

**Ibi Batéké degraded savannah
afforestation project for fuelwood
production (Democratic Republic of
Congo)**

Novacel sprl

Validation Report

01 December 2010

Subject: Validation of a CDM Project	Accredited DOE : Ernst & Young et Associés (France)
Project Participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOVACEL sprl • ORBEO 	Project Site(s): The project is located at the Ibi estate, Mbankana village, Municipality of Maluku, Province of Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of Congo.
Project Title: Ibi Batéké degraded savannah afforestation project for fuelwood production (Democratic Republic of Congo)	
Applied Methodology / Version: AR-ACM0001 version 03	Scope: 14
First PDD Version: Date of issuance: August 1 st , 2009 Version No.: PCI-B#1 Starting Date of GSP: November 7 th , 2009	Final PDD version: Date of issuance: December 1 st , 2010 Version No.: PCI-B#1.1
Estimated Annual Emission Reduction: 54 511 tCO ₂ e	
Assessment Team Leader: Ghislain Jalaly Auditor : Thomas Roulleau Expert : Raphael Manley	Technical Reviewer : Philippe Aubain
Summary of the Validation Opinion: The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided Ernst & Young with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of all stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM. Hence Ernst & Young is recommending the project for registration by the CDM Executive Board.	

Glossary

AR	Afforestation and Reforestation Project Activities
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CL	Clarification Request
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EB	Executive Board
EIA / EA	Environmental Impact Assessment / Environmental Assessment
ER	Emission reduction
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
GPG LULUCF	Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry.
IRL	Information Reference List
MP	Monitoring Plan
PDD	Project Design Document
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVM	Validation and Verification Manual

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	6
1. Objective.....	6
2. Scope	6
2. METHODOLOGY	7
1. Appointment of the Assessment Team	9
2. Review of Documents.....	10
3. Follow-up Interviews.....	10
4. Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests	10
5. Internal Quality Control.....	11
3. SUMMARY.....	12
1. Approval	12
2. Participation.....	12
3. Project design document.....	12
4. Project description	13
5. Baseline and monitoring methodology	13
6. Additionality	17
7. Monitoring plan	18
8. Sustainable development	19
9. Local stakeholder consultation	19
10. Environmental and socio-economic impacts	19
4. COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOs	20
5. VALIDATION OPINION.....	21
6. Annex 1: Validation Protocol.....	22
7. Annex 2: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests	66

8. Annex 3: Information Reference List (IRL) 87

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

1. INTRODUCTION

1. Objective

The validation objective is an independent assessment by a Third Party (Designated Operational Entity = DOE) of a proposed project activity against all defined criteria set forth by the registration under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). Validation is part of the CDM project cycle and results in a conclusion by the executing DOE whether a project activity is valid and should be submitted for registration to the CDM Executive Board (CDM-EB). The ultimate decision on the registration of a proposed project activity rests with the CDM-EB and the Parties involved.

The project activity covered by this validation report has been submitted under the project title “Ibi Batéké degraded savannah afforestation project for fuelwood production” (Democratic Republic of Congo).

2. Scope

The scope of any assessment is defined by the underlying legislation, regulation and guidance given by relevant entities or authorities. In the case of CDM project activities the scope is set by:

- The Kyoto Protocol, in particular § 12 and modalities and procedures for the CDM
- Decision 2/CMP1 and Decision 3/CMP.1 (Marrakech Accords)
- Further COP/MOP decisions with reference to the CDM (e.g. decisions 4-8/CMP.1)
- Decisions and specific guidance by the EB published under <http://cdm.unfccc.int>
- Validation and Verification Manual (VVM)
- Guidelines for Completing the Project Design Document (CDM-PDD), and the Proposed
- New Baseline and Monitoring Methodology (CDM-NM)
- Baselines and monitoring methodologies (including GHG inventories)
- Management systems and auditing methods
- Environmental issues relevant to the sectoral scope applied for
- Applicable environmental, social impacts, and aspects of CDM project activity
- Sector specific technologies and their applications
- Current technical and operational knowledge of the specific sectoral scope and information on best practice

The validation is not meant to provide any consulting towards the project participant (PP). However, stated requests for clarifications, corrective actions, and/or forward actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.

Once Ernst & Young received a first PDD version, it was made publicly available at the UNFCCC webpage to start a 45 day global stakeholder consultation process (GSP). The original PDD and the modified PDD will form the basis for the final evaluation. Information on both PDD versions is presented on page 2.

2. METHODOLOGY

The project assessment applies standard auditing techniques to assess the correctness of the information provided by the project participants. The assessment is based on the latest version of the “Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Manual”. The work starts with the appointment of the team covering the technical scope(s), sectoral scope(s) and relevant host country experience for evaluating the CDM project activity. Once the project is made available for the stakeholder consultation process, members of the team carry out the desk review, followup actions, resolution of issues identified, and finally preparation of the validation report. The prepared validation report and other supporting documents then undergo an internal quality control before submission to the CDM-EB.

In order to ensure transparency, assumptions are clear and explicitly stated; the background material is clearly referenced. Ernst & Young developed methodology-specific checklists and protocol customised for the project. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), the discussion of each criterion by the assessment team, and the results from validating the identified criteria.

The validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organizes details and clarifies the requirements a CDM project is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent validation process where the validator has to document how a particular requirement has been validated, as well as the results of the validation and any adjustments, if any, made to the project design.

The validation protocol consists of two tables. The different columns in these tables are described in the figure below.

Validation Protocol Table 1: Conformity of Project activity and PDD					
CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
<i>The checklist is organized in sections following the arrangement of the applied PDD version. Each section is then further sub-divided. The lowest level constitutes a checklist question/criterion.</i>	<i>Gives reference to documents where the answer to the checklist question or item is found in case the comment refers to documents other than the PDD.</i>	<i>Gives reference to the means of verification : MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview</i>	<i>The section contains the discussion on the conformance of the project to the checklist question. It is further used to explain the conclusions reached.</i>	<i>Conclusions are presented based on the assessment of the first PDD version. This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (✓), or a Corrective Action Request (CAR) due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below). Clarification Request (CR) is used when the validation team has identified a need for further clarification. Forward action request to highlight issues related to project implementation that requires review during the first verification.</i>	<i>Conclusions are presented in the same manner based on the assessment of the final PDD version and further documents including assumptions presented in the documentation.</i>

Validation Protocol Table 2: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests			
Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref to PDD	Summary of project owner response	Final conclusion
<i>If the conclusions from table 1 are a Corrective Action, a Clarification or a Forward action Request, these should be listed in this section.</i>	<i>Reference to section of the PDD</i>	<i>The responses given by the client or other project participants during the communications with the validation team should be summarized in this section.</i>	<i>This section should summarize the discussion on and revision to project documentation together with the validation team's responses and final conclusions. The conclusions should be reflected in Table 1, under "Final Conclusion".</i>

The completed validation protocol is enclosed in Annex 1 to this report, and the resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests is enclosed in Annex 2.

1. Appointment of the Assessment Team

The verification team has been appointed according to the experience in GHG verification, experience in the forestry sector, and relevant host country experience required amongst team members for verifying the GHG removals achieved by the project activity.

- Assessment Team Leader (ATL)
- Greenhouse Gas Auditor (GHG-A)
- Experts (E)

The verification team consisted of the following members:

Name	Qualification	Experience in GHG verification	Experience in the forestry sector	Experience in the host country
Ghislain Jalaly	ATL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Thomas Roulleau	GHG-A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Raphael Manley	E		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Ghislain Jalaly graduated as an engineer at AgroParisTech in Environmental Economy. Ghislain led the international development of the environmental consultancy Creocan in West Africa and the Middle East, specializing in environmental impacts assessment and monitoring. He joined Ernst & Young Climate Change and Sustainability Services in 2006, handling GhG (EU-ETS) and environmental and social auditing, as well as economic development surveys related to environmental issues.

Thomas Roulleau graduated as an engineer at AgroParisTech (INAPG) in Environmental Economy. During his training, he specialized in CO₂ market and credits (EU-ETS, Voluntary market), carbon projects development (CDM, JI), and forestry projects. He joined the Paris office of Ernst & Young in 2007 after a first work experience at Lafarge (CDM development, global carbon strategy).

Raphaël Manlay was trained as an engineer at AgroParisTech-ENGREF, the School of Forestry, Agricultural and Environmental Engineering of the Paris Institute of Technology for Life, Food and Environmental Sciences (created after the merging of INA-PG, ENSAIA and ENGREF). He did his PhD in environmental sciences at both AgroParisTech-ENGREF and at the Institute of Research for Development (IRD) in Senegal. He is now a lecturer at AgroParisTech-ENGREF, where he teaches in the European Erasmus mundus MSc course “Sustainable tropical forestry”. He is an associate scientist at IRD in the joint research unit Eco&Sols.

2. Review of Documents

The first version of the PDD was submitted to the DOE in November 2009. The first PDD version submitted by the PP and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline have been reviewed to verify the correctness, credibility, and interpretation of the presented information. Furthermore, a cross-check between information provided and information from other sources (if available) has been done as initial step of the validation process. A complete list of all documents and proofs reviewed is attached as Annex 3 to this report.

3. Follow-up Interviews

Between 30/11/2009 and 03/11/2009 Ernst & Young performed interviews and physical site inspection with project stakeholders to confirm relevant information, and to resolve issues identified in the first document review. The table below provides a list of all persons interviewed in this context.

Name	First name	Organisation
ENDUNDO	José E.B.	MINISTERE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT, CONSERVATION DE LA NATURE & TOURISME
MALELE	Sebastien	MINISTERE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT, CONSERVATION DE LA NATURE & TOURISME
MARIE-NELLY	Marie-Rose	World Bank
LUMBUENAMO	Raymond	WWF
BELANGER	Lyna	WRI
LABI MBAMA MUKONSU	Honoré	Chef de la Chefferie de Mbankana
KABALA	Mwe mba	Director of the Kinzono center
MSWEYA	Aseme	Director of the Mampu station
FLADIN	Mister	Direction Assitant of CADIM
NGUNGO	Delphin	Ingenior in Agronomy at CADIM
MUSHIETE	Olivier	Director Principal of Novacel
STEFFENS	Jean-Claude	Monitoring and Quality Management at Novacel
NGABULONGO	Ruphin	Monitoring and Quality Management coordinator at Novacel
KAYUKA	Delly	Head of the Ibi station, Novacel
MULABU	Dany	Head of the forest section, Novacel
SASSA	Raphaël	Public relations, Novacel
DEMENOIS	Julien	Project developer, ONF International
MULUMBA	Jean-Baptiste	Financial audit, Cauditec

4. Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the validation is to resolve the requests for corrective actions, clarifications, and any other outstanding issues which needed to be clarified for Ernst & Young's conclusion on the project design. The CARs and CRs raised by Ernst & Young were resolved during

communication between the client and Ernst & Young. To guarantee the transparency of the validation process the concerns raised and responses that were given are documented in more detail in the validation protocol in Annex 1.

The final PDD version submitted in November 2010 served as the basis for the final assessment presented. The modification on the final PDD version are not considered to be significant with respect to the qualification of the project as a CDM project based on the two main objectives of the CDM: reduction of anthropogenic GHG emissions and contribution to sustainable development.

5. Internal Quality Control

As final step of a validation activity the final documentation, which includes the validation report and the validation protocol, has to undergo an internal quality control by the Quality Internal Controller. In this particular case, the review process was carried out by Philippe Aubain, who is the technical Reviewer, with the relevant expertise in the auditing process.

After confirmation of the PP, the validation opinion and relevant documents are submitted to the EB through the UNFCCC web-platform.

3. SUMMARY

The assessment work and the main results are described below in accordance with the VVM reporting requirements. The reference documents indicated in this section and Annex 1 are stated in Annex 3.

1. Approval

The project participants are (i) NOVACEL sprl and (ii) ORBEO. The host Party Democratic Republic of Congo meet the requirements to participate in the CDM.

The DNA of Democratic Republic of Congo issued a LoA (IRL 24) in October 2010 authorizing NOVACEL sprl participant. The DNA of France issued a LoA (IRL 62) in April 2010 authorizing ORBEO participant. ERNST & YOUNG received these letters from the project participants and considers the provided letters authentic.

The DNA of Democratic Republic of Congo issued a first LoA in August 2007 which has been replaced by a second LoA in October 2010. The Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservancy and Tourism met during the site visit confirmed the approval of the DNA of Democratic Republic of Congo.

ERNST & YOUNG confirms that letters of approval refer to the precise proposed CDM project activity title in line with the title in the PDD “Ibi Batéké degraded savannah afforestation project for fuelwood production (Democratic Republic of Congo)”.

Both letters also indicate that the participating Parties are Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, and that the participation in the “Ibi Batéké degraded savannah afforestation project for fuelwood production (Democratic Republic of Congo)” project is voluntary.

The LoA of Democratic Republic of Congo also confirms that the proposed CDM project activity contributes to the sustainable development of Democratic Republic of Congo.

Based on the information given in these letters, ERNST & YOUNG considers the approval as unconditional with respect to these items. ERNST & YOUNG considers that the requirements of VVM (§§ 45-48) are met.

2. Participation

The participants of the project activity were approved by the corresponding Parties, which is confirmed with the issued LoAs. The means of validation used are the same as described in section 3.1, specifically in regard to the approval process of the project activity.

3. Project design document

The PDD complies with the relevant form and guidance provided by UNFCCC. The most recent version of the PDD template was used. ERNST & YOUNG considers that the guidelines for the completion of the PDD in their most recent version were followed. Relevant information was provided by the participants in the applicable PDD sections. Accuracy and completeness were assessed through the checklist included in Annex 1 of this report.

4. Project description

The following description of the project in the PDD was verified during the on-site audit: “the A/R CDM project activity envisages establishing various types of forest plantation based on the four following silvicultural models:

1. Plots to be harvested: *Acacia sp.*, *Eucalyptus sp.* and *Pinus sp.* intercropped with cassava (3106.33 ha);
2. Plots not to be harvested: mixture of local and exotic species intercropped with cassava (465.60 ha);
3. Plots not to be harvested: various local and exotic species (421.80 ha);
4. Enhancement of natural regeneration through fire control (232.80 ha);

The information presented in the PDD on the technical design is consistent with the actual planting and implementation of the project activity as confirmed by:

- Review of data and information (Annex 3). This was verified with other independent sources if available.
- An on-site visit has been performed and relevant stakeholder and personnel with knowledge of the project were interviewed (IRL 1).
- Finally, information related to similar projects or technologies as the CDM project activity have been used (if available) to confirm the accuracy and completeness of the project description.

In conclusion, ERNST & YOUNG confirms that the project description, as included to the PDD, complies with the requirements of the CDM.

5. Baseline and monitoring methodology

Applicability of the selected methodology

Compliance with each applicability condition as listed in the chosen baseline and monitoring methodology AR-ACM0001 version 03 has been demonstrated. The results of the assessment are detailed in the Annex 1.

ERNST & YOUNG confirms that the chosen baseline and monitoring methodology is applicable to the project activity. Emission sources, which are not addressed by the applied methodology, and which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emission reductions, have not been identified.

Project boundary, pools and eligibility

The project boundary was assessed through physical site inspection, interviews and secondary documents received on the design of the project.

The **project area** covers a total of 4129 ha. The geographical project boundary as defined in the field was found to be consistent with the indications in the PDD and the provided digital boundary files (IRL 63).

Complementary to the field visits of the audit team, the most relevant documents assessed in order to confirm the project boundary are the following:

- GPS coordinates and GIS files (IRL 63)
- Maps of project boundary as also included to the final PDD (IRL 46)

- GPS coordinates of the land contracts (IRL 64)

The boundaries were validated during the validation process using standard audit techniques; details of all observations are presented in the Annex 1. ERNST & YOUNG confirms that the identified boundaries as documented in the PDD and the attached digital boundary files (IRL 63) are adequately defined for the project activity.

In regard to **control over the project area**, the project participant has established contractual agreements with the land holder, the State of Republic Democratic of Congo (IRL 20). The land rights documentation was reviewed and complies with the legal system of the host country. Thus, control over the project area by the PP is considered to be established. It has been confirmed that NOVACEL possesses the land use right, including the trees and future emission reductions for duration of the project.

The **carbon pools** and the relevant emissions sources and gases (compare sections on removals and emissions below) have been selected in line with the applicable methodology and this information is included accordingly in the PDD. Following the answers of the A/R Working Group to the AR_AM_CLA_0009, as the default method cannot be applied, the Soil Organic Carbon has been conservatively neglected.

In regard to **eligibility of lands**, the project area fully complies with the requirements of the most recent Eligibility Procedure as defined by the EB. Among others, the assessment of compliance was based on the following evidence:

- Landsat image of 2005, 2001 and 1987 (IRL 71);
- Studies on fires, 2006 (IRL 13);
- Field visits of the audit team (IRL 1).

Landsat image and field visits of the audit team confirm that vegetation at the time of the project start was clearly below the forest threshold according to the DNA definition. Due to the high frequency of fires, it was found that the vegetation prior to project start would not have surpassed this threshold at maturity without the project activity. This assessment was reviewed by the audit team during the onsite visits and it was confirmed that no forest was on the project area before project start.

No forest had been on the project area on 31 December 1989, as documented through interviews and landsat image (1987). Eligibility was also verified during interviews with local stakeholders on site, who confirmed that no forest had been on the project area since 1989.

Baseline identification

The PDD identifies the baseline scenario as “unmanaged grassland with wildfire-dominated ecological conditions and natural succession regrowth dynamics”. This baseline scenario was determined by using the A/R Methodological tool “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality in A/R CDM project activities” (Version 01) as required by the methodology.

The information included in the PDD was validated by a document review, the on-site visit of the project area and by cross-checking the information presented with similar relevant projects and literature. The sources referenced in the PDD have been quoted correctly.

Field visits and interviews confirmed the chosen baseline approach as per CDM Modalities and Procedures: “Existing or historical, as applicable, changes in carbon stocks in the carbon pools within the project boundary”. In this project, the historic land use applicable to the project area prior to project start would also be the likely future land use in absence of the project.

ERNST & YOUNG confirms that no reasonable alternative baseline scenario was excluded in the analysis of baseline scenarios. Based on the demonstration presented in the PDD and references, the identified baseline scenario is considered as reasonable. Taking the definition of the baseline scenario into account, ERNST & YOUNG confirms that all relevant CDM requirements, including relevant national and sectoral policies and circumstances, were correctly taken into account. A verifiable description of the baseline scenario was included in the PDD.

As requested in the item 86 of VVM, ERNST & YOUNG confirms that:

1. All the assumptions and data used by the project participants are listed in the PDD, including their references and sources;
2. All documentation used is relevant for establishing the baseline scenario and correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD;
3. Assumptions and data used in the identification of the baseline scenario are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable;
4. Relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances are considered and listed in the PDD;
5. The approved baseline methodology has been correctly applied to identify the most reasonable baseline scenario and the identified baseline scenario reasonably represents what would occur in the absence of the proposed CDM project activity.

Algorithm and/or formulae used

ERNST & YOUNG verified the calculations of baseline stocks and removals, project emissions, leakage and the expected net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks. Corresponding calculations were carried out with the Excel tool TARAM (IRL 31). Correctness of calculations has been verified step by step for all calculations sheets.

ERNST & YOUNG considers the values and estimates presented in the PDD reasonable based on the documentation reviewed, the audit team experience and the result of the interviews.

The sources used in the PDD are correctly quoted and interpreted. All assumptions and data indicated in the PDD and all relevant sources were checked and confirmed. Detailed information on the verification of parameters used in the equations can be found in Annex 1.

The requirements of the methodology have been correctly applied and all values used are considered reasonable in the context of the proposed CDM project activity. Data sources are quoted correctly. Hence, the calculation of baseline stocks and removals, project emissions, leakage and the expected net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks can be considered correct.

Baseline stocks and greenhouse gas removals by sinks

The stratification process considered one baseline strata based on the pre-existing vegetation, as lands selected are homogeneous and composed of grassy savannah. Baseline stocks were estimated through field measurement as requested by the Annex 17 and the audit team. By this field measurements, it has been assessed that the density of baseline above-ground biomass was $11,46 \text{ t ms.ha}^{-1}$, and the default value calculated was $11,36 \text{ t ms.ha}^{-1}$, and therefore justified that the default value could be used. For the calculations, values for Biomass Expansion Factors, Root-to-Shoot Ratio and Wood Density were taken from IPCC tables. Conservative choices have been made in the calculation of removals. The choice of data sources is considered adequate.

The parameters and equations presented in the PDD and further documentation were crosschecked and compared with the requirements and guidelines of the applied methodology and respective tools. The review of the equation included all formulae presented in the PDD and the digital calculation files.

ERNST & YOUNG considers the calculation of the baseline stocks and GHG removals as correct.

Project emissions

The methodology considers emissions from biomass burn (non-CO₂). This source was discussed in the PDD and respectively in the audit process. In line with the design of this project, no biomass burning for site preparation will occur, which is considered credible. A clarification to the methodology has been requested on the biomass removed and burned outside the project area (AR_AM_CLA008 of the A/R WG 27). It has been concluded that the non-CO₂ emissions related to the burning of removed biomass outside the project activity should not be accounted.

Leakage

Leakage was estimated for all leakage sources as foreseen by the methodology. It was demonstrated that emissions from leakage of activity displacement (pre-project grazing and fuelwood collection) is zero.

As requested by the methodology, the tool “Estimation of GHG emissions related to displacement of grazing activities in A/R CDM project activity” was applied. As no breeding was occurring in the project area, it was confirmed that no displacement of animals could have occurred. This has been reconfirmed through interviews with local landholder. Therefore, leakage is considered zero.

Net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks

The estimates on the expected anthropogenic removals which are likely to be achieved by the planned reforestation activities under the project scenario are based on values from IPCC. The sources were reviewed and confirmed during the onsite visit and are consistent with data from international database IPCC GPG LULUCF (IRL 72).

Regarding the Soil Organic Carbon pool, as the project does not satisfy all the conditions listed in the default method approach, the default approach cannot be applied. Therefore, the ex-ante emissions of soil organic carbon are conservatively neglected.

Over the crediting period of 30 years, total net anthropogenic removals of 1,635,338 tCO₂-e are expected. The calculations of the net anthropogenic GHG removals were carried out with TARAM Excel spreadsheets (IRL 31). It has been verified that all calculations are correct and in compliance with the applied AR-CDM methodology, and that the steps of the calculations are fully traceable and adequate for the project conditions.

6. Additionality

The additionality of the project has been demonstrated in the PDD using the A/R methodological tool “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality in A/R CDM project activities” (Version 01). The additionality is demonstrated through barrier analysis and common practice analysis as requested in the tool.

The analyses presented in the PDD were assessed based on a document review, interviews onsite and additional documents. The data, rationales, assumptions, justifications and documentation provided were checked using local knowledge and sectoral and financial expertise. Based on these validation steps ERNST & YOUNG confirms that the documentation assessed is appropriate for this project. Further analysis of the additionality is summarized below.

The project is considered additional as the degraded lands which are reforested under the project activities would have remained without forest cover.

Start date and prior consideration of the CDM

The project activity started on 1 July 2008. The starting date reflects the start of actual project implementation (site preparation) (IRL 73).

The starting date has been confirmed via the report of activity of May 2008 (IRL 73).

The CDM consideration prior to project start was documented through letter of Intent of potential purchase of emission reductions of the World Bank, dated 20 September 2005 (IRL 19). Another letter of intent has been signed in 2007 (IRL 18), and a first contract has been signed in February 2008 (IRL 17). Therefore, it is confirmed that continuing and real actions were taken to secure CDM status for the project in parallel with its implementation, as required by the EB 49, Annex 22. The project complies with the requirement of prior CDM consideration.

Identifications of alternatives

Relevant alternatives (baseline scenario) were identified in the context of the additionality test:

Scenario 1 - Unmanaged grassland with wildfire-dominated ecological conditions and natural succession regrowth dynamics (business as usual)

Scenario 2 - Fire control without introducing agricultural activities

Scenario 3 - Slow agricultural and cattle breeding development through conventional activities

Scenario 4 - Savannah conversion into a managed forest (acacia, eucalyptus and local species planted), with fuel wood harvest and other management activities substituted for fire as the predominant disturbance process (corresponding to the project scenario but with no CDM support)

The list of alternatives to the project is presented in the PDD and includes the project activity undertaken without being registered as CDM project. The remaining alternative considers all plausible scenarios

taking into account all relevant local and sectoral situations. Hence the list of alternatives is considered to be complete.

Barrier analysis

The barrier analysis has been used to demonstrate the additionality of the project.

The investment barrier is the main barrier preventing the implementation of the project without carbon credits. PP cannot have access to long term credit with affordable interest rate. This barrier was confirmed with document review and interviews onsite of the World Bank, NGO, and Agricultural associations. Only one project of reforestation has been implemented in the region in the 1990s but was supported by the European Commission (Mampu project) (IRL 65).

Moreover, **technological barriers** have been presented. As the project can be considered as a first of its kind, the project is facing technological barriers such as experience of wildfire prevention, silvicultural expertise and practices. These technological barriers have been confirmed through interview onsite with the local association of farmers (IRL 1).

The PP considers the fact that the area is outside forestry priority as an **institutional barriers**. Indeed, as the area is not part of the forestry priority, no financial public support can be expected.

The result of this assessment shows clearly that the barriers presented in the PDD can be considered real. These barriers prevent the project activity from being implemented while it would not prevent at least the baseline of the project. This was confirmed based on the documentation review, interviews and local and sectoral expertise of the assessment team.

Common practice analysis

The region for the common practice analysis was defined as the Batéké plateau, which is relevant in terms of ecological conditions and economical situation. Therefore, the presented approach can be considered appropriate for the common practice analysis.

Only one reforestation project has been carried out in the region: the Mampu project. However, this project is very different compared to the proposed project activity. The Mampu project was financed by the European Commission. Therefore, it can be confirmed that the proposed CDM activity is not a common practice in the defined region.

7. Monitoring plan

The monitoring plan presented in the PDD complies with the requirement of the methodology and the CDM Modalities and Procedures. The assessment team checked all parameters presented in the monitoring plan against the requirements of the methodology; no deviations relevant for the project activity have been found in the monitoring plan. For the monitoring of carbon stock changes the requirements and parameter list as per methodology were followed.

Regarding Soil Organic Carbon, following the clarification request AR_AM_CLA009 of the A/R WG 27, as the project does not satisfy all the conditions listed in the default method approach, the default

approach cannot be applied. Therefore, the ex-post emissions of soil organic carbon are conservatively neglected. In compliance with the methodological tool, further parameters regarding project emissions are listed in section E.4.2. of the PDD.

The procedures were reviewed by the assessment team on paper and through interviews with the relevant personnel. This information together with a physical inspection allows the assessment team to confirm that the proposed monitoring plan is feasible within the project design. The PP has developed quality assurance and quality control procedures (IRL 70), based on Standard Operating Procedures, which will allow the monitoring of reliable data.

Under consideration of the pre-fixed verification frequency of every 5 years and the defined forest management and harvesting system it is considered that there will be no systematic coincidence of verifications with peaks in carbon stocks.

8. Sustainable development

The LoA of the Host Country Democratic Republic of Congo clearly presents a statement that the project contributes to the sustainable development of the Host Party.

9. Local stakeholder consultation

The stakeholder process took place the 18 July 2006. It was carried out in line with PDD guidance and documented appropriately.

The assessment team reviewed the documentation in order to validate the inclusion of relevant stakeholders. Different methods of invitation have been used depending on stakeholders. It is confirmed that the communication method used to invite stakeholders is considered appropriate. The summary of comments presented in the PDD was cross checked confirmed with interviews with stakeholders during the onsite visit and it is found to be complete.

The relevant comments presented by the local stakeholders were taken into due account by the PP, the same was cross-checked with the information obtained during the interviews.

Hence the local stakeholder consultation was adequately performed according to the CDM requirements.

10. Environmental and socio-economic impacts

The PP undertook an analysis of environmental and socio-economic impacts according to the requirements of the guidelines for PDD completion. The assessment team carried out a document review of the information presented.

An Environmental and socio-economic Impact Assessment was conducted in 2007 by Oréade-Brèche. No significant negative environmental impacts are anticipated. Positive effects on biodiversity and protection against soil erosion can be expected.

BERCI conducted in 2006 a socio-economic impact study, in which no significant negative socio-economic impacts have been identified. The results of these studies have been confirmed onsite with interviews of local communities and NGOs.

Therefore, the audit team concluded that no negative environmental and social impacts are expected.

4. COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS

ERNST & YOUNG published the project documents on the UNFCCC website for comments during a 45 day period.

The following table presents all gathered key information:

webpage:	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/DB/J6C8N428538MSZMTCXAY0XYB0A31QE/view.html
Dates of the global stakeholder consultation process:	07 Nov 09 - 21 Dec 09
Comment submitted by:	No comments received.
Response by Ernst & Young:	-

5. VALIDATION OPINION

ERNST & YOUNG has performed a validation of the following proposed CDM project activity “Ibi Batéké degraded savannah afforestation project for fuelwood production (Democratic Republic of Congo)”. Methodology-specific customized validation checklists and protocol for the project were built to carry out the validation.

The review of the project design documentation, onsite interviews and further verification of references provided ERNST & YOUNG with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of stated criteria in the protocol. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM. Therefore, ERNST & YOUNG recommends the project for registration by the CDM Executive Board.

The compliance of the proposed project with the applied methodology demonstrates that the proposed project activity is not a likely baseline scenario. Therefore, it is considered that emission reductions attributable to the project are additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. Given that the project is implemented as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated amount of emission reductions as specified within the final PDD version.

The validation is based on the information made available to us, as well as the engagement conditions detailed in this report. The validation was performed following the VVM requirements. The single purpose of this report is its use during the registration process as part of the CDM project cycle.
Paris, 01 December 2010.

Christophe Schmeitzky

Partner, Ernst & Young et Associés.



6. Annex 1: Validation Protocol

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A. General Description of Project Activity					
A.1. Title of the proposed project activity					
Are the title of the project, the version number of the PDD, and the date of issue described?	2	DR, I	<p>Title : Ibi Batéké degraded savannah afforestation project for fuelwood production (Democratic Republic of Congo)</p> <p>Version : PCI-B#1</p> <p>Date : August, 7, 2009</p> <p>The title enables the identification of the unique CDM activity.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.2. Description of the proposed project activity					
Does the PDD clearly describe the purpose of the project?	1, 2	DR, I	<p>Purposes of the project activity are clearly defined: to sequester CO2 through fast growing forest plantations on savannah grassland with occasional scattered shrubs, to supply the capital city of Kinshasa (8-10 million inhabitants) with charcoal through fuelwood production, to reduce soil erosion and water loss through runoff, to reduce degradation and deforestation of remaining forest galleries and to alleviate poverty through the introduction of long term income enhancement mechanisms for local communities.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Does the PDD clearly describe how the project activity is undertaken?	1, 2	DR, I	The means intended to achieve the objectives of the project activity and the modalities of implementation of the project activity are well described in the PDD. The project activity consists in the plantation of shrubby savannah grassland with specific tree species including native and exotic species. The project activity encompasses pure forestry plots and agroforestry plots with the introduction of cassava intercrops. The production of fuelwood to supply local markets and Kinshasa will create employment opportunities (harvesting, timber processing, charcoal production).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3. Project participants					
Have the Parties and project participants participating in the project been listed in the table as required?	2	DR, I	The table has been included to the PDD as required. The project participants are: - NOVACEL sprl (Democratic Republic of Congo); - ORBEO (France); - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as Trustee of the BioCarbon Fund (Government of Spain).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Have all involved Parties provided a valid and complete letter of approval and have all private/public project participants been authorized by an involved Party?	1, 2, 24	DR, I	The Democratic Republic of Congo provided a valid and complete letter of approval. Corrective Action Request n° 1 Please provide letter of approval of France and Spain.	CAR 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl						
Do all participating Parties fulfill the participation requirements as follows: - Ratification of the Kyoto Protocol - Designated a National Authority - Host Party DNA communicated minimum values for forest definition	2, 23	DR, I	All required criteria are complied with. For forest definition, see: http://cdm.unfccc.int/DNA/index.html <table><tr><td>A single minimum tree crown cover value between 10 and 30 per cent</td><td>A single minimum land area value between 0,05 and 1 hectare</td><td>A single minimum tree height value between 2 and 5 meters</td></tr><tr><td>30 %</td><td>0,5</td><td>3</td></tr></table>	A single minimum tree crown cover value between 10 and 30 per cent	A single minimum land area value between 0,05 and 1 hectare	A single minimum tree height value between 2 and 5 meters	30 %	0,5	3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A single minimum tree crown cover value between 10 and 30 per cent	A single minimum land area value between 0,05 and 1 hectare	A single minimum tree height value between 2 and 5 meters									
30 %	0,5	3									
A.4. Description of physical location and boundaries of the A/R CDM project activity:											
Has the location of the project including Host Party, Region/State/Province and City/town/community been defined?	2, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50	DR, I	The proposed project activity is located in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Province of Kinshasa, Municipality of Maluku, Mbankana village, Ibi estate.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
Has an appropriately detailed geographic delineation of the project boundary including a unique identifier been included?	2, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50	DR, I	The project’s spatial boundaries are defined in chapter A.4.2 of the PDD. The project comprises one plain area of land, of which three built areas are excluded. The area to be planted represents 4.226,53 ha. Corrective Action Request n° 2 An area of experimental plantation stands G3 should be excluded from the project area.	CAR 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Is the project boundary under control of the participants geographically delineated? (AR-ACM0001)	2, 20, 48, 49	DR, I	<p>The project boundary has been geographically delineated. However, the area under control of the participants has not been geographically delineated.</p> <p>Corrective Action Request n° 3</p> <p>The area under control of the project participants should be geographically delineated (see Corrective Action Request n° 4).</p>	CAR 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does each discrete area of land have a unique identification? (AR-ACM0001)	2, 48, 49	DR, I	The project activity is intended to be undertaken in one single area.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.5. Technical description of the AR activity					

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Has a description of the present environmental conditions of the project area (including climate, hydrology, soils, ecosystems and land use) been included?	2, 8	DR, I	A description of the present environmental conditions of the area planned for the proposed A/R CDM project activity, including of climate, hydrology, soils and ecosystems (including land use) topics, is included in the PDD. The PDD states that the project area is composed of sandy and sandstone geological associations from the « Kalahari system ». The soils have a fair proportion of fine elements and weak chemical fertility. The area has a hot and humid tropical climate. The project area is covered with grass and shrubby savannah, with a South to North wood density incremental gradient. Two plant species are dominant: <i>Hyparrhenia diplandra</i> (herbaceous layer) and <i>Hymenocardia acida</i> (woody layer). Savannah is yearly overrun by fires, generally originating from anthropogenic causes. Large mammals and small herbivores can be observed in the region but are facing extinction due to excessive hunting.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the description of rare and endangered species and their habitat provided, if any?	2, 8	DR, I	A description of endangered species is provided in section A.5.2 of the PDD. The only identified endangered species that may be sheltered on the project area is the White-headed Robin-chat (<i>Cossypha heinrichi</i>), which is classified as “Vulnerable” by the IUCN. The biotope of the “Plateau des Bateke” is quite homogeneous, thus the project activity cannot be considered as a threat to ecological habitats considering its limited ground coverage.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the varieties and species selected clearly defined and described?	2, 8	DR, I	The species of <i>Acacia sp.</i> , <i>Eucalyptus sp.</i> , <i>Pinus sp.</i> , local species and other exotic species selected to be planted are defined in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Has the technology to be applied and required know-how been adequately described?	1, 2	DR, I	<p>The site and soil preparation, nursery and plantation management, maintenance and protection are described in the PDD.</p> <p>The 4,227 ha planted surface is distributed as follows: agroforestry stands (3,572 ha), pure forestry stands (422 ha) and natural regeneration stands (233 ha). Agroforestry and pure forestry plots are initially planted at 900-1,111 trees/ha density.</p> <p>Agroforestry stands are mainly composed of <i>Acacia sp.</i> (73%), <i>Eucalyptus sp.</i>, <i>Pinus sp.</i>, local and exotic species intercropped with cassava. Soils preparation is carried out by removal of ligneous regrowth and stumps removal and ploughing. Pure forestry stands are composed of the same tree species.</p> <p>Seeding is performed using different techniques depending on tree species, using seeds harvested from locally selected trees. Intercropped cassava is grown on a maximum of 18 months cycle basis, with mechanical maintenance twice a year. Harvesting cycles are planned differently depending on stands (5-21 years for <i>Acacia</i> agroforestry stands, 18 years for <i>Pinus</i> and <i>Eucalyptus</i> agroforestry stands, > 30 years for local and exotic species, no harvesting for pure <i>Acacia</i>, <i>Pinus</i> and <i>Eucalyptus</i> stands).</p> <p>25m wide living firebreaks made of fire resistant herbaceous species are installed. Mechanical maintenance is performed twice a year.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other technologies within the project period?	1, 2	DR, I	No changes are expected in the technologies to be applied within the project period.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Does the project result in a transfer of technology to the host country?	1, 2	DR, I	The PDD states that technology transfers could be achieved at several levels, <i>e.g.</i> seeds collection, soils preparation techniques, optimization of plantation, maintenance and production, plantation management, etc. The species genetic basis is developed based on testing on seeds provided by Australian research services.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Are measures described how to minimize potential leakage?	2, 8	DR, I	<p>The PDD addresses potential leakage limitations due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Displacement of subsistence agricultural activities (cassava mainly), through cassava intercropping - Displacement of harvesting activities, through authorizing organized collection of wood within the project area by local harvesters. <p>As no specific fencing is foreseen in the project area, leakage from this source can be considered as not relevant.</p> <p>After the site visit and the interview of local stakeholder, it is clear that the project area is not concerned by breeding. The leakage from animals grazing displacement is not relevant.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 1</p> <p>Please justify that the wood burned for the cassava drying activity induced by the project will not induce significant additional leakage.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 2</p> <p>Please precise how wood harvesting by local farmers within the project boundaries will be managed.</p>	CL 1 CL 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.6. Description of legal title to the land, current land tenure and rights to tCERs / ICERs issued for the proposed A/R CDM project activity					

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Does the project consider and describe the current legal title to the land?	2, 20, 21	DR, I	<p>The legal title to the land is described in the PDD. The Mushiete family has land rights on a territory including the project area at Ibi station since 1969 in the traditional law, and has signed a long term lease (30 years renewable, from the 01/01/2007) with NOVACEL.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 3</p> <p>Please justify the discrepancy between the area of land concerned by the contract between the RDC and Olivier Mushiete, and the area of land concerned by the long term lease to NOVACEL.</p> <p>Corrective Action Request n° 4</p> <p>Cadastral documents provided along with the five emphyteutic lease contracts (covering 1,000 ha parcels each) between Olivier Mushiete and the DRC are not georeferenced. Please document the correspondence between the five parcels mentioned above and the project area. (see Corrective Action Request n° 3)</p>	CL 3 CAR 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the current land tenure and land use properly described?	2, 20, 21	DR, I	The current land tenure and land use is properly described in the PDD in line with the long term lease contract established between Olivier Mushiete and NOVACEL.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Has it been made clear who has the right to access the sequestered carbon?	2, 20, 21	DR, I	NOVACEL possesses the land use right, including the trees and future emission reductions for duration of the project. Clarification Request n° 4 Please precise in the PDD that the rights of access to carbon credits from sequestration belong to the project proponent (NOVACEL).	CL 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.7. Assessment of the eligibility of the land					
Has the latest version of the AR eligibility procedure been applied?	2, 36	DR, I	The latest version of the AR eligibility procedure has been used: AR-AM-Tool 10, Version 1: "Procedures to demonstrate the eligibility of lands for afforestation and reforestation CDM project activities".	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<p>Is adequate evidence provided which demonstrates that</p> <p>(i) the land in the project boundary is not forest at project start</p> <p>(ii) the activity is an afforestation or reforestation by indicating historic land use (reforestation: unstocked by Dec. 1989; afforestation: unstocked >50 y)</p>	1, 2	DR, I	<p>(i) The statement in the PDD, site visit and interviews with information owners confirm that the land is not currently a forest according to the DRC CDM DNA definition of forests.</p> <p>(ii) The documentation provided (satellite imagery, bibliography) and site visit provide adequate evidence that the project complies with land-use requirements for reforestation projects. Although interviews with information owners confirm that it is quite unlikely that the project area could have been considered as a forest within the last 50 years according to the DNA forest definition, stronger evidence should be provided to assess the project's compliance with afforestation projects definition.</p> <p>Corrective Action Request n° 5</p> <p>In the absence of evidence that the project area could not be considered as a forest within the last 50 years according to the DNA forest definition, the project proponent should consider the project as a reforestation project in the section A.7 of the PDD.</p>	CAR 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.8. Approach for addressing non-permanence					
Has the approach to address non-permanence been specified (tCER, ICER)?	2	DR, I	The issuance of tCER for the net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved by the proposed A/R CDM project activity is chosen.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.9. Estimated amount of net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks over the chosen crediting period					
Has the table on estimated net anthropogenic removals over the chosen crediting period been completed?	2, 31	DR, I	The table of estimated amount of net anthropogenic GHG removals is provided. The data in the table was computed using TARAM.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.10. Public funding of the proposed A/R CDM project activity					
Is an indication on public funding (from Annex I countries) included to the PDD?	2	DR, I	No public funding from country included in Annex I are involved in the proposed project activity.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B. Duration of the Project Activity/Crediting Period					
B.1 Starting date of the project and the crediting period					
Does the starting date reflect the date of implementation (or when real action began that resulted in changes to the actual net removals) and has it been adequately justified?	1, 2	DR, I	The starting date of the project activity is the 1 st of July 2008, corresponding with the site preparation before planting. Clarification Request n° 5 Please provide the reporting sheet of July 2008	CL 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2 Expected operational lifetime					
Has the expected operational lifetime been defined?	2	DR, I	The expected operational lifetime of the proposed project activity is over 30 years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.3 Choice of crediting period and related information					

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Is the project fixed or renewable and does it has an appropriate crediting period length defined?	2	DR, I	Fixed crediting period of 30 years is selected.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C. Application of Baseline and Monitoring Methodology					
C.1. Title and reference of approved methodology					
Are the title and the reference of the baseline methodology applicable to the project activity defined?	2, 35	DR, I	Yes. The title and the version of the methodology applied are defined: AR-ACM0001 version 03.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Has the most current version of the methodology been used (consider also PDD formats, eligibility procedure, AR add. tool)?	2, 35-45	DR, I	<p>Yes, the most recent version of the methodology has been applied (version 03), as well as the most recent versions of tools, except for the tool “Estimation of GHG emissions due to clearing, burning and decay of existing vegetation attributable to a CDM A/R project activity”.</p> <p>Corrective Action Request n° 6</p> <p>The tool “Estimation of GHG emissions due to clearing, burning and decay of existing vegetation attributable to a CDM A/R project activity” has been revised in the EB 50 (Version of the 16 October 2009). Please use the version 03.</p>	CAR 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.2. Assessment and justification of selected methodology					

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Does the project use the baseline approach from paragraph 22 of the CDM A/R modalities and procedures: Existing or historical, as applicable, changes in carbon stocks in the carbon pools within the project boundary”?	2	DR, I	The baseline approach 22a (Existing or historical, as applicable, changes in carbon stocks in the carbon pools within the project boundary) is applied in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the A/R CDM project activity implemented on degraded lands, which are expected to remain degraded or to continue to degrade in the absence of the project, and hence the land cannot be expected to revert to a non-degraded state without human intervention; (AR-ACM001)	1, 2, 35, 13	DR I	For the demonstration that lands are degraded or degrading, a study from Bwebwe has been used. This study shows that several fires have occurred during the dry season on the project area. It has been confirmed by interviews on site and by the observation of burnt bark on most the shrub trees. Clarification Request n° 6 Please provide all the record of fires on the project area since the monitoring of fires has started.	CL 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Has the latest version of the “Tool for the identification of degraded or degrading lands for consideration in implementing A/R CDM project activities” been applied for demonstrating that lands are degraded or degrading; (AR-ACM001)	1, 2, 42	DR, I	Yes, the latest version of the “Tool for the identification of degraded or degrading lands for consideration in implementing A/R CDM project activities” has been applied.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Encroachment of natural tree vegetation that leads to the establishment of forests according to the host country definition of forest for CDM purposes is not expected to occur; (AR-ACM001)	1, 2	DR, I	The encroachment of natural tree vegetation that leads to the establishment of forests is not expected to occur because of the high frequency of fires.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Flooding irrigation is not applied in the project activity; (AR-ACM001)	1, 2	DR, I	Flooding, which is not a common practice in the region, will not be apply in the project activity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If at least a part of the project activity is implemented on organic soils, drainage of these soils is not allowed and not more than 10% of their area may be disturbed as result of soil preparation for planting;	1, 2, 11	DR, I	According to the pedagogical study, the soil is not organic.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The establishment of project shall not decrease availability of fuelwood.	1, 2	DR, I	<p>The few local farmers will be able to collect fuelwood without compromising the tree growth. Human pressure is low in the area.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 7</p> <p>The PDD states that the population density in the region is less than 1 inhabitant per km². Please provide reference/evidence of the population density.</p>	CL 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.3. Assessment of the selected carbon pools an demission sources of the approved methodology					
Are the carbon pools considered in the project activity in line with the requirements of the methodology?	1, 2	DR, I	Only above, belowground and soil carbon pools are considered. Other carbon pools (dead wood, litter) are conservatively set as zero.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.4 Description of ex ante stratification					

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Is the ex-ante stratification of the baseline and the project presented in the PDD?	1, 2	DR, I	Yes. Lands selected for the baseline represent a single ex-ante baseline stratum. For the project activity, 9 strata can be defined according to the type of stands and planted species.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.5 Identification of baseline scenario					
C.5.1. Description of the application of the procedure to identify the most plausible baseline					
Is the application of the methodology and the discussion and determination of the chosen baseline transparent?	1, 2, 43	DR, I	For the identification of the baseline scenario, the “combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate the additionality in A/R CDM project activities” is used.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the starting date of the A/R CDM project activity after 31 December 1999?	1, 2	DR, I	Yes, the starting date of the project activity is the 1st of July 2008.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the sale of CERs was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity?	1, 2, 17, 18, 19	DR, I	The financial support of UMICORE and SUEZ was conditioned on the CDM eligibility of the project. Moreover, the World Bank addressed a Letter of Intent in September 2005.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does all the credible alternative land use scenarios to the proposed activity been identified?	1, 2	DR, I	4 alternatives scenarios have been identified: Scenario 1 - Unmanaged grassland with wildfire-dominated ecological conditions and natural succession regrowth dynamics (business as usual) Scenario 2 - Fire control without introducing agricultural activities Scenario 3 - Slow agricultural and cattle breeding development through conventional activities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>Scenario 4 - Savannah conversion into a managed forest (acacia, eucalyptus and local species planted), with fuel wood harvest and other management activities substituted for fire as the predominant disturbance process (corresponding to the project scenario but with no CDM support)</p> <p>Another credible scenario could have been large agricultural activities (maize and cassava). The large demand in food supply from Kinshasa tends to stimulate the development of larger farms. However, flying over from Kinshasa to the project area, it appears that large farms are closer to Kinshasa than the project area and that even the biggest farms were much smaller than the project area. Moreover, choosing this baseline would have lead to higher emissions reductions, therefore this scenario can be conservatively set aside.</p>		
Are the barriers that prevent the implementation of alternative scenarios justified?	1, 2	DR	<p>2 types of barriers have been identified: investment and technological barriers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The investment barriers have been correctly justified and confirmed by onsite interviews. <p>- In the scenario 2, there is no public fund for fire control available, as it has been confirmed by the ministry of environment.</p> <p>- The scenario 3 refers to local agricultural and cattle breeding activities. It has been confirmed by local agricultural associations that local farmer are not</p>	<p>CL 8</p> <p>CL 9</p> <p>CL 10</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>able to exploit more than 2 ha per year per person. Agricultural activities on such large area will require the use of fertilizer, whose cost will be prohibitive.</p> <p>- The scenario 4 which correspond to the project without CDM revenues will not be implemented without high capital expenses. The loans mean rate is 17 % in 2008, which prevent the development of such project. The only similar project (Mampu) was technically and financially supported by the European Union.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The technical barriers are: The lack of experience in wildfire prevention on savannah area (scenario 2) and in large agricultural activities (scenario 3). Concerning scenario 4, the project is said to be a first of its kind. However, the agroforestry Mampu project which is few kilometers aside has been implemented before. <p>Site visit and interviews confirmed that prescriptions aiming at limiting burning practices by growers and hunters are not enforced and non-compliance with these requirements is widespread in the country.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 8</p> <p>Please document/justify the following assertions :</p> <p>- p37: natural conditions (sandy soils, grassy/shrubby savannahs)</p>		

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>Clarification Request n° 9</p> <p>Please document/justify the following assertions : - p37: the area is not part of forest policy priorities.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 10</p> <p>Please document/justify the following assertions : - 38: “Public funding for agricultural development is low and under continual pressure from other budgetary requirements” ; “The prevailing practice in the region is subsistence farming” ;</p>		
Has the baseline been established on a project- specific basis?	2	DR, I	Yes. The baseline scenario is established on the Ibi-Batéké project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the baseline scenario sufficiently take into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies, macro-economic trends and political aspirations?	1, 2	DR, I	Ditto	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the baseline determination compatible with the available data?	1, 2	DR, I	Ditto	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Does the selected baseline represent the most likely scenario among other possible and/or discussed scenarios?	1, 2	DR, I	<p>The continuation of the current situation: “unmanaged grassland with wildfire-dominated ecological conditions and natural succession regrowth dynamics is selected as the baseline”.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 11</p> <p>More details should be provided on the references used for the demonstration. (see Clarification Request n° 8 to Clarification Request n° 10)</p>	CL 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is it demonstrated/justified that the project activity itself is not a likely baseline scenario?	1, 2	DR, I	<p>It has been demonstrated that the project activity will face investment barriers without CDM revenues, as well as technological barrier, as the project is a first of its kind.</p> <p>Corrective Action Request n° 7</p> <p>Please provide a more accurate description of the Mampu project and explain why the project activity is different.</p>	CAR 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is all literature and sources clearly referenced?	1, 2	DR, I	<p>Corrective Action Request n° 8</p> <p>The literature and sources are not clearly referenced. (See Clarification Request n° 8 to Clarification Request n° 10)</p>	CAR 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.6 Assessment and demonstration of additionality					

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Is the starting date of the project prior to the global stakeholder comments? If yes, below questions apply.	2	DR, I	Yes the starting date is prior the global stakeholder comments process.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the timeline of the project clearly described in PDD according to the requirement of PDD guideline? (EB41 Annex12 B.5.)	2	DR, I	<p>Although not explicitly stated in A/R PDD guideline, it is preferable that the timeline of events and actions taken to achieve CDM registration be indicated in PDD with description of evidence (Ref. B.5. of PDD guideline: EB41 Annex 12)</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 12</p> <p>Please provide an implementation timeline of the proposed CDM project activity. The timeline should include, the date when the investment decision was made, the date when soil preparation started, the date when plantation started. In addition to this implementation timeline please provide a timeline of events and actions which have been taken to achieve CDM registration, with description of the evidence used to support these actions.</p>	CL 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Were the CDM benefits considered necessary in the decision to undertake the project as a CDM project activity? (EB41 Annex 46)	1, 2	DR, I	Ditto	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the sufficient evidences provided that the benefit of CDM subjected to serious consideration in implementing the project?	1, 2	DR, I	Ditto	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Is the additionality of the project demonstrated according to the requirements of applied methodology (e.g. through (a) barrier analysis, (b) investment analysis, (c) common practice analysis)?	2, 43	DR, I	The additionality is demonstrated through barrier analysis and common practice analysis as requested in the combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate the additionality in A/R CDM project activities.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are sufficient evidences provided, which support the discussion and or analysis conducted to demonstrate additionality?	1, 2, 43	DR, I	Ditto	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.7 Estimation of the ex ante baseline net GHG removals					
Have the ex-ante baseline removal calculations been provided in the table, do they correspond to the chosen crediting period and use the approach provided in the selected approved methodology?	1, 2	DR, I	Final results of the ex-ante baseline emissions are presented in a table and are in line with the methodology applied (II.4.2 : steady state).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the steady rate estimated on the basis of transparent and verifiable information originating as appropriate from available literature, data from comparable areas, from field measurements or from other sources relevant to the baseline circumstances? (AR-ACM001)	1, 2, 51	DR, I	It seems realistic to consider that under the conditions of the baseline scenario (frequent fires established for a long time), a steady state is reached. Clarification Request n° 13 Please provide all the record of fires on the project area since the monitoring of fires has started. (See Clarification Request n° 6)	CL 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.8 Completion of the baseline study					

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Have the date of completion and the name of the person (or entity) determining the baseline been specified?	2	DR, I	Date of completion of baseline study is 17/12/2008. People determining the baseline have been included in the document.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D. Estimation of ex ante Actual Net Removals, Leakage and Net Anthropogenic Removals					
D.1 Estimation of ex ante actual net removals					
Are the calculations of ex-ante actual net removals for the crediting period consistent with the approach in the selected methodology and adequately defined?	2	DR, I	In PDD formulas have been used according to methodology.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are all aspects related to direct and indirect GHG emissions and removals captured in the project design?	1, 2	DR, I	The methane emissions due to the burning of existing biomass which is removed during site preparation are not included. A clarification of the methodology has been asked on this subject (AM_CLA_0008).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	1, 2, 29	DR, I	<p>Yes, the ex-ante GHG calculations have been done in TARAM.</p> <p>Clarification request to the Meth Panel (AM_CLA_08)</p> <p>Clarification request to the Meth Panel (AM_CLA_09)</p> <p>Corrective Action Request n° 9</p> <p>Please correct the ex-ante calculation according to the Corrective Action Request n° 2.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 14</p> <p>It difficult to track coherence between the PDD and the TARAM excel file; please provide detailed description of how values in PDD Table 5 were compiled from TARAM.</p>	<p>CAR 9</p> <p>CL 14</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Have conservative assumptions been used to calculate project GHG emissions and removals?	1, 2	DR, I	<p>Assumptions have been clearly defined or explained by the project participant.</p> <p>For the loss of biomass due to site preparation, the carbon loss relative to the existing biomass which is removed is calculated based on default IPCC 2006 values. However, these values are not genus-specific. As requested in EB46 report, Annex 17 “guidelines on conservative choice of data when estimating biomass stocks and change in woody vegetation”, 3(ii), field measurements must be realized.</p> <p>Corrective Action Request n° 10</p> <p>Please proceed to the necessary field measurement as explained by the Annex 17 “guidelines on conservative choice of data when estimating biomass stocks and change in woody vegetation”</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 15</p> <p>Please explain how the compliance of the values chosen for the parameters with the "Guidelines on conservative choice of default data for estimation of biomass stocks and change in woody vegetation" (v01)-EB46-Annex 17 was checked (e.g., which literature databases were searched for identification of more local values than the IPCC sources). Explain how the values of parameters Dj, BEF and RS were computed from IPCC sources.</p>	<p>CAR 10</p> <p>CL 15</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Does the PP assume that changes in carbon stock of above-ground and below-ground biomass of non tree vegetation may be conservatively assumed to be zero for all strata in the project scenario?	1, 2	DR, I	Changes in carbon stock of above-ground and below-ground of non tree biomass are conservatively assumed to be zero for all strata in the project scenario.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Has the most recent version of the approved methodological tool "Estimation of emissions from clearing, burning and decay of existing vegetation due to implementation of an A/R CDM project activity" been used?	2, 41	DR, I	The AR-AM-Tool Version 2 "Estimation of GHG emissions from clearing, burning and decay of existing vegetation due to implementation of a CDM A/R project activity", which was the most recent one at the time of submission, has been used.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is the following applicability conditions respected?</p> <p>A If the use of fire for site preparation is not specifically excluded, and the methodology within which this tool is applied does not include accounting of leakage emissions due to the spread of fire beyond the project boundary, then add the following applicability condition:</p> <p>If fire is used during site preparation then fire control measures such as installation of fire-breaks or back-burning shall be taken to ensure fire does not spread outside the project boundary: that is, no biomass burning shall be permitted to occur beyond the project boundary due to site preparation activities.</p>	1, 2, 41	DR, I	<p>The use of fire is excluded for site preparation.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 16</p> <p>The existing biomass which is removed during site preparation is burned in cassava dryer, outside the project boundary. A clarification on the methodology is in progress on this issue (AM_CLA_0008).</p>	CL 16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<p>Is the following applicability conditions respected?</p> <p>Calculation of emissions can be simplified, and project emissions reduced, if trees existing at the time the project commences are not removed or damaged as part of site preparation. If emissions from clearance of existing tree biomass are not to be accounted, add the following applicability condition:</p> <p>Site preparation shall be restricted to clearance of non-tree vegetation, with any biomass burning (if applicable) carried out in such a way as to avoid damage to existing trees within the project boundary.</p>	1, 2, 41	DR, I	Emissions from clearance of existing trees are accounted for in agroforestry and pure plantation stands, but not in natural generation stands. In natural generation stands, only non-tree vegetation is to be cleared.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is the following applicability conditions respected?</p> <p>Unless changes in the soil carbon pool are explicitly accounted, add the following applicability condition to ensure site preparation activities do not result either in significant emissions from oxidation of soil carbon or in significant accountable losses due to erosion:</p> <p>Site preparation shall be carried out in a manner consistent with the conditions in the Procedure to determine when accounting of the soil organic carbon pool may be conservatively neglected in CDM A/R project activities; EB 33 Meeting Report, Annex 15.</p>	1, 2, 41	DR, I	Changes in soil carbon pool are accounted in the methodology.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Is the methodological procedure of the tool “Estimation of emissions from clearing, burning and decay of existing vegetation due to implementation of an A/R CDM project activity” applied in a correct manner?	1, 2, 41	DR, I	<p>Corrective Action Request n° 11</p> <p>Please adjust the default value for the carbon fraction of shrub at 0,49 instead of 0,50.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 17</p> <p>A clarification request is in progress relating to the methane emissions of existing biomass burned in cassava dryers (AM_CLA_0008).</p>	CAR 11 CL 17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Which method has been used to estimate the mean carbon stock in above-ground and below-ground biomass: the Biomass Expansion Factors (BEF) method or the Allometric Equations method?	1, 2	DR, I	The Biomass Expansion Factors (BEF) method has been used.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Has the method selected to estimate the mean carbon stock in above-ground and below-ground biomass been used correctly?	1, 2	DR, I	The method has been used correctly.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.2 Estimation of ex ante leakage					

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Are potential leakage effects beyond the chosen project boundaries properly identified?	1, 2	DR, I	<p>The methodology takes into account only activity displacement leakage, and in particular the displacement of grazing activity. In the project, the displacement of grazing activity is not relevant.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 18</p> <p>The methane emissions due to the burning in the cassava dryer of the biomass removed during the site preparation. A clarification request is in progress to determine if these emissions shall be considered as a leakage.</p>	CL 18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Have these leakage effects been properly accounted for in calculations?	1, 2	DR, I	As requested by the methodology, only leakage due to the displacement of grazing activity due to the project implementation has been considered.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Estimation of LKActivityDisplacement - Carbon stock decreases caused by displacement of pre-project grazing: Have the emissions from LKActivityDisplacement been estimated adequately and in line with the methodology requirements? Is sufficient evidence provided on input values?	1, 2	DR, I	As verified onsite, there is no breeding in the project area. Therefore leakage due to grazing is assumed to be null.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E. Monitoring Plan					
E.1. Monitoring of project implementation					
Is the monitoring plan based on the methodology previously approved by the CDM Executive Board? A/R Modalities §26.	2,3	DR, I	Yes. The title and the version of the methodology applied are defined: AR-ACM0001 version 03.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Is the monitoring methodology applicable for this project and is the appropriateness justified? A/R Modalities §26a	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Yes. The monitoring methodology is applicable for this project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the monitoring methodology reflect good monitoring and reporting practices appropriate to the types of A/R project activity? A/R Modalities §26b	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Yes, the methods follow the approved methodology approach, and good monitoring and reporting practices appropriate to the types of A/R project activity.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the monitoring methodology take into account uncertainties by appropriate choice of monitoring methods (e.g number of samples) to achieve reliable estimates of the net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks? A/R Modalities §26c.	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Yes, the methods follow the approved methodology approach. Cf E.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the discussion and selection of the monitoring methodology transparent?	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are carbon pools monitored by collecting transparent and verifiable information to demonstrate that any choice made regarding carbon pools does not lead to an increase of the net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks?	1, 2, 3	DR, I	A clarification request to the Meth Panel is under progress on soil carbon. Corrective Action Request n° 12 Please name the parameters to be monitored accordingly with the methodology.	CAR 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the monitoring plan include provisions for a periodic calculation of the net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks?	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Clarification Request n° 19 Please provide more details on the periodic calculation of the net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks.	CL 19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Does the monitoring plan include provisions for the monitoring of changes in circumstances within the project boundary that affect legal title to the land or right of access to the carbon pools? A/R Modalities §26f.	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Yes, the monitoring plan includes the monitoring of project boundary. See Corrective Action Request n° 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will all the monitored data be archived for 2 years following the end of the last crediting period?	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Corrective Action Request n° 13 Please insert in the procedure for data management that data must be archived for 2 years.	CAR 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the geographic position of the project boundary recorded for all areas of land? Is it achieved by survey or by using georeferenced special data?	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Yes, the geographic position of the project boundary is recorded for all areas of land, by survey.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.2. Monitoring of sampling design and stratification					
Have results of the application of the stratification procedure from the selected methodology been adequately described?	1, 2, 3, 25	DR, I	Yes, the application of the stratification procedure has been adequately described.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Have the number of sample plots and their proposed distribution over the project area been properly calculated and described?	1, 2, 3, 25	DR, I	Corrective Action Request n° 14 An error in the calculation of the number of sample plots for the project stratum n°9 has been identified. The $Z_{\alpha/2}$ used in the calculation is not correct. Please use the value: $Z_{\alpha/2} = 1,9599$ and correct the number of plots in consequence.	CAR 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Is the monitoring of the project boundary and the strata incorporated to monitoring schemes?	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Yes, the monitoring of the project boundary is included in the monitoring scheme. Forward Action Request n° 1 Please take into account the new project area. See Corrective Action Request n° 2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FAR 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the sample size and allocation among strata determined by using the tool “Calculation of the number of sample plots for measurements within A/R CDM project activities”?	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Yes, the tool “Calculation of the number of sample plots for measurements within A/R CDM project activities” has been used.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the targeted precision level for biomass estimation within each stratum $\pm 10\%$ of the mean at a 95% confidence level?	1, 2, 3, 38, 25	DR, I	Yes, the targeted precision level for biomass estimation within each stratum is $\pm 10\%$ of the mean at a 95% confidence level.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the PDD/Monitoring plan include indications on plot localizing, monitoring frequency and concrete indications on measurements of carbon stock changes over time in plots (omission of baseline trees and non tree biomass)?	1, 2, 3, 38, 25	DR, I	The monitoring plan includes indications on plot localizing, monitoring frequency and concrete indications on measurements of carbon stock changes in plots. The monitoring schedule does not maximize emissions reductions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.3. Monitoring of Baseline Net GHG Removals by Sinks					

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Is monitoring of the baseline net removals required by the selected methodology? If yes, - has the application of the procedure for selection of sample plots been adequately defined and has all data to be collected or used been listed? - has the application of the procedure for selection of sample plots been adequately defined and has all data to be collected or used been listed?	1, 2	DR, I	Not Applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.4. Monitoring of Actual Net GHG Removals by Sinks					
Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimation or measuring the actual net greenhouse gas removals by sinks during the crediting period?	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Yes, the monitoring plan included in the PDD describes the archiving of all relevant data. See Corrective Action Request n° 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the monitoring plan specify techniques and methods for sampling and measuring individual carbon pools included in the actual net greenhouse gas removals by sinks?	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Do these techniques and methods reflect accepted principles and criteria for forest inventory?	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Yes. The techniques and methods described in the PDD reflect good principles for forest inventory.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the choices of project GHG indicators reasonable?	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will it be possible to monitor / measure the specified project GHG indicators?	1, 2, 3	DR, I	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Will the indicators give opportunity for real measurements of achieved GHG removals?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will the indicators enable comparison of project data and performance over time?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.5. Monitoring of Leakage					
If monitoring of leakage is required by the selected methodology has this been stated and has the data and information that will be collected to monitor leakage been adequately defined?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	No leakage has been identified in the project activity. Clarification Request n° 20 The methane emissions from the biomass removed and burned in cassava dryers may be considered as a leakage. See clarification request to the meth panel (AM_CLA_0008).	CL 20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the procedures for measurements for the monitoring of leakage clearly defined and do they follow typical forest mensuration practices?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Not Applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Have procedures for the periodic review of the implementation of activities and measures to minimize leakage been adequately defined?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Not relevant, as the project is not concerned by any leakage. See Clarification Request n° 20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.6 QA/QC procedures undertaken for data monitored					

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Have QA/QC procedures been defined appropriately and are explanations of procedures (including their absence) reasonable?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Some QA/QC procedures have been developed. Clarification Request n° 21 Please provide the missing procedures and the corresponding action sheets.	CL 21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.7 Operational and management structure of project operator					
Has the operational and management structure that the project operator will implement in order to monitor actual removals and leakage by the project been adequately defined?	1, 2 ,15	DR, I	PDD E.7 describes the authority and responsibility of project management.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are procedures identified for training of monitoring personnel?	1, 2 ,3, 16	DR, I	Procedures regarding monitoring training of personnel have been described in the monitoring plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are procedures identified for emergency preparedness for cases where emergencies can cause unintended emissions?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Procedures regarding fire, pest and disease and droughts have been described in the monitoring plan. Clarification Request n° 22 Please provide the procedures regarding fire, pest and disease and droughts.	CL 22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Are procedures identified for calibration of monitoring equipment?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Monitoring equipment would be calibrated using standard forest management and inventory operating procedures. Clarification Request n° 23 Please provide the procedures regarding monitoring equipment calibration.	CL 23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are procedures identified for maintenance of monitoring equipment and installations?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Procedures regarding monitoring training of personnel have been described in the monitoring plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are procedures identified for monitoring, measurements and reporting?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Procedures for monitoring, measurements and reporting are identified in the monitoring plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are procedures identified for day-to-day records handling (including what records to keep, storage area of records and how to process performance documentation)	1, 2, 3, 15, 16	DR, I	The “Cellule Qualité et Suivi Statistique” (CQSS) has developed standardized operating procedures for collection, reporting, filing and archival of the project data and information. Clarification Request n° 24 Please detail the procedures regarding day-to-day records handling.	CL 24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are procedures identified for dealing with possible monitoring data adjustments and uncertainties?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Clarification Request n° 25 Please provide a procedure for dealing with possible monitoring data adjustments and uncertainties.	CL 25	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Are procedures identified for review of reported results/data?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Procedures for review of reported results/data are identified in the monitoring plan. Clarification Request n° 26 Please provide the corresponding procedure.	CL 26	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are procedures identified for internal audits of GHG project compliance with operational requirements where applicable?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Procedures for internal audits are identified in the monitoring plan. Clarification Request n° 27 Please provide the corresponding procedure.	CL 27	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are procedures identified for project performance reviews before data is submitted for verification, internally or externally?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Procedures for project performance reviews before data is submitted for verification are identified in the monitoring plan. Clarification Request n° 28 Please provide the corresponding procedure.	CL 28	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are procedures identified for corrective actions in order to provide for more accurate future monitoring and reporting?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Procedures for corrective actions in order to provide for more accurate future monitoring and reporting are identified in the monitoring plan. Clarification Request n° 29 Please provide the corresponding procedure.	CL 29	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.8 Person applying monitoring plan					

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Has the person or entity applying the monitoring plan been named, are they listed as a project participant and has contact information been provided?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	The entity applying the monitoring plan is the Follow up and Control unit (Research and Development – CQSS).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.9 Monitoring of Sustainable Development Indicators/ Environmental Impacts					
Does the monitoring plan provide the collection and archiving of relevant data concerning environmental, social and economic impacts?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	The monitoring plan does not provide the collection and archiving of relevant data concerning environmental, social and economic impacts. Only the area of slash and burn is monitored.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the monitoring plan provide provisions for the collection and archiving of planned monitoring and remedial measures?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	<p>PDD F.3 describes measures to protect the environment: fire control and permanent monitoring, wildlife habitat improvement, and population awareness raising and environmental education.</p> <p>Corrective Action Request n° 15</p> <p>Please provide the plans and explain what is to be monitored and how.</p>	CAR 15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the choice of indicators for sustainability development (social, environmental, economic) reasonable?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Ditto	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will it be possible to monitor the specified sustainable development indicators?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Ditto	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Are the sustainable development indicators in line with stated national priorities in the Host Country?	1, 2 ,3	DR, I	Ditto	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F. Environmental Impacts					
Has an analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity been adequately documented, including (i) impacts on biodiversity and natural ecosystems (e.g. hydrology, soils, pests) and (ii) impacts outside the project boundary?	2, 8	DR, I	<p>Environmental impacts of the project activity are addressed succinctly in the PDD, including impacts on biodiversity (soil fauna, endangered species) and natural ecosystems (climate, hydrology, soils, pests) and impacts outside the project boundary (wild fire, wood exploitation, indirect incomes generation).</p> <p>Corrective Action Request n° 16</p> <p>Please provide details on diseases management, following the PDD implementation guidelines.</p>	CAR 16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If any negative impact is considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, has a statement that the project participants have undertaken an environmental impact assessment in accordance with the procedures required by the host Party (including conclusions and references to supporting information) been provided?	2, 8	DR, I	No significant negative environmental impact was identified. Nevertheless, a Socio-Environmental Impact Assessment (Ref. 7) is appended to the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the planned monitoring and remedial measures to address significant environmental impacts adequately described?	2, 8	DR, I	No significant negative environmental impact is expected.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country?	2, 8	DR, I	Corrective Action Request n° 17 Please document/justify compliance of the project activity with national environmental and forestry policies, including environmental evaluation of projects.	CAR 17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G. Socio-Economic Impacts					
Has the analysis of the socio-economic impacts of the project activity been sufficiently described?	2, 8	DR, I	Socio-economic impacts of the project activity (local employment, seasonal employment, local trade) are addressed in the PDD, based on the results of the socio-economic impact assessment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the analysis adequately include (where applicable) information on local communities, indigenous people, land tenure, local employment, food production, cultural and religious sites and access to fuelwood and other forest products?	2, 8	DR, I	The PDD includes information on local communities, indigenous people, land tenure, local employment, food production and access to fuelwood. Impacts of the project activity on population flows and competition with preexisting activities are not applicable considering the low density of population in the area and the limited ground coverage in the area.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Are potential impacts outside the project boundary analyzed?	2, 8	DR, I	<p>Socio-economic impacts of the project on local employment, living standard, local trade and the diversification of local economy in the region around Mbankana are described in the PDD.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 30</p> <p>Please assess and provide supporting evidence for jobs creation, wages, labor conditions, living conditions (including social facilities and activities created for the activity purpose) and capacity building procedures/program.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 31</p> <p>Please justify the following assertion: “representing around 220 full time positions (over the whole year)”, and reformulate it using the “full-time equivalent” terminology.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 32</p> <p>Please provide supporting evidence for the figure of 60-70% of permanent jobs created, or update the figure.</p>	<p>CL 30</p> <p>CL 31</p> <p>CL 32</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
If any negative impact is considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, has a statement that the project participants have undertaken a socio-economic impact assessment in accordance with the procedures required by the host Party (including conclusions and references to supporting information) been provided?	2, 8	DR, I	<p>No significant negative environmental impact was identified. Nevertheless, a Socio-Environmental Impact Assessment (Ref. 7) is appended to the PDD.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 33</p> <p>Please justify that possible negative impacts in the following fields are not significant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - work penibility - population inflow - degraded infrastructures - competition with preexisting activities within the project area and in the surroundings 	CL 33	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Has an adequate description of the planned monitoring and remedial measures to address significant socio-economic impacts been provided?	2, 8	DR, I	<p>No significant negative socio-economic impact is expected.</p> <p>See Clarification Request n° 33</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the project comply with legislation in the host country?	2, 8	DR, I	<p>Clarification Request n° 34</p> <p>Please justify compliance of the project activity with national labor and economic legislations.</p>	CL 34	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H. Stakeholder Comments					

*MoV = Mean of Verification, DR = Document Review, I = Interview.

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	2, 32, 33	DR, I	It was verified that relevant stakeholders have been consulted several times in 2006, as described in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?	2, 8	DR, I	According to the PDD and the socio-economic and environmental impact assessment, presentations of the project have been made in Lingala, Téké and French.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Has sufficient time been given to stakeholders to comment on the project design?	2, 8	DR, I	According to the document provided, stakeholders have been consulted several times in 2006. It is considered that they had sufficient time to comment on the project design.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, has the stakeholder consultation process been carried out in accordance with such regulations/laws?	2	DR, I	No specific regulation on stakeholder consultation is available in the host country.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is a summary of the stakeholder comments received provided?	2	DR, I	A summary of the discussion groups has been included in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST QUESTIONS	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	2	DR, I	<p>Yes, answers to the stakeholder comments have been provided in the PDD.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 35</p> <p>Please describe fire breakers maintenance procedure.</p> <p>Corrective Action Request n° 18</p> <p>Please mention how local farmers' expectations will be managed: possible use of the projects' technical means, improved access to healthcare and water, infrastructure maintenance, forestation, creation of an arboretum.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 36</p> <p>Please describe how awareness raising toward fire risk management will be implemented.</p> <p>Clarification Request n° 37</p> <p>Please provide evidence of provisions for fire-fighting facilities (vehicles, water tanks) or change the formulation in the PDD to show that actions have not been defined/provisioned yet.</p>	<p>CL 35</p> <p>CAR 18</p> <p>CL 36</p> <p>CL 37</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

7. Annex 2: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref to PDD	Summary of project owner response and follow-up from audit team	Final conclusion
<p>Corrective Action Request n° 1</p> <p>Please provide letter of approval of France and Spain.</p>	A3	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The Letter of Approval of France has been provided. The Letter of Approval of Spain will be requested once all the CAR and CL will be closed accordingly with the procedures of the Spanish DNA.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>Provide the Letter of Approval of Spain.</p> <p>Project team 15/11/2010:</p> <p>The IBRD has been removed from the project participants. Therefore, the Letter of Approval of Spain is no more required.</p> <p>Auditor 29/11/2010:</p> <p>All the required LoAs of the project participants included in the last version of the PDD have been provided.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Corrective Action Request n° 2</p> <p>An area of experimental plantation stands G3 should be excluded of the project area.</p>	A4	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The mentioned area inside stand G3 was taken away. A corrected excel file which gives area of each stand, including G3, and the Google Earth file (.kml) gives spatial localization and area of each stand have been provided.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The area of experimental plantation has been excluded of the project area.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p>Corrective Action Request n° 3</p> <p>The area under control of the project participants should be geographically delineated (see Corrective Action Request n° 4).</p>	A4	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>A study, related to the cadastral register, was implemented and achieved by the Government of DRC through its department responsible of land tenure issues. The area under control of participants was provided through the document provided to Novacel by the Government of DRC. The results of the study have been given in an attached Google Earth file.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The documents provided by the Government of DRC include a geographical delineation of the area under control of the project participants.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clarification Request n° 1</p> <p>Please justify that the wood burned for the cassava drying activity induced by the project will not induce significant additional leakage.</p>	A5	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>Following the Clarification request AR_AM_CLA008 of the A/R WG 27, the non-CO2 emission due to the burning of biomass, removed during site preparation, outside the project boundary is considered as a leakage directly linked to the market, and therefore should not be taken into account.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>Following the clarification provided by the A/R WG, and as the biomass from site preparation will have been absorbed by the fuelwood demand (largely greater than the supply) in the region of Kinshasa, the potential leakage due to non-CO2 emissions from biomass burning should not be taken into account.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clarification Request n° 2</p> <p>Please precise how harvesting by local farmers within the project boundaries will be managed.</p>	A5	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The rules and the management of harvesting by local farmers within the project area have been provided. The harvesting of living trees within the project boundaries is not allowed except by Novacel employees in execution of Novacel operations (planned harvesting), while sporadic harvesting of deadwood within the project boundary is tolerated and collection of trees removed during site preparation by workers and local farmers for domestic usage is allowed.</p> <p>The quantity of wood that could be harvested is limited because project boundaries</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		<p>are situated at much larger distance (several kilometers) of the local farmers' dwellings, the project is compact with no dispersed planted areas, the project boundaries are at the same time communication tracks used by project vehicles, farmers do not own chain saws and on the side of the main road, the domain is guarded by security teams to prevent manioc stealing and this discourages also any illegal wood harvesting by external people.</p> <p>Therefore, the management is based on two rules</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explaining to the farmers what they are allowed and not allowed to do within the project boundaries, in accordance to traditional community laws - Controlling the planted areas for illegal cutting during the normal maintenance activities. <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The information received, jointly with site visit are considered as sufficient evidence.</p>	
<p>Clarification Request n° 3</p> <p>Please justify the discrepancy between the area of land concerned by the contract between the RDC and Olivier Mushiete, and the area of land concerned by the long term lease to NOVACEL.</p>	A6	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The discrepancy between the two documents has been justified as follows: In the long-term lease contract, the Mushiete family gives to Novacel the right to exploit their whole area of land, not limited to the Project area. Novacel is also entitled, in execution of that contract, to collect all revenues from the said area of land (including carbon credits with all other revenues derived from its activities). The area of land in question is the land to which they have entitlement under traditional law. This document is necessary (and used) to underpin the right of Novacel to exploit this area (for any purpose) to secure the ability of Novacel to collect investments to finance its activities.</p> <p>The contract between RDC and Olivier Mushiete has been established at a later stage in the framework of the Project and possible extensions. Due to high administrative costs of cadastral documents, the area of land with cadastral documents is limited to that area of land that is used now or will be used in a near future. Further cadastral acts will be requested as needed when further extensions are planned.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The information received, jointly with site visit are considered as sufficient evidence.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Corrective Action Request n° 4	A6	Project team 08/11/2010: Please refer to the CAR n°3. Auditor 10/11/2010: Please refer to the CAR n°3.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Cadastral documents provided along with the five emphyteutic lease contracts (covering 1,000 ha parcels each) between Olivier Mushiete and the DRC are not georeferenced. Please document the correspondence between the five parcels mentioned above and the project area. (see CAR n°3)			
Clarification Request n° 4	A6	Project team 08/11/2010: It has been specified in the PDD that thanks to the leasing contract, the project proponent Novalcel disposes of the usufruct of the land, including the carbon credits generated from the proposed project activity. Auditor 10/11/2010: The PDD has been modified as requested.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please specify in the PDD that the rights of access to carbon credits from sequestration belong to the project proponent (NOVACEL).			
Corrective Action Request n° 5	A7	Project team 08/11/2010: The project proponent specified in the demonstration of the eligibility of the lands that the project is a reforestation. Auditor 10/11/2010: The PDD has been modified as requested.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
In the absence of evidence that the project area could not be considered as a forest within the last 50 years according to the DNA forest definition, the project proponent should consider the project as a reforestation project in the section A.7 of the PDD.			
Clarification Request n° 5	B1	Project team 08/11/2010: The project proponent provides additional information on the activities which occurred in July 2008.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please provide the reporting sheet of July 2008			

		<p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>Please provide a report which justifies the activities of July 2008.</p> <p>Project team 15/11/2010:</p> <p>A report of may 2008 explaining the starting date of the project activity has been provided.</p> <p>Auditor 15/11/2010</p> <p>A report of activity showing that the activity of plants breeding and site preparation started in the beginning of July 2008 have been provided. The starting date of 1st July is considered as acceptable for the starting of the project activity.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request n° 6</p> <p>The tool “Estimation of GHG emissions due to clearing, burning and decay of existing vegetation attributable to a CDM A/R project activity” has been revised in the EB 50 (Version of the 16 October 2009). Please use the version 03.</p>	C1	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The PDD has been modified using the version 3 of the tool “Estimation of GHG emissions due to clearing, burning and decay of existing vegetation attributable to a CDM A/R project activity”.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The PDD has been modified as requested.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clarification Request n° 6</p> <p>Please provide all the record of fires on the project area since the monitoring of fires has started.</p>	C2	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The project proponent provided the record of fires since the project started.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>As observed during the site visit, the risk of fire is considered as high. The record of fires confirms that the risk is high. However, the procedures on fire management and prevention give sufficient confidence that the risk is properly managed.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Clarification Request n° 7	C2	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>According to the following reference: “BERCI, 2006. Analyse d’impact socio-environnemental du projet “Puits Carbone, station Ibi”, 75p », as stated in its page 27, the population density on the Bateke Plateau is very low, with 8 hab/km2.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>Please modify the PDD accordingly and indicate the reference.</p> <p>Project team 15/11/2010:</p> <p>The project team modified the PDD.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The PDD has been modified as requested.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clarification Request n° 8</p> <p>Please document/justify the following assertions :</p> <p>- p37: natural conditions (sandy soils, grassy/shrubby savannahs)</p>	C5	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>According to the following reference: “Ndembo Longo J., 2006. Etude pédologique de la concession du projet, 30p », as stated in its page 6, paragraph 9, the identified soils belong to the arenoferrasols. They are sandy soils that belong to the ocre sands serie of Kalahari.</p> <p>According to the following reference: “Oréade Brèche, 2006. Puits de carbone d’Ibi, Plateau des Bateke, Etude d’impact socio-environnemental, 93p », as stated in its page 14, paragraph “flora and ecosystems”, the vegetation in the concession is composed of grassy savannahs or savannahs with few shrubs.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The sources have been verified. The references have been indicated in the PDD.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification Request n° 9	C5	Project team 08/11/2010:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p>Please document/justify the following assertions :</p> <p>- p37: the area is not part of forest policy priorities.</p>		<p>According to the following reference: “MECNT, 2008, Programme National Forêts et Conservation, draft consolidé, 15p », which is the strategic frame of the governmental action for forest and conservation in DR Congo, the Plateau Bateke region is not mentioned and therefore is not considered as a priority for forest policy.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The source has been verified. The reference has been indicated in the PDD.</p>	
<p>Clarification Request n° 10</p> <p>Please document/justify the following assertions :</p> <p>- 38: “Public funding for agricultural development is low and under continual pressure from other budgetary requirements” ; “The prevailing practice in the region is subsistence farming” ;</p>	C5	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>According to the following reference: “World Bank 2009, Democratic Republic of Congo, Economic report: Fall 2008, 20p”, it is stated in its page 11 that the government is carrying out reforms in all sectors aiming at implementing its poverty reduction strategy, as well as the huge program which comes from and the priority <i>Cinq chantiers de la République</i>, namely Education, Health, Infrastructure, Energy and Employment. Target sectors of this large reform agenda include governance and transparency, administration, public finance management, procurement, statistical capacity building, and the business environment whose reforms should enhance the economy’s supply response. Decentralization aspects are also gradually integrated into programs and reforms. Therefore, agricultural development is not part of those priorities.</p> <p>According to the following reference: “BERCI, 2006. Analyse d’impact socio-environnemental du projet “Puits Carbone, station Ibi”, 75p », as stated in its page 37, « l’agriculture pour la population du plateau de Bateke est en grande partie traditionnelle et sert d’abord à l’autosuffisance alimentaire. »</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The source has been verified. The reference has been indicated in the PDD.</p>	☑
<p>Clarification Request n° 11</p> <p>More details should be provided on the references used for the demonstration. (see</p>	C5	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>Please refer to the answers given for CL 8 to CL 10.</p>	☑

Clarification Request n° 8 to Clarification Request n° 10)		Auditor 10/11/2010: The sources have been verified. The references have been indicated in the PDD.	
Corrective Action Request n° 7 Please provide a more accurate description of the Mampu project and explain why the project activity is different.	C5	Project team 08/11/2010: A more accurate description of the Mampu project has been provided included a table summarizing the differences between the two projects. Auditor 10/11/2010: The document provided clearly shows that the project of Mampu is different compared to the proposed project activity. The proposed project activity can be considered as a first of its kind in the region.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Corrective Action Request n° 8 The literature and sources are not clearly referenced. (See Clarification Request n° 8 to Clarification Request n° 10)	C5	Project team 08/11/2010: The literature and sources have been referenced in the modified PDD. Auditor 10/11/2010: The sources have been verified. The references have been indicated in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification Request n° 12 Please provide an implementation timeline of the proposed CDM project activity. The timeline should include, where applicable, the date when the investment decision was made, the date when soil preparation started, the date when plantation started. In addition to this implementation timeline please provide a timeline of events and actions which have been taken to achieve CDM registration, with description of the evidence used to support	C6	Project team 08/11/2010: The timeline has been included in the Quality Manual (pp 22 to 25) provided separately. Auditor 10/11/2010: The information received, jointly with site visit is considered as sufficient evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

these actions.			
<p>Clarification Request n° 13</p> <p>Please provide all the record of fires on the project area since the monitoring of fires has started. (See Clarification Request n° 6)</p>	C6	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>Please refer to the answers given for Clarification Request n° 6.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>As observed during the site visit, the number of fires occurring nearby or in the project area can be considered as high. Jointly with the interview during the site visit, and the literature provided, the baseline scenario (frequent fires established for a long time) is considered as realistic.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Corrective Action Request n° 9</p> <p>Please correct the ex-ante calculation according to the Corrective Action Request n° 2</p>	D1	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The ex-ante emissions have been corrected according to the modification of the project area due to the CAR 2 and CAR 3.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The ex-ante calculations have been corrected according to the new area.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clarification Request n° 14</p> <p>It difficult to track coherence between the PDD and the TARAM excel file; please provide detailed description of how values in PDD Table 5 were compiled from TARAM.</p>		<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>A table of correspondence between the PDD tables and TARAM excel files has been provided.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The information has been provided as requested.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Corrective Action Request n° 10</p> <p>Please proceed to the necessary field measurement as explained by the Annex 17 “guidelines on conservative choice of data when estimating biomass stocks and change in</p>	D1	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The field measurements have been realized as explained by the Annex 17 “guidelines on conservative choice of data when estimating biomass stocks and change in woody vegetation”.</p> <p>As the default value does not differ for more than 10 % of the value estimated through field measurement, the default value is considered as valid.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

woody vegetation"		<p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The methodology of the field measurement complies with SOP. The default value used for the above-ground biomass of the baseline 11.36 tms.ha⁻¹ is considered as valid.</p>	
<p>Clarification Request n° 15</p> <p>Please explain how the compliance of the values chosen for the parameters with the "Guidelines on conservative choice of default data for estimation of biomass stocks and change in woody vegetation" (v01)-EB46-Annex 17 was checked (e.g., which literature databases were searched for identification of more local values than the IPCC sources). Explain how the values of parameters Dj, BEF and RS were computed from IPCC sources.</p>	D1	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The following literature databases and institutions were consulted: Bois et Forêts des Tropiques, Horizons (IRD), Google scholar, AgroParisTech-ENGREF database, IUCN website, FAO website, Mampu staff, Kinzono field station staff.</p> <p>No species-specific values were found. In compliance with Annex 17 of EB 46, genus-specific values in the same ecological zone were searched but none of them were found before the start of the validation process. Therefore, IPCC literature was chosen (IPCC 2003, Good Practice Guidance for LULUCF; IPCC 2006, Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas inventories).</p> <p>The values of parameters Dj, BEF and RS have been calculated from the IPCC 2003 default values corrected as requested by EB46 Annex 17.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The choice of default values is considered as correct following the request of the methodology and the EB 46 Annex 17.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clarification Request n° 16</p> <p>The existing biomass which is removed during site preparation is burned in cassava dryer, outside the project boundary. A clarification on the methodology is in progress on this issue.</p>	D1	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>Please refer to CL 1.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>Please refer to CL 1.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Corrective Action Request n° 11</p> <p>Please adjust the default value for the carbon</p>	D1	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>Considering a default value for the carbon fraction of shrub of 0,50 instead of 0,49 is conservative, therefore adjusting the default value for the carbon fraction of shrub at</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

fraction of shrub at 0,49 instead of 0,50.		<p>0.49 instead of 0.50 is not considered as not necessary.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>In order to simplify the formulae, the project proponent decided to use the same carbon fraction for trees and shrub (0,50), which is conservative. Being conservative this approach does not lead to higher emissions reduction than the use of the default carbon fraction value for shrub, and therefore is considered as acceptable.</p>	
<p>Clarification Request n° 17</p> <p>A clarification request is in progress relating to the methane emissions of existing biomass burned in cassava dryers.</p>	D1	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>Please refer to CL 1.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>Please refer to CL 1.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clarification Request n° 18</p> <p>The methane emissions due to the burning in the cassava dryer of the biomass removed during the site preparation. A clarification request is in progress to determine if these emissions shall be considered as a leakage.</p>	D2	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>Please refer to CL 1.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>Please refer to CL 1.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Corrective Action Request n° 12</p> <p>1. Please name the parameters to be monitored accordingly with the methodology.</p>	E2	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The presentation of the parameters to be monitored has been modified accordingly with the methodology.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>Please specify the measurement procedures and the QA/QC procedures in the tables.</p> <p>Project team 15/11/2010:</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		<p>The project team provided the tables including the measurement procedures and the QA/QC procedures.</p> <p>Auditor 15/11/2010:</p> <p>The measurement procedures and the QA/QC procedures have been completed in the tables of the part E.1.1 of the PDD, and refer to the Quality Manual. All the measurement procedures and the QA/QC procedures comply with SOP</p>	
<p>Clarification on Approved Methodologies AR_AM_CLA_0009.</p> <p>Following the answers of the A/R Working Group to the AR_AM_CLA_0009, as the default method shall not be applied, the SOC should not be taken into account in the ex-post emissions calculations.</p>		<p>Project team 01/12/2010:</p> <p>The project team modified the PDD and the monitoring plan. In accordance with the clarification AM_CLA_0009, soil organic carbon pool is conservatively neglected as the project does not match with eligibility criteria of the default approach of the methodology used to include soil organic carbon.</p> <p>Auditor 01/12/2010:</p> <p>The PDD and the monitoring plan have been modified as requested: the soil organic carbon is conservatively neglected, both for ex-ante and ex-post emissions calculations.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clarification Request n° 19</p> <p>Please provide more details on the periodic calculation of the net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks.</p>	E2	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>Periodic calculation of the net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks will be done every 5 years accordingly to the methodology. The first monitoring is planned in 2012.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The planned verification dates does not maximize the emission reductions.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Corrective Action Request n° 13</p> <p>Please insert in the procedure for data management that data must be archived for 2 years.</p>	E2	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The section 8.5 of the Quality Manual specifies and modified procedure "PROT CQSS-11" specifies that the data will be archived for 2 years.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		The procedure for data management specifies that the data will be archived for 2 years.	
<p>Corrective Action Request n° 14</p> <p>An error in the calculation of the number of sample plots for the project stratum n°9 has been identified. The $Z_{\alpha/2}$ used in the calculation is not correct. Please use the value: $Z_{\alpha/2} = 1,9599$ and correct the number of plots in consequence.</p>	E2	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The $Z_{\alpha/2}$ value has been corrected and the corrected number of plots calculated.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>In the excel file for calculating the number of plots per strata, the area of strata should corrected according to the CAR 2 and CAR 3.</p> <p>Project team 15/11/2010:</p> <p>The project team provided a table modified with the corrected areas.</p> <p>Auditor 15/11/2010:</p> <p>The calculation of the number of plots is correct and takes into account the requested corrections. The total number of sample plots is 96, and has been correctly reported in the PDD.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Forward Action Request n° 1</p> <p>Please take into account the new project area. See Corrective Action Request n° 2</p>	E2	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The sampling design and stratification will be based on the new project area in accordance with CAR2, once it will be checked and updated during the next monitoring event.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The project proponent shall take into account the new project area in the sampling design and stratification.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clarification Request n° 20</p> <p>The methane emissions from the biomass</p>	E5	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>Please refer to CL 1.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

removed and burned in cassava dryers may be considered as a leakage.		Auditor 10/11/2010: Please refer to CL 1.	
Clarification Request n° 21 Please provide the missing procedures and the corresponding action sheets.	E6	Project team 08/11/2010: All the procedures have been included in the Quality Manual. Auditor 10/11/2010: The means of implementation of the monitoring plan, presented in the Quality Manual, are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by from the proposed CDM project activity can be reported ex post and verified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification Request n° 22 Please provide the procedures regarding fire, pest and disease and droughts.	E7	Project team 08/11/2010: The procedures regarding fire, pest and disease and droughts have been included in the Quality Manual. Auditor 10/11/2010: The means of implementation of the monitoring plan, presented in the Quality Manual, are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by from the proposed CDM project activity can be reported ex post and verified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification Request n° 23 Please provide the procedures regarding monitoring equipment calibration.	E7	Project team 08/11/2010: The procedures regarding regarding monitoring equipment calibration has been included in the Quality Manual. Auditor 10/11/2010: The means of implementation of the monitoring plan, presented in the Quality Manual, are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by from the proposed CDM project activity can be reported ex post and verified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification Request n° 24 Please detail the procedures regarding day-to-	E7	Project team 08/11/2010: The procedures regarding day-to-day records handling has been included in the Quality Manual.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

day records handling.		<p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The means of implementation of the monitoring plan, presented in the Quality Manual, are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by from the proposed CDM project activity can be reported ex post and verified</p>	
<p>Clarification Request n° 25</p> <p>Please provide a procedure for dealing with possible monitoring data adjustments and uncertainties.</p>	E7	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The uncertainty of data is discussed in the Quality Manual.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The means of implementation of the monitoring plan, presented in the Quality Manual, are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by from the proposed CDM project activity can be reported ex post and verified</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clarification Request n° 26</p> <p>Please provide the corresponding procedure.</p>	E7	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The procedure regarding the review of the reported results has been included in the Quality Manual.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The means of implementation of the monitoring plan, presented in the Quality Manual, are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by from the proposed CDM project activity can be reported ex post and verified</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clarification Request n° 27</p> <p>Please provide the corresponding procedure.</p>	E7	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>Internal audits organization has been discussed in the Quality Manual.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The means of implementation of the monitoring plan, presented in the Quality Manual, are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by from the proposed CDM project activity can be reported ex post and verified.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification Request n° 28	E7	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>Please refer to CL 26.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please provide the corresponding procedure.		Auditor 10/11/2010: Please refer to CL 26.	
Clarification Request n° 29 Please provide the corresponding procedure.	E7	Project team 08/11/2010: Please refer to CL 26. Auditor 10/11/2010: Please refer to CL 26.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Corrective Action Request n° 15 Please provide the plans and explain what is to be monitored and how.	E7	Project team 08/11/2010: Fire occurring in the project area is systematically monitored. Auditor 10/11/2010: The wildlife habitat improvement is not monitored. However, there is no negative impact expected in the wildlife. In conclusion, the monitoring plan, and the means of implement presented in the Quality Manual, are sufficient compared to the expected impact of the project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Corrective Action Request n° 16 Please provide details on diseases management, following the PDD implementation guidelines.	F	Project team 08/11/2010: On the Bateke plateau, a long experience exists with planting Eucalyptus and Acacia trees (e.g. Mampu project), and no disease has been observed that could result in any significant danger for the planted trees. No large scale disease is known for the local and exotic species in the conditions prevalent on the Bateke savannah. Specific disease management is thus considered as non applicable to the Project Activities. Auditor 10/11/2010: Based on the interviews onsite, and the environmental studies, the need for specific disease management is not necessary.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p>Corrective Action Request n° 17</p> <p>Please document/justify compliance of the project activity with national environmental and forestry policies, including environmental evaluation of projects.</p>	F	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The project has been developed in close contact with the Ministry of Environment of the RDC. The Minister Jose Endundo has been personally in Ibi to visit the Project. The LOA of the RDC testifies of the compliance of the Project with environmental regulations and policies and has been signed by the minister for Environment in person. An extensive impact assessment study has been conducted during Project preparation that is referenced in the PDD.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The interview of the DNA during the site visit and the Letter of Approval signed by the Minister Jose Endundo, which specifies that the proposed project activity contributes to the sustainable development of the Democratic Republic of Congo, are considered as sufficient evidence.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clarification Request n° 30</p> <p>Please assess and provide supporting evidence for jobs creation, wages, labor conditions, living conditions (including social facilities and activities created for the activity purpose) and capacity building procedures/program.</p>	F	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The Novacel company has hired qualified personnel for its staff, as detailed in the Quality Manual Section 3.5 "Organisation et responsabilités". In October 2010, 16 people were in service and 9 positions were still open. The number of seasonal workers is more variable as it is dependant of seasonal activities: its maximum is reached during wet season when planting occurs, while dry season activities is more bound to maintenance and fire prevention.</p> <p>The management of workers is trusted to an external company "Pay Network" who ensures that all laws and regulations about wage levels (respect of legal minimum wage levels), payment of corresponding taxes.</p> <p>Seasonal workers have access to the accommodation buildings with potable water and firewood for free. They have access to the local shop, and external people are allowed to hold their personal shop on the domain next to the workers' buildings. The workers have access to the medical facility next to the school. In case of emergency.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		Auditor 10/11/2010: Based on the site visit and the additional evidence provided, it can be confirmed that the project has a positive impact on local employment.																
Clarification Request n° 31 Please justify the following assertion: “representing around 220 full time positions (over the whole year)”, and reformulate it using the “full-time equivalent” terminology.	F	Project team 08/11/2010: According to the statistics of Pay Network, the table gives numbers related to the beginning of 2010. <table><tr><th>Month</th><th>Number of persons occupied</th><th>Total salaries</th><th>Working days</th><th>Full-time equivalent</th></tr><tr><td>January 2010</td><td>308</td><td>10 436 800 CDF</td><td>5200</td><td>260</td></tr><tr><td>February 2010</td><td>402</td><td>14 128 600 CDF</td><td>7000</td><td>350</td></tr></table> Auditor 10/11/2010: This answer does not justify the following statement in the PDD: “The inhabitants of this region will benefit from the project in two ways. Some of them will be employed directly by the project at least as temporary workers. 300 jobs are expected to be filled during the peak period (around 6 months), representing around 220 full time positions (over the whole year).” The part of the statement “representing around 220 full time positions (over the whole year)” should be either justified or deleted. Project team 15/11/2010: The project team deleted the statement. Auditor 29/11/2010: The PDD has been modified as requested.	Month	Number of persons occupied	Total salaries	Working days	Full-time equivalent	January 2010	308	10 436 800 CDF	5200	260	February 2010	402	14 128 600 CDF	7000	350	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Month	Number of persons occupied	Total salaries	Working days	Full-time equivalent														
January 2010	308	10 436 800 CDF	5200	260														
February 2010	402	14 128 600 CDF	7000	350														
Clarification Request n° 32 Please provide supporting evidence for the	F	Project team 08/11/2010: The PDD has been modified and the figure “60-70% of permanent jobs created” has been replaced by “a significant part of the jobs (not to be estimated precisely at this	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>															

figure of 60-70% of permanent jobs created, or update the figure.		stage) will remain permanent too". Auditor 10/11/2010: The new formulation is considered as satisfactory.	
<p>Clarification Request n° 33</p> <p>Please justify that possible negative impacts in the following fields are not significant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - work hardness - population inflow - degraded infrastructures - competition with preexisting activities within the project area and in the surroundings 	F	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The work at the Ibi station is exactly of the same kind as the work of local farmers on their fields. However, as the Ibi work is defined as a daily task of reasonable size, that task is most often already done at noon, while local farmers work until dawn. Except for the inflow of seasonal workers, who leave the project area once their time is done (according to the RDC law), no specific population movements are observed on the Project Domain. The accommodation infrastructures are dimensioned for the number of workers, and increasing as that number grows. No infrastructures are degraded due to Project activities: to the contrary, a large number of pre-existing ruins have been rehabilitated and roads are now maintained to prevent erosion and other damages, improving the accessibility of the surrounding dwellings. The Project area was abandoned for the last 20 years and no economic activity of significant size was observed since then. The surroundings are dominated by subsistence farming on land that is outside the Project area and is therefore undisturbed.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010: The following possible negative impacts: work hardness, population inflow, degraded infrastructures, competition with preexisting activities within the project area and in the surroundings are considered as not significant for the project activity.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clarification Request n° 34</p> <p>Please justify compliance of the project activity with national labor and economic legislations.</p>	F	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>Novacel has outsourced its personnel management to the "Pay Network" company, well established in the Kinshasa area. Pay Network ensures that Novacel complies with all labour laws and regulations. Novacel follows the recommendations of Pay Network and pays all related wages and corresponding charges. Novacel accounts are audited by the Cauditec Audit company. Cauditec is a</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		<p>recognized Congolese company with several multinationals as clients. It ensures that Novacel complies with all economic laws and regulations of the RDC.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>Following the site visit, it is considered that the project activity is compliant with national labor and economic legislations.</p>	
<p>Clarification Request n° 35</p> <p>Please describe fire breakers maintenance procedure.</p>	H	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>The description of the fire breakers maintenance is described in the section 6.4 "Infrastructure" of the Quality Manual.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The means of implementation of the monitoring plan, presented in the Quality Manual, are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by the proposed CDM project activity can be reported ex post and verified.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Corrective Action Request n° 18</p> <p>Please mention how local farmers' expectations will be managed: possible use of the projects' technical means, improved access to healthcare and water, infrastructure maintenance, forestation, creation of an arboretum.</p>	H	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>A large part of the activities of Gi-Agro is dedicated to the formation and awareness building of the surrounding dwellings: health care, nutrition, and alphabetization are among the top subjects to improve the quality of local farmers' life.</p> <p>The continuous contact and the direct perception of the way trees can be planted and grown on the Bateke plateau, encourages them to plant trees in (part of) their own area. Novacel is able and willing to help them in motorized site preparation (against payment) and to provide these farmers with high quality seedlings. Discussions are ongoing with international NGOs to channel adapted means to help them to fill the gap.</p> <p>Privileged contact with the chiefs in Mbankana also helps Novacel to monitor and discuss the best means to fulfill the expectations of local people.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The information provided is considered as sufficient.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p>Clarification Request n° 36</p> <p>Please describe how awareness raising toward fire risk management will be implemented.</p>	H	<p>Project team 08/11/2010:</p> <p>Experience has shown that fires are started by 3 categories of people: people passing on the RN1 road , workers of Novacel, local farmers and hunters. Local farmers and personnel are more open to specific formation as this is repeated many times. A large part or the activities of Gi-Agro towards the local farmers is dedicated to the formation and awareness building in the surrounding dwellings : beside health care, nutrition, alphabetization the fire risk is among the important subjects.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>The information provided is considered as sufficient.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Clarification Request n° 37</p> <p>Please provide evidence of provisions for fire-fighting facilities (vehicles, water tanks) or change the formulation in the PDD to show that actions have not been defined/provisioned yet.</p>	H	<p>Fire fighting infrastructures will be implemented progressively while the planted area (and thus the risk of destruction) increases.</p> <p>Auditor 10/11/2010:</p> <p>During the site visit, it was observed that fire fighting infrastructures are limited at this time. However, the fighting facilities are expected to be implemented progressively.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

8. Annex 3: Information Reference List (IRL)

Ref	Document or Type of Information		
1	Interviews		
	Name	First name	Organisation
	ENDUNDO	José E.B.	MINISTERE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT, CONSERVATION DE LA NATURE & TOURISME
	MALELE	Sebastien	MINISTERE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT, CONSERVATION DE LA NATURE & TOURISME
	MARIE-NELLY	Marie-Rose	World Bank
	LUMBUENAMO	Raymond	WWF
	BELANGER	Lyna	WRI
	LABI MBAMA MUKONSU	Honoré	Chef de la Chefferie de Mbankana
	KABALA	Mwe mba	Director of the Kinzono center
	MSWEYA	Aseme	Director of the Mampu station
	FLADIN	Mister	Direction Assitant of CADIM
	NGUNGO	Delphin	Ingenior in Agronomy at CADIM
	MUSHIETE	Olivier	Director Principal of Novacel
	STEFFENS	Jean-Claude	Monitoring and Quality Management at Novacel
	NGABULONGO	Ruphin	Monitoring and Quality Management coordinator at Novacel
	KAYUKA	Delly	Head of the Ibi station, Novacel
	MULABU	Dany	Head of the forest section, Novacel
	SASSA	Raphaël	Public relations, Novacel
	DEMENOIS	Julien	Project developer, ONF International
	MULUMBA	Jean-Baptiste	Financial audit, Cauditec
2	Project Design Document		
3	Monitoring Plan		
4	République Démocratique du Congo. Mémoire de politiques économiques et financiers pour la période allant d'avril à décembre 2006		
5	World Bank, Democratic Republic of Congo : Economic Report : Fall 2008.		
6	République Démocratique du Congo, Ministère de l'Environnement, Conservation de la Nature et Tourisme. Programme national 'Forêt & Conservation de la nature'		
7	FOA, Département des forêts. 2005. Evaluation des ressources forestières mondiales 2005. Rapport national. République Démocratique du Congo.		

8	Oréade-Brèche. Puits de carbone d'Ibi Plateau des Batéké. Etude d'impact socio-environnemental.
9	Berci, 2006. Analyse d'impact socio environnemental du projet « Puits carbone Station Ibi ».
10	Saint-André, L., Thongo M'Bou, A., Mabiala, A., Mouvondy, W., Jourdan, C., Rounsard, O., Deleporte, P., Hamel, O., Nouvellon, Y., 2004. Age-related equations for above- and below-ground biomass of Eucalyptus hybrid in Congo
11	Boissezon, P., Les sols de savane des plateaux batéké
12	Ndembo Longo, J., 2006. Etude pédologique de la concession du projet
13	Bwebwe J., 2006. Nature et effets des feux de brousse dans la zone entre les rivières Bombo et Lufimi au plateau des Batéké, Mémoire Faculté des Sciences Agronomiques, Université de Kinshasa.
14	Bernhard-Reversat, F., Diangana, D., Tsatsa, M., 1993. Biomasse, minéralomasse et productivité en plantation d'acacia mangium et A. auriculiformis au Congo.
15	Novacel Organization Diagram
16	Novacel : Management
17	ERPA-1
18	Letter of intent 1
19	Letter of intent 2
20	Contrats d'emphytéose (Emphyteusis Contracts)
21	Contrat de bail à la ferme (tenancy agreement)
22	Chefferie de Mbankana, Attestation.
23	Democratic Republic of Congo : DNA forest definition
24	Letter of Approval of the host country
25	Sample plots_070809
26	Voies d'accès et coupes feux
27	Schema bloc carré std
28	Site preparation_Road creation
29	Calcul plantations
30	CERs_Total 200709
31	Tool for afforestation & reforestation approved methodologies (TARAM Excel files)
32	Motion de soutien
33	PV_Local stakeholder
34	Biocarbon fund, 2006. Declaration of interest.
35	Approved consolidated afforestation and reforestation baseline and monitoring methodology (AR-ACM0001): "Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land", version 03.
36	AR-AM-Tool "Procedures to demonstrate the eligibility of lands for afforestation and reforestation CDM project activities", Version 01
37	AR-AM-Tool "Tool for testing significance of GHG emissions in A/R CDM project activities", Version 01
38	AR-AM-Tool "Calculation of the number of sample plots for measurements within A/R CDM project activities", Version 02
39	AR-AM-Tool "Procedure to determine when accounting of the soil organic carbon pool may be conservatively neglected in CDM A/R project activities", Version 01
40	AR-AM-Tool "Estimation of GHG emissions related to displacement of grazing activities in A/R CDM project activity", Version 02
41	AR-AM-Tool "Estimation of GHG emissions from clearing, burning and decay of existing vegetation due to implementation of a CDM A/R project activity", Version 02
42	AR-AM-Tool "Tool for the identification of degraded or degrading lands for consideration in implementing CDM A/R project activities", Version 01
43	AR-AM-Tool "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality in A/R CDM project activities", Version 01
44	Procedure to demonstrate the eligibility of lands for afforestation & reforestation CDM project activities

45	Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism. Forty-fourth meeting
46	Map Ibi-phase 1- 081203
47	Schéma Ibi village 081015
48	Relevé GPS Ibi 09/08 ONFI
49	Annexe 1. Relevé GPS Ibi 0908
50	Coordonnées géographiques des superficies à exclure de la zone projet
51	Elenga H., Shwartz D., Vincens D., 1994. Pollen evidence of late Quaternary vegetation and inferred climate changes in Congo.
52	Lubini Ayingweu, C., Etude Phytosociologique et écologique des formations herbeuses basses et arbustives de la station Ibi au plateau de Batéké, Kinshasa.
53	GI Agro., 2009. Puits de Carbone Ibi-Batéké. Ateliers de restitution et validation
54	Programme of the local stakeholder meetings.
55	Presentation of the 18/07/2006 on climate change and CDM.
56	Participants of the stakeholder meetings, July 2006.
57	Invitations of stakeholders meeting, July 2006.
58	Financial agreements of Novacel (Confidential).
59	Descoings, B., Les grandes régions du Congo.
60	Bisiaux, F., Peltier, R., Muliele, J-C., 2009. Plantations industrielles et agroforesterie au service des populations des plateaux Batéké, Mampu, en République démocratique du congo.
61	Walters, G., Touladjan, S., Savanna burning yesterday and today in Gabon's Batéké Plateaux: foraging-fires and ecosystem effects.
62	Letter of Approval of France.
63	GPS positions of plots and GPS files
64	Fiches cadastrales géoréférencés
65	Note descriptive. Projet de reboisement Mampu.
66	Note technique. Confirmation de la valeur de la biomasse existante par des mesures de terrain. NT-006
67	ONFI. Arguments regarding the non consideration of leakage related to combustion, outside project boundaries, of biomasse from site preparation.
68	Fires reports (14 reports)
69	Table of conversion between initial id and Taram id
70	Quality Manual
71	LandSat Images
72	international database IPCC GPG LULUCF
73	Conseil d'administration, Mai 2008.
74	AM CLA 0008. Response form for request for clarification on Approved Methodologies
75	AM CLA 0009. Response form for request for clarification on Approved Methodologies