.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator B1.4 - Describe possible adverse effects of non-native species used by the project on the region's environment, including impacts on native species and disease introduction or facilitation. Project proponents must justify any use of non-native species over native species	The PDD states that only locally appropriate, native species used in the Russas project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B1.4 of the PDD.
Findings:	If planting trees is part of the project, a list of species to be planted should be provided so that this claim can be checked.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide a list of the species that will be used in the project.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	A list of the locally sourced species was added to the CCBS PDD on October 17, 2013.
Evidence used to close NCR	The list of species to be used was provided. They are native and non-invasive.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator B1.5 - Guarantee that no GMOs will be used to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals.	The PDD states this guarantee
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B1.5 of the PDD.
Findings:	The guarantee was made. The indicator is addressed.

B2 Offsite Biodiversity Impacts

Indicator B2.1 - Identify potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts that the project is likely to cause.	The project is unlikely to cause any negative offsite impacts, unless they are leakage-related. Deforestation will be monitored within the project zone, and activities planned to reduce leakage.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B2.1 of the PDD, the nature of the project.
Findings:	Not clearing the native vegetation from the land is unlikely to cause problems for habitat offsite. Indicator addressed.

Indicator B2.2 - Document how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite biodiversity impacts.	The PDD refers the reader to section CM2.2 and the VCS PD sections on leakage mitigation.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections B2.2 and CM2.2 of the PDD, section 3.3 of the VCS PD.
Findings:	The mitigation measures mentioned in CM2.2 are related to social impacts, not leakage. The VCS PD section on leakage does not discuss mitigation for wildlife.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please address mitigation for offsite biodiversity impacts in this section.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	Section B2.2 was revised on October 31, 2013 to clarify how offsite biodiversity impacts will be mitigated.
Evidence used to close NCR	The revised PDD states that negative offsite biodiversity impacts are unlikely, but if they occur will be a result of leakage. Activities are designed to minimize migration from the project zone to outside the zone, and neighboring landowners are encouraged to develop similar projects (which was successful in the case of the adjacent Valparaiso project).
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator B2.3 - Evaluate likely unmitigated negative offsite biodiversity impacts against the biodiversity benefits of the project within the project boundaries. Justify and demonstrate that the net effect of the project on biodiversity is positive.	The PDD states that the overall effect of the project on biodiversity will be positive, both on and offsite. More forest cover/habitat will be preserved than would be destroyed as a result of project activities.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B2.3 of the PDD, the project design and common sense.
Findings:	Reason dictates the acceptance of the statements of the project proponents, that conserving native forest vegetation will not result in a net negative effect on biodiversity.

B3 Biodiversity Impact Monitoring

Indicator B3.1 - Develop an initial plan for selecting biodiversity variables to be monitored and the	The PDD states that the project proponents have an initial and full biodiversity impact monitoring plan.

frequency of monitoring and reporting to ensure that monitoring variables are directly linked to the project's biodiversity objectives and to anticipated impacts (positive and negative).	The initial plan is to monitor forest loss, which is used as a proxy for habitat availability on a yearly basis, using Acre State's remote sensing data. Threatened and endemic species identified by camera traps will be used to analyze population and distribution.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections B3.1 and B3.2 of the PDD.
Findings:	Variable to be monitored is forest cover, frequency of monitoring is yearly. Indicator B3.1 has been adequately addressed.

Indicator B3.2 - Develop an initial plan for assessing the effectiveness of measures used to maintain or enhance High Conservation Values related to globally, regionally or nationally significant biodiversity (G1.8.1-3) present in the project zone.	The PDD states that the plan is to monitor aerial imagery from Acre State each year for forest cover loss, and incorporate data from camera traps to develop population and distribution analyses.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B3.2 of the PDD.
Findings:	The wildlife-related HCVs include rare and endemic species and rare/threatened habitat. The habitat these species use is rainforest, so it is likely that measuring the forest cover change in the project zone is an adequate measure of the effectiveness of the project activities.

Indicator B3.3 - Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.	The PDD states that the project proponents will continue to monitor forest cover, along with monitoring diversity, distribution and population with camera traps. This constitutes the full monitoring plan.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section B3.3 of the PDD.
Findings:	It seems early to declare that a full monitoring plan is

	in existence. Actual species inventories for the lands have not yet occurred. The presence or absence of some species may call for additional methods for monitoring. Camera traps and forest cover monitoring may turn out to be the best or only options, but that has not yet been demonstrated through a discussion of the animals and habitats determined to be present on the project lands.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Demonstrate that monitoring forest cover and using camera traps is sufficient to monitor all wildlife species of interest in the rainforests of Acre.
Date issued	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date	The following was added to the CCBS PDD on November 11, 2013: "Monitoring forest cover and using wildlife cameras will be sufficient to monitor all wildlife species of interest – particularly medium-to-large mammals – throughout the Project Zone's rainforests. This has been demonstrated via local studies conducted near the Project Zone indicating the type of biodiversity likely present, along with CarbonCo and Carbon Securities' successful use of wildlife cameras at the Purus Project (another REDD+ project near Manoel Urbano, Acre) which has identified numerous mammals."
Findings	The project is committing to creating a full monitoring plan for relevant elements within the required time frame. Issue addressed.
Date issued:	2014-03-17

Gold Level Section

GL2 Exceptional Community Benefits

Indicator GL2.1 - Demonstrate that the project zone is in a low human development country OR in an administrative area of a medium or high human development country in which at least 50% of the population of that area is below the national poverty line.	The PDD states that Brazil is considered a high human development country, but at least 50% of the population in the project zone is below the national poverty line. The 2010 Census estimates that 54.1% of the population of Acre lives on half the minimum wage. The nominal median monthly income of rural

	permanent private households in Cruzeiro do Sul is R$130.75.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section GL2.1 of the PDD, results of census for Cruziero do Sul.
Findings:	This indicator can easily be answered by stating the poverty line for Brazil, and stating the median income for the area. Instead, a mixture of figures is offered, including minimum wage, except for the poverty line for Brazil. The relationship between minimum wage and the poverty line in Brazil is not known to the auditors.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide the data necessary to determine if 50% of the local population is below the poverty line.
Date issued:	7 October 2013.
Project proponent response/actions	The national poverty line for Brazil was added to the CCBS PDD on October 11, 2013.
Evidence used to close NCR:	The updated PDD reports the poverty line for Brazil as R$180.14/month while the median income for the area is $130.75/month. At least 50% of the population is below the poverty line.
Date closed:	13 December 2013

Indicator GL2.2 - Demonstrate that at least 50% of households within the lowest category of well-being (e.g., poorest quartile) of the community are likely to benefit substantially from the project.	The PDD states that all community members, regardless of background, longevity on the project or the size of holdings, will be allowed to participate. Project proponents will seek to prevent elite capture. Benefit distribution will be "very equal." • Several barriers to participation due to poverty are listed, including: • living far from project HQ, • fewer agricultural tools available • lack of boat, motor or fuel • poor health and nutrition Remedies for overcoming these barriers will be available, including fuel for boats, mechanized agricultural tools will be purchased by the association, healthcare, including doctor visits, are free,
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section GL2.2 of the PDD. Various other parts of the document.

Findings:	It appears that barriers to participation by the poorest community members have been addressed, with the possible exception of transportation for those without boats. Metrics need to be provided to demonstrate that the 50% of households within the poorest quartile are likely to benefit substantially.
Non-Conformity Report (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide some metrics demonstrating that at least 50% of households within the lowest category of well-being (e.g., poorest quartile) of the community are likely to benefit substantially from the project. The BNS would appear to be a good source from which to make this demonstration.
Date issued:	7 October 2013
Project proponent response/actions	Metrics derived from the BNS were calculated and added to the CCBS PDD on October 31, 2013 to demonstrate at least 50% of the households within the poorest quartile of the community are likely to benefit substantially from the Project. The supporting documentation from the BNS (see Excel tab entitled, "Bottom Quartile Needs") was uploaded to DropBox.
Evidence used to close NCR	The updated PDD points out that the BNS survey has identified the poorest quartile of the community, and the basic necessities which these families lack. The project activities are targeted towards supplying some of these necessities through services (health clinic, agricultural courses, transportation) and the monitoring plan will monitor whether access to basic needs for the poorest families improves.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Indicator GL2.3 - Demonstrate that any barriers or risks that might prevent benefits going to poorer households have been identified and addressed in order to increase the probable flow of benefits to poorer households.	The PDD identifies several potential barriers and has addressed them reasonably. See indicator GL2.2.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G2.2 of the PDD.
Findings:	Barriers identified and mitigation measures to get around them seem reasonable. Indicator GL2.3 has been adequately addressed.

Indicator GL2.4 - Demonstrate that measures have been taken to identify any poorer and more vulnerable households and individuals whose well-being or poverty may be negatively affected by the project, and that the project design includes measures to avoid any such impacts. Where negative impacts are unavoidable, demonstrate that they will be effectively mitigated.	The PDD states that the BNS (basic needs survey) identified the poorer, more vulnerable households. All communities have been consulted. No negative impacts are expected.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section GL2.2 of the PDD, the BNS.
Findings:	The BNS should be able to identify the poorest households. No negative impacts are reasonably expected, however. Indicator GL 2.4 has been adequately addressed.

Indicator GL2.5 - Demonstrate that community impact monitoring will be able to identify positive and negative impacts on poorer and more vulnerable groups. The social impact monitoring must take a differentiated approach that can identify positive and negative impacts on poorer households and individuals and other disadvantaged groups, including women.	The BNS will be administered regularly (every 2 years). This will give project proponents the data they need to monitor whether people of all economic classes involved have been impacted economically
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section GL2.3 of the PDD
Findings:	It is likely that the BNS, administered regularly, will pick up the general well-being of community members, including the poorest members.
Clarification Request (CR):	Please clarify how the BNS is a differentiated approach that can identify positive and negative impacts on other disadvantaged groups, including women.
Date issued:	
Project proponent response/actions	The following was added to the CCBS PDD on October 31, 2013: “The Basic Necessities Survey is a differentiated approach because the Survey allows for the identification of the poorest communities and will

	enable the Project to specifically target their needs (for example, lack of transportation to participate in the Project). Furthermore, the Survey was administered with women throughout the Project and the Project will specifically target their unique needs (for example, access to education for their children) as well."
Evidence used to close NCR	The above addition to the updated PDD clarifies that the BNS targets the community's women for monitoring, and will be able to differentiate impacts on people at different economic levels.
Date closed	13 December 2013

Public Shareholder Comments

Public comments for CCBA were solicited in four ways; posting of the PDD to the CCBA website, making the PDD available in the communities in the project zone, public meetings, several email communications and through an article in the 29 July 2013 edition of the local newspaper, the Jurua Tribunal. A single comment was received during the comment period through the CCB website from Norman Bishop, in strong support of the project. ESI confirms that the comment did not include any question or criticism that would require any response from the project proponent. ESI is satisfied with the results of the public shareholder/stakeholder meetings outreach programs.

Local Shareholder Comments

The PDD was made available at the Russas office in the project zone. Additional copies were distributed by BioCarbon Partner's Community Engagement Team.

Meetings were held where the project was presented and explained. Community members were given the opportunity to discuss, question and provide feedback. Community members were encouraged to submit written comments to community coordinators. All comments received were positive and in support of the project. Comments were received from the following individuals both unsolicited or during the public comment period:

- Romario Tavares D'avila- Presidente da Camara Municipal de Cruzeiro do Sul
- Senador Euardo Braga- PMDB- Amazonas
- Maria Cristina Benwinda Fernandes- Superintendente Regional Interina
- Gelnilosn Figueiredo de Araujo- Director Presidente do ITERACRE
- Francisca R. do Nacimiento-Secretaria Municipal De Meio Ambiente
- Eufran Ferreira do Amaral- Director-Presidente do Instituto de Mudancas Climaticas e Regulacao de Servicos Ambientais
- Elson Santiago- Deputado-Presidente do Assembleia Legislativa
- Ilmara Rodrigues Lima- Secretaria Estadual de Turismo e Lazer
- Norman Bishop

CCB Public Comment Period

The project PDD was posted to the CCBA website for the formal 30-day public comment period 18 July 2013 – 17 August 2013. One comment was received and can be viewed in Appendix B.

Public Meetings

Ilderlei Souza Rodrigues Cordierio and CarbonCo staff held several public meetings in the community zones, between 2011 and 2013, according to the following schedule:

March 17, 2011 – Ilderlei Souza Rodrigues Cordeiro met with the Russas Project's local communities to discuss the Project and an "ata" was signed, which supports the project state date.
November and December 2011 - Ilderlei Souza Rodrigues Cordeiro informally met with the local community to discuss the Russas Project and informally met local officials (including the mayor) in Cruzeiro do Sul.
March 2012 - Ilderlei Souza Rodrigues Cordeiro met again with the local community to discuss the Project. The local community expressed the desire to work with açaí, which was later incorporated into the agriculture surveys. The area's biodiversity was also discussed and this is when the idea to reintroduce the Amazonian manatee was raised. The community explained the Amazonian manatee used to exist in the Valparaiso River, but now there are none remaining.
January 2013 – Ilderlei Souza Rodrigues Cordeiro met with some community members in Cruzeiro do Sul. The community was stopping deforestation and wanted to know how they would benefit from the project.
March 30 - April 1, 2013 – CarbonCo, Carbon Securities, Ilderlei Souza Rodrigues Cordeiro, and Sebastião Tome de Melo Junior (son-in-law of Manoel Batista Lopes) visited the Russas-Valparaiso communities, further discussed the Projects, and administered the Household Survey and Participatory Rural Assessment (PRA), Basic Necessity Survey (BNS), and the Agricultural Surveys.
May 11-15, 2013 - Ilderlei Souza Rodrigues Cordeiro visited the Russas-Valparaiso Projects to administer additional Household Survey and Participatory Rural Assessment (PRA), Basic Necessity Survey (BNS), and the Agricultural Surveys.

Ilderlei Souza Rodrigues Cordierio led the official meetings, describing the contents of the PDD, outlines were handed out in English and Portugese, questions and discussion encouraged. The validator's site visit was announced and posted at community centers. Full copies of the PDD were presented to the local community. Minutes were taken at each meeting.

Smaller, local follow-up meetings at the village level were organized to ensure dissemination of the PDD, to collect questions and feedback from community members, and to disseminate information in local languages.

During ESI's site visit of 19-24 August 2013, one public meeting was held on August 24, 2013 at the home of the onsite project manager. Validators met with approximately 50 people from the communities in the Russas project area. The interviews were done in a more collective style due

to the large number of people in attendance. This community seems very close knit and appeared to be enjoying their neighbors company. The people all seemed positive about the project and all appeared to respect Ilderlei. We asked them several questions relating to their understanding of the project, what they thought would be the most useful benefits and what they were willing to give in return for stopping their deforestation. They all seemed genuinely satisfied with the idea of getting health services and land title in exchange for lessening their deforestation. It seems that most of them practice some kind of agriculture and cattle ranching, with agriculture being stronger in this area. They spoke about how they have to continue to cut down new parts of the forest because they can't get the crops to grow as well after the first year however most expressed interest in learning new methods of crop production so they could stop the destruction of the forest.

Individuals interviewed while on site included*:
Ilderlei Souza Rodrigues Cordierio
Manoel Lopez
Eddie
Francisca Nascimiento
Jose Delmar
Romario Tavares
Marmud, Maria and Glaouco
Cleito
Fatima
Maria
Alderlene Lima Souza
Glauco Da Silva De Carvelho
Marmude Denis De Carvelho
Antonio Eder da Silva Carvelho
Cleito Santos De Oliveira
Maria Da Patima Denis De Carvelho
Maria Francisca Basilio Barroso
Maria Hose Da Silva De Oliveira
Benjamin Denis De Carvacho
Marcelo Melo De Carvacho
Jose Nilson Souza Belerra
Antonio Gomes Maciel
Getulio Nascimento Da Silva
Mauricio Nunes Ferriera
Francisco souza Silva
Raimundo Nonato Souza
Jose Maria Nascimento Da Silva
Josoe Gonzalves Da Silva
Genival Silva De Oliveria
Francisco dos Santos Silva

Jose Cusorio Bezerra Da Silva
Maria Edna Da Silva
Eliana Fernandes De Negrero
Sebastiao Braga
Gelson Do Carmo Batista
Jose Ribarnar
Approximately 25 anonymous community participants
*Where first names are given only, this is because the individual chose to only give one name.

The validators confirmed that the meeting notices had been visibly and appropriately posted in central areas of the villages. Validators further observed notices in the local newspaper announcing the site visit. The validator observed the process taken by the meeting facilitators and determined that the Project was well understood and appreciated by the communities. Many of the community members were able to clearly articulate an accurate understanding of the Project and its benefits on the community and environment, which showed the validator that the dissemination of Project information and training has been successful to-date.

Validation Conclusion

ESI confirms all validation activities, including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance and the PDD adherence to the CCB Project Design Standards, Second Edition, as documented in this report are complete. ESI concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that the CCB Project Design Documentation *The Russas Project* (19 March 2014), meets the requirements of the CCB Project Design Standards (Second Edition – December 2008) and Gold Level for Exceptional Community Benefits.

Submittal Information

Report Submitted to:	CarbonCo, LLC 3 Bethesda Metro Center, Suite 700 Bethesda, Maryland 20814 Climate, Community& Biodiversity Alliance
Report Submitted (CCBA-Approved Verifier) by:	Environmental Services, Inc. 7220 Financial Way, Suite 100 Jacksonville, Florida 32256
Lead Validator and Regional Technical Manager (QA/QC) Names and Signatures:	 Shawn McMahon – Lead Validator

	Janice McMahon Janice McMahon – Vice President and Regional Technical Manager Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division
Date:	19 March 2014

SMM/JPM/rmb/VO13023.00 CCB Val Report-final.doc
K:pf 03/19/14f

Appendix A – Documents Reviewed / Received

Documents received 11 July 2013

- Russas Project Final Draft CCBS PDD - English (7-8-13).pdf

Documents received 17 July 2013

- Russas Project Final Draft VCS PD (7-17-2013).pdf
- Russas Project Final Draft CCBS PDD - Portuguese (7-16-13).pdf
- Russas Project Final Draft VCS PD (7-17-2013) Shawn Notes.pdf

Documents received 13 August 2013

- Russas Valparaiso Project Archive
    - 01 Project Document
        - Russas Project 2013.07.15.xls
        - Russas Project Final Draft VCS PD (7-17-2013).doc
        - Russas Project Final Draft VCS PD (7-17-2013).pdf
    - 02 Forest Inventory
        - Salimon et al 2011.pdf
        - Brown 1997 Estimating Biomass and Biomass Change of Tropical Forests FAO.pdf
        - Russas Valparaiso Forest Inventory 2013.06.29.doc
        - RusVal_Data_2013.06.24a.xls
        - RusVal_EqVal 2013.06.24a.xls
    - 03 Literature Sources
        - Salimon et al 2011.pdf
        - FAO 2010 FRA Brasil.pdf
    - 04 Project Proponents Contracts
        - Russas Tri-Party, Fully Signed and Certified (English).pdf
    - 05 Community Contracts
        - Russas Atas, March 2011 to May 2013.pdf
    - 07 Laws
        - Procedimentos de Segurança em Campo (TECMAN).pdf
        - Employee Handbook 2010 April.pdf
    - 08 Letter of Approval
        - OAB-AC - Ofício Declaraç_o.pdf
        - OAB AC translation.doc
    - 10 Participatory Rural Appraisal
        - PRA Results March 2013.xls
    - 13 VCS CDM Documents
        - Methodology

- VMD0017 X_UNC v2.0.pdf
- VM0007 REDD-MF Version 1.4.pdf
- VMD0001 CP-AB Live biomass.pdf
- VMD0002 CP-D Dead wood.pdf
- VMD0007 BL-UP v3.2.pdf
- VMD0010 LK-ASU Unplanned leakage.pdf
- VMD0013 E-BB Biomass burning.pdf
- VMD0015 M-MON, v2.1.pdf
- VMD0016 X-STR Stratification.pdf

▪ VCSVCS Standard, v3.3.pdf

- AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v3.2.pdf
- AFOLU Requirements v3.3_0.pdf

o 14 Maps and GIS

▪ Inventory Plots

- RUSVAL_inventoryCompleted2013.06.24.shx
- RUSVAL_inventoryCompleted2013.06.24.dbf
- RUSVAL_inventoryCompleted2013.06.24.prj
- RUSVAL_inventoryCompleted2013.06.24.sbn
- RUSVAL_inventoryCompleted2013.06.24.sbx
- RUSVAL_inventoryCompleted2013.06.24.shp
- RUSVAL_inventoryCompleted2013.06.24.shp.xml

▪ Geographical Boundaries

- RussasShapefiles

▪ GPS_out

- GPX file"
- Rus_Strata.kmz
- Rus_Strata__SA_Lambert_Confml_Conic.kml
- RussasLB.kmz
- RussasPA.kmz
- RussasProperty.kmz
- RusStrataLB.kmz

o 15 Risk Assessment

▪ Pro Forma for Russas and Valparaiso Project (7-22-13).xls
▪ Cochrane and Laurance 2002 Fire as a large-scale edge effect in Amazon.pdf
▪ Cochrane et al. 1999 Positive Feedbacks in the Fire Dynamic of Tropical Forest.pdf
▪ Espírito_Santo et al. 2010 Storm intensity and forest disturbances in the Amazon.pdf

- 16 Miscellaneous
  - Russas Sustainable Fuelwood Analysis 2013.07.15.xls

Documents received 20 August 2013

- Cursos Projetos Russas e Valparaiso
  - Registro fotografico dos cursos
    - Fotos Foz do Valparaiso
      - MOV08830.THM
      - 100_5405.JPG
      - 100_5406.JPG
      - 100_5407.JPG
      - 100_5408.JPG
      - 100_5409.JPG
      - 100_5410.JPG
      - 100_5411.JPG
      - 100_5412.JPG
      - 100_5413.JPG
      - 100_5414.JPG
      - 100_5417.JPG
      - 100_5418.AVI
      - 100_5419.JPG
      - 100_5420.JPG
      - 100_5421.JPG
      - 100_5422.JPG
      - 100_5423.JPG
      - 100_5424.JPG
      - 100_5425.JPG
      - 100_5426.JPG
      - 100_5427.JPG
      - 100_5428.JPG
      - 100_5429.JPG
      - 100_5430.JPG
      - 100_5431.JPG
      - 100_5432.JPG
      - 100_5433.JPG
      - 100_5434.JPG
      - 100_5435.JPG
      - 100_5436.JPG
      - 100_5437.JPG
      - DSC08821.JPG
      - DSC08824.JPG
      - DSC08825.JPG
      - DSC08826.JPG
      - DSC08827.JPG

- DSC08828.JPG
- DSC08829.JPG
- DSC08832.JPG
- DSC08834.JPG
- DSC08835.JPG
- DSC08838.JPG
- DSC08840.JPG
- DSC08846.JPG
- DSC08849.JPG
- DSC08850.JPG
- DSC08855.JPG
- DSC08858.JPG
- DSC08860.JPG
- DSC08861.JPG
- DSC08864.JPG
- DSC08865.JPG
- DSC08868.JPG
- DSC08869.JPG
- DSC08870.JPG
- DSC08873.JPG
- DSC08875.JPG
- DSC08883.JPG
- MOV08710.THM
- MOV08822.THM
- MOV08830.MPG

o Certificados
  - Certificado 04 - Cultivo da Graviola.pptx
  - Certificado 01 - Cultivo da Banana.pptx
  - Certificado 02 - Cultivo do Milho.pptx
  - Certificado 03 - Cultivo da Macaxeira.pptx

o Listas de presenças digitalizadas dos cursos
  - Lista de presença digitalizada - Três Bocas
    - Lista de presença Três Bocas pag 3.tif
    - Lista de presença Três Bocas pag 1.tif
    - Lista de presença Três Bocas pag 2.tif
  - Lista de presença digitalizada - Foz do Valparaiso
    - Lista de presença Foz do Valparaiso pag 2.tif
    - Lista de presença Foz do Valparaiso pag 1.tif
  - Lista de presença digitalizada - Lua Clara
    - Lista de presença Lua Clara pag 2.tif
    - Lista de presença Lua Clara pag 1.tif
  - Lista de Presença digitalizada - Terra Firme
    - Lista de Presença Terra Firme pag 3.tif
    - Lista de presença Terra Firme pag 1.tif
    - Lista de presença Terra Firme pag 2.tif

- Materia Jurua Oline Valparaiso e Russas
  - Texto Jornal.docx
  - Comunidade Foz do Valpaiso.JPG
  - Comunidade Lua Clara.JPG
  - Comunidade Terra Firme.JPG
  - Comunidade Três Bocas.JPG
- Materiais oudiovisuais utilizados nos Cursos
  - Folder.docx
  - Cultura da Banana
    - Tratos culturais.docx
    - Fotos
      - pra_fig5.JPG
      - armadilhapmolequedabananeira.jpg
      - download (1).jpg
      - download (2).jpg
      - download (3).jpg
      - download (4).jpg
      - download.jpg
      - images (1).jpg
      - images (11.jpg
      - images.jpg
      - pra_fig1.JPG
      - pra_fig2.JPG
    - Videos
      - PRAGAS BANANEIRAS.avi
    - Apresentação.pptx
    - Pragas_de_bananeira.pdf
  - Cultura da Graviola
    - Plantio da Graviola.docx
    - Fotos
      - images.jpg
      - 584e8b209c6c83f78e15b06d9faaea5a6608fb48.jpg
      - download (1).jpg
      - download.jpg
      - images (4).jpg
    - Video
      - Bahia é o maior produtor de graviola.flv
    - Apresentação.pptx
    - Calda Bordaleza.docx
  - Cultura da Macaxeira
    - Variedades.docx
    - Fotos
      - Praga.jpg
      - 026.jpg
      - 341938.jpg
      - 4749698908_a3a9a2cc61_m.jpg

        - DSC09839Cpia.jpg
        - foto_por_Auro_Otsubo-Embrapa_copa_navirai.JPG
        - images (1).jpg
        - images.jpg
    - Videos
        - Dia de Campo na TV - Culturas agrícolas de várzeas(1).avi
    - Apresentação.pptx
    - Pragas.docx
- Cultura do Maracuja
    - Apresentação.pptx
    - Fotos
        - Maracujás-300x249.jpg
        - 1752171962.jpg
        - download.jpg
        - image002.jpg
        - images (1).jpg
        - images (2).jpg
        - images (3).jpg
        - images (4).jpg
        - images (5).jpg
        - images (6).jpg
        - images (7).jpg
        - images (8).jpg
        - images (9).jpg
        - images.jpg
    - Video
        - Produção de maracujá.avi
        - Embrapa apresenta inovação na polinização do maracujá.avi
        - POLINIZAÇÃO DA FLOR DE MARACUJÁ - CINCINATO ALENCAR.avi
        - Polinização Manual do Maracujá.avi
        - PRODUÇÃO DE MARACUJÁ CLÁUDIA.avi
- Cultura do Milho
    - Pragas.docx
    - Fotos
        - SNA_milho3.jpg
        - ab7cfecbd0b8a757e5110572623aaf36.jpg
        - download.jpg
        - images (1).jpg
        - images (2).jpg
        - images (3).jpg
        - images.jpg
    - Apresentação.pptx
- Produção de Mudas
    - Apresentação.pptx
- Roçado Sustentavel com uso de leguminosa - Mucuna preta

- Fotos
  - SAM_8833.JPG
  - download (1).jpg
  - download (2).jpg
  - download (3).jpg
  - download.jpg
  - download9.jpg
  - images (1).jpg
  - images (2).jpg
  - images (3).jpg
  - images (4).jpg
  - images (5).jpg
  - images (6).jpg
  - images (7).jpg
  - images (8).jpg
  - images (10).jpg
  - images.jpg
  - images7.jpg
  - images8.jpg
- Banner.pptx

Documents received 14 November 2013

- CFO Letter of Support for Purus, Russas and Valparaiso Projects.pdf
- Public Comment Period Announcements
  - Tribuna do Juruá Public Comment Period for Russas-Valparaiso Projects (Print).pdf
  - Brian McFarland's Promotion of Public Comment Period.pdf
  - CF's Newsletter for Purus, Russas and Valparaiso Projects' CCBS Public Comment Period.pdf
  - Tribuna do Juruá Public Comment Period for Russas-Valparaiso Projects (Online).pdf
- Revised CCBS PDDs - 11-14-13
  - NCR Checklist Russas_round1_draft2, Brian's Responses.docx
  - NCR Checklist Valparaiso_round1, Brian's Responses.docx
  - Russas Project CCBS PDD - English, Revised - 11-11-13.pdf
- Addendum to Russas Tri-Party Agreement, Fully Signed.pdf
- Addendum to Valparaiso Tri-Party Agreement, Fully Signed.pdf
- BNS for Russas and Valparaiso.xlsx
- CarbonCoCarbonNeutralSignedVERPADecember 302012.pdf
- CarbonCo's Bank Statement.pdf

Documents received 20 December 2013

- 01 Project Document
  - Revised CCBS PDDs - 11-14-13
    - NCR Checklist Russas_round1_draft2, Brian's Responses.docx
    - Russas Project CCBS PDD - English, Revised - 11-11-13.pdf
  - PD Submission 7-17-2013
    - Valparaiso Project Final Draft VCS PD (7-17-2013).pdf

        - Russas Project 2013.07.15.xls
        - Russas Project Final Draft VCS PD (7-17-2013).doc
        - Russas Project Final Draft VCS PD (7-17-2013).pdf
        - Valparaiso Project 2013.07.16.xls
        - Valparaiso Project Final Draft VCS PD (7-17-2013).doc
- 02 Forest Inventory
    - Salimon et al 2011.pdf
    - Brown 1997 Estimating Biomass and Biomass Change of Tropical Forests FAO.pdf
    - Russas Valparaiso Forest Inventory 2013.06.29.doc
    - RusVal_Data_2013.06.24a.xls
    - RusVal_EqVal 2013.06.24a.xls
- 03 Literature Sources
    - Salimon et al 2011.pdf
    - FAO 2010 FRA Brasil.pdf
- 04 Project Proponents Contracts
    - Addendum to Russas Tri-Party Agreement, Fully Signed.pdf
    - Russas Tri-Party, Fully Signed and Certified (English).pdf
- 05 Community Contracts
    - Russas Atas, March 2011 to May 2013.pdf
- 06 Title Documentation
    - Russas Project Landownership Documentation.pdf
- 07 Laws
    - Procedimentos de Segurança em Campo (TECMAN).pdf
    - Employee Handbook 2010 April.pdf
- 08 Letter of Approval
    - Mayor's Letter of Support for Russas Project.pdf
    - Mayor's Letter of Support for Valparaiso Project.pdf
    - OAB AC translation.doc
    - OAB-AC - Ofício Declaraç_o.pdf
    - Russas Letters of Support Translated.docx"
    - Russas Project Letters of Support, #1.pdf
    - Russas Project Letters of Support, #2.pdf
- 09 Project Meeting Notes
    - Russas and Valparaiso Project Notes.docx
- 10 Participatory Rural Appraisal
    - PRA Results for Russas-Valparaiso Projects.xlsx
    - Russas Project and Leakage Belt PRAs.pdf
- 11 Basic Necessity Survey
    - BNS for Russas and Valparaiso.xlsx
    - Russas and Russas Leakage Belt BNS.pdf
- 12 Agricultural Survey
    - Russas and Russas Leakage Belt Ag Surveys.pdf
    - Russas-Valparaiso Ag Courses Aggregated.xlsx
- 13 VCS CDM Documents
    - VCS
        - VCS Standard, v3.3.pdf

        - AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v3.2.pdf
        - AFOLU Requirements v3.3_0.pdf
    - Methodology
        - VMD0017 X_UNC v2.0.pdf
        - VM0007 REDD-MF Version 1.4.pdf
        - VMD0001 CP-AB Live biomass.pdf
        - VMD0002 CP-D Dead wood.pdf
        - VMD0007 BL-UP v3.2.pdf
        - VMD0010 LK-ASU Unplanned leakage.pdf
        - VMD0013 E-BB Biomass burning.pdf
        - VMD0015 M-MON, v2.1.pdf
        - VMD0016 X-STR Stratification.pdf
- 14 Maps and GIS
    - Inventory Plots
        - RUSVAL_inventoryCompleted2013.06.24.shx
        - RUSVAL_inventoryCompleted2013.06.24.dbf
        - RUSVAL_inventoryCompleted2013.06.24.prj
        - RUSVAL_inventoryCompleted2013.06.24.sbn
        - RUSVAL_inventoryCompleted2013.06.24.sbx
        - RUSVAL_inventoryCompleted2013.06.24.shp
        - RUSVAL_inventoryCompleted2013.06.24.shp.xml
    - Geographical Boundaries
        - RussasShapefiles
            - Strata
                - RusStrataLB_2013.07.06.shx
                - RusStrata_2013.07.06.dbf
                - RusStrata_2013.07.06.prj
                - RusStrata_2013.07.06.sbn
                - RusStrata_2013.07.06.sbx
                - RusStrata_2013.07.06.shp
                - RusStrata_2013.07.06.shp.xml
                - RusStrata_2013.07.06.shx
                - RusStrataLB_2013.07.06.dbf
                - RusStrataLB_2013.07.06.prj
                - RusStrataLB_2013.07.06.sbn
                - RusStrataLB_2013.07.06.sbx
                - RusStrataLB_2013.07.06.shp
                - RusStrataLB_2013.07.06.shp.xml
            - ProjectBoundaries
                - RussasLB_2013.07.05.dbf
                - RussasLB_2013.07.05.prj
                - RussasLB_2013.07.05.sbn
                - RussasLB_2013.07.05.sbx
                - RussasLB_2013.07.05.shp
                - RussasLB_2013.07.05.shp.xml
                - RussasLB_2013.07.05.shx
                - RussasPA_2013.07.05.dbf

    - RussasPA_2013.07.05.prj
    - RussasPA_2013.07.05.sbn
    - RussasPA_2013.07.05.sbx
    - RussasPA_2013.07.05.shp
    - RussasPA_2013.07.05.shx
    - RussasProperty_2013.03.14.dbf
    - RussasProperty_2013.03.14.prj
    - RussasProperty_2013.03.14.sbn
    - RussasProperty_2013.03.14.sbx
    - RussasProperty_2013.03.14.shp
    - RussasProperty_2013.03.14.shx
    - RussasRRD_2013.07.05.dbf
    - RussasRRD_2013.07.05.prj
    - RussasRRD_2013.07.05.sbn
    - RussasRRD_2013.07.05.sbx
    - RussasRRD_2013.07.05.shp
    - RussasRRD_2013.07.05.shp.xml
    - RussasRRD_2013.07.05.shx
    - RusVAL_RRL_2013.07.05.dbf
    - RusVAL_RRL_2013.07.05.prj
    - RusVAL_RRL_2013.07.05.sbn
    - RusVAL_RRL_2013.07.05.sbx
    - RusVAL_RRL_2013.07.05.shp
    - RusVAL_RRL_2013.07.05.shp.xml
    - RusVAL_RRL_2013.07.05.shx
  - ProjectBoundaries
    - RusVAL_RRL_2013.07.05.dbf
    - RusVAL_RRL_2013.07.05.prj
    - RusVAL_RRL_2013.07.05.sbn
    - RusVAL_RRL_2013.07.05.sbx
    - RusVAL_RRL_2013.07.05.shp
    - RusVAL_RRL_2013.07.05.shp.xml
    - RusVAL_RRL_2013.07.05.shx
- 15 Risk Assessment
  - Pro Forma for Russas and Valparaiso Project (7-22-13).xls
  - CarbonCoCarbonNeutralSignedVERPADecember 302012.pdf
  - CarbonCo's Bank Statement.pdf
  - CFO Letter of Support for Purus, Russas and Valparaiso Projects.pdf
  - Cochrane and Laurance 2002 Fire as a large-scale edge effect in Amazon.pdf
  - Cochrane et al. 1999 Positive Feedbacks in the Fire Dynamic of Tropical Forest.pdf
  - Espírito_Santo et al. 2010 Storm intensity and forest disturbances in the Amazon.pdf
- 16 Miscellaneous
  - Sustainable Fuelwood Analysis
    - alparaiso Sustainable Fuelwood Analysis 2013.07.15.xls
    - Russas Sustainable Fuelwood Analysis 2013.07.15.xls
  - Public Comment Period Announcements

        - Tribuna do Juruá Public Comment Period for Russas-Valparaiso Projects (Print).pdf
        - Brian McFarland's Promotion of Public Comment Period.pdf
        - CF's Newsletter for Purus, Russas and Valparaiso Projects' CCBS Public Comment Period.pdf
        - Tribuna do Juruá Public Comment Period for Russas-Valparaiso Projects (Online).pdf
- 17 Validation
    - Validation Finding Responses 2013.12.20
        - RusVal_Data_2013.12.20.xls
        - Additional Support
            - ZEE Acre 2006.pdf
            - Accuracy Assessment
                - Acre_2012AA.xls
                - AccuracyAssessment.docx
                - Acre_2012AA.kmz
            - GIS Files
                - 2012 deforestation revised
                    - Desmate_Acre_1988_2012_Merge_6pixel.shx
                    - Desmate_Acre_1988_2012_Merge_6pixel.dbf
                    - Desmate_Acre_1988_2012_Merge_6pixel.prj
                    - Desmate_Acre_1988_2012_Merge_6pixel.sbn
                    - Desmate_Acre_1988_2012_Merge_6pixel.sbx
                    - Desmate_Acre_1988_2012_Merge_6pixel.shp
                    - Desmate_Acre_1988_2012_Merge_6pixel.shp.xml
                - Ac_Conservation_units
                    - Ac_Conservation_units.shx
                    - Ac_Conservation_units.dbf
                    - Ac_Conservation_units.prj
                    - Ac_Conservation_units.sn"
                    - Ac_Conservation_units.sbx
                    - Ac_Conservation_units.shp
                    - Ac_Conservation_units.shp.xml
                - Ac_Indigenous_lands
                    - Ac_Indigenous_lands.shx
                    - Ac_Indigenous_lands.dbf
                    - Ac_Indigenous_lands.prj
                    - Ac_Indigenous_lands.sbn
                    - Ac_Indigenous_lands.sbx
                    - Ac_Indigenous_lands.shp
                    - Ac_Indigenous_lands.shp.xml
                - Georeferencing
                    - russa certoo.dwg
                    - 20130222_103204.jpg
                - Inventory Strata
                    - RusVALStrata_2013.08.20.shx
                    - RusVALStrata_2013.08.20.dbf

        - RusVALStrata_2013.08.20.prj
        - RusVALStrata_2013.08.20.sbn
        - RusVALStrata_2013.08.20.sbx
        - RusVALStrata_2013.08.20.shp
        - RusVALStrata_2013.08.20.shp.xml
    - Strata
        - RusStrata_2013.12.13.shx
        - RusStrata_2013.12.13.dbf
        - RusStrata_2013.12.13.prj
        - RusStrata_2013.12.13.sbn
        - RusStrata_2013.12.13.sbx
        - RusStrata_2013.12.13.shp
        - RusStrata_2013.12.13.shp.xml
    - Vegetation
        - Ac_Vegetation.shx
        - Ac_Vegetation.dbf
        - Ac_Vegetation.prj
        - Ac_Vegetation.sbn
        - Ac_Vegetation.sbx
        - Ac_Vegetation.shp
        - Ac_Vegetation.shp.xml
- Model
    - Output
        - Model output.jpg
        - PredictionMap
            - 2010_modeledresult.rst
            - 2010_modeledresult.RDC
        - RiskMap
            - RiskMap.rst
            - RiskMap.RDC
        - Final_rank.RDC
        - Final_rank.rst
        - Final_rank_reclass_1213.RDC
        - Final_rank_reclass_1213.rst
        - Final_Russas_baseline.RDC
        - Final_Russas_baseline.rst
        - Final_RussasLB_baseline.RDC
        - Final_RussasLB_baseline.rst
        - Land Change Modeler MLP Model Results.docx
        - model output iterations confirmation.html
    - Factor maps
        - RTRM_MOSAIC_FULL_UTM_AC.rst
        - RC_ALLROADS_PR_SC_UTM_DIST_MASK.RDC
        - RC_ALLROADS_PR_SC_UTM_DIST_MASK.rst
        - RC_DEFORESTATION_TO1995_ANO.RDC
        - RC_DEFORESTATION_TO1995_ANO.rst
        - RC_RIVERS_ALL_1VAL_DIST_MASK.RDC

        - RC_RIVERS_ALL_1VAL_DIST_MASK.rst
        - rrl_Protectedlands_dist.RDC
        - rrl_Protectedlands_dist.rst
        - RTRM_MOSAIC_FULL_UTM_AC.RDC
    - Anderson et al 2009 Biogeosciences.pdf
    - Arag_o and Shimabukuro 2010.pdf
    - Baker et al 2004 Variation in wood density in Amazon.pdf
    - METODOLOGIA DESMATAMENTO DO ACRE 2011.doc
    - METODOLOGIA DO ACRE 2011 (English).docx
    - Post Deforestation Stocks 2013.07.12.xls
  - CarbonCo_Russas_Final Round 1 NCRs Responses 2013.12.20.xlsx
  - Russas Project 2013.12.20.xls
  - RussasProject VCS PD 2013.12.20.doc

Documents received 10 January 2014

- CarbonCo_Russas_Final Round 1 NCRs Responses 2014.01.10.xlsx
- validation finding responses 2014.01.10
  - RussasProject VCS PD 2014.01.10.doc
  - CarbonCo_Russas_Final Round 1 NCRs Responses 2014.01.10.xlsx
  - Russas Project 2014.01.10.xls
  - additional support
    - RusVAL_RRD_2013.12.10
      - RusVAL_RRD_2013.12.10.shx
      - RusVAL_RRD_2013.12.10.dbf
      - RusVAL_RRD_2013.12.10.prj
      - RusVAL_RRD_2013.12.10.sbn
      - RusVAL_RRD_2013.12.10.sbx
      - RusVAL_RRD_2013.12.10.shp
      - RusVAL_RRD_2013.12.10.shp.xml
    - RussasLB_2013.12.10
      - RussasLB_2013.12.10.shx
      - RussasLB_2013.12.10.dbf
      - RussasLB_2013.12.10.prj
      - RussasLB_2013.12.10.sbn
      - RussasLB_2013.12.10.sbx
      - RussasLB_2013.12.10.shp
      - RussasLB_2013.12.10.shp.xml
    - RusStrataLB_2013.12.13
      - RusStrataLB_2013.12.13.shx
      - RusStrataLB_2013.12.13.dbf
      - RusStrataLB_2013.12.13.prj
      - RusStrataLB_2013.12.13.sbn
      - RusStrataLB_2013.12.13.sbx
      - RusStrataLB_2013.12.13.shp
      - RusStrataLB_2013.12.13.shp.xml

Documents received 15 January 2014

- Russas Project Transfer Agreement (Original and Translated).pdf
- Russas Project CCBS PDD - English, Revised - 1-15-14.pdf
- Russas Project Certidao de Inteiro Teor (Original and Translated).pdf
- Russas Project Memorial Descritivo (Original and Translated).pdf

Documents received 16 January 2014

- CarbonCo_Russas_Final Round 1 NCRs Responses 2014.01.16.xlsx
- Validation Finding Responses 2014.01.16
    - RussasProject VCS PD 2014.01.16.doc
    - CarbonCo_Russas_Final Round 1 NCRs Responses 2014.01.16.xlsx
    - Finding 47 and 48 River and settlement Responses 2014 01 16.docx
    - Additional
        - Settlements_2014.01.16.xlsx
        - River Density_2014.04.14.xlsx
        - Settlements_2014.01.14
            - RRD_municipalities.shx
            - Ac_Municipalities_boundaries.dbf
            - Ac_Municipalities_boundaries.prj
            - Ac_Municipalities_boundaries.sbn
            - Ac_Municipalities_boundaries.sbx
            - Ac_Municipalities_boundaries.shp
            - Ac_Municipalities_boundaries.shp.xml
            - Ac_Municipalities_boundaries.shx
            - LB2_municipalities.dbf
            - LB2_municipalities.prj
            - LB2_municipalities.sbn
            - LB2_municipalities.sbx
            - LB2_municipalities.shp
            - LB2_municipalities.shp.xml
            - LB2_municipalities.shx
            - PA_municipalities.dbf
            - PA_municipalities.prj
            - PA_municipalities.sbn
            - PA_municipalities.sbx
            - PA_municipalities.shp
            - PA_municipalities.shp.xml
            - PA_municipalities.shx
            - RRD_municipalities.dbf
            - RRD_municipalities.prj
            - RRD_municipalities.sbn
            - RRD_municipalities.sbx
            - RRD_municipalities.shp
            - RRD_municipalities.shp.xml

- Navigable Rivers
  - RRD_NavRivers.shx
  - LB_NavRivers.dbf
  - LB_NavRivers.prj
  - LB_NavRivers.sbn
  - LB_NavRivers.sbx
  - LB_NavRivers.shp
  - LB_NavRivers.shp.xml
  - LB_NavRivers.shx
  - nav_rivers.dbf
  - nav_rivers.prj
  - nav_rivers.sbn
  - nav_rivers.sbx
  - nav_rivers.shp
  - nav_rivers.shp.xml
  - nav_rivers.shx
  - PA_NavRivers.dbf
  - PA_NavRivers.prj
  - PA_NavRivers.sbn
  - PA_NavRivers.sbx
  - PA_NavRivers.shp
  - PA_NavRivers.shp.xml
  - PA_NavRivers.shx
  - RRD_NavRivers.dbf
  - RRD_NavRivers.prj
  - RRD_NavRivers.sbn
  - RRD_NavRivers.sbx
  - RRD_NavRivers.shp
  - RRD_NavRivers.shp.xml

Documents received 17 January 2014

- CarbonCo_Russas_Final Round 1 NCRs Responses 2014.01.17.xlsx
- Validation Finding Responses 2014.01.17
  - RussasProject VCS PD 2014.01.17.doc
  - Additional work
    - Russas Sustainable Fuelwood Analysis 2014.01.16.xls
    - FAO 2004 UBET.pdf
  - CarbonCo_Russas_Final Round 1 NCRs Responses 2014.01.17.xlsx

Documents received 29 January 2014

- Russas Project CCBS PDD, Final (English) 1-29-14.pdf

Documents received 21 February 2014

- Russas Project CCBS PDD, Final (Portuguese) 2-19-14.pdf
- Russas Project CCBS PDD, Final (English) 1-29-14.pdf

Documents received 24 February 2014

- Additional
  - Ac_Vegetation
    - Ac_Vegetation.shx
    - Ac_Vegetation.dbf
    - Ac_Vegetation.prj
    - Ac_Vegetation.sbn
    - Ac_Vegetation.sbx
    - Ac_Vegetation.shp
    - Ac_Vegetation.shp.xml
  - Baseline
    - LB
      - RussasLBBaseline_022014.shx
      - RussasLBBaseline_022014.dbf
      - RussasLBBaseline_022014.prj
      - RussasLBBaseline_022014.sbn
      - RussasLBBaseline_022014.sbx
      - RussasLBBaseline_022014.shp
      - RussasLBBaseline_022014.shp.xml
    - PA
      - RussasPABaseline_022014.shx
      - RussasPABaseline_022014.dbf
      - RussasPABaseline_022014.prj
      - RussasPABaseline_022014.sbn
      - RussasPABaseline_022014.sbx
      - RussasPABaseline_022014.shp
      - RussasPABaseline_022014.shp.xml
    - RRL
      - rank_rrl_220.tif.vat.dbf
      - rank_rrl_220.dbf
      - rank_rrl_220.prj
      - rank_rrl_220.sbn
      - rank_rrl_220.sbx
      - rank_rrl_220.shp
      - rank_rrl_220.shp.xml
      - rank_rrl_220.shx
      - rank_rrl_220.tfw
      - rank_rrl_220.tif
      - rank_rrl_220.tif.aux.xml

- rank_rrl_220.tif.ovr

- Elevation
  - AC_strm_utm_bin500m.tif.vat.dbf
  - AC_strm_utm_bin500m.tfw
  - AC_strm_utm_bin500m.tif
  - AC_strm_utm_bin500m.tif.aux.xml
  - AC_strm_utm_bin500m.tif.ovr
- Navigable Rivers
  - RRD1_NavRivers.shx
  - nav_rivers.dbf
  - nav_rivers.prj
  - nav_rivers.sbn
  - nav_rivers.sbx
  - nav_rivers.shp
  - nav_rivers.shp.xml
  - nav_rivers.shx
  - PA_NavRivers.dbf
  - PA_NavRivers.prj
  - PA_NavRivers.sbn
  - PA_NavRivers.sbx
  - PA_NavRivers.shp
  - PA_NavRivers.shp.xml
  - PA_NavRivers.shx
  - RRD1_NavRivers.dbf
  - RRD1_NavRivers.prj
  - RRD1_NavRivers.sbn
  - RRD1_NavRivers.sbx
  - RRD1_NavRivers.shp
  - RRD1_NavRivers.shp.xml
- Revised 2012 Deforestation Dataset
  - Desmate_Acre_1988_2012_Revised.shx
  - Desmate_Acre_1988_2012_Revised.dbf
  - Desmate_Acre_1988_2012_Revised.prj
  - Desmate_Acre_1988_2012_Revised.sbn
  - Desmate_Acre_1988_2012_Revised.sbx
  - Desmate_Acre_1988_2012_Revised.shp
  - Desmate_Acre_1988_2012_Revised.shp.xml
- Roads_2014.02.20
  - RRD_roads20140220.shx
  - Ac_Roads.dbf
  - Ac_Roads.prj

- Ac_Roads.sbn
- Ac_Roads.sbx
- Ac_Roads.shp
- Ac_Roads.shp.xml
- Ac_Roads.shx
- RRD_roads20140220.dbf
- RRD_roads20140220.prj
- RRD_roads20140220.sbn
- RRD_roads20140220.sbx
- RRD_roads20140220.shp
- RRD_roads20140220.shp.xml

o RRD
- RusVAL_RRD_2013.2.18.shx
- RusVAL_RRD_2013.2.18.dbf
- RusVAL_RRD_2013.2.18.prj
- RusVAL_RRD_2013.2.18.sbn
- RusVAL_RRD_2013.2.18.sbx
- RusVAL_RRD_2013.2.18.shp
- RusVAL_RRD_2013.2.18.shp.xml

o RRD_Deforestation2014.02.19
- RRD_Deforestation2014.02.19.xlsx
- GIS
  - RRD_Defor20140219.shx
  - RRD_Defor20140219.dbf
  - RRD_Defor20140219.prj
  - RRD_Defor20140219.sbn
  - RRD_Defor20140219.sbx
  - RRD_Defor20140219.shp
  - RRD_Defor20140219.shp.xml

o RRL
- RusVAL_RRL_2014.02.07.shx
- RusVAL_RRL_2014.02.07.dbf
- RusVAL_RRL_2014.02.07.prj
- RusVAL_RRL_2014.02.07.sbn
- RusVAL_RRL_2014.02.07.sbx
- RusVAL_RRL_2014.02.07.shp

o RRL_AmtDefor 2014.02.18
- RRL_AmtDefor 2014.02.18.xlsx
- GIS
  - RRL_Deforestation2014.02.shx
  - RRL_Deforestation2014.02.dbf

- RRL_Deforestation2014.02.prj
- RRL_Deforestation2014.02.shp
- RRL_Deforestation2014.02.shp.xml

- Russas Forest Inventory
  - RusVal_Data_2014.02.19.xls
  - Russas Valparaiso Forest Inventory 2014.02.19.doc
- Settlements_2014.02.20
  - RRD_municipalities220.shx
  - Ac_Municipalities_boundaries.dbf
  - Ac_Municipalities_boundaries.prj
  - Ac_Municipalities_boundaries.sbn
  - Ac_Municipalities_boundaries.sbx
  - Ac_Municipalities_boundaries.shp
  - Ac_Municipalities_boundaries.shp.xml
  - Ac_Municipalities_boundaries.shx
  - LB2_municipalities.dbf
  - LB2_municipalities.prj
  - LB2_municipalities.sbn
  - LB2_municipalities.sbx
  - LB2_municipalities.shp
  - LB2_municipalities.shp.xml
  - LB2_municipalities.shx
  - PA_municipalities.dbf
  - PA_municipalities.prj
  - PA_municipalities.sbn
  - PA_municipalities.sbx
  - PA_municipalities.shp
  - PA_municipalities.shp.xml
  - PA_municipalities.shx
  - RRD_municipalities220.dbf
  - RRD_municipalities220.prj
  - RRD_municipalities220.sbn
  - RRD_municipalities220.sbx
  - RRD_municipalities220.shp
  - RRD_municipalities220.shp.xml
- SlopeClass
  - SlopeClass.shx
  - LB_slope20140221.dbf
  - LB_slope20140221.prj
  - LB_slope20140221.sbn
  - LB_slope20140221.sbx

- LB_slope20140221.shp
- LB_slope20140221.shp.xml
- LB_slope20140221.shx
- PA_slope20140221.dbf
- PA_slope20140221.prj
- PA_slope20140221.sbn
- PA_slope20140221.sbx
- PA_slope20140221.shp
- PA_slope20140221.shp.xml
- PA_slope20140221.shx
- RRD_slope20140221.dbf
- RRD_slope20140221.prj
- RRD_slope20140221.sbn
- RRD_slope20140221.sbx
- RRD_slope20140221.shp
- RRD_slope20140221.shp.xml
- RRD_slope20140221.shx
- SlopeClass.dbf
- SlopeClass.prj
- SlopeClass.sbn
- SlopeClass.sbx
- SlopeClass.shp
- SlopeClass.shp.xml

o Soils

- RRL_soil20140221.shx
- Ac_Soil.dbf
- Ac_Soil.prj
- Ac_Soil.sbn
- Ac_Soil.sbx
- Ac_Soil.shp
- Ac_Soil.shp.xml
- Ac_Soil.shx
- DeforRRD_soil20140221.dbf
- DeforRRD_soil20140221.prj
- DeforRRD_soil20140221.sbn
- DeforRRD_soil20140221.sbx
- DeforRRD_soil20140221.shp
- DeforRRD_soil20140221.shp.xml
- DeforRRD_soil20140221.shx
- LB_soil20140221.dbf
- LB_soil20140221.prj

- LB_soil20140221.sbn
- LB_soil20140221.sbx
- LB_soil20140221.shp
- LB_soil20140221.shp.xml
- LB_soil20140221.shx
- PA_soil20140221.dbf
- PA_soil20140221.prj
- PA_soil20140221.sbn
- PA_soil20140221.sbx
- PA_soil20140221.shp
- PA_soil20140221.shp.xml
- PA_soil20140221.shx
- RRD_soil20140221.dbf
- RRD_soil20140221.prj
- RRD_soil20140221.sbn
- RRD_soil20140221.sbx
- RRD_soil20140221.shp
- RRD_soil20140221.shp.xml
- RRD_soil20140221.shx
- RRL_soil20140221.dbf
- RRL_soil20140221.prj
- RRL_soil20140221.sbn
- RRL_soil20140221.sbx
- RRL_soil20140221.shp
- RRL_soil20140221.shp.xml

o VegClass

- RRD_veg20140221.shx
- Ac_VegClass.dbf
- Ac_VegClass.prj
- Ac_VegClass.sbn
- Ac_VegClass.sbx
- Ac_VegClass.shp
- Ac_VegClass.shp.xml
- Ac_VegClass.shx
- LB_veg20140221.dbf
- LB_veg20140221.prj
- LB_veg20140221.sbn
- LB_veg20140221.sbx
- LB_veg20140221.shp
- LB_veg20140221.shp.xml
- LB_veg20140221.shx

        - PA_veg20140221.dbf
        - PA_veg20140221.prj
        - PA_veg20140221.sbn
        - PA_veg20140221.sbx
        - PA_veg20140221.shp
        - PA_veg20140221.shp.xml
        - PA_veg20140221.shx
        - RRD_veg20140221.dbf
        - RRD_veg20140221.prj
        - RRD_veg20140221.sbn
        - RRD_veg20140221.sbx
        - RRD_veg20140221.shp
        - RRD_veg20140221.shp.xml
    - AcrePrecipitationMap_2014.02.20.jpg
    - Cairns Root to Shoot 2014.02.06.xlsx
    - CP-D Lying Dead changes 2014 02 19.docx
    - ElevationMap_2014.02.20.jpg
    - pontius_etal_2008_ars.pdf
    - Post Deforestation Stocks 2014.02.14.xls
    - River Density_2014.02.20.xlsx
    - Road Density_2014.02.20.xlsx
    - Settlements_2014.02.20.xlsx
    - SlopeComparison_2014.02.21.xlsx
    - SoilComparison_2014.02.21.xlsx
    - VegClassComparison_2014.02.20.xlsx
- CarbonCo_Russas_Final Round 2 NCRs_2014.02.21.xls"
- Russas Project 2014.02.21.xls
- RussasProject VCS PD 2014.02.21 track changes.doc
- RussasProject VCS PD 2014.02.21.doc

Documents received 19 March 2014

- Russas Project CCBS PDD, Final (Portuguese) 3-19-14.pdf
- Russas Project CCBS PDD, Final (English) 3-19-14.pdf

Appendix B – Public Comments Received During Public Comment Period

Comments received by the CCBA during the validation audit.
CCB Standards Second Edition
Project: The Russas Project
Comment 1
Date: 24 July 2013
Sent by: Norman Bishop

The Russas Project has huge potential for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD+) projects that will mitigate deforestation, preserve extraordinary biodiversity, and provide alternative economic opportunities to local communities. Social projects and activities to mitigate deforestation pressures and benefit the local communities include, but are not limited to: agricultural extension training, forest patrols of potential deforestation sites, improving local schools and health clinics, and eventually building better houses and installing solar photovoltaic panels for the local communities to improve their livelihoods.

The Russas Project will also provide a variety of essential ecosystem services such as: erosion and flood control; water cycling, filtration and storage; oxygen production and nutrient recycling; genetic repository for medicinal plants; and habitat for thousands of native Amazonian animal (including scarlet macaws and Amazon River dolphins) and plant species.