VERIFICATION REPORT

RIMBA RAYA BIODIVERSITY RESERVE PROJECT

AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U.
Document Prepared By: AENOR
Contact Information: 6 Génova. 28004 Madrid – Spain
www.aenor.com

Project Title	Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project
Version	01
Report ID	Verification report Rimba Raya 20200511

Report Title	Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project Verification Report
Client	InfiniteEarth Limited Unit 618 Tower B New Mandarin Plaza 14 Science Museum Rd TST Kowloon Hong Kong Email: contact@infinite-earth.com
Pages	70
Date of Issue	11 May 2020
Prepared By	AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U.
Contact	Génova 6. 28004 Madrid- Spain. Telephone +34 914326000 jlfuentes@aenor.com , www.aenor.com
Approved By	Jose Luis Fuentes
Work Carried Out By	Project Manager: Jose Luis Fuentes Team Leader: Juan Carlos Gómez Auditor: Carlos Jiménez Technical Reviewer: Elena Llorente

Summary

AENOR was contracted by InfiniteEARTH to conduct the fifth VCS and fourth CCB monitoring period verification (23 June, 2017 – 30 June, 2019) of the Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project (Validated Project Description dated 15 May, 2011).

AENOR started the verification in 21 December, 2019 when the Project Proponent submitted the monitoring reports for VCS/CCB and other supporting documents, such as the calculation spread sheet, GIS package, the non-permanence risk assessment, etc. The field visit took place from 27 to 31 January 2020, in which the auditor team visited the project area, interviewed key stakeholders, staff and other related experts and verified the implemented activities.

The Rimba Raya project follows the framework of Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) through Avoided Planned Deforestation (APD). The project is achieving GHG emission reductions through avoiding deforestation and consequent conversion to palm oil plantation.

The project was implemented in response to the on-going loss of national forest cover that has been brought about through clearing of forest areas with fire to open-up land for agricultural use, especially palm oil plantations.

The Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project, an initiative by InfiniteEARTH, aims to reduce Indonesia's emissions by protecting areas which encompasses tropical peat swamp forest from conversion to oil palm. This area, rich in biodiversity, especially of the endangered Bornean orangutan, was slated by the Provincial government to be converted into four palm oil estates. Located on the southern coast of Borneo in the province of Central Kalimantan, the project is also designed to protect the integrity of the adjacent world-renowned Tanjung Puting National Park, by creating a physical buffer zone on the full extent of the ~90km eastern border of the park. The previously validated Project Description (PD) entitled Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project describes the general principles of the project.

The Rimba Raya Carbon Accounting Area (CAA) comprises 47,237 hectares of uninhabited lowland peat swamp forest located in Seruyan Hilir District; Danau Sembuluh; and Hanau, Seruyan Regency; in the province of Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. The project monitors for encroachment and land-use change within the CAA as well within a 3-km buffer zone bordering the CAA in order to ensure that any drainage activities that may impact the CAA are accounted for.

The project is monitored each year. Annual monitoring activities consist of remote sensing and GIS analysis, routine field patrols, and directed field sampling in areas prioritized by systematic site assessments. A key feature of the Rimba Raya monitoring plan is to employ spatial data and tools to systematically monitor land cover change, forest degradation and carbon pools in the project area and project buffer. This is combined with ground-based surveys to investigate and record information on any activities that affect project carbon stocks and peat emissions (e.g. fire, logging).

The monitoring period verification objective included an assessment of compliance with the validated PD, VCS Version 4 and CCB Second Edition, and all associated updates, and the likelihood that implementation of the GHG project resulted in the GHG emission removal enhancements as stated by the project developer (ISO 14064-3:2006). The scope of the verification included the assessment of the VCS Monitoring & Implementation Report and the execution of the GHG project as stated in the validated PD for the 23 June, 2017 – 30 June, 2019 monitoring period (fifth period).

The monitoring period verification criteria followed the guidance documents provided by VCS and CCB and included the following: VCS Program Guide v4.0 issued 19 September, 2019; VCS Standard v4.0 issued 19 September, 2019; Program Definitions (19 September 2019, v4.0); AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (v4.0, 19 September 2019); Methodology for Conservation Projects that Avoid Planned Land Use Conversion in Peat Swamp Forests - VM0004 v1.0 issued August 2010; and CCBA Project Design Standards (Second Edition, December 2008); as well and the previously validated PD (dated 15 May, 2011).

A summary of all findings is included in Appendix C. There are no restrictions of uncertainty. AENOR confirms all monitoring period verification activities, including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance, monitoring and project documentation adherence to the VCS Version 4 and CCB Second Edition, as documented in this report are complete. AENOR concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project meets VCS Program v4 and CCB Second Edition requirements for the fifth monitoring period including having achieved all requirements for CCB Second Edition Gold Level.

Three Corrective Actions Request and three Clarifications were issued for VCS and four Corrective Actions Request and five Clarifications and were reported for CCB. These issues came up during the verification process and were closed prior to finish.

The GHG assertion provided by the project proponent and verified by AENOR has resulted in 6,890,938 tCO2e net issuable Verified Carbon Units (VCU) by the project during the fifth monitoring/verification period (23 June, 2017 – 30 June, 2019), considering 10% of buffer withholding based on the VCS Non-Permanence Risk Assessment Tool v4.0 (in which the Project took the minimum risk rating), which means a buffer allocation of 791,235 (tCO2e), of a total net GHG Emission Reductions or Removals of 7,722,728 tCO2e.

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The objective of the verification audit was to conduct an independent assessment of the project to determine:

• The extent to which methods and procedures, including monitoring procedures, have been implemented in accordance with the validated project description, including the monitoring plan.

• The extent to which GHG emission reductions and removals reported in the monitoring report are materially accurate.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of the verification included the review of the GHG project and implementation; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHG's; and time periods covered. The Rimba Raya project follows the framework of Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) through Avoided Planned Deforestation (APD). The geographic verification scope is defined by the project boundary, the carbon reservoir types, management activities, growth and yield models, inventory program, and contract periods.

The scope of the project was outlined by the Project Proponent within the Validated Project Description dated 15 May 2011 and is re-defined as follows for the GHG project:

Baseline Scenario	The Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project, an initiative by InfiniteEARTH, aims to reduce Indonesia's emissions by preserving more than 47,237 hectares (carbon accounting area) of tropical peat swamp forest. This area, rich in biodiversity, including the endangered Bornean orangutan, was slated by the Provincial government and Ministry of Forestry to be converted into four palm oil estates.
Activities/Technologies/Processes	VM0004, v1.0 Conservation – avoided planned land use change in peat swamp forests
Sources/Sinks/Reservoirs	Peat soils Aboveground tree biomass Wood Products
GHG Type	CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O
Time Period (state date, crediting period, verification period)	- Crediting period: 1 July 2009 - 30 June 2039 - VCS Fifth Monitoring Period: 23 June 2017 – 30 June 2019 - CCB Fourth Monitoring Period: 23 June 2017 – 30 June 2019
Project Boundary	Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project – 47,237 Carbon Accounting hectares; located in the Seruyan Regency, in the province of Central Kalimantan, Borneo. The Project lies between 112°01'12 "- 112°28'12" east longitude and 02°31'48"- 03°21'00" south latitude

Total net issuable VCUs generated during Monitoring Period	6,890,938 tCO2e

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

- VCS Program Guide v4.0 issued 19 September, 2019;

- VCS Standard v4.0 issued 19 September, 2019;

- Program Definitions (19 September 2019, v4.0);

- AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (v4.0, 19 September 2019);

- Methodology for Conservation Projects that Avoid Planned Land Use Conversion in Peat Swamp Forests - VM0004 v1.0 issued August 2010;

- CCBA Project Design Standards (Second Edition, December 2008).

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 Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project was initiated by InfiniteEARTH Ltd to reduce emissions in Indonesia by conserving 47,237 hectares which encompasses large areas of tropical peat swamp forest. Deforestation and land conversion in Indonesia has substantially increased in recent years. The project area was planned for conversion into palm oil plantations by the Provincial government, which would degrade biodiversity and habitat for the endangered Bornean orangutan. Without the Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project, the project area would be subsequently converted to oil palm plantation from management activities, including logging, burning slash and remaining forest, and comprehensive drainage of the peat lands. The resulting release of millions of tons GHG emissions from above and belowground carbon sources over the lifetime of the project would contribute to local and global environmental concerns. The project is also intended to protect the biodiversity of adjacent Tanjung Puting National Park by creating a physical buffer along the eastern border of the park.

Economic incentives for preservation of the tropical peat land forests are created by InfiniteEARTH – the Project Proponent – using the sale of carbon credits that are generated by the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS). Carbon credits are validated through the Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) and Avoided Planned Deforestation (APD) frameworks. The sustainable revenue stream from carbon credit sales supports local community development, provincial government infrastructure, and project area protection. Community involvement is enhanced through the development of programs to improve quality of life, such as water filtration devices, increased access to healthcare, and early childhood development and access to education, sustainable livelihoods promotion, etc. Therefore, the overall goal of the project is to demonstrate that protection of endangered peat swamps is advantageous to commercial institutions, social programs, and environmental objectives.

The Rimba Raya Carbon Accounting Area (CAA) consists of 47,237 hectares of lowland peat swamp forest located in Seruyan Hilir District, Danau Sembuluh and Hanau, Seruyan Regency, in the province of Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. The CAA defines the boundary for CO2e emissions reductions accounting and lies within a Project Management Zone (PMZ) that will be protected and managed by the Project. The PMZ lies between 112°01'12"-112°28'12" east longitude and 02°31'48"-03°21'00" south latitude and is bounded by Tanjung Puting National Park in the west, the Java Sea in the south, the Seruyan River in the east, and a palm oil concession in the north.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Audit Team Composition (*Rules* 4.3.1)

Name	Position in the team
José Luis Fuentes	Project Manager
Juan Carlos Gómez	Team Leader
Carlos Jiménez	Auditor
Elena Llorente	Technical Reviewer

José Luis Fuentes is the manager of the Climate Change Unit of AENOR. He is a Forestry Engineer and has a Master in Business Administration and a Post-Graduate in Environmental Management. He has more than 15 years of experience in auditing, consulting and training activities related to environmental and carbon management projects. Jose Luis has actively participated in the audit of international sustainable development projects in several carbon schemes, such as the Clean Development Mechanisms (CDM), Verified Carbon Standard (VCS), Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards (CCB), Gold Standard (GS) and carbon footprints (ISO 14067 and ISO 14064). Jose Luis has extensive technical knowledge about the regulatory framework, policies and technical provisions emanating from the Paris Agreement, the Kyoto Protocol and the Conferences of the Parties.

Juan Carlos Gómez has more than 5 years of professional experience in climate change. He is a Forestry Engineer and holds Master in Sustainable Development and Corporate. He has developed his entire career in the field of climate change. He is an expert in the development of climate change mitigation and adaptation policies and has worked in LATAM countries and Africa, auditing REDD+ under VCS and CCB, and forestry projects under the CDM and JI.

Carlos Jimenez is a Forestry Engineer and holds Master in Rural Development. He has 8 years of experience in natural resources management and sustainable development. His experience covers working with public and private sector, as well as civil society organizations; with focus in forest risk commodities, community-based development projects, and consultancy on ecosystem services. Since 2016 he works as an auditor of sustainable forest management (FSC) and forest carbon certification schemes (VCS, CCB) in Latin America and Asia.

Elena Llorente has a degree in Environmental Sciences and more than 14 years of professional experience in climate change and sustainability projects. She has worked for the UNFCCC, specifically in the management of carbon and climate change as an auditor and technical reviewer of projects and programs of mitigation activities under different types of carbon standards such as CDM and JI of the UNFCCC, VCS and Gold Standard.

The following table summarizes the experience of the team members in the assessment of climate, community development and biodiversity in similar projects.

Country	Project	Standard	Team member/ Role
Colombia	Bajo Calima y Bahía Málaga (BCBM) REDD+ Project	VCS&CCB	Jose Luis Fuentes/ Team leader and auditor Elena Llorente Pérez/ Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor
Colombia	Cajambre REDD+ Project	VCS&CCB	Jose Luis Fuentes/ Team leader and auditor Elena Llorente Pérez/ Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor
Colombia	Mutatá REDD+ Project	VCS&CCB	Jose Luis Fuentes/ Team leader and auditor Elena Llorente Pérez/ Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor
Colombia	Concosta REDD+ Project	VCS&CCB	Jose Luis Fuentes/ Team leader and auditor Elena Llorente Pérez/ Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor
Colombia	Sivirú, Usaragá, Pizarro y Pilizá (SUPP) REDD+ Project	VCS&CCB	Jose Luis Fuentes/ Team leader and auditor Elena Llorente Pérez/ Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor
Colombia	Carmen del Darién (CDD) REDD+ Project	VCS&CCB	Jose Luis Fuentes/ Team leader and auditor Elena Llorente Pérez/ Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor
Colombia	Rio Pepe y ACABA REDD+ Project	VCS&CCB	Jose Luis Fuentes/ Team leader and auditor Elena Llorente Pérez/ Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor
Colombia	Acapa – Bajo Mira y Frontera (ACAPA-BMF) REDD+ Project	VCS&CCB	Jose Luis Fuentes/ Team leader and auditor Elena Llorente Pérez/ Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor
Colombia	Proyecto de compensación de emisiones Conservación del bosque Galilea Amé.	NTC 6082/ Guía ES-I-CC-002	Juan Carlos Gómez/ Team leader and auditor Elena Llorente Pérez/ Technical reviewer
Colombia	Proyecto de Mitigación Forestal Bonanza Verde	NTC 6082/ Guía ES-I-CC-002	Juan Carlos Gómez/ Team leader and auditor Carlos Jiménez/ Auditor

Country	Project	Standard	Team member/ Role
			Elena Llorente Pérez/ Technical reviewer
Colombia	Bonos Verdes Colombia Grupo Custodiar S.A.	NTC 6082/ Guía ES-I-CC-002	Carlos Jiménez/ Auditor Elena Llorente/ Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Technical reviewer
Colombia	Recuperación de suelos degradados con el uso de incentivos financieros en el Centro y Oriente de Colombia	NTC 6082/ Guía ES-I-CC-002	Elena Llorente Pérez/ Team leader and auditor Carlos Jiménez/ Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor Jose Luis Fuentes/ Technical reviewer
Colombia	Proyecto de Conservación PALAMEKU KUWEI REDD+	NTC 6082/ Guía ES-I-CC-002	Juan Carlos Gómez/ Team leader and auditor Elena Llorente Pérez/ Technical reviewer
Colombia	Proyecto de Conservación Tángara REDD+	NTC 6082/ Guía ES-I-CC-002	Carlos Jiménez/ Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor Elena Llorente Pérez/ Technical reviewer
Colombia	Reforestación de suelos degradados por la ganadería y la agricultura en Antioquia.	NTC 6082/ Guía ES-I-CC-002	Elena Llorente Pérez/ Team leader Carlos Jiménez/ Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor Jose Luis Fuentes/ Technical reviewer
Colombia	Mitigación de Cambio Climático en áreas degradadas por ganadería “Fincas La Clara y Suebrá”.	NTC 6082/ Guía ES-I-CC-002	Elena Llorente Pérez/ Team leader Carlos Jiménez/ Auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Technical reviewer
Colombia	Proyecto de Mitigación Forestal Resguardo Indígena Tikuna, Cocama y Yagua (TICOYA)	NTC 6082/ Guía ES-I-CC-002	Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor Elena Llorente Pérez/ Technical reviewer
Indonesia	Indonesia - Norway Verification of reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation	FREL	Jose Luis Fuentes/ Project manager Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor Carlos Jiménez/ Auditor Elena Llorente Pérez/ Technical reviewer
Lao PDR	Burapha Agroforestry Co., Ltd. Stora Enso Lao Co., Ltd	FSC Forest Management	Carlos Jiménez/ Lead auditor
Thailand	Phatthalung Paratex Co. Ltd.	FSC Forest Management	Carlos Jiménez/ Lead auditor
Vietnam	Huong Son Forestry Company	FSC Forest Management	Carlos Jiménez/ Lead auditor
Cambodia	Grandis Timber Limited	FSC Forest Management	Carlos Jiménez/ Lead auditor
Peru	Reduction of Deforestation and Degradation of Tropical Dry Forest in Piura and Lambayeque	VCS & CCB	Jose Luis Fuentes/ Team leader and auditor
Peru	Cordillera Azul National Park (PNCAZ) REDD+ Project	VCS & CCB	Jose Luis Fuentes/ Team leader and auditor
Peru	Alto Mayo Conservation Iniciative	VCS & CCB	Elena Llorente Pérez/ Auditor Jose Luis Fuentes/ Technical reviewer
Peru	Reduction of deforestation and degradation in Tambopata	VCS & CCB	Elena Llorente Pérez/ Team leader and

Country	Project	Standard	Team member/ Role
	National Reserve and Bahuaja-Sonene National Park within the area of Madre de Dios region – Peru		auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor Jose Luis Fuentes/ Technical reviewer
Peru	REDD+ Project in the Alto Huayabamba Conservation Concession (CCAH)	VCS & CCB	Elena Llorente Pérez/ Team leader and auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor Jose Luis Fuentes/ Technical reviewer
Peru	Forest Management to reduce deforestation and degradation in Shipibo Conibo and Cacataibo indigenous communities of Ucayali region	VCS & CCB	Elena Llorente Pérez/ Team leader and auditor Juan Carlos Gómez/ Auditor

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 in 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.

A project specific Verification and Sampling Plan was developed to guide the verification auditing process to ensure efficiency and effectiveness. The purpose of the Verification and Sampling Plan was to present a risk assessment for determining the nature and extent of verification procedures necessary to ensure the risk of auditing error was reduced to a reasonable level. The Verification & Sampling Plan methodology was derived from all items in our verification process stated above. Specifically, the sampling plan utilized the VCS guidance documents and ISO 14064-3. Any modifications applied to the Verification and Sampling plan were made based upon the conditions observed for monitoring in order to detect the processes with highest risk of material discrepancy.

The verification activities in which risks were assessed were the evaluations of the monitoring system (data flow, data control procedures, etc.) but mainly the quality of raw data as well as sources and the spreadsheet calculations. AENOR reproduced and verified 100% of sheets in the VM0004 spreadsheet calculation for the monitoring period 23 June 2017 – 30 June 2019 for the project area. The project boundary and deforested areas in the project area for the monitoring period were 100% checked using the GIS database.

The carbon stock changes and forest classes in the project area were also 100% verified and crosschecked with validated values. For data provided for the reference region, AENOR carried out onsite samples of data since they had already been previously validated and posed a lower risk to the emissions reductions achieved by the project.

AENOR carried out a deep and meticulous review of the sheets in order to verify the correct application of the methodology (formulae, equations.) and checked that data required calculating the GHG removals were appropriately provided. Based on the assessment carried out, AENOR confirms with a reasonable level of assurance that the claimed emission reductions are free from material errors, omissions or misstatements.

In addition, a risk-based approach was used for the on-the-ground field sampling effort in order to select key areas for direct observation of forest losses, land uses, stated project activities and monitoring methodologies. The most likely access points for anthropogenic fire and deforestation within the Project Area vicinity were toured in order to allow the VVB to establish a reasonable level of assurance regarding the implementation of project activities, and to further confirm the reported areas of ex post disturbance.

AENOR confirms that sufficient evidence was presented for the reported net anthropogenic GHG emission reductions and that there is a clear audit trail that contains the evidence and records that validate the stated figure in this verification report since:

- Sufficient evidence available: The project participant has provided the 100% of data used in the calculations to achieve the final amount of GHG emission reductions reported.

- Nature of evidence: The raw data were collected from reliable sources. They are detailed in the project documents and have been provided to the verification team and were checked during the onsite visit.

- Cross-checked evidence: AENOR cross-checked the collected information through an on-site inspection to the project area and reproducing calculations.

Hence, AENOR confirms that the stated figures in the monitoring report are correct and confirms that is able to certify net anthropogenic GHG removals based on verifiable and reliable evidence.

2.3 Document Review

A detailed review of all project documentation was conducted to ensure consistency with, and identify any deviation from, VCS program requirements, CCB program requirements, the methodology (VM0004, v1.0), and the validated PD. Initial review focused on the Monitoring Report (MR) and included an examination of the project details, implementation status, data and parameters, and quantification of GHG emission reductions and removals. Documents reviewed included data from monitoring, carbon rights contracts, economic analysis, maps and aerial images, fire specific monitoring data, deforestation and field patrolling reports, biomass and carbon calculation spread sheets, and responses to Corrective Action Requests (CARs), Clarifications (CLs) and Observations.

The verification included a review of the validated PD and MR, relative to the field conditions observed and interviews with project management staff. Modifications to the Verification and Sampling plan were made based upon the conditions observed for monitoring in order to detect the processes with highest risk of material discrepancy.

The VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool was used by the Project Proponent to assess overall project risk. The VVB reviewed the Non-Permanence Risk Report provided with the verification supporting documentation and confirmed that the Project adheres to the requirements set out in the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool. Each risk factor was thoroughly assessed for conformance. The final score was calculated to be 10%.

For a listing of all documents received from the client for this verification, please see Appendix 1.

2.4 Interviews

Interviews were performed during the verification site inspection and as part of the overall verification process which was additional to that provided in the project description, monitoring report and any supporting documents. The AENOR verification team met with individuals with various roles in the project. This included a series of interviews with on-site and in-country staff that support the mission of the project and other conservation objectives. Onsite interviews and informal discussions were conducted with project staff, members of Orangutan Foundation International, technical consultant ecoPartners, members and leaders of the local communities.

A detailed list of interviewees can be found in Annex 2. In section 2.5 below is indicated the stakeholder groups interviewed during the onsite visit.

2.5 Site Inspections

The verification site visit was done to help the VVB reach reasonable assurance level for verification of monitoring period reported elements. It also allowed the VVB to understand application of the methodology on-site, confirm the implementation of project activities, and to identify possible sources of error to focus desktop verification efforts.

A ground inspection was made of the project area from 27 January 2020 – 31 January 2020 and surrounding areas located at the Seruyan Hilir District; Danau Sembuluh; and Hanau, Seruyan Regency; in the province of Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. The site visit ground inspection was performed to assess monitoring efforts, including but not limited to unplanned deforestation activities, unplanned degradation, and community member feedback for the field sampling effort, direct measurement, observation and review of the monitoring period emission reductions in the key areas were determined to be the greatest risk, followed by ground-truthing and review of project activities. Ground-truth plots and/or survey locations were selected and sampled based on access and safety. The sampling activities and features are provided below for each of these key elements:

Date	Project activities and interviews (Central Kalimantan, Indonesia).
27/Jan/2020	- Opening meeting. - Applicable document revision (monitoring procedures, carbon calculation, financial issues, benefit sharing, etc.). - Visit Orangutan Foundation International and Orangutan Care Centre & Quarantine. Interview with responsible staff. - Interview with Representative of Tanjung Putting National Park (TPNP).
28/Jan/2020	1. Natai Kopi site: - Land use check and boundaries (tall grasslands, swamp peat forest). - Tree planting and cash crop plantations (agroforestry system). - Native species nursery. - Firefighting demonstration. - Interview with North Unit local staff. 2. Ulak Batu village: - Village library. Interview with local authorities and project beneficiaries. - Solar power facilities. Interview project beneficiaries. 3. Muara Dua Village: - Interview with North Unit local staff.
29/Jan/2020	4. Tatah Ji: - Visit nursery, post guard, replanting block, hydrant system. 5. Muara Dua Village:

	- Visit Muara Dua village library. Interview with project beneficiaries. - Visit water purifying system. Interview with project beneficiaries. 6. Jahitan village: - Visit water purifying system. Interview with project beneficiaries. - Visit chicken farm. Interview with project beneficiaries. 7. Telaga Pulang village - Visit High School and interview with scholarship recipients. 8. Baung Seberang village: - Visit water purifying system. Interview with project beneficiaries. - Visit and interview with recipient of solar lanterns. 9. Sungai Baung: - Land use check and boundaries. 10. Rimba Release Camp: - Orangutan release location. - Land use check and boundaries. Demonstration of carbon monitoring in Canals. - Interview to OFI staff.
30/Jan/2020	11. Belanti hamlet: - Visit Rimba Raya Floating Clinic. Interview with healthcare staff and patients. 12. Tampudau village: - Solar power electrification and solar home system project. Interview with beneficiaries. 13. Kuala Pembuang: - Interview with Southern Unit local staff. - Visit Terasi Zuper. Interview to women work group from Sungai Perlu for shrimp paste commercialization.
31/Jan/2020	14. Sampit Rimba Raya office: - Applicable document revision (monitoring procedures, training, community agreements, geodatabase, etc.). - Closing meeting.

2.6 Resolution of Findings

All documentation provided by the Project Proponent was assessed against the applicable version of the relevant VCS and CCB guidance document. Several clarification requests (CL) and corrective action requests (CAR) were raised and submitted to the Project Proponent, which addressed them either by providing to the audit team the requested information or by making the appropriate corrections. Updated versions of the documentation were submitted by the Project Proponent and the audit team reassessed them against the guidance documentation. This process was repeated iteratively until all CL and CAR were fully closed. Specifically, three CLs and three CARs were reported for VCS and five CLs and four CARs were issued for CCB.

All findings issued by the AENOR audit team during the verification process have been closed for both VCS and CCB Standards. In accordance with Section 4.1.13 of the VCS Standard, all findings issued during the verification process, and the inputs for their closure, are described in Appendix 3 of this report.

2.6.1 Forward Action Requests

No FARs were raised to the PP during the verification process.

2.7 Eligibility for Validation Activities

AENOR holds accreditation for validation for the relevant sectorial scope 14 under which this project activity is classified. Either way, validation activities were not undertaken as part of this monitoring period verification.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

The verification team is not aware of project involvement in other forms of environmental credits from its activities. The project has not been registered, and is not seeking registration, under any other GHG programs. The Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project currently only seeks carbon credits under the VCS program. This was confirmed through a risk-based internet review.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

No new methodology deviations were applied during the monitoring and quantification of VCUs for this monitoring period. A detailed description of the previous methodology deviations can be found in Section 2.2.2.1 Methodology Deviations for Previous Monitoring Periods.

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

Two PD deviations have occurred during this monitoring period: two entities are no longer involved with the project: PT Pandu Maha Wana Asia Pacific Consulting Solutions and Environmental Accounting Services. Both were removed in MR from section 2.1.4 Other Entities Involved in the Project, and other applicable sections when mentioned; and were properly reported as deviations (2.2.4.1 Deviations for this Monitoring Period). This was confirmed during the site visit. These deviations have no impacts on the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario. Therefore, no actions in conformance are required.

Other relevant deviations from prior monitoring periods continue.

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

No new minor changes to Project Description are reported for this monitoring period; previous ones are described in Section 2.2.3.1 Minor Changes to the Project Description in Previous Monitoring Periods.

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

Not applicable.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Public Comments (*Rules* 4.6)

No comments were received during the public comment period.

4.2 Summary of Project Benefits

The project seeks to reduce emissions in Indonesia by conserving 47,237 hectares encompassing tropical peat swamp forest. Deforestation and land conversion in Indonesia has substantially increased in recent years. The project area was planned for conversion into palm oil plantations by the Provincial government, which would degrade biodiversity and habitat for the endangered Bornean orangutan. Without the Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project, the project area would be subsequently converted to oil palm plantation from management activities, including logging, burning slash and remaining forest, and comprehensive drainage of the peat lands. The resulting release of millions of tons GHG emissions from above and belowground carbon sources over the lifetime of the project would contribute to local and global environmental concerns.

The sustainable revenue stream from carbon credit sales supports local community development, provincial government infrastructure, and project area protection. Community involvement is enhanced through the development of programs to improve quality of life, such as water filtration devices, increased access to healthcare, and early childhood development and access to education, sustainable livelihoods promotion, etc. Therefore, the overall goal of the project is to demonstrate that protection of endangered peat swamps is advantageous to commercial institutions, social programs, and environmental objectives.

Verifiers were able to substantiate through site visit observations, interviews and document review that during this monitoring period, Rimba Raya has shown substantial climate benefits from avoided emissions. Verifiers were also able to confirm that the project has demonstrated that the rights and needs of local communities have been appropriately addressed as well as important biodiversity conservation issues.

4.3 General

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

The project activities and Monitoring Plan, as described in the validated PD, have been fully initiated. There are no remaining issues from the validation. As this is the fifth verification, most activities have been implemented, and verifiers observed much progress during the verification site visit compared to the fourth verification.

Verifiers requested to visit examples of all activities during the various site inspections and subsequently confirmed the initial implementation of all items related to climate, community, and biodiversity through interviews with local stakeholders and onsite records review. Climate objectives are avoiding the 130 million tons of CO2e that would have been emitted in the ‘without project’ scenario, and to pose as a physical barrier between oil palm plantations and Tanjung Puting National Park, to protect the hydrological integrity of the park and avoid emissions from drained peat swamp.

Biodiversity objectives are to expand the contiguous habitat of the national park all the way to the Seruyan River, to the east of the park, providing a physical boundary, and supporting the work of Orangutan Foundation International with project activities aimed at extending the organization’s conservation activities, orangutans’ rehabilitation/releasing and environmental education programs.

Community objectives are to engage with the communities in the project zone to improve access to healthcare, education and governmental services, and to ensure food security, access to employment and capacity building opportunities.

The inexistence of any material discrepancies between project implementation and the project description was confirmed through the overall audit process including interviews and documentary review. The implementation status of the monitoring plan and the completeness of monitoring, including the suitability of the implemented monitoring system was confirmed through review of VM0004 adopted procedures and comparison of monitoring results against the validated project design. Implementation status of individual elements is summarized below:

• The primary project activity, establishing the Rimba Raya Reserve, achieves biodiversity goals.

• Hiring of local guards/field crews/community developers is providing income opportunities in local communities. A number of people were hired and trained for guarding/patrol and fire brigades during the monitoring period as part of ongoing and regular hiring practices.

• Fire response system: people have been hired and training has been commencing for fire protection activities. Full field crews were confirmed in place for firefighting. New guard posts and fire towers are under currently construction.

• Replanting/enrichment: 70,000 seedlings were planted (not for carbon accounting purposes), and were sourced and purchased from village nurseries that are supported by individuals and families from the community whose labor grows and maintains the seedlings.

• Cash crop agroforestry activities and agricultural/agroforestry training: nurseries established, plantings begun, providing income, food sources for communities.

• OFI funding: biodiversity clearly benefits. E.g. 6 orangutans (rehabilitated in OFI facilities) were released from the Rimba Release Camp in July 2017.

• Co-management of Tanjung Puting National Park, this activity provides needed resources to the underfunded park, benefiting biodiversity and communities through employment opportunities.

• Social buffer: the goal is to surround the project with communities in its favor, who understand and bolster the project and its goals. Activity took place in this regard during the monitoring period, education, hiring and training in regard to the project and project supported activities was clearly in evidence during the site visit.

• Community centers, with several centers built and multiple positive impacts for communities and social empowerment of local groups beneficiaries (communities, woman, and youth).

• Clean water systems: 300 ceramic water filter devices were distributed and were in use during the monitoring period, and a pilot water purifying system was installed in Baung Barat that can provide 2,000 liters of clean water in 4-5 hours.

• Fuel efficient stoves: pilot programs for efficient stoves have met limited success, but efforts are continuing to provide stoves desired by community members.

• Small scale solar lighting: solar lanterns and limited numbers of solar panels have been distributed and one solar power plant of 12kWh per day was installed in Ulak Batu village in 2018, providing illumination for 57 houses and some public facilities, including road illumination. Two more solar power plants and electrification systems are under development in other communities.

• Micro-credit: Micro finance programs led to the development of an additional chicken farm in Jahitan “Manuk Taheta”, in addition to an existing program supporting a chicken farm in Baung “Indah Berseri.”

• Sustainable healthcare – the project has started collaboration with a health care program group to develop a strategy to deliver health care in project zone communities. Water filters were distributed and a clean water system was installed in the village of Baung

• Floating clinic first steps: during a trial run of the floating clinic, 316 patients were given medical care throughout the project zone. It is currently working, in coordination with government public health services.

• Capacity building programs: some capacity building related to agricultural education and other general subject areas for high school and middle school students (24 scholarships, 2 libraries, and 61 reading glasses) are underway. Continued progress is being made in developing various economic working groups so that local community members can seek alternative livelihoods and/or employment directly related to the project, such as the 17 women involved in project-related employment.

No new methodology deviations relating to monitoring and/or measurement of GHG emission reductions or removals were applied, neither the PD nor the monitoring program. AENOR has confirmed 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. The project implementation is in accordance with the project description, there´s no discrepancies.

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. 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 no remaining issues from the previous verification, since it is the first verification.

The GHG emission reductions generated by the project have not become included in an emissions trading program other than the VCS program and it has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit as confirmed through a risk-based review by the verification team.

Sustainable development contributions are applicable to this project although Indonesia has achieved many Sustainable Development Goals. The project was confirmed to be actively supporting many UN SDGs as reported in Table 3 of the monitoring report through the site visit interviews and document review as part of the verification. The goals of the project activities, providing income, increasing forest cover and crop diversity, are clearly and directly related to increasing the well-being of the local communities. On the other hand, the project is seeking the validation and verification under Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard by Verra.

Hence, after a complete review of the different documents provided and the on-site visit, AENOR is able to confirm that the project implementation is in accordance with the project description contained in the PD and the implementation status described in the MR. There are not material discrepancies between project implementation and the project description.

4.3.2 Risks to the Project (G3.5)

The MR describes (section 2.2.5 Risks to the Project) the natural and human-induced risks to be continued pressure from oil palm expansion at the northern boundary, and from fires lit by bordering communities for agricultural or other purposes. Through the utilization of carbon funding, the Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project has expanded and enhanced the patrol and protective work being undertaken in the area since 1971 by OFI. This funding has increased the patrols to act as a deterrent and the physical presence through marking of boundaries as well as the installation of posts and fire towers in order to efficiently monitor and respond to threats.

Forest patrols protect the forested area from illegal activities by way of community socialization. Communities around the project area are included in patrols, thus the communities are made aware that such illegal activities are forbidden. Patrol activities are conducted by monitoring vulnerable areas either on foot, by motorcycle or by boat.

The MR also states the project will continue to seek ways to expand the income of local community members, reducing pressure on the project area lands. The site visit confirms that the project remains under pressure from an oil palm plantation seeking to expand at its northern boundary, but that the line is being held in a contested area near Ulak Batu. Burning pressures from surrounding communities also appear to be risks. During the monitoring period, many of the fire/monitoring teams have been hired from local communities. Temporary tree planters and seedling growers have derived income through the project.

AENOR deems that the Project Proponent identified correctly the risks to the project benefits but the most important is that the PP created, and it is implementing actions to reduce or diminish the negative impacts of these risks in the benefits on the climate, community and biodiversity.

4.3.3 Enhancement of High Conservation Values (G3.6)

The MR explains that the HCVs identified for the project area are dependent upon the natural area remaining undrained and undeveloped. The main project activity and project goal (protection and enhancement of the project area) enhance the HCVs. Measures to maintain HCVs are listed appropriately in the MR and details of risk management for HCVs are described above in Section 2.2.6 Enhancement of High Conservation Values and 5.1.2 High Conservation Value Protection onwards.

AENOR checked during site visit the implementation of some activities focused to protect these areas, such training activities, patrolling, etc. Given that forest conservation, including the protection and maintenance of HCV areas, is one of the key objectives of the project, and multiple project activities are dedicated specifically to maintaining or enhancing forest ecosystems, impacts on HCVs have been positive as compared to the without project scenario. Therefore, AENOR confirms that project activities are maintaining or even enhancing the HCVs.

4.3.4 Benefit Permanence (G3.7)

The MR states in Section 2.2.7 Benefit Permanence that the Project Proponents have had carbon revenues since 2013 through several sales and that sufficient funds are available to conduct the project. A detailed financial analysis was provided as evidence to support the assertion of adequate funds and a sufficient cash flow to continue project activities through the next year. The creation of the project area, as well as the revenue made from the sale of carbon credits, as explained by the proponent, will continue to fund community-based action so that benefits are experienced during the lifetime of the project and that they positively impact future generations of the community.

AENOR verified the benefit-permanence activities (transition to sustainable local livelihoods, degraded area restoration, diversification of incomes in communities, capacity building, etc.) through the desk review and during the on-site visit and consider the activities correct.

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

The Project Proponent has worked to create effective means of communication and consultation with the community so that their input can help to steer the project. In partnership with World Education, a well-known development organization that has been working with communities in the area since 2003, the project proponent engaged local communities to assess community development needs, local uses of surrounding forests and community land uses. Socio-economic studies were carried out throughout the course of project development and implementation, the last one in 2017, provided an updated look into the lives of stakeholders living in the project zone in terms of physical, financial, social and natural capital indicators. The results from the study's consultation and survey components provided a deeper understanding of community needs and were incorporated into the development of the project so that program goals match local needs.

Formal and informal meetings with public officials and community members revealed permanent contact between stakeholders and project management staff, and regular updates and community consultations. Communications between project management and the community was described as suitable by the communities and working groups interviewed (eleven working groups, beneficiaries and local assemblies interviewed in ten different communities; see section 2.5 Site Inspections in this report). All activities implemented have the approval of the involved communities, and documented records of this are kept onsite. This was also confirmed in the interview with OFI staff, with the Representative of Tanjung Putting National Park and with and four groups of Rimba Raya staff from the three regions. In conclusion, community groups and other stakeholders are effectively consulted, and their feedback is taken as an input for the project development; what is properly documented.

Additionally, the project has signed agreements with 9 of the 14 communities around the project area as observed during the site visit, which contain mutually agreement upon points in order to ensure benefit sharing was implemented for village communities. The procedure followed to carry out a village agreement is described in the MR.

The auditors found that constant communications exist between the project and community members, traditional and official leaders, and other stakeholders. Managers are stationed in villages in the project zone, with locally hired staff. Regional government officials are in regular contact with management. The Jakarta staff is in daily contact with relevant national government officials, as their offices are within the

Ministry of Forestry offices. Communications between the project and stakeholders is effective and nearly constant in many ways.

The MR states in section 2.3 Stakeholder Engagement that a summary of this monitoring report was distributed in the project zone in all villages and sub-district seats; notices were also placed on village bulletin boards and distributed (30 “post-office” boxes in all participating villages and hamlets). Both things were checked during the site visit, and messages regarding the scheduling of the auditor site visit and contact information for the auditing team and for filing comments with VCS/CCB were seen on community bulletin boards, in the local language.

The measures above are described in the MR, and follow the procedures determined in PD, although according to the experience gained some of them have been adapted. That said, the stakeholder communication and engagement strategy is running adequately, as AENOR could confirm.

4.3.6 Stakeholder Grievance Redress Procedure (G3.10)

A grievance/conflict resolution process is in place where World Education serves as the third-party mediator, should that become necessary, to include local villagers hired as community development staff and trained as facilitators.

During the verification site visit the grievance process SOP was reviewed and the grievance process involvement of local community was confirmed to be publicized and practiced as originally intended; the communities and working groups interviewed showed knowledge of this procedure. Additionally, it was verified onsite that 30 “post-office” boxes in all participating villages and hamlets were located, and a sample of grievances/communications confidentially submitted were reviewed (being most of them requests for further activities development or expressions of gratitude).

The grievance redress procedure was also observed during the site visit and discussed and all elements found to have been needed in the process were included to make sure it meets with standard conflict resolution protocols. The full grievance/conflict resolution process is provided in the monitoring report Section 2.3.4.

According the above evidences, AENOR ensured that the grievance redress procedure is implemented according to the project’s validated design and it is effective in its aim.

4.3.7 Worker Relations (G4.3 – G4.6)

Plans for training and capacity building of project employees have been in place since the first CCB verification. The MR further describes training that occurred during the monitoring period (sections 2.4.1 Required Technical Skills and Expertise and 2.4.2 Worker Training), including; Rapid Assessment training, Firefighting and prevention training for fire brigades, Wildlife monitoring, Agro-forestry/ecosystem restoration and HCV training, Small business development (particularly targeting women). A firefighting drill/demonstration was carried out during the site visit.

Interviews during the site visit confirmed employees were trained and well-versed in the skills needed to carry out their jobs. Women involved in chicken enterprises were trained and using the skills they learned. The MR (section 2.4.3 Community Employment Opportunities) describes the policy for hiring employees, according to Employment Opportunity Policy. Jobs are announced on village bulletin boards, in village

offices and local mosques. Members of project zone communities are given priority for all positions. Women and minority group members were said to be adequately represented in this process. 71 people, mostly local, are the current staff, and out of it 17 are women. Women were also the beneficiaries of the micro-credit program, in income producing activities, like shrimp paste production and chicken meat production.

The Project Proponent manages a comprehensive list of laws that govern relations between workers and employers, described in MR (section 2.4.4 Relevant Laws and Regulations Related to Worker's Rights). All employees have signed employment agreements and provided a copy of regulations so they are aware of their rights. An updated health and safety SOP was provided to verifiers. Responsibilities, use and care of PPE are described in MR (2.4.5 Occupational Safety Assessment). Details of safety SOPs and related were observed during the site visit, workers interviewed were confirmed to have been informed of risks and verbally instructed how to minimize them, at the time new employees are hired. No labor conflicts were evidenced during the interviews to staff.

AENOR did not detect incompliances with them checking the documents provided and interviewing to the workers. Then, the audit team deems that the project fulfills with CCB requirements related to labor relations.

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

The MR shows (2.4.1 Required Technical Skills and Expertise) that the technical skills of the project proponent and other partner organizations were maintained and that project activities were implemented successfully. EcoPartners, LLC carried out the monitoring and GHG emissions quantification reductions. It is a well-known consulting company for carbon offset projects, and provided technical input with remote sensing and support through the verification. Key skills include supervision of physical assets, administration, logistics, budgets, human resources, certification of carbon credits and management and monitoring of wildlife habitat and wildlife populations. InfiniteEARTH and OFI have also this expertise, which is further explained, in detail, in the MR.

The MR states that the project has had revenues since a large sale of credits was made in 2013 (2.4.6 Financial Health of Implementing Organization). Since that time, several million more credits were sold. It further states that both the project and InfiniteEARTH have funds available to manage the project operations, and that further proprietary information can be made available to the verification body. The Project provided verifiers with an updated budget and cash flow worksheet. The Project's breakeven point was confirmed to be already reached in 2018. Thus, they have the suitable and appropriate technical and management capacity to develop the project, as it was checked by AENOR during the on-site visit.

4.3.9 Legal Status (G5.1)

In the MR is listed all the relevant national and local laws and regulations (2.4.4 Relevant Laws and Regulations Related to Worker's Rights, 2.5.1 National and Local Laws). In Indonesia, the government owns all land and grants rights of use. The government of Indonesia began formally regulating REDD projects in 2009. The MR states all laws will be followed or exceeded. Employees are informed of their rights upon hiring. Indonesia is not a party to any emissions limiting treaties or regulations.

AENOR did not detect during the onsite visit or desk review incompliances related to laws and regulations.

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

The MR states that the project does not encroach on private, community or government property. No one lived on project lands before the project start date. Local community members may still use project lands for fishing, collecting of forest products and small-scale removal of trees. The project has signed agreements with 9 of the 14 communities around the project area as observed during the site visit. The project developers are not encroaching on private or community property. All project area land belongs to the Government of Indonesia, and the appropriate licenses and authorizations for management rights were put in place prior to commencement of major project activities and have been maintained during this monitoring period, and the Project has been extensively consulted with local community leaders and members.

Further, the report states that the project has not required anyone to relocate and has preserved the right to access the project area for fishing, small scale removal of trees and non-timber forest products. The project pledges never to relocate any people who could conceivably encroach on project area lands. The communities interviewed (see section 2.5 Site Inspections in this report) expressed not to suffered limited in access to the project area in terms of the use of the resources or transit.

The monitoring report lists encroachment by palm oil plantations, illegal logging and resource use by surrounding communities as three illegal activities that can impact the climate, community and biodiversity goals of the project. Guard posts were built along the northern boundary of the project area, as that was found to be vulnerable to palm oil plantation encroachment. Work toward better relations between palm oil plantations and the project has been going on, materialized in the case of orangutans sighted inside the plantations

Guard posts have also been built in other parts of the project area and patrols are ongoing for fires, illegal logging and hunting. The project partnered with World Education to help surrounding communities to become more self-sufficient in food production to reduce the need to use the project area for resource extraction and causing fires. Based on site visit observations and document review verifiers can conclude that the project has protected the rights of traditional 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)

The monitoring report lists (section 2.5.4 Identification of Illegal Activity) encroachment by palm oil plantations, illegal logging and resource use by surrounding communities as three illegal activities that can impact the climate, community and biodiversity goals of the project. Guard posts were built along the northern boundary of the project area, as that was found to be vulnerable to palm oil plantation encroachment. A pineapple plantation was planted between the palm oil operations and the project. Work toward better relations between palm oil plantations and the project has been going on.

Guard posts have also been built in other parts of the project area and patrols are ongoing for fires, illegal logging and hunting. Forest patrols protect the forested area from illegal activities by way of community socialization. Communities around the project area are included in patrols, thus the communities are made aware that such illegal activities are forbidden. Patrol activities are conducted by monitoring vulnerable areas either on foot, by motorcycle or by boat.

The project partnered with World Education to help surrounding communities to become more self-sufficient in food production to reduce the need to use the project area for resource extraction and causing fires.

During AENOR onsite visit, no illegal activities out of control and monitoring were detected. The Project does not and has not benefited from any illegal activity.

4.4 Climate

4.4.1 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

Procedures for quantifying the baseline emissions were conducted in accordance with the methodology. The verification team performed an intensive review of all input data, parameters, formulas, calculations, conversions, statistics and resulting uncertainties and output data to ensure consistency with the VCS documentation, methodology and associated tools, and the PD and MR. Further, the verification team reproduced calculations for selected samples to ensure accuracy of the results. Conversion factors, formulas, and calculations were provided by project proponents in spreadsheet format to ensure all formulas were accessible for review. The verification team recalculated subsets of the analysis to confirm correctness. Project proponent also provided a step-by-step overview of select calculations to ensure the verification team understood the approach and could confirm its consistency with the methodologies, PD and MR. Where applicable, references for analysis methods or default values were checked against relevant scientific literature for best practice.

- ***Baseline Scenario Emissions:***

Section 3.2.1 of the Monitoring Report and the calculation spreadsheet submitted to AENOR provide information related to the baseline emissions calculations.

AENOR has checked the calculations provided and confirmed that this amount of baseline emissions is in conformance and have followed the methodology in the validated PD.

- ***Calculation of Project Emissions:***

Project Emissions from three sources (selective logging-degradation, fire and deforestation) are calculated in accordance Equations 89 and 90 of VM0004.

$$C_{PRJ} = \sum_{t=1}^{t^*} \sum_{i=1}^{m_{PS}} C_{P,it} \qquad \text{VM0004 – 89}$$

$$C_{P,it} = E_{P,it}^{logging} + E_{P,it}^{fire} + E_{P,it}^{LCC} \qquad \text{VM0004 – 90}$$

where,

C_{PRJ} Sum of emissions that occur within the project boundary as a result of emissions that were unanticipated and/or unable to be avoided by project activities; tCO_2-e

$C_{P,it}$ Sum of emissions that occur within the project boundary in stratum *i* at time *t* as a result of emissions that were unanticipated and /or unable to be avoided by project activities; tCO_2-e

$E_{P,it}^{logging}$ GHG emissions due to logging in stratum *i*, time *t*; tCO_2-e

$E_{P,it}^{fire}$ GHG emissions due to fire in stratum *i*, time *t*; tCO_2-e

$E_{P,it}^{LCC}$ GHG emissions due to land use/land cover change in stratum *i*, time *t*; tCO_2-e

i 1,2,3,.....m_{PS} strata

t 1,2,3,...t^* years

Total project emissions are calculated within an accounting model developed for the Rimba Raya project and which was shared with auditors. Since the prior monitoring period ended on 22 June 2017 and the current monitoring period ended on 30 June 2019, the monitoring period extends for over 2 years. In order to account for this, accounting for year 9 of the project has been extended to 374 days in order to ensure project emissions are conservatively calculated. Thus, where drainage emissions are reported on an annual basis below, for year 9 of the project (the first year of this monitoring period) they were multiplied by a factor of 374/365 within the actual accounting model. Any total project emissions reported below for project year 9 took this into account.

- Estimation of GHG emissions due to selective logging ($E_{P,it}^{logging}$):

The GHG emissions attributable to logging within the project boundary over the monitoring period are estimated is accordance with Equation 91 of VM0004.

$$E_{P,it}^{logging} = \left(N_{P,it}^{gaps} \times EF_{logging,i}\right) + E_{drainage,it}^{logging} \qquad \text{VM0004 – 91}$$

where;

$E_{P,it}^{logging}$	GHG emissions due to logging in stratum *i*, time *t*; tCO_2-e
$N_{P,it}^{gaps}$	number of logging gaps detected in stratum *i*, *time t*, in the project area; dimensionless
$EF_{logging,i}$	average logging emission factor for stratum *i*,; tCO_2-e (logging gap)$^{-1}$
$E_{drainage,it}^{logging}$	CO_2 emissions from peat drainage in stratum *i*, time *t*; tCO_2-e

In accordance with the methodology the Logging Gap Emissions Factor was estimated at the beginning of the project and is described in the validated Monitoring Plan.

There were 8 logging gaps identified within the Project area in the monitoring period. The emissions associated with the logging gaps totaled 44 tCO_2-e. The total emissions attributable to logging and canal drainage in the Project area were determined to be 119,846 t CO2e for this monitoring period.

- GHG Emissions due to fire (E_{it}^{fire}):

Since there were no burns within the CAA during this monitoring period, project emissions from both biomass and peat burning during this monitoring period are 0 tCO_2e.

- GHG Emissions due to land clearing ($E_{P,it}^{LCC}$)

LandSAT and PlanetScoper imagery were used to detect deforestation not due to fire or logging within the CAA. This is the forest area that transitioned during this monitoring period but didn't overlap with logging gaps or the burn area.

The GHG emissions attributable to deforestation are estimated according to Equation 121.

$$E_{P,it}^{LLC} = \sum_{t=1}^{t^*} \sum_{i=1}^{Mpx} \left(A_{P,LCC,it} \times EF_{P,LCC,AG,it}\right) + \left(A_{peatimpact,it}^{LCC} \times EF_{peatdrainage,it}\right) \qquad \text{VM0004 - 121}$$

where;

$E_{P,it}^{LLC}$	GHG emissions due to land cover change in the project area; tCO_2-e
$A_{P,LCC,it}$	GHG emissions due to land cover change in the project area; t CO_2-e
$A_{peatimpact,it}^{LLC}$	area of drainage impact due to land cover change in stratum *i*, monitoring year *t*, ha
$EF_{P,LCC,AG,it}$	average deforestation emission factor for stratum *i*, monitoring year *t*; t CO_2-e ha^{-1}
$EF_{Peat\ drainage,it}$	average peat drainage emission factor for stratum *i*, monitoring year *t*; t CO_2-e ha^{-1}

Within the CAA and a 3km buffer zone surrounding the project area, deforestation was spatially delineated using Sentinel-2 and PlanetScope imagery to produce an LULC classification. The VM0004 Methodology requires this classification achieve an overall accuracy of 80% or more, which was analysed using an accuracy assessment. In accordance with the methodology it was conservatively assumed that the area affected by land cover change (not related to fire or logging) was equal to 100% of the converted area (AP,LLC,it). Additionally, it is conservatively estimated that all aboveground biomass is emitted from forest strata, following the procedure provided by equation 122 of the methodology, which is used to calculate $EF_{P,LCC,AG,it}$.

Land use activities resulted in 259 ha of land conversion during this monitoring period, 185 ha of which is classified as deforestation. This deforestation activity is predominately driven by the local coastal communities in the southern project area, a finding that is consistent with results from prior monitoring periods. Monitored area deforested during monitoring period and related deforestation emissions can be found below.

Stratum	**Area Transitioned (ha)**	**$EF_{P,LCC,AG,it}$ (tCO_2e ha^{-1})**	**Monitoring Period Deforestation Emissions (tCO_2e)**	**Legacy Peat Drainage Emissions (tCO_2e)**	**Total Deforestation Emissions (tCO_2e)**
Data gap	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Coastal forest	14.4	157.7	2,274.2	0.0	2,274.2
Grass	12.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Low, sparse veg.	45.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Peat swamp forest	170.0	377.7	64,186.0	8,655.2	72,841.2
Riparian forest	0.4	377.7	147.2	0.0	147.2
Shrubland	16.1	0.0	0.0	1,248.9	1,248.9
Water	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wetlands	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	**259.4**	**N/A**	**66,608**	**9,904**	**76,512**

Deforestation activities did not result in any peat drainage since there was no conversion to plantation and the associated peat drainage activities did not occur. Therefore emissions from the deforestation activities in peat swamp forest only impacted aboveground biomass. Some legacy drainage emissions were identified in previous monitoring periods due to the encroachment of oil palm into the northern buffer zone and these legacy emissions within the CAA continue to be included in accounting.

- Treatment of Uncertainty Ex-Post

Total uncertainty is calculated using equation 130 of VM0004, which combines baseline emissions and uncertainty with project monitoring period emissions and uncertainty to calculate overall uncertainty for the monitoring period. Total uncertainty per equation 130 is estimated at 10.5%, and since this exceeds the 10% threshold a deduction is being applied to emissions reductions during

this monitoring period. Emissions reductions have been adjusted using this uncertainty percentage using equation 131 of the methodology.

Uncertainty for the ex-post, with-project scenario was estimated for the current reporting period as the weighted geometric average of $U_{P,SS,i}$ across all strata *i,* where $U_{P,SS,i}$ is the percentage uncertainty expressed as a margin of error at the 90% confidence level relative to emissions for stratum *i* at time *t* as defined in equations 127 and 128 of VM0004.

Assumptions of uncertainty were made for several monitoring variables:

The uncertainty of $N\_(P,i)^{gaps}$ = 0, as the number of logging gaps is known and uncertainty of $A_{peatimpact,ilogging}$ = 0 as the area of logging impact was directly measured in the field and not from imagery. The variable *CE* is an IPCC default value, and is a constant with no associated uncertainty. The uncertainty for both market effects leakage and activity displacement leakage was found to be zero. No emissions from market effects leakage were accounted for during this monitoring period, therefore the uncertainty for this estimate is 0. Additionally, the area of activity displacement leakage was zero for this monitoring period, as the methodology does not require the monitoring of activity displacement leakage after the first 5 years of the project lifetime. Likewise, for market effects leakage, the variable $C_{B,XBT,it}$, which is the carbon emissions due to displaced timber harvests in the baseline scenario in stratum i, time t, is zero for this monitoring period.

As illustrated in the conceptual diagram of monitoring equations, Figure 4 in Section 19.3 of VM0004, and Figure 3 in Section 10.2.2, equations 91, 109, 121, and 66 are the equations that comprise the calculation of leakage and project emissions. These equations give the final emissions estimates for $E_{P,SS,it}$, as defined by equation 127 (shown below). $U_{P,SS,i}$ was quantified for all variables specified in Figure 4 of the VM0004 methodology, and multiplied that uncertainty against the associated emissions source, $E_{P,SS,it}$, that is associated with each variable. Hence the combined uncertainty is calculated as:

$$Uncertainty_{P,it} = \frac{\sqrt{\left(U_{P,SS1,i} * E_{P,SS1,it}\right)^2 + \left(U_{P,SS2,i} * E_{P,SS2,it}\right)^2 \ldots + \ldots \left(U_{P,SSn,i} * E_{P,SSn,it}\right)^2}}{E_{P,SS1,it} + E_{P,SS2,it} \ldots + \ldots E_{P,SSn,it}}$$

where $U_{P,SS1,i}$ is the uncertainty for each variable specified in the VM0004 methodology with associated uncertainty in the project boundary and associated with emissions due to logging, fire and land clearing (deforestation), market effects leakage and activity displacement leakage.

$Uncertainty_{P,it}$ was calculated to be 2.0% for this monitoring period, but as monitoring period emissions in the baseline scenario greatly exceed those estimated in the project scenario, the application of equation 130 results in a total uncertainty of 10.5% for this monitoring period.

- ***Leakage***

Expansion of palm oil concessions were not monitored during this monitoring period, as the methodology requires only 5 years of leakage monitoring from the project start date. As the project start date is 1 July 2009, this 5 year period extended through the end of June 2014, outside the bounds of this monitoring period.

Although activity shifting leakage is no longer actively monitored, residual peat drainage emissions from areas of expansion by palm oil plantations continue to be included in accounting. The only leakage emissions accounted for are due to peat drainage in leakage areas that had already been classified as deforested in previous monitoring periods.

$$\Delta C_{it\_continued} = ME_{B,dd,it} \qquad \text{(VM004 – 82)}$$

Where:

$\Delta C_{it\_continued}$ = average greenhouse gas emissions resulting from continued peat drainage or soil emissions in stratum i, t CO_2-e ha^{-1}.

$ME_{B,dd,it}$ = mean CO_2 emissions from drained peat in stratum i, time t, t CO_2 ha^{-1}

$ME_{B,dd,it}$ was calculated by multiplying average emissions within oil palm plantations for each cm of drainage depth by the measured drainage depth within these plantations. The validated value for average emissions of 1.3 tCO_2 ha^{-1} y^{-1} multiplied by the measured drainage depth results in an emission factor of 73.2 tCO_2/ha*yr. Since conversion of peat swamp forest to plantation was found to occur on a total of 1,279 ha in the 5 year period of monitoring leakage, annual leakage was calculated as shown below:

73.15 t CO_2 ha^{-1} y^{-1} * 1,279 ha = 93,537 t CO_2e y^{-1}

Since annual leakage is calculated based on a 365 day year, adjustments are made to account for project years that do not cover exactly 365 days, such as project year 9, which began on 22 June 2017 and ended on 30 June 2018. While making these adjustments the project team noticed that there was an error in the previous monitoring period that did not account for the leap day on 29 February 2016. In order to be conservative in leakage emissions estimates, a correction has been made for project year 9 by adding an extra day of leakage estimates, which is equivalent to 256 tCO_2e (93,537 tCO_2e yr^{-1} / 365 days yr^{-1}). Legacy activity shifting leakage emissions are 189,380 tCO_2e for this monitoring period.

- ***Net GHG Emission Reductions and Removals***

Actual net greenhouse gas emissions avoided are presented in table below (grey shaded years represent previously issued VCs; white years represent current monitoring period). The buffer allocation was calculated using the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool V4.0. The project was

calculated to have a risk rating of 10%, the lowest risk rating allowable under the VCS Non-Permanence Risk assessment (see section 4.4.3 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis).

The total net issuable VCUs generated during the monitoring period covered (23 June 2017 – 30 June 2019) are estimated to be 6,890,938 tCO2e.

Project Year	Monitoring Dates (Day/Month/Year)	Net VCU Allocation (tCO2e)	Buffer Allocation (tCO2e)	Buffer Release (tCO2e)
1	1/7/2009 - 30/6/2010	2,181,352	242,372	36,355
2	1/7/2010 - 30/6/2011	2,453,742	433,013	187,639
3	1/7/2011 - 30/6/2012	2,788,156	492,027	213,211
4	1/7/2012 - 30/6/2013	3,347,516	601,138	260,493
5	1/7/2013 - 30/6/2014	4,393,291	672,485	232,783
6	1/7/2014 - 30/6/2015	3,885,255	442,088	66,313
7	1/7/2015 - 30/6/2016	3,172,906	362,938	54,441
8	1/7/2016 - 22/6/2017	4,063,462	339,175	50,876
9	23/6/2017 - 30/6/2018	3,509,354	402,900	0
10	1/7/2018 - 30/6/2019	3,381,583	388,335	0
Total		**36,883,231**	**4,376,471**	**1,102,111**

Total GHG Emissions Reductions generated over the project lifetime (prior to uncertainty adjustment) are shown is table below:

Project 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)
1	2,462,212	(38,488)	0	2,423,724
2	3,654,181	(767,425)	0	2,886,756
3	3,592,611	(312,427)	0	3,280,184
4	4,124,970	(117,382)	(58,934)	3,948,654
5	5,362,569	(189,603)	(93,537)	5,079,431
6	5,069,617	(648,737)	(93,537)	4,327,344
7	4,279,896	(650,514)	(93,537)	3,535,845
8	4,036,912	(645,155)	(91,230)	3,300,526
9	4,128,393	(99,385)	(96,099)	3,932,908
10	3,980,330	(96,972)	(93,537)	3,789,820
Total	**40,691,691**	**(3,566,088)**	**(620,411)**	**36,505,191**

Finally, next table includes final estimates for emissions reductions, buffer allocation, and VCUs (rounded down as required by the latest version of AFOLU Requirements), calculated for each vintage year within the monitoring period.

Year	Net GHG Emission Reductions or Removals (tCO2e)	Annual Buffer Allocation (tCO2e)	Net Verified Carbon Units (tCO2e)
2017	2,029,549	207,914	1,810,977
2018	3,813,844	390,750	3,403,066
2019	1,879,336	192,572	1,676,895
Total	**7,722,728**	**791,235**	**6,890,938**

AENOR reproduced the calculations to achieve the same results and deems they are depicted clearly and correctly in the provided sheets. AENOR verification team was able to trace calculations directly from the data sources of inventory´s field measurements. Formulae used are in compliance with MR, PD and methodology like the default values used to determine the parameters, they are appropriate. Thus, the net amount of VCUs to be issued is accurate and realistic.

AENOR verified for the parameters available at validation the values reported or the references to the documents where they are used or explained by reviewing, reproducing and crosschecking the evidence provided by the PP. AENOR checked the values of these parameters to be appropriate and correctly used in equations. Data and parameters available at validation are the ones stated in section 3.1.1 of the MR.

On the other hand, the data and parameters monitored to calculate the VCUs to be issued are the ones stated in section 3.1.2 of the MR. AENOR checked that the list of parameters to be monitored was complete and consistent with information in the monitoring plan of the PD.

Regarding the accuracy of spreadsheet, formulae, conversions and aggregations and consistent use of data and parameters, the PP elaborated a complete procedure to assure the accuracy and appropriateness of data. During the verification process, AENOR not only verified the spreadsheet calculation, data and parameters but also the AENOR team could verify that the PP conducted a rigorous QC/QA procedure of its field measurements and an assessment of uncertainty. Thus, AENOR deems the PP performed good practices in this assessment and concludes that GHG removals were quantified correctly in accordance with the project description and applied methodology.

AENOR verified the consistency and accuracy of each parameter detailed in its section 3 by crosschecking the information in the MR with the information in PD as well as checking values and reproducing the calculations in the spreadsheet calculation package (see Appendix 1) and did not find inconsistencies. Therefore, AENOR deems that values reported for the parameters are accurate and consistent.

The following tables summarize the data and parameters used by the PP to calculate the GHG emission removals, which has been assessed by AENOR:

Data/Parameter available al validation (Data unit)	Source of data	Value applied	Purpose of the data/parameter
CF Carbon fraction of dry matter (Dimensionless)	IPCC default value = 0.50	0.5	Used in multiple carbon calculations to convert biomass to carbon as detailed in VM0004.
$A_{B, it,logged}$ Area of land logged under the baseline scenario for stratum i, in time t (Ha)	Analysis of remote sensing data and/or legal records and/or survey information for lands owned or controlled or previously owned or controlled by the baseline agent of deforestation	Rate 2,800 ha yr^{-1} (stratum i, time t)	Used in Timber Extraction spreadsheet
P Percent of harvest industrial roundwood going into long term wood products (Dimensionless)	Industry standard value: FAO 1995. FAO Yearbook: Forest products. FAO For. Serv. No. 28, FAO, Rome, 422 p.	0.25	Used in Timber Extraction spreadsheet
AP Plot Area (m^2)	Aerial plot measurement	10,000	parameter created but not used
Φ Volume-weighted average wood density (g cm^3)	Literature Value: Reyes, Brown, Chapman and Lugo (1992) mean wood density for tropical Asia represented by 428 species, SE = 0.007	0.57 (SD = 0.145)	Used in Biomass Burning Spreadsheet
$PB_{BB,it}$ Average proportion of $C_{B,AC,it}$ burnt under the baseline scenario in stratum i, time t (Dimensionless)	methodology (p. 16)	1	Used in Biomass Burning -BL E51
CE Average biomass combustion efficiency (Dimensionless)	IPCC default =0.50	0.5	Used in Biomass Burning spreadsheet
$A_{cleared B,it}$ Average annual area of deforestation by the baseline agent of deforestation for the 5 years prior to project implementation (Ha)	GPS coordinates and/or remote sensing data and or/legal parcel records	Rate 2,800 ha yr^{-1} (stratum i, time t)	Quantification of baseline emissions
N/C ratio Nitrogen-carbon ratio (Dimensionless)	IPCC default = 0.01	0.01	used in Biomass Burning spreadsheet
ER_{N2O} Emission ratio for N_2O (t CO_2-e (t C)$^{-1}$)	IPCC default value = 0.007	0.007	see Biomass Burning spreadsheet
ER_{CH4} Emission ratio for CH_4 (t CO_2-e (t C)$^{-1}$)	IPCC default value = 0.012	0.012	see Biomass Burning spreadsheet
GWP_{N2O} Global Warming Potential for N_2O (t CO_2-e (t N_2O)$^{-1}$)	IPCC 4th Assessment Report	298	see Biomass Burning spreadsheet
GWP_{CH4} Global Warming Potential for CH4 (t CO2-e (t CH_4)$^{-1}$)	IPCC 4th Assessment Report	25	see Biomass Burning spreadsheet
DBH diameter at breast height of tree (cm)	Field Measurement.	See Carbon Survey Report data	Quantification of baseline emissions
$A_{itplanted}$ area of biomass growth on future land use in the baseline scenario in stratum *i* at time *t* (Ha)	Analysis of remote sensing data and/or legal records and/or survey information for lands owned or controlled or previously owned or controlled by the baseline agent of deforestation.	Rate 2,800 ha yr^{-1}	Based on historical rate of plantation conversion by the baseline agent. See discussion Baseline Report. For values see oil palm regrowth worksheet. Annual area of planting cohorts A-F shown in columns E, I, M, Q, U, Y.
age_{peak} age of stand at peak production (Years)	Literature values: Data reported in Cannell M.G. R. 1982. World Forest Biomass and Primary Production Data. Academic Press. London. 391 pp.	14	See discussion Baseline Report Oil Palm Growth Model Data
$D_{B,,drain,it}$ average depth of peat drainage or average depth to water table	Methodology default value = 100 cm	100	See Peat Drainage spreadsheet

Data/Parameter available al validation (Data unit)	Source of data	Value applied	Purpose of the data/parameter
under the baseline scenario in stratum i, time t (cm)			
$A_{B,drain,it}$ area of drainage impact under the baseline scenario in stratum i, time t (Ha)	Analysis of remote sensing data and/or legal records and/or survey information for lands owned or controlled or previously owned or controlled by the baseline agent of deforestation	See Peat Drainage spreadsheet	Quantification of baseline emissions
D_{peat} average depth of peat in project area (Meters)	Field Measurements	4.3	See Carbon Survey Report
$D_{B,burn,it}$ Depth of peat burned under the baseline scenario in stratum i at time t (cm)	Combination of literature values, confirmed with field measurements.	The project will use the value of 0.18 m, 0.11 m, and 0.043 m for the first, second, and third fires respectively	Quantification of baseline emissions
$A_{B,burn,it}$ Area of peat burned under the baseline scenario in stratum i at time t (Ha)	Analysis of remote sensing data and/or legal records and/or survey information for lands owned or controlled or previously owned or controlled by the baseline agent of deforestation	See Peat Burning spreadsheet	Quantification of Baseline Scenario
BD_i Bulk density of peat in stratum i (g cm^{-3} = t m^{-3})	Default value	0.1505	Site specific values of peat bulk density are applied to all peat vegetation strata in the project area. Ex-post this value will be listed as the default value for all peat strata until (as required by the methodology) new data become available.
EF_{CO2} CO_2 emissions from the combustion of peat (g CO_2 (t peat)$^{-1}$)	Literature value. Muraleedharan et al. (2000) cited in the methodology p. 38	185,000	Peat Burning spreadsheet
EF_{CH4} CH4 emissions from the combustion of peat (g CH_4 (t peat)$^{-1}$)	Literature value	5,785 g/ton peat	Peat Burning – BL worksheet cell E6
LDF Logging Damage Factor for calculating the biomass of dead wood created during logging operations per cubic meter extracted (t C m^{-3})	Default value of 0.37 t C m^{-3} from 534 logging gaps measured by Winrock International in Bolivia, Belize, Mexico, the Republic of Congo, Brazil and Indonesia may be used for tropical broadleaf forests.	0.37	Used in Equation 68 of VM0004
PML_{FT} Mean merchantable biomass as a proportion of total aboveground tree biomass for each forest type to which displacement of logging activities is likely to occur (%)	GIS data from landcover/forest maps published by Ministry of Forestry. All forest types in which commercial logging could take place within PT Best concessions were considered.	< 0.20	Quantification of baseline emissions
$V_{B,it}$ Volume of timber projected to be extracted from within the project boundary during the baseline in stratum i at time t (m^3)	Source of data same as biomass logged parameter.	Embedded in Equation 68, see biomass burning spreadsheet	Note that this volume does not include logging slash left onsite. Extracted volumes reported are gross volumes removed.
PMP_i Merchantable biomass as a proportion of total aboveground tree biomass for stratum i within the project boundaries (%)	unpublished data from Mawas, Winrock 2008	Mean 0.36, SD 0.169	Same as B logged (Biomass Extracted as Merchantable Timber >30cm in Timber Extraction spreadsheet)
$HistHa_i$ Average annual area of deforestation by the baseline	Analysis of remote sensing data and/or legal records and/or survey information for lands owned or controlled or	6113.7	See discussion Baseline Report

Data/Parameter available al validation (Data unit)	Source of data	Value applied	Purpose of the data/parameter
agent of the planned deforestation in stratum i for the 5-10 years prior to project implementation (Ha)	previously owned or controlled by the baseline agent of deforestation		
$A_{defLK,it}$ The total area of deforestation by the baseline agent of the planned deforestation in stratum i at time t (Ha)	Analysis of remote sensing data and/or legal records and/or survey information for lands owned or controlled or previously owned or controlled by the baseline agent of deforestation	Not calculated as of year 1 (no leakage)	Legal records will include government permits to deforest including concession licenses.

Data Unit / Parameter	Data unit	Description	Source of data
$N_{gapsP,\ it}$	Dimensionless	Number of logging gaps detected in stratum i, time t in the project area	Remote sensing and field data
$D_{bottom,tr,ik}$	Cm	Diameter at the stump end of log extracted from timber tree tr in stratum i, gap k	Field visit
$D_{top,tr,ik}$	Cm	Diameter at the crown end of log extracted from timber tree tr in stratum i, gap k	Field visit
f *i*	t m^{-3}	Wood density of extracted log in stratum *i*	Literature Value: Reyes, Brown, Chapman and Lugo (1992) mean wood density for tropical Asia represented by 428 species, SE = 0.007
$D_{s,tr,ik}$	Cm	Diameter of the stump of the logged timber tree tr in stratum i, gap k	Field visit
$H_{tr,ik}$	M	Height of tree tr in stratum i, gap k	Field visit
$D_{pce\text{-}b,tr,ik}$	Cm	Diameter of bottom end of piece left from timber tree tr in stratum i, gap k	Field Visit
$L_{pce,tr,ik}$	M	Length of piece left from timber tree tr in stratum i, gap k	Field Visit
$D_{pce\text{-}t,tr,ik}$	Cm	Diameter of top end of piece pce left from timber tree tr in stratum i, gap k: cm	Field Visit
$D_{logging\ drain,it}$	Cm	Average depth of peat drainage or average depth to water table in drained area of stratum i, time t during the dry season	Field measurements
$A_{logging\ peatimpact,it}$	Ha	Area of drainage impact in stratum i, time t	Peat expert consultation
$MC_{burnedP,AG,it}$	t C ha^{-1}	Estimated aboveground carbon stock after burning under the project case for stratum i, time t	Conservatively assume complete loss of aboveground biomass and no regrowth.
N/C ratio	Dimensionless	Nitrogen-carbon ratio	IPCC default=0.01
$A_{p,burn,it}$	Ha	Area burned in stratum i, time t in the project area	Field measurements or using high resolution digital aerial imagery
$D_{P,burn,it}$	Cm	Depth of peat burned under the project scenario in stratum i at time t:	Methodology default value
$A_{P,\ LCC,\ it}$	Ha	Area that underwent land cover change in stratum i, monitoring year t:	High resolution digital aerial imagery or field measurements
$A^{\ LCCn}{}_{peatimpact,it}$	Ha	Area of drainage impact due to land cover change in stratum i, monitoring year t	Medium/high resolution imagery combined with field measurements as appropriate.
$D_{\ LCC\ drain,it}$	Cm	Average depth of peat drainage or average depth to water table in the deforested area under the project scenario in stratum i, time t	Field measurements or estimated from literature values if measurements not available.

The valued used are consistent with validated PD and indicated sources, and were correctly inputted in the calculation spreadsheets. For all these parameters reported in the monitoring report, AENOR cross-checked with the PD and the spreadsheet calculations that values/calculations/methods match and are free of mistakes and errors.

In order to verify the accuracy and consistency of parameters monitored and used to calculate the removals achieved for the monitoring period, the AENOR verification team reproduced the calculations checking the correctness of the formulae applied and assumptions used, when applicable and that values used matched with data sources.

After a deep and thorough review and reproduction of calculations and the corresponding tracks to the other spreadsheets, AENOR deems the parameters monitored and available at validation are correct, reliable and consistent. Information in the monitoring report is in compliance with the PD, the calculations provided and the applicable methodology. Then, the results showed in the monitoring report are reliable, consistency and accuracy.

Moreover, AENOR also verified a complete GIS package provided to cross check the information with data values used in calculations and monitoring report. Other default values used are from sources well accredited and validated at validation stage.

By crosschecking samples of original data sources from PP and taken by AENOR from the on-site visit with data in the spreadsheet calculation and other supporting documents such as the GIS package, AENOR verified the consistent between data and did not detect manual transposition errors between data sets.

For this period no leakage monitoring is required following VM0004, as the methodology does not require the monitoring of activity displacement leakage after the first five years of the project lifetime.

Based on the above, AENOR can conclude that GHG emission reductions and removals have been quantified correctly in accordance with the project description and applied methodology.

4.4.2 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

The data and parameters used to determine greenhouse gas emission reductions and removals are listed in section 3 of the monitoring report.

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.

AENOR verified that the monitoring crews implemented the monitoring plan as it is established in the validated PD. AENOR also found evidence during the on-site visit that key workers are fully involved in monitoring events (training, measuring, archiving, reporting, quality control, etc.).

Quality assurance and control is an essential part of company procedures in order to assure the accuracy of inventory data, modeling results, and carbon accounting. Quality assurance procedures are done in order to minimize and correct any potential data transcription, calculation, or formatting errors that may result in inaccurate carbon accounting results.

Field monitoring occurs within each field unit on a minimum of an annual basis, and in some locations where there is concern for, or a history of encroachment, it can be more frequently. Monitoring trip reports are kept at the field unit level for each trip and compiled by field unit manager as a summary to be

provided to the Sampit office on a monthly basis. These reports along with work progress reports are provided on a monthly report to InfiniteEARTH and Rimba Raya Conservation Jakarta office to prepare the annual monitoring plan. Project data are stored and regularly maintained on redundant external hard drives at onsite (Pangkalan Bun, Central Kalimantan) and offsite (Jakarta) locations and secured with backup software using standard protocols. Any changes in these locations are listed in annual verification reports.

In accordance with VCS, the Project Proponent is committed to storing all project data in a secure and retrievable manner for at least two years after the end of the project crediting period. In order to facilitate project management and long-term accounting, all primary data outputs supporting annual verification including the spatial database, is stored and maintained for each 10-year crediting period. Project data are managed by the Rimba Raya Conservation project coordinator in conjunction with the GIS manager to ensure security, accessibility and long-term storage.

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.

AENOR deems that evidence is enough to reproduce calculations in quality. Above procedures to ensure this are described in section 6.2 Quality Assurance and Quality Control of the MR.

4.4.3 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project Monitoring Report utilized the non-permanence risk analysis tool, AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool 4.0, to assess risk according to internal risk, external risk, natural risk, and mitigation measures for minimizing risk. The verification team reviewed the Non-Permanence Risk Report following VCS Standard v4.0 Section 3.2.9 and confirmed that the project adheres to the requirements set out in the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool.

At all levels, the verification team evaluated the rationale, appropriateness, and justifications of risk ratings chosen by the project proponent. Each risk factor was thoroughly assessed for conformance. There were no CAR or CL findings related to the AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool or Report.

The final score was calculated to be 6% and thus the project is able to take the minimum risk rating of 10%. A brief review of each factor is found in the table below:

Internal Risks		
Risk Factor	**Rationale & Quality**	**Conclusion**
Project Management	GHG credits are not based on planted species. While it is highly unlikely that any encroachment would affect 50% of carbon stocks on which GHG credits have been issued, the project is taking a conservative approach to this risk assessment in determining the potential for encroachment. The management team includes individuals with skills necessary to undertake all project activities. Project proponents and technical consultants have experience in the development of carbon projects with the same project activities thus also lowering	A risk rating of **-2** is appropriate given the rationale provided and all statements made are substantiated.

	overall internal risk. Management team is located in the country and the project area can be accessible in one day. An adaptive management plan is in place to create effective means of communication and consultation with stakeholders so that their input can help to steer the project.	
Financial viability	Project has met cash flow breakeven point as of 2018. Items presented to the verification team by project proponents give reasonable assurance that the risk rating for financial viability is appropriately set.	A risk rating of **0** is appropriate given the rationale provided and all statements made are substantiated.
Opportunity Cost	The alternative land use scenario for the Rimba Raya Project Area is conversion to Palm Oil. Palm oil produces high net revenues and financial returns for the palm oil company and the Government through royalties. The results of the NPV analysis determined that the NPV of palm oil production was more than 200% of the Project Activity. The financial model was confirmed through review of materials that substantiate NPV assumptions including but not limited to; literature sources, carbon credit value estimates and commodity price changes. Literature sources were found to be reputable (World Bank). Therefore the Project applied the highest opportunity cost rating possible in the risk assessment. Project proponent is not a non-profit organization. Project is protected by a legally binding agreement to continue management practices that protect the credited carbon stocks over the length of the project crediting period.	A risk rating of **6** is appropriate given the rationale provided.
Project Longevity	Legal contractual agreements to address enforceability of carbon stock protection for the project exist as the project holds licenses that cover the entire project lifetime. Project activities will be maintained for 60 years from the beginning of the project start date (i.e. Project longevity). This is longer than the project crediting period (i.e. 30 years) as the license granted over the project is for 60 years. (30 years + 30 years renewable). This license held by the Project and the intention to set up a perpetual fund for project management and activities demonstrates that appropriate licenses and funds will be available to ensure continued activities beyond the project crediting period. The risk associated with project longevity = 30-(60/2)=0.	A risk rating of **0** is appropriate given the rationale provided.
	Total Internal Risks	**4**
External Risks		
Risk Factor	**Rationale & Quality**	**Conclusion**
Land Tenure	Forest land is owned by the Government of Indonesia and User Rights are allocated under a process of allocating concessions; therefore the ownership and the resource access/user rights are held by different entities. Infinite Earth has secured the Right of Use to Project Area which is documented and authorized by the	A risk rating of **2** is appropriate given the rationale provided.

	Forestry Minister and signed by the Director General of the Planning Department. There are clear property rights and no disputes over the land. Outside of natural tidal processes which possess little risk to the project's carbon stocks, multiple sources demonstrate that seawater rise provides minimal risk to the project area.	
Community Engagement	There are no established communities living within the project boundaries. More than 20% of the communities who live within 20km of the Project boundaries and who rely on resources within the Project Area (such as fishing and subsistence agriculture) were consulted throughout the CCB project development stage and continue to be the focus of the on-going community consultation being delivered by World Education. The project has focused on community engagement in the design and approach to community development activities in the Rimba Raya area to achieve validation against the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standard. Extensive stakeholder consultation and community institution building was confirmed during the site visit. Consultation on community needs was confirmed for those communities visited that are close to the project area.	A risk rating of **-5** is appropriate given the rationale provided.
Political Risk	Indonesia presents a score of 0.20 according to the World Bank Institute´s Worldwide Governance Indicators Indonesia is receiving REDD+ readiness funding from the World Bank FCPF and UN REDD. The project jurisdiction, Central Kalimantan, is participating in the country's REDD Task Force. Indonesia is participating in the CARE REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards initiative.	A risk rating of **0** is appropriate given the rationale provided.
	Total External Risks	**0**
Natural Risks		
Risk Factor	**Rationale & Quality**	**Conclusion**
Natural Risk	The risk rating was taken for Natural Risks Fire and Extreme Weather. Natural fire incidence is low as the elevated water table in undrained peat lands prevents spreading. Previous fires in drained areas visited during the site visit were confirmed to be anthropogenic. The verification team agrees with this assessment as being appropriate. Verification Team agrees that the forests of the project area have a high species diversity and therefore resistant to catastrophic disturbance caused by insect pests or forests diseases. Project proponents appropriately base risk of extreme weather risk rating from the likelihood of wind disturbance which could influence carbon stocks. Local geology (i.e. volcanoes, fault lines) are not active in the project area and the risk rating was appropriately given as zero.	A combined natural risk rating of **2.0** is appropriate given the rationale provided and all statements made are substantiated.
	Total Natural Risks	**2.0**
Overall Risk Rating = 6%, Non-Permanence Risk Rating = 10%		

AENOR has checked that information provided in the Non-Permanence Risk Report version for the monitoring period is consistent with supporting documents provided. The assumptions and justifications provided to determine the risk rating of each risk factor are developed and they are based on provided documents using conservative assessments. AENOR deems that information provided is reliable and appropriate from official sources, thus, the overall risk rating is credible and realistic. The project has applied the minimum Non-Permanence Risk Rating of 10%. As required, is reassessed and given risk scores at each verification period.

For this period there is no release of buffer credits following VCS Registration and Issuance Process Document 19 September 2019, v4.0.

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

The full monitoring plan and results are available on the VCS/CCBA project database website. The reports are available by anyone upon request and actively disseminated to all stakeholders on an annual basis prior to any upcoming audit. A summary of the monitoring report and the monitoring results copied for distribution on the community information board in all of the villages within the Rimba Raya operational area as well as district and sub-district seats. This was confirmed during the onsite visit in all villages and hamlets. Notices were observed to have been placed on the community information boards within villages about the availability of any summary or important project documentation. World Education and Rimba Raya office locations were observed to have copies of the monitoring report and other relevant project documentation to distribute to community members that make requests and made available in the local language.

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

The primary drivers of environmental degradation due to climate change in the region of the project area are drought and associated fires. Fire patrols, patrol stations and firefighting brigades have been set up and trained by the project. Reforestation, agroforestry, and protecting large patches of forest are also designed to mitigate environmental degradation. Activities to mitigate threats to food security include fire suppression, reforestation and agroforestry, soil enrichment with biochar and crop diversification. Activities to mitigate threats to income include fire suppression, education and the planned floating clinic. Further information on these activities is summarized in Section 3.3.1 Activities and/or Processes Implemented for Adaptation of the MR.

According to site visit to activities and interviews held with stakeholders, AENOR confirms that the activities implemented deliver the intended impacts regarding adaptation to climate change risks.

4.5 Community

4.5.1 Community Impacts (CM1.1)

The MR states in section 4.1.1 Community Impacts (CM1.1) that community impacts of the project were evaluated through the Theory of Change framework. In comparison with the ‘without project’ scenario, the most obvious benefits are that the project lands remain intact, and continue to deliver the ecosystem services often taken for granted, like clean water, flood mitigation, fish populations and the continued availability of non-timber forest products.

The original promise of palm oil production assumed that it would mostly be produced by small holders. The reality is that most palm oil is produced by large plantations, often installed without consulting local communities. Wages are low because there are few other income producing opportunities and workers are often imported from other islands.

The monitoring report goes on to compare the project benefits and goals with what would become of those goals if the project area was converted to a palm oil plantation, as originally planned. None of the benefits or goals would be achieved, as they are not the interests of the palm oil industry. Palm oil interests do occasionally provide communities with money for holiday celebrations and other purposes.

The report concludes that the community benefits are positive for the 'with project' scenario compared with the 'without project' scenario. Community impacts for this monitoring period was summarized in section 4.3.1 Implementation Status of this report.

The site visit interviews with community members and leaders demonstrated that communities were receiving benefits they would not otherwise have received in the absence of the project. Jobs were created and other income-producing opportunities were made available, and have included the poorest people and women. In opinion of AENOR, the assessment of impacts is accurate and reflects faithfully the project benefits in communities.

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

The site visit interviews with community members and leaders demonstrated that communities were receiving benefits they would not otherwise have received in the absence of the project. Jobs were created and other income-producing opportunities were made available, and have included the poorest people and women. All evidence indicates that project benefits have reached essentially all households in the communities.

Net Positive Community Well-being impacts are fully described in section 4.1.2.2 Project Scenario of the MR, including the ones below, which were verified during the onsite visit:

Project Activity	Output (from this monitoring period)	Outcome (from this monitoring period)
Employment opportunities through Monitoring activities	Construction of 1 fire tower in Batu Hirang and 1 guard post in Tatah Ji 2 guard posts in area of Segintung River and Natai manned 24/7 by North Unit field staff. 3 hydrant wells were installed in Tatah Ji Trainings for fire suppression and equipment utilization.	Increased employment of community members. Increased number of community members with alternative revenue streams.
Community based agro-forestry	Pineapple and djengkol planting has continued as part of agroforestry program.	Development of community based food sources Decrease in unsustainable forest clearing for agriculture. Increase in sustainable agro-forestry land

Project Activity	Output (from this monitoring period)	Outcome (from this monitoring period)
Water access Livelihood conditions Health	Distribution of 300 water filters to villages for clean and drinkable water Distribution of fuel efficient stoves Solar lanterns, solar panels in 57 houses. Floating clinic (316 patients attended in the first trial)	Increased number of community members with access to clean water. Decreased number of community members becoming ill due to water-borne and sanitation-related illnesses Improved conditions for households
Micro Credit Program	Continuation of working groups – shrimp paste and chicken meat production	Increased number of community members (notably women) pursuing independent, sustainable sources of income based off of learning new skills/knowledge. Increase in independent food production
Community centers in strategically selected villages inside the Project zone. Support to local education	Operation of 2 libraries and continued operation of community centers during the monitoring period. 61 reading glasses have been distributed to community members in need. 24 scholarships were distributed to students in 2018 for the completion of senior high school year	Provision of a central community space and building for educational activities to occur/educational resources to exist. Increased number of people with access to educational spaces/educational material
Extend World Education's ongoing programs for food security, access to government services, and capacity building within the project zone	Continuation of working groups – shrimp paste and chicken meat production 2,287 people were trained as a result of project activities	Increased number of community members (notably women) gaining skills and education from capacity building.
Employment of women in project related employment	17 women employed in project activities	Increased number of women that are financially self-sufficient
Employment opportunities through Monitoring activities	Employment of 71 staff and community staff	Increased number of people involved in climate, forest and biodiversity monitoring of forested areas

AENOR verified the above net impact by their outcomes onsite: all the activities were visited during the field trip, and moreover, eleven communities and working groups/beneficiaries were interviewed, as well as four Rimba Raya staff groups and stakeholders such as OFI and the Representative of Tanjung Putting National Park (see section 2.5 Site Inspections in this report). They confirmed the results mentioned, which is also supported in the extensive documentary evidences provided for the verification (see Appendix 1: list of evidences provided, in this report).

According to AENOR observations, the net impacts are properly addressed, measured and reported.

4.5.3 Protection of High Conservation Values (CM1.2)

According to the HCV assessment done by the Project Proponent for the project area, the community-related HCVs include:

- HCV4.1: Areas or ecosystems important to the provision of water and prevention of floods for downstream communities.
- HCV4.3: Areas that Function as Natural Barriers to the Spread of Forest or Ground Fire.
- HCV5: Natural areas critical for meeting the basic needs of local people.
- HCV6: Areas critical for maintaining the cultural identity of local communities.

Project activities to protect and/or enhance community-related HCV are discussed in detail in section 4.1.3 Protection of High Conservation Values (CM1.2) of the MR. The threats of the 'without project' scenario to these HCVs are discussed, and management activities to reduce or prevent those threats are listed. None of the project activities have had, nor are likely to have, a negative impact on community-related HCVs. They are designed to either protect or enhance existing HCVs, as was verified by AENOR during the onsite visit.

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

The Project Proponent identified potential impacts to subsistence livelihoods, hunting, forest harvesting and employment. However, according to interviews and observations during the site visit, these impacts are low.

The monitoring report states that there has been no imposition on traditional hunting and harvesting, because the project does not seek to restrict them and they add little to local economies. Negative impacts from hunting are limited, as one of the key game animals is the wild hog, which are not eaten or hunted by local Muslims. Some deer are occasionally harvested. Project activities enhance fishing opportunities.

According to surveys, local communities are not actively engaged in logging, beyond simple usage for domestic construction but not for firewood. As a means to mitigate loss of income from logging, other revenue sources were introduced, including a pineapple plantation or chicken farm development. In addition, the project is actively planting tree seedlings within the project buffer area. Seedlings are purchased from local community nurseries and planted by temporary employees of the project, who are from the communities.

Employment in local communities has not been greatly impacted, because palm oil plantations prefer to hire workers from other islands. Some employment and income producing opportunities have been created by the project. Using the Theory of Change framework and results from monitoring, project developers have determined the project has a net positive impact on all stakeholder groups. This analysis is further described in a table in section 4.2 Offsite Stakeholder Impacts. All off-site stakeholders with negative impacts as a result of the project were either the displaced palm oil plantations or people

engaged in illegal activities. Others have benefited from the maintenance and improvements in ecosystem services, or have received the benefits of social and economic programs.

The negative impacts of the project to people involved in illegal activities or the identified agents of land degradation are unavoidable. Thus, AENOR confirms that the net impacts to all other stakeholders are clearly positive.

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

A plan for monitoring community was developed early in the project lifetime and successfully validated. Results of the most recent monitoring are included in Table 26 of the MR, were communities (villages, hamlets, working groups, etc.), indicators, frequency of measurement and reporting, and the results are compiled. Through document review and the site visit AENOR confirmed the monitoring plan is in place and monitoring is going on.

The HCVs related to community well-being are conserved by conserving the natural landscape and preventing its drainage and conversion to oil palm plantation.

Project Proponent showed that monitoring is be able to identify positive and negative impacts on the more vulnerable people in the communities. Livelihoods were found to be dependent on fishing and farming, with productivity in decline and project activities were designed to enhance these activities. Survey results were provided to verifiers and they directly address whether the survey subjects have benefited from the project and their attitudes and expectations toward the project and other aspects of life in the community, confirmed during the onsite interviews (see section 2.5 Site Inspections of this report).

AENOR confirms dates, frequency and sampling methods used are in accordance with the validated project design and with the procedures and systematics used in the verification event. AENOR confirms that community monitoring plan is implemented as the monitoring report and the validated PD.

4.5.6 Community Monitoring Plan Dissemination (CM3.3)

The full monitoring plan and results are available on the VCS/CCBA project database website. The community monitoring reports are available by anyone upon request and actively disseminated to all stakeholders on an annual basis prior to any upcoming audit. A summary of the monitoring report and the monitoring results copied for distribution on the community information board in all of the villages within the Rimba Raya operational area as well as district and sub-district seats. This was confirmed during the onsite visit in all villages, hamlets and working groups gathering points, and described in section 4.3.3 Dissemination of Monitoring Plan and Results of the MR. World Education and Rimba Raya office locations were observed to have copies of the monitoring report and other relevant project documentation to distribute to community members that make requests and made available in the local language. It is clear to AENOR that project developers have met their commitment to developing a monitoring plan and are implementing the dissemination actions agreed.

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

As described in MR section 4.4.1 Barriers to Benefits, the main barriers or risks that might prevent project benefits from reaching the poorer households were identified as 1) communications on program

opportunities are restricted, intentionally or unintentionally, from poorer households, 2) communities being provoked by opponents of the project to reject the project by spreading misinformation.

The project explicitly addresses these barriers as an objective of the project, engaging with at least 25% of the poorest people in each community to identify the presence of these barriers and to overcome these risks. A special supplemental survey was conducted in 2017 at the end of the previous monitoring period to assess the presence of these barriers and risks in a differentiated approach.

These barriers and risks are mitigated through direct communication with the target households, and by taking advantage of, but not relying exclusively on, traditional forms of communication. Communication with communities has therefore followed two paths: the traditional system via local government (sub-District, township and village heads) and a direct grassroots system, delivering project information directly through physical site visits. This approach aims to appease local government and traditional leaders, not overstepping or offending them, but has also ensured that communication with the poorest households has been fluid and has maximized their participation in project activities.

AENOR can conclude that project activities have tended to increase the flow of benefits to poorer households.

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

The project has been able to demonstrate that measures have been taken to identify poorer and more vulnerable households and individuals whose well-being or poverty may be negatively affected by the project, as described in MR section 4.4.2 Protections for Poorer and More Vulnerable Households and Individuals. Multiple surveys were conducted and a detailed Theory of Change model was developed to study the impacts of the Project on the poor, vulnerable, and marginal groups as well as women.

The Project has been designed such that it offers a multitude of programs and activities to communities across the Project area. During this monitoring period, this has included the continued implementation of a micro-credit program, reforestation in spread across the Project zone, continued planting at pineapple and djengkol agroforestry sites, maintaining an orangutan release site (employment) as well as distribution of water filters and clean water systems to villages. These programs and activities are designed and implemented to target and prioritize involvement of individuals in the poorest quartile of households; however they have reached far more than 50% of the poorest quartile.

The poorest quartile has benefited from this project substantially by gaining access to resources previously unavailable to them; clean water, health care, education, training, credit and employment opportunities. Their involvement in any of the programs and use of any of the services has been optional, but participation has been high and is expected to grow based on community consultation and feedback from local and international NGOs working in the area. Individuals in this quartile are offered services and opportunities that improve quality of life for their families, empowering them and lifting them from chronic poverty.

The steps taken by the project support an overall conclusion that the project fulfilled the requirements of GL2.4 of the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards.

4.6 Biodiversity

4.6.1 Biodiversity Changes (B1.1)

The MR states that the net biodiversity impacts are positive; changes in biodiversity in the project zone due to project activities are monitored according to procedures described in 5.3.1 Biodiversity Monitoring Plan Development. Metrics include the number of hectares significantly better managed for biodiversity in comparison with the 'without project' scenario, and the increased number of critically endangered species that benefit from reduced threats, either in the project area and the Tanjung Puting National Park.

The 'without project' scenario equates to conversion of most or all remaining forests in the project area to oil palm plantations, which is currently the greatest threat to biodiversity in the project zone. A sharp decline in the biodiversity of the project zone through direct negative impacts of land clearing and associated indirect impacts (e.g., providing access to more remote forests for hunting, illegal logging, increased fire risk, and the draining of peat swamp forest) would be the result. Such indirect impacts would also allow greater access to Tanjung Putting National Park which would result in a significant impact on the park's biodiversity and threaten the OFI Orangutan release program.

Monitoring components to detect changes in biodiversity due to project activities are:

- Preliminary Biodiversity Monitoring Components: Forest Cover and Condition, Plant and Wildlife Populations, Quality and Condition of Aquatic and Wetland Ecosystems, Fire.

- Comprehensive Biodiversity Monitoring Component – HCVs: Ecosystem mapping, Confirmation of Species Likely or Potentially Present, Bird Survey of Lake Sebuluh, HCV Full Assessment.

In opinion of AENOR, information about benefits on biodiversity from project activities is accurate since is based on record taken from project stakeholders and direct measurements, based on reliable sources and validated methodologies. AENOR concludes that the 'with project' scenario preserves habitat for rare, endangered and endemic species and the 'without project' scenario eliminates that same habitat.

4.6.2 High Conservation Values Protected (B1.2)

The MR states that no planned project activities negatively impacted HCVs in the project zone, and goes into detail. The primary purpose of the project has always been to protect the biodiversity-related HCVs of the project area.

Table 31 in MR below summarizes the most severe threats for HCVs 1-3 in the project zone and provides associated management recommendations and activities to alleviate these threats. This highlights the project focus on maintaining and enhancing forests and natural ecosystems to protect HCVs 1-3. A total of 54 species listed as Critically Endangered or Endangered by IUCN are likely present in the Rimba Raya Project area, 8 of which have been confirmed present in Tanjung Putting National Park during the 2017-2019 monitoring period. An additional 40 species listed as Vulnerable by IUCN are likely present in the Project area, 13 of which were confirmed in Tanjung Putting National Park within the monitoring period. Project conservation activities are directly related to conservation of the project area and have protected these species.

Threats and impacts of the project on each HCV are further detailed. In each case, the conclusion was that the project has produced net positive impacts on them.

4.6.3 Invasive Species (B1.3)

The Rimba Raya project plan includes both an enrichment component for forested areas that may have been slightly degraded due to illegal logging, and a rehabilitation component for deforested and highly degraded areas that required significant restoration work.

The species that are used for enrichment and rehabilitation are listed in Table 33. None of these species are invasive in Borneo. This conclusion was substantiated by observations of tree planting efforts during the site visit.

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

No non-native species are used by the project. The MR provides a list of species used in replanting, in table 33. This conclusion was substantiated by observations of tree planting efforts during the site visit.

4.6.5 GMO Exclusion (B1.5)

The monitoring report includes guarantee that no GMOs are used to generate GHG emission reductions or removals. AENOR believes this to be reasonable based on the project characteristics and goals.

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

To gauge off-site impacts to biodiversity that may be caused by the project, the Project Proponent has been monitoring the movements and business activities of oil palm companies that are planning to retire their licenses in the project area as a result of project activities.

The project has also documented the political economic dimensions of illegal logging activities in the project zone (e.g., where loggers originate, who is funding the illegal logging) and report the activity to appropriate authorities. Alternative job opportunities have been sought for local residents involved in the illegal logging through community development initiatives such as the forest and fire patrol system. The project has also attempted to track where illegal logging operations relocate, in an effort to monitor off-site impacts to biodiversity.

It should be noted, finally, that any potential off-site negative impacts to biodiversity have been more than offset by the project's role as a physical buffer to Tanjung Putting National Park and the protection that the project has already offered to the park's biodiversity.

In opinion of AENOR after visiting the project region, project has adequately identified all potentially negative offsite biodiversity impacts and has taken actions to mitigate them.

4.6.7 Net Biodiversity Benefits (B2.3)

The project has not had any negative impacts on biodiversity outside the project zone resulting directly from project activities. There is the possibility for activities currently active in, or slated for, the project area to be displaced into neighboring areas or other parts of Kalimantan.

At a landscape spatial scale, oil palm development and illegal logging has continued to spread into other areas regardless of project activities in the project area. This can be argued based on the current distribution of both activities in and near the project zone, existing oil palm licenses in the region, local development plans for a major crude palm oil export facility on the southern coast of the project area and ongoing expansion of both activities across Kalimantan. For oil palm, current land use planning in Kalimantan, current and predicted expansion rates for oil palm in Kalimantan, and continued market demand for this relatively inexpensive oil indicate that oil palm will continue its rapid expansion. For illegal logging, a lack of enforcement of Indonesian laws limiting unpermitted logging and timber export, and continuing global markets for cheap, illegal wood, indicate that this threat to biodiversity will likely also continue.

The project's presence may shift the spatio-temporal dynamics and/or intensity of when these activities reach other areas in the immediate vicinity, but given the full range of factors driving oil palm expansion mentioned above, the incremental impact within the project zone and adjacent areas is likely to be small.

From a biodiversity perspective, both oil palm and illegal logging are environmentally unsustainable options, to be minimized or avoided wherever possible. By creating and protecting a large area of natural habitat contiguous with TPNP, the project has helped to maintain and enhance biodiversity in a region that would otherwise be degraded or lost to these two activities.

The presence of the project and its biodiversity related project activities, such as:

- Protection: construction of 1 fire tower in Batu Hirang and 1 guard post in Tatah Ji, 2 guard posts in area of Segintung River and Natai manned 24/7 by North Unit field staff, 3 hydrant wells were installed in Tatah Ji.

- Conservation: 15,187 hectares of forest continued to be protected within the 47,237 hectare project area. Replanting of 70,000 seedlings.

- Funding of OFI activities. During this monitoring period, 6 orangutans were released into the wild.

- Co-management of Tanjung Puting National Park supporting park personnel training, capacity-building opportunities, improved equipment for monitoring and communication, and the reserve's fire brigade.

Have created benefits within the project zone that are unparalleled in comparison with the expected impacts of oil palm expansion into the area (as well as offsite areas) had the project not been present. The benefits which exist within the project zone greatly outweigh the potential impacts of unmitigated negative offsite action. Because of the project and its implemented project activities, the net effect of the project on biodiversity in and around the project zone is positive as it was demonstrated to AENOR.

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

A full biodiversity monitoring plan was developed and is in operation. An initial plan was developed and included in the project PD and the previous MR. Monitoring report results details are described in table 37 of the MR. Regarding previous monitoring periods, in this fifth period, a new biodiversity monitoring measure has been included since February 2019: 25 camera traps were installed to aid in biodiversity monitoring and species distribution analysis in the project zone.

In opinion of AENOR, the monitoring plan is effective to have a real idea of the situation. Measures scheduled and designed by the project proponent to maintain or enhance the biodiversity are correct and results confirm their effectiveness.

4.6.9 Biodiversity Monitoring Plan Dissemination (B3.3)

The full monitoring plan and results are available on the VCS/CCBA project database website. The biodiversity monitoring reports are available by anyone upon request and actively disseminated to all stakeholders on an annual basis prior to any upcoming audit. A summary of the monitoring report and the monitoring results copied for distribution on the community information board in all of the villages within the Rimba Raya operational area as well as district and sub-district seats. This was confirmed during the onsite visit in all villages, hamlets and working groups gathering points, and described in section 4.3.3 Dissemination of Monitoring Plan and Results of the MR. World Education and Rimba Raya office locations were observed to have copies of the monitoring report and other relevant project documentation to distribute to community members that make requests and made available in the local language. It is clear to AENOR that project developers have met their commitment to developing a monitoring plan and are implementing the dissemination actions agreed.

AENOR visited a representative number of places and interviewed many stakeholders affected by the project and the feedback from all of them along with evidence and records provided allows to AENOR confirms that results of biodiversity monitoring were disseminated in accordance with the validated project design.

4.7 Additional Project Implementation Information

AENOR confirms that all the information contained in the PD and MR is available for public review. Only documentation related to the financial health of the implementing organization and the project is considered commercially sensitive information. AENOR has checked the information and is able to confirm that it meets the VCS and CCB Program definition of commercially sensitive information and that it is not related to the determination of the baseline scenario, demonstration of additionality, and estimation and monitoring of GHG emission reductions and removals of the project. This information was used exclusively as evidence to support the financial viability claims of the PP related to the Non-permanence Risk Report.

4.8 Additional Project Impact Information

The project has been able to demonstrate impacts to all CCB indicators as mentioned throughout this report in addition to achieving CCB Gold Level. No further steps to verify additional monitoring were necessary. The reported project impact information was sufficient and suitable for the verification of the project's CCB impacts.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

After review of all project information, procedures, calculations, and supporting documentation and site visits, AENOR confirms that the monitoring conducted by the Project Proponent, along with the supporting Monitoring & Implementation Report, are accurate and consistent with all aforementioned VCS Version 4 and CCB Version 2 criteria, the validated PD, and the selected methodology (VM0004 v1.0). AENOR confirms that the Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project, Monitoring & Implementation Report

(Version 1.16 dated 20 April 2020) has been implemented in accordance with the validated PD including any validated changes as applicable.

AENOR confirms all verification activities, including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance, monitoring and project documentation adherence to VCS Version 4 (and all associated updates), and CCB Project Design Standards (Second Edition), as documented in this report are complete. AENOR concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that the Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project, meets the requirements of VCS Version 4 (and all associated updates) and CCB Project Design Standards (Second Edition) for the monitoring period (23-June-2017 to 30-June-2019).

The project is achieving the climate, community, and biodiversity benefits, including Gold Level Climate Change Adaptation, Exceptional Community, and Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits as described in the Monitoring & Implementation Report Version 1.16 dated 20 April 2020.

The GHG assertion provided by the project proponent and verified by AENOR has resulted in a total net GHG Emission Reductions or Removals of 7,722,728 tCO2e by the project during the monitoring/verification period (23 June, 2017 – 30 June, 2019). Considering 10% of buffer withholding based on the VCS Non-Permanence Risk Assessment Tool v4.0 (in which the Project took the minimum risk rating), which means a buffer allocation of 791,235 tCO2e, the Verified Carbon Units (VCU) to be issued are 6,890,938 tCO2e.

For this period no leakage monitoring is accounted following VM0004, as the methodology does not require the monitoring of activity displacement leakage after the first five years of the project lifetime.

For this period there is no release of buffer credits following VCS Registration and Issuance Process Document 19 September 2019, v4.0.

Verification/monitoring period: From 23-June-2017 to 30-June,-2019.

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

Project 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)
2017-2018	4,128,393	-99,385	-96,099	3,932,908
2018-2019	3,980,330	-96,972	-93,537	3,789,820
Total	8,108,723	-196,357	-189,636	7,722,728

Year	Net GHG Emission Reductions or Removals (tCO2e)	Annual Buffer Allocation (tCO2e)	Net Verified Carbon Units (tCO2e)
2017	2,029,549	207,914	1,810,977
2018	3,813,844	390,750	3,403,066
2019	1,879,336	192,572	1,676,895
Total	7,722,728	791,235	**6,890,938**

APPENDIX 1: LIST OF EVIDENCES PROVIDED

General documents
Monitoring report: - Final version: CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5_v1.16 - Rimba Raya CCB_VCS Monitoring Report 2017_2019 MP5 v1.3 - CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5_v1.9 - CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5_v1.15 Monitoring report public summary: - Final version: 201219_CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Summary_v1.5_ BAHASA - Rimba Raya CCB_VCS Monitoring Report Summary v1.2 BAHASA - Non-Permanence Risk Report: RimbaRaya_NPR_M5_V1.4 VCS-Risk-Report-Calculation-Tool-v4.0_RimbaRaya_MP5_v1.0 wgidataset_RimbaRaya_10142019
Biodiversity
Camera trap - wildlife survey: - 20190326 Wildlife (Biodiversity) Survey_Camera Traps_eng_Report No.2A - Wildlife (Biodiversity) Survey_Camera Traps_eng_Report No.2B OK - Wildlife (Biodiversity) Survey_Camera Traps_Report No.1
Mangrove replanting – reports: - Report No. 1 - November 2018_rev1 - Mangrove Replanting Report No. 2 - Mangrove Replanting Report No. 3-Implementation stage
Raw Data Rapid Assesment: - Peta rapid assessment plot - Rekap_rapid_setiap_area
Water quality test: - Pemantauan Kualitas Air di kab seruyan tahun 2018 - Laporan Hasil Uji Coba Air di Seruyan 2018 - Laporan Hasil Uji Coba Air di Seruyan 2019 - Laporan uji kualitas air Oktober 2019
Other: - Basic Information - Audit 2017 (poin5-BS)-Nandez_edited-ENG (REV2) - Compiled Biodiversity Report_2019 - Laporan Orangutan release 2017 - Laporan Rapid Assesment Training dan Refreshment Training - Laporan Survey Lokasi Release Camp Orangutan Bersama OFI
Climate
Activity Reports: - Agarwood Planting - funded by Kyoto University: 5000 Agarwood (KU) for Local Community - Report No. 3 20190109 Agarwood Planting_Eng OK Report Phase 2 - BLOCK II (Agarwood KU) July 2019-sent to DN - ANNUAL REPORT CLIMATE-FIRE TRAINING+FIREFIGHTING 2017-2019 Fire Training Certificate_Sundaji Budi Darmawan_2312'15-ok

Tambahan Pengertian Dasar atas Sistem Tingkat Bahaya Kebakaran APRIL_Ind
Gaining a Basic Understanding of APRIL Fire Danger Rating System_Eng
Procurement fire fighting equipment n field vehicle
FIRE EQUIPMENT LIST - RRC Update 2019
20191021_koordinat dan lokasi sumur Bor
20191017 CAPROS-Pengecekan Jalan Negara Utara
20191016_Laporan kegiatan dan pengendalian kebakaran di wilayah RRC _ Januari sd Agustus 2019
20190725_Laporan Refresing dan pengecekan Peralatan Kebakaran
20180925_ CAPROS_Refresing dan evaluasi fire control unit Utara
20180925_ CAPROS_Refresing dan evaluasi fire control unit Tengah
20180925_ CAPROS_Refresing dan evaluasi fire control unit Selatan
Basic Firefighter Training RRC Jan 2016
Itinerary and Budget fire training session 2 Telaga Pulang
Summary Report FFTR Training 2
221016_Laporan kegiatan dan pengendalian kebakaran di wilayah RRC _ 2017
20191015_Rekap hotspot dan patroli 2017
20181016_Laporan kegiatan dan pengendalian kebakaran di wilayah RRC _ 2018
20191015_Rekap hotspot dan patroli 2018
20191016_Laporan kegiatan dan pengendalian kebakaran di wilayah RRC _ Januari sd Agustus 2019
20191015_Rekap hotspot dan patroli Jan sd Agustus 2019
170816_Laporan orientasi lapangan pengelolaan kebakaran di Unit Utara
221016_Laporan kegiatan dan pengendalian kebakaran di wilayah RRC _ 2016
270916_Laporan sosialisasi protokol koordinasi pencegahan dan penanggulangan kebakaran
20180815_Patroli S.Buaya, Unit Tengah (patrol report)
20190725_Laporan Refreshing Protokol Fire Management dan pengecekan peralatan Kebakara
200304_ToR RRC Pembangunan Menara Pemantau Api-Batu Hirang

- Collaboration with TNTP:
20190114 Kegiatan Penanaman Gaharu di Taman Nasional Tanjung Putting
Laporan KOLABORASI TNTP RRC 2013-2018
LAPORAN PENANAMAN GAHARU BLOK II
Laporan Semester 1 RRC-Btntp 2019 –SIGNED
PERJANJIAN KERJASAMA TNTP 2018-2023 – Signed
Signed Peta

- Illegal Logging 2017 – 2019:
2019-06-18 Illegal Logging
Foto patoli illegal logging
Laporan illegal logging
2018-Laporan Pengecekan Logging di Sungai Perlu
0.Rekap Data MWS dn FDR CU-YN OK.xlsx
2018-Laporan Pengecekan Logging di Sungai Perlu.docx
20190124_Rekap MWS dan FDR Selatan.xlsx
20190925_Form 7.jpg
Analisa realisasi patroli & FDR-CLID04.xlsx
Forest Protection and Safeguards-RRC.pdf
Form 7 - Laporan patroli api dan kegiatan illegal.doc

- Replanting reports 2014 – 2019
20190406 Laporan Penanaman Unit Tengah 2019
Laporan Penanaman Unit Tengah 2016-2017
Laporan replanting ulak batu nov 2014
Mangrove Replanting Report No. 3-Implementation stage
PETA KOORDINAT REPLANTING TATAH SELAMAT 2018-2019
PETA KOORDINAT UJI COBA TATAH SELAMAT 2018-2019
Replanting Summary RR

Report_ReplantingMuaraDua__2015 (6 Jan 2016)
Carbon Accounting: - 20191116 North Road Impact v1.1 - Peat Drainage Impact Report_v1.1 - Rimba Raya_2017_2019_v1.4 - SouthernCanal_DrainageAnalysis_v1.0
Geospatial: - Canal Monitoring Kudung Canal: SouthernCanal_PlotLocations, CAA_PeatAOI_UTM49S_20191216_v1 Ulak Batu-Baung Road: NorthernRoad_CAA_AOI_20191218, Road_Plots_20191203b - LULC Classification: LULC_and_Transitions_MP4 LULC_Data_CAA20191216 LULC_Data_20191216 Compiled_Points_Classified Accuracy Assessment_2010-2019_final_v1.0 - ProjectBoundaries ProjectManagementZone
QA/QC Plan_v 1.3
Community
- Floating Clinic Floating Clinic Report No. 1 20190517 Laporan Mei 2019_COMDEV 20190523 PUSKESMAS Lap. Pelayanan KLINIK TERAPUNG 20190803 LAPORAN UJICOBA KLINIK TERAPUNG CAPROS try Out KLINIK TERAPUNG lapiran foto CAPROS try Out KLINIK TERAPUNG - MONEV SOLAR LANTERN 2019 20190930 Data INPUT & ANALISA Quick Survey SL SEPTEMBER 2019 20191021 MONEV Solar Lanter September 2019 - MONEV WATER FILTER 2019 20190930 Data INPUT & ANALISA Quick Survey WF SEPTEMBER 2019 20191021 MONEV manfaat WF SEPTEMBER 2019 - NZ Aid - Solar electrification in Ulba 20190802. Laporan Monev Solar Sel by Fauzan 20190805 CAPROS_MONEV LTS Ulak Batu by Herlinda 20190805 Lap. Hasil MONEV Jaringan Listrik Tenaga Surya Ulak Batu Installation and Implementation Stage - Oct 2018 Report Electrification Project in Ulak Batu Stage 1 - Aug 2018 - Reading glasses program 20180312_laporan bulan Maret 2018_COMDEV (incl kacamata baca) 20190308 CAPROS_Pembagian kacamata Baca-PALINGKAU - Scholarship reports Report tahap 1 - July 2018-rev eng

Report tahap 2 - January 2019-eng
Scholarship Report August 2019 english-Report Phase 3
20190807 Report tahap 3 Beasiswa Pendidikan Putra Putri Seruyan - Agustus 2019

- Seruyan River Cleaning Program
20190327 LAPORAN tahap II Seruyan River Cleaning_ENG-OK
Progress Report River Cleaning Movement-Phase 1-REV OK

- Updated initiatives
20191003 Chicken projects 2017- OKTOBER 2019
20191006 Zuper update OKTOBER 2019
20191014 LAP kegiatan Ikan Kering Karya Bersama Tampudau
20191014 Lap. Pendampingan HARAPAN BERKEMBANG
Laporan kegiatan Budidaya Ikan Patin
Proposal Perikanan Mentari - Palingkau

- Village Library Muara Dua n Ulak Batu
20191023 Lap PERPUSTAKAAN HARATI September 2019
20191024 Koleksi buku perpustakaan HARATI BERSAMA
20191023 Data Infentarisasi Buku PERPUSTAKAAN ULBA September 2019
20191023 Data Pengunjung PERPUSTAKAAN ULBA September 2019
20191023 Lap PERPUSTAKAAN REKREASI ULBA September 2019

- Village Water Purifying System-pilot project
Hasil uji Laboratorium Kualitas Air
20191004 Rencana Anggar Air Bersih_Desa Baung
20191113 Sistem Pengelolaan INSTALASI AIR LAYAK MINUM_Desa Baung

- Training:
TOR mini Lokakarya Pengembangan Mulok Pendidikan Lingkungan Hidup-ADIWIYATA
Kerangka acuan pengembangan kegiatan program pembibitan tanaman hutan dan sayuran melalui mata pelajaran muatan lokal
PETLAP SL Pembibitan Tanaman Hutan_Des 2014
PETLAP Sosialisasi di SD-SMP-SMA_ok
160317_Modul Pembuatan Sumur Bor v2
Report – Phase 1 Education Scholarship for Seruyan Children
Report – Phase 2 Education Scholarship for Seruyan Children

- Village agreements:
Kesepakatan Desa Baung
Kesepakatan Desa Muara Dua
Kesepakatan kerjasama masyarakat desa palingkau dengan rimba raya conservation

- Others:
20191016 Perkembangan PEMETAAN PARTISIPATF September 2019
Capacity Building for comdev Staff 2016
Rimba Raya Endline _QUICK SURVEY _Edy September 2017
20180613_Laporan Bulanan Kegiatan Koordinator Community Development
CL ID 01 Template Summary 1.2 Standardized Benefit Metrics

Project Ownership

- Decree & Maps:
Map-peta sk 735-reduced
Perjanjian Kerja Sama APL 95 ha 2018-2023
Working Area Map
APL Agreement and Map

Map-peta sk 735-reduced National Park MOU Map. New Agreement TNTP-RRC (010713) (2) peta lbr 1 SK 23 thn 2018 - Rimba Raya Conservation SK 735 Final Decree Addendum SK Definitif PT. RRC 2018 SK Menhut No 146.2013 - Total Area: CAABoundaries Final Working Area Map Support Letter PETA REVISI KEGIATAN RE PT RRC RimbaRaya_PMZandCCA
Rimba Raya Policies and SOPs
Conflict resolution procedure - update 2019 Grant and support policy of Rimba Raya Conservation (BILINGUAL) Kebijakan Anti Penyuapan dan Korupsi – Rimba Raya Conservation (BILINGUAL) Kebijakan Kontrol Akutansi Internal – Rimba Raya Conservation (BILINGUAL).docx Kebijakan Pemberian Hadiah, Uang Perjalanan, dan Hiburan – Rimba Raya Conservation (BILINGUAL).docx Kebijakan PengadaanPembelian Barang – Rimba Raya Conservation (BILINGUAL).docx Kebijakan Perihal Konflik Kepentingan – Rimba Raya Conservation (BILINGUAL).docx Pedoman Perilaku Bisnis Rimba Raya Conservation (BILINGUAL).docx Peluang kerja Rimba Raya Conservation (BILINGUAL).docx PEMBERITAHUAN larangan gratifikasi.docx PROSED~1.DOC RR_SOP_OSHE_Worker Safety_Eng_2010-07-20 (translated).pdf SOP - Handling Conflicts and Grievances .docx SOP Rimba Raya Bilingual 2017-Field Ops_v1.2.docx SOP Worker Health and Safety v1.1.pdf
Theory of Change
Theory of Change Monitoring - Climate Community & Biodiversity v1.4.xlsx Theory of Change Summary - Climate, Community & Biodiversity v1.3.xlsx TOC Activity Matrix v1.10 - Chicken Farm.pdf TOC Activity Matrix v1.10 - Water Filter.pdf TOC Activity Matrix v1.17.xlsm
Contracts with other entities
Kontrak WEI Jan-Des 2017 Signed agreeement RRC WEI 2019 – 2020 Perjanjian Kerjasama PT RRC dengan APCS Juli-Desember 2015
Other:
- Status of Project submission in the National Registry System: Official Invitation in FGD Workshop Registration in the platform
- Finantial: Rimba_Raya_Budget_and_Cashflow_2017_2019 v1.1 Rimbya Raya NPV Analysisv1.0

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Name	Position/Role/ Occupation
Todd Lemons	Infinite Earth Chairman and CEO
Jim Procanik	Infinite Earth Managing Director
Marco Bustamante:	Infinite Earth Director of Project Operations
Sylviana Andhella:	Executive Director (PT. Rimba Raya Conservation)
Febrasius Masal	General Manager (PT. Rimba Raya Conservation)
Anthon Kesaulya	Community Development Manager (PT. Rimba Raya Conservation)
Fernandez Ngariswara	Biodiversity Manager (PT. Rimba Raya Conservation)
Arman Nur Ikhsan	GIS Specialist (PT. Rimba Raya Conservation)
Various	OFI Care Centre & Quarantine Staff
Helmi	Head of Tanjung Puting National Park
Franciscus X	Rimba Raya Reserve North Unit Manager
Various	Rimba Raya Reserve North Unit Staff
Erdiansyah	Ulak Batu Town Chief
Various	Ulak Batu Governmental staff
Various	Muara Dua village library staff
Various	Muara Dua school students
Various	Muara Dua water purifying system beneficiaries
Maskanah	Jahitan chicken farm owner and member of women group
Mohamed Ahyar	Jahitan village head
Various	Jahitan water purifying system operators
Various	Telaga Pulang High School scholarship recipients
Various	Baung Seberang water purifying system operators
Various	Baung Seberang solar lanterns beneficiaries
Hartono	Rimba Raya Reserve Central Unit Manager
Various	Rimba Raya Reserve Central Unit Staff
Ili Rahmah	Belanti hamlet villager/ User of floating clinic
Arbayah	Belanti hamlet villager/ User of floating clinic
Ermawati	Floating clinic nurse
Miranda Styawulandari	Floating clinic nurse
Ertee	Tampadau Village Head
Various	Tampadau solar power electrification and solar home system beneficiaries
Various	Terasi Zuper shrimp paste working group

Name	Position/Role/ Occupation
Henry Soeyatno	Rimba Raya Reserve South Unit Manager
Various	Rimba Raya Reserve South Unit Staff

APPENDIX 3: CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS AND CLARIFICATION

VCS CORRECTIVE ACTIONS REQUESTS (CARS)

VCS CAR ID	**01**	**Date:** 21/02/2020
Description of CAR		
GHG Accounting/Crediting Period in page 1 is no properly indicated.		
Project participant response		**Date:** D13/03/2020
The crediting period stated on the cover page of the Monitoring report has been updated to reflect the appropriate crediting period length, which is also stated in section 2.1.6.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 27/03/2020
The PP has made the appropriate correction. CAR closed.		

VCS CAR ID	**02**	**Date:** 21/02/2020
Description of CAR		
In MR, section 3.1.2, in several cases boxes are not complete or properly completed. Also, some data/parameters are duplicated in section 3.1.1.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 13/03/2020
The tables in sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 were updated to contain all necessary information. Duplicate parameter tables were removed from section 3.1.2 when they were determined to be unnecessary.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 27/03/2020
The PP has made the appropriate corrections. CAR closed.		

VCS CAR ID	**03**	**Date:** 21/02/2020
Description of CAR		
In section 3.1.1: - Value of “Depth of peat burned under the baseline scenario in stratum i at time t” (34 cm) does not match with the value stated in the PD deviation. - Value of “Bulk density of peat in stratum I” stated (0.1505) does not match the value stated in the PD.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 27/03/2020
ecoPartners confirmed the inclusion of an outdated value for the depth of peat burn parameter in section 3.1.1 of the Monitoring Report. The parameter has been updated to reflect the correct values of 0.18 m, 0.11 m, and 0.043 m for the first, second, and third fires respectively. The difference in values reported for the bulk density of peat between the Monitoring Report and PD were determined to originate due to field data that was collected during the second monitoring period (see "InfiniteEarth_MonitoringReportM2-Final.docx") to update the bulk density value with project specific data. This new value was never recorded as a project description deviation in the second monitoring period report, hence the discrepancy, but has been added as a project description deviation in Section 2.2.4.2 of the current monitoring report to address this finding.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5 InfiniteEarth_MonitoringReportM2-Final.docx		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 27/03/2020
The PP has made the appropriate corrections. CAR closed.		

VCS CLARIFICATION REQUESTS (CLS)

VCS CL ID	**01**	**Date:** 21/02/2020
Description of CL		
In the MR, it does not appear a breakdown of the land use areas that help to understand the relation amongst forest cover types and peat. For example, in the report is mentioned 15,091 hectares of peat swamp forest or 47,237 ha of non-forest land positively impacted, with no clear consistency along the report.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 13/03/2020
It was recognized that there were inconsistencies throughout the report as to the stated values of forest, non-forest and peat areas. A table has been added to the MR to clearly demonstrate the hectares for each land cover type in Section 3.2.2.3 and corrections have been made throughout the MR to reflect the total forest and non-forest areas protected through the project.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 27/03/2020
The PP has provided the requested information and modified the MR in accordance. CL closed.		

VCS CL ID	**02**	**Date:** 21/02/2020
Description of CL		
According to 2.2.2 Methodology Deviations (page 42), “The second deviation was the use of community engagement and field monitoring instead of aerial imagery to detect logging gaps due to the high degree of difficulty in obtaining annual high resolution imagery and then actually observing the location of logging gaps.” However, for the carbon accounting, no evidences of the logging gaps (and the final figure) in the monitored period have been provided.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 13/03/2020
Logging gaps were monitored through field monitoring and documentation was provided in the initial submission to AENOR. The logging gaps observed during this monitoring period are detailed in section 3.2.2.1 of the monitoring report. The files documenting the logging gaps detected are titled "2018-Laporan Pengecekan Logging di Sungai Perlu" and "Laporan illegal logging" indicating 6 gaps found in 2018 and and 2 gaps found in 2019, for a total of 8 logging gaps in this monitoring period. In the accounting model, these documented logging gaps were accounted for in the "Timber Extraction" tab.		
Documentation provided by project participant		

Laporan illegal logging.doc 2018-Laporan Pengecekan Logging di Sungai Perlu.doc Rimba Raya_2017_2019_v1.4.xlsx CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5	
DOE assessment	**Date:** 27/03/2020
The PP has provided the requested information and updated the MR in order to clarify the interpretation of the information. CL closed.	

VCS CL ID	**03**	**Date:** 21/02/2020
Description of CL		
Status of Project submission in the National Registry System http://ditjenppi.menlhk.go.id/srn/index.php?r=site%2Findex&sektor=forestry		
Project participant response		**Date:** 13/03/2020
In 2018, Directorate General Of Climate Change of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) invited all parties to participate in the FGD on the Workshop of SRN (National Registry System) implementation Acceleration (see Official Invitation in FGD Workshop.pdf dated 9 July 2018) and encouraged the REDD+ actors to register their activities (mitigation and adaptation). More than 150 businesses were invited and approximately 90 of them registered their activities in the SRN platform including PT. Rimba Raya Conservation (Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project). The SRN Register Number is 005-VII-2018-1070 (see Registration in the platform.docx).		
Documentation provided by project participant		
Official Invitation in FGD Workshop.pdf Registration in the platform.docx		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 27/03/2020
It is possible to find the project in the Penanggung jawab (Responsible parties) website section, but not in the list of projects or the map, were the type of activities and emissions reduction are indicated. Please, review this situation. The legal compliance with this requirement is not described in MR. CL still open.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 04/10/2020
"The National Registry System (SRN) is managed by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) through the Director General of Climate Change (DGCC). This platform reports climate change mitigation and adaptation activities in the national context with no-legal binding commitments and unclear timeline for effective subscription for organizations leading REDD+ activities. This could explain that the registration of REDD+ activities has not been fully completed in the platform, especially in the private		

sector. Nevertheless; the auditor findings have recently made Rimba Raya to review the further steps with the SRN in order to be displayed in the website's project list and map and found the following: There are three main steps that project proponents developing mitigation and adaptation activities must follow, namely registration, validation, and verification. Up-to-date, Rimba Raya has completed the first stage by submitting a variety of information to the DGCC (register Number is 005-VII-2018-1070); however, there are additional technical documents to be submitted and validated in order to receive a validation number by the SRN Secretariat Team. Finally, verified activities are registered activities that have been examined to whether or not they have achieved the reported emission reductions and/or removal. The completeness of this phase provides a verification number."
Documentation provided by project participant
Not applicable.

DOE assessment	**Date:** 17/04/2020
Please, include this information in section 2.5.1 of the MR as to report the compliance of Rimba Raya Reserve Project with the National Registry System. CL still open.	
Project participant response	**Date:** 20/04/2020
The information described above in prior findings responses has been included in section 2.5.1 of the updated monitoring report to support the compliance of the project with the National Registry System.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
Please see updated monitoring report.	
DOE assessment	**Date:** 30/04/2020
The PP has modified the MR in accordance. CL closed.	

CCB CORRECTIVE ACTIONS REQUESTS (CARS)

CCB CAR ID	**01**	**Date:** 21/02/2020
Description of CAR		
Impacts not properly reported in MR: 1. In several sections (page 30, 39, 158, 164, etc.) it is mentioned that the libraries are not currently working; but according to site visit, all of them were working. 2. In several sections (33, 58) it is mentioned that fire towers are already built; but according to site visit, none had been finished in the monitoring period. 3. No mention to 24 scholarships in 1.1 Unique Project Benefits and other parts of the report. 4. No mention to 67 reading glasses distributed during 2019 in 1.1. Unique Project Benefits. 5. Mention to two new mangrove nurseries (pages 38, 58) in Pantai Seribu Cemara (Sungai Bakau village) and Sei Patin (Sungai Undang village); not reported in other proper sections of the report. The only ones reported were nurseries of Muara Dua y Ulak Batu, from previous periods.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 13/03/2020
In 2017 RR has started to develop 2 village libraries, one in Ulak Batu “Kreasi UlBa” and Muara Dua “Harati Bersama”. Since then, they have never stopped running This correction has been made on pages 30, 39, 158, and 164 to clarify that the libraries are currently in operation. Rimba Raya has 2 fire towers under construction to be shortly finished, one located in Natai Ulak Batu – in the collaboration area with Tanjung Puting national park. And the other one is in Batu Hirang, Tatah Ji Muara Dua. On pages 33 and 58, as well as in corresponding tables, this information has been corrected to clarify that the fire towers are currently under construction. As an initial effort to support government programs in education, Rimba Raya provides 24 scholarship packages for 24 students coming from 7 villages for academic year 2018/2019 – 2020/2021 to enter Senior High School and Vocational school in Kuala Pembuang: SMAN 1 Kuala Pembuang and SMKN 1 Seruyan located in Kuala Pembuang and SMAN 2 Danau Sembuluh located in Telaga Pulang. The Unique Project Benefits table in section 1.1 has been updated to include scholarship information, as well as reading glasses program information. Mangrove nurseries information has been updated throughout the report to include reference to the two new instances, specifically in table 20 in section 3.3.1. Other sections where plant nurseries in Ulak Batu and Muara Dua are mentioned also include separate references to the two new mangrove nurseries established in Pantai Seribu Cemara (Sungai Bakau village) and Sei Patin (Sungai Undang village), and the mangrove nurseries are also mentioned in section 5.3.2 of the monitoring report.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
Summary of each initiative.docx Reports of Village Library in Muara Dua and Ulak Batu Scholarship Program-Report Phase 3- August 2019 ENG OK.pdf Mangrove Planting reports (Mangrove Replanting Program in Sungai Tatah Ecotourism Area, Seruyan Regency, Mangrove Replanting Report No. 2, Mangrove Replanting Report No. 3-Implementation stage-English CR)		

DOE assessment	**Date:** 27/03/2020
1. The PP has made the appropriate corrections. 2. The PP has made the appropriate corrections. 3. The PP has made the appropriate corrections. 4. In section 1.1 and 4.1.3 it is stated that 67 pair of reading glasses were distributed during this monitoring period. However, in section 1.2 it is stated that 61 people benefited from reading glasses in this monitoring period. Please, clarify. 5. The PP has made the appropriate corrections. CAR still open.	
Project participant response	**Date:** 04/10/2020
During the monitoring period, 61 people benefited from the distribution of reading glasses. The monitoring report has been updated to reflect the correct amount.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5	
DOE assessment	**Date:** 17/04/2020
The PP has meade the appropriate correction. CAR closed.	

CCB CAR ID	**02**	**Date:** 21/02/2020
Description of CAR		
Monitoring system (mentioned in tables 6, 7, 25, 33 of MR) is not adapted to current information gathered in the Project. For example, Rapid Assessment and camera traps are not included, even when they are the current means for biodiversity monitoring. Thus: 1) adapt monitoring system to current monitoring activities (forest, land use change, communities and biodiversity), 2) If changes, report changes as a PD deviation.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 13/03/2020
Tables 6, 7, 25, and 33 have been updated in the monitoring report to reflect current information. No PD deviations were determined to be necessary, as no monitoring activities had been discontinued or changed substantially since the drafting of the PD.		

Documentation provided by project participant	
CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5	
DOE assessment	**Date:** 27/03/2020
- Table 6 and 7 were properly modified: non currently applicable elements were takeout and monitoring element frequency in this period was indicated. This is closed. - Table 25 (Table 26 in current MR): there are no changes, what may be appropriate. However, the activities of the monitoring component cannot be found as indicators/results yet in the evidences (documents) provided (including TOC document). E.g.: if the indicator “Number of households that have upgraded from leaf to aluminium roofs” is included, where has been this information monitored? - Table 33 (Table 34 in current MR): there are no changes; however, the comments in “Rimba Raya Project CCB_VCS Monitoring Report 2017_2019 MP5 v1.3_RR comments” document are not aligned with the current table: In case there are deviations amongst the detection frequency and the real frequency during the verified period, it should be indicated in the table. E.g. Bird Survey of Lake Sebuluh, HCV Full Assessment or Orangutan Survey were not done in this period, while the indicated frequency of reporting is bi-annually. CAR still open.	
Project participant response	**Date:** 04/10/2020
Section 4.3.1 was updated with an additional table to reflect the outputs monitored for community during this monitoring period. Table 26 was reflective of the surveys done every 3-5 years by the project to assess the community baseline and community needs. This survey was last conducted during the previous monitoring period, in 2016/2017 and was not done during this monitoring period. Text was added to this section to clarify the intent of these variables and their frequency of monitoring. Table 34 was updated to reflect the monitoring that actually occurred during this monitoring period based on input from the Rimba Raya team, and as requested by the audit team.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5	
DOE assessment	**Date:** 17/04/2020
The PP has meade the appropriate correction. CAR closed.	

CCB CAR ID	**03**	**Date:** 21/02/2020
Description of CAR		
In MR, 2.1.10 Sustainable Development table, activities are not aligned with the impacts already assessed within SDVista PD and MR. E.g.: while in VCS/CCB MR, SDG 7 related to Energy is not included in table 2.1.10, it is considered in SDVista documents. Or, while in several SDG of table 2.1.10 a “sustainable fishery working group” is mentioned, this does not appear in any other part of the report as an impact/result. Or no mention to scholarships en SDG for Education in 2.1.10 Sustainable Development table.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 13/03/2020
In section 2.1.10 in the sustainable development table, mentions to the fisheries working group have been removed, as the program has been discontinued. Scholarships for students have also been included in the table, to align with the Sustainable Development Goals listed elsewhere in the report. Energy achievemnts, however, were achieved in previous monitoring periods, and thus they have been included in SD VISta documentation but not documentation for this current monitoring period, 2017-2019.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 27/03/2020
The PP has made the adequate corrections. CAR closed.		

CCB CAR ID	**04**	**Date:** 27/03/2020
Description of CAR		
The summary of the MR (Rimba Raya CCB_VCS Monitoring Report Summary v1.2 BAHASA) is not updated according to the modifications to the last version of the MR (CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5_v1.9).		
Project participant response		**Date:** 04/10/2020
The MR summary document has been updated to include all modifications made in the latest verison of the MR. Please see most recent version of the MR summary document.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
201219_CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_Summary_v1.5_ BAHASA		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 17/04/2020

The PP has made the appropriate corrections. CAR closed.

CCB CLARIFICATION REQUESTS (CLS)

CCB CL ID	**01**	**Date:** 21/02/2020
Description of CL		
It is not clear, along the MR, some results of the table 1.2 Standardized Benefit Metrics: - It has not been provided records of the impact; and what are the sources of this information. For example, in case of education, when reporting X people, it is not clear what activities were considered for reporting (scholarships, workshops, libraries) and the records were that figures are supported (e.g. attendance list). - In the same regard, it is not clear the system were the accountability of the impact is registered, considering Project lifetime and monitoring period, to avoid double accountability amongst periods; particularly in case of Training, Employment, Livelihoods, Health, Education, Water, Well-being. Additionally, some figures in the table 1.2 Standardized Benefit Metrics require revision: - Health: there are more women than the total figure. - Education: check the low rate of women. - Water: if the total amount of people benefited is the same as for the period, review the case of women. - "Number of hectares of non-forest land in which improved land management has occurred as a result of the project's activities, measured against the without-project scenario" stated is 47.237 ha. This is total number of CAA, not non-forested land. - Biodiversity/species: number of Critically Endangered or Endangered species does not match the reported in the table of page 2 (Exceptional Biodiversity Adaptation Benefits); 5.1.2 High Conservation Value Protection (page. 197) or 5.3.3 Optional Criterion: Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits (page 220).		
Project participant response		**Date:** 27/03/2020
Table 1.2 for the Standardized Benefits Metrics has been updated to address the provided finding. Specifically, each metric now includes the number of records for each project activity, i.e. the number of people that were benefitted by each project activity. The number of participants in each project activity are recorded periodically or at the time of an event and stored digitally. These documents may be made available upon request. Records concerning the number of community members benefitted during this monitoring period versus throughout the lifetime of the project have been checked and updated to reflect the most accurate results, particularly in the metrics identified in the finding as Training, Employment, Livelihoods, Health, Education, Water, and Well-being. Additionally, the particular figures identified in the finding have been addressed. Specifically, the number of women included in the Health metric has been appropriately updated. The number of women included in the Education metric has been checked and updated accordingly. The total number of people affected as well as the number of women affected through improvements in water quality and access to water quality has been updated to reflect the most recent and accurate results. The number of hectares of non-forest land in which improved land management that has occurred as a result of the project has been updated to reflect the proper area, at 32,049 hectares. And finally, the number of Critically Endangered and Endangered species has been updated to reflect the most accurate and recent results for this monitoring period and for the project lifetime. They are now in accordance with the numbers provided in other areas of the report, as well.		

Documentation provided by project participant	
CL ID 01 Template Summary Calculation for MR 2017 CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5	
DOE assessment	**Date:** 27/03/2020
Clarifications requested have been provided correctly. CL closed.	

CCB CL ID	**02**	**Date:** 21/02/2020
Description of CL		
Misunderstandings in MR: - In several parts of the report the term “micro-credit” is used as “small loans”. However, bearing the meaning of the concept, it does not match with the practice (grant, fund). - When reporting the floating clinic as an impact is several parts of the report, is not clear the specific contribution of the Project, considering that according to site visit, at least the nurses and doctor are contracted by Government.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 13/03/2020
To clarify, the micro credits provided by Rimba Raya have the following structure: Rimba Raya shall provide the start-up capital The start-up capital is designed to purchase and procure the required materials The start-up capital is expected to be returned to: a) Enlarge the working group in terms of production and/or membership b) The members might split of and develop another group Terms and Condition in providing the start-up capital or funding for the initiative projects: The start-up capital (most of the time) is provided to the group not in cash form, yet in a complete required materials. The start-up capital shall not be returned to Rimba Raya in terms of money. The work group has agreed to split the net profit under the following distribution: 70% for the members and 30% for returning the capitals. In regards to the floating clinic, RR covers the 100 percent of its operation, including the daily allowances of the nurses to accompany the medical activity in the 7 villages and 2 hamlets. While the Governmental Healthcare System supports RRs in appointing the nurses to accompany the operation and pays their base salaries, the government does not cover the additional costs for nurses to visit the project zone or the operational costs of the floating clinic. Nursing staff is not sent to the project zone by the government, rather, RR sees to it that a team of nurses can staff the floating clinic and pays all of their operational expenses to do so. Additionally, RR fully supplies medicines to the villagers based on their respective prescription. This provision encompasses the most costly component for a successful operation.		

Likewise, the impact is visible by identifying diseases that were unknown by patients such as malaria, gastritis, among others. Without RR taking the initiative to staff and operate the floating clinic as well as pay for the clinic's operational costs, these medical services would not be available to the community.
Documentation provided by project participant
Summary Floating Clinic Trial Spreadhseet Summary Floating Clinic Highlights Chicken Project Report (https://app.box.com/file/626974039698) Kebu Terasi Zuper

DOE assessment	**Date:** 27/03/2020
The PP has provided the requested information, however this clarifications are not included yet in MR. CL still open.	
Project participant response	**Date:** 04/10/2020
Section 2.2.1 of the MR has been supplemented with information regarding the micro-crediting program and the floating clinic.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
Summary Floating Clinic Trial Spreadhseet Summary Floating Clinic Highlights Chicken Project Report (https://app.box.com/file/626974039698) Kebu Terasi Zuper	
DOE assessment	**Date:** 17/04/2020
The PP has provided the requested information. CL closed.	

CCB CL ID	**03**	**Date:** 21/02/2020
Description of CL		
In page 5 (MR), 1 Summary of project benefits, it is stated "The project monitors and reports on the Project CAA, a 3km buffer zone surrounding the Project CAA (collectively known as the Total Project Management Zone), and an extensive leakage belt". According to the redaction, it seems like Total Project Management Zone is the Project CAA plus 3km buffer zone, what would not be correct.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 13/03/2020
The project no longer monitors the leakage belt, but does conduct monitoring and project activities within the CAA as well as the 3km buffer zone. The language in section 1 has been updated to state: "The project monitors for encroachment and land-use change within the CAA as well within a 3-km buffer zone bordering the CAA in order to ensure that any drainage activities that may impact the CAA are accounted for."		

Documentation provided by project participant	
CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5	
DOE assessment	**Date:** 27/03/2020
The PP has provided the requested clarification and made the adequate corrections. CL closed.	

CCB CL ID	**04**	**Date:** 21/02/2020
Description of CL		
In the MR is mentioned “Likewise, routine patrol is carried out twice monthly to monitor for logging outside of what is permitted by the project. Maps of areas that are vulnerable to logging have been created. Any instances of illegal logging have been documented throughout this monitoring period” (page 6), “Routine monitoring patrols at guard posts, major waterways and project access points are monitored as part of forest protection activities throughout the project management zone. Patrol activities were compiled in quarterly reports” (page 105); none of this records have been presented.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 13/03/2020
The forest patrol is composed of fire and illegal activities patrol. This is stated in the SOP Forest Protection and Safeguards. (Attached is the SOP). RR Field Staff use form 7 to record their activities. In regards to page 105: Patrol activities were summarized and analysed in a quarterly manner for organizational purposes but reported in monthly documents. Attached spreadsheet is the evidence of the collection of information on the ground for forest patrol and patrol based on FDR (from mini-weather station).		
Documentation provided by project participant		
SOP of Forest Protection and Safeguards. Form 7. Forest Patrol and Patrol based on FDR recapitulation per year in excel sheet and Patrol graphic chart. Illegal logging reports from year 2018 and brief report for year 2019 (filled up form 7, map and picture).		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 27/03/2020
The PP has provided the requested information and made the adequate corrections. CL closed.		

CCB CL ID	**05**	**Date:** 21/02/2020
Description of CL		
In MR, 2.1.4 Other Entities Involved in the Project, it is requested clarification for: - The current relation with World Education. According to the visit, Edy Hartono is already working directly a part of Rimba Raya. - The current relation with EAS. - PT Pandu Maha Wana Asia Pacific Consulting Solutions is no longer working with the Project since 2015, according to page 57.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 13/03/2020
RRBR has been engaged with World Education since the project began; however, since 2015 we had a contract with Widya Erti Indonesia (WEI – Indonesia Word Education) which is based in Indonesia and performs as the local entity from WE. Since 2018 RR has compacted their service for specific advice and inputs (especially for social economy and community development) as nearly all of the field work is done by RR field staffs directly. Here some additional inputs: 1. It is correct that the former WE staffs are employed by Rimba Raya. For instance, the Community Development Manager Bung Anthon and the Central Unit Manager Pak Hartono proves the legacy of learning. However; it is a false statement that Mas Edy Hartono has worked directly for RR at any stage of the project. 2. RR is in constant communication with WEI and the last meeting was held on September 2019 with Mas Khrisna and Pak Toyo. A field visit was planned to gather further information of potential initiatives. The overload of activities on both sides keep postponing this field trip, but the synergetic work expects to be completed on 2020. 3. Currently, the focal points for communication with WEI are Mas Edy Hartono and Mas Khrisna. Regarding the current relation with EAS, before the audit in 2017, there was a partnership with EAS. This contract was directly with IE. The focal point was Dr. Carly Green. It is correct that PT Pandu Maha Wana Asia Pacific Consulting Solutions is no longer working with the Project. Since 2016, RR has leading the entire operations in the area.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
Agreement between Rimba Raya and Widya Erti Indonesia for 2017 – 2020.		
DOE assessment		**Date:** 27/03/2020
In case of clarification regarding World Education, the additional comments provided are accepted. In case of PT Pandu Maha Wana Asia Pacific Consulting Solutions, 2.1.4 Other Entities Involved in the Project section should be updated in consequence, and indicate it as a PD deviation. If EAS has not directly collaborated in this monitoring period, it should be also indicate in 2.1.4. CL still open.		
Project participant response		**Date:** 04/10/2020

Both PT Pandu Maha Wana Asia Pacific Consulting Solutions and Environmental Accounting Services have been removed from listing under Section 2.1.4 of the MR. These entities are no longer involved with the project. Appropriate PD deviations covering the removal of these entities can be found in Section 2.2.4.1 of the MR.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
CCB_VCS_Monitoring_Report_2017_2019_MP5	
DOE assessment	**Date:** 17/04/2020
Althought this information has been updated in Section 2.2.4.1 of the MR, several non-proceeding mentions to PT Pandu Maha Wana Asia Pacific Consulting Solutions (or by its acronym APCS) are done in the MR. It also happens in one case for Environmental Accounting Services. CL still open	
Project participant response	**Date:** 20/04/2020
Mentions to PT Pandu Maha Wana Asia Pacific Consulting Solutions and its acronym APCS (with the exception of its mention in the PD deviations) have been removed from the report. Mentions to Environmental Accounting Services (with the exception of its mention in the PD deviations) have also been removed from the monitoring report.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
Please see updated monitoring report.	
DOE assessment	**Date:** 30/04/2020
The PP has modified the MR in accordance. CL closed.	