



Industrie Service

Validation Report

World Bank

Validation of the “Facilitating Reforestation for
Guangxi Watershed Management in Pearl River
Basin” project in China

Validation Report No. 756176, Revision 02

2006, July 24

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
Carbon Management Service
Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich - GERMANY

Validation of the “Facilitating Reforestation for Guangxi Watershed Management in Pearl River Basin” project in China



Page 2 of 29

Report No.	Date of first issue	Revision No.	Date of this revision	Certificate No.
756176	25 th February 2006	02	24 th July 2006	-
Subject:		Validation of an Afforestation and Reforestation CDM Project		
Executing Operational Unit:		TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH Carbon Management Service Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich Federal Republic of Germany		
Client:		World Bank 1818 H Street NW Washington DC – 20043 United States of America		
Contract approved by:		Michael Rumberg		
Report Title:		Validation of the “Facilitating Reforestation for Guangxi Watershed Management in Pearl River Basin” project in China		
Number of pages		29 (excluding annexes)		
Summary: <p>The Certification Body “Climate and Energy” has been ordered by World Bank to perform a validation of the above mentioned project.</p> <p>Using a risk based approach, the validation of this project has been performed by document reviews and on-site inspection, audits at the locations of the project and interviews at the offices of the project owner.</p> <p>As the result of this procedure, it can be confirmed that the submitted project documentation is in line with all requirements set by the Kyoto Protocol, the Marrakech Accords and relevant guidance by the CDM Executive Board. The project will hence be recommended by TÜV SÜD for registration with the UNFCCC under the CDM. Prior to submission of the project for registration the participating countries need to submit Letters of Approval to the audit team.</p> <p>Additionally the assessment team reviewed the estimation of the projected emission reductions. We can confirm that the indicated amount of emission reductions of 773 842 tonnes CO_{2e} over a crediting period of thirty years, resulting in a calculated annual average of 25 795 tonnes CO_{2e}, represent a reasonable estimation using the assumptions given by the project documents.</p>				
Work carried out by:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Michael Rumberg (Project manager, GHG lead auditor)Jimmy Zhou (ISO 9001 and 14001 lead auditor, GHG auditor – trainee)Hubertus Schmidtke (Technical expert, GHG auditor – trainee)		Internal quality control: Werner Betzenbichler Susan Bautista	

Abbreviations

AE	Applicant Operational Entity
AR	Afforestation and Reforestation Project Activities
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CR	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.
KP	Kyoto Protocol
MP	Monitoring Plan
PDD	Project Design Document
TÜV SÜD	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVM	Validation and Verification Manual

Table of Contents	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	5
1.1 Objective	5
1.2 Scope	5
1.3 GHG Project Description	7
2 METHODOLOGY	7
2.1 Review of Documents	9
2.2 Follow-up Interviews	9
2.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests	10
3 VALIDATION FINDINGS	12
3.1 Participation Requirements	12
3.2 Project Design	14
3.3 Baseline and Additionality	19
3.4 Monitoring Plan	23
3.5 Calculation of net GHG removals	24
3.6 Environmental Impacts	25
3.7 Socio-Economic Impacts	26
3.8 Comments by Local Stakeholders	27
4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS	28
5 VALIDATION OPINION	29

Annex 1: Validation Protocol

Annex 2: Information Reference List

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

World Bank has commissioned TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH (TÜV SÜD) to validate the “Facilitating Reforestation for Guangxi Watershed Management in Pearl River Basin” project in China. The validation serves as a design verification and is a requirement of all CDM projects. The purpose of a validation is to have an independent third party assessment of the project design. In particular, the project's baseline, the monitoring plan (MP), and the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC and host country criteria are validated in order to confirm that the project design as documented is sound and reasonable and meets the stated requirements and identified criteria. Validation is a requirement for all CDM projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of certified emission reductions (CERs).

UNFCCC criteria refer to the Kyoto Protocol criteria and the CDM rules and modalities as agreed in the Bonn Agreement and the Marrakech Accords.

1.2 Scope

The validation scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project's baseline study and monitoring plan and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against Kyoto Protocol requirements, UNFCCC rules and associated interpretations. TÜV SÜD has, based on the recommendations in the Validation and Verification Manual employed a risk-based approach in the validation, focusing on the identification of significant risks for project implementation and the generation of CERs.

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

The audit team has been provided with a final PDD in December 2005. It serves as the basis for the assessment presented herewith. Based on this documentation an extensive document review and a fact finding mission in form of an on-site audit has taken place. During that process, the client decided to revise the PDD according to the CARs and CRs indicated in the audit process. The revised final PDD was submitted in July 2006. The changes in the December-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 to achieve a reduction of anthropogenic GHG emissions and to contribute to sustainable development. Hence no repetition of the public stakeholder process has taken place. After the accreditation of the DOE under the respective scope a revised PDD has been submitted referring to version 02 of the methodology which has been approved during the time the accreditation procedure was running.

Studying the existing documentation belonging to this project, it was obvious that the competence and capability of the validation team has to cover at least the following aspects:

- Knowledge of Kyoto Protocol and the Marrakech Accords
- Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
- Skills in environmental auditing (ISO 14000, EMAS)
- Quality assurance
- Carbon sequestration by trees
- Monitoring concepts
- Political, economical and technical frame conditions in host country

According to these requirements TÜV SÜD has composed a project team in accordance with the appointment rules of the TÜV certification body “climate and energy”:

Michael Rumberg is head of the division CDM/JI at TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH. He holds a master degree in forest sciences. In his position he is responsible for the implementation of validation, verification and certifications processes for greenhouse gas mitigation projects in the context of the Kyoto Protocol. Before entering this company he worked as an expert for renewable energy, forestry, environmental issues, climate change and sustainability within the environmental branch of an insurance company. His competences are covering risk assessments, quality and environmental auditing (EMS auditor), baseline setting, monitoring and verification due to the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol.

Jimmy Zhou is deputy head of the TÜV Management Service department at Guangzhou offices of TÜV Product Service Ltd. He is an environmental engineer. In his position he is responsible for the implementation of certification processes for quality and environmental management systems. He has received extensive training in CDM related issues and participated already in several CDM project assessments as a trainee auditor and local expert.

Hubertus Schmidtke is an expert for forest inventory design with respect to monitoring of carbon pools in afforestation and reforestation projects. He has received extensive training in CDM related issues and participated already in AR CDM project assessments as a trainee auditor and technical expert.

The audit team covers the above mentioned requirements as follows:

- Knowledge of Kyoto Protocol and the Marrakech Accords (RUMBERG)
- Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (RUMBERG /ZHOU)
- Skills in environmental auditing (RUMBERG / ZHOU)
- Quality assurance (RUMBERG / ZHOU)
- Carbon sequestration in trees (RUMBERG/SCHMIDTKE)
- Monitoring concepts (RUMBERG/SCHMIDTKE)
- Political, economical and technical frame conditions in host country (ZHOU)

In order to have an internal quality control of the project, a team of the following persons has been composed by the certification body “climate and energy”:

- Werner Betzenbichler (head of certification body “climate and energy”)
- Susan Bautista (lead auditor ISO 9001/41001, technical expert)

1.3 GHG Project Description

The objective of the project activity is directed towards to project areas which are separated from each other:

- 1) Establishment of 2000ha of multi purpose forest in Huanjiang County of Guangxi .
- 2) Establishment of 2000ha of multi purpose forest in Cangwu County of Guangxi .

Project participants are:

- Xinghuan Forestry Development Company Ltd.,
- The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as a Trustee of the Bio Carbon Fund of the World Bank for Italy
- The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as a Trustee of the Bio Carbon Fund of the World Bank for Spain.

The project starting date is April 1, 2006. The 30 year non renewable crediting period starts as well on April 1, 2006.

2 METHODOLOGY

The project assessment aims at being a risk based approach and is based on the methodology developed in the Validation and Verification Manual (for further information see www.vvmanual.info), an initiative of all Applicant Entities, which aims to harmonize the approach and quality of all such assessments.

In order to ensure transparency, a validation protocol was customised for the project, according to the Validation and Verification Manual. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), means of verification and the results from validating the identified criteria. The validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organises, details and clarifies the requirements a CDM project is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent validation process where the validator will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

The validation protocol consists of three tables. The different columns in these tables are described in Figure 1.

The completed validation protocol is enclosed in Annex 1 to this report.

Validation Protocol Table 1: Mandatory Requirements			
Requirement	Reference	Conclusion	Cross reference
The requirements the project must meet.	Gives reference to the legislation or agreement where the requirement is found.	This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (OK), or a Corrective Action Request (CAR) of risk or non-compliance with stated requirements. The corrective action requests are numbered and presented to the client in the Validation report.	Used to refer to the relevant checklist questions in Table 2 to show how the specific requirement is validated. This is to ensure a transparent Validation process.

Validation Protocol Table 2: Requirement checklist				
Checklist Question	Reference	Means of verification (MoV)	Comment	Draft and/or Final Conclusion
The various requirements in Table 1 are linked to checklist questions the project should meet. The checklist is organised in seven different sections. Each section is then further sub-divided. The lowest level constitutes a checklist question.	Gives reference to documents where the answer to the checklist question or item is found.	Explains how conformance with the checklist question is investigated. Examples of means of verification are document review (DR) or interview (I). N/A means not applicable.	The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist question and/or the conformance to the question. It is further used to explain the conclusions reached.	This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (OK), or a Corrective Action Request (CAR) due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below). Clarification is used when the validation team has identified a need for further clarification.

Validation Protocol Table 3: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests			
Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests	Ref. to checklist question in table 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation conclusion
If the conclusions from the draft Validation are either a Corrective Action Request or a Clarification Request, these should be listed in this section.	Reference to the checklist question number in Table 2 where the Corrective Action Request or Clarification Request is explained.	The responses given by the Client or other project participants during the communications with the validation team should be summarised in this section.	This section should summarise the validation team's responses and final conclusions. The conclusions should also be included in Table 2, under “Final Conclusion”.

Figure 1 Validation Protocol Tables

2.1 Review of Documents

The project design document submitted by the Client and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline were reviewed. A complete list of all documents reviewed is attached as annex 2 to this report.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

In the period of February 20 – 24, 2006, TÜV SÜD performed interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of

- Changwu County Government,
- Changwu Forestry Bureau,
- Changwu Fuyuan Forestry Centre,
- Changwu Kanyuan Forestry Centre,
- China Forestry & Technology Institute,
- China National Forestry Bureau,
- Guangxi Forestry Bureau, Huanjiang Agriculture Bank,
- Huanjiang County Government,
- Huanjiang County Office,
- Huanjiang Credit Bank,
- Huanjiang Forestry Bureau,
- Luhuan Forestry Development Company Ltd.,
- Minglun Town in Huanjiang County,
- PMO Guangxi Forestry Bureau,
- Shantian Village in Shatou Township in Changwu County,
- The World Bank and
- Xinghuan Forestry Development Company Ltd.

were interviewed.

The main topics of the interviews are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organisation	Interview topics
Changwu County Government Huanjiang County Government Huanjiang County Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Project design ➤ Sustainable development issues ➤ Additionality ➤ Management system ➤ Environmental impacts ➤ Stakeholder process ➤ Approval by the host country

Changwu Forestry Bureau	Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Project design ➤ Technical equipment
Guangxi Forestry Bureau	Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Sustainable development issues ➤ Additionality
Huanjiang Forestry Bureau	Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Monitoring plan ➤ Management system ➤ Environmental impacts ➤ Stakeholder process
Changwu Forestry Centre, Changwu Kanyuan Forestry Centre	Fuyuan Centre, Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Project design ➤ Technical equipment ➤ Sustainable development issues ➤ Additionality ➤ Monitoring plan
Luhuan Development Company Ltd. Xinghuan Development Company Ltd.	Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Management system ➤ Environmental impacts ➤ Stakeholder process
China Forestry & Technology Institute	Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Project design ➤ Technical equipment
China National Forestry Bureau	National Forestry Bureau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Sustainable development issues ➤ Additionality
Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute	Forestry Survey & Design Institute	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Crediting period ➤ Monitoring plan
PMO Guangxi Forestry Bureau	Guangxi Forestry Bureau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Management system ➤ Environmental impacts
The World Bank	The World Bank	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Stakeholder process ➤ Approval by the host country
Huanjiang Agriculture Bank	Agriculture Bank	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Additionality
Huanjiang Credit Bank	Credit Bank	
Minglun Town, Huanjiang County, Guangxi Province	Town, County, Guangxi Province	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Project design ➤ Technical equipment ➤ Sustainable development issues
Shantian Village, Shatou Township, Changwu County	Village, Township, Changwu County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Additionality ➤ Monitoring plan ➤ Management system ➤ Environmental impacts ➤ Stakeholder process ➤ Approval by the host country

2.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the validation was to resolve the requests for corrective actions and clarification and any other outstanding issues which needed to be clarified for TÜV SÜD's

positive conclusion on the project design. The Corrective Action Requests and Clarification Requests raised by TÜV SÜD were resolved during communication between the client and TÜV SÜD. To guarantee the transparency of the validation process, the concerns raised and responses that have been given are summarised in chapter 3 below and documented in more detail in the validation protocol in annex 1.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

In the following sections the findings of the validation are stated. The validation findings for each validation subject are presented as follows:

- 1) The findings from the desk review of the final project design document and the findings from interviews during the follow up visit are summarised. A more detailed record of these findings can be found in the Validation Protocol in annex 1.
- 2) Where TÜV SÜD had identified issues that needed clarification or that represented a risk to the fulfilment of the project objectives, a Clarification or Corrective Action Request, respectively, have been issued. The Clarification and Corrective Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Validation Protocol in annex 1. The validation of the project resulted in one outstanding issue, three Corrective Action Request and thirty two Clarification Requests.
- 3) Where Clarification or Corrective Action Requests have been issued, the exchanges between the Client and TÜV SÜD to resolve these Clarification or Corrective Action Requests are summarised.
- 4) The final conclusions for validation subject are presented.

The validation findings relate to the project design as documented and described in the final project design documentation.

3.1 Participation Requirements

3.1.1 Discussion

Project participants in the final PDD are individual farmers/communities, Luhuan Forestry Development Company Ltd., Xinghuan Forestry Development Company Ltd., Fuyuan Forestry Farm, Kangyuan Forestry Farm, all China; The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as a Trustee of the Bio Carbon Fund of the World Bank, Italy and the government of Spain.

The list of project participants lists “farmers/local communities” as project participants. The same should be identified in more detail and explained to the audit team also considering the procedures for Letters of Approval to be issued by the Chinese government. In addition the role of Spain should be clarified as the country is not mentioned in Annex 1 to the PDD.

The participating Party, China, as the host Party, has ratified the Kyoto Protocol and installed a designated national authority (DNA). But the project has not received a Letter of Approval – confirming the voluntary participation and contribution of the project to the sustainable development of the host country - from the government of China yet.

As the category of afforestation/reforestation is explicitly mentioned in the “Measures for Operation and Management of Clean Development Mechanism Projects in China” the same is deemed to be realistic.

Spain and Italy have established Designated National Authorities.

A Letter of Approval by the Designated National Authorities of the other participating Parties should as well be submitted to the audit team prior to submission of the project for registration.

Furthermore the audit team has verified that the Party China has defined minimum criteria for afforestation and reforestation projects being in line and fulfilling the requirements regarding the

definition of “forest” laid out in section F, paragraph 8 a-c of the annex to the decision -/CMP.1 “Modalities and procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism” (see UNFCCC website (<http://cdm.unfccc.int/DNA>)). China does hence qualify as a host under CDM AR.

3.1.2 Findings

Outstanding issue:

A Letter of Approval by the Designated National Authorities of China as well as the other participating Parties should be submitted to the audit team prior to submission for registration. Hereby the option to get a statement regarding the significance of environmental and socio economic impacts should be evaluated. In addition the role of Spain should be clarified as the country is not mentioned in Annex 1 to the PDD.

Response:

The Letter of Approval will be submitted to the audit team before submission for registration. The environmental impact assessment of the GIFDCP which include the Bio Carbon Fund part has been approved by Guangxi Provincial Environmental Protection Agency. The social economic assessment has also been conducted by an expert team consisting of national and international experts. Both environmental and social economic assessment reports have been submitted to audit team during on-site audit, which indicated that no significant negative impacts were found. Spain has been confirmed to be a project participant.

Corrective Action Request No. 1:

The list of project participants lists “farmers/local communities” as project participants. The same should be identified in more detail and explained to the audit team also considering the procedures for Letters of Approval to be issued by the Chinese government.

Response:

The participants list has been revised to address the comments. Xinghuan Forestry Development Company Ltd, Italy and Spain are to be considered as project participants.

3.1.3 Conclusion

The non significance of the project regarding environmental and socio economic terms is considered to be proven by the performed surveys and support letters from the provincial government. The Letters of Approval are still missing and this issue is considered to be pending but needs only to be resolved before the project is submitted for registration.

3.2 Project Design

3.2.1 Discussion

The objective of the project is to remove GHG emissions by reforestation measures. The project hereby qualifies as an AR Project under the CDM as it fulfils the requirements defined for eligible projects according to the information given in the PDD.

The physical location and project boundaries are described. The project comprises two distinct areas of land to be planted totalling 4000ha of land.

The project is developed as part of a larger umbrella project carried out by the Guangxi Forestry Bureaux with support of the World Bank. The project design has been carefully developed and the subsequent implementation is planned including risk mitigation measures to ensure a successful implementation of the project. The project design with respect to seeding and harvesting procedures is considered as reflecting current good practice in the project area or being above local standards. It will create employment opportunities for local farmers and environmental benefits such as soil protection and water management options.

The project has already obtained the necessary approval regarding environmental and social aspects.

As the project has a long term lifetime of 30 years the option to have a technology substitution has been reviewed carefully. With respect to planting procedures it has to be expected that the current planting technique will also be applied in the future together with resprouting. The use of automated planting procedures has not to be expected due to the landform and income situation in the project area.

The project design in itself is rather complex by consideration of various types of project participants – not in the sense of the CDM – such as individuals, households, farmers, communities, commercial forest enterprises, provincial and state forest agencies as well as national and international research institutions and national and international financial institutions. But the audit team got evidence during the visit on site that the project is well communicated between all participants, resulting in a high awareness level of all parties. Hence during project preparation consideration has been given to the specific design of the project.

A technical description of the project is included in the PDD. The same specifies the selected species and defines clearly the present environmental conditions such as climate, hydrology soils as well as the regional fauna. Also the land rights, the ownership of the sequestered carbon, respective carbon credits and the current land use are described in a plausible manner.

Only limited information regarding training has been made transparent in the PDD.

Relevant gases for the project scenario are CO₂ and N₂O. The gases have been specified in chapter A.4.3 of the PDD in a proper manner but the format the information has been given needs to be adjusted.

The carbon pools have been selected in a proper manner and in accordance with the methodology prescription. The same has been substantiated by supporting documentation and could also be verified during on site auditing. Out of the prescribed carbon pools, only the aboveground and the belowground biomass have been selected. The three other pools will not be considered but the same is justified as being conservative and the argumentation is considered as being plausible.

An approach addressing the issue of non permanence of afforestation and reforestation activities under the CDM has been chosen in line with the modalities and procedures.

The starting date of the project and the lifetime are clearly defined and the definition is in line with the requirements.

The project financing has not led to a diversion of official development assistance according to the information given in the PDD. The same has been verified during the on site audit. But GEF funding is provided for the overall umbrella project. It hence should be clarified whether the financial aid also applies to the CDM project assessed herewith.

It moreover has been defined by contractual arrangements which have been verified during the on site audit how the revenue from the CDM project is shared by the various stakeholders. The same approach is deemed accepted under national regulations. The final approval will be given by the Letter of Approval to be issued by the host government.

The project design document does mainly conform with the AR CDM Project Design Document format (version 02) valid by the time of PDD submission.

3.2.2 Findings

Clarification Request No. 1:

The role GEF financing plays for the umbrella project and its implication for the project assessed herewith with respect to ODA should be explained to the audit team.

Response:

The GEF fund will support the nature reserve management which is separated and outside from this CDM project.

The project financing has been reviewed by the audit team.

Clarification Request No. 2:

Documentation should be submitted to demonstrate that the chosen verification schedule will not lead to more emission reductions than other options. The time verification occurs should be indicated in the PDD.

Response:

The requested information has been submitted and updated in the revised PDD.

It has been clearly demonstrated that the verification schedule does not lead to a time coincidence of peaks of carbon storage and verification audits.

Clarification Request No. 4:

The following chapters do not comply with the guidelines for completing the PDD for AR CDM project activities:

- A.4.3: Table missing
- A.4.4: Table missing
- A.4.5: Definition on afforestation and reforestation as well as land eligibility
- B.4: Statement on project participants

The information is either missing or located in another part of the PDD. The information should be added or the PDD structure should be adjusted according the guidance given in the document mentioned above.

Response:

Based on newest guideline approved by EB23 (24-26 Feb 2006), the project proponent added/revised:

- A.4.3: table added
- A.4.4: table added
- A.4.5: moved land eligibility section located under section B.3 to A.4.5.
- B.4: Statement added

Clarification Request No. 5:

It should be qualified whether the project area complies with the definition of reforestation or should be even considered as an afforestation as the land has not been forested for more than 50 years.

Response:

As elaborated in Annex 3 of PDD, lands to be planted were mostly deforested during 1950s-1980s. A few piece of lands may have been non-forested before 1956 and that are hence eligible for afforestation. However since the area of such lands is quite limited and it is hard to provide evidence, we consider the project a reforestation. This approach is deemed acceptable as in any case the project complies with either the afforestation or reforestation definition.

Clarification Request No. 6:

It should be explained why to a width of 10 m is referred to - as the definition of forest land under UNFCCC does not include this parameter.

Response:

It is included in the domestic forest definition and has been removed from the PDD in the revised version.

Clarification Request No. 7:

The correct identification of sites has been done by manual identification of the project boundaries whereas the PDD states that GPS data has been used and information on this is also given in annex 5 to the PDD. The project proponent should explain this contradiction. It should be noticed that the GPS measurement should be done in advance to the issuance of the final validation opinion. Finally maps with proper project boundaries and an English legend should be submitted to the audit team.

Response:

The GPS measurement for project site boundaries has been completed by the Guangxi Forestry Design Institute and the project site boundaries have been clearly defined by using GPS. The relevant maps with proper project boundaries have been updated in the revised PDD. Within the boundary, the planting sites now are broken down to 80 patches instead of 52 parcels as it has been based on in the field survey. The reason is as follows: according to the previous manual identification, there are 52 parcels of sites within the project boundary. However some of the sites have small streams or ditches with existing forests. Although we have taken these forests

areas in the streams or ditches out of the project areas, we treated the sites in two sides of the streams and ditches as one site parcel. During the GPS process, those sites have been spited along forest boundary in streams or ditches. Therefore the number of sites now is 80 patches within the project boundary. The detailed site boundary information is submitted to the audit team.

The data has been checked for plausibility and no indication has been received stating any incorrect measurement. The increase in single land parcels is not deemed to add any risk to the project site identification but should rather help to get more exact data.

It moreover needs to be noticed that the actual project area will be identified ex-post during the verification audit.

Clarification Request No. 8:

For all statements and assumptions made in chapter A.4.1.5 the respective sources should be named and identified in the PDD. In addition all categorisations made use of and abbreviations used should be explained at least in the initial use.

Response:

The information sources have been indicated as a footnote in the revised PDD section A.4.1.5.

Clarification Request No. 9:

The gases specified in this chapter should be directly linked to the activities listed. To be clarified.

Response:

The PDD has been updated accordingly.

Clarification Request No. 10:

The content of the larger umbrella project GIFDCP should be explained and the role of the CDM component should be presented in a short description.

Response:

A paragraph has been added at the end of section A.2 describing the GIFDCP and the role of the CDM component. Moreover additional information regarding the umbrella project has been submitted to the audit team.

Clarification Request No. 11:

A time schedule for project implementation should be submitted.

Response:

The requested information has been submitted. The project is in line with the current schedule.

Clarification Request No. 12:

A statement regarding the occurrence of a technology transfer to the host Party as part of the project activity is missing in the PDD. Respective evidence should be given.

Response:

The issue has been clarified in the revised PDD.

Clarification Request No. 13:

Information on rare and endangered species should clearly refer to the project area and/or to the surrounding area.

Response:

Related text has been revised.

Clarification Request No. 14:

Information on required training in advance to the project implementation should be submitted to the audit team.

Response:

To prepare and initiate the project appropriately, several training courses have been held in the following aspect: (a) BioCarbon project management, (b) participatory forestry assessment, (c) nursery management; and (d) planting design. Before the plantation activities being taken, the training course to the forest farms and households on site preparation, planting practice and the environment protection will be arranged by the county forestry bureaus and forest farms. Respective documents have been provided.

Clarification Request No. 15:

The land ownership and contractual arrangements in quantitative terms (in ha) for each county should be described (land tenure and management) in a clear manner. During the on site audit contradicting information has been presented to the audit team.

Response:

Table A-5 has been added in section A.4.6 of the PDD, indicating the land tenures and production arrangement for the two counties in a clear manner.

Clarification Request No. 23:

The starting date of the project and the start of the crediting period should be reviewed in the light of the current time schedule (see also CR 26). In addition justification for the starting date should be given.

Response:

The project start date will keep unchanged to meet the planting season. Justification for the starting date has been given.

3.2.3 Conclusion

The project does comply with the requirements.

3.3 Baseline and Additionality

3.3.1 Discussion

The baseline approach chosen – existing or historical changes in carbon stocks in the carbon pools within the project boundary - (in accordance with section G, paragraph 22 of the annex to the decision -/CMP.1 “Modalities and procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism”) is considered to be plausible and substantiated by the information given for the project assessed herewith.

The project has applied the AR methodology ARAM0001 version 02 previously approved by the Methodology Panel and the Executive Board. As the methodology applied has been developed for the project assessed herewith the same is deemed to be most applicable. In addition the project has demonstrated clearly that it meets all applicability criteria outlined in the methodology.

The methodology is applied in a transparent manner. All equation need have been made use of and applied in a transparent manner. the application is making use of conservative assumptions. The baseline is established in a project specific manner but could also apply to other AR projects having similar natural frame conditions. Hence, according to all arguments given in the PDD and verified by the audit team, the selected baseline represents the most likely scenario among other possible and/or discussed scenarios.

The additionality of the project has been demonstrated by application of the tool for demonstration and assessment of the additionality in AR CDM project activities.

The argumentation given in the PDD indicates that the project activity itself is not the baseline scenario and the same has also been verified during interviews performed during the on site audit. But documented evidence needs to be submitted regarding various arguments to substantiate and prove the argumentation given. The legal restriction of the land use to forestry has been demonstrated by providing the respective documentation

Uncertainties related to the baseline have been described in a qualitative and quantitative manner in annex 3 to the PDD.

3.3.2 Findings

Corrective Action Request No. 2:

Under step 1a of the “tool for demonstration and assessment of additionality in A/R CDM project activities” the proposed project not undertaken as a A/R CDM project needs to be included and considered as one option.

Response:

"The proposed project not undertaken as an A/R CDM project", as one of alternatives, has been included under step 1a of the additional tool in section B.3 of the PDD.

Corrective Action Request No. 3:

No written evidence could be submitted that only with the proposed project activity commercial banks are willing to give loans as described in the barrier analysis. Hence the statement should be removed or modified in the PDD.

Response:

Related texts in PDD have been revised. The document says that it increases the chance to get loan for reforestation on remote degraded lands with the proposed A/R CDM project.

The revised text reflects the actual situation.

Clarification Request No. 3:

The emission factor chosen for diesel emissions from vehicles needs to be confirmed by written evidence or an alternative but documented source should be chosen.

Response:

Ms. Xiulian Hu from Energy Institute has confirmed the emission factor to be part of the next national communication by emailing the audit team on March 2nd 2006.

Clarification Request No. 16:

Documented evidence for the performance of each step of the ex ante stratification process has been provided. But also the outcome of the same in form of maps outlining the location of each stratum should be submitted. In addition a map with the location of the single tree species to be planted should be submitted to give evidence for the mosaic approach described in the PDD.

Response:

Additional information has been submitted for ex ante stratification including manual, report and stratum spreadsheet. Maps outlining the location of each stratum have been added.

Clarification Request No. 17:

The financial calculations and the sensitivity analysis presented need to be substantiated by written evidence (financial analysis model) and all parameters need to be verifiable. Hereby is should be noted that the CDM specific cost should not be included in the “without CDM” calculation but only in the “with CDM” calculation.

Response:

The required documentation has been submitted and is deemed acceptable.

Clarification Request No. 18:

The benchmark (12% IRR) set by the project proponent referring to NDRC needs to be submitted to the audit team for plausibility and applicability check.

Response:

A document substantiating the benchmark set has been submitted. The benchmark (12% FIRR) for agriculture projects is issued by the Chinese Ministry of Agriculture. As there is no forestry specific benchmark available, local people usually use this benchmark for agriculture in forestry projects.

The approach is deemed plausible and appropriate.

Clarification Request No. 19:

Documented evidence should be submitted that the Chinese government is actually only willing to give funding as long as the project is implemented under CDM.

Response:

A respective document regarding the equity commitment by Guangxi Forestry Bureau has been submitted.

Clarification Request No. 20

Documented evidence needs to be submitted when it has been decided to proceed with the project and how CDM has taken into consideration by that time.

Response:

A paragraph has been added respectively at the last para in PDD section A.2 and Step 3 “Barrier Analysis” of the Additionality Tool under Section B.3 to clarify the relationship of the proposed project and umbrella project. During on-site audit, Guangxi Forestry Bureau has explained to the audit team that without the CDM project and GEF project, the NDRC would not agree to apply the World Bank Loan for the forest resource development project.

This can be demonstrated by the document that the Guangxi PMO reported to the Guangxi Forestry Bureau after internal discussion with NDRC and the Ministry of Finance in November 2003. In addition, World Bank has provided internal documents demonstrating the consideration of CDM for the project before the project has been finally approved.

Clarification Request No. 21:

The barrier analysis needs to be reviewed in the light of the following comments: In general the listed barriers might be applicable for households/farmers but not for commercial enterprises. The investment barrier seems not substantiated as 90% of the investment is financed by private equity and loans and the consideration of CDM could not be proven so far (see CAR 4). The interviewed banks moreover confirmed that they haven given loans for 10 years in the past to afforestation projects. The technological barrier does not seem plausible as the forest enterprises involved are experienced in afforestation projects and have a solid track record in doing the same being specialized in this type of service. The institutional barrier again only applies to the households/farmers but not to the enterprises. The market ‘barrier could not be confirmed during the on site audit as forest enterprises stated that he price for timber has been relatively constant over the last five years. Also the relevance of transportation cost to overall cost was only estimated to be 10%. The issues should be reflected and discussed and a justification should be provided or the PDD should be modified.

Response:

- Actually barriers for enterprises are less relative to household/farmers. But there are still some important barriers.
- The private equity is mainly from selling wood and non-wood forest products (it may not be called as equity). The investment barriers in PDD mean the establishment investment which is a big barrier even for enterprises. Though the portion of plantation, establishment cost is relative low, compared with total cost, but it is crucial for initiating the project. Most plantation operation cost will be the harvest cost and is short-term investment and it is easier to be mobilized.
- Bank loan obtained in the past was just for A/R on economically attractive lands rather than remote degraded lands. Due to the high transportation cost and lower productivity of degraded lands, reforestation on remote degraded lands is economically unattractive, so it is difficult to obtain loan from local bank.
- The forest enterprises do have experiences in AR project, but these experiences are limited to AR on good condition sites. AR on degraded lands is much more difficult than good sites. These forest enterprises do not have any experiences on the remote degraded lands. As briefed by the project entities during the field visit, the project entities are largely rely on the technical support and improved technology transfer including the good seedling supply from the local forestry agencies in the project implementation course.
- Yes the institutional barriers mostly applies to households/farmers, related text in PDD has been revised.
- The market risk for the participants are largely because the nature of remote degraded lands with low productivity and high transportation costs, which cause the high cost of the timber production, would reduce the marketing competitive capacity. Regarding to the mentioned 10%, it is the cost proportion for AR project in good sites nearby as the enterprises have no experiences of AR on remote degraded lands. Due to the low productivity of the degraded lands and remote features of the sites, the transportation cost must take much higher proportion in overall cost.

The related text in PDD has been revised

Conclusion:

The argumentation regarding the investment barrier is deemed convincing regarding general terms and the reference to degraded land is valid to be considered. The arguments regarding transportation cost are substantiated by submitted documentation. The argumentation regarding technological and market barriers is considered to be plausible and testimonial evidence has been obtained on site.

The barriers are considered to be valid but would need to be substantiated by more documented evidence as for example comparison o transportation cost between commercial plantations and the project site considering the share of transport cost to overall cost.

But as the project has already proven in step 2 of the additionality tool that the project is not the commercially most attractive alternative, the indication of barriers given here is considered to be plausible and a submission of further documentation is not necessary.

Clarification Request No. 22:

Under step 1b of the additionality discussion only for the project scenario the compliance with the legal obligations has been described. The same should be done for all other scenarios listed under step 1a of the tool.

Response:

The issue has been clarified in the revised PDD.

3.3.3 Conclusion

The project does comply with the requirements.

3.4 Monitoring Plan

3.4.1 Discussion

The project has applied the AR methodology AR-AM0001 version 02 previously approved by the Methodology Panel and the Executive Board.

As the methodology applied has been developed for the project assessed herewith the same is deemed to be most applicable. In addition the project has demonstrated clearly that it meets all applicability criteria outlined in the methodology.

The application follows the prescribed methodology. The monitoring plan contains all relevant parameters. Hereby convincing argumentation is given in chapter A.4.4 of the PDD regarding the omission of single pools. The methodology does not foresee to monitor sustainable development indicators.

The responsibility of project management and planning should be discussed in further detail in the PDD or an annexed document. Hereby especially the role of the forest bureau versus the forest enterprises/farmers/households/ communities should be explained as it is only briefly described.

The PDD outlines in section E and F potential risks, which can cause unintended emissions, and envisaged countermeasures. Respective preparations as far as already in place have been verified in additional documentation and got confirmed during the on site audit. In annex 4 of the PDD the way possible monitoring errors are detected and how the project proponent will handle the same has been outlined. QA/QC procedures to review the reported results have been described in annex 4 of the PDD as well. The control measures go all along the data processing from data entry into the system till the final resulting CER calculations.

3.4.2 Findings

Clarification Request No. 24:

The following monitoring parameters are currently missing in the PDD:

- Standard deviation of each stratum (2.1.1.05)
- Number of sample plots (2.1.1.06)
- Total increase in GHG emissions (2.1.2.25)

In case not deemed necessary, respective justification should be given.

Response:

The issue has been clarified in the revised PDD.

Clarification Request No. 25:

The project proponent should explain to the audit team how he recognises in case one of the farmers does not prolong his contract with the enterprises and whether this will be detected by the current monitoring method.

Response:

The contract between the farmers and enterprises are signed based on the project implementation period for 30 years. The villages, which have lands being contracted to farmers, have committed to allow those farmers, whose land use contract will expire before the end of the crediting period, to continuously use the land until the end of the crediting period. Respective documentation has been provided.

The documentation is deemed sufficient.

3.4.3 Conclusion

The project does comply with the requirements.

3.5 Calculation of net GHG removals

3.5.1 Discussion

The project boundaries are clearly described. The project does properly account for all relevant emissions GHG calculations are documented in a complete and transparent manner

All emissions have been determined according to the methodology applied at this project.

Uncertainties have been addressed in a proper manner.

The project leakage emissions are limited to transport emissions due to fossil fuel combustion from transporting seedlings, labours, fertilizer, wood and other products. As the land to be planted is abandoned and not used for agricultural or grazing purposes the leakage effect is considered to be negligible.

3.5.2 Findings

Clarification Request No. 27:

The calculations regarding the ex ante estimation of the net removal, baseline net removal and leakage should be submitted to the audit team.

Response:

The requested information has been submitted. The calculations are made in a transparent and conservative manner. Uncertainties are defined.

Clarification Request No. 28

The method chosen for the estimation of baseline net GHG removals by sinks should clearly stated.

Response:

The issue has been clarified in the revised PDD.

Clarification Request No. 29:

Baseline net GHG removals are caused by existing trees. It should be demonstrated that the land covered by these trees is not to be defined as forest by submission of the sample results regarding tree density and crown cover. Currently only average values have been submitted. In case of forest land occurrence the respective area should be taken out of the project area hereby considering the sampling approach and be in line with sound statistical methods.

Response:

After looking at the original plot sampling record, one plot has 90 trees per hectare. Although crown cover currently is below 20% it is potentially over the threshold in the crediting period. A corresponding 9.05 ha parcel of lands has been taken out from the project sites.

Clarification Request No. 30:

The method applied to the estimation of baseline net GHG removals by sinks requires to pay attention regarding bigger BEF for single trees compared to forest stands (page 8 AR-AM0001) in order to avoid an underestimation of the baseline net GHG removals. The same is not reflected in the PDD.

Response:

To make the baseline net removal by sinks conservative, we assumed that the BEF for single trees is 50% higher than forests and baseline net removal by sinks has been re-estimated and updated.

This approach is deemed acceptable.

3.5.3 Conclusion

The project does comply with the requirements.

3.6 Environmental Impacts

3.6.1 Discussion

The PDD contains in chapter E.1 a description of the environmental impacts. Next to this various studies have been carried out to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project

measures. The PDD does hereby describe the impacts on biodiversity and natural ecosystems. This is in line with the requirements as outlined in the modalities and procedures for AR CDM projects.

An EIA is required and has been submitted to the audit team for verification. The authorities have approved the project. The environmental impacts are according to the EIA study not considered significant but the final answer can only be given by the time the Letter of Approval has been issued.

Potential negative environmental effects are not to be expected, corresponding risks have been identified and are addressed.

3.6.2 Findings

Clarification Request No. 31:

Environmental impacts outside the project boundary should be described. To be added.

Response:

Additional information has been provided in the revised PDD.

3.6.3 Conclusion

The project does comply with the requirements.

3.7 Socio-Economic Impacts

3.7.1 Discussion

The PDD contains in chapter F a description of the socio economic impacts. Next to this studies have been carried out to evaluate the impacts of the project. The PDD does clearly describe the socio economic impact of the project activity. The conclusions drawn are deemed appropriate. There is no host country requirement for a socio economic assessment but the same has nevertheless been carried out due to investor requirements.

Explanation has been given with respect to effects on food production, potential influence on cultural and religious sites and whether the project increases the risk of a shortness of fuel wood. This is in line with the modalities and procedures for AR CDM projects.

The socio economic impacts are according to the statement in a regional level not considered significant but the final answer can only be given by the time the Letter of Approval has been issued.

Potential risks have been identified and are addressed.

3.7.2 Findings

None

3.7.3 Conclusion

The project does comply with the requirements.

3.8 Comments by Local Stakeholders

3.8.1 Discussion

During the project planning phase the following stakeholders have been consulted:

- Local population
- Farmers
- Enterprises
- Administration on local and regional

Details are given in the PDD in section G.

The comments have been invited via personal meetings during which the project has been introduced to the local people. Approval of the project has been obtained from local and regional authorities.

Well in advance (up to 18 month) to the project start the project has been introduced to the local population.

Stakeholder comments have been systematically recorded and taken into account for example when selecting tree species to be planted.

3.8.2 Findings

Clarification Request No. 32:

The list of preferences (original documents) with respect to tree species developed during the training seminars with the farmers should be submitted to the audit team.

Response:

The original list of preference of tree species in Shangang Village of Xunle Townships has been submitted as an example.

3.8.3 Conclusion

The project does comply with the requirements.

4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS

The PDD has been made public by February 16, 2006 until April 1, 2006.

No stakeholder comments have been received.

5 VALIDATION OPINION

TÜV SÜD has performed a validation of the “Facilitating Reforestation for Guangxi Watershed Management in Pearl River Basin” project in China. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM modalities and procedures and subsequent decisions by the CDM Executive Board.

The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the project does meet all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM and all relevant host country criteria. The project will hence be recommended by TÜV SÜD for registration with the UNFCCC.

By storage of carbon dioxide by trees, the project results in reductions of CO₂ emissions that are real, measurable and give long-term benefits to the mitigation of climate change. An analysis of the investment barriers demonstrates that the project activity was at the time, when it was planned and realized, not a likely baseline scenario. Emission reductions attributable to the project are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity.

Additionally the assessment team reviewed the estimation of the projected emission reductions. We can confirm that the indicated amount of emission reductions of 773 842 tonnes CO_{2e} over a crediting period of thirty years, resulting in a calculated annual average of 25 795 tonnes CO_{2e}, represent a reasonable estimation using the assumptions given by the project documents.

The validation is based on the information made available to us and the engagement conditions detailed in this report. The validation has been performed using a risk based approach as described above. Hence, TÜV SÜD can not be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the validation opinion.

Munich, 2006-07-24



Werner Betzenbichler

**Head of certification body “climate
and energy”**

Munich, 2006-07-24



Michael Rumberg

Project Manager

Annex 1:

Validation Protocol

Table 1 Mandatory Requirements for AR Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Project Activities

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	CONCLUSION	Cross Reference / Comment
1. The project shall assist Parties included in Annex I in achieving compliance with part of their emission reduction commitment under Art. 3	Kyoto Protocol Art.12.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Table 2, Section E.4.1
2. The project shall assist non-Annex I Parties in achieving sustainable development and shall have obtained confirmation by the host country thereof	Kyoto Protocol Art. 12.2, Marrakesh Accords, CDM Modalities §40a, AR CDM Modalities 15a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Table 2, Section A.5
3. The project shall assist non-Annex I Parties in contributing to the ultimate objective of the UNFCCC	Kyoto Protocol Art.12.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Table 2, Section E.4.1
4. The project shall have the written approval of voluntary participation from the designated national authorities of each party involved	Kyoto Protocol Art. 12.5a, Marrakesh Accords, CDM Modalities §40a, AR CDM Modalities 15a	O 1 and CAR 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Outstanding issue:</u> A Letter of Approval by the Designated National Authorities of China as well as the other participating Parties should be submitted to the audit team prior to submission for registration.



Industrie Service

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	CONCLUSION	Cross Reference / Comment
			<p>Hereby the option to get a statement regarding the significance of environmental and socio economic impacts should be evaluated.</p> <p>In addition the role of Spain should be clarified as the country is not mentioned in Annex 1 to the PDD.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request No. 1:</u></p> <p>The list of project participants lists “farmers/local communities” as project participants. The same should be identified in more detail and explained to the audit team also considering the procedures for Letters of Approval to be issued by the Chinese government.</p>
5. The net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks shall be real, measurable and give long-term benefits related to the mitigation of climate change	Kyoto Protocol Art. 12.5b	☑	Table 2, Section E
6. The proposed afforestation or reforestation activity under the CDM is additional as the actual net greenhouse gas removals by sinks are increased above the sum of the changes in carbon stocks in the carbon pools within the project boundary that would have occurred in the absence of the registered CDM AR project activity.	Kyoto Protocol Art. 12.5c, Marrakesh Accords, CDM Modalities §43, AR CDM Modalities § 12d	☑	Table 2, Section B.2



Industrie Service

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	CONCLUSION	Cross Reference / Comment
7. Potential public funding for the project from Parties in Annex I shall not be a diversion of official development assistance	Marrakech Accords	CR 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project financing has not led to a diversion of official development assistance according to the information given in the PDD. The same has been verified during the on site audit. But GEF funding is provided for the overall umbrella project. It hence should be clarified whether the financial aid also applies to the CDM project assessed herewith.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 1:</u></p> <p>The role GEF financing plays for the umbrella project and its implication for the project assessed herewith with respect to ODA should be explained to the audit team.</p>
8. Parties participating in the CDM shall designate a national authority for the CDM	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §29	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	China, Spain and Italy have established Designated National Authorities.
9. The host country shall be a Party to the Kyoto Protocol	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §30	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	China is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol and has accessed the Protocol at 08/30/2002.
10. Comments by local stakeholders shall be invited, a summary of these provided and how due account was taken of any comments received	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §37b, AR CDM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Table 2, Section H



Industrie Service

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	CONCLUSION	Cross Reference / Comment
	Modalities § 12b		
11. Documentation on the analysis of the environmental and socio-economic impacts of the project activity, including transboundary impacts, shall be submitted, and, if those impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the Host Party, an environmental and/or socio economic impact assessment in accordance with procedures as required by the Host Party shall be carried out.	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §37c, AR CDM Modalities § 12c	☑	Table 2, Section F and G
12. Baseline and monitoring methodology shall be previously approved by the CDM Methodology Panel / Executive Board.	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §37e, AR CDM Modalities § 12g and 20a	☑	Table 2, Section B.1.1 and D.1.1
13. Provisions for monitoring, verification and reporting shall be in accordance with the modalities described in the Marrakech Accords, the annex to the Modalities and Procedures for AR project activities, decision 19/CP9 and relevant decisions of the COP/MOP	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §37f, AR CDM Modalities § 12h, 25 and 26	☑	Table 2, Section D
14. Comments by local stakeholders shall be invited, a summary of these provided and how due account was taken of any comments received	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §37b	☑	Table 2, Section G
15. Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited NGOs shall have been invited to comment on the validation requirements for minimum 45 days, and the project design document and comments have been made publicly available	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities, §40, AR CDM	☑	The PDD has been made public by February 16, 2006 and will be public until April 1, 2006. No stakeholder comments have been received.



Industrie Service

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	CONCLUSION	Cross Reference / Comment
	Modalities §15b and c		
16. A baseline shall be established on a project-specific basis, in a conservative and transparent manner and taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities, §45c,d; AR CDM Modalities §20b, c and e	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Table 2, Section B.2
17. The baseline is established in a way that avoids double counting and is chosen out of the baseline methodologies available.	AR CDM Modalities §21 and 22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Table 2, Section B
18. The baseline methodology shall exclude to earn CERs for decreases in activity levels outside the project activity or due to force majeure	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities, §47	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Table 2, Section B.2
19. Does the host country comply with the participation requirements outlined in the Modalities and Procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism?	AR CDM Modalities, § 8 and 9; § 12a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	China basically fulfils all participation requirements outlined in the Modalities and Procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities under the CDM.
20. Management activities including harvesting cycles and verifications are chosen such that a systematic of verification and peaks in carbon stocks is avoided	AR CDM Modalities, §12e	CR 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Clarification Request No. 2:</u> Documentation should be submitted to demonstrate that the chosen verification schedule will not lead to more emission reductions than other options. The time verification occurs should be indicated in the PDD.



Industrie Service

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	CONCLUSION	Cross Reference / Comment
21. Project participants have specified the approach proposed to address non permanence.	AR CDM Modalities, § 12f	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Table 2. Section A.7
22. The proposed project activity conforms to all other requirements AR project activities under the CDM in decision 19/CP.9, the present annex and relevant decisions by the COP/MOP and the Executive Board.	AR CDM Modalities, § 12i	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Table 2
23. The project is designed in a manner that minimizes leakage effects.	AR CDM Modalities, § 24	CR 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project leakage emissions are limited to transport emissions due to fossil fuel combustion from transporting seedlings, labours, fertilizer, wood and other products. As the land to be planted is abandoned and not used for agricultural or grazing purposes the leakage effect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 3:</u></p> <p>The emission factor chosen for diesel emissions from vehicles needs to be confirmed by written evidence or an alternative but documented source should be chosen.</p>
24. The project design document shall be in conformance with the UNFCCC CDM-AR-PDD format	Marrakech Accords, CDM AR Modalities, Appendix B, EB	CR 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project design document does mainly conform with the AR CDM Project Design Document format (version 02) valid by the time of PDD



Industrie Service

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	CONCLUSION	Cross Reference / Comment
	Decisions		<p>submission.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 4:</u></p> <p>The following chapters do not comply with the guidelines for completing the PDD for AR CDM project activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A.4.3: Table missing• A.4.4: Table missing• A.4.5: Definition on afforestation and reforestation as well as land eligibility• B.4: Statement on project participants <p>The information is either missing or located in another part of the PDD. The information should be added or the PDD structure should be adjusted according the guidance given.</p>

Table 2 Requirements Checklist

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A. General Description of Project Activity					
A.1. Project Type					
A.1.1. Does the project comply with one of the project types of A/R CDM project activities defined?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes. The project is considered as an afforestation or reforestation activity.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.1.2. Does the project fulfil the definition of afforestation or reforestation?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	<p><u>Clarification Request No. 5:</u></p> <p>It should be qualified whether the project area complies with the definition of reforestation or should be even considered as an afforestation as the land has not been forested for more than 50 years.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 6:</u></p> <p>It should be explained why to a width of 10 m is referred to - as the definition of forest land under UNFCCC does not include this parameter.</p>	CR 5 CR 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.2. Project Boundaries and Components					
A.2.1. Are the project's spatial (geographical) boundaries clearly defined?	1, 2, 33, 34,	DR, I	Yes, the projects spatial boundaries are defined. But the definition has up to now not taken place according to the prescribed	CR 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	35, 40, 48, 54, 58, 59, 65, 66		<p>approach in the applied methodology.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 7:</u></p> <p>The correct identification of sites has been done by manual identification of the project boundaries whereas the PDD states that GPS data has been used and information on this is also given in annex 5 to the PDD. The project proponent should explain this contradiction. It should be noticed that the GPS measurement should be done in advance to the issuance of the final validation opinion. Finally maps with proper project boundaries and an English legend should be submitted to the audit team.</p>		
A.2.2. Are the project's system boundaries clearly defined?	1, 2, 33, 34, 35, 40, 48, 54, 58, 59, 65	DR, I	Yes, the system boundaries are clearly defined. The project comprises two distinct areas of land to be planted totalling 4000ha of land.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.1.2.1 Are the varieties and species selected clearly defined?	1, 2, 48, 65	DR, I	Yes, the species are defined properly in chapter A.4.2 of the PDD and the information given there has been verified	CR 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			during the on site audit. <u>Clarification Request No. 8:</u> For all statements and assumptions made in chapter A.4.1.5 the respective sources should be named and identified in the PDD. In addition all categorisations made use of and abbreviations used should be explained at least in the initial use.		
A.1.2.2 Are the greenhouse gases whose emissions will be part of the project specified?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	The gases have been specified in chapter A.4.3 of the PDD in a proper manner but the format the information has been given needs to be adjusted. <u>Clarification Request No. 9:</u> The gases specified in this chapter should be directly linked to the activities listed. To be clarified.	CR 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.1.2.3 Have the carbon pools been properly and in a correct manner selected?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	The carbon pools have been selected in a proper manner and in accordance with the methodology prescription. The same has been substantiated by supporting documentation and could also be verified during on site auditing.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3. Technology to be employed					
A.3.1. Does the project design reflect current good	1-8,	DR,	The project is developed as part of a larger	CR 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
practices?	11, 12, 13, 19- 26, 33- 35, 49, 50, 57, 65	I	<p>umbrella project carried out by the Guangxi Forestry Bureaux with support of the World Bank. The project design has been carefully developed and the subsequent implementation is planned including risk mitigation measures to ensure a successful implementation of the project. The project design with respect to seeding and harvesting procedures is considered as reflecting current good practice in the project area or being above local standards. The project design in itself is rather complex by consideration of various types of project participants – not in the sense of the CDM – such as individuals, households, farmers, communities, commercial forest enterprises, provincial and state forest agencies as well as national and international research institutions and national and international financial institutions. But the audit team got evidence during the visit on site that the project is well communicated between all participants, resulting in a high awareness level of all parties. Hence during project preparation consideration has been given to the specific design of the project.</p> <p>But further written information on the umbrella project should be submitted.</p>	CR 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<u>Clarification Request No. 10:</u> The content of the larger umbrella project GIFDCP should be explained and the role of the CDM component should be presented in a short description. <u>Clarification Request No. 11:</u> A time schedule for project implementation should be submitted.		
A.3.2. Does the project use state of the art technology or would the technology result in a significantly better performance than any commonly used technologies in the host country?	1-8, 11, 12, 13, 19- 26, 33- 35, 49, 50, 57, 65	DR, I	The project uses state of the art technology with respect to the local and regional frame conditions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3.3. Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other technologies within the project period?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	As the project has a long term lifetime of 30 years the option to have a technology substitution needs to be reviewed carefully. With respect to planting procedures it has to be expected that the current planting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			technique will also be applied in the future together with resprouting. The use of automated planting procedures has not to be expected due to the landform and income situation in the project area.		
A.3.4. Does the project result in a transfer of technology to the host country?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	<u>Clarification Request No. 12:</u> A statement regarding the occurrence of a technology transfer to the host Party as part of the project activity is missing in the PDD. Respective evidence should be given.	CR 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3.5. Does the PDD contain a correct description of the present environmental conditions of the area including a description climate, hydrology, soils, ecosystems and the possible presence of rare and endangered species and their habitats?	1, 2, 37, 58, 59, 65	DR, I	Yes, the PDD does contain the respective information following the structure prescribed in the guidelines for completing AR PDD. In additional documentation, such as for example landform and soil maps (in the required resolution) the information has been substantiated. Most of the information is clearly described. <u>Clarification Request No. 13:</u> Information on rare and endangered species should clearly refer to the project area and/or to the surrounding area.	CR 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3.6. Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to work as presumed during the project period? Does the project make provisions for meeting training and maintenance needs?	1, 2, 63, 65	DR, I	Only limited information regarding training has been made transparent in the PDD. <u>Clarification Request No. 14:</u> Information on required training in advance	CR 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			to the project implementation should be submitted to the audit team.		
A.4. Project participants					
A.4.1. Are the project participants clearly defined?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	The list of project participants lists “farmers/local communities” as project participants. The same should be identified in more detail and explained to the audit team also considering the procedures for Letters of Approval to be issued by the Chinese government.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.5. Contribution to Sustainable Development					
A.5.1. Is the project in line with relevant legislation and plans in the host country?	1, 2, 3-8, 9, 19-24, 28-32, 45, 49, 50, 65, 67	DR, I	The question can finally be answered after the issuance of the Letter of Approval by the host government. The project has already obtained the necessary approval regarding environmental and social aspects.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.5.2. Is the project in line with host-country specific	1, 2,	DR,	The question can finally be answered after	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
CDM requirements?	3-8, 9, 19- 24, 28- 32, 45, 49, 50, 65, 67	I	the issuance of the Letter of Approval by the host government. The category of afforestation/reforestation is explicitly mentioned in the “Measures for Operation and Management of Clean Development Mechanism Projects in China” even if not set as a priority project type.		
A.5.3. Is the project in line with sustainable development policies of the host country?	1, 2, 3-8, 9, 19- 24, 28- 32, 45, 49, 50, 65, 67	DR, I	The question can finally be answered after the issuance of the Letter of Approval by the host government.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.5.4. Will the project create other environmental or social benefits than GHG emission removals?	1, 2, 3-8, 9, 19- 24,	DR, I	Yes the project will create employment opportunities for local farmers and environmental benefits such as soil protection and water management options.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	28-32, 45, 49, 50, 65				
A.6. Land Use and Land Rights					
A.6.1. Does the project consider and describe the current legal title to the land?	1, 2, 49, 50, 65	DR, I	Yes, the current legal title to the land is generally described. <u>Clarification Request No. 15:</u> The land ownership and contractual arrangements in quantitative terms (in ha) for each county should be described (land tenure and management) in a clear manner. During the on site audit contradicting information has been presented to the audit team.	CR 15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.6.2. Is the current land tenure and land use properly described?		DR, I	The legal restriction of the land use to forestry has been demonstrated by providing the respective documentation (land use plan and legal regulation).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.6.3. Has it been made clear who has the right to access the sequestered carbon?	1, 2, 25, 26, 39,	DR, I	Yes, it has been defined by contractual arrangements which have been verified during the on site audit how the revenue from the CDM project is shared by the	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	49, 50, 65, 67		various stakeholders. The same approach is deemed accepted under national regulations. The final approval will be given by the Letter of Approval to be issued by the host government.		
A.7. Non Permanence					
A.7.1. Has an approach regarding the issue of non permanence been selected?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes, 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"/>
A.7.2. Is the approach applied in a correct manner?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes, the application and interpretation is correct.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B. Project Baseline					
B.1. Baseline Methodology					
B.1.1. Is the baseline methodology previously approved by the CDM Methodology Panel?	1, 2, 41, 65	DR, I	Yes, the project has applied the AR methodology ARAM0001 previously approved by the Methodology Panel and the Executive Board.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.2. Is the baseline methodology the one deemed most applicable for this project and is the	1, 2, 41,	DR, I	As the methodology applied has been developed for the project assessed herewith	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
appropriateness justified?	65		the same is deemed to be most applicable. In addition the project has demonstrated clearly that it meets all applicability criteria outlined in the methodology.		
B.2. Baseline Determination					
B.2.1. Is the application of the methodology and the discussion and determination of the chosen baseline transparent?	1, 2, 41, 52, 65	DR, I	Yes, the methodology is applied in a transparent manner. All equation need have been made use of and applied in a transparent manner.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.2. Has the baseline been determined using conservative assumptions where possible?	1, 2, 41, 52, 65	DR, I	Yes, the application is making use of conservative assumptions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.3. Has the baseline been established on a project-specific basis?	1, 2, 41, 52, 65	DR, I	The baseline is established in a project specific manner but could also apply to other AR projects having similar natural frame conditions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.4. Does the baseline scenario sufficiently take into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies, macro-economic trends and political aspirations?	1, 2, 41, 52, 65	DR, I	Yes, step 3 of the determination of the most plausible baseline scenario – in the PDD - describes the relevant national and/or sectoral policies.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.5. Is the baseline determination compatible with the available data?	1, 2, 41, 48, 52,	DR, I	Yes, basically this is the case. Documented evidence for the performance of each step of the ex ante stratification	CR 16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	65		process has been provided. <u>Clarification Request No. 16:</u> But also the outcome of the same in form of maps outlining the location of each stratum should be submitted. In addition a map with the location of the single tree species to be planted should be submitted to give evidence for the mosaic approach described in the PDD.		
B.2.6. Does the selected baseline represent the most likely scenario among other possible and/or discussed scenarios?	1, 2, 41, 52, 65	DR, I	Yes, according to all arguments given in the PDD and verified by the audit team, the selected baseline represents the most likely scenario among other possible and/or discussed scenarios.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.7. Is it demonstrated/justified that the project activity itself is not a likely baseline scenario?	1, 2, 10, 25, 26, 27, 38, 39, 42, 47, 51, 56, 60, 61,	DR, I	The argumentation given in the PDD indicates that the project activity itself is not the baseline scenario and the same has also been verified during interviews performed during the on site audit. But documented evidence needs to be submitted regarding various arguments to substantiate and prove the argumentation given. <u>Corrective Action Request No. 2:</u> Under step 1a of the “tool for demonstration and assessment of additionality in A/R CDM project activities” the proposed project not	CAR 2 CAR 3 CR 17 CR 18 CR 19 CR 20 CR 21 CR 22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	62, 65		<p>undertaken as a A/R CDM project needs to be included and considered as one option.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request No. 3:</u></p> <p>No written evidence could be submitted that only with the proposed project activity commercial banks are willing to give loans as described in the barrier analysis. Hence the statement should be removed or modified in the PDD.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 17:</u></p> <p>The financial calculations and the sensitivity analysis presented need to be substantiated by written evidence (financial analysis model) and all parameters need to be verifiable. Hereby is should be noted that the CDM specific cost should not be included in the “without CDM” calculation but only in the “with CDM” calculation.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 18:</u></p> <p>The benchmark (12% IRR) set by the project proponent referring to NDRC needs to be submitted to the audit team for plausibility and applicability check.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 19:</u></p> <p>Documented evidence should be submitted that the Chinese government is actually only</p>		



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>willing to give funding as long as the project is implemented under CDM.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 20:</u></p> <p>Documented evidence needs to be submitted when it has been decided to proceed with the project and how CDM has taken into consideration by that time.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 21:</u></p> <p>The barrier analysis needs to be reviewed in the light of the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In general the listed barriers might be applicable for households/farmers but not for commercial enterprises.• The investment barrier seems not substantiated as 90% of the investment is financed by private equity and loans and the consideration of CDM could not be proven so far (see CAR 4).• The interviewed banks moreover confirmed that they haven given loans for 10 years in the past to afforestation projects.• The technological barrier does not seem plausible as the forest		



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>enterprises involved are experienced in afforestation projects and have a solid track record in doing the same being specialized in this type of service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The institutional barrier again only applies to the households/farmers but not to the enterprises.• The market 'barrier could not be confirmed during the on site audit as forest enterprises stated that the price for timber has been relatively constant over the last five years. Also the relevance of transportation cost to overall cost was only estimated to be 10%. <p>The issues should be reflected and discussed and a justification should be provided or the PDD should be modified.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 22:</u></p> <p>Under step 1b of the additionality discussion only for the project scenario the compliance with the legal obligations has been described. The same should be done for all other scenarios listed under step 1a of the tool.</p>		



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.2.8. Have the major risks to the baseline been identified?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes, uncertainties related to the baseline have been described in a qualitative and quantitative manner in annex 3 to the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.9. Is all literature and sources clearly referenced?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Partly. See other questions of chapter B as for example B.2.7.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C. Duration of the Project/ Crediting Period					
C.1.1. Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes. <u>Clarification Request No. 23:</u> The starting date of the project and the start of the crediting period should be reviewed in the light of the current time schedule. In addition justification for the starting date should be given.	CR 23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.1.2. Is the assumed crediting time clearly defined and reasonable? (renewable crediting period of max. two x 20 years or fixed crediting period of max. 30 years)?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	The crediting period is clearly defined.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D. Monitoring Plan					
D.1. Monitoring Methodology					
D.1.1. Is the monitoring methodology previously approved by the CDM Methodology Panel?	1, 2, 41,	DR,	Yes, the project has applied the AR methodology AR-AM0001 previously	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	65	I	approved by the Methodology Panel and the Executive Board.		
D.1.2. Is the monitoring methodology applicable for this project and is the appropriateness justified?	1, 2, 41, 65	DR, I	As the methodology applied has been developed for the project assessed herewith the same is deemed to be most applicable. In addition the project has demonstrated clearly that it meets all applicability criteria outlined in the methodology.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.3. Does the monitoring methodology reflect good monitoring and reporting practices?	1, 2, 41, 65	DR, I	<p>Yes as it follows the prescribed methodology.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 24:</u></p> <p>The following monitoring parameters are currently missing in the PDD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard deviation of each stratum (2.1.1.05) • Number of sample plots (2.1.1.06) • Total increase in GHG emissions (2.1.2.25) <p>In case not deemed necessary, respective justification should be given.</p>	CR 24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.4. 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	1, 2, 41, 65	DR, I	Yes, the methods follow the approved methodology approach.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
sinks?					
D.1.5. Is the discussion and selection of the monitoring methodology transparent?	1, 2, 41, 65	DR, I	The approach is prescribed by the methodology selected and the same is applied in a transparent manner.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.6. 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, 41, 65	DR, I	Yes, convincing argumentation is given in chapter A.4.4 of the PDD regarding the omission of single pools.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.7. Does the monitoring plan include provisions for a periodic calculation of the net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks?	1, 2, 41, 65	DR, I	Yes according to the monitoring plan outlined in Table Annex 4-2 of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.8. 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?	1, 2, 41, 64, 65	DR, I	<u>Clarification Request No. 25:</u> The project proponent should explain to the audit team how he recognises in case one of the farmers does not prolong his contract with the enterprises and whether this will be detected by the current monitoring method.	CR 25	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.2. Monitoring of Actual Net GHG Removals by Sinks					
D.2.1. 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, 65	DR, I	Yes, the monitoring plan contains all relevant parameters.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.2.2. 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, 65	DR, I	Yes, the techniques are outlined and prescribed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.2.3. Do these techniques and methods reflect accepted principles and criteria for forest inventory?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes, as they follow the approach given during the approval process of the underlying methodology.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.2.4. Are the choices of project GHG indicators reasonable?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes, they are in line with the requirements of the methodology.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.2.5. Will it be possible to monitor / measure the specified project GHG indicators?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.2.6. Will the indicators give opportunity for real measurements of achieved GHG removals?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.2.7. Will the indicators enable comparison of project data and performance over time?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes, under the condition that all measures will be implemented as planned.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3. Monitoring of Leakage					
D.3.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for determining leakage?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.2. Have relevant indicators for GHG leakage been included?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.3. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for determining leakage?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.3.4. Will it be possible to monitor the specified GHG leakage indicators?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.4. Monitoring of Baseline Net GHG Removals by Sinks					
D.4.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for determining baseline net greenhouse gas removals by sinks during the crediting period?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.4.2. Is the choice of baseline indicators, in particular for baseline emissions, reasonable?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.4.3. In case the project uses control plots for baseline determination: Are methods and techniques for measuring individual carbon pools and greenhouse gas sources specified?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	It is not foreseen to make use of control plots.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.4.4. Will it be possible to monitor the specified baseline indicators?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.5. Monitoring of Sustainable Development Indicators/ Environmental Impacts					
D.5.1. Does the monitoring plan provide the collection and archiving of relevant data concerning environmental, social and economic impacts?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	The methodology does not foresee to monitor sustainable development indicators.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.5.2. Does the monitoring plan provide provisions for the collection and archiving of planned	1, 2, 65	DR, I	See D.5.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
monitoring and remedial measures?					
D.5.3. Is the choice of indicators for sustainability development (social, environmental, economic) reasonable?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	See D.5.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.5.4. Will it be possible to monitor the specified sustainable development indicators?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	See D.5.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.5.5. Are the sustainable development indicators in line with stated national priorities in the Host Country?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	See D.5.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6. Project Management Planning					
D.6.1. Is the authority and responsibility of project management clearly described?	1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 19-26, 57, 63, 65	DR, I	The general set up is outlined in chapter C.7 of the PDD. <u>Clarification Request No. 26:</u> Project management and planning should be discussed in further detail in the PDD or an annexed document. Hereby especially the role of the forest bureau versus the forest enterprises/farmers/households/communities should be explained.	CR 26	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.2. Is the authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting clearly described?	1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 19-26,	DR, I	See D.6.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	57, 63, 65				
D.6.3. Are procedures identified for training of monitoring personnel?	1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 19- 26, 57, 63, 65	DR, I	See D.6.1 and CR 14 above.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.4. Are procedures identified for emergency preparedness for cases where emergencies can cause unintended emissions?	1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 19- 26, 57, 63, 65	DR, I	The PDD outlines in section E and F potential risks, which can cause unintended emissions, and envisaged countermeasures. Respective preparations as far as already in place have been verified in additional documentation and got confirmed during the on site audit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.5. Are procedures identified for calibration of monitoring equipment?	1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 19- 26, 57,	DR, I	See D.6.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	63, 65				
D.6.6. Are procedures identified for maintenance of monitoring equipment and installations?	1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 19- 26, 57, 63, 65	DR, I	See D.6.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.7. Are procedures identified for monitoring, measurements and reporting?	1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 19- 26, 57, 63, 65	DR, I	See D.6.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.6.8. 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, 6, 8, 11, 12, 19-26, 57, 63, 65	DR, I	See D.6.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.9. Are procedures identified for dealing with possible monitoring data adjustments and uncertainties?	1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 19-26, 57, 63, 65	DR, I	In annex 4 of the PDD the way possible monitoring errors are detected and how the project proponent will handle the same has been outlined.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.10. Are procedures identified for review of reported results/data?	1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 19-26, 57, 63, 65	DR, I	QA/QC procedures to review the reported results have been described in annex 4 of the PDD. The control measures go all along the data processing from data entry into the system till the final resulting CER calculations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.6.11. Are procedures identified for internal audits of GHG project compliance with operational requirements where applicable?	1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 19- 26, 57, 63, 65	DR, I	QA/QC procedures to review the reported results have been described in annex 4 of the PDD. The control measures go all along the data processing from data entry into the system till the final resulting CER calculations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.12. Are procedures identified for project performance reviews before data is submitted for verification, internally or externally?	1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 19- 26, 57, 63, 65	DR, I	QA/QC procedures to review the reported results have been described in annex 4 of the PDD. The control measures go all along the data processing from data entry into the system till the final resulting CER calculations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.6.13. Are procedures identified for corrective actions in order to provide for more accurate future monitoring and reporting?	1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 19- 26, 57, 63, 65	DR, I	In annex 4 of the PDD the way possible monitoring errors are detected and how the project proponent will handle the same has been outlined.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
E. Calculation of GHG Emissions by Sources and Removals by Sinks					
E.1. Estimated Actual Net GHG Removals by Sinks					
E.1.1. Are all aspects related to direct and indirect GHG emissions and removals captured in the project design?	1, 2, 52, 65	DR, I	Yes all relevant flows of GHG emissions have been considered <u>Clarification Request No. 27:</u> The calculations regarding the ex ante estimation of the net removal, baseline net removal and leakage should be submitted to the audit team.	CR 27	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.2. Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	1, 2, 52, 65	DR, I	See E.1.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.3. Have conservative assumptions been used to calculate project GHG emissions and removals?	1, 2, 52, 65	DR, I	See E.1.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.4. Are uncertainties in the GHG emissions and removals estimates properly addressed in the documentation?	1, 2, 52, 65	DR, I	See E.1.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.5. Have all relevant greenhouse gases and source categories listed in Kyoto Protocol Annex A been evaluated?	1, 2, 52, 65	DR, I	Yes, the PDD and the underlying calculations cover all relevant gases.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
E.2. Leakage					
E.2.1. Are potential leakage effects beyond the chosen project boundaries properly identified?	1, 2, 52, 65	DR, I	Yes, basically all relevant leakage effects based on the options outlined in the methodology have been properly calculated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.2.2. Have these leakage effects been properly accounted for in calculations?	1, 2, 52, 65	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.2.3. Does the methodology for calculating leakage comply with existing good practice?	1, 2, 52, 65	DR, I	The calculation is according to the prescribed equations of the methodology.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.2.4. Are the calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	1, 2, 52, 65	DR, I	See E.1.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.2.5. Have conservative assumptions been used when calculating leakage?	1, 2, 52, 65	DR, I	All assumptions are deemed plausible and conservative.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.2.6. Are uncertainties in the leakage estimates properly addressed?	1, 2, 52, 65	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.3. Estimated Baseline Net GHG Removals by Sinks					
E.3.1. Have the most relevant and likely operational characteristics and baseline indicators been chosen as reference for baseline emissions?	1, 2, 52, 65	DR, I	<u>Clarification Request No. 28:</u> The method chosen for the estimation of baseline net GHG removals by sinks - out of	CR 28	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			the existing options - should explicitly stated in the PDD.		
E.3.2. Are the baseline boundaries clearly defined and do they sufficiently cover sources and sinks for baseline emissions/removals?	1, 2, 52, 65	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.3.3. Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	1, 2, 52, 54, 55, 65	DR, I	<p><u>Clarification Request No. 29:</u></p> <p>Baseline net GHG removals are caused by existing trees. It should be demonstrated that the land covered by these trees is not to be defined as forest by submission of the sample results regarding tree density and crown cover. Currently only average values have been submitted. In case of forest land occurrence the respective area should be taken out of the project area hereby considering the sampling approach and be in line with sound statistical methods.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 30:</u></p> <p>The methodology applied to the estimation of baseline net GHG removals by sinks requires to pay attention regarding bigger BEF for single trees compared to forest stands (page 8 AR-AM0001) in order to avoid an underestimation of the baseline net GHG removals. The same is not reflected in the PDD.</p>	<p>CR 29</p> <p>CR 30</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
E.3.4. Have conservative assumptions been used when calculating baseline emissions?	1, 2, 52, 54, 55, 65	DR, I	Yes, in general this is the case but see comments under E.3.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.3.5. Are uncertainties in the GHG emission estimates properly addressed in the documentation?	1, 2, 52, 54, 55, 65	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.3.6. Have the project baseline(s) and the project emissions/removals been determined using the same appropriate methodology and conservative assumptions?	1, 2, 52, 54, 55, 65	DR, I	Yes, the methodology is correctly applied. Regarding assumptions made, see comment under E.3.3 and E. 3.4.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.4. Estimated Net Anthropogenic GHG Removals by Sinks					
E.4.1. Will the project result in net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks?	1, 2, 52, 65	DR, I	Yes, under the condition that all open issues raised under chapter B and E of this protocol will be resolved.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F. Environmental Impacts					
F.1.1. Has an analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity been sufficiently described?	1, 2, 3-8,	DR, I	Yes, the PDD contains in E.1 a description of the environmental impacts. Next to this	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	9, 19- 24, 28- 32, 45, 49, 50, 65		various studies have been carried out to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project measures.		
F.1.2. Does this impact analysis include impacts on biodiversity and natural ecosystems (e.g. hydrology, soils, pests) as well as impacts outside the project boundary?	1, 2, 3-8, 9, 19- 24, 28- 32, 45, 49, 50, 65	DR, I	The analysis also considers impacts on biodiversity and natural ecosystems. <u>Clarification Request No. 31:</u> Environmental impacts outside the project boundary should be described. To be added.	CR 31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.3. Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and if yes, is an EIA attached and approved?	1, 2, 3-8, 9, 19- 24, 28- 32, 45,	DR, I	Yes, an EIA is required and has been submitted to the audit team for verification. The authorities have approved the project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	49, 50, 65				
F.1.4. Are environmental impacts considered either significant by the project participants or the host Party? Has subsequently an EIA taken place?	1, 2, 3-8, 9, 19- 24, 28- 32, 45, 49, 50, 65	DR, I	The environmental impacts are according to the EIA study not considered significant but the final answer can only be given by the time the Letter of Approval has been issued.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.5. Will the project create any adverse environmental effects?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	Such effects are not to be expected.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.6. Are transboundary environmental impacts considered in the analysis?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	No, but as the project is far from the national boundaries the same is considered acceptable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.7. Have identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design? What are the planned monitoring and remedial measures?	1, 2, 3-8, 9, 19- 24, 28- 32, 45,	DR, I	Potential risks have been identified and are addressed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	49, 50, 65				
F.1.8. Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country?	1, 2, 3-8, 9, 19- 24, 28- 32, 45, 49, 50, 65	DR, I	Yes all relevant approvals have been obtained by the project up to now.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G. Socio-Economic Impacts					
G.1.1. Has an analysis of the socio-economic impacts of the project activity been sufficiently described?	1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 44, 65	DR, I	Yes, the PDD contains in chapter F a description of the socio economic impacts. Next to this studies have been carried out to evaluate the impacts of the project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.2. Does this impact analysis include impacts on socio-economic impacts (e.g. local communities, land tenure, food production) inside as well as outside the project boundary?	1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 44, 65	DR, I	Such an analysis has been outlined in the PDD and the conclusions drawn are deemed appropriate.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
G.1.3. Are there any Host Party requirements for an Socio-Economic Impact Assessment, and if yes, is such an assessment attached and approved?	1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 44, 65	DR, I	There is no host country requirement for such an assessment but the same has nevertheless been carried out due to investor requirements.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.4. Are socio-economic impacts considered either significant by the project participants or the host Party? Has subsequently an Socio-Economic Impact Assessment taken place?	1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 44, 65	DR, I	The impacts are according to the statement in a regional level not considered significant but the final answer can only be given by the time the Letter of Approval has been issued.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.5. Will the project create any adverse socio-economic effects?	1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 44, 65	DR, I	Such effects have been considered and evaluated but are not to be expected.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.6. Are transboundary socio-economic effects considered in the analysis?	1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 44, 65	DR, I	No, but as the project is far from the national boundaries the same is considered acceptable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.7. Have identified socio-economic effects been addressed in the project design? What are the planned monitoring and remedial measures?	1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 44, 65	DR, I	Potential risks have been identified and are addressed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.8. Does the project comply with legislation in the host country?	1, 2, 3, 6,	DR, I	Yes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	8, 44, 65				
H. Stakeholder Comments					
H.1.1. Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	1, 2, 3, 6, 14- 18, 25- 26, 36- 37, 44, 53, 63, 64, 65	DR, I	Yes, during the project planning phase the following stakeholders have been consulted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local population • Farmers • Enterprises • Administration on local and regional Details are given in the PDD in section G.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H.1.2. Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?	1, 2, 3, 6, 14- 18, 25- 26, 36- 37, 44,	DR, I	Yes via personal meetings the project has been introduced to the local people. Approval of the project has been obtained from local and regional authorities.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	53, 63, 64, 65				
H.1.3. Has sufficient time been given to stakeholders to comment on the project design?	1, 2, 3, 6, 14- 18, 25- 26, 36- 37, 44, 53, 63, 64, 65	DR, I	Yes. Well in advance (up to 18 month) to the project start the project has been introduced to the local population.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H.1.4. 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?	1, 2, 65	DR, I	There is no such requirement.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H.1.5. Is a summary of the stakeholder comments received provided?	1, 2, 3, 6, 14- 18, 25- 26, 36-	DR, I	<u>Clarification Request No. 32:</u> The list of preferences (original documents) with respect to tree species developed during the training seminars with the farmers should be submitted to the audit team.	CR 32	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	37, 44, 53, 63, 64, 65				
H.1.6. Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	1, 2, 3, 6, 14- 18, 25- 26, 36- 37, 44, 53, 63, 64, 65	DR, I	Yes, stakeholder comments have been systematically recorded and taken into account for example when selecting tree species to be planted.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Table 3: Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<p><u>Outstanding issue:</u></p> <p>A Letter of Approval by the Designated National Authorities of China as well as the other participating Parties should be submitted to the audit team prior to submission for registration.</p> <p>Hereby the option to get a statement regarding the significance of environmental and socio economic impacts should be evaluated.</p> <p>In addition the role of Spain should be clarified as the country is not mentioned in Annex 1 to the PDD.</p>	Table 1	<p>The Letter of Approval will be submitted to the audit team before submission for registration.</p> <p>The environmental impact assessment of the GIFDCP which include the Bio Carbon Fund part has been approved by Guangxi Provincial Environmental Protection Agency. The social economic assessment has also been conducted by an expert team consisting of national and international experts. Both environmental and social economic assessment reports have been submitted to audit team during on-site audit, which indicated that no significant negative impacts were found.</p> <p>Spain has been confirmed to be a project participant.</p>	<p>The non significance of the project regarding environmental and socio economic terms is considered to be proven by the performed surveys and support letters from the provincial government.</p> <p><u>Outstanding issue:</u></p> <p>The Letters of Approval are still missing and this issue is considered to be pending but needs only to be resolved before the project is submitted for registration.</p>
<p><u>Corrective Action Request No. 1:</u></p> <p>The list of project participants lists “farmers/local communities” as project participants. The same should be identified in</p>	Table 1	<p>The participants list has been revised to address the comments. Xinghuan Forestry Development Company Ltd, Italy and Spain are to be considered as</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
more detail and explained to the audit team also considering the procedures for Letters of Approval to be issued by the Chinese government.		project participants.	
<u>Corrective Action Request No. 2:</u> Under step 1a of the “tool for demonstration and assessment of additionality in A/R CDM project activities” the proposed project not undertaken as a A/R CDM project needs to be included and considered as one option.	B.2.7	”The proposed project not undertaken as an A/R CDM project”, as one of alternatives, has been included under step 1a of the additional tool in section B.3 of the PDD.	☑
<u>Corrective Action Request No. 3:</u> No written evidence could be submitted that only with the proposed project activity commercial banks are willing to give loans as described in the barrier analysis. Hence the statement should be removed or modified in the PDD.	B.2.7	Related texts in PDD have been revised. The document says that it increases the chance to get loan for reforestation on remote degraded lands with the proposed A/R CDM project.	The revised text reflects the actual situation. ☑
<u>Clarification Request No. 1:</u> The role GEF financing plays for the umbrella project and its implication for the project assessed herewith with respect to ODA should be explained to the audit team.	Table 1	The GEF fund will support the nature reserve management which is separated and outside from this CDM project.	The project financing has been reviewed by the audit team. ☑
<u>Clarification Request No. 2:</u> Documentation should be submitted to demonstrate that the chosen verification	Table 1	The requested information has been submitted and updated in the revised PDD.	It has been clearly demonstrated that the verification schedule does not lead to a time coincidence of peaks of



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
schedule will not lead to more emission reductions than other options. The time verification occurs should be indicated in the PDD.			carbon storage and verification audits. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 3:</u> The emission factor chosen for diesel emissions from vehicles needs to be confirmed by written evidence or an alternative but documented source should be chosen.	Table 1	Ms. Xiulian Hu from Energy Institute has confirmed the emission factor to be part of the next national communication by emailing the audit team on March 2 nd 2006.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 4:</u> The following chapters do not comply with the guidelines for completing the PDD for AR CDM project activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.4.3: Table missing • A.4.4: Table missing • A.4.5: Definition on afforestation and reforestation as well as land eligibility • B.4: Statement on project participants The information is either missing or located in another part of the PDD. The information should be added or the PDD structure should be adjusted according the guidance given in the document mentioned above.	Table 1	Based on newest guideline approved by EB23 (24-26 Feb 2006), the project proponent added/revised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.4.3: table added • A.4.4: table added • A.4.5: moved land eligibility section located under section B.3 to A.4.5. • B.4: Statement added 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<u>Clarification Request No. 5:</u> It should be qualified whether the project area complies with the definition of reforestation or should be even considered as an afforestation as the land has not been forested for more than 50 years.	A.1.2	As elaborated in Annex 3 of PDD, lands to be planted were mostly deforested during 1950s-1980s. A few piece of lands may have been non-forested before 1956 and that are hence eligible for afforestation. However since the area of such lands is quite limited and it is hard to provide evidence, we consider the project a reforestation.	This approach is deemed acceptable as in any case the project complies with either the afforestation or reforestation definition. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 6:</u> It should be explained why to a width of 10 m is referred to - as the definition of forest land under UNFCCC does not include this parameter.	A.1.2	It is included in the domestic forest definition and has been removed from the PDD in the revised version.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 7:</u> The correct identification of sites has been done by manual identification of the project boundaries whereas the PDD states that GPS data has been used and information on this is also given in annex 5 to the PDD. The project proponent should explain this contradiction. It should be noticed that the GPS measurement should be done in advance to the issuance of the final validation opinion. Finally maps with proper project boundaries and an English legend should be	A.2.1	The GPS measurement for project site boundaries has been completed by the Guangxi Forestry Design Institute and the project site boundaries have been clearly defined by using GPS. The relevant maps with proper project boundaries have been updated in the revised PDD. Within the boundary, the planting sites now are broken down to 80 patches instead of 52 parcels as it has been based on in the field survey. The reason is as follows: according to	The data has been checked for plausibility and no indication has been received stating any incorrect measurement. The increase in single land parcels is not deemed to add any risk to the project site identification but should rather help to get more exact data. It moreover needs to be noticed that the actual project area will be identified ex-post during the verification audit.



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
submitted to the audit team.		the previous manual identification, there are 52 parcels of sites within the project boundary. However some of the sites have small streams or ditches with existing forests. Although we have taken these forests areas in the streams or ditches out of the project areas, we treated the sites in two sides of the streams and ditches as one site parcel. During the GPS process, those sites have been spited along forest boundary in streams or ditches. Therefore the number of sites now is 80 patches within the project boundary. The detailed site boundary information is submitted to the audit team.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 8:</u> For all statements and assumptions made in chapter A.4.1.5 the respective sources should be named and identified in the PDD. In addition all categorisations made use of and abbreviations used should be explained at least in the initial use.	A.1.2.1	The information sources have been indicated as a footnote in the revised PDD section A.4.1.5.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 9:</u> The gases specified in this chapter should be directly linked to the activities listed. To be	A.1.2.2	The PDD has been updated accordingly.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
clarified.			
<u>Clarification Request No. 10:</u> The content of the larger umbrella project GIFDCP should be explained and the role of the CDM component should be presented in a short description.	A.3.1	A paragraph has been added at the end of section A.2 describing the GIFDCP and the role of the CDM component. Moreover additional information regarding the umbrella project has been submitted to the audit team.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 11:</u> A time schedule for project implementation should be submitted.	A.3.1	The requested information has been submitted.	The project is in line with the current schedule. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 12:</u> A statement regarding the occurrence of a technology transfer to the host Party as part of the project activity is missing in the PDD. Respective evidence should be given.	A.3.4	The issue has been clarified in the revised PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 13:</u> Information on rare and endangered species should clearly refer to the project area and/or to the surrounding area.	A.3.5	Related text has been revised.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 14:</u> Information on required training in advance to the project implementation should be submitted to the audit team.	A.3.6	To prepare and initiate the project appropriately, several training courses have been held in the following aspect: (a) BioCarbon project management, (b) participatory forestry assessment, (c)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
		nursery management; and (d) planting design. Before the plantation activities being taken, the training course to the forest farms and households on site preparation, planting practice and the environment protection will be arranged by the county forestry bureaus and forest farms. Respective documents have been provided.	
<u>Clarification Request No. 15:</u> The land ownership and contractual arrangements in quantitative terms (in ha) for each county should be described (land tenure and management) in a clear manner. During the on site audit contradicting information has been presented to the audit team.	A.6.1	Table A-5 has been added in section A.4.6 of the PDD, indicating the land tenures and production arrangement for the two counties in a clear manner.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Documented evidence for the performance of each step of the ex ante stratification process has been provided. <u>Clarification Request No. 16:</u> But also the outcome of the same in form of maps outlining the location of each stratum should be submitted. In addition a map with the location of the single tree species to be	B.2.5	Additional information has been submitted for ex ante stratification including manual, report and stratum spreadsheet. Maps outlining the location of each stratum have been added.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
planted should be submitted to give evidence for the mosaic approach described in the PDD.			
<u>Clarification Request No. 17:</u> The financial calculations and the sensitivity analysis presented need to be substantiated by written evidence (financial analysis model) and all parameters need to be verifiable. Hereby is should be noted that the CDM specific cost should not be included in the “without CDM” calculation but only in the “with CDM” calculation.	B.2.7	The required documentation has been submitted and is deemed acceptable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 18:</u> The benchmark (12% IRR) set by the project proponent referring to NDRC needs to be submitted to the audit team for plausibility and applicability check.	B.2.7	A document substantiating the benchmark set has been submitted. The benchmark (12% FIRR) for agriculture projects is issued by the Chinese Ministry of Agriculture. As there is no forestry specific benchmark available, local people usually use this benchmark for agriculture in forestry projects.	The approach is deemed plausible and appropriate. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 19:</u> Documented evidence should be submitted that the Chinese government is actually only willing to give funding as long as the project is implemented under CDM.	B.2.7	A respective document regarding the equity commitment by Guangxi Forestry Bureau has been submitted.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<u>Clarification Request No. 20</u> Documented evidence needs to be submitted when it has been decided to proceed with the project and how CDM has taken into consideration by that time.	B.2.7	<p>A paragraph has been added respectively at the last para in PDD section A.2 and Step 3 “Barrier Analysis” of the Additionality Tool under Section B.3 to clarify the relationship of the proposed project and umbrella project. During on-site audit, Guangxi Forestry Bureau has explained to the audit team that without the CDM project and GEF project, the NDRC would not agree to apply the World Bank Loan for the forest resource development project.</p> <p>This can be demonstrated by the document that the Guangxi PMO reported to the Guangxi Forestry Bureau after internal discussion with NDRC and the Ministry of Finance in November 2003. In addition, World Bank has provided internal documents demonstrating the consideration of CDM for the project before the project has been finally approved.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 21:</u> The barrier analysis needs to be reviewed in the light of the following comments:	B.2.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Actually barriers for enterprises are less relative to household/farmers. But there	The argumentation regarding the investment barrier is deemed convincing regarding general terms and



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<p>In general the listed barriers might be applicable for households/farmers but not for commercial enterprises.</p> <p>The investment barrier seems not substantiated as 90% of the investment is financed by private equity and loans and the consideration of CDM could not be proven so far (see CAR 4).</p> <p>The interviewed banks moreover confirmed that they haven't given loans for 10 years in the past to afforestation projects.</p> <p>The technological barrier does not seem plausible as the forest enterprises involved are experienced in afforestation projects and have a solid track record in doing the same being specialized in this type of service.</p> <p>The institutional barrier again only applies to the households/farmers but not to the enterprises.</p> <p>The market barrier could not be confirmed during the on-site audit as forest enterprises stated that the price for timber has been relatively constant over the last five years. Also the relevance of transportation cost to overall cost was only estimated to be 10%.</p>		<p>are still some important barriers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The private equity is mainly from selling wood and non-wood forest products (it may not be called as equity). The investment barriers in PDD mean the establishment investment which is a big barrier even for enterprises. Though the portion of plantation, establishment cost is relative low, compared with total cost, but it is crucial for initiating the project. Most plantation operation cost will be the harvest cost and is short-term investment and it is easier to be mobilized. Bank loan obtained in the past was just for A/R on economically attractive lands rather than remote degraded lands. Due to the high transportation cost and lower productivity of degraded lands, reforestation on remote degraded lands is economically 	<p>the reference to degraded land is valid to be considered. The arguments regarding transportation cost are substantiated by submitted documentation.</p> <p>The argumentation regarding technological and market barriers is considered to be plausible and testimonial evidence has been obtained on site.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u></p> <p>The barriers are considered to be valid but would need to be substantiated by more documented evidence as for example comparison of transportation cost between commercial plantations and the project site considering the share of transport cost to overall cost.</p> <p>But as the project has already proven in step 2 of the additionality tool that the project is not the commercially most attractive alternative, the indication of barriers given here is considered to be plausible and a submission of further documentation is not necessary.</p> <p>☑</p>



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<p>The issues should be reflected and discussed and a justification should be provided or the PDD should be modified.</p>		<p>unattractive, so it is difficult to obtain loan from local bank.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The forest enterprises do have experiences in AR project, but these experiences are limited to AR on good condition sites. AR on degraded lands is much more difficult than good sites. These forest enterprises do not have any experiences on the remote degraded lands. As briefed by the project entities during the field visit, the project entities are largely rely on the technical support and improved technology transfer including the good seedling supply from the local forestry agencies in the project implementation course.• Yes the institutional barriers mostly applies to households/farmers, related text in PDD has been revised.• The market risk for the participants are largely because the nature of remote degraded	



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
		<p>lands with low productivity and high transportation costs, which cause the high cost of the timber production, would reduce the marketing competitive capacity. Regarding to the mentioned 10%, it is the cost proportion for AR project in good sites nearby as the enterprises have no experiences of AR on remote degraded lands. Due to the low productivity of the degraded lands and remote features of the sites, the transportation cost must take much higher proportion in overall cost.</p> <p>The related text in PDD has been revised</p>	
<p><u>Clarification Request No. 22:</u></p> <p>Under step 1b of the additionality discussion only for the project scenario the compliance with the legal obligations has been described. The same should be done for all other scenarios listed under step 1a of the tool.</p>	B.2.7	The issue has been clarified in the revised PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Clarification Request No. 23:</u></p>	C .1.1	The project start date will keep	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
The starting date of the project and the start of the crediting period should be reviewed in the light of the current time schedule (see also CR 26). In addition justification for the starting date should be given.		unchanged to meet the planting season. Justification for the starting date has been given.	
<u>Clarification Request No. 24:</u> The following monitoring parameters are currently missing in the PDD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard deviation of each stratum (2.1.1.05) • Number of sample plots (2.1.1.06) • Total increase in GHG emissions (2.1.2.25) In case not deemed necessary, respective justification should be given.	D.1.3	The issue has been clarified in the revised PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 25:</u> The project proponent should explain to the audit team how he recognises in case one of the farmers does not prolong his contract with the enterprises and whether this will be detected by the current monitoring method.	D.1.8	The contract between the farmers and enterprises are signed based on the project implementation period for 30 years. The villages, which have lands being contracted to farmers, have committed to allow those farmers, whose land use contract will expire before the end of the crediting period, to continuously use the land until the	This is considered to be the best achievable assurance by today. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
		end of the crediting period. Respective documentation has been provided.	
<u>Clarification Request No. 26:</u> Project management and planning should be discussed in further detail in the PDD or an annexed document. Hereby especially the role of the forest bureau versus the forest enterprises/farmers/households/communities should be explained.	D.6.1	Revised information has been provided in section C.7 and annex 4 of the revised PDD. In addition further monitoring documents including information responsibilities and technical performance have been submitted.	The documentation is deemed sufficient. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 27:</u> The calculations regarding the ex ante estimation of the net removal, baseline net removal and leakage should be submitted to the audit team.	E.1.1	The requested information has been submitted. The calculations are made in a transparent and conservative manner. Uncertainties are defined.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 28</u> The method chosen for the estimation of baseline net GHG removals by sinks should clearly stated.	E.3.1	The issue has been clarified in the revised PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 29:</u> Baseline net GHG removals are caused by existing trees. It should be demonstrated that the land covered by these trees is not to be defined as forest by submission of the	E.3.3	After looking at the original plot sampling record, one plot has 90 trees per hectare. Although crown cover currently is below 20% it is potentially over the threshold in the crediting period. A corresponding 9.05 ha parcel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Pre-Validation Report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
sample results regarding tree density and crown cover. Currently only average values have been submitted. In case of forest land occurrence the respective area should be taken out of the project area hereby considering the sampling approach and be in line with sound statistical methods.		of lands has been taken out from the project sites.	
<u>Clarification Request No. 30:</u> The method applied to the estimation of baseline net GHG removals by sinks requires to pay attention regarding bigger BEF for single trees compared to forest stands (page 8 AR-AM0001) in order to avoid an underestimation of the baseline net GHG removals. The same is not reflected in the PDD.	E.3.3	To make the baseline net removal by sinks conservative, we assumed that the BEF for single trees is 50% higher than forests and baseline net removal by sinks has been re-estimated and updated.	This approach is deemed acceptable. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 31:</u> Environmental impacts outside the project boundary should be described. To be added.	F.1.2	Additional information has been provided in the revised PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Clarification Request No. 32:</u> The list of preferences (original documents) with respect to tree species developed during the training seminars with the farmers should be submitted to the audit team.	H.1.5	The original list of preference of tree species in Shangang Village of Xunle Townships has been submitted as an example.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>




Industrie Service


- oOo -

Annex 2:


Information Reference List

Final Report	2006-07-24	Validation of the “Facilitating Reforestation for Guangxi Watershed Management In Pearl River Basin”, China Information Reference List	Page 1 of 5	 Industrie Service
--------------	------------	---	----------------	--


Reference No.	Document or Type of Information																																												
1.	<p>On-site interviews at the offices and the project site of the “Facilitating Reforestation for Guangxi Watershed Management In Pearl River Basin, China” in Nanning, Huanjiang and Changwu County, Guangxi Province, China by auditing team of TÜV SÜD, performed between February 20 – 24, 2006:</p> <p>Validation team on site:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Michael Rumberg</td><td>TUV Industrie Service GmbH TÜV SÜD Group.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Jimmy Zhou</td><td>TUV Product Service Ltd. Guangzhou Branch TUV SUD Group</td></tr> </table> <p>Interviewed persons:</p> <table> <tr><td>Jiesen Liang</td><td>Changwu County Government (Deputy Head)</td></tr> <tr><td>Kan Xu</td><td>Changwu Forestry Bureau (Director)</td></tr> <tr><td>Monghua Li</td><td>Changwu Forestry Bureau (Deputy Director)</td></tr> <tr><td>Luran Chen</td><td>Changwu Forestry Bureau (Officer)</td></tr> <tr><td>Zhongxing Huang</td><td>Changwu Forestry Bureau (Officer)</td></tr> <tr><td>Guangshi Yu</td><td>Changwu Fuyuan Forestry Centre (Representative)</td></tr> <tr><td>Yonghua Shu</td><td>Changwu Fuyuan Forestry Centre (Representative)</td></tr> <tr><td>Yicai Huang</td><td>Changwu Kanyuan Forestry Centre (Representative)</td></tr> <tr><td>Jinyuan Chen</td><td>Changwu Kanyuan Forestry Centre (Representative)</td></tr> <tr><td>Xiaoquan Zhang</td><td>China Forestry & Technology Institute (National Consultant)</td></tr> <tr><td>Chunfeng Wang</td><td>China National Forestry Bureau (Division Chief)</td></tr> <tr><td>Zhigao Wang</td><td>Guangxi Forestry Bureau (Deputy Director)</td></tr> <tr><td>Yong Huang</td><td>Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute (Deputy Director)</td></tr> <tr><td>Zhuping Mo</td><td>Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute (Chief engineer)</td></tr> <tr><td>Huang Qing</td><td>Huanjiang Agriculture Bank (Deputy President)</td></tr> <tr><td>Jixie Qing</td><td>Huanjiang County Government (Prolocutor)</td></tr> <tr><td>Feining Nan</td><td>Huanjiang County Government (Deputy Head of Huangjiang County)</td></tr> <tr><td>Beili Mo</td><td>Huanjiang County Office (Secretary)</td></tr> <tr><td>Lijie Men</td><td>Huanjiang Credit Bank (Vice President)</td></tr> <tr><td>Xiqiang Huang</td><td>Huanjiang Forestry Bureau (Director)</td></tr> </table>	Michael Rumberg	TUV Industrie Service GmbH TÜV SÜD Group.	Jimmy Zhou	TUV Product Service Ltd. Guangzhou Branch TUV SUD Group	Jiesen Liang	Changwu County Government (Deputy Head)	Kan Xu	Changwu Forestry Bureau (Director)	Monghua Li	Changwu Forestry Bureau (Deputy Director)	Luran Chen	Changwu Forestry Bureau (Officer)	Zhongxing Huang	Changwu Forestry Bureau (Officer)	Guangshi Yu	Changwu Fuyuan Forestry Centre (Representative)	Yonghua Shu	Changwu Fuyuan Forestry Centre (Representative)	Yicai Huang	Changwu Kanyuan Forestry Centre (Representative)	Jinyuan Chen	Changwu Kanyuan Forestry Centre (Representative)	Xiaoquan Zhang	China Forestry & Technology Institute (National Consultant)	Chunfeng Wang	China National Forestry Bureau (Division Chief)	Zhigao Wang	Guangxi Forestry Bureau (Deputy Director)	Yong Huang	Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute (Deputy Director)	Zhuping Mo	Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute (Chief engineer)	Huang Qing	Huanjiang Agriculture Bank (Deputy President)	Jixie Qing	Huanjiang County Government (Prolocutor)	Feining Nan	Huanjiang County Government (Deputy Head of Huangjiang County)	Beili Mo	Huanjiang County Office (Secretary)	Lijie Men	Huanjiang Credit Bank (Vice President)	Xiqiang Huang	Huanjiang Forestry Bureau (Director)
Michael Rumberg	TUV Industrie Service GmbH TÜV SÜD Group.																																												
Jimmy Zhou	TUV Product Service Ltd. Guangzhou Branch TUV SUD Group																																												
Jiesen Liang	Changwu County Government (Deputy Head)																																												
Kan Xu	Changwu Forestry Bureau (Director)																																												
Monghua Li	Changwu Forestry Bureau (Deputy Director)																																												
Luran Chen	Changwu Forestry Bureau (Officer)																																												
Zhongxing Huang	Changwu Forestry Bureau (Officer)																																												
Guangshi Yu	Changwu Fuyuan Forestry Centre (Representative)																																												
Yonghua Shu	Changwu Fuyuan Forestry Centre (Representative)																																												
Yicai Huang	Changwu Kanyuan Forestry Centre (Representative)																																												
Jinyuan Chen	Changwu Kanyuan Forestry Centre (Representative)																																												
Xiaoquan Zhang	China Forestry & Technology Institute (National Consultant)																																												
Chunfeng Wang	China National Forestry Bureau (Division Chief)																																												
Zhigao Wang	Guangxi Forestry Bureau (Deputy Director)																																												
Yong Huang	Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute (Deputy Director)																																												
Zhuping Mo	Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute (Chief engineer)																																												
Huang Qing	Huanjiang Agriculture Bank (Deputy President)																																												
Jixie Qing	Huanjiang County Government (Prolocutor)																																												
Feining Nan	Huanjiang County Government (Deputy Head of Huangjiang County)																																												
Beili Mo	Huanjiang County Office (Secretary)																																												
Lijie Men	Huanjiang Credit Bank (Vice President)																																												
Xiqiang Huang	Huanjiang Forestry Bureau (Director)																																												

Final Report	2006-07-24	Validation of the "Facilitating Reforestation for Guangxi Watershed Management In Pearl River Basin", China Information Reference List	Page 2 of 5	 Industrie Service
--------------	------------	---	----------------	--


Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
	<p>Chaoran Wei Huanjiang Forestry Bureau (Deputy Director)</p> <p>Weidong Luo Huanjiang Forestry Bureau (Officer)</p> <p>Zhenbiao Men Huanjiang Forestry Bureau (Project Officer)</p> <p>Bingtao Huang Huanjiang Forestry Bureau (Deputy Project Officer)</p> <p>Jiaochai Wei Huanjiang Forestry Bureau (Deputy Project Officer)</p> <p>Zhixiang Yang Luhuan Forestry Development Company Ltd., Huangjiang (Manager)</p> <p>Jiyue Mo Minglun Town, Huanjiang County, Guangxi Province (Farmer' Representative)</p> <p>Sanzhong He PMO Guangxi Forestry Bureau (Deputy Chief)</p> <p>Mingjiao Li PMO Guangxi Forestry Bureau (Deputy Chief)</p> <p>Fufu Li PMO Guangxi Forestry Bureau (Chief)</p> <p>Guqing Kong Shantian Village, Shatou Township, Changwu County (Village Head)</p> <p>Huixin Guo Shantian Village, Shatou Township, Changwu County (Farmers' Representative)</p> <p>Yingshu Zhong Shantian Village, Shatou Township, Changwu County (Farmers' Representative)</p> <p>Shuoteng Xu Shantian Village, Shatou Township, Changwu County (Farmers' Representative)</p> <p>Jin Liu The World Bank (Forestry Specialist)</p> <p>Yingxue Lu Xinghuan Forestry Development Company Ltd., Huanjiang (Manager)</p>
2.	Final Project Design Document, submitted December 2005
3.	Ethnic Minority Development Plan, Guangxi Forestry Bureau, November 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
4.	Pest Management Plan, Guangxi Forestry Bureau, November 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
5.	Environmental Protection Guidelines for Plantation Management, Guangxi Forestry Bureau, November 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
6.	Social Assessment Report and Annex, Guangxi Forestry Bureau, November 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
7.	Environmental Impact Report, Environmental Protection Research Institute of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, November 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
8.	Measurement and Monitoring Plan for Guangxi Forestry Development and Protection Project, Guangxi Forestry Bureau, December 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
9.	Approval Letter for Environmental Impact Report of Guangxi Forestry Development and Protection Project, Guangxi Environmental Protection Bureau, December 2005, submitted Feb. 2006

Final Report	2006-07-24	Validation of the "Facilitating Reforestation for Guangxi Watershed Management In Pearl River Basin", China Information Reference List	Page 3 of 5	 Industrie Service
--------------	------------	---	----------------	--

Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
10.	Approval Letter for Utilization of Bank Loan for Guangxi Forestry Development and Protection Project, NRDC, December 2004, submitted Feb. 2006
11.	Forestry Inventory Manual, Guangxi Institute of Forestry Inventory and Design, 1986, submitted Feb. 2006
12.	Forestry Survey Manual for Guangxi Reforestation Project, Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, April 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
13.	On-site Classification Survey Report, Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, May 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
14.	Leaflet of CDM A/R Project, Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, May 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
15.	Summary Report of Farmers Investigation (e.g. Shangan Natural Village, Shunle Township, Huangjiang County), Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, 25 th May 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
16.	Questionnaire for Jianli Natural Village, Leyi Village, Mulun Township, Huangjiang County, Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, 26 th May 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
17.	Summary Report of Seminar with Teyao Natural Village, Shangchao Township, Huangjiang County, Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, 25 th May 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
18.	List of Farmers / Communities for Questionnaire Investigation for 2006 and 2007, Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, submitted Feb. 2006
19.	State Technical Regulations for Afforestation / Reforestation: GB/T 15776-1995, China State Afforestation Bureau, 1996, submitted Feb. 2006
20.	State Technical regulations for establishing Eironmental Service Forests: GB/T 18337.1-2001, GB/T 18337.2-2001, GB/T 18337.3-2001, China State Afforestation Bureau, 2001, submitted Feb. 2006
21.	State Technical regulations for Designing of Afforesation / Reforestation: LY/T 1607-2003, China State Forestry Bureau, 2003, submitted Feb. 2006
22.	State Technical regulations for Forest Management: GB/T 15781-1995, China State Forestry Bureau, 2003, submitted Feb. 2006
23.	Standards for Seedling Qualification: GB 6000-1999, China State Forestry Bureau, 2003, submitted Feb. 2006
24.	Technical Standard for Seedling Breeding, China State Forestry Bureau, 2003, submitted Feb. 2006
25.	Local Contract between with two companies (Luhuan Forestry Development Company Ltd. and Xinghuan Forestry Development Company Ltd.) and farmers / communities involved (Shangan Village), Jiyue Mo, Nov. 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
26.	Local Contract between with two companies (Fuyuan Forestry Farm, Changwu and Kangyuan Forestry Farm, Changwu) and farmers

Final Report	2006-07-24	Validation of the "Facilitating Reforestation for Guangxi Watershed Management In Pearl River Basin", China Information Reference List	Page 4 of 5	 Industrie Service
--------------	------------	---	----------------	--

Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
	/ communities involved (Shatian Village, Shatou Township, Changwu County), Guqing Kong, Dec. 2004, submitted Feb. 2006
27.	Air-seeding Contract with Shatou Township, Location: Yazhu Mountain, Total area: 12957 Mu, Actual Area: 10866 Mu, Changwu Forestry Bureau, 19 th March 1990, submitted Feb. 2006
28.	Guangxi Integrated Forestry Development and Conservation Project Appendix A: Terms of Reference Environmental Assessment, submitted Feb. 2006
29.	Guangxi Integrated Forestry Development and Conservation Project Appendix B: List of EIA Team Members, submitted Feb. 2006
30.	Guangxi Integrated Forestry Development and Conservation Project Appendix C: List of Authors Consulted for the Preparation of EIA Report, submitted Feb. 2006
31.	Guangxi Integrated Forestry Development and Conservation Project Appendix D: References Record of Workshop / Interview, submitted Feb. 2006
32.	Guangxi Integrated Forestry Development and Conservation Project Appendix E: Background information including data, maps, graphs, documents, etc, submitted Feb. 2006
33.	Plan (1997~2010) of Changwu Land Utilization, Changwu Government, Oct. 1999, submitted Feb. 2006
34.	Distribution Map of the Forestry of Changwu County, Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, May 1988, submitted Feb. 2006
35.	Reforestation Plan of Changwu, Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, Aug. 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
36.	On-site Survey Questionnaire of Dongxin Village, Xingde Township, Changwu County, Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, April 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
37.	Assessment form for the main physical & chemistry factors of Soil (Cangwu County), Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, April 2005, submitted Feb. 2006
38.	Statement on Loan Conditions, Agricultural Bank of China, Feb 16, 2006, submitted Feb 2006
39.	Letter of Intent between the World Bank and Fuyan Forestry Farm and Luhuan Forestry Development Company, dated May 23, 2005, submitted Feb 2006
40.	Survey on existing tree coverage, Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, April 2005, submitted Feb 2006
41.	Approved Consolidated Baseline and Monitoring Methodology AR-AM0001, version 02, UNFCCC 2005
42.	Tool for demonstration and assessment of additionality for AR Projects, UNFCCC 2005
43.	UNFCCC homepage http://www.unfccc.int
44.	Statement on social impact, Guangxi Development and Reform Committee, submitted March 2006

Final Report	2006-07-24	Validation of the “Facilitating Reforestation for Guangxi Watershed Management In Pearl River Basin”, China Information Reference List	Page 5 of 5	 Industrie Service
--------------	------------	---	----------------	--

Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
45.	Project approval, Guangxi Provincial Environmental Protection Agency, submitted March 2006
46.	Brief Introduction of Guangxi Integrated Forestry Development And Conservation Project, World Bank, submitted March 2006
47.	Statement on financial contribution, Guangxi Forestry Bureau, submitted March 2006
48.	Documentation on project area stratification, including manual, report, maps and calculation, submitted March 2006
49.	China Forestry Law (Chinese and English version), submitted March 2006
50.	State inventory manual for project inventory planning and design, submitted March 2006
51.	Economic assessment Manual for Agricultural Projects, China Agriculture Publishers, submitted March 2006
52.	Calculation of emission reduction, excel sheet, submitted March 2006
53.	Tree selection documentation, Shangang Village of Xunle Townships, submitted March 2006
54.	Documentation on tree samples in project area, Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, submitted March 2006
55.	Explanation of Latin names for remaining trees in the project area, Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, submitted March 2006
56.	Financial model for the project, World Bank, submitted March 2006
57.	Project implementation schedule, Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, submitted March 2006
58.	Map on existing soil types and its distribution, Guangxi Forestry Survey & Design Institute, submitted March 2006
59.	Examples for topographic maps of the project area, submitted March 2006
60.	Evaluation of PIN for Guangxi project, World Bank (email), dated July 4, 2004, submitted March 2006
61.	Transportation cost documentation, excel sheet, submitted March 2006
62.	Meeting minutes, Guangxi PMO sent to Guangxi Forestry Bureau, dated November 2003, submitted March 2006
63.	Documentation on training courses (a) BioCarbon project management on Sept 22-23 2004, (b) participatory social-economic assessment on Jan 7-8 2005, (c) nursery management on Dec 30 2005 in Cangwu and Feb 26-29 2006 in Huanjiang, (d) planting design on Jan 13 2006, submitted March 2006
64.	Documentation on commitment for land use from various villages, submitted March 2006
65.	Revised Final Project Design Document, submitted July 2006
66.	GPS data of project area, excel sheet, submitted April 2006
67.	Measures for Operation and Management of Clean Development Mechanism Projects in China, dated October 12, 2005