4TH VERIFICATION REPORT FOR THE PROJECT ALTO MAYO CONSERVATION INITIATIVE

AENOR

Document Prepared By AENOR INTERNACIONAL, S.A.U.

6 Génova. 28004 Madrid – Spain. www.aenor.es

Project Title	Alto Mayo Conservation Initiative
Version	02
Report ID	2018/169/VOL/08

Report Title	4Th Verification Report for Alto Mayo Conservation Initiative
Client	Conservation International Foundation
Pages	70
Date of Issue	13-December-2018
Prepared By	AENOR INTERNACIONAL, S.A.U.
Contact	Génova 6. 28004 Madrid- Spain. Telephone +34 914326000 jfuentes@aenor.com, medioambiente@aenor.com, www.aenor.es
Approved By	Jose Luis Fuentes Perez
Work Carried Out By	Lead Auditor: Richard Daniel Gonzales Toledo Auditor: Elena Llorente Perez

Summary

AENOR INTERNACIONAL, S.A.U. (hereinafter AENOR) started the verification process on September 14, 2018 when the project proponent submitted the Monitoring and Implementation Report (15 June 2016

to 14 June 2018) and supporting documents, such as the calculation spreadsheet and the non-permanence risk assessment. The field visit took place on October 22-26, 2016, in which the auditors visited the project area, interviewed key stakeholders, staff and other related experts, and also reviewed the design and supporting documents.

The verification scope is to verify that actual monitoring systems and procedures are in compliance with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan; evaluate the GHG emission reduction data and express a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emission reduction data is free from material misstatement and reported GHG emission data is sufficiently supported by evidence.

The purpose of the verification was to determine the conformance of the project with respect to the VCS Standard version 3.7, the CCB Project Design Standards Second Edition and the validated VCS Project Description (VCS-PD) and CCB Project Design Document (CCB-PDD).

The auditor submitted to the PPs a first version of a VCS-CCB verification protocol, in which 1 corrective action request (CAR) was reported (see in appendix 2 of this verification report). This issue, raised during the verification process, was appropriately closed by means of corrections and providing requested evidences.

Thus, once all issued detected were appropriate solved, AENOR have carried out this final verification report and deems with reasonable level of assurance that the project complies with all of the verification criteria. The assessment team has no restrictions or uncertainties with respect to the compliance of the project with the verification criteria; hence, the audit team concludes that the net GHG emissions reductions or removals 1,142,776 tonnes CO2 equivalent, over the monitoring period, 15 June 2016 to 14 June 2018 has been quantified in accordance with VCS rules. Finally, a buffer discount rate of 10% was applied, that results in 1,028,498 VCUs

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The objective of the verification audit was to conduct an independent assessment of the project against all defined criteria as defined by the VCS Standard version 3.7 and the CCB Project Design Standards Second Edition to determine:

- The extent to which methods and procedures, including monitoring procedures, have been implemented in accordance with the CCB-PDD and VCS-PD.
- The extent to which GHG emission reductions and removals reported in the monitoring report are materially accurate.
- The extent to which CCB standards has been addressed during the project implementation period.

The Verification will result in a conclusion by AENOR whether the project activity is in compliance with the CCB Standard second edition.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of the verification audit is to verify the emissions reductions and/or removals of the project “Alto Mayo Conservation Initiative”, against the Verified Carbon Standard version 3.7 and the CCB Project Design Standards, the applied methodology and tools and the validated VCS PD and CCB PDD throughout the monitoring period from 15 June 2016 to 14 June 2018.

The objectives of this audit included a verification of the projects calculated removals with the Verified Carbon Standard requirements and any additional requirements of VCS AFOLU projects. The audit assessed the project with respect to the validated baseline scenarios presented in the PD.

Criteria from the following documents were used to assess this project:

- VCS Program Guide v.3.7
- VCS Standard v.3.7
- VCS AFOLU Requirements v.3.6
- VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v.3.3
- VCS Methodology 0015 version 1.0
- CCB Project Design Standards Second Edition.
- CCB Program Rules v.3.1

Unless otherwise indicated, the assessment was performed against the most recent version of the relevant VCS guidance document.

1.3 Level of Assurance

The assessment was conducted to provide a reasonable level of assurance of conformance against the defined audit criteria and materiality thresholds within the audit scope. Based on the audit findings, a positive evaluation statement reasonably assures that the project GHG assertion is materially correct and is a fair representation of the GHG data and information.

All the revisions of the verification report before being submitted to the client were subjected to an independent internal technical review to confirm that all verification activities had been completed according to the pertinent AENOR instructions required. The technical review was performed by a technical reviewer(s) qualified in accordance with AENOR´s qualification scheme for CDM/VCS validation and verification.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The Alto Mayo Protected Forest (AMPF) covers approximately 182,000 hectares of land in the Peruvian Amazon of extremely high value for biodiversity conservation and watershed protection. Conserving the Alto Mayo forests is critical for mitigating global climate change, conserving biodiversity, and ensuring the provision of ecosystem services to the local population.

The Alto Mayo Conservation Initiative project helps to conserve the ecologically rich AMPF, which provides vital fresh water supplies to downstream communities, and is home to many threatened and endemic plant and animal species, such as the yellow-tailed woolly monkey (*Oreonax flavicauda*)

The AMPF was established as a protected area in 1987; however, even with this important designation, the protected area faces intense deforestation pressure from unsustainable farming practices. Despite the designation of the Alto Mayo forests as a Natural Protected Area (NPA) by the State, insufficient funds for managing the area, the building of a national highway in 1975 that crosses the AMPF, and the high rates of migration from the Andes to the Amazon region have resulted in widespread settlement inside the area, making it one of the NPAs with the highest deforestation rate in Peru. The threats to the area have increased in the last decade with the linking of the highway to other regional mega-development projects such as IIRSA2 and the rising price of coffee -the main crop grown in this area-, leading to increasing deforestation and the subsequent loss of ecosystem services that this NPA provides. In 2000, the AMPF was ranked as having the second largest area of deforestation among Peruvian Natural Protected Areas. This scenario will continue unless new mechanisms are designed to add value to the standing forest so that it can compete economically with other land uses.

In response, Conservation International and its allies in the region designed the Alto Mayo Conservation Initiative (AMCI), whose main goal is to promote the sustainable management of the AMPF and its ecosystem services for the benefit of the local populations and the global climate. To meet these goals the project developed six strategies:

- ✓ Improve the governance and enforcement capabilities of the AMPF local Head Office.

- ✓ Promote sustainable land use practices that will reduce deforestation and forest degradation within and beyond the AMPF's boundaries through the signing of Conservation Agreements with local communities.

- ✓ Promote change in the perception of the local population towards the importance of the AMPF by increasing its environmental awareness and involvement in the conservation of the Protected Area.

- ✓ Ensure the long-term sustainability of the AMCI by creating long-term financial mechanisms through carbon financing and other PES schemes.

- ✓ Integrate the AMPF in the broader policy agenda at the local, regional and national level, and more recently.

- ✓ Strengthen the relationship and consolidate the processes and mechanisms of participative management and conflict resolution with the communities in the project zone under a social management strategy.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

The verification was performed through a combination of document review, interviews and communications with relevant personnel and on-site inspections. The project was assessed for conformance to the criteria described in Section 1.2 of this report. As discussed in this report, findings were issued to ensure that the project was in full conformance to all requirements.

Criteria from the following documents were used to assess this project: VCS Program Guide v.3.7, VCS Standard v.3.7, VCS AFOLU Requirements v.3.6, VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v.3.3, VCS Methodology 0015 version 1.0, CCB Project Design Standards Second Edition and Rules for the use of the Climate, Community, & Biodiversity Standards.

2.1 Audit Team Composition (*Rules* 4.3.1)

The team involved in this verification is summarized below:

Name	Position	Experience and expertise
Fuentes Perez JOSE LUIS	Approver and technical reviewer	More than 10 years' experience as CDM qualified auditor. Specialist in forestry sector. Has participated in 10 validation/verification process, including REDD+ and Afforestation/Reforestation projects.
Gonzales Toledo RICHARD DANIEL	Lead auditor	More than 5 years' experience as CDM qualified auditor. Local expert. Has participated in 4 CCB-VCS verification process located in Perú.
Llorente Perez ELENA	Auditor	More than 10 years' experience as CDM qualified auditor. Team leader validator and verifier. specialist in environmental sector.

2.2 Method and Criteria

The verification was performed through a combination of document review, interviews and communications with relevant personnel and on-site inspections. The project was assessed for conformance to the criteria described in Section 1.2 of this report. As discussed in this report, findings were issued to ensure that the project was in full conformance to all requirements.

Criteria from the following documents were used to assess this project: VCS Program Guide v.3.7, VCS Standard v.3.7, VCS AFOLU Requirements v.3.6, VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v.3.3, VCS Methodology 0015 version 1.0, CCB Project Design Standards Second Edition and Rules for the use of the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards.

2.3 Document Review

The Monitoring and Implementation Report, CCB Project Design Document, VCS project description and supporting documentation were carefully reviewed for conformance to the verification criteria and consistency. The audit team examined plot data sheets; spreadsheets used to enter and compile the plot data and reproduced the removal spreadsheet calculations to obtain same results than those appearing in the Monitoring report. The Non-Permanence Risk Report for this monitoring period was assessed, as well. Appendix 1 to this report details the list of documents provided by PPs and reviewed by AENOR during the process.

2.4 Interviews

The list of the interviewed people is following detailed. The people interviewed were those directly affected or involved in the project activity, and in some cases were just indirectly affected.

Audit Date	Name	Title
22/10/2018 (CI-Rioja Office)	Braulio Andrade	AMPF Project director CI-Peru
	Fabiano Godoy	Carbon Fund Technical Director Conservation International
	Fernando Guerra	Project coordinator
	Ivonne Paico	Responsible of Alto Mayo Forest conservation - SERNAMP
	Janet Llallahui	AMPF Park Ranger.
	Jorge Morocho	ECOAN specialist
23/11/2018 (Nueva Zelandia Village)	Ever Chamba	Project Conservation Agreement Subscriber
	Gliserio Carrasco	Project Conservation Agreement Subscriber
	Marilu Pinedo	Project Conservation Agreement Subscriber
	José Altamirano	ECOAN specialist

Audit Date	Name	Title
23/11/2018 (Palestina Village)	Maria Celmira	President of Palestina Sustainable economic development association.
24/11/2018 (Aguas Verdes Villlage)	Gerson Ruiz	AMPF Park Ranger.
	Juan Pérez	Project Conservation Agreement Subscriber
24/11/2018 (Arena Blanca Village)	24/11/2018	24/11/2018
	(Arena Blanca Village	(Arena Blanca Village
24/11/2018 (COOPBAM headquarters)	Francisco Herrera	COOPBAM President
	Abdias Basques	COOPBAM safety committee president
	Alexander Cruzado	COOPBAM promoter
	Segundo Grimaniel	COOPBAM promoter
	Hugo Cahuapaza	Technical Team
25/10/2018 (CI-Rioja Office)	Segundo Calle	Presidente of management committee. BPAM-ECOAN
	Jimmy Pinedo	remote sensing coordinator

2.5 Site Inspections

Site inspections were conducted on October from 22 to 25, 2018. The objectives of the site visit were to assess the accuracy of the Monitoring Report including project implementation status; to assess conformance to the monitoring plan; to assess whether project activities are being implemented according to the project description; and to assess the quality of field data collection techniques.

During the on-site assessment, different project sectors were visit. The auditor visited some agroforestry plots and conducts some interviews with farmers, project alleys and project staff. The site inspections were conducted by the auditor Richard Gonzales.

Date	Location	Topic
22/10/2018	Rioja	✓ Initial meeting. CI-Rioja Offcice. ✓ Meeting with AMPF Project director CI-Peru ✓ Meeting with Carbon Fund Technical Director CI ✓ Meeting with CI Local staff (Project coordinator) ✓ Meeting with Responsible of Alto Mayo Forest conservation - SERNAMP ✓ Meeting with AMPF Park Ranger. ✓ Meeting with ECOAN specialist

Date	Location	Topic
23/10/2018	Nueva Zelandia	✓ Interviews with Project Conservation Agreement Subscribers ✓ Meeting with ECOAN specialist
	Palestina	✓ Meeting with the President of Sustainable economic development association.
24/10/018	Aguas Verdes	✓ Meeting with AMPF Park Ranger. ✓ Visit to project pilots: Orchids, bird watching and Pitajaya ✓ Interviews with subscribers
	Arena Blanca	✓ Visit to project pilot of bird watching ✓ Interviews with subscribers
	Rioja	✓ Meeting with coffee growers Association COOPBAM ✓ Meeting with ECOAN specialist
25/10/018	Rioja	✓ President of management committee. BPAM-ECOAN ✓ remote sensing coordinator

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

During this verification no forward actions were raised.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

Not applicable.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

Not applicable.

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

Not applicable.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

Not applicable.

3.3 Project Description Deviations (*Rules* 3.5.7 – 3.5.10)

Not applicable.

3.4 Minor Changes to Project Description (*Rules* 3.5.6)

Not applicable.

3.5 Monitoring Plans (CL3.2, CM3.3, B3.3)

Not applicable.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Public Comments (*Rules* 4.6)

The Project Implementation Report was submitted to VERRA website for a 30-day public comment. The monitoring report (initial version) and its summary were uploaded on 14 September 2018. No public comments were received during the verification process.

4.2 Summary of Project Benefits

The audit team reviewed sections 1.1 and 1.2 of the project monitoring report and confirmed that the sections provide an adequate summary of the project benefits. All items required to be monitored and reported have been included as required. Furthermore, all items summarized are supported in the appropriate climate, community, and biodiversity sections. The benefits, also, were verified during the on-site visit through interviews with local stakeholders

4.3 General

4.3.1 Implementation Status (G3.4, CL1.5)

The audit team assessed the implementation of the project activities against VCS Project Description and CCB project description. The audit team confirmed that Section 2.1 of the monitoring report provides an accurate description of the implementation status.

During the on-site visit, many interviews with different stakeholders were performed in order to confirms the project status described in the monitoring report. Activities and implementation schedule of the project were observed and confirmed with members of communities involved in the project; also, was verified the compliance of agreement of commitments in terms of the project activities. No material discrepancies were found.

Audit team confirmed that all monitoring activities documented in Sections 2.2 and 3.1.3 of the monitoring report was correctly carried out, accordingly with the requirements and frequency of the monitoring plan. Furthermore, during previous verifications deviations were requested; then, the verification team assessed whether deviations were correctly. Applied.

During this verification process, verification team has not detected project changes in regards of the project title, its purposes and objectives and that no additional project description deviations apart from those reported in previous verification, which are described in sections 3.3 and 3.4 of the monitoring repot.

AENOR´s verification team checked the monitoring plan contained in the registered VCS-PD and compared it with the monitoring report, to verify whether there was any difference that would cause an increase in estimates of the GHG emission reductions in the current monitoring period. AENOR has confirm that there are no material discrepancies between the actual monitoring system, and

the monitoring plan set out in the project description and the applied methodology. Also, as required by the monitoring plan and the applicable methodology VM0015 Version 1.0 the project proponent effectively monitors the required parameters to determine the project's removals by sinks and emissions by sources

The parameters reported, including source, frequency and review criteria as indicated in the monitoring plan were verified to be correct and in line with the validated monitoring plan of the VCS-PD. Necessary management system procedures including responsibility and authority of monitoring activities have been verified to be consistent with the PD. Knowledge of personnel associated with the project activity was also found to be satisfactory. For this monitoring period there are not remaining issues from previous verification.

The project has not participated nor been rejected under any other GHG programs. GHG emission reductions or removals generated by the project are not included in an emission trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading. The project has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit. Neither has become eligible to do so since previous verification

AENOR is able to conclude that the project has been implemented as described in validated project description and has correctly applied previous deviations.

4.3.2 Risks to the Project (G3.5)

Section 2.2.5 of the monitoring report summarizes the potential risks to the project benefits and mitigation measures for those risks. The potential risk identified, such as coffee rust, lack of alternative livelihoods, long-term sustainability of technical assistance, consolidation of financial sustainability, continuity of the administration contract with the government of Peru, social conflicts and effects of climate change have been assessed and mitigation measures for those risks have been adopted, as described in the Non-Permanence Risk Report: *"Non-Permanence Risk Analysis – Report 5"*. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures have been confirmed during verification.

Furthermore, the AFOLU Non-Permanence tool has been applied in order to determine the amount of buffer credits to be hold.

4.3.3 Enhancement of High Conservation Values (G3.6)

The validated CCB PDD provides a full description of the high conservation values claimed for the area. Specific measures carried out to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of HCVs are described in the MR (section 2.2.6).

The main aspects for HCVs considered for this monitoring period are:

- ✓ Degraded forest restauration of coffee under the agroforestry systems
- ✓ Technical support to coffee producers for selling the production to the special markets such as Canada, USA,

- ✓ tourism initiatives, at family and community levels (birds and orchid tourism are being developed by subscribers)

The audit team reviewed the project plan for the maintenance and enhancement of the project high conservation values, which also were confirmed during the on-site visit. Its verification team conclusions that measures taken to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation values attributes are consistent with the precautionary principle.

4.3.4 Benefit Permanence (G3.7)

Section 2.2.7 of the MR describes the permanent benefits regarding generated by the project in terms of climate, community and biodiversity. Examples of such activities include:

- ✓ The transfer of leadership of all the management processes to the staff of the AMPF Headquarters, which implies a permanent training of capacities and the building of a community-institutional relationship.

- ✓ The gradual implementation of healthy families and communities through social management strategies, conservation agreements, communication and environmental education.

- ✓ The project has supported the preparation of project profiles and/or previous actions such as the disclosure statements needed for the land where schools will be built in Juan Velazco and Aguas Verdes, as well as the health center in Aguas Verdes.

- ✓ The project investment is aimed at the construction of field schools in Aguas Verdes and Sol de Oro, both towns located in strategic zones.

Everything described above must have a positive impact on the development of the local population settled in the project area. To confirm activities described above, the audit team review training materials; management documents of project profiles and interviewed community members.

The audit team is able to confirm that at this time procedures are in place to ensure project benefits beyond the project lifetime and are consistent with the implementation plans described in the PD.

4.3.5 Stakeholder Engagement (G3.8 – G3.9)

To assess the projects consultation methods, used to inform communities the issues related to the project activities; the audit team assessed the following:

- ✓ Reviewed the consultation procedures, as described in the PD.

- ✓ Reviewed documents located in the project headquarters to ensure records of information sharing and consultation meetings are kept and archived according to the data management procedures described in the PD.

- ✓ interviewed local community members as to the validity of what is being claimed by the project proponents.

- ✓ verified that there were no comments during of the 30-day public comment

For the indicator G3.8 of CCB PDD, which describes the stakeholder consultation process. The project stakeholder consultation process includes many opportunities for stakeholder feedback both at the planning and project implementation stages.

Throughout the reporting period the project has engaged with key stakeholders; technical advisory group, subscribers and promoters, local people and indigenous communities. Engagement measures are described in the section 2.3.1.

Indicators reported in the spreadsheet title *"Sup.Inf.MIR_01_2016-2018_Socioeconometri and Biodiversity Metrics*" shown the stakeholder engagement results obtained during the implementation period 2016-2018. In addition, during the site visit evidence of meetings with different key stakeholders was provided to the audit team.

For the indicator G3.9, project proponent has described the steps and communications methods. This report was uploaded into the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance's website for public comments. The public comment period was available 30 days. For people living in the project zone without internet access, information regarding the content of the document was communicated through the Management Committee, park rangers, and Conservation Agreement technicians with information on how to submit their comments. Hard copies of the document were available for public viewing and comment during the public comment period at the AMPF Head Office as well as at Conservation International's offices in Rioja, allowing local, regional and national stakeholders to provide feedback on the document. Key information in Spanish about the project and the main results was organized in a poster to facilitate the comprehension of local population.

In all cases, the audit team was able to confirm the validated procedures and based on all the above, the audit team confirms that the project has indeed carried out effective stakeholder engagement.

4.3.6 Stakeholder Grievance Redress Procedure (G3.10)

The conflict and grievance resolution mechanism are described in detail in the section G3.10 of the CCB-PD. During this monitoring the process remained the same. Prior to the site visit, the audit team reviewed the project grievance redress procedures as described in the PD. Once on the site; verification team interviewed the AMPF Head Office (SERNAMP) and local community members. Grievances were recorded in the communities: El Triunfo, Miraflores, Nuevo Amazonas, Nuevo Eden and Nuevo Jaen, during the on-site visit it was verified that they are processed according to legal requirements.

4.3.7 Worker Relations (G4.3 – G4.6)

Project proponent developed specific training plans, for years 2017 and 2018.The training plan is described for the Conservation Agreements Technical Team, monitoring and surveillance team and the AMPF head office staff. Training sessions are held often. Several activities were developed in this period and evidence was provided to the audit team. In addition, a safety protocol was developed and implemented. The risks in the development of the work of the management team have been minimized thanks to the implementation of the security protocol.

Verification team interviewed project employees as to the requirements of the standards regarding employment. The audit team witnessed a number of individuals performing project tasks and confirmed that practices were in place to minimize risk as much as possible.

4.3.8 Technical and Management Capacity (G4.2, G4.7)

According to the monitoring report, professional team in charge of the project are mainly members from four institutions: Conservation International, Asociación Ecosistemas Andinos (ECCOAN), The National Service of Natural Protected Areas (SERNANP) and the Mono Tocón Project (PMT). The latter only participated in the first 8 months of this period with the fourth primate monitoring in the AMPF. This activity was later replaced to initiate the design of a biodiversity monitoring protocol through the use of trap cameras.

Management skills requirements, for all involved personnel, are detailed in the report *"Sup.inf_nprt_01_Technical expertise magmt team.xlsx."* The audit team reviewed the report and confirmed that it documents the key technical skills that will be required to implement the project successfully, including community engagement, biodiversity assessment and carbon measurement and monitoring skills. The expertise of the team was contrasted during the site visit.

Regarding the financial heath, PP has provided the evidence called: *"Sup.Inf_nprt_08_CI Foundation and affiliates financial report.pdf",* which details the result of the financial statements. Moreover, it was provided a financial model called: *"Sup.Inf_nprt_07a_Financial models summary Alto Mayo_4", t*he financial analysis is based on a revision of the model prepared for initial validation of the project. The model shows actual expenses for implementing the project from 2008 to 2022; these expenses are reported and approved by SERNANP annually since the start of the Administration Contract. Financial viability, also, is described in of the Non-Permanence Risk Report.

Based on provided evidences, described above, the audit team is able to confirm that the project has the capacity to implement the project as described in the validated project description.

4.3.9 Legal Status (G5.1)

The CCB-PD states that all local, national and international laws are followed (Section 1.11 of the VCS PD and Sections G4.5 and G5.1-2 of the CCB-PD. The supervision and control of the project activity are in charge of SERNANP, which is a government entity responsible of natural protected areas. The regulation (RP. 26-2014-SERNANP) provides a specific legal framework to obtain the right to commercialize carbon certificates generated within a natural protected area.

In accordance with the MR, since the last monitoring period, there were no changes in the laws and statues listed. This issue was corroborated during the on-site visit with an intertied with a representative of SERNANP, who has provided the current agreement between SERNANP and project participants.

4.3.10 Rights Protection and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (G5.3-G5.5)

AMPF is part of the Peruvian Natural Protected Area system. Their management and protection is the responsibility of the Peruvian State, who by SERNANP granted the co-management rights to

Conservation International. Within an ANP is prohibited titling of property or any other right on the surface to private. The project utilizes a participatory design, and participation in the project activities is voluntary. There is no encroachment on the property of others

Based on the above and information gleaned from community interviews, the audit team was able to confirm that the rights of Indigenous Peoples, communities and other stakeholders in accordance to the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards and the validated project design.

4.3.11 Identification of Illegal Activities (G5.5)

According to CCB-PD the common illegal activities inside the AMPF are the deforestation due to coffee plantation, poaching, butterfly and orchids extraction and land trafficking. These illegal activities have a direct influence on the project's climate, community, and biodiversity impact. Project benefits are not derived from illegal activities. Site visit observations and interviews with participants further confirm these elements.

In addition, according to the MR, between 2016 and April 2018, more than 558 ranger patrols have been implemented to prevent and mitigate illegal activities (mainly deforestation and fauna and flora extraction). Then, verification team confirm that this Issue is addressed.

4.4 Climate

4.4.1 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

All calculations of greenhouse gas emission reductions and removals were checked by the verifier. No errors were discovered that materially affect the stated greenhouse gas emission reductions and removals of the project. The methods used to estimate greenhouse gas benefits of the project were consistent with the methodology and the validated project document

The data and parameters used to determine greenhouse gas emission reductions and removals are listed in section 3.2 of the monitoring report. In accordance with the validated PD and applied methodology, carbon stocks/ha in the different strata are considered fixed, thus the proponent carried out no new forest inventory during the monitoring period of 2016-2018.

AENOR conducted an intensive review of all input data, parameters, formulas, calculations, conversions, statistics and resulting uncertainties and output data to ensure consistency with the VCS and CCB standards, the project PD and the methodology. Further, verification team reproduced calculations for selected samples to ensure accuracy of the results. Samples of data with associated conversion factors, formulae, and calculations were provided by the project proponent in spreadsheet format to ensure all formulas were accessible for review. The verifier recalculated subsets of the analysis to confirm correctness. The project proponent also provided a step-by-step overview of calculations to ensure the understood the approach and could confirm its consistency with the methodology and PD.

Uncertainty was assessed as required. The Verifier recalculated the statistics independently to confirm the accuracy of the reported precision. The Verifier confirmed confidence deductions were required and properly allocated to the average carbon stock of pre-montane forest, dwarf forest and post-deforestation land use, as the uncertainty of the carbon estimate was above 10%.

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

4.4.2 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

During AENOR's verification, the evidence provided by the project proponent was more than sufficient in both quantity and quality to support the determination of GHG emission removals reported by the project. Throughout the verification, the project proponent demonstrated a commitment toward conservativeness and took all measures appropriate to ensure the reliability of evidence provided. Interviews conducted (oral evidence) are outlined in Section 2.4, and the final documents received from the project proponent supporting the determination of GHG removals can be viewed in Appendix 1.

The assessment suggested that the data used to determine emissions reductions are of high quality and had been collected in a manner that is consistent with the VCS standard, methodology, and monitoring plan.

4.4.3 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

The determined value of the overall risk rating has not changed since the previous verification. Therefore, verification team assessed Whether any circumstances or conditions may have occurred since the prior verification and whether items meant to address certain risks are in place and functioning as intended.

The determined value of the overall risk rating of 10% is appropriate and in conformance with the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, to the extent that said determined value was appropriate and in conformance to the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool at the time of the prior verification audit. Finally, for instances in which there were no changes from the previous risk assessment, the audit team confirmed that the risk rating remains valid to the extent that it was valid in the first place.

4.4.4 Dissemination of Climate Monitoring Plan and Results (CL3.2)

Prior to on-site visit, the audit team reviewed the project monitoring report and confirmed that it provides a description of the activities utilized to disseminate the monitoring plan and results to project stakeholder. During the on-site assessment, the audit team held interviews with local communities who confirmed claims in the monitoring report regarding the status of the project implementation. Overall, the verification team has a high level of confidence that the dissemination of the project monitoring plan results took place in conformance with the validated PD. A full monitoring plan was developed.

4.4.5 Optional Gold Level: Climate Change Adaptation Benefits (GL1.4)

No applicable.

4.5 Community

4.5.1 Community Impacts (CM1.1)

Previous to on-site visit, the audit team reviewed the project monitoring report in order to confirm that it provides a description of the community impacts of the project activities. During the on-site visit, the audit team held interviews with local communities and community groups who confirmed claims in the monitoring report regarding information on the project's community impacts. In addition, the audit team visited communities where project activities are taking place, along with community members who confirmed the activities were implemented by project personnel and are providing positive benefits.

The monitoring plans describe specific indicators, which are used to collect and analyze the data required to meet project's impacts. Section 4.1 describes several activities developed and linked to the following positive community impacts into the project zone:

- ✓ Governance of the AMPF is strengthened.
- ✓ Production systems of the local population are improved and coffee associations in connection to special markets are promoted.
- ✓ Capacity building and knowledge is generated among local people for sustainable management of their production systems.
- ✓ Living conditions of the local population in harmony with the objectives of the AMPF are improved.
- ✓ Economic alternatives for the population are generated through conservation actions aligned with AMPF management.
- ✓ Ecosystem services of the AMPF (water and soil) are maintained and improved for the benefit of population in the project zone.
- ✓ Natural resources within the BPAM are sustainably managed by the local population.
- ✓ The partnership between the local population and the AMPF Head Office are empowered for conservation

Furthermore, the following negative impacts in the project area are listed and described.

- ✓ Decrease economic opportunities from illegal activities
- ✓ Decrease provision of basic services within the AMPF
- ✓ Improved control over the expansion of the agricultural frontier
- ✓ Less support from land holders to their families in the area of origin

In addition, socio-economic positive impacts outside the project area have been also listed and described in the MR. Those impacts are:

- ✓ Ecosystem services of the AMPF (water and soil) are maintained and improved for the benefit of the population outside the project zone.
- ✓ Technology is transferred to improve coffee production systems outside project zone.
- ✓ New projects for sustainable development of the Alto Mayo watershed are leverage

Finally, socio-economic negative impacts outside include:

- ✓ Demand for conventional coffee practices are displaced to native communities increasing unsustainable land use in areas rented by them.
- ✓ Customary uses of the native communities are affected by increased surveillance and control program of the PNA (Project natural area).

Therefore; after confirming throught interviews, positive and negatives impacts, with local communities, the verification team has a high level of confidence that the community impacts described in the project monitoring report are accurate.

4.5.2 Net Positive Community Well-being (CM1.1)

Overall, the net socioeconomic impacts in the project area are quite positive. The successful implementation of conservation agreements in the area has enabled a transition to more sustainable practices and livelihoods, thus reducing the potential negative impacts associated to the elimination of illicit activities. This issue was confirmed during the on-site visit.

4.5.3 Protection of High Conservation Values (CM1.2)

According to the monitoring report all the population groups in the Alto Mayo basin (settlers, native communities, and peasant communities) make small scale use of different areas of the AMPF to meet some of their basic needs, characterizing HCVs. The areas within the AMPF, where resources such as firewood and construction materials are used and the collecting of different forest products is made, are concentrated in areas near the population centers of the main sub-basins where population is settled. Those issues were confirmed during the visit to project area. Then, the verification team concluded that project proponent has provided accurate and sufficient information to describe the effects of the project activities.

4.5.4 Other Stakeholder Impacts (CM2.2-CM2.3)

The potential negative offsite stakeholder impacts identified for the project are listed as:

- ✓ Demand for conventional coffee practices are displaced to native communities increasing unsustainable land use in areas rented by them.
- ✓ Customary uses of the native communities are affected by increased surveillance and control program of the PNA (protection natural areas)

According to the monitoring report (section 4.2.1) Native Communities are performing their usual activities in their territory and there is no evidence that they are affecting the AMPF. Also. during this monitoring period, there have been no recorded conflicts between settlers of Native Communities and staff of the AMPF due to customary practices within the protected area.

During the site visit has not detected any offsite negative stakeholder impacts. No community member interviewed within the leakage belt has indicated any negative impacts as a result of project activities. Furthermore, as mitigation measure CI Peru, with the support of CSP, has been implementing the project "Strengthening Governance and Capacities of Awajún Indigenous Communities to Develop Partnerships for Sustainable Product Sourcing in the Alto Mayo Basin" in the Awajún community located in the Buffer Zone in Alto Mayo. The project's main objective is to achieve a suitable level of indigenous governance in this community to contribute to the conservation of remnant plant cover and the implementation of sustainable practices that improve production in deforested areas. This is done through the conservation agreements model that capitalizes the great experience gained within the PNA and the projects that CI Peru implements in the community of Awajún Shampuyacu.

Measures to mitigate the potential risk are been implemented. These measures include mainly technology transfer to improve coffee production systems and strengthening governance and capacities in native communities.

4.5.5 Community Monitoring Plan (CM3.1, CM3.2, GL2.5)

Full monitoring plan was developed as described in CCB-PD. The monitoring plan was developed and within one year from the validation and its implementation was verified in the second and third verification events, respectively 2015 and 2016.

4.5.6 Community Monitoring Plan Dissemination (CM3.3)

Prior to on-site visit, the audit team reviewed the project monitoring report and confirmed that it provides a description of the activities utilized to disseminate the monitoring plan and results to project stakeholder. During the on-site assessment, the audit team held interviews with local communities who confirmed claims in the monitoring report regarding the status of the project implementation. Overall, the verification team has a high level of confidence that the dissemination of the project monitoring plan results took place in conformance with the validated PD. A full monitoring plan was developed.

4.5.7 Optional Gold Level: Barriers to Benefits (GL2.3)

Not applicable.

4.5.8 Optional Gold Level: Protections for Poorer and the more Vulnerable (GL2.4)

Not applicable.

4.6 Biodiversity

4.6.1 Biodiversity Changes (B1.1)

As the biodiversity benefits associated with the project are highly correlated with project activities developed in project area, then, the audit team reviewed socioeconomic and metrics report (*"Sup.Inf_MIR_01_2016-2018 Socio economic and biodiversity metrics"*), specifically avoided deforestation and degradation and confirmed the information to be sufficient to describe the effects of the project activities. In addition, the audit team reviewed the biodiversity monitoring records and confirmed that the monitoring of biodiversity is taking place as described in the validated PD.

4.6.2 High Conservation Values Protected (B1.2)

No negative impacts to biodiversity are reported. Reasoning, based on monitoring findings that are used as the basis for claims and the impacts on biodiversity from a project of this nature are almost always net positive. As stated above there are no negative biodiversity related impacts on the area of HCVs.

4.6.3 Invasive Species (B1.3)

Only native species have been used in the restoration areas, verification team visited nurseries in the project site and confirmed this fact.

On the other hand, the project has used non-native species in the agroforestry system, however those species were already introduced to the AMPF previously to the project (see section 5.1.4 of the MR) and has not resulted to be invasive.

The audit team reviewed the activities implemented by the project proponent and confirmed that the activities include protecting existing forest, but does not introduce new species to the existing forest. The few species that have been introduced before project implementation and are used in the agroforestry system. Based on these activities, the audit team confirms that no invasive species have been introduced by the project.

4.6.4 Impacts of Non-native Species (B1.4)

The project has used non-native species in the agroforestry system, however those species were already introduced to the AMPF previously to the project and are used in agroforestry system for food security.

4.6.5 GMO Exclusion (B1.5)

No genetically modified organisms (GMO) have been used. To confirm this issue the audit team reviewed the activities implemented by the project proponent, which include protecting existing forest, but does not introduce new species to the existing native forests. Based on these activities, the audit team confirms that no GMO's are included in the project and thus the project does not generate any GHG emission reductions through the use of GMO's.

4.6.6 Negative Offsite Biodiversity Impacts and Mitigation (B2.2)

The PP has identified two negatives impact outside the project area (see section 4.6.1):

- ✓ Deforestation of the habitat of the species of high importance for biodiversity is displaced to in the leakage belt.
- ✓ Illegal extraction of flora and fauna is displaced to out of the project area creating additional pressure on forests in the buffer zone.

Even those negative aspects, according to the monitoring of socio economic and biodiversity metrics *"Sup.Inf_MIR_01_2016-2018 Socio economic and biodiversity metrics",* the local communities not only decrease the extraction of flora and fauna inside, but also became conservationists, through the signage of conservation agreements. Consequently, the project has a minimal (if any) negative impact on the flora and fauna outside the project area. Verification team interviewed some local inhabitants, who has signed conservation agreement, to confirm the attitude change towards conservation, all of them were in favor of forest conservation.

4.6.7 Net Biodiversity Benefits (B2.3)

Given that no negative impacts on biodiversity inside project zone have occurred and, also, positive aspect has been reported outside of the project (see section 4.6.1); the net biodiversity benefits are clearly positive.

4.6.8 Biodiversity Monitoring Results (B3.1, B3.2)

Biodiversity and socioeconomic monitoring plans ("*Protocolo de monitoreo de biodiversidad del Bosque de Protección Alto Mayo".*) describe specific indicators, which are used to collect and analyze the data required to meet project's impacts. Section 5.1.1 of the monitoring report described several actions developed and liked to the following positive biological impacts into the project zone:

- ✓ The habitat of high importance species for the biodiversity of the AMPF in conserved.
- ✓ Habitat fragmentation of high importance species for the biodiversity of the AMPF is avoided.
- ✓ High Conservation Value Areas of the AMPF is maintained and/or enhanced.
- ✓ Populations of endemic and threatened species above its critical level are maintained and / or recovered
- ✓ Pressure reduced to ecosystems of the AMPF through the promotion of sustainable use practices by local people.
- ✓ Operational capacity of the AMPF Head Office is strengthened and the response to the pressures on the area is improved.

- ✓ Degraded ecosystems of the AMPF are restored through the implementation of reforestation and agroforestry systems.

- ✓ Biodiversity and ecosystem services of the AMPF are recognized and valued by locals, who become allies in the conservation.

- ✓ Illegal extraction of wildlife in the AMPF is reduced.

No negative impacts inside of the Projet zone to biodiversity are identified.

Outside the project area, impacts include:

- ✓ Connectivity of the Conservation Corridor Abiseo-Cóndor-Kutukú – CCACK is maintained.

- ✓ Ecosystem services of the AMPF (water and soil) are maintained and improved for the benefit of population outside project zone.

- ✓ Biodiversity and ecosystem services by AMPF natural resources stocks outside project zone are recognized and valued.

- ✓ Technology is transferred to improve coffee production systems outside project zone.

- ✓ New projects for the conservation of biodiversity in the Alto Mayo are leveraged.

Most important results of the monitoring are summarized below:

- ✓ The habitat of high importance species for the biodiversity of the AMPF in conserved: The observed deforestation decreased 32% from 339 ha/y in the first monitoring period (2008-2012) to 230 ha/y in 2016-2018 (Figure 5), demonstrating the effectives of the project's strategies. In 2018, 150,365 ha of forest were successfully protected in the AMPF and over 2,600 ha of forest loss was avoided. This issue where confirmed with Forest Cover and Change Map and with the monitoring result from annual area deforestation.

- ✓ The monitoring of primates ended in June 2017. The monitoring of primates was carried out in 6 micro-watersheds. It covered 33 transects measuring more than 1 km each. The most commonly found species in all the sub-basins assessed was the Peruvian yellow-tailed woolly monkey (Lagothrix flavicauda), followed by the Andean white-fronted capuchin monkey (Cebus yuracus) and the Andean night monkey (Aotus miconax), unlike the large-headed capuchin monkey (Sapajus macrocephalus) that was only found in the Huasta sub-basin. Verification reviewed the report "Libro de experiencias 2017: Monitoreo de Primates Bosques de Protección Alto Mayo", which documents in a comprehensive manner the monitoring process of monkeys.

- ✓ Pressure reduced to ecosystems of the AMPF through the promotion of sustainable use practices by local people. The implementation of agroforestry system is having a positive effect, as native species are being planted and the habitat is being restored. 300 hectares of pilot plots under agroforestry systems were installed and 1747 hectares are under

organic certification. It was confirmed with interviews with coffee producer from COOPBAM.

- ✓ The project has promoted the use of up to 293 new improved cooking stoves in the area during these monitoring periods, which consume an average of 52% less firewood than regular cooking stoves. The use of improved cooking stoves helps reduce pressure on forest fragments and remaining primary forests in areas close to the population.

- ✓ The results on environmental illicit activities reported by the surveillance and control area of the AMPF management office indicated that eight interventions were made on wood trafficking. There were 22 findings of logging and/or deforestation, 17 in primary forests and 5 in secondary forests. On the contrary, no wildlife traffic has been reported. These results, compared with the ones obtained in previous years, show a reduction of environmental illicit acts. These facts were confirmed against park rangers interviews.

No negative impacts to biodiversity are identified. Net Impacts on biodiversity is considered are considered positive.

In addition, outside the project area, positive impacts include:

- ✓ Connectivity of the Conservation Corridor Abiseo-Cóndor-Kutukú – CCACK is maintained.

- ✓ Ecosystem services of the AMPF (water and soil) are maintained and improved for the benefit of population outside project zone.

- ✓ Biodiversity and ecosystem services provided by AMPF natural resources stocks outside project zone are recognized and valued.

- ✓ Technology is transferred to improve coffee production systems outside project zone.

- ✓ New projects for the conservation of biodiversity in the Alto Mayo are leveraged.

The project has also demonstrated 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 list of species used in the project provided in section 5.1. of the MR, was checked y verifiers against the global invasive species database (http://www.issg.org), the Invasive Species Compendium and the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species considers the species native to the area. Verifiers conclude that no invasive species, or genetically modified organisms (GMO's) are being used in project activities, and no adverse impacts are possible.

4.6.9 Biodiversity Monitoring Plan Dissemination (B3.3)

The audit team reviewed the project monitoring report and confirmed it provides a description of the project activities utilized to disseminate the monitoring plan and results to project stakeholder. Also, during the on-site visit, the audit team held interviews with local communities and community groups who confirmed that the monitoring plan is in place and is described in the document "*Protocolo de monitoreo de biodiversidad del Bosque de Protección Alto Mayo*". Then, the

verification team has a high level of confidence that the dissemination of the project monitoring plan results took place in conformance with the validated PD.

4.7 Additional Project Implementation Information

For this monitoring, the annual forest deforestation parameters identified as cloud in the 2018 land cover map were temporarily excluded from baseline and project emissions. Therefore, the total baseline carbon stock changes in the project area during this monitoring period reported in MR Tables 02.a-c differ from the total baseline carbon stock changes in the project area reported on VM Tables 15.a-c of the AMCI Methodological Annex. In like manner, the total baseline carbon stock changes in the leakage belt, tables 04.a-c differ from the total baseline carbon stock change in the leakage belt reported in VM Tables 29.a-c of the AMCI Methodological Annex.

Verification team reviewed the spreadsheets of emission reduction calculation (monitoring tables): *"VM0015_Monitoring_tables_AMPF_2016-2018",* in order to confirm the calculation, also during the visit, the responsible of GIS data processing were interviewed and explained the results from maps. Verification team was able to reproduce same values an confirms that emission reduction calculation is in line with the monitoring plan and applied methodology.

4.8 Additional Project Impact Information

The CCB-PD includes the list of species found in the AMPF categorized by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as Critically Endangered (CR) and Endangered (EN), according to the requirements of the GL3.1.1 indicator.

The list of critically endangered and endangered species is shown in table 8 of the monitoring report. Furthermore, table 9 shown the list of vulnerable species. Some species that have been removed from the list submitted in the PD, because the most recent IUCN categorization does not consider these species as Critically Endangered, Endangered or Vulnerable anymore, but Least Concern, Near Threatened, Data Deficient, or not evaluated.

The audit team has confirmed that these species are currently present in the IUCN Red List.

Furthermore, section 7 of the monitoring report describes how the project activities contribute conserving biodiversity at project site

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

AENOR has verified that the project is in compliance with the Verified Carbon Standard version 3.7 and the CCB Standards Second Edition without qualifications or limitations.

The project has been implemented in accordance with the project description and its validated variations and the data and information supporting the GHG assertion are historic in nature.

AENOR is able to issue a positive verification opinion for the 1,142,776 tonnes CO2e of verified emissions reductions, as reported in the Monitoring Report version 1, dated 27 October 2018. The verification assessment covered the monitoring period from 15 June 2016 to 14 June 2018 and verified that calculated emission reductions and/or removals were achieved during the monitoring

period with a reasonable level of assurance. The overall risk rating was 10 %. Therefore, the total number of credits to be deposited in the buffer account is 114,278 VCUs and the total VCUs to be issued are 1,028,498 tCO2e.

Reporting period: From 15 June 2016 to 14 June 2018

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

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO_2e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO_2e)	Leakage emissions (tCO_2e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO_2e)
2017	679,227	88,771	0	531,411
2018	641,089	88,771	0	497,087
Total	**1,320,317**	**177,541**	**0**	**1,028,498**

APPENDIX 1: LIST OF EVIDENCE PROVIDED

N°	Document
1	Alto Mayo Conservation Initiative Monitoring & Implementation N°4 (2016-2018)
2	Non-Permanence Risk Report N°5 (2016-2018)
3	CCBS Summary Page - Spanish
4	VM0015 Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation. v1.0
5	VCS-Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in VCS AFOLU Project Activities
6	AMCI VCS PD. 2015/08/07
7	AMCI VCS PD Methodological Annex. 2015/08/07
8	AMCI CCB-PDD. 2012/08/23
9	AMCI Socio Economic and Biodiverstiy metrics (2016-2018)
10	AMCI Socioeconomic Protocol
11	Biodiversity monitoring protocol of of BPAM
12	Experiences Book 2017 – Monkey monitoring of BPAM
13	Health security and environmental plan. May 2017.
14	Land cover and change monitoring procedures
15	Mapping and drone image processing. Version 1
16	BPAM Research strategy 2017-2019.
17	BPAM Renewable and natural resources management plan
18	BPAM Tourist plant. March 2017.
19	BPAM Training plan for management 2017
20	BPAM Training plan for management 2018
21	Alto Mayo Protected Forest Annual Report 2017. SERNANP.
22	Alto Mayo Protected Forest Annual Report 2018. SERNANP
23	Images captures by camera traps in Alto Mayo and Shampuyaco Indigenous Communities.
24	Administration Contract BPAM

N°	Document
25	Administration Contract BPAM Amendment. January 2018.
26	Analysis of Agents, Drivers and Underlying Causes of Deforestation in BPAM
27	BPAM Social management plan
28	BPAM Conflict management strategy
29	BPAM Community relationship protocol
30	Foundation and affiliates financial report. June 2016.
31	Conservation agreements model.
32	Guidelines for Conservation Agreements. SERNANP
33	Approved Conservation Agreement Model. SERNANP
34	Complaint resolution reports (El Triunfo, Miraflores, Nuevo Amazonas, Nuevo Eden and Nuevo Jaen)
35	Master Plan BPAM 2008-2013.
36	Legal land tenure in BPAM. SPDA.
37	Law of Natural Protected Areas (law N° 26834).
38	BPAM communication strategy 2017-2018
39	Stakeholder engagement plan. December 2016
40	BPAM Community development plan 2017
41	Infographic CI Peru in San Martin.
42	Physical Vulnerability Map of Peru- MINAM
43	Physical Susceptibility Map of Peru. MINAM. 2015
44	BPAM Communication Strategy. CI. 2013
45	Training plan for project technical team.
46	Geological risk in San Martin region. INGEMMET 2010.
47	Peru's governances score 2010-2014
48	Function and technical expertise of BPAM management team. Period 2016-2018
49	Financial Models

N°	Document
50	Financial analysis tool
51	BPAM opportunity cost calculation
52	BPAM communication plan 2018
53	Peru governance score 2012-2016
54	VM0015_Monitoring_tables_AMPF_2016-2018
55	Signatories conservation agreement report 2017-2018
56	GIS Data

APPENDIX 2: VCS VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Table 01: VCS Requirements

VCS Requirement	Ref	Comments	Draft conclusion	Final conclusion
1. Project Details				
1.1 Summary Description of Project				
Is a summary description of the project provided in the Monitoring Report (MR)? Is the project implementation in line with the P.D?	D.R I	A description of the project is provided in section 2.1 of the Monitoring Implementation Report. The project has been implemented as the P.D. states. **CAR 1: During the on-site inspection was identified some differences in the unique benefit project report and Standardized Benefit Metrics, between Monitoring report and supporting evidences provided during the visit.** PP has updated the MR, and included correct information, as verified during the on-site assessment	**CAR 1**	OK
1.2 Project Location				
Is the project location and geographic included in the MR and in line with PD?	D.R I	Project location and geographic information provided are in compliance with the monitoring plan.	OK	OK
Is the project area provided by the PP? Is the area of the project strata provided?	D.R I	KML files have been provided. All the relevant geographic database of baseline and project monitoring has been provided to the audit team. AENOR has checked the evidence provided and has found it is correct.	OK	OK

1.3 Project Proponent				
Are contact information and roles/responsibilities for the project proponent(s) provided?	D.R I	As noted in the MR, the project proponent is Conservation International Foundation (CI) through its Peru office (CI-Peru). CI-Peru is responsible for the implementation of the conservation strategies and has overall control and responsibility of the project. Moreover, its responsibilities and roles are also detailed. As per the Administration Contract, CI-Peru co-manages the AMPF together with the local Head Office of the National Service of Natural Protected Areas by the State (SERNANP). CI-Peru has the right of use of any greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions and/or removals arising during the contract period in connection with its performance of environmental services that generate GHG emission reductions and/or removals in the AMPF.	OK	OK
Are the PPs same as in the P.D?	D.R I	PP in the monitoring report are the same as in the monitoring plan	OK	OK
1.4 Other Entities Involved in the Project				
Are contact information and roles/responsibilities for any other project participant(s) provide?	D.R I	Yes, information about roles and responsibilities of other entities involved is provided.	OK	OK
1.5 Project Start Date				
Is the project start date, specifying the day, month and year indicated? Is the start date in line with the PD?	D.R I	Yes, according to the validated P.D the effective start date is June 15, 2008.	OK	OK
1.6 Project Crediting Period				

Is the project crediting period indicated and in line with PD? (specifying the day, month and year for the start and end dates and the total number of years)	D.R I	Yes, the M.R states a 20 years crediting period (from June 15, 2008 to June 14, 2028. The project crediting is subject to renewals.	OK	OK
2. Implementation Status				
2.1 Sectoral Scope and Project Type				
Is the sectoral scope(s) applicable to the project, the AFOLU project category and activity type (if applicable) indicated? Is the project is a grouped project?	D.R I	The sectoral scope and project type are identified in the report. The project is not a grouped project.	OK	OK
For a grouped project, provide relevant information about new instances of the project activity(s) and demonstrate that each new instance of the project activity(s) meets the eligibility criteria set out in the project description.	D.R I	N/A	N/A	N/A
2.2 Description of the Project Activity				
Implementation Status of the Project Activity				
Describe the implementation status of the project activity(s). Is the implementation in line with the PD? Provide information regarding the operation of the project activity(s) during this monitoring period, including any information on events that may impact the GHG emission reductions or removals and monitoring.	D.R I	Monitoring report, section 2.2., described the implementation status of the project accordingly and in line with the PD. Evidence of the implementation of reported activities, which include capacity building workshops and support towards the communities for implementation of sustainable economic activities has been provided to the audit team.	OK	OK

Are project activities such as forest management activities and harvesting carried out in line with the PD? Is any project emissions described, in particular fire or any other events leading to GHG emission during the project activity?				
Has any project description deviations occurred during the monitoring period?		No deviations were performed during the monitoring period.	OK	OK
Has any project description deviation occurred since project validation?	D.R I	No deviations were performed during the monitoring period.	OK	OK
Are all relevant licenses obtained? (e.g. Environmental licenses)	D.R I	All relevant licenses were obtained.	OK	OK
Are land titles and carbon rights hold by the PP? In case not all land was under control at validation, is it ensured that 100% of the land is under control of the PP?	D.R I	Yes, according with the evidence provided.	OK	OK
Is a description of the non-permanence risk factors included?	D.R I	Yes, the risks are described in section 2.2.5. The updated version is in accordance with the guidelines provided by the AFOLU Non-permanence Risk Tool.	OK	OK
3. Legal Status				
3.1 Compliance with Laws, Statues, Property Rights and Other Regulatory Frameworks				
Is compliance of the project with all and any relevant local, regional and national laws, statutes and regulatory frameworks identified and demonstrated.		Yes, the project is incompliance with all laws, statutes, and other regulatory frameworks identified. 26-2014-SERNANP from SERNANP to develop, implement and	OK	OK

		commercialize from the conservation of natural ecosystems generated within a natural protected area. CI has signed an additional addendum with SERNAM to extend the period of the conservation agreement		
3.2 Evidence of Right of Use				
Is evidence of right of use with respect to the GHG emission reductions and removals provided?		CI-Peru signed an Administrative Contract with SERNAP which gives CI-Peru co-management authority over the AMPF. Greenhouse gas emissions reductions or removals rights in the project area have also been bestowed upon CI-Peru. Administration Contract and RP. 26-2014-SERNANP has been reviewed and verified, included the addendum signed in 2018.	OK	OK
3.3 Emissions Trading Programs and Other Binding Limits				
Where applicable, demonstrate that net GHG emission reductions or removals generated by the project will not be used for compliance with an emissions trading program or to meet binding limits on GHG emissions		Currently, Peru does not have any binding commitments and/or obligations to reduce GHG emissions.	OK	OK
3.4 Participation under Other GHG Programs				
Is the project registered in another GHG program?		The project has not been registered by other GHG program.	OK	OK
3.5 Other Forms of Environmental Credit				
Demonstrate that the project neither has nor intends to generate any other form of GHG-related environmental credit for GHG emission reductions		The project has not and does not intend to generate any other form of GHG-related environmental credit for GHG emissions reductions or removals claimed under the	OK	OK

or removals claimed under the VCS Program, or that any such credit has been or will be cancelled from the relevant program		VCS Program. The only GHG-related environmental credit generated by the project will be under the VCS.		
3.6 Projects Rejected by Other GHG Programs				
Indicate whether the project has been rejected by any other GHG programs. Where the project has been rejected, provide the relevant information		The project has not been rejected under any other GHG program.	OK	OK
4. Application of Methodology				
4.1 Title and Reference of Methodology				
Is the title, reference and version number of the methodology(s) applied to the project included in the MR and in line with MP?	D.R I	The project applies the "Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation" (VM0015, Version 1.0) approved by the VCS on July 12, 2011. The project used the VCS Tool VT0001 "Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in VCS Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Project Activities" (Version 1.0) in order to demonstrate the additionality of the project.	OK	OK
4.2 Deviations from the Monitoring Plan				
If any, Is deviations from the monitoring plan in the project description described and justified?	D.R I	No deviations from the project description during this monitoring period were identified	OK	OK
4.3 Project Boundary				
Define the VCS project boundary and identify the relevant GHG sources, sinks and reservoirs for the		The project boundary, including spatial, temporal, carbon pools, and sources of GHG emissions, did not change since the validation. The same carbon pools and GHG sources were considered in the baseline and	OK	OK

project and baseline scenarios (including leakage if applicable).		project scenario, and only include above- and below-ground biomass. Project boundary definition is described in a complete manner in the validated PD and AMCI Methodology Annex.		
4.4 Baseline Scenario				
Is the baseline scenario identified and justified?		The justification and description of the Baseline scenario is described in a complete manner in the validated PD and AMCI Methodology Annex.	OK	OK
4.5 Additionality				
Is the additionality of the project, undertaken in accordance with the applied methodology?		Demonstration and assess of the project additionality was undertaken in accordance with the VCS Tool VT0001 "Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in VCS Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Project Activities" (Version 1.0) in order to demonstrate the additionality of the project. Section 2.5 of the VCS PD describes the process.	OK	OK
5 Monitoring Data and Parameters				
5.1 Description of the Monitoring Plan				
Is the monitoring plan described?	D.RI	A full description of the monitoring plan is detailed in the biodiversity and socio-economic protocols as part of the CCBS PD, and in the Section 4.3 of VCS PD. Section 5.1 gives a description of the implementation of the protocols for this monitoring period.	OK	OK
Are organizational structure, responsibilities and competencies identified in the MR?	D.RI	A full description of the monitoring plan is detailed in the biodiversity and socio-economic protocols as part of the CCBS PD, and in the Section 4.3 of VCS PD. Section	OK	OK

		5.1 gives a description of the implementation of the protocols for this monitoring period.		
Are methods described for: Data generation (*see also SOPs for each parameter*)		A full description of the monitoring plan is detailed in the biodiversity and socio-economic protocols as part of the CCBS PD, and in the Section 4.3 of VCS PD. Section 5.1 gives a description of the implementation of the protocols for this monitoring period.	OK	OK
Data handling, in particular transcribing field data to digital calculation sheets (see also SOPs for each parameter)	D.R I	A full description of the monitoring plan is detailed in the biodiversity and socio-economic protocols as part of the CCBS PD, and in the Section 4.3 of VCS PD. Section 5.1 gives a description of the implementation of the protocols for this monitoring period.	OK	OK
Data storage, including back-up of the field sheets and digital data	D.R I	A full description of the monitoring plan is detailed in the biodiversity and socio-economic protocols as part of the CCBS PD, and in the Section 4.3 of VCS PD. Section 5.1 gives a description of the implementation of the protocols for this monitoring period.	OK	OK
QA/QC procedures (e.g. re-check of data measurement, data entry, etc. – see also SOPs for each parameter))	D.R	A full description of the monitoring plan is detailed in the biodiversity and socio-economic protocols as part of the CCBS PD, and in the Section 4.3 of VCS PD. Section 5.1 gives a description of the implementation of the protocols for this monitoring period.	OK	OK
Are procedures described for handling internal auditing and non-conformities?	D.R	A full description of the monitoring plan is detailed in the biodiversity and socio-economic protocols as part of the CCBS PD, and in the Section 4.3 of VCS PD. Section 5.1 gives a description of the implementation of the protocols for this monitoring period.	OK	OK
5.2 Data and Parameters Available at Validation				

Are all parameters "available at validation" listed as per MP and applied methodology?	D.R I	The list of parameters available at validation are given in the PD.	OK	OK
Are all data and parameters "available at validation" described using the VCS table format?	D.R I	The list of parameters available at validation are given in the PD.	OK	OK
5.3 Data and Parameters Monitored				
Are all "monitoring" parameters listed as per MP and applied methodology?	D.R I	All parameters, from monitoring plan, are included in the monitoring report.	OK	OK
Are all data and parameters "to be monitored" described using the VCS table format?	D.R I	VCS table format has been appropriately for monitoring parameters.	OK	OK
6 Quantification of GHG Emission Reductions and Removals				
6.1 Baseline Emissions				
Are baseline net GHG removals quantified correctly, and in line with the applied methodology and MP?	D.R I	Yes, the baseline net GHG removal quantified was correctly quantified and in line with the applied methodology and monitoring plan. Areas covered by cloud in the 2018 land cover map have been temporarily excluded from this monitoring report and therefore the numbers in the MR Tables 02.a, b and c differ from those shown in VM Tables 15.a, b, and c, respectively. This procedure is considered conservative. The baseline calculation was provided to the audit team. Calculations contain traceable formulae. Calculations were checked and results were founded correct.	OK	OK

6.2 Project Emissions				
Are project net GHG removals quantified correctly, and in line with the applied methodology and MP?	D.R I	Net GHG removals have been quantified correctly and in line with the applied methodology and monitoring plan.	OK	OK
Is the required precision level met for net GHG removals?	D.R I	The required precision level is met for the net GHG removals.	OK	OK
Are project net GHG emission sources listed in line with the applied methodology and MP? Are these emission sources quantified correctly and in line with the applied methodology and MP?	D.R I	The project net GHG emission sources listed are in line with the applied methodology and MP. These emission sources are quantified correctly and in line with the applied methodology and MP.	OK	OK
6.3 Leakage				
Are sources of leakage listed in line with the applied methodology and MP?	D.R I	Sources of leakage are listed in line with the methodology and MP. Explanations are reported in the monitoring report to assess the values assigned to each kind of leakage considered by the methodology.	OK	OK
Is leakage quantified correctly, and in line with the applied methodology and MP?	D.R I	The methodological procedures described in the Monitoring Report are clear and the calculations are traceable. Leakage is correctly quantified.	OK	OK
6.4 Summary of GHG Emission Reductions and Removals				
Are the net GHG emission reductions and removals quantified correctly and in line with the applied methodology and PD? Are net changes in carbon stocks included?	D.R I	The net GHG emission reductions and removals are quantified correctly and in line with the applied methodology and monitoring plan. Monitoring report and calculations provide net changes in carbon stocks.	OK	OK
Are the deductions of VCUs due to the buffer calculated correctly?	D.R	Yes, the deductions are in accordance with the in the Non-permanence risk report.	OK	OK

	I			
If applicable, is the release of VCUs from the buffer calculated correctly?	D.R I	N/A	OK	OK

Table 02: VCS Resolution of findings

CAR ID	**01**	**Date:**12/11/2018
Description of CAR		
During the on-site inspection was identified some differences in the unique benefit project report and Standardized Benefit Metrics, between Monitoring report and supporting evidences provided during the visit.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 14/11/2018
The metrics were revised, and the numbers match the text in the MIR and the evidences provided during the filed visit.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
A new version of the MIR (file named AMPF MIR 4rd verification_v2018_10_27.pdf) was provided		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 30/11/2018
Final version of the MR, contain properly information; same as verified during the on-site visit. **Then CAR is closed**		

APPENDIX 3: CCB VERIFICATION FINDINGS SUMMARY

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 MR details the location of the project and basic physical parameters. There have been no changes to aspects such as geology, soils, and overall climate.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR, PD, Administration Contract SERNANP-CI, GIS Package, KML Files, Plan Maestro del BPAM-SERNANP 2008-2013, site visit,
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G1.2 – The types and condition of vegetation within the project area.	This indicator was addressed in the validated PD. The types and condition of vegetation within the project area have not changed.
Evidence used to assess conformance	PD and site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G1.3 – The boundaries of the project area and the project zone	According to the MR 2016-2018, the boundaries of project area and project zone still being the same as were described in the PD without alterations. The boundaries of the project were confirmed at verification and have not changed at the date. This indicator has been correctly addressed-
Evidence used to assess conformance	PD, MR, AMCI Methodology Annex, KLM files, GIS package and interviews during the site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
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	This indicator was addressed in the validated PD.

Guidelines for National GHG Inventories for Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU) or a more robust and detailed methodology.	
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018 and CCB Project Validation and Verification report for the project.
Finding	No findings were raised.
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 and describes any community characteristics.	The reader is referred to the validated PD, which describes the local communities in the project area and project zone and the basic socioeconomic and cultural information. None of these aspects have changed since the original validation, which was also confirmed during the site visit.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018 and CCB Project Validation and Verification report for the project.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G1.6 – A description of current land use and customary and legal property rights including community property in the project zone, identifying any on-going or unresolved conflicts or disputes and identifying and describing any disputes over land tenure that were resolved during the last ten years (see also G5).	The reader is referred to the validated PD, which describes this indicator.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018 and CCB Project Validation and Verification report for the project.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G1.7 – A description of current biodiversity within the project zone (diversity of species and ecosystems) and threats to that biodiversity, using	The reader is referred to the validated PD, which fully describes the biodiversity as of validation.

appropriate methodologies, substantiated where possible with appropriate reference material.	
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018 and CCB Project Validation and Verification report for the project.
Finding	No findings were raised.
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: **8.1. Globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values;** **8.1.1 Protected areas** **8.1.2 Threatened species** **8.1.3 Endemic species** **8.1.4 Areas that support significant concentrations of a species during any time in their lifecycle (e.g. migrations, feeding grounds, breeding areas)** **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;** **8.3. Threatened or rare ecosystems** **8.4. Areas that provide critical ecosystem services (e.g., hydrological services, erosion control, fire control);** **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); and**	The reader is referred to the validated PD, which fully describes the biodiversity as of validation.

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).	
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018 and CCB Project Validation and Verification report for the project.
Finding	No findings were raised.
G2. Baseline projections	
Indicator G.2.1 - 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, 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 referred to the CCB PD. The effects of the baseline scenario on the communities and biodiversity are detailed in Sections G2.1-5 of the CCBSPD. The scenario was identified using a participatory consultation process, following steps in the VCS methodology.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018, section 2.5 of the VCS PD, observations during site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.2.2 - 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 reader is referred to the validated PDD, which states that VCS tool VT0001, "Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in AFOLU project activities" was used to determine additionality. In the absence of the REDD project, the major barriers (lack of sustainable investment from Peruvian government to improve protected area management capacity, lack of skills and knowledge on production of organic coffee) will continue to prevent effective reductions in the deforestation rate in the AMPF. Is reasonable to assume that no

	changes have occurred to the validated scenario. Site visit observations also confirm this.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018, PD and VCS Methodology, VCS tool VT0001
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.2.3.- 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-CO2 GHG emissions such as CH4 and N2O in the 'without project' scenario. Non-CO2 gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of CO2-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**	This indicator was addressed in the validated PD. The estimated carbon stock changes associated with the 'without project' reference scenario was confirmed at validation.

carbon accounting methodology before the start of the project.	
Evidence used to assess conformance	PD VCS and AMCI Methodology Annex.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.2.4.- 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 reader is referred to the validated PD. The validated PD describes how 'without project' reference scenario would affect communities in the project zone. Is reasonable to assume that no changes have occurred to this 'without project' scenario. Site visit observations also confirmed this.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018 and Section G2.4 of the CCB-PD
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.2.5.- Describe how the 'without project' reference scenario would affect biodiversity in the project zone (e.g., habitat availability, landscape connectivity and threatened species).	The reader is referred to the validated PD. The validated PD describes how 'without project' reference scenario would affect biodiversity in the project zone. The 'without project' reference scenario remains unchanged from validation. Site visit observations also confirmed this.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018 and Section G2.5 of the CCB-PD
Finding	No findings were raised.
G3. Project Design and Goal	
Indicator G.3.1.- Provide a summary of the project's major climate, community and biodiversity objectives.	The projects goals include reducing emissions from the deforestation of the project area (the Alto Mayo Protected Forest), maintaining ecosystem services for the benefit of local communities and reducing habitat loss for threatened and endangered wildlife species.
Evidence used to assess conformance	PD and MR 2016-2018

Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.3.2.- Describe each project activity with expected climate, community and biodiversity impacts and its relevance to achieving the projects objectives.	Indicators reported in the spreadsheet title *"Sup.Inf.MIR_01_2016-2018_Socio economic and Biodiversity Metrics"* shown the project activities results obtained during the implementation period 2016-2018.
Evidence used to assess conformance	Socio economic and Biodiversity Metrics, interviews during the site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.3.3.- 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).	A map of the project area and zone is included in the MR.
Evidence used to assess conformance	Project Map, Master Plan.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.3.4.- 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.	Project lifetime and GHG accounting period are explain and justified. The start date is 15 June 2008. The project lifetime is 20 years, 15 June 2008 – 14 June 2028, with potential for renewals. The project lifetime and the crediting period are the same. This monitoring period started 15 June 2016 and ended 14 June 2018. The implementation schedule, indicating key dates and milestones in the project's development, is described in in the MR.
Evidence used to assess conformance	CCB PD and MR 2016-2018.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.3.5.- Identify likely natural and human-induced risks to the expected climate, community and	The MR identified different risk types faced by the project categorized into internal, external and natural risks in accordance with the VCS Non-Permanence risk tool.

biodiversity benefits during the project lifetime and outline measures adopted to mitigate these risks.	Section 2.2.5 of the MR lists specific risks faced by the project. Different risks, such as coffee rust, lack of alternative livelihoods, long-term sustainability of technical assistance, consolidation of financial sustainability, continuity of the administration contract with the government of Peru, social conflicts and effects of climate change are described and measures adopted to mitigate these risks were included.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR and PD
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.3.6.- 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.	Three strategies developed with the aim of preserving High Conservation Values areas within the AMPF: a) Control and Surveillance, b) Conservation Agreements c) Communications and environmental education. The strategies, including control and surveillance, and the conservation agreements, were designed to ensure the conservation objectives of the AMPF, without harming the living conditions of the population. In that sense, activities on the ground are focused on areas with higher threats to the biodiversity, as well around the settlements. Areas targeted where were determined using the results of the monitoring of primates to establish the baseline. Tourism activities were used to help local communities realize the importance of the AMPF. The strategy of Tourism Use in the AMPF is prioritizing activities with a focus on the avifauna, orchids and butterfly tourism.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018, PD and interviews during the site visit
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.3.7.- Describe the measures that will be taken to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.	The MR describes measures taken to maintain and enhance benefit beyond the project lifetime. Measures adopted to mitigate identified risks were described. Those risk included long-term sustainability of technical assistance, consolidation of financial sustainability, social conflicts, among others.

	For financial sustainability the project is generating strategies to consolidate the relationship with buyers, such as Disney, that could ensure significant purchases for the following years.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018 and PD
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.3.8.- 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.	This indicator was addressed in section G3.8 of CCB PD, which describes the stakeholder consultation process. The project stakeholder consultation process includes many opportunities for stakeholder feedback both at the planning and project implementation stages. Indicators reported in the spreadsheet title title *"Sup.Inf.MIR_01_2016-2018_Socio economic and Biodiversity Metrics*" shown the stakeholder engagement results obtained during the implementation period 2016-2018. In addition, during the site visit evidence of meetings with different key stakeholders was provided to the audit team.
Evidence used to assess conformance	CCB PD, MR 2016-2018, "title *"Sup.Inf.MIR_01_2016-2018_Socio economic and Biodiversity Metrics*", interviews during the site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.3.9.- 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. Project proponents must play an active role in distributing key project documents to affected communities and stakeholders and hold widely	A number of methods of communication were described. For people living in the project zone without internet access, information regarding the content of the document was communicated through the Management Committee, park rangers, and Conservation Agreement technicians with information on how to submit their comments. Hard copies of the document were available for public viewing and comment during the public comment period at the

publicized information meetings in relevant local or regional languages.	AMPF Head Office as well as at Conservation International's offices in Rioja, allowing local, regional and national stakeholders to provide feedback on the document. Key information in Spanish about the project and the main results was organized in a poster to facilitate the comprehension of local population. Posters advertising result of project implementation period 2016-2018 were seen during the site visit. This indicator has been adequately addressed.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR published in VERRA Platform, posters and interviews during the site visit and interviews during the site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.3.10.- 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. Grievances and project responses must be documented.	The conflict and grievance resolution mechanism is described in detail in the section G3.10 of the CCB PD. During this monitoring the process it was recorded grievances in the communities: El Triunfo, Miraflores, Nuevo Amazonas, Nuevo Eden and Nuevo Jaen. They are assessed as established in the PD.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018, CCB-PD, agreements with communities, SERNANP Reports, interviews during the site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.3.11.- 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	The technical and financial proposal approved extends the Administration Contract for 5 years and requires a minimal investment of S/17 million. Details of project financing are described in the financial analysis of the Non-Permanence Risk Report. Project revenues are predominantly funded by credit purchase

achieve the anticipated climate, community and biodiversity benefits.	agreements with Disney, including future agreements until 2020. These analyses suggest that even with fairly conservative assumptions about carbon price and the volumes of emissions reductions the project will have long-term financial sustainability.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MIR, Non-permanence risk report and CCB PD.
Finding	No findings were raised.
G4. Management Capacity and Best Practices.	
Indicator G.4.1.- 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.	This indicator has been correctly addressed in the MR. The MR states the project proponent is Conservation International Foundation (CI) through its Peru office, called CI-Peru. The AMPF is co-managed by CI-Peru and the local Head Office of the National Service of Natural Protected Areas by the State (SERNANP). Several other entities are also involved, and their duties and roles are described in section 1.4. An organizational chart is also provided.
Evidence used to assess conformance	PD, MR 2016-2018, Administration Contract SERNANP-CI, RP. 26-2014-SERNANP and interviews during the site visit
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.4.2.- 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.	Management skills requirements, for all involved personnel, are detailed in the report *"Sup.inf_nprt_01_Technical expertise magmt team.xlsx."* The audit team reviewed the report and confirmed that it documents the key technical skills that will be required to implement the project successfully, including community engagement, biodiversity assessment and carbon measurement and monitoring skills. The expertise of the team was contrasted during the site visit.

Evidence used to assess conformance	*"Sup.inf_nprt_01_Technical expertise magmt team.xlsx."* and interviews during the site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.4.3.- 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, 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.	In accordance with the MI, all new staff of the AMPF, regardless of the organization that hires them, receives an induction orientation from their supervisor. In addition, specific training plans are described. The training plan is described for the Conservation Agreements Technical Team, monitoring and surveillance team and the AMPF head office staff. Training sessions are held often. Several activities were developed in this period and evidence was provided to the audit team.
Evidence used to assess conformance	Training Plan for Project Technical Team, reports and list of attendance of workshops.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.4.4.- 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.	PP has provided information regarding opportunities to fill job position by local people. This was also verified through interviews to some workers during the on-site visit.
Evidence used to assess conformance	Interviews during the on-site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.

Indicator G.4.5.- 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 applicable laws and/or regulations covering worker rights and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.	In accordance with the MR, an extensive analysis of laws, statutes and regulations that are applicable to the project, including worker's rights, was done and is described in detail in the Section 1.11 of the VCS PD and Sections G4.5 and G5.1-2 of the CCB PD. It is stated there were no changes in laws listed in the PD, except a new regulation regarding the commercialization rights from conservation projects enacted in 2014. There no changes in laws or regulations covering workers' rights.
Evidence used to assess conformance	PD and interviews during the site visit with SERNANP representative.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.4.6.- 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.	A safety protocol was developed and implemented. Verification team interviewed project employees as to the requirements of the standards regarding employment. The audit team witnessed a number of individuals performing project tasks and confirmed that practices were in place to minimize risk as much as possible.
Evidence used to assess conformance	PD and interviews during the site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.4.7.- Document the financial health of the implementing organization(s) to demonstrate that financial resources budgeted will be adequate to implement the project.	Regarding the financial heath, PP has provided the evidence called: *"Sup.Inf_nprt_08_CI Foundation and* affiliates *financial report.pdf",* which details the result of the financial statements. Moreover, it was provided a financial model called: *"Sup.Inf_nprt_07a_Financial models summary Alto Mayo_4", t*he financial analysis is based on a revision of the model prepared for initial validation of the project. The model shows actual expenses for implementing the project from 2008 to 2022; these expenses are reported and approved by SERNANP annually since the start of the Administration Contract. Financial viability, also, is described in of the Non-Permanence Risk Report.

Evidence used to assess conformance	Non-permanence risk report, document titled and "Sup.Inf_nprt_08_CI Foundation and affiliates financial report.pdf".
Finding	No findings were raised.
G5. Legal Status and Property Rights.	
Indicator G.5.1.- 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 CCB PD states that all local, national and international laws are followed, and to see the VCS PD for details. The VCS PD includes relevant laws, an explanation of those laws and the way in which the project proponents comply with them. In addition, section 2.5 of MR states that an additional regulation was enacted, the regulation (RP. 26-2014-SERNANP), which provides a specific legal framework to obtain the right from SERNANP to commercialize carbon certificates generated within a natural protected area. In accordance with the MIR, since the last monitoring period, there were no changes in the laws and statues listed.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR, interview with SERNANP representatives
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.5.2.- Document that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, including the established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the communities.	The project proponent presents approval from the Peruvian government, represented by SERNANP, by means of a contract titled —Administration Contract SERNANP-CI. The Administration Contract gives CI-Peru co-management authority over the AMPF and vests CI with the right of use over any greenhouse gas emission reductions or removals within the AMPF, in order to support the effective implementation of the PA's Master Plan. In addition, the regulation (RP. 26-2014-SERNANP), provides a specific legal framework to obtain the right from SERNANP to commercialize carbon certificates generated within a natural protected area.

	The project proponent, under the Administration Contract, is responsible for developing annual workplans and budgets detailing the set of activities to be implemented. The workplan and budget is then reviewed and approved by SERNANP, which is the national authority of protected areas, and by the management committee. SERNANP approves a yearly work plan and budget for the project, indicating on-going approval.
Evidence used to assess conformance	Administration Contract SERNANP-CI, RP. 26-2014-SERNANP,and interviews during the site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.5.3.- 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.	This indicator was discussed in the PD. The project area and zone remain the same as when it was validated. AMPF is part of the Peruvian Natural Protected Area system. Their management and protection is the responsibility of the Peruvian State, who by SERNANP granted the co-management rights to Conservation International. Within an ANP is prohibited titling of property or any other right on the surface to private. The project utilizes a participatory design, and participation in the project activities is voluntary. There is no encroachment on the property of others.
Evidence used to assess conformance	PD and on-site visit interviews.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.5.4.- 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 project does not intend to involuntarily reallocate people or the activities important for the livelihoods and culture of the communities. Instead, the project strategies provide incentives for the voluntary adoption of more sustainable practices. As the implementation of infrastructure is not allowed inside the protected area, the project is working with regional government to develop functional hub, where basic services would be provided to the local population. These claims were confirmed during the on-site visit.

Evidence used to assess conformance	interviews during the on-site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.5.5.- 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.	According to CCB-PD the common illegal activities inside the AMPF are the deforestation due to coffee plantation, poaching, butterfly and orchids extraction and land trafficking. These illegal activities have a direct influence on the project's climate, community, and biodiversity impact. Project benefits are not derived from illegal activities. Site visit observations and interviews with participants further confirm these elements. In addition, according to the MR, between 2016 and April 2018, more than 558 ranger patrols have been implemented to prevent and mitigate illegal activities (mainly deforestation and fauna and flora extraction). Then, verification team confirm that this Issue is addressed.
Evidence used to assess conformance	CCB- PD and interviews during the on-site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator G.5.6.- 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 project proponent presents approval from the Peruvian government, represented by SERNANP, by means of a contract titled —Administration Contract SERNANP-CI. The Administration Contract gives CI-Peru co-management authority over the AMPF and vests CI with the right of use over any greenhouse gas emission reductions or removals within the AMPF, in order to support the effective implementation of the PA's Master Plan. In addition, the regulation (RP. 26-2014-SERNANP), provides a specific legal framework to obtain the right from SERNANP to commercialize carbon certificates generated within a natural protected area
Evidence used to assess conformance	Administration Contract SERNANP-CI, RP. 26-2014-SERNANP and interviews during the site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.

Climate Section:	
CL1 Net Positive Climate Section	
Indicator CL.1.1- 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 or carbon stocks over the duration of the project or the project GHG accounting period.	the net changes in carbon stocks are in accordance with the VCS methodology VCS Methodology VM0015: "Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation" v1.0. GHG emissions calculation spreadsheet has been provided.
Evidence used to assess conformance	VCS-PD, MR-2016-2018, VCS Methodology VM0015: "Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation" v1.0, GHG emission calculation spreadsheet and AMCI Methodology Annex.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator CL.1.2- Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO2 GHG emissions such as CH4 and N2O in the *with* and *without* project scenarios if those gases are likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO2-equivalent) of the project's overall GHG emissions reductions or removals over each monitoring period.	The project estimates changes in emissions of non-CO_2 GHG emissions such as CH4 and N2O in the with and without project scenarios in conformance with the VCS Methodology VM0015: "Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation" v1.0. These sources and methods for estimation have been successfully verified and validated.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR, VCS Methodology VM0015: "Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation" v1.0, GHG emission calculation spreadsheet and AMCI Methodology Annex.

Finding	No findings were raised.
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 in the with and without project scenarios in conformance with the VCS Methodology VM0015: "Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation" v1.0. These sources and methods for estimation have been successfully verified and validated.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR, VCS Methodology VM0015: "Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation" v1.0, GHG emission calculation spreadsheet and AMCI Methodology Annex.
Finding	No findings were raised.
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-CO2 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).	PP has provided the net climate impact assessment of the project for the complete implementation period. The GHG emissions calculation was provided to the audit team, which is completely traceable and in accordance with the applied methodology.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR, VCS Methodology VM0015: "Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation" v1.0, GHG emission calculation spreadsheet and AMCI Methodology Annex.
Finding	No findings were raised.
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 has not and does not intend to generate any other form of GHG-related environmental credit for GHG emissions reductions or removals claimed under the VCS Program. The only GHG-related environmental credit generated by the project will be under the VCS.

Evidence used to assess conformance	VCS-PD
Finding	No findings were raised.
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.	This indicator was addressed in the PDD and AMCI methodology annex.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018, VCS PD, CCB PDD and AMCI methodology annex.
Finding	No findings were raised.
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.	This issue was addressed during project validation. CCB PDD refers to the Section 1.13 of VCS PD, which described the measures designed to management leakage. MR describes measures implemented.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018, VCS PD, CCB PDD and AMCI methodology annex.
Finding	No findings were raised.
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).	In accordance with the methodological process established, any likely project-related unmitigated negative offsite impact shall be subtracted as a “leakage emission” During this implementation period there are not leakage emission reported.
Evidence used to assess conformance	VCS-PD, GHG Calculation spreadsheet, maps and GIS package.

Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator CL2.4.- Non-CO2 gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO2-equivalent) of the net change calculations (above) of the project's overall off-site GHG emissions reductions or removals over each monitoring period.	This issue was addressed during project validation. During this period leakage is reported to be zero.
Evidence used to assess conformance	VCS-PD, GHG Calculation spreadsheet, maps and GIS package.
Finding	No findings were raised.
CL3 Climate Impact Monitoring	
Indicator CL.3.1.- Develop an initial plan for selecting carbon pools and non-CO2 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 CO2-equivalent benefits generated by the project. Non-CO2 gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of CO2-equivalent) of the project's overall GHG impact over each monitoring period. Direct field measurements using scientifically	A full monitoring plan was developed.

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.	
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018, VCS PD, CCB PD.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator CL.3.2.- 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.	A full monitoring plan was developed.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018, VCS PD, CCB PD.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Community Section	
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 wellbeing 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 wellbeing, including potential impacts of changes in natural resources and ecosystem services identified as	Previous to on-site visit, the audit team reviewed the project monitoring report in order to confirm that it provides a description of the community impacts of the project activities. During the on-site visit, the audit team held interviews with local communities and community groups who confirmed claims in the monitoring report regarding information on the project's community impacts. In addition, the audit team visited communities where project activities are taking place, along with community members who confirmed the activities were implemented by project personnel and are providing positive benefits. The monitoring plans describe specific indicators, which are used to collect and analyze the data required to meet project's impacts. Section 4.1 describes several

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 wellbeing in the absence of the project (completed in G2). The difference (i.e., the community benefit) must be positive for all community groups.	activities developed and linked to the following positive community impacts into the project zone: ✓ Governance of the AMPF is strengthened. ✓ Production systems of the local population are improved and coffee associations in connection to special markets are promoted. ✓ Capacity building and knowledge is generated among local people for sustainable management of their production systems. ✓ Living conditions of the local population in harmony with the objectives of the AMPF are improved. ✓ Economic alternatives for the population are generated through conservation actions aligned with AMPF management. ✓ Ecosystem services of the AMPF (water and soil) are maintained and improved for the benefit of population in the project zone. ✓ Natural resources within the BPAM are sustainably managed by the local population. ✓ The partnership between the local population and the AMPF Head Office are empowered for conservation Furthermore, the following negative impacts in the project area are listed and described. ✓ Decrease economic opportunities from illegal activities ✓ Decrease provision of basic services within the AMPF ✓ Improved control over the expansion of the agricultural frontier ✓ Less support from land holders to their families in the area of origin In addition, socio-economic positive impacts outside the project area have been also listed and described in the MR. Those impacts are: ✓ Ecosystem services of the AMPF (water and soil) are maintained and improved for the benefit of the population outside the project zone.

	✓ Technology is transferred to improve coffee production systems outside project zone. ✓ New projects for sustainable development of the Alto Mayo watershed are leverage Finally, socio-economic negative impacts outside include: ✓ Demand for conventional coffee practices are displaced to native communities increasing unsustainable land use in areas rented by them. ✓ Customary uses of the native communities are affected by increased surveillance and control program of the PNA. Therefore; after confirming troth interviews, positive and negatives impacts, with local communities, the verification team has a high level of
Evidence used to assess conformance	AMCI Socioeconomic Protocol and Biodiversity monitoring protocol of of BPAM
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator CM1.2.- Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.4-6 will be negatively affected by the project.	According to the monitoring report all the population groups in the Alto Mayo basin (settlers, native communities, and peasant communities) make small scale use of different areas of the AMPF to meet some of their basic needs, characterizing HCVs. The areas within the AMPF, where resources such as firewood and construction materials are used and the collecting of different forest products is made, are concentrated in areas near the population centers of the main sub-basins where population is settled. Those issues were confirmed during the visit to project area. Then, the verification team concluded that project proponent has provided sufficient information to describe the effects of the project activities
Evidence used to assess conformance	CCB-PD
Finding	No findings were raised.
CM2 Offsite Stakeholder Impacts	

Indicator CM 2.1.- Identify any potential negative offsite stakeholder impacts that the project activities are likely to cause.	Potential negative offsite stakeholder impacts that project activities are likely to cause are listed in int MR.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018.
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator CM2.2.- Describe how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite social and economic impacts.	Measures to mitigate the potential risk are been implemented. These measures include mainly technology transfer to improve coffee production systems and strengthening governance and capacities in native communities. CI Peru has been implementing the project "Strengthening Governance and Capacities of Awajún Indigenous Communities to Develop Partnerships for Sustainable Product Sourcing in the Alto Mayo Basin" in the Awajún community located in the Buffer Zone in Alto Mayo.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018
Finding	No findings were raised.
Indicator CM2.3.- Demonstrate that the project is not likely to result in net negative impacts on the wellbeing of other stakeholder groups.	Measures to mitigate the potential risk are been implemented. These measures include mainly technology transfer to improve coffee production systems and strengthening governance and capacities in native communities.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018 and interviews during the site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
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	This indicator was addresses in the validated PD.

development objectives and to anticipated impacts (positive and negative).	
Evidence used to assess conformance	Socio economic protocol
Finding	No findings were raised.
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 wellbeing (G1.8.4-6) present in the project zone.	This indicator was addresses in the validated PDD.
Evidence used to assess conformance	PD
Finding	No findings were raised.
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	This indicator was addresses in the validated PD.
Evidence used to assess conformance	Socio economic protocol
Finding	No findings were raised.
Biodiversity Section	
B.1 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	As the biodiversity benefits associated with the project are highly correlated with project activities developed in project area, then, the audit team reviewed socioeconomic and metrics report (*"Sup.Inf_MIR_01_2016-2018 Socio economic*

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.	*and biodiversity metrics"*), specifically avoided deforestation and degradation and confirmed the information to be sufficient to describe the effects of the project activities. In addition, the audit team reviewed the biodiversity monitoring records and confirmed that the monitoring of biodiversity is taking place as described in the validated PD.
Evidence used to assess conformance	*"Sup.Inf_MIR_01_2016-2018 Socio economic and biodiversity metrics"*
Finding	No findings were raised.
B.1.2. Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.1-3 will be negatively affected by the project.	No negative impacts to biodiversity are reported. Reasoning, based on monitoring findings that are used as the basis for claims and the impacts on biodiversity from a project of this nature are almost always net positive. As stated above there are no negative biodiversity related impacts on the area of HCVs.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018 and interviews during the site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
B.1.3. 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.	Only native species have been used in the restoration areas, verification team visited nurseries in the project site and confirmed this fact. On the other hand, the project has used non-native species in the agroforestry system, however those species were already introduced to the AMPF previously to the project (see section 5.1.4 of the MR) and has not resulted to be invasive. The audit team reviewed the activities implemented by the project proponent and confirmed that the activities include protecting existing forest, but does not introduce new species to the existing forest. The few species that have been introduced before project implementation and are used in the agroforestry system. Based on these activities, the audit team confirms that no invasive species have been introduced by the project.
Evidence used to assess conformance	Global invasive species database (http://www.issg.org). Invasive Species Compendium and the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species

	(http://www.cabi.org/isc/datasheet/11975 and http://www.iucnredlist.org/details/32292/0) and on-site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
B.1.4. 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 project has used non-native species in the agroforestry system, however those species were already introduced to the AMPF previously to the project and are used in agroforestry system for food security.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018 and interviews during the on-site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
B.1.5. Guarantee that no GMOs will be used to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals.	No genetically modified organisms (GMO) have been used. To confirm this issue the audit team reviewed the activities implemented by the project proponent, which include protecting existing forest, but does not introduce new species to the existing native forests. Based on these activities, the audit team confirms that no GMO's are included in the project and thus the project does not generate any GHG emission reductions through the use of GMO's.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018 and interviews during the on-site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
B2. Offsite Biodiversity Impacts	
B.2.1. Identify potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts that the project is likely to cause.	Potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts include: ✓ Displacement of deforestation outside the project area. ✓ Displacing illegal extraction of flora and fauna out of the project area. Regarding the displacement of deforestation, during the monitoring period leakage was found to be 0.

Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018 and interviews during the on-site visit.
Finding	No findings were raised.
B.2.2. Document how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite biodiversity impacts.	The PP has identified two negatives impact outside the project area (see section 4.6.1): ✓ Deforestation of the habitat of the species of high importance for biodiversity is displaced to in the leakage belt. ✓ Illegal extraction of flora and fauna is displaced to out of the project area creating additional pressure on forests in the buffer zone. Even those negative aspects, according to the monitoring of socio economic and biodiversity metrics *"Sup.Inf_MIR_01_2016-2018 Socio economic and biodiversity metrics",* the local communities not only decrease the extraction of flora and fauna inside, but also became conservationists, through the signage of conservation agreements. Consequently, the project has a minimal (if any) negative impact on the flora and fauna outside the project area. Verification team interviewed some local inhabitants, who has signed conservation agreement, to confirm the attitude change towards conservation, all of them were in favor of forest conservation.
Evidence used to assess conformance	*"Sup.Inf_MIR_01_2016-2018 Socio economic and biodiversity metrics"* and interview with farmers
Finding	No findings were raised.
B.2.3. 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.	Given that no negative impacts on biodiversity inside project zone have occurred and, also, positive aspect has been reported outside of the project are (see section 4.6.1) the net biodiversity benefits are clearly positive.
Evidence used to assess conformance	MR 2016-2018 and interviews during the on-site visit.

Finding	No findings were raised.
B3. Biodiversity Impact Monitoring	
B.3.1. Develop an initial plan for selecting biodiversity variables to be monitored and the 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).	This indicator was addresses in the validated PD.
Evidence used to assess conformance	PD and biodiversity protocol monitoring
Finding	No findings were raised.
B.3.2. 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.	This indicator was addresses in the validated PD.
Evidence used to assess conformance	PD and biodiversity protocol monitoring
Finding	No findings were raised.
B.3.3. 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 audit team reviewed the project monitoring report and confirmed it provides a description of the project activities utilized to disseminate the monitoring plan and results to project stakeholder. Also, during the on-site visit, the audit team held interviews with local communities and community groups who confirmed that the monitoring plan is in place and is described in the document "*Protocolo de monitoreo de biodiversidad del Bosque de Protección Alto Mayo*". Then, the verification team has a high level of confidence that the dissemination of the project monitoring plan results took place in conformance with the validated PD.
Evidence used to assess conformance	PD and biodiversity protocol monitoring

Finding	No findings were raised.
GOLD LEVEL SECTION	
GL3. Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits:	
GL.3.1. Vulnerability	
GL.3.1.1 Critically Endangered (CR) and Endangered (EN) species - presence of at least a single individual; or Vulnerable species (VU) - presence of at least 30 individuals or 10 pairs.	The CCB-PD includes the list of species found in the AMPF categorized by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as Critically Endangered (CR) and Endangered (EN), according to the requirements of the GL3.1.1 indicator. The list of critically endangered and endangered species is shown in table 8 of the monitoring report. Furthermore, table 9 shown the list of vulnerable species. Some species that have been removed from the list submitted in the PD, because the most recent IUCN categorization does not consider these species as Critically Endangered, Endangered or Vulnerable anymore, but Least Concern, Near Threatened, Data Deficient, or not evaluated. The audit team has confirmed that these species are currently present in the IUCN Red List. Furthermore, section 7 of the monitoring report describes how the project activities contribute conserving biodiversity at project site
Evidence used to assess conformance	IUCN Red List
Finding	No findings were raised.