


CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|---|--|
|  <p align="center">Project design document form (afforestation or reforestation) (Version 10.0)</p> | |
| Complete this form in accordance with the instructions attached at the end of this form. | |
| BASIC INFORMATION | |
| Title of the project activity | Humbo Ethiopia Assisted Natural Regeneration Project |
| Scale of the project activity | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Large-scale <input type="checkbox"/> Small-scale |
| Version number of the PDD | 04 |
| Completion date of the PDD | 3104/1008/2018 |
| Project participants | <p>Ethiopia: World Vision Ethiopia</p> <p>Spain: Kingdom of Spain - Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment and Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness</p> <p>Japan: Japan Petroleum Exploration Co., Ltd. (JAPEX); The Okinawa Electric Power Co., Inc.; Suntory Holdings Limited; Tokyo Electric Power Company Holdings, Inc.; Sumitomo Joint Electric Power Co., Ltd.; Japan Iron and Steel Federation (JISF); Sumitomo Chemical; Idemitsu Kosan Co., Ltd.</p> <p>Italy: Government of Italy - Ministry for the Environment Land and Sea</p> <p>France: Eco-Carbone S.A.S.</p> <p>Luxembourg: Ministry of Sustainable Development and Infrastructure</p> |
| Host Party | Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (host) |
| Applied methodologies and standardized baselines | <p>This project activity uses the approved baseline methodology AR-AM0003, Version 4, <i>Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land through tree planting, assisted natural regeneration and control of animal grazing.</i></p> <p>This methodology utilizes <i>Version 2 of the Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in A/R CDM Project Activities</i></p> <p>Tool for calculation of number of sample plots for measurements within A/R CDM project activities, version 02(EB 46, Annex 19).</p> |

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Estimated amount of annual average net anthropogenic GHG removals | 289,773,343 t CO ₂ e |
|---|---------------------------------|

SECTION A. Description of project activity

A.1. Purpose and general description of project activity

>> The proposed afforestation / reforestation activity, the Humbo Assisted Regeneration project, involves the restoration of indigenous tree species in a mountainous region of South Western Ethiopia. The project contributes to climate change mitigation objectives by contributing to the GHG removals by sinks through assisted natural regeneration project. Furthermore, the project complements to the natural resource management goals of the Ethiopian Agricultural Rural Development and Forestry Coordination Office (ARDFCO), and social development goals of the Ethiopian government, and the World Vision Ethiopia, the humanitarian organization implementing the project.

The proposed activity is located in the Humbo Woreda, Wolayita zone, Southern Nations Nationalities and Peoples Region (SNNPR), South Western Ethiopia.




Figure A –1 Location of the proposed CDM activity within Ethiopia

The latest estimates show that Ethiopia has less than 2.7% of its original high forest. It is reported that about 40,000 hectares or 0.8% of total forest cover has been lost between 1995 and 2000 (GPG for LULUCF 2003¹, table 3A.1.1). The loss of forest cover has adverse effect on livelihoods of communities and as well as biodiversity. It is reported that Ethiopia has some 119 species on the IUCN Red List of threatened species, and eight of which are considered critically endangered. This project seeks to establish biodiverse native forest and support income and employment generation activities through assisted natural regeneration of the Humbo area.



Photo A-1 Humbo Project Site (in the background)

¹ IPCC 2003. Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry. Kanagawa, Japan, Institute for Global Environmental strategies (IGES) for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

The project activities contribute to sustainable development in the following ways.

1. Regeneration of native forest, utilizing the farmer managed natural regeneration (FMNR) and traditional forest establishment techniques.
2. Enhancement of GHG removals by sinks in the project area.
3. Promotion of native vegetation and biodiversity in the project area, which can be utilized as a refuge for local and migratory species and to improve the connectivity of fragmented forest resources.
4. Reduction in soil erosion and flooding and help maintain supply of the subterranean streams to support the region's water supply.
5. Provision of income stream for communities through sustainable harvesting of forest resources.

To achieve these goals, this project seeks to undertake the following activities:

- ☐ Restoration of approximately 2,724 hectares of biodiverse natural forest in the Humbo Woreda, using indigenous and naturalized species.
- ☐ Community management of public land with multiple objectives of promoting natural resource management, poverty alleviation and biodiversity enhancement
- ☐ Development of a model of community land use that would enhance GHG removals by sinks from regenerating native vegetation, which can be replicable in other regions of Ethiopia.
- ☐ Formation of seven community cooperative societies and securing legal title to manage the proposed regeneration area, and adopting a constitution and by-laws to manage the project.
- ☐ Establishment of institutional structure with right to the Certified Emissions Reductions (CERs) generated from the site.
- ☐ Establishment of a system to monitor the carbon stocks and recording and reporting on the changes in carbon stocks.
- ☐ Establishment of a system to monitor the environmental and social issues relevant to the project.

The implementation of farmer managed natural regeneration (FMNR) will be done over a period of three to five years. Species endemic to the area are used to restore the forest. These will include *Acacia spp.*, *Aningeria adolfihericii*, *Podocarpus facutus*, *Olea africana*, *Cordia africana*, *Croton macrostachytus*, *Erthrina spp.*, *Ficus spp.*, *Hagenia abyssinica*, among others. The naturalized species such as *Grevillea robusta* and *Eucalyptus globulus* are also considered for planting in blocks and on the perimeter of the sites.

No genetically modified organisms or invasive alien species are used in this project

The project developer, World Vision, has experience in community capacity building, and in protecting and restoring forest ecosystems in Ethiopia and other countries of Sub-Saharan Africa. This project fits within the goals of World Vision, the local government and the local community goals of transforming communities through sustainable development activities and offers the following benefits.

- ☐ Development of more robust land use and land access rights
- ☐ Protection of fragile water catchment areas
- ☐ Protection against land erosion
- ☐ Facilitation of income generation and community asset creation and awareness generation.

The Humbo Assisted regeneration project seeks to establish seven community cooperative societies, which have legal ownership to 2,724 hectares of community land. These groups intend to manage the areas for the purposes of carbon removal using the Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration techniques, environmental benefits (biodiversity, water quality, and habitat) and income producing activities for the local population. Bylaws agreed upon at project inception will form the rules for community cooperative societies to manage the project. The cooperative

societies will comprise representatives from World Vision, the ARDFCO, local community and gender categories.

Through the assisted natural regeneration ~~activities~~activities, the project will generate about ~~289,773~~343 t CO₂e per year during the 30 years fixed crediting period.

A.2. Project boundary

>> The project comprises an area of 2,724 hectares delineated using GPS. The project lands are administered by seven kebele (village regions).

Humbo (Tebella) Township approximate coordinates:

Latitude From 6° 46"48.47 to 6° 41"04.28 N

Longitude From 37° 48"35.44 to 37° 55"14.51 E




Figure A-2 Area to be regenerated in the Humbo Woreda

The UTM zone of the project area is: WGS84: UTM Zone 37N

A.3. Legal title to land

>> The area where the proposed project is to be implemented (as with all land in Ethiopia) is the property of the Federal Government of Ethiopia. The land is „communal land” and management of the land is not allocated to any individual, group or organization. The land is degraded and is utilized ad hoc by community members for fuel wood collection, charcoal making, and grazing by the surrounding community.

The Federal Rural Land Administration and Land Use Proclamation No. 456/2005, and the SNNPRS (Regional) Rural Land Administration and Utilization Proclamation No. 53/2003, are the legal instruments that specify the content of rights a rural landholder or cooperative may have over an area of land. Within SNNPRS proclamation no 53/2003 a possessory right is defined as „the right any peasant or pastoral shall have to use rural land for agriculture or natural resource development activities.“ Natural resource is defined as „living things and non-living things which are gift of nature found on the land“. Legal counsel and confirmation from the EPA, state, and

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

woreda level natural resource management specialists confirm that this includes rights to carbon sequestered in the forest.

The two proclamations also specify the types of holdings pertaining to rural land; provisions on land measurement, registration and holding certificate; duration of rural land use rights and transfer of rights; obligations of rural land users etc. The Federal Proclamation requires enactment of land administration and land use law consisting provisions to implement the federal law.

“Holding Right” or “Possessory Right” (the term used in the SNNPRS Proclamation) is defined as the right of any peasant or pastoralist (semi-pastoralist) to use rural land for the purpose of agricultural and natural resources development and the right includes the right to lease and bequeath it to family members. Similar to what is provided in the respective Federal and Regional Constitutions, the Rural Land Administration and Use Proclamations also provide for the right to acquire property produced on the land by the labour or capital of the holder of the right and to sell, exchange and bequeath same. Thus, the bundle of rights included within the term “land holding right” includes the right to use, lease and bequeath the land to heirs and acquire private property over both immovable and movable property that is produced by the labour or capital of the landholder concerned.

There are three different types of land holdings provided in the Proclamations, namely, private holding, state holding and communal holding. The definition given to the latter types of land holdings in both the Federal and Regional Proclamations is more or less similar in nature. “Private holdings” is defined as rural land under the holding of peasants or pastoralists or other bodies legally entitled to use rural land (e.g. private investors). “State holdings” is defined as rural land demarcated or to be demarcated as Federal or Regional state holding and includes forest lands, wildlife protected areas, state farms etc. “Communal holdings” are defined as rural land which is allocated by the government to local communities for common grazing, forestry and other social services.

The SNNPRS Proclamation defines “community holdings” in a slightly different manner, being “land which is not designated as state or private holding and is being used by the local community as common holding for the purpose of grazing, forestry or other social services”. Thus, the Regional Proclamation takes into account the existing use of land. Land that community uses for grazing and fuel wood falls under the term “community holding”.

For the purpose of this reforestation project, the most important definition is that given to “community holdings”. Accordingly, the definition given under both the Federal and Regional laws allows the designation of the potential project sites as community holdings. The law also provides that holding certificates (title deeds) will also be issued as proof of rural land use right. Indeed, after the Humbo project site was designated as communal holdings, a holding certificate or title deed were given to the holders of the right (see Article 8 of the SNNPRS Proclamation No. 53/2003) that is, the seven cooperative societies. In discussions with the authorities at both the Regional and Woreda (local) levels, officials have shown their full support to the project and their readiness to transfer the land rights to the communities participating in the project. They have also confirmed that they will issue holding certificates to the communities in accordance with the law.

Although the regional land proclamation does not specifically identify carbon sequestration, an independent consultant in Ethiopian law confirmed that those who possess community holdings (user rights certificates issued from proclamations SNNPR 53/2003 and Federal 456/2005) have the right to all the products produced from the land, and that the products produced from the land would therefore necessarily include sequestered carbon. This interpretation of the legal framework has also been confirmed through legal counsel by the Environmental Protection Agency (Designated National Authority for the Clean Development Mechanism), the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, and the Humbo Woreda Bureau for Agriculture and Rural Development. Appendix 5 presents detailed information on the legal status of the lands included in the project.

A.4. Eligibility of land

>> The Ethiopian DNA has determined that within Ethiopia, a forest is defined as land with trees that has:

- A minimum area of 0.05 hectares;
- A minimum tree crown cover of 20 per cent;
- A minimum average tree height above 2 m.

The minimum tree crown cover value falls between 10 and 30 per cent and the minimum land area value falls between 0.05 and 1 hectare defined by paragraph 8 in decision 19/CP.9. Therefore, the forest definition of the Ethiopian government complies with the UNFCCC definition of a forest and can be used for the purposes of the Kyoto Protocol.

Field survey assessments have confirmed that no area in the project boundary could be considered a forest. Although the sites have vegetation below the threshold of a forest, these sites are not expected to become forest in the future without the project due to anthropogenic pressure from grazing and fuelwood collection. Forest destruction on communal land has been a major problem for the past 30 years. This problem is well documented:

- The Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (IPCC 2003) identifies that Ethiopia is losing as much as 40,000 hectares of vegetation annually. As the project region is densely populated, it has lost almost all of its native forest.
- According to the UN report „Forest fires in Ethiopia“ compiled for the UN Emergencies Unit for Ethiopia (UN-EUE), land tenure is the single most important factor in natural resources management, environmental degradation and fire use. The report notes "without changing ownership either literally or symbolically to give local communities a greater sense of investment in the land, environmental disasters will continue and the 2.7% of the country that is forested will rapidly diminish".
- The IUCN Red list confirms the state of forest destruction „Forest destruction has been dramatic in Ethiopia's highlands. Measures to stop further deforestation and reforestation with indigenous trees are urgently needed.
- The Nechisar National Park, some 50 kilometres from the project site holds a documented example of forest destruction. Tilahun et al. (1996) in „Bird Areas of Ethiopia“ identify the threats of intensive natural resource use, fuelled by the fast growth in the nearby town of Arba Minch. Previously one of the best protected areas in the country, the park is now exploited for livestock grazing and wood for construction and fuel.



Photo A-2 Grazing in the project area



Photo A-3 Charcoal production near the project area

The aerial photographic information for the project sites is provided in section B.4. Additionally, evidence in the form of affidavits and written testimony provided by village leaders through participatory rural appraisal confirms that the project sites did not have vegetation since December 31, 1989 (Appendix 10).

A.5. Environmental conditions

>>Climate

The Inter Tropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ) has influence on the climate in the Humbo region. With the northward movement of the ITCZ between May and October, warm moist air is drawn from the Indian Ocean, which causes rainfall on the southern slopes of the Ethiopian Highlands. During the remainder of the year, the ITCZ lies south of the highlands, and the winds move from the Red Sea to the north and east. These winds typically contain less moisture and cause rainfall on the northern side of the highland massif. From May to October, winds blow from the southwest and bring rainfall. During the rest of the year, onshore winds from the Red Sea bring moisture to the Northern regions of the country while the areas around Humbo remain drier. Overall, the highest annual rainfall (up to 2,500 mm) is on the south- western scarp faces of the highlands, which support montane or transitional forests.

Humidity is sometimes high due to cloud precipitation and local interactions between topography and weather. Unlike the moist equatorial mountains, the effects of cold descend further down on these dry highlands. Temperatures vary according to the season and elevation, but mean maxima range from 18 to 24°C and mean minima from 12 to 15°C

Hydrology

Surface Hydrology

Rainfall in the project region varies from 700-1000 mm (see Map A.1). Due to the steep terrain and denuded soil, erosion can be severe, and heavy rains cause flooding of low-lying areas. In times of extreme rainfall, mudslides damage roads, bridges and other infrastructure and cause localized flooding.


The catchment of the Abaya - Chamo Basin covers an area of approximately 18,000 km², so the Humbo and Soddoo areas form a small part of this large hydrological system. Lake Chamo and Lake Abaya have a combined surface area of 1,440 km². The headwater areas also extend into the Western and Eastern Ethiopian Highlands and the lakes are located at the bottom of the Rift Valley. Decades of erosion has turned the waters of Lake Abaya to a murky brown colour due to high ferrous hydroxide and sediment load which are threats to the lake ecosystem.

Subsurface Hydrology

The site is located immediately above the Likemse springs, a hydrological system which deliver potable water to a population of over 65,000 people in and around Humbo. Reduction in vegetation cover, clearing for agriculture and grazing, has resulted in a loss of groundwater. The project could play a significant role in reducing the runoff and helping to conserve the water supplies required for meeting the potable water needs in the region.

Geology

The project site runs along the edge of the Ethiopian portion of the Great Rift Valley. This geological feature runs north to south for some 5,000 km, from northern Syria in Southwest Asia to central Mozambique in East Africa. The valley formed in the rifts of African and Arabian tectonic plates varies in width from 30-100 km and a few hundred to several thousand meters in depth.



Map A-1 Rainfall in the Abaya district

The southern end of the Red Sea marks a fork in the rift. The Afar Triangle or Danakil Depression of Ethiopia is the probable location of a triple junction that is underlain by a mantle plume. The Gulf of Aden is an eastward continuation of the rift and before the rift opened, the Arabian Peninsula was attached to the Horn of Africa. From this point the rift continues as part of the Mid-oceanic ridge of the Indian Ocean. In a southwest direction the fault continues as the Great Rift Valley, which split the older Ethiopian highlands into two halves.

The Ethiopian Highlands are a rugged mass of mountains in Ethiopia and Eritrea in northeastern Africa and form the largest continuous area of its altitude in the continent with over 1500 m (5000 ft). The summits reach up to 4900 m (15,000 to 16,000 ft).

Soils

Soils in the project area have been identified as Vertisols / Nitosols, underlain with ancient Precambrian basement rocks in the plains and calcareous soils at the hills. These soil types are common in the Ethiopian Highlands with a Nitosol / Vertisol gradient often occurring between the higher/steeper areas and the lower flatter areas. Nitosols are highly erodible and often acidic. Over-clearing has led to significant soil erosion problems, with mudslides occurring on the site².

Ecosystem

The project offers a significant opportunity to realize biodiversity outcomes alongside those of climate protection through the reestablishment of natural habitat. Indigenous species will be naturally regenerated or planted resulting in biodiversity. Natural regeneration will improve ecological succession, creating the conditions for establishing climax species for ecological community, and for maintenance of forest cover.

Fast-growing naturalized species will also be planted on the perimeter and within the project boundary to enhance fuel wood and charcoal supply. The naturalized species have been used by the communities over a long period. The re-establishment of native forests will provide wildlife habitat and improve floral and faunal diversity and will enhance natural regeneration through improved seed dispersal.

Vegetation of the project area

The vegetation categories of the project area includes Ethiopian montane grassland and woodland and Ethiopian montane forest³.

Ethiopian montane grasslands and woodlands⁴ -

Conservation status: critical/endangered

The montane vegetation includes *Hagenia abyssinica*, *Podocarpus falcatus* and *Juniperus procera*. A variety of Ethiopian endemic species including the critically endangered Walia ibex (*Capra waliae*) and endangered mountain Nyala (*Tragelaphus buxtoni*) are found in the region. The endemism peaks in the forest/ woodland/ grassland complex. As the region is densely populated, there is significant anthropogenic pressure on the vegetation areas. The area of the proposed Humbo Community Forest was cleared in the mid 1970's (see Appendix 10).

Biodiversity features

The ecoregion has a number of endemics in all taxonomic groups, and covers the two endemic bird areas⁵. The south Ethiopian Highlands endemic bird area is centered on the forests, grasslands and thickets to the southwest of the Bale Mountains and around the town of Yabello. Ruppell's chat (*Myrmecocichla melaena*) and Ankober serin (*Serinus ankoberensis*) are two notable near-endemic areas. Among the birds, only the lineated pytilia (*Pytilia lineata*) is endemic to this ecoregion. A number of Ethiopian endemics occur only in this ecoregion and the Ethiopian Montane Moorland ecoregion. These high-altitude ecoregions are especially known for their diversity of small mammals with over 10 near- endemic species, but also harbour notable near-

² See fao.org/Wairdocs/ILRI/x5493E/x5493e19.htm

³ These two biological communities and the threats they face have been detailed by the World Wildlife Fund, and can be found at www.worldwildlife.org.

⁴ Ecological descriptions were sourced from [wwf.org](http://www.wwf.org)

⁵ Stattersfield, A.J., Crosby, M.J., Long, A.J. & Wege, D.C. 1998. Endemic Bird Areas of the World. Priorities for Biodiversity Conservation. *BirdLife Conservation Series No. 7. BirdLife International, Cambridge, UK. 846 pp.*

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

endemic large mammals, such as the Walia ibex (*Capra waliae*), the mountain Nyala (*Tragelaphus buxtoni*), and the Gelada Baboon (*Theropithecus gelada*). Most of these species are shared with the Ethiopian Montane Moorland ecoregion.

At least 10 amphibians are endemic or near-endemic to the ecoregion, together with five species of near-endemic reptiles. Most of the species are shared either with the lower altitude Ethiopian Montane Woodland ecoregion, or with the higher altitude Ethiopian Montane Moorland ecoregion. The mountain Nyala is not a montane specialist, but has been restricted to Afromontane areas through habitat loss. Found only in the southern part of the highlands, the lower reaches of its altitudinal range are more suitable to the mountain Nyala than the higher, less vegetated ones, but the lower habitat has mostly been converted to cultivation and pastoralism⁶. The mountain Nyala population in Bale Mountains National Park was thriving until 1991 when it was severely reduced by local people, in protests and upheaval associated with the change in government. Another antelope commonly found at lower elevations is Menelik's bushbuck (*Tragelaphus scriptus meneliki*), a subspecies of bushbuck endemic to Ethiopia.

A number of the endemic species are endangered. Threatened bird species include two near-endemics, the Ankober serin (*Serinus ankoberensis*, EN) and the white-winged flufftail (*Sarothrura ayresi*, EN). Several distinctive mammalian endemics face global extinction. The walia ibex numbers fewer than 400 individuals (Nievergelt et al. 1998), and it is threatened through habitat loss and hybridization with free-ranging domestic goats. Other mammals found in this ecoregion include olive baboon (*Papio anubis*), black and white colobus monkey (*Colobus guereza*), golden jackal (*Canis aureus*), leopard (*Panthera pardus*), lion (*Panthera leo*), spotted hyaena (*Crocuta crocuta*), caracal (*Caracal caracal*), serval (*Felis serval*), bush duiker (*Sylvicapra grimmia*) and bush pig (*Potamochoerus porcus*). Two different subspecies of the *Cercopithecus* superspecies are found in this ecoregion: the Djam-djam or Bale monkey (*Cercopithecus aethiops djamdjamensis*, DD), which is restricted to the southern highlands and the black-faced vervet (*Cercopithecus aethiops aethiops*). All these species, including the black and white colobus monkey, are suffering from a decrease in suitable habitat. Colobus populations are increasingly fragmented, with groups living in small remnant forest patches, often a single church graveyard.

Ethiopian montane forests

Conservation Status: critical/endangered

The Ethiopian montane woodland ecoregion is biodiverse, poorly known and highly threatened. The rugged topography of this ecoregion rings the highlands of Ethiopia and Eritrea, extending to outlying massifs in Sudan. Remnant patches of natural vegetation consist mostly of podocarp and juniper forests, with some acacias found at lower elevations. While soils are rather infertile, this area is densely populated and most land has been converted to agriculture where the topography permits, however there is no agriculture practiced within the boundary of the project. Notable endemics found here include the yellow-throated serin and Prince Ruspoli's turaco. Many of the endemic species are threatened due to the loss of their habitat.

Biodiversity features

Forest types present in this ecoregion range from wet to dry, giving the area high biodiversity values. The patterns of endemism and their association with the forests of the area are complex and have been presented previously^{7, 8}. There is an area of bird endemism on the southeast corner

⁶ Kingdon, J. 1989. Island Africa: The evolution of Africa's rare animals and plants. Princeton University Press. Princeton, NJ, USA. 287 pp

⁷ Friis, I. 1992. *Forests and Forest Trees of Northeast Tropical Africa*. HMSO, Kew Bulletin Additional Series XV

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

of the southern Ethiopian highlands and another one in the higher plateau of the northern Ethiopian highlands and Eritrea⁹. Other plant and animal endemics are found along the drier northeastern margins of the Ethiopian highlands, which link to the mountains of northern Eritrea and Somalia as well as the Day Forest in the Goda Massif in Djibouti.

Threatened species include four strict endemics, including Djibouti francolin (*Francolinus ochropectus*, CR), Harwood's francolin (*Francolinus harwoodi*, VU), Prince Ruspoli's turaco (*Tauraco ruspoli*, VU) and yellow-throated seedeater (*Serinus flavigula*, VU), all of which are primarily threatened by habitat loss¹⁰ (Magin 2001). Prince Ruspoli's turaco is further restricted where its range overlaps with the near- endemic white-cheeked turaco (*Tauraco leucotis*). Where both species are present, Prince Ruspoli's turaco is only found in juniper forest, but where it occurs alone, it inhabits both broad-leaved and juniper forest. Both birds are part of a recent radiation of small, red-winged turacos. However, the white-cheeked turaco is extremely adaptable and the regional representative of a type that is found across all of Africa. Prince Ruspoli's turaco has not become significantly distinct and is declining as the white-cheeked turaco advances¹⁹.

The ecoregion also contains part of the South Ethiopian highlands endemic bird area²², centered on the forests, grasslands and thickets to the southwest of the Bale Mountains and including the Yabello Sanctuary at around 1,700 m where the endemic Sidamo lark (*Heteromirafrida sidamoensis*, EN), white- tailed swallow (*Hirundo megaensis*, VU) and Ethiopian bush-crow (*Zavattariornis stresemanni*, VU) occur. Other birds considered as near-endemic to this ecoregion include dark-headed oriole (*Oriolus monacha*), Abyssinian catbird (*Parophasma galinieri*), Abyssinian slaty flycatcher (*Dioptrornis chocolatinus*), and yellow-fronted parrot (*Poicephalus flavifrons*).

Mammals with ranges restricted to Ethiopia that occur in this ecoregion include the shrew, (*Crocidura harenni*) CR, the narrow-footed woodland mouse (*Grammomys minnae*), and Menelik's bushbuck (*Tragelaphus scriptus menelikii*), a subspecies of bushbuck with long, dark fur. Males are black while females are chestnut colored with white spots. Some other mammals found in this ecoregion are: olive baboons (*Papio anubis*), black and white colobus monkeys (*Colobus guereza*), black-faced vervet monkey (*Cercopithecus aethiops aethiops*), bush duikers (*Sylvicapra grimmia*), warthogs (*Phacochoerus aethiopicus*), bush pigs (*Potamochoerus porcus*) and hippopotamus (*Hippopotamus amphibius*).

Predators include caracals (*Caracal caracal*), golden jackals (*Canis aureus*), black backed jackals (*Canis mesomelas*), leopards (*Panthera pardus*, EN), lions (*Panthera leo*, VU), spotted hyaenas (*Crocuta crocuta*) and servals (*Felis serval*). Antelope species found here include Swayne's hartebeest (*Alcelaphus buselaphus swaynei*, EN), Guenther's dikdik (*Madoqua guentheri*) and greater kudu (*Tragelaphus strepsiceros*). Many of these larger mammals are only found in protected areas, most notably Nechisar National Park and Sikele reserve. In the early 1900s, elephant (*Loxodonta africana*), black rhinoceros (*Diceros bicornis*), buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*) and oryx (*Oryx gazella*) were found in the Nechisar area but all have been eliminated¹¹.

⁸ Lovett, J. C. and I. Friis. 1996. Patterns of endemism in the woody flora of north-east and east Africa. Pages 582- 601 in L. J. G. van der Maesen, X. M. van der Burgt, J. M. van Medenbach de Rooy, editors. The Biodiversity of African Plants. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers

⁹ Stattersfield, A.J., Crosby, M.J., Long, A.J. & Wege, D.C. 1998. *Endemic Bird Areas of the World. Priorities for Biodiversity Conservation*. BirdLife Conservation Series No. 7. BirdLife International, Cambridge, UK. 846 pp

¹⁰ Magin, G. 2001. Djibouti chapter in: Fishpool, L.D.C. and Evans, M.I. (eds). Important Bird Areas in Africa and associated islands: priority sites for conservation. Newbury and Cambridge, U.K: Pisces Publications and BirdLife International (BirdLife Conservation Series No. 11)

¹¹ Yalden, D.W., Largen, M.J., Kock, D., Hillman, J.C. 1996. Catalogue of the mammals of Ethiopia and Eritrea. 7. Revised checklist, zoogeography and conservation. *Tropical Zoology* 9: 3-164

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

Although accurately ascribing species of amphibian and reptile to this complex ecoregion has proven problematic, there are believed to be a number of near-endemic species of both taxonomic groups in these forests. Of the five endemic amphibians two are tree frogs (*Afrivalus clarkei* and *Afrivalus enseticola*), two are ranid frogs (*Phrynobatrachus bottegi* and *Phrynobatrachus sciagallarum*), and one is a caecilian (*Sylvacaecilia grandisonae*). Two endemic chameleons are found, including two species of chameleons, *Chamaeleo balebicornutus* and *Chamaeleo harennae*.

Presence of rare or endangered species

This region contains several threatened species, identified in the World Conservation Union (IUCN) red list, associated with the temperate and tropical mountain forest habitats which are anticipated to benefit directly from the proposed project. These are identified in Table A-1.

Table A-1. IUCN Red List Species endemic to the project area

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <i>Afrivalus enseticola</i> | Ethiopian Banana Frog (E) |
| <i>Caprimulgus solala</i> | Nechisar Nightjar (E) |
| <i>Grammomys minnae</i> | Ethiopian Thicket Rat (E) |
| <i>Heteromira fra sidamoensis</i> | Sidamo Bushlark |
| <i>Hipposideros megalotis</i> | Ethiopian Large-Eared Roundleaf Bat (E) |
| <i>Kerivoula eriophora</i> | Ethiopian Woolly Bat (E) |
| <i>Lycaon pictus</i> | African Wild Dog |
| <i>Panthera leo</i> | African Lion |
| <i>Vulpes pallida</i> | African Sand Fox |
| <i>Phoenicopus minor</i> | Lesser Flamingo |

A.6. Measures

>>Historical Land-Use

Based on results from the Participatory Rural Appraisal (Appendix 10) during the era of emperor H/Silassie, the Humbo forest was characterized by thick and dense forest with height greater than 7m with various indigenous species. During this time the forest lands were owned by the landlords. Then during the Derg regime, land was transferred to the tenants who had been excluded from the land by legislation. This empowered the tenants to indiscriminately exploit the forest, harvesting forest products like wood for fuel, timber and construction materials. In addition, the tenants also sought to occupy the new land and use it for production of food. As such, indiscriminate deforestation commenced without restrictions as noted in the data "everybody tried to cut down the trees to make charcoal, sell wood, make ploughing tools and construct houses..." Wild fires also became a common occurrence as the tenants sought to burn charcoal and new grass/fodder for animals.

As the population pressure surged in the late 1980/90's coupled with the 1984 drought, the remaining vegetation covers was completely destroyed exposing the land to the current visible effects of soil erosion leaving the land almost barren. As trends evolved, the community's coping mechanisms also evolved leading them to uprooting of tree stumps for charcoal- a coal like fuel from wood which became brisk business in the area. This desperate action coupled with over grazing and cyclical droughts that followed the 1984 drought episode halted the natural regeneration of the trees exposing the land to hostile weather elements that left the land bare and barren until the commencement of the current intervention in 2005.

The PRA also suggests that the situation continued to deteriorate in the late 1990's when the EPRDF government overthrew the communist DERG regime of Haile Mariam Mengistu. This could be attributed to the fact that there was no change of government policy on the subject matter in tandem with increased population pressure on the land.

Measures to be employed and/or implemented by the project activity

The Technology to be employed in this project is Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration¹² (FMNR), and planting of seedlings raised from nursery stock. The FMNR technique has been developed in Niger Republic, West Africa over 20 years where it is now practiced on over 2 million hectares. The technique has also spread to Chad, Burkina Faso and Senegal. FMNR falls within the definition of afforestation / reforestation in the manner articulated in the approved methodology AR-AM0003 version 04¹³

The Farmer Managed Natural Revegetation Technique

Farmer managed Natural Revegetation (FMNR) is a system of farm and forest vegetation established by poor rural communities to achieve the objective of forest restoration over a short period. They have rights to forests and their products. Professor Chris Reij, of Vrije University in Amsterdam¹⁴ and Dr. Peter Cunningham, SIM International, has documented the technique, and this work is publicly available¹⁵.

Implementation of FMNR

FMNR is implemented in areas that have root stock that could re-sprout under protection and management. It works best where annual rainfall is in excess of 650mm and is not suitable for areas with an annual rainfall of less than 200mm. Root stock from trees cleared as long as 60 years ago can remain in the soil, re-sprouting periodically. This root stock will develop new shoots each year, and these can be mistaken for small shrubs or broadleaf groundcover species. On farmland, standard practice for farmers has been to slash this regrowth each year in preparation for planting crops. In non-arable areas, such growth is controlled through regular burning, grazing and fuel wood collection. However, with training, the local communities could identify young shoots tend and manage them to regenerate the root stock.

The proposed Humbo community forest area has been found suitable for application of the FMNR technique.

In the most basic form of FMNR, all stalks except one are cut from the root stock. Side branches are then pruned half way up the stem. Selecting and pruning the best five to seven stems can offer more benefits, and this has been the practice in West Africa. Unwanted stems are removed, and the managed stems increase in size each year, protecting the immediate soil environment and providing other useful materials and services such as fodder, humus, habitat, and protection from the wind and shade. On occasions that a stem is harvested, a younger stem is selected to replace it.

Different tree species require different pruning techniques, and these are determined through on-site observation. A small handsaw or machete is the only tool used for pruning side branches of young shoots. Land managers revisit the project area every 2-4 months to re-prune as necessary.

¹² For more information on FMNR
www.irinnews.org/report.asp?ReportID=55911&SelectRegion=West_Africa

¹³ IPCC definition: Afforestation/ reforestation is defined as the direct human induced conversion of non forested land to forested land through planting seeding and/or the human induced promotion of natural seed sources. AR-AM0003 classifies the management of resprouting shoots as one example of „natural seed sources“.

¹⁴ Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration. Impressions of a short field trip. June 9-11, 2004. Reij. C. Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam.

¹⁵ Reforesting the Sahel: Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration. Cunningham P.J and Abas. T.

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

Heavy equipment is not required as a result there will be minimal soil disturbance when this technique is used. Integrated fire management approaches are implemented in cooperation with the local communities.

Grazing is prevented during the vulnerable period after pruning. The decision to allow grazing would be depend upon the growth of trees beyond the height that would not be vulnerable to grazing.

Supplemental planting

Supplemental planting will be used to augment the FMNR established forests. The nursery will have the capacity to deliver up to 1,000,000 seedlings per year for the first two years, sufficient to reforest 500 hectares at 1000 stems per hectare. The nursery will be set up in a conventional manner. Seedlings will be planted in small pits (0.3m x 0.3m x 0.2m), which are pre-dug through community labor schemes.

Seedlings will be planted at the start of the rainy season and follow up weed control will be undertaken.

Harvest

The project area is expected to be harvested at years 12, 22 and 31 years. The management plan will maintain 50% of the standing biomass for the benefits of biodiversity, environmental protection and other ongoing services. Forest products are transported by donkey. Therefore, no leakage emission from the transport of harvested produce is expected. The forest products will be processed at the city of Soddo, approximately 40km from the project site.

Species and varieties selected for the proposed project activity

Tree species to be included in reforestation schedules include those indigenous to the project area, and other naturalized species that are widely used¹⁶. It is envisaged there will be many grass, ground layer, and shrub species, which will establish on the site with the progress in project implementation. The species proposed for planting include:

Table A-2 Species proposed for planting in the project.

| Supplemental planting | Buffer zone plantation | Live fence & erosion control |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| <i>Shinus molle</i> | | <i>Euphorbia abyssinica</i> |
| <i>Eucalyptus camaldulensis</i> | <i>Azadiractha indica</i> | <i>Euphorbia tirucalli</i> |
| <i>Acacia saligna</i> | <i>Casuarina cunninghamia</i> | <i>Agave americana</i> |
| <i>Moringa stenopetala</i> | <i>Casuarina equisetiolia</i> | <i>Aloe abyssinica</i> |
| <i>Bahinia tomentosa</i> | <i>Shinus molle</i> | <i>Euphorbia scoparia</i> |
| <i>Acacia nilotica</i> | <i>Eucalyptus camaldulensis</i> | <i>Euphorbia candelabrum</i> |
| <i>Parkinsonia aculeata</i> | <i>Eucalyptus saligna</i> | |

¹⁶ A Forestry analysis has been prepared and is available as Appendix 6.

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <i>Podocarpus falcatus</i> <i>Eucalyptus globulus</i> <i>Pygeum africanum</i> <i>Hagenia abyssinica</i> <i>Syzygium guineesense</i> <i>Cordia africana</i> <i>Olea africana</i> <i>Albizia gummifer</i> <i>Azadiractha indic</i> <i>Phytolacca dodecandra</i> <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> <i>Crotolaria anchnocarpoides</i> <i>Acacia saligna</i> <i>Acacia melanoxylon</i> <i>Psidium guajava</i> <i>Rosa abyssinica</i> <i>Erythrina brucei</i> <i>Grevillea robusta</i> <i>Rubus apetalus</i> <i>Morus alba</i> <i>Delonix regia</i> <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> <i>Juglans regia</i> <i>Ficus spp.</i> <i>Croton macrostachys</i> <i>Carisa edulis</i> <i>Maytenus ovatus</i> , <i>Hibiscus rosa</i> <i>Acacia abyssinica</i> | | |
|--|--|--|

Provide a short summary of the baseline scenario as established in section [Error! Reference source not found.B.4 below](#).

The site on which the project is to be established was reported as having vegetation prior to 1972 (the earliest aerial photographs are from this period). Interviews with local Kebele leaders indicated that the area was cleared between 1975 and 1985 for agriculture and fuel wood and was subjected to severe soil erosion.

Based on analysis in section B.4 the carbon stocks in all the baseline strata are in a state of continued decline. This conclusion is justified in sections A.2, A.3, A.4, and B.2, as well as in field survey assessments. There is no possibility for the establishment of natural regeneration in the baseline scenario due to anthropogenic pressures. In the absence of the project, each stratum will see a net decrease in carbon stored above and below ground biomass.

Describe how the measures and know-how for their use are transferred to the host Party, where applicable.

The project will provide training in reforestation and regeneration techniques to the local communities through community society cooperatives. Additionally, the cooperatives will offer training in a range of activities including sustainable forest management; agro-forestry, improved agricultural practices, eco-tourism; fire management; community conflict resolution and cooperatives management; project and leakage monitoring; poultry management, alternative energy sources, apiculture and fodder development.

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

A.7. Approach to addressing non-permanence

>> The project team chooses to utilize the tCER mechanism for the net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved by the proposed A/R CDM project activity. The project is designed to facilitate the long- term establishment of mature trees, as well as the sustainable harvesting of forest products.

Issues relating to permanence will be addressed in the project area in the following ways.

Measures to strengthen the protection of forest

Protection measures will be implemented to protect the regenerated and reforested areas. The community will be given the responsibility of protecting the forestry resources created under the project.

Establishment of alternate sources of fuel wood, fodder and building materials

The project will establish alternate forest for the production of alternative sources of fuel wood and building materials on currently cleared areas within the project boundary in order to reduce pressure on the natural forests. This action is more clearly articulated in the leakage section of this document (C4). The project will also facilitate the use of alternate areas for grazing in nearby grasslands, to compensate for the loss of grazing lands with the area occupied by the project.

Provision of user rights to communities

The delineation of user rights to communities will motivate families to protect the forests created under the project.

Economic gains from the CERs delivered to the communities

The communities will be the direct beneficiaries of the economic gains from the project, and therefore will be motivated to protect their source of economic gain, minimizing the risk of non-permanence.

Training and knowledge management on forest protection measures

The project proponent will conduct training and knowledge management on forest protection initiatives through the community society cooperatives.

A.8. Parties and project participants

| Parties involved | Project participants | Indicate if the Party involved wishes to be considered as project participant (Yes/No) |
|--|---|--|
| Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (host) | World Vision Ethiopia | No |
| Government of Canada | International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as a trustee of BioCarbon Fund | Yes |
| Kingdom of Spain - | ... Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment and Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness | No |
| Japan | Japan Petroleum Exploration Co., Ltd. (JAPEX); The Okinawa Electric Power Co., Inc.; Suntory Holdings Limited; Tokyo Electric Power Company Holdings, Inc.; Sumitomo Joint Electric Power | No |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | | |
|---------------------|--|----|
| | Co., Ltd.; Japan Iron and Steel Federation (JISF); Sumitomo Chemical; Idemitsu Kosan Co., Ltd. | |
| Government of Italy | - Ministry for the Environment Land and Sea | No |
| France: | Eco-Carbone S.A.S. | No |
| Luxembourg: | Ministry of Sustainable Development and Infrastructure | No |

A.9. Public funding of project activity

>> No public funding is involved in undertaking this A/R CDM project activity.

The costs of project development will be from a long-term loan/grant from World Vision Australia. Landholders and other land managers will contribute to the management and maintenance of the forest. Direct operating and maintenance costs will be covered by World Vision Australia through discretionary philanthropic funds contributed from churches, corporations and individuals.

There is no public finance involved in this project that will result in a diversion of official development assistance.

A.10. History of project activity

>> intentionally left blank

A.11. Debundling

>>Not Applicable

SECTION B. Application of selected methodologies and standardized baselines**B.1. Reference to methodologies and standardized baselines**

>> This project activity uses the approved baseline methodology AR-AM0003, Version 4, *Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land through tree planting, assisted natural regeneration and control of animal grazing* (<http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/U3WW9YEC2X333WW8CPVQ6CGVY6IBPJ>).

This methodology utilizes *Version 2 of the Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in A/R CDM Project Activities*¹⁷.

This methodology utilizes the tool for calculation of number of sample plots for measurements within A/R CDM project activities, version 02 (EB 46, Annex 19)

B.2. Applicability of methodologies and standardized baselines

>> The proposed A/R CDM activity complies with the following applicability conditions of AR-AM0003.

- ☐ *The project activity can lead to a shift of pre-project activities outside the project boundary, e.g. a displacement of grazing and fuelwood collection activities, including charcoal production;*
 - There will be temporary displacement of both grazing and fuel-wood collection (including charcoal production) activities from the project sites, these are articulated section B.6 of this document.
- ☐ *Lands to be afforested or reforested are severely degraded and the lands are still degrading or remain in a low carbon steady state;*
 - The proposed project areas have been denuded and anthropogenic pressures prohibit natural regeneration. These areas have low carbon stocks, which are being reduced and are therefore degrading or in a low carbon steady state, and therefore fulfil this applicability condition of the methodology. This is attested to in the PRA workshops, which have been held in the region (see Appendix 10), and in the forester's report (available upon request). To reverse the degraded status of lands, the lands that are in degraded condition under state ownership are transferred to the cooperatives for management, with accompanying user rights as per proclamations SNNPR 53/2003 and Federal 456/2005. Further to this, without substantive change in forest management, from *ad-hoc* utilization of all forest resources by any person to forest management using the FMNR techniques as proposed in this project the forest vegetation is not expected to be re-established on the site. The details of which are presented in section B.4.
- ☐ *Environmental conditions or anthropogenic pressures do not permit the encroachment of natural tree vegetation that leads to the establishment of forests according to the threshold values of the national definition of forest for CDM purposes;*
 - Anthropogenic pressures do not permit the encroachment of natural forest vegetation, and is discussed in section B.5.
- ☐ *Lands will be afforested or reforested through promotion of natural regeneration and or direct planting or seeding;*
 - Lands will be afforested or reforested through promotion of natural regeneration and/or direct planting and seeding. The FMNR technique is a form of assisted natural regeneration technique pioneered in West Africa and considered appropriate

¹⁷ http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/tools/ar/methAR_tool01_v02.pdf

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

to this region. FMNR will be practiced on the project sites, as described in section A.6.

- ☐ *Site preparation does not cause significant longer-term net decreases of soil carbon stocks or increases of non-CO₂ emissions from soil;*
 - Using the FMNR techniques very limited levels of soil disturbance will occur on a small number of hectares, the potential decrease in soil carbon is extremely low, see section A.6.
- ☐ *Carbon stocks in soil organic carbon, litter and dead wood can be expected to decrease more due to soil erosion and human intervention or increase less in the absence of the project activity, relative to the project scenario;*
 - Soil erosion and land degradation data produced by the World Bank¹⁸ indicated that the project area is losing an average of between 4 and 10 tonnes of topsoil erosion per hectare per year due to erosion, and is allocated the highest possible environmental degradation index. Due to their steep terrain, the sites are subject to higher levels of erosion and as a consequence, the soil carbon levels in the baseline scenario are expected to show a gradual decline. Due to anthropogenic pressures, the dead wood and litter levels are also expected to decrease in the baseline scenario (see PRA workshop report, Appendix 10). While in the project scenario, the deadwood, litter and soil carbon pools are expected to increase. Therefore, not accounting their changes in the project scenario is conservative.
- ☐ *Flooding irrigation is not permitted;*
 - The project is not expected to practice irrigation as discussed in section A.6.
- ☐ *Soil drainage and disturbance are insignificant, so that non- CO₂-greenhouse gas emissions from this type of activities can be neglected;*
 - Site preparation is not expected to cause significant longer-term net decreases of soil carbon stocks or increases of non-CO₂ emissions from soil. As very limited levels of soil disturbance will occur, the potential change in soil carbon as result of project site preparation activities is insignificant (see section A.6). As no irrigation or fertilizers will be utilized, there is no anticipated increase in the levels of non-CO₂ GHG from the soil.
- ☐ *The amount of nitrogen-fixing species (NFS) used in the AR CDM project activity is not significant, so that greenhouse gas emissions from denitrification can be neglected in the estimation of actual net greenhouse gas removals by sinks;*
 - The number of nitrogen fixing shrub species included in the project activity are anticipated to be insignificant (less than 5%). These species are also indigenous to the region (see A.6)
- ☐ *The AR CDM project activity is implemented on land where there are no other on-going or planned AR activities.*
 - There are no on-going or alternate AR activities in the project area, and this has been confirmed by the official agencies in the region.

B.3. Carbon pools, sources and greenhouse gases (GHGs)

>> The methodology includes **above-ground biomass** and **below-ground biomass**. Both carbon pools are considered appropriate given that the objective and technology of the project is natural regeneration of degraded areas with supplementary planting.

¹⁸ World Bank Background report, assessing Ethiopia growth potential and potential obstacles, April 2004:31

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| Carbon pools | | Selected? | Justification/Explanation |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|---|
| Baseline | Carbon pool 1 Aboveground biomass | Yes | The carbon pool is considered appropriate given that the objective and technology of the project is natural regeneration of degraded areas with supplementary planting. |
| | Carbon pool 2 Belowground biomass | Yes | The carbon pool is considered appropriate given that the objective and technology of the project is natural regeneration of degraded areas with supplementary planting. |
| | Carbon Pool 3 Soil | No | Not applicable |
| Project activity | Carbon pool 1 Aboveground biomass | Yes | The carbon pool is considered appropriate given that the objective and technology of the project is natural regeneration of degraded areas with supplementary planting. |
| | Carbon pool 2 Belowground biomass | Yes | The carbon pool is considered appropriate given that the objective and technology of the project is natural regeneration of degraded areas with supplementary planting. |
| | Carbon pool 3 Soil | No | Not applicable |

The project is not expected to result in emissions for the following reasons:

- ☐ Manual methods are used for carrying out the project tasks. Therefore, no emissions associated with the use of fossil fuels are relevant for the project context.
- ☐ There is no clearance of vegetation for site preparation
- ☐ Biomass burning is not undertaken in the project
- ☐ The project does not use fertilizers
- ☐ Live fences are used for fencing. Therefore, wood from project area is not used as the fencing material.

Therefore, the project emissions are expected to be zero.

| Source | | GHG | Included? | Justification/Explanation |
|------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|---------------------------|
| Baseline | Source 1 | CO ₂ | | |
| | Not applicable | CH ₄ | | |
| | | N ₂ O | | |
| | Source 2 | CO ₂ | | |
| | Not applicable | CH ₄ | | |
| | | N ₂ O | | |
| | --- | --- | | |
| | | --- | | |
| | | --- | | |
| Project activity | Source 1 | CO ₂ | | |
| | | CH ₄ | | |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| Source | GHG | Included? | Justification/Explanation |
|----------------|------------------|-----------|---------------------------|
| Not applicable | N ₂ O | | |
| Source 2 | CO ₂ | | |
| | CH ₄ | | |
| Not applicable | N ₂ O | | |
| --- | --- | | |
| | --- | | |
| | --- | | |

B.4. Establishment and description of baseline scenario

>> The steps outlined in AR AM0003 version 4 are applied below to identify the most plausible baseline scenario.

Step 1: Define the project boundary.

The process followed in delineating the project boundary is described in section A.2 above, and the forest boundary perimeter coordinates are identified in Appendix 12.

Step2: Analyze historical land use, local and sectoral land-use policies or regulations and land use alternatives.

a) **Analyze the historical and existing land-use / land-cover changes in the context of the socioeconomic conditions prevailing within the boundary of the proposed AR CDM project activity and identify key factors that influence the land-use / land-cover changes over time.**

The site on which the project is to be established was reported as having vegetation prior to 1972 (the earliest aerial photographs are from this period). Interviews with local Kebele leaders indicated that the area was cleared between 1975 and 1985 and was subjected to severe soil erosion. The following aerial photographs taken in 1973 seem to demonstrate that at this point in time, the area had been substantially cleared and could not be considered a forest. The evidence from aerial photographs of the project area in 1973 and 1979 does not clearly indicate that the area was subjected to deforestation, although the project site in 1973 does appear to demonstrate that the project area has minimal vegetation.




Photo B-1 Humbo Site 1973




Photo B-2 Humbo Site 1973 enlargement




Photo B-3 Humbo site 1979



Photo B-4 Humbo Site 1979

The project site is severely degraded areas and the community has depended on these lands for grazing and limited firewood collection

b) Show that historical and current land-use / land-cover change has lead to progressive degradation of the land over time including a decrease or steady state of the carbon stocks in the carbon pools.

- Data on the historical and current land use/land cover change has been collated from participatory rural appraisals (PRAs) in the Soddo and Humbo project. The PRA concluded that in the period between 1970 and 1985 there had been a progression of land degradation, which had led to a low but decreasing carbon state (see appendix 10). It was further confirmed that carbon stocks are declining and will continue to decline if land management remains in the status quo. The available aerial photographs of the site confirm this.

The following published information on the destruction of Ethiopia's high forests since the early 1970s also provides supporting evidence.

- In a 2005 paper entitled *Institutional Factors shaping Coffee Forest Management in Ethiopia: The Case of Bonga Forest/Kaffa Zone*, Till Stellmacher observes „Since nationalization of land holdings in 1975, stewardship for forest resources is a governmental matter. Nevertheless, ever since, forest use and conservation has been a low priority topic in the governmental framework of Ethiopia, facing drastic financial and personnel shortage. For example, for the entire Southern Province (SNNPRS), which comprises largest areas of Ethiopian high forests, workforce responsible for natural resource conservation consists of two persons only, based at the Regional Agricultural Office in Awassa, the Province capital.
- The Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (IPCC 2003) identifies that Ethiopia is losing as much as 40,000 hectares of vegetation annually, and this region being relatively densely populated has lost almost all its native forest.
- According to the UN report „Forest fires in Ethiopia" compiled for the UN Emergencies Unit for Ethiopia (UN-EUE), land tenure is reported as the single most important factor in natural resources management, environmental degradation and fire use. "Without changing ownership either literally or symbolically to give local communities a greater sense of investment in the land,

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

environmental disasters will continue and the 2.7% of the country that is forested will rapidly diminish".

- The IUCN Red list confirms that the „forest destruction has been dramatic in Ethiopia's highlands. Measures to stop further deforestation and reforestation with indigenous trees are urgently needed.
- The Nechisar National Park, some 50 kilometers from the project site holds a documented example of forest destruction. Tilahun *et al.* (1996) in „Bird Areas of Ethiopia" identify "the threats of intensive natural resource use, fueled by the fast growth in the nearby town of Arba Minch. Previously one of the best protected areas in the country, the park is now exploited for livestock grazing and wood for construction and fuel."

c) Assessment of the National and/or sectoral policies.

Several decades of political instability have led to very limited implementation of activities involving the protection and enhancement of natural forest resources. Since the removal of the communist regime in 1993, laws relating to environmental protection have been passed. One example at a federal level is the establishment of an Environmental Protection Organs Proclamation¹⁹ governing environmental regulations, and overseeing the targeted increase in Ethiopia's forest cover. While biodiversity preservation and enhancement are broad governmental objectives, these objectives are neither binding nor enforced (Stellmacher 2005 (page 5) documents this in the proceedings of the International Trade and the Protection of Natural Resources in Ethiopia Conference, 2005, hosted by the German Ethiopian Association). Government resources are prioritized on the more pressing domestic issues of food security and national economic development, prohibiting widespread investment in biodiversity enhancement and protection in areas such as Humbo. It has been identified that despite laws prohibiting clearing, this practice continues in Ethiopia to this day. Ethiopia's total forest cover is being reduced by between 40,000 and 140,000 hectares annually^{20, 21}. It is clear that in the absence of the proposed A/R project this area will not be reforested, and the current degrading land management regime will continue.

d) Identify alternative land uses including alternative future public or private activities on the degraded lands including any similar AR activity or any other feasible land development activities, that are not in contradiction with the identified local, national or sectoral land-use policies and regulations and that could be implemented within the boundary of the proposed AR CDM project activity. In doing so, use land records, field surveys, data and feedback from stakeholders, and other appropriate sources.

Given the topography and the obvious soil degradation problems on the site, the only alternative land use to the proposed A/R project is a continuation of the current management regime, leading to further land and biodiversity degradation.

e) Demonstrate that the land use change/cover would either not change, or would lead to further degradation and carbon stock decrease in the absence of the proposed project activity.

Given that there are no suitable alternate land uses aside from the proposed project activity, the land would continue to be managed in the current manner, and carbon stocks would continue to decline. Significant technical, land title, and financial barriers prohibit the transformation of lands from the current land use to the proposed alternate land management regime. The most significant of these barriers includes the divulging

¹⁹ Proclamation No 295/2002 Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia

²⁰ GPG for LULUCF projects, IPCC

²¹ National Meteorological Services Agency *Initial National Communication of Ethiopia to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)* June 2001

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

of user rights to the appropriate community groups, the education in the FMNR techniques, and the costs associated with these activities.

Step 3: Stratification of the A/R CDM project area

The AR CDM Project area has been stratified, and ex-ante stratification is described in section B7.2.

Step 4. Determination of baseline scenario for each stratum

As the baseline scenario is not likely to change from their current status of degraded and subject to further degradation. The baseline is identified as the *continuation of the pre-project land use*.

The carbon stocks in all the baseline strata are in a state of continued decline. This conclusion is justified in sections A.2, A.3, A.4, and B.2, as well as in field survey assessments. There is no possibility for the establishment of natural regeneration in the baseline scenario due to anthropogenic pressures. In the absence of the project, each stratum will see a net decrease in carbon stored above and below ground biomass. However, to be conservative, baseline assessment considered the changes in carbon stocks of few isolated standing trees in each baseline strata (this scenario is very conservative as it much more likely the existing vegetation would be cleared in the baseline scenario), and accounted in the calculation of the baseline GHG removals by sinks.

B.5. Demonstration of additionality

>> The version 02 of the *Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in A/R CDM Project Activities* is used to demonstrate the additionality of the project below.

STEP 0: Preliminary screening based on the starting date of the project activity

The starting date of the project is **1 December 2006**. The following table demonstrates the progression of the project.

| Event | Date |
|--|---------------|
| Tony Rinaudo and Paul Dettmann, World Vision communicate on the opportunities in Carbon Sequestration for World Vision | July 2004 |
| Paul Dettmann recommends a CDM project be undertaken in a World Vision partner country | August 2004 |
| Ethiopia is selected as candidate country | August 2004 |
| Tony Rinaudo and Paul Dettmann visit Humbo ADP in Ethiopia to identify suitable project | October 2004 |
| Project site identified | October 2004 |
| PIN completed for Humbo site (available upon request) | April 2005 |
| PIN Submitted to BioCarbon Fund | May 2005 |
| BioCarbon Fund requests Carbon Finance Document | June 2005 |
| Carbon Finance Document completed (available upon request) | July 2005 |
| World Bank pre-feasibility assessment | January 2006 |
| Inclusion of project in to BioCarbon Fund | February 2006 |
| PDD initiated | March 2006 |
| Project inception | December 2006 |
| PDD Completion and submission to validation | August 2008 |

STEP 1: Identification of alternatives to the project activity consistent with current laws and regulations**Sub-step 1a: Define alternatives to the project activity**

The alternative activities relevant to this project include:

- ☐ Continuation of the current land use activity, grazing and fuelwood collection.
- ☐ Assisted regeneration and reforestation of the land in the project boundary performed without being registered as the A/R CDM project activity
- ☐ Commercial timber production

Sub-step 1b. Enforcement of applicable laws and regulations

The Ethiopian government has identified its desire to see afforestation/reforestation works extended, however, specific regulation supporting the implementation of such projects is not available. Funds for this activity are severely limited and very little forestry related resources are available in the Humbo Woreda. The baseline scenario is compliant with all Ethiopian legal and regulatory requirements, and this situation is not likely to change.

STEP 2: Investment analysis

Not undertaken for this project.

STEP 3: Barrier analysis**Sub-step 3a: Identify barriers proposed project activity:**

This project faces following barriers, which prohibit it from getting implemented in the absence of income derived from the sale of carbon credits. These barriers are:

a) Investment barriers

This project faces investment barriers, which prohibit its implementation without income derived from the sale of carbon credits. Firstly, the costs of nursery establishment and of implementing a training program among the forest users regarding the implementation of FMNR are significant. In order to precipitate this carbon project, World Vision Australia has committed US\$103,700 over three years for nursery establishment and management, as well as US\$ 39,550 over three years for forest management training, and \$138,600 over three years for project related staff costs. In addition, the costs of establishing the legal and socio-economic framework for the efficient running of the seven community cooperatives have been significant (over US\$11,000) and it would not be possible without the possibility of revenue provided by carbon finance to establish these institutions. The communities of Humbo are particularly poor, with the average per capita income in this Woreda was less than \$100 per year in 2003²². It is therefore not possible that these costs could be borne by the communities financed by a system of royalties from increased forest production. Sources of commercial finance have been considered, but banks have formally rejected the request²³.

The Ethiopian government has expressed its desire to see revegetation works extended, however this is unlikely to as funds for forestry activities are severely limited, and very little forestry related resources are available in Ethiopia and specifically in the Humbo Woreda. The project team discussed the possibility of project finance with various financial institutions, and the project could not secure commercial project finance. To illustrate this, a statement from United Bank S.C., Ethiopia, is provided in Appendix 15, stating that such project cannot receive bank loan financing.

The revenue from sale of CERs would partially support the costs of implementing the project. Considering the lack of alternative sources to fund the project, the project costs cannot be met without the revenue from the sale of CERs, which would only be possible as a registered CDM

²² SNNPR statistics department, *Regional basic Socio-economic and Demographic Information*, 2003

²³ See Appendix 15.

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

project. Therefore, registration of this project as a CDM activity would facilitate in partially overcoming the investment barriers.

b) Lack of organisation of local communities

Despite the environmental needs of the Humbo Woreda (district), there has been no institution with requisite capacity to implement a program of forest restoration on the proposed project sites. The Woreda level government forestry department indicated that its financial resources and local technical extension resources are extremely limited, and it therefore could not develop the project without assistance. In the absence of financial resources and capacity of local institutions, the restoration of these areas could not occur.

c) Barriers related to prevailing practice

The unsustainable use of communal lands is a major cause of forest loss in the region. This project is a first of its kind in the country (using a forest cooperative to restore native forest), which seeks to demonstrate that protecting highly degraded land against over-grazing would lead to regrowth of forest biomass without the need to make costly investment in planting. Through implementation of this CDM project, the above barrier was overcome.

d) Barriers relating to land tenure, ownership, inheritance and property rights

Prior to the implementation of the project area, the area had been categorised as communal land. Within Ethiopia, communal lands have no specific land management rights associated to any individuals or communities. Due to the fact that this project was specifically identified as for carbon sequestration, the government was willing to allocate user rights (a form of land tenure delivering management and forest product rights) to the community (through the forest cooperative). As a CDM project, the above barrier was overcome.

e) First of a kind project

There have not been projects similar to this project implemented in Ethiopia. At the inception of the project, staff sought to gain insight from other projects with similar attributes. The Dodolla participatory forest management project, located at Adaba-Dodolla north-east of Shashamane is a project developed to *protect an existing* Juniper forest is not a forest restoration project. As no other project has been implemented with the objective of establishing a forest through assisted natural regeneration, this project can be considered as the first of a kind project. As a consequence, this project needs to significant barriers in the establishment, implementation and monitoring phase.

Sub-step 3b: Show that the identified barriers would not prevent the implementation of at least one of the alternatives (except the proposed project activity).

The only identified alternative to the project is continuation of the pre-project land use (continuing degradation as communal land). This activity does not face the above-mentioned barriers. Given that the *status quo* of continuing degradation as communal land for the past three decades, the above-mentioned barriers do not prohibit the land use that results in continued degradation.

STEP 4. Common practice analysis

Activities similar to this project have **not** been implemented in the region. The project seeks to establish community cooperatives to implement the project, promote the establishment of indigenous and species and management, and granting of user rights. Government forestry staff from State and Woreda offices were consulted regarding comparable examples. However, no projects of this type have been reported, and therefore this can be recognized as a **first of its kind** project.

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

Based on the information and evidence presented under the above steps, the proposed CDM project activity is not the baseline scenario, and is thus additional.

B.6. Estimation of net anthropogenic removals

B.6.1. Explanation of methodological choices

>> Estimation of the ex ante baseline net GHG removals by sink

Based on the approved methodology AR-AM0003, version 04 and as per the data and information presented in baseline stratification, the net change in baseline net GHG removals by sinks are considered as zero.

Due to lack of satellite imagery, a Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) was conducted to gather data from the residents on the trends of the forest and the changes it has undergone in the last thirty years. There is evidence of a progression of land clearing and degradation within this region with escalation since the 1970s. *The true baseline scenario is therefore a total removal of all vegetation on the project site, and a continued diminishing of the carbon stocks of the region.* The conservative scenario of *no net increase or decrease* in carbon stocks (zero baseline) has been chosen for the baseline. This is conservative because of the net actual loss of carbon in baseline scenario. For further details see Appendix 10 Participatory Rural Appraisal.

In the TARAM file the baseline removals are calculated in the worksheet BLexa, and results are summarized in table A5:Q40 of this sheet. These calculations are performed taking into account the information of the baseline vegetation of the four baseline strata included in the worksheets BLS1 to BLS2. The woody and the non-woody vegetation are considered in steady state in this project case (instead of decreasing) and for this reason there are not baseline GHG removals by sinks.

The baseline woody vegetation carbon stock is calculated as shown in the appendix 3 and the non-woody vegetation carbon stock has been calculated with the default IPCC parameters of the following table.

Table B-1: Parameters used to calculate non-woody biomass carbon stock

| Parameter used | Value | Unit | Source |
|----------------------|-------|---------------|--|
| Root to shoot | 2.8 | dimensionless | Table 3.4.3 GPG IPCC 2003. R:S ratio for the vegetation type shrubland |
| Above ground biomass | 2.3 | t d.m./ha | Table 3.4.2 GPG IPCC 2003 Peak aboveground live biomass for the climate zone tropical-dry |
| Carbon Fraction | 0.5 | tC/t d.m. | IPCC |

As mentioned above, both woody and non-woody vegetation are in a steady state or decreasing and for this reason the baseline removals by sinks are zero. Even so, the information of the existing carbon stock in the baseline is necessary for the calculation of the biomass loss during the project implementation due to pre-existing vegetation clearance and or decay.

Table B-2: Baseline net GHG removals by sinks

| Please present final results of your calculations using the following tabular format. | |
|--|--|
| Year | Annual estimation of baseline net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks in tonnes of CO ₂ e |
| 2007 | 0 |
| 2008 | 0 |
| 2009 | 0 |
| 2010 | 0 |
| 2011 | 0 |
| 2012 | 0 |
| 2013 | 0 |
| 2014 | 0 |
| 2015 | 0 |
| 2016 | 0 |
| 2017 | 0 |
| 2018 | 0 |
| 2019 | 0 |
| 2020 | 0 |
| 2021 | 0 |
| 2022 | 0 |
| 2023 | 0 |
| 2024 | 0 |
| 2025 | 0 |
| 2026 | 0 |
| 2027 | 0 |
| 2028 | 0 |
| 2029 | 0 |
| 2030 | 0 |
| 2031 | 0 |
| 2032 | 0 |
| 2033 | 0 |
| 2034 | 0 |
| 2035 | 0 |
| 2036 | 0 |
| Total estimated baseline net GHG removals by sinks (tonnes of CO₂ e) | 0 |
| Total number of crediting years | 0 |
| Annual average over the crediting period of estimated baseline net GHG removals by sinks (tonnes of CO₂ e) | 0 |

Estimation of actual changes in living biomass carbon stocks in the project scenario (section 7.1 of AR-AM0003 version 04)

A. Treatment of pre-existing non-tree and tree vegetation

The pre-existing tree vegetation will be left standing and thus there is no biomass stock change due to the clearance of this type of vegetation. In TARAM the results of the biomass stock change due to the clearance of tree vegetation are in the worksheet Aexa table F29:l62 and are based on the information of the pre-existing woody vegetation per baseline stratum in the BLS sheets and in the type of treatment of this vegetation per stand model in SM1 and SM2 cells C10, C11 and C12.

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

As in this project case the trees are left standing (Cell C10=100%) the biomass stock change is zero. In accordance with the methodology AR-AM0003 version 4, Section 7.1, it can be estimated that carbon stocks are not significant, which may be reflected in two situations. One of which is, carbon stocks of pre-existing vegetation are not included in the carbon stock changes (project or actual removals) regardless of pre-existing vegetation is standing or harvested. In the context of this project, the above statement indicates that pre-existing vegetation is part of the baseline, therefore, it is not included in the actual (project) removals. As presented in the baseline information in Appendix 3, the carbon stock of pre-existing vegetation is 3.5 tons to 8.85 tons, which is insignificant, and not relevant for the calculation of actual removals.

In the case of the non-tree vegetation, as mentioned in the 15th page of the methodology (4th paragraph), All existing non-tree vegetation is assumed to disappear in the year of site preparation because of biomass clearance, disturbance or future competition from planted trees. This is a conservative assumption because there will be some non-tree vegetation in the project scenario. TARAM calculates this biomass loss using equation 14 of the methodology in the worksheet Aexa table N29:Q62. These calculations are based on the biomass stock and parameters provided in the baseline strata's worksheets (BLS 1 to BLS4; cells C15 to C17). TARAM calculates $E_{\text{biomassloss}}$ in Aexa with this stock information, with the project planting plan (Table D-2 and TARAM; sheet AR-Plan) and with the type of treatment (burned or not burned) described in SM1 and SM2 cell C13. The necessary parameters to calculate biomass loss are described in table C-5 and project biomass loss due to clearance and or decay of pre-existing non-tree vegetation is specified per project year in table B-3.

The biomass loss due to clearance of the pre-existing vegetation has been revised to reflect the re-stratification of the project area during Monitoring Period 1. Overall the cumulative loss is almost the same changing from -43711.7 to -43711.8 tCO₂e.

Formatted: Subscript

Table B-3 Biomass loss due to clearance of the pre-existing vegetation

| Project year | Above-ground biomass | | Below-ground biomass | | Total biomass loss ($E_{\text{biomassloss}}$) | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------|
| | annual | cumulative | annual | cumulative | annual | cumulative |
| | tCO ₂ e yr ⁻¹ | tCO ₂ e | tCO ₂ e yr ⁻¹ | tCO ₂ e | tCO ₂ e yr ⁻¹ | tCO ₂ e |
| 1 | -11337.4-9394.7 | -11337.4-9394.7 | -31744.7-26305.3 | -31744.7-26305.3 | -43082.1-35700.0 | -43082.1-35700.0 |
| 2 | -93.6-843.3 | -11431.0-40238.4 | -262.1-2364.3 | -32006.8-28666.6 | -355.7-3204.7 | -43437.8-38904.7 |
| 3 | -29.5-843.3 | -11460.5-44084.4 | -82.6-2364.3 | -32089.5-34027.9 | -112.2-3204.7 | -43550.0-42409.3 |
| 4 | -16.9-421.7 | -11477.4-44503.4 | -47.2-4480.7 | -32136.7-32208.6 | -64.1-4602.3 | -43614.1-43744.7 |
| 5 | -25.70.0 | -11503.1-44503.4 | -72.00.0 | -32208.7-32208.6 | -97.70.0 | -43711.8-43744.7 |
| 6 | 00.0 | -11503.1-44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7-32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8-43744.7 |
| 7 | 00.0 | -11503.1-44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7-32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8-43744.7 |
| 8 | 00.0 | -11503.1-44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7-32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8-43744.7 |
| 9 | 00.0 | -11503.1-44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7-32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8-43744.7 |
| 10 | 00.0 | -11503.1-44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7-32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8-43744.7 |
| 11 | 00.0 | -11503.1-44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7-32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8-43744.7 |
| 12 | 00.0 | -11503.1-44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7-32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8-43744.7 |
| 13 | 00.0 | -11503.1-44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7-32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8-43744.7 |
| 14 | 00.0 | -11503.1-44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7-32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8-43744.7 |

Formatted Table

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | | | | | | |
|----|------|----------------------|------|----------------------|------|----------------------|
| 15 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 16 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 17 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 18 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 19 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 20 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 21 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 22 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 23 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 24 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 25 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 26 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 27 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 28 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 29 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |
| 30 | 00.0 | -11503.1- 44503.4 | 00.0 | -32208.7- 32208.6 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43744.7 |

Table B-4 Planting plan

| Project year | Hectares planted per year and Baseline stratum/stand model | | | | |
|--------------|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | Humbo Baseline Strata 1 /Biodiversity | Humbo Baseline Strata 2 /Biodiversity | Humbo Baseline Strata 3 /Biodiversity | Humbo Baseline Strata 53 /Eucalyptus / Grevillea | Humbo Baseline Strata 4 /Biodiversity |
| 1 | 234 | 745631 | 1699454 | 11.4 | 95114.4 |
| 2 | | | | 22.2200 | |
| 3 | | | | 7200 | |
| 4 | | | | 4100 | |
| 5 | | | | 6.1 | |
| 6 | | | | | |

Formatted: Font: Arial, Character scale: 95%

Formatted: Right, Right: 0,1 cm, Space Before: 2,1 pt, Line spacing: Exactly 10,55 pt

Formatted: Font: Arial, 10 pt, Character scale: 95%

Formatted: Right, Right: 0,1 cm, Space Before: 2,1 pt, Line spacing: Exactly 10,55 pt

B. Treatment of trees

To calculate the carbon stock change in living biomass in the project scenario this project uses method 2 (stock change) applying equations 8, 9, 10, 11 and 20 of the methodology. TARAM calculates this stock change in Aexa sheet, tables A67:M100 (total) and A29:E62 (per stand model). Basically, the information necessary to calculate this stock changes is the growth models per stand model, the species parameters, the specific management (thinning and harvesting) and the planting plan. In TARAM the species parameters are included in sheet Species and the specific sources of this parameters are described below in tables B-6 and B-9, the planting plan in AR-Plan sheet described above in table D-2 and the growth information and management in sheets SM1 and SM2 (growth models in table A52:K87 and management in table A90:BS123). The necessary

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

information to fill out SM1 and SM2 sheets is described in the following paragraphs and the summary of the results is included in tables B-5, B-7, B-8 and B-10.

Data used for ex ante estimation of actual net GHG removals by sinks

The GPG-LULUCF manual recommends the use of following data sources to estimate biomass increase.

- a) Existing local sources and specific species;
- b) National and species specific (e.g. from national GHG inventory);
- c) Species specific from neighboring countries with similar conditions (sometimes c) might be preferable to b));
- d) Species specific relevant at the global level (e.g. GPG-LULUCF).

In Ethiopia there is a lack of local growth data available to estimate the biomass stock change achieved by the proposed A/R CDM project activity.

a) Stand model 1

There is no published data available to predict growth of natural multi-species forests in the SNNPR State, Ethiopia, and data on natural multi-species forests is generally difficult to find. Therefore, the approach used to estimate yields in the Stand Model 1 of the project is application of existing information for similar climatic zone and vegetation type as reported in the Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (IPCC 2003), and adjusted for the local circumstances drawing on the expert opinion.

1. Based on its altitude (as determined by GPS measurements) and annual rainfall, the project site belongs mostly to tropical montane dry forests (Table 5-1, IPCC Guidelines 1996). Some parts of the project area are reported to have higher annual rainfall and can be categorized as tropical montane moist forests.
2. In Africa, the mean aboveground biomass stock in naturally regenerated tropical montane dry forests is estimated to be 40 t dry matter/ha, and in naturally regenerated tropical montane moist forests 191 t dry matter/ha (Table 3A.1.2, GPG for LULUCF).
3. The average annual increment in aboveground biomass in natural regeneration in such dry forests is 2.0 t dry matter/ha/yr for forests younger than 20 years old and 1.5 t dry matter/ha/yr for forests older than 20 years. For tropical montane moist forests, the corresponding figures are 5.0 t and 1.0 t dry matter/ha/yr, respectively (Table 3A.1.5, GPG for LULUCF).
4. As the project follows an approach of combined natural regeneration and supplementary planting, biomass stock and annual increment figures for plantations are considered to come up with a realistic estimation. In Africa, montane dry broadleaf tree plantations are considered to have an average aboveground biomass stock of 40 t dry matter/ha in forests younger than 20 years, and 60 t dry matter/ha in older forests. In tropical montane moist broadleaf plantations, these figures are 100 t and 150 t, respectively (Table 3A.1.3, GPG for LULUCF). Data on average annual increment in montane plantations in Africa is scarce: for montane moist forest plantations younger than 20 years old, the rate 11.0 t dry matter/ha/yr is given (Table 3A.1.6, GPG for LULUCF).
5. As the above rates are average figures for all forests of this type in Africa, the expert input of Dr. Deribe Gurmu (Ethiopian Forestry Department), an expert in Ethiopian forestry, was used, together with consultation of other forestry professionals. As a result of this consultative process, a mean annual increment of 6 t dry matter/ha/yr was considered to be appropriate. This mean annual increment was used to estimate the ex ante biomass over the project period.
6. The total biomass is the sum of above ground biomass and below ground biomass. The below ground biomass is calculated as a proportion (27%) of the above ground biomass, as per the GPG for LULUCF (IPCC 2003).
7. The total ex ante biomass estimated is considered reasonable for the forest type taking into account the data available for the forest types of the region.

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

The growth data information used for calculation of *ex ante* GHG removals by sinks is presented in Appendix 16 and in the following table. For this stand model the information comes directly from the sources in above ground biomass (first column of the table) considering also two thinning's of 25 m³, at stand age 12 and 22. Total GHG removals by sinks are calculated in table B-5 using equations 8, 9 and 11 of the methodology based on the above ground biomass stock and the with the parameters of table B- 6.

Table B-5 Stand model 1 GHG removals by sinks

| Age | Above ground biomass | Below ground biomass (eq.11) | Total biomass (AGB+BGB) | Total carbon stock (Total biomass*CF) | Total CO2 (Total carbon stock*44/12) |
|-----|----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | t d.m./ha | t d.m./ha | t d.m./ha | tC/ha | tCO2/ha |
| 1 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 4.5 |
| 2 | 5.1 | 1.4 | 6.5 | 3.2 | 11.9 |
| 3 | 8.8 | 2.4 | 11.1 | 5.6 | 20.4 |
| 4 | 13.1 | 3.6 | 16.7 | 8.3 | 30.6 |
| 5 | 18.0 | 4.9 | 22.9 | 11.4 | 42.0 |
| 6 | 23.4 | 6.3 | 29.7 | 14.8 | 54.4 |
| 7 | 29.2 | 7.9 | 37.1 | 18.6 | 68.0 |
| 8 | 35.6 | 9.6 | 45.2 | 22.6 | 82.8 |
| 9 | 42.4 | 11.4 | 53.8 | 26.9 | 98.7 |
| 10 | 49.9 | 13.5 | 63.4 | 31.7 | 116.2 |
| 11 | 57.5 | 15.5 | 73.0 | 36.5 | 133.8 |
| 12 | 39.3 | 10.6 | 49.9 | 24.9 | 91.5 |
| 13 | 46.8 | 12.6 | 59.5 | 29.7 | 109.0 |
| 14 | 54.6 | 14.7 | 69.4 | 34.7 | 127.2 |
| 15 | 62.2 | 16.8 | 79.0 | 39.5 | 144.8 |
| 16 | 69.5 | 18.8 | 88.2 | 44.1 | 161.8 |
| 17 | 76.5 | 20.7 | 97.2 | 48.6 | 178.2 |
| 18 | 83.6 | 22.6 | 106.2 | 53.1 | 194.7 |
| 19 | 90.7 | 24.5 | 115.1 | 57.6 | 211.1 |
| 20 | 97.7 | 26.4 | 124.1 | 62.1 | 227.5 |
| 21 | 104.8 | 28.3 | 133.1 | 66.5 | 244.0 |
| 22 | 86.9 | 23.5 | 110.3 | 55.2 | 202.2 |
| 23 | 93.9 | 25.4 | 119.3 | 59.6 | 218.7 |
| 24 | 101.0 | 27.3 | 128.2 | 64.1 | 235.1 |
| 25 | 108.0 | 29.2 | 137.2 | 68.6 | 251.5 |
| 26 | 115.1 | 31.1 | 146.2 | 73.1 | 268.0 |
| 27 | 122.2 | 33.0 | 155.1 | 77.6 | 284.4 |
| 28 | 129.2 | 34.9 | 164.1 | 82.1 | 300.9 |
| 29 | 136.3 | 36.8 | 173.1 | 86.5 | 317.3 |
| 30 | 143.3 | 38.7 | 182.1 | 91.0 | 333.8 |

Table B-6 Parameters used in the GHG removals calculation (stand model 1)

| Parameters used | Value | Unit | Source |
|-----------------|-------|---------------|----------------------------|
| Root to shoot | 0.27 | dimensionless | Table 3A.1.8 GPG IPCC 2003 |
| Carbon Fraction | 0.5 | tC/t d.m. | IPCC |

b) Stand Model 2

For the second stand model involving Eucalyptus and Grevillea interplanting, a stand model projection was made on the following assumptions.

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

Eucalyptus globulus has an average growth rate of 30 m³/ha/yr in Ethiopia (Davidson 1989, Pohjonen and Pukkala 1990)²⁴ when inter-planted with *Grevillea robusta*, it is assumed to have an average MAI of 6 m³/ha/yr²⁵, at a stocking density of 500 stems per hectare (total 1000 stems per hectare when including both species).

Grevillea robusta has an average grow rate of 10-12 m³/ha/yr²⁶. When mixed with *Eucalyptus globulus* it is assumed to have an average MAI of 3 m³/ha/yr at a stocking density of 500 stems per hectare (total 1000 stems per hectare when including both species).

Based on the above growth rates in an inter-planted situation, *Eucalyptus* and *Grevillea* mixed plantation has an average MAI of 8.9 m³/ha/yr at a stocking density of 1000 stems per hectare (500 of each species) over the initial 20-year period, plus woody biomass, prunings and thinnings.

In TARAM in SM2 table A52:K87 has been filled out with above ground biomass calculated in table D-5 based on the stand volume information and using equation 20 and 10 of the methodology. TARAM calculates the GHG removals per hectare using equations 8, 9, 11 and 20 as described in tables B-7 and B-8 using the parameters of table B-9. Both species of the stand model have two thinning's and a final harvesting described in the fourth column of tables B-7 and B-8.

²⁴ <http://www.fao.org/docrep/004/ac121e/ac121e04.htm#bm04.3>

²⁵ Many tree species, including both *Eucalyptus globulus* and *Grevillea robusta*, grow more quickly in a single- species plantation than in a mixed plantation. However, such plantations are not favored by users of forest since they tend to have other effects that are considered negative.

²⁶ <http://www.fao.org/docrep/s4550e/s4550e0b.htm>

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

Table B-7 Stand model 2 (*Grevillea robusta*) GHG removals by sinks

| Year | Initial stand volume (=Final stand volume previous year) | Growth (MAI) | Losses (thinning and harvesting) | Final stand volume (eq. 20) | Above ground biomass (eq. 10) | Below ground biomass (eq. 11) | Total biomass (AGB+BGB) | Total carbon stock (Total biomass*CF) | Total CO2 (Total carbon stock*44/12) |
|------|---|--------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | m3/ha | m3/ha/yr | m3/ha | m3/ha | t d.m./ha | t d.m./ha | t d.m./ha | tC/ha | tCO2/ha |
| 1 | 0.0 | 0.8 | | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.8 |
| 2 | 0.8 | 1.6 | | 2.4 | 2.4 | 0.6 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 5.5 |
| 3 | 2.4 | 2.4 | | 4.7 | 4.7 | 1.3 | 6.0 | 3.0 | 11.0 |
| 4 | 4.7 | 2.8 | | 7.5 | 7.5 | 2.0 | 9.5 | 4.8 | 17.5 |
| 5 | 7.5 | 3.0 | | 10.5 | 10.5 | 2.8 | 13.3 | 6.7 | 24.5 |
| 6 | 10.5 | 3.0 | | 13.5 | 13.5 | 3.6 | 17.2 | 8.6 | 31.5 |
| 7 | 13.5 | 3.0 | | 16.5 | 16.5 | 4.5 | 21.0 | 10.5 | 38.4 |
| 8 | 16.5 | 3.0 | | 19.5 | 19.5 | 5.3 | 24.8 | 12.4 | 45.4 |
| 9 | 19.5 | 3.0 | | 22.5 | 22.5 | 6.1 | 28.6 | 14.3 | 52.4 |
| 10 | 22.5 | 3.0 | | 25.5 | 25.5 | 6.9 | 32.4 | 16.2 | 59.4 |
| 11 | 25.5 | 3.0 | | 28.5 | 28.5 | 7.7 | 36.2 | 18.1 | 66.4 |
| 12 | 28.5 | 3.0 | 14.0 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 4.7 | 22.2 | 11.1 | 40.7 |
| 13 | 17.5 | 3.0 | | 20.5 | 20.5 | 5.5 | 26.0 | 13.0 | 47.7 |
| 14 | 20.5 | 3.0 | | 23.5 | 23.5 | 6.3 | 29.8 | 14.9 | 54.7 |
| 15 | 23.5 | 3.0 | | 26.5 | 26.5 | 7.2 | 33.7 | 16.8 | 61.7 |
| 16 | 26.5 | 3.0 | | 29.4 | 29.5 | 8.0 | 37.5 | 18.7 | 68.7 |
| 17 | 29.4 | 3.0 | | 32.4 | 32.5 | 8.8 | 41.3 | 20.6 | 75.7 |
| 18 | 32.4 | 3.0 | | 35.4 | 35.5 | 9.6 | 45.1 | 22.5 | 82.7 |
| 19 | 35.4 | 3.0 | | 38.4 | 38.5 | 10.4 | 48.9 | 24.5 | 89.7 |
| 20 | 38.4 | 3.0 | | 41.4 | 41.5 | 11.2 | 52.7 | 26.4 | 96.7 |
| 21 | 41.4 | 3.0 | | 44.4 | 44.5 | 12.0 | 56.5 | 28.3 | 103.7 |
| 22 | 44.4 | 3.0 | 14.0 | 33.4 | 33.5 | 9.0 | 42.5 | 21.3 | 78.0 |
| 23 | 33.4 | 3.0 | | 36.4 | 36.5 | 9.9 | 46.3 | 23.2 | 85.0 |
| 24 | 36.4 | 3.0 | | 39.4 | 39.5 | 10.7 | 50.2 | 25.1 | 92.0 |
| 25 | 39.4 | 3.0 | | 42.4 | 42.5 | 11.5 | 54.0 | 27.0 | 99.0 |
| 26 | 42.4 | 3.0 | | 45.4 | 45.5 | 12.3 | 57.8 | 28.9 | 105.9 |
| 27 | 45.4 | 3.0 | | 48.4 | 48.5 | 13.1 | 61.6 | 30.8 | 112.9 |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| 28 | 48.4 | 3.0 | | 51.4 | 51.5 | 13.9 | 65.4 | 32.7 | 119.9 |
| 29 | 51.4 | 3.0 | | 54.4 | 54.5 | 14.7 | 69.2 | 34.6 | 126.9 |
| 30 | 54.4 | 3.0 | 57.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Table B-8 Stand model 2 (*Eucalyptus globulus*) GHG removals by sinks

| Year | Initial stand volume (=Final stand volume previous year) | Growth (MAI) | Losses (thinning and harvesting) | Final stand volume (eq. 20) | Above ground biomass (eq. 10) | Below ground biomass (eq. 11) | Total biomass (AGB+BGB) | Total carbon stock (Total biomass*CF) | Total CO2 (Total carbon stock*44/12) |
|------|---|--------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | m3/ha | m3/ha/yr | m3/ha | m3/ha | t d.m./ha | t d.m./ha | t d.m./ha | tC/ha | tCO2/ha |
| 1 | 0.0 | 1.6 | | 1.6 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 4.1 |
| 2 | 1.6 | 3.2 | | 4.7 | 5.2 | 1.5 | 6.7 | 3.3 | 12.2 |
| 3 | 4.7 | 4.7 | | 9.5 | 10.3 | 3.0 | 13.3 | 6.7 | 24.4 |
| 4 | 9.5 | 5.5 | | 15.0 | 16.4 | 4.7 | 21.1 | 10.6 | 38.7 |
| 5 | 15.0 | 6.0 | | 21.0 | 22.9 | 6.6 | 29.5 | 14.8 | 54.2 |
| 6 | 21.0 | 6.0 | | 27.0 | 29.4 | 8.5 | 38.0 | 19.0 | 69.6 |
| 7 | 27.0 | 6.0 | | 33.0 | 36.0 | 10.4 | 46.4 | 23.2 | 85.1 |
| 8 | 33.0 | 6.0 | | 39.0 | 42.5 | 12.3 | 54.9 | 27.4 | 100.6 |
| 9 | 39.0 | 6.0 | | 44.9 | 49.1 | 14.2 | 63.3 | 31.7 | 116.1 |
| 10 | 44.9 | 6.0 | | 50.9 | 55.6 | 8.3 | 64.0 | 32.0 | 117.3 |
| 11 | 50.9 | 6.0 | | 56.9 | 62.2 | 9.3 | 71.5 | 35.7 | 131.1 |
| 12 | 56.9 | 6.0 | 28.0 | 34.9 | 38.1 | 5.7 | 43.9 | 21.9 | 80.4 |
| 13 | 34.9 | 6.0 | | 40.9 | 44.7 | 6.7 | 51.4 | 25.7 | 94.2 |
| 14 | 40.9 | 6.0 | | 46.9 | 51.2 | 7.7 | 58.9 | 29.5 | 108.0 |
| 15 | 46.9 | 6.0 | | 52.9 | 57.8 | 8.7 | 66.4 | 33.2 | 121.8 |
| 16 | 52.9 | 6.0 | | 58.9 | 64.3 | 9.6 | 74.0 | 37.0 | 135.6 |
| 17 | 58.9 | 6.0 | | 64.9 | 70.9 | 10.6 | 81.5 | 40.7 | 149.4 |
| 18 | 64.9 | 6.0 | | 70.9 | 77.4 | 11.6 | 89.0 | 44.5 | 163.2 |
| 19 | 70.9 | 6.0 | | 76.9 | 83.9 | 12.6 | 96.5 | 48.3 | 177.0 |
| 20 | 76.9 | 6.0 | | 82.9 | 90.5 | 13.6 | 104.1 | 52.0 | 190.8 |
| 21 | 82.9 | 6.0 | | 88.9 | 97.0 | 14.6 | 111.6 | 55.8 | 204.6 |
| 22 | 88.9 | 6.0 | 28.0 | 66.9 | 73.0 | 11.0 | 84.0 | 42.0 | 153.9 |
| 23 | 66.9 | 6.0 | | 72.8 | 79.5 | 11.9 | 91.5 | 45.7 | 167.7 |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|-----|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|
| 24 | 72.8 | 6.0 | | 78.8 | 86.1 | 12.9 | 99.0 | 49.5 | 181.5 |
| 25 | 78.8 | 6.0 | | 84.8 | 92.6 | 13.9 | 106.5 | 53.3 | 195.3 |
| 26 | 84.8 | 6.0 | | 90.8 | 99.2 | 14.9 | 114.1 | 57.0 | 209.1 |
| 27 | 90.8 | 6.0 | | 96.8 | 105.7 | 15.9 | 121.6 | 60.8 | 222.9 |
| 28 | 96.8 | 6.0 | | 102.8 | 112.3 | 16.8 | 129.1 | 64.6 | 236.7 |
| 29 | 102.8 | 6.0 | | 108.8 | 118.8 | 17.8 | 136.6 | 68.3 | 250.5 |
| 30 | 108.8 | 6.0 | 114.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Table B-9 Parameters used in the GHG removals calculation (stand model 2)

| Parameters used | Value | Unit | Source |
|-----------------------------------|--|---------------|---|
| <i>Grevillea robusta</i> | | | |
| Wood density | 0.501 | t/m3 | PP file and www.fao.org |
| Root to shoot | 0.27 | dimensionless | Table 3A.1.8 GPG IPCC 2003; mean value for Tropical/sub-tropical dry forest |
| Biomass expansion factor | 2 | dimensionless | Table 3A.1.10 GPG IPCC 2003; mean value for tropical broadleaf |
| Carbon Fraction | 0.5 | tC/t d.m. | IPCC |
| <i>Eucalyptus globulus</i> | | | |
| Wood density | 0.546 | t/m3 | PP file and www.fao.org |
| Root to shoot | 0.29 (AGB<50 td.m./ha); 0.15 (AGB>50 td.m./ha) | dimensionless | Table 3A.1.8 GPG IPCC 2003; mean value for Eucalyptus plantation |
| Biomass expansion factor | 2 | dimensionless | Table 3A.1.10 GPG IPCC 2003; mean value for tropical broadleaf |
| Carbon Fraction | 0.5 | tC/t d.m. | IPCC |

Estimation of the increase in GHG emissions by sources within the project boundary as a result of the implementation of an A/R CDM project activity

Project is not burning biomass and not using fossil fuel in its activities and thus, there are not project emissions by sources. For this reason, the actual net GHG removals by sinks are equal, in this project case, to the actual changes in living biomass carbon stocks in the project scenario (sum of the changes in living biomass plus the biomass loss). (See table below).

Table B-10 Estimate of actual net CO2 removals by sinks

| Project year | Sum of the changes in tree biomass carbon stocks in the project scenario (eq 15 of the methodology) | | Total biomass loss (Table D-1) | | Actual net GHG removals by sinks ²⁷ (eq. 13 of the methodology) | |
|--------------|---|----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|----------------------|
| | annual | cumulative | annual | cumulative | annual | cumulative |
| | tCO2e yr-1 | tCO2e | tCO2e yr-1 | tCO2e | tCO2e yr-1 | tCO2e |
| 1 | 12211.1404 06.7 | 12211.1404 06.7 | -43082.1- 35700.0 | -43082.1- 35700.0 | -30871.0- 25594.3 | -30871.0- 25594.3 |
| 2 | 19999.6176 04.3 | 32210.7277 10.0 | -355.718- 3204.7 | -43437.8- 38904.7 | 19643.8143 99.6 | -11227.2- 11194.6 |
| 3 | 23275.5224 95.7 | 55486.2502 05.7 | -112.163- 3204.7 | -43550- 42109.3 | 23163.4192 91.1 | 11936.2809 6.4 |
| 4 | 28059.4292 41.6 | 83545.6794 47.4 | -64.0933- 1602.3 | -43614.1- 43711.7 | 27995.3276 39.3 | 39931.5357 35.7 |
| 5 | 31282.3341 33.0 | 114827.911 3580.4 | - 97.74230.0 | -43711.8- 43711.7 | 31184.5341 33.0 | 71116.1698 68.7 |
| 6 | 34438.0381 96.7 | 149265.915 1777.1 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43711.7 | 34438.0381 96.7 | 105554.110 8065.5 |
| 7 | 37534.2413 73.5 | 186800.119 3150.7 | 00.0 | -43711.8- 43711.7 | 37534.2413 73.5 | 143088.314 9439.0 |
| 8 | 40595.3440 | 227395.423 | 00.0 | -43711.8- | 40595.3440 | 183683.619 |

Formatted Table

²⁷ Equal to actual changes in living biomass carbon stocks in the project scenario

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | | | | | | |
|----|------------|------------|------|-----------|------------|------------|
| | 77.3 | 7228.0 | | 43711.7 | 77.3 | 3516.3 |
| 9 | 43642.0466 | 271037.428 | | -43711.8- | 43623.6466 | 227307.124 |
| | 03.8 | 3831.8 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 03.8 | 0420.1 |
| 10 | 48033.1503 | 319070.533 | | -43711.8- | 48003.1503 | 275310.329 |
| | 93.4 | 4225.2 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 93.4 | 0613.5 |
| 11 | 47859.8475 | 366930.338 | | -43711.8- | 47825.2475 | 323135.433 |
| | 38.0 | 1763.2 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 38.0 | 8051.5 |
| 12 | -113351.8- | 253578.629 | | -43711.8- | -113393.3- | 209742.125 |
| | 86275.8 | 5487.4 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 86275.8 | 1775.7 |
| 13 | 46150.9308 | 299729.432 | | -43711.8- | 46104.7308 | 255846.828 |
| | 26.3 | 6313.7 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 26.3 | 2602.0 |
| 14 | 48847.0336 | 348576.535 | | -43711.8- | 48796.3336 | 304643.131 |
| | 85.2 | 9998.9 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 85.2 | 6287.3 |
| 15 | 47518.6388 | 396095.039 | | -43711.8- | 47463.2388 | 352106.335 |
| | 62.1 | 8861.0 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 62.1 | 5149.3 |
| 16 | 45986.5461 | 442081.544 | | -43711.8- | 45926.5461 | 398032.840 |
| | 64.7 | 5025.6 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 64.7 | 1314.0 |
| 17 | 45039.2458 | 487120.749 | | -43711.8- | 44974.6458 | 443007.344 |
| | 80.3 | 0906.0 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 80.3 | 7194.3 |
| 18 | 45004.9470 | 532125.553 | | -43711.8- | 44933.3470 | 487940.749 |
| | 27.1 | 7933.1 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 27.1 | 4221.4 |
| 19 | 45074.8470 | 577200.458 | | -43711.8- | 45003.3470 | 532944.054 |
| | 27.1 | 4960.2 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 27.1 | 1248.6 |
| 20 | 45074.8470 | 622275.263 | | -43711.8- | 45247.1470 | 578191.158 |
| | 27.1 | 1987.4 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 27.1 | 8275.7 |
| 21 | 45074.8470 | 667350.067 | | -43711.8- | 45003.3470 | 623194.463 |
| | 27.1 | 9014.5 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 27.1 | 5302.9 |
| 22 | -111874.2- | 555475.859 | | -43711.8- | -111948.0- | 511246.355 |
| | 82661.0 | 6353.5 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 82661.0 | 2641.9 |
| 23 | 42918.6276 | 598394.462 | | -43711.8- | 42847.1276 | 554093.458 |
| | 01.9 | 3955.4 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 01.9 | 0243.8 |
| 24 | 44394.9276 | 642789.465 | | -43711.8- | 44325.7276 | 598419.160 |
| | 01.9 | 1557.3 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 01.9 | 7845.7 |
| 25 | 44686.3373 | 687475.768 | | -43711.8- | 44619.4373 | 643038.564 |
| | 14.5 | 8871.8 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 14.5 | 5160.2 |
| 26 | 44482.3470 | 731958.073 | | -43711.8- | 44415.4470 | 687454.069 |
| | 27.1 | 5899.0 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 27.1 | 2187.3 |
| 27 | 45074.8470 | 777032.978 | | -43711.8- | 45007.9470 | 732461.973 |
| | 27.1 | 2926.1 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 27.1 | 9214.5 |
| 28 | 45074.8470 | 822107.782 | | -43711.8- | 45007.9470 | 777469.878 |
| | 27.1 | 9953.3 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 27.1 | 6241.6 |
| 29 | 45074.8470 | 867182.587 | | -43711.8- | 45007.9470 | 822477.783 |
| | 27.1 | 6980.4 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 27.1 | 3268.8 |
| 30 | 40535.3470 | 907717.892 | | -43711.8- | 40705.3470 | 863183.088 |
| | 27.1 | 4007.6 | 00.0 | 43711.7 | 27.1 | 0295.9 |

Estimate of the ex ante leakage

Labor used for the proposed A/R CDM project activity are from local villages; hence transportation for laborers is not needed. All seedlings will be raised on or near the site and will be transported to the project sites by manpower and project vehicles, whose emissions are calculated in the project scenario. Timber harvested from site will be transported using manpower, or existing donkeys and carts. There will be no clearing of vegetation for fencing material; rather live fences will be utilized.

Equation 28 in the approved methodology is used for the calculation of leakage:

$$LK = LK_{Vehicle} + LK_{ActivityDisplacement} + LK_{fencing}$$

where:

LK = total GHG emissions due to leakage; tonnes CO₂-e.

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

$LK_{Vehicle}$ = total GHG emissions due to fossil fuel combustion from vehicles; tonnes CO₂-e.

$LK_{ActivityDisplacement}$ = leakage due to activity displacement; tonnes CO₂-e.

$LK_{fencing}$ = leakage due to increased use of wood posts for fencing up to year t^* ; tonnes CO₂-e.

However, given that live fences will be utilized $LK_{fencing} = 0$

Given that fossil fuel emissions can be ignored (decision of EB 42) $LK_{vehicle} = 0$ Leakage is therefore assessed for activity displacement only

Activity displacement

Assessment of leakage from fuelwood collection

There is no leakage expected from fuel wood collection²⁸. The project will generate enough fuel wood within the project area, initially through pruning of existing vegetation to assist natural regeneration and later from planted areas within the project boundary, as well as areas planted outside the project boundary from seedlings supplied through the project.

During project preparation, pre-project fuel wood collection was estimated at 4.3 t/ha, while post project just after one and half year fuel wood estimation gave 5.13t/ha (see Appendix 14 on Leakage). The pre- project estimate was based on interviews and focus groups with a representative sample of the community, while the post-project assessment was based on sampling over strata and validation interviews. The fuel wood removed as a result of pruning was collected from four sample areas of 100m² from four cooperatives (randomly selected) and was then weighed. Based on the data delivered from this procedure the fuel wood collection following project implementation is 5.1 t per hectare.

Based on field experience from Niger²⁹ (Tony Rinaudo) as well as published literature³⁰ the project team assessed that the fuelwood yield from the project more than compensates for the change from fuelwood collection to cooperative community management that would generate higher levels of fuelwood as thinning and pruning activities would increase the amount of biomass available. Through interviews with community members, it was clarified that the communities are collecting a large amount of these pruned branches.

As per the methodology on leakage assessment, the project meets the condition,

$$FG_{BL} < FG_{AR,t}$$

Therefore, leakage from fuelwood can be ignored.

Assessment of leakage from grazing

There is anticipated to be no net leakage due to the relocation of animals from the project³¹. The number of animals using the project area Na_{BL} was calculated by counting the total number of animals.

| Strata Number | Number of goats | Number of ox / cow / bull |
|------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
|------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|

²⁸ See TARAM V1.3_HAR_ETHIOPIA 090511.xls

²⁹ Rinaudo, T, various publications including <http://www.frameweb.org/CommunityBrowser.aspx?id=2871&lang=en-US>

³⁰ Callesen, I. and Østergaard, 2008 – www.orgprints.org/12222/01/Callesen_12222_ed.doc

³¹ See TARAM V1.3_HAR_ETHIOPIA (APRIL 5 2009).xls

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-------------|
| Strata 1 | 0 | 264 |
| Strata 2 | 0 | 1,577 |
| Strata 3 | 0 | 1,219 |
| Strata 4 | 0 | 940 |
| <i>Total Na_{BL}</i> | 0 | 3990 |

Given that methodology equation 30 states that leakage due to the displacement of grazing animals can be set at zero in the circumstance that $Na_{BL} < Na_{AR,t}$ (equation 32), and the cut and carry system (See photo B-6) of fodder production results in an increased number of animals supported by the project area³² through cut and carry and stall feeding of animals within enclosed paddocks outside the project area), the leakage from the project due to displacement of grazing animals is considered to be zero.

In addition to the project area being anticipated to produce more fodder than is required from the pre-existing animal populations, application of equation 33 demonstrates that the areas outside the project (EGL) would also more than accommodate Na_{BL} .

³² For information on cut and carry offering increases in animal carrying capacity see: Sustainable Land Management Sourcebook, World Bank 2008, pp30-31

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

EGL has been calculated as 11,383 hectares which, according to local government statistics, is the area in these seven kebele, outside the project area, used for multiple purposes including cropping, grazing and fodder development. It is not possible to explicitly separate areas for each of these purposes, as many areas have multiple or seasonal uses, and crop residue from these areas is used as animal fodder. It has been determined that this area could accommodate an average of 1.5 ox / cow / bulls per hectare, a total of 17,075 animals, the current population of EGL is 8,684 ox/cow/bulls as well as 2288 goats. The TARAM spreadsheet³³ calculates the total biomass consumed by both goats and ox/cow/bulls using equations 32-42 and the total biomass requirement from Na_{BL} is less than is provided by EGL, therefore in the case that no pasture production was available from the project site (cut and carry) leakage would still be zero. Photo B-5 below demonstrates the extent of farming and grazing land within a 10-km radius of the project site.




Photo B-5 Humbo Site radius of 10km demonstrating no areas of remaining forest cover



Photo B-6 Farmers carrying grass after cutting – the 'cut and carry' method.

³³ TARAM V1.3_HAR_ETHIOPIA (APRIL 5 2009).xls

Leakage from the clearing of vegetation for fencing material

There will be no leakage due to the clearing of vegetation for fencing material, as live fences will be utilised.

Table B-11: Annual and cumulative leakage emissions associated with the project

| Year | Annual leakage emissions (t CO ₂ -e.yr ⁻¹) |
|--|--|
| 2007 | - |
| 2008 | - |
| 2009 | - |
| 2010 | - |
| 2011 | - |
| 2012 | - |
| 2013 | - |
| 2014 | - |
| 2015 | - |
| 2016 | - |
| 2017 | - |
| 2018 | - |
| 2019 | - |
| 2020 | - |
| 2021 | - |
| 2022 | - |
| 2023 | - |
| 2024 | - |
| 2025 | - |
| 2026 | - |
| 2027 | - |
| 2028 | - |
| 2029 | - |
| 2030 | - |
| 2031 | - |
| 2032 | - |
| 2033 | - |
| 2034 | - |
| 2035 | - |
| 2036 | - |
| Total Estimated leakage (t CO₂ e) | - |
| Total number of crediting years | - |
| Annual average leakage over the crediting period (t CO₂ e) | - |

B.6.2. Data and parameters fixed ex ante*(Copy this table for each piece of data or parameter.)*

| | |
|--|---|
| Data/Parameter | CF _j |
| Data unit | tonnes C |
| Description | Carbon fraction of species, j |
| Source of data | Local, national, GPG for LULUCF IPCC |
| Value(s) applied | 0.5 |
| Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comment | Local-derived and species-specific value have the priority (IPCC default = 0.5) |

| | |
|--|--|
| Data/Parameter | 44/12 |
| Data unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Ratio of molecular weights of Carbon and CO ₂ |
| Source of data | Universal constant |
| Value(s) applied | 44/12 |
| Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures | Not applicable |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comment | Not applicable |

| | |
|--|--|
| Data/Parameter | 16/12 |
| Data unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Ratio of molecular weights of CH ₄ and carbon |
| Source of data | Universal constant |
| Value(s) applied | 16/12 |
| Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comment | Not applicable |

| | |
|--|---|
| Data/Parameter | 44/28 |
| Data unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Ratio of molecular weights of N ₂ O and Nitrogen |
| Source of data | Universal constant |
| Value(s) applied | 44/28 |
| Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comment | |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|--|---|
| Data/Parameter | <i>Confidence level</i> |
| Data unit | % |
| Description | <i>Confidence level</i> |
| Source of data | AR-CDM-PDD |
| Value(s) applied | 95% |
| Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures | Not applicable |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comment | For the purpose of QA/QC and measuring and monitoring precision control |

| | |
|--|--|
| Data/Parameter | P |
| Data unit | % |
| Description | Desired level of precision |
| Source of data | Defined |
| Value(s) applied | 10% |
| Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comment | For QA/QC and measuring and monitoring precision control |

| | |
|--|--|
| Data/Parameter | GWPC4 |
| Data unit | - |
| Description | Global warming potential for CH ₄ |
| Source of data | IPCC literature - EB decisions |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comment | (IPCC default = 21) |

| | |
|--|--|
| Data/Parameter | <i>R_i</i> |
| Data unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Root to shoot ratio |
| Source of data | Local-derived, national inventory |
| Value(s) applied | Natural regeneration by broad category 0.27 <i>Eucalyptus</i> spp. 0.29 <i>Grevillea</i> spp. 0.27 |
| Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures | |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comment | Local-derived and species-specific value have the priority |

| | |
|--|---|
| Data/Parameter | XF |
| Data unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Plot expansion factor from per plot values to per hectare values (Eq. 76) |
| Source of data | Calculations |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comment | (Eq. 78) |

| | |
|--|--|
| Data/Parameter | Za/2 |
| Data unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Value of the statistic z (normal probability density function), for $\alpha = 0.05$ (implying a 95 % confidence level) |
| Source of data | statistic book |
| Value(s) applied | 95% |
| Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comment | |

B.6.3. Ex ante calculation of net anthropogenic removals

Ex-ante calculations are provided in the TARAM V1.3_HAR_ETHIOPIA_—(APRIL—5 200920_October_2018).xls

The ex ante estimates of net anthropogenic removals have been revised due to the re-stratification of the project area in Monitoring Period 1 and reduction in the area of Strata 3 by 4.07 hectares in Monitoring Period 2 due to construction of a road leading to removal of regenerated biomass. Overall, this has led to a reduction in the ex ante estimate by 17,113 tCO₂-e. The original estimate for total ex ante estimate was 880,295.9 whilst the revised figure is 863,183.0 tCO₂-e. The majority of the change is due to the re-stratification whilst the contribution of the road to the overall change is -823 tCO₂-e.

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

B.6.4. Summary of ex ante estimates of net anthropogenic removals

| Year | Baseline net removals (t CO ₂ e) | Actual net removals (t CO ₂ e) | Leakage (t CO ₂ e) | Net anthropogenic removals (t CO ₂ e) | Cumulative anthropogenic removals (t CO ₂ e) |
|--------|---|---|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Year 1 | 0 | -30871.0-25594.3 | | -30871.0-25594.3 | -30871.0-25594.3 |

Formatted Table

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | | | | |
|---------|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Year 2 | 0 | <u>19643.8</u> 14399.6 | <u>19643.81</u> 4399.6 | <u>-11227.2</u> 11194.6 |
| Year 3 | 0 | <u>23163.4</u> 19294.4 | <u>23163.41</u> 9294.4 | <u>11936.28096.4</u> |
| Year 4 | 0 | <u>27995.3</u> 27639.3 | <u>27995.32</u> 7639.3 | <u>39931.535735.7</u> |
| Year 5 | 0 | <u>31184.5</u> 34133.0 | <u>31184.53</u> 4133.0 | <u>71116.169868.7</u> |
| Year 6 | 0 | <u>34438.0</u> 38196.7 | <u>34438.03</u> 8196.7 | <u>105554.1140806</u> 5.5 |
| Year 7 | 0 | <u>37534.2</u> 41373.5 | <u>37534.24</u> 1373.5 | <u>143088.314943</u> 9.0 |
| Year 8 | 0 | <u>40595.3</u> 44077.3 | <u>40595.34</u> 4077.3 | <u>183683.619354</u> 6.3 |
| Year 9 | 0 | <u>43623.6</u> 46603.8 | <u>43623.64</u> 6603.8 | <u>227307.124012</u> 0.1 |
| Year 10 | 0 | <u>48003.1</u> 50393.4 | <u>48003.15</u> 0393.4 | <u>275310.329054</u> 3.5 |
| Year 11 | 0 | <u>47825.2</u> 47538.0 | <u>47825.24</u> 7538.0 | <u>323135.433805</u> 1.5 |
| Year 12 | 0 | - <u>113393.3</u> -86275.8 | - <u>113393.3</u> -86275.8 | <u>209742.125477</u> 5.7 |
| Year 13 | 0 | <u>46104.7</u> 30826.3 | <u>46104.73</u> 0826.3 | <u>255846.828260</u> 2.0 |
| Year 14 | 0 | <u>48796.3</u> 33685.2 | <u>48796.33</u> 3685.2 | <u>304643.131628</u> 7.3 |
| Year 15 | 0 | <u>47463.2</u> 38862.1 | <u>47463.23</u> 8862.1 | <u>352106.335514</u> 9.3 |
| Year 16 | 0 | <u>45926.5</u> 46164.7 | <u>45926.54</u> 6164.7 | <u>398032.840134</u> 4.0 |
| Year 17 | 0 | <u>44974.6</u> 45880.3 | <u>44974.64</u> 5880.3 | <u>443007.344719</u> 4.3 |
| Year 18 | 0 | <u>44933.3</u> 47027.1 | <u>44933.34</u> 7027.1 | <u>487940.749422</u> 1.4 |
| Year 19 | 0 | <u>45003.3</u> 47027.1 | <u>45003.34</u> 7027.1 | <u>532944.054124</u> 8.6 |
| Year 20 | 0 | <u>45247.1</u> 47027.1 | <u>45247.14</u> 7027.1 | <u>578191.158827</u> 5.7 |
| Year 21 | 0 | <u>45003.3</u> 47027.1 | <u>45003.34</u> 7027.1 | <u>623194.463530</u> 2.9 |
| Year 22 | 0 | - <u>111948.0</u> -82661.0 | - <u>111948.0</u> -82661.0 | <u>511246.355264</u> 1.9 |
| Year 23 | 0 | <u>42847.1</u> 27601.9 | <u>42847.12</u> 7601.9 | <u>554093.458024</u> 3.8 |
| Year 24 | 0 | <u>44325.7</u> 27601.9 | <u>44325.72</u> 7601.9 | <u>598419.160784</u> 5.7 |
| Year 25 | 0 | <u>44619.4</u> 37314.5 | <u>44619.43</u> 7314.5 | <u>643038.564516</u> 0.2 |
| Year 26 | 0 | <u>44415.4</u> 47027.1 | <u>44415.44</u> 7027.1 | <u>687454.069218</u> 7.3 |
| Year 27 | 0 | <u>45007.9</u> 47027.1 | <u>45007.94</u> 7027.1 | <u>732461.973924</u> 4.5 |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Year 28 | 0 | <u>45007.9</u> <u>47027.1</u> | | <u>45007.94</u> <u>7027.1</u> | <u>777469.878624</u> <u>4.6</u> |
| Year 29 | 0 | <u>45007.9</u> <u>47027.1</u> | | <u>45007.94</u> <u>7027.1</u> | <u>822477.783326</u> <u>8.8</u> |
| Year 30 | 0 | <u>40705.3</u> <u>47027.1</u> | | <u>40705.34</u> <u>7027.1</u> | <u>863183.088029</u> <u>5.9</u> |
| Total | | <u>863183.088029</u> <u>5.9</u> | | <u>863183.0880295</u> <u>9</u> | |
| Total number of crediting years | | 30 | | 30 | |
| Annual average over the crediting period | | <u>2934328772.82</u> | | <u>2877229343.82</u> | |

B.7. Monitoring plan

B.7.1. Data and parameters to be monitored:

The approved methodology proposes methods for monitoring the following elements:

- The project boundary, forest establishment, and forest management activities;
- Actual net GHG removals by sinks including changes in carbon stock in above-ground biomass and below-ground biomass, increase in GHG emissions within the project boundary due to site preparation, transportation, thinning, logging and fertilization;
- Leakage due to displacement of grazing and fuelwood collection activities,

A Quality Assurance/Quality Control plan, including field measurements, data collection verification, data entry and archiving will be implemented as part of the monitoring plan of the proposed AR CDM project activity to ensure the integrity of data collected.

Monitoring of forest establishment and management

a) Monitoring of the project boundary

The project boundary is used to delineate the project area. The location of each node of the project boundary will be measured during fieldwork and archived in the database. The project boundary would need to be monitored at periodic intervals such as site preparation, planting, silvicultural operations, fire risk assessment etc. Results of the monitoring will be inserted in the database and stored electronically and in paper formats.

Table B-1 Data for monitoring of the project boundary

| | |
|--|--|
| Data/Parameter | Project boundaries |
| Data Unit | % |
| Description | GPS points to be measured |
| Source of data | Field measurements |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | GPS |
| Monitoring frequency | At verification |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | A random sample of 1% of original GPS points will be monitored at each verification to ensure accuracy of project boundary |

b) Monitoring of the forest establishment:

To ensure the planting quality and forest establishment, the following monitoring activities will be conducted:

- Confirm that site and soil preparation are implemented based on practice documented in section A, no slash and burn and overall tillage will be used in the site and soil preparation.
- Survival rate checking
 - The initial survival rate of planted trees will be checked three months after the planting, and re-planting will be conducted if the survival rate is lower than 90%.
 - Final survival checking will be carried out three years after the planting.
 - Survival checking will be conducted for each plantation site.
- Weeding checking: to check and confirm that the weeding practice where necessary is implemented.
- Surveying and checking the area of planted species and planting year for each stratum and sub-stratum.

Table B-2 Data for monitoring forest establishment

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | Site preparation |
| Data Unit | Yes/No |
| Description | Sites that were disturbed during pit preparation |
| Source of data | Entire project area |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At vegetation removal |
| QA/QC procedures | Not applicable |
| Purpose of data | Baseline net removals |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | Seedling survival |
| Data Unit | % |
| Description | % of seedlings relative to target stocking density |
| Source of data | Permanent sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Quarterly year 1(3-months after planting), then annually up to year 3 |
| QA/QC procedures | Not applicable |
| Purpose of data | Not applicable |
| Additional comments | Replanting required if less than 90% survival |

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Weeding efficacy |
| Data Unit | Yes/No |
| Description | Efficacy of weeding |
| Source of data | Permanent sample plots |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | Not applicable |
| Monitoring frequency | Quarterly year 1 (3-months after planting), then annually up to 1 year after the last planting date |
| QA/QC procedures | Not applicable |
| Purpose of data | Baseline net removals |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Area of planted strata |
| Data Unit | Ha |
| Description | |
| Source of data | All boundaries monitored |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | GPS |
| Monitoring frequency | At the end of year 1 |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | |

c) Monitoring of forest management:

To ensure the forest management is well implemented the following monitoring activities will be conducted in the first three years after planting:

- Cleaning and site preparation measures: date, location, area, biomass removed and other measures undertaken;
- Planting: date, location, area, tree species (establishment of the stand models);
- Thinning: date, location, area, tree species, thinning intensity, volumes or biomass removed; Harvesting: date, location, area, tree species, volumes or biomass removed;
- Coppicing: date, location, area, tree species, volumes or biomass removed;
- Fuel wood collection: date, location, area, tree species, volumes or biomass removed;
- Checking and confirming that harvested lands are re-planted, re-sowed or coppiced as planned or as required by forest law;
- Checking and ensuring that good conditions exist for natural regeneration if harvested lands are allowed to regenerate naturally;
- Monitoring of disturbances: date, location, area (GPS coordinates and remote sensing, as applicable), tree species, type of disturbance, biomass lost, implemented corrective measures, change in the boundary of strata and stands.

Table B3 Monitoring of forest management

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | Site preparation – date |
| Data Unit | Date |
| Description | |
| Source of data | |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Project start |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Baseline net removals |
| Additional comments | <i>Assessment of FMNR (see Section A6)</i> |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Site preparation – location |
| Data Unit | Parcel ID |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Project start |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Baseline net removals |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Site preparation – area |
| Data Unit | Ha |
| Description | |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Project start |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Baseline net removals |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Site preparation – biomass loss |
| Data Unit | tonnes |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Project start |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Baseline net removals |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Planting/Replanting – date |
| Data Unit | Date |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At project start/rotation |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Baseline net removals |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Planting/Replanting - location |
| Data Unit | Parcel ID |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At project start/rotation |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Baseline net removals |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Planting/Replanting – area |
| Data Unit | Hectares |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At project start/rotation |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Baseline net removals |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Planting/Replanting - species |
| Data Unit | Species |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At project start/rotation |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Baseline net removals |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Planting/Replanting |
| Data Unit | Stems/Ha |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At project start/rotation |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Baseline net removals |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | Management -Thinning/ harvesting/coppicing - date |
| Data Unit | Date |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At project start/rotation |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Baseline net removals |
| Additional comments | |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | Management -Thinning/ harvesting/coppicing - location |
| Data Unit | Parcel ID |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | periodic |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | Management -Thinning/ harvesting/coppicing - area |
| Data Unit | Hectares |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | periodic |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | Management -Thinning/ harvesting/coppicing - species |
| Data Unit | Species |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | periodic |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | Management -Thinning/ harvesting/coppicing - volume |
| Data Unit | M ³ |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | periodic |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comments | |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Fuel wood collection – date |
| Data Unit | Date |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | periodic |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Fuel wood collection – Location |
| Data Unit | Parcel ID |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | periodic |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Fuel wood collection – Area |
| Data Unit | Hectares |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | periodic |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Fuel wood collection – Species |
| Data Unit | Species |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | periodic |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Additional comments | |
|---------------------|--|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Fuel wood collection - volume |
| Data Unit | M³ |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | periodic |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Disturbances – date |
| Data Unit | Date |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At occurrence |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Disturbances – location |
| Data Unit | Parcel ID |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At occurrence |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Disturbances – Area |
| Data Unit | Hectares |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At occurrence |
| QA/QC procedures | |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Purpose of data | |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Disturbances – Species |
| Data Unit | Species |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At occurrence |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Disturbances – Type |
| Data Unit | |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At occurrence |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | Disturbance – biomass loss |
| Data Unit | Tonnes |
| Description | |
| Source of data | sample plots |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At occurrence |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | |
| Additional comments | |

d) Monitoring of the actual net GHG removals by sink:

Actual GHG removals will be estimated using data for biomass growth. The biomass growth will be calculated as a function of growth volume estimated. The estimated growth volume for the first stand model of mixed native species is based on the GPG-LULUCF data tables (3A.1.2 and 3A.1.3) as well as in field measurements. For the second stand model involving a mixed plantation of *Eucalyptus globulus* and *Grevillea robusta* the growth volume is based on available literature^{34, 35}.

1. Native species stand model: The data on forest type relevant for the region based on the GPG-LULUCF data tables (3A.1.2 and 3A.1.3) is used for projecting the carbon stock. In addition, expert consultations to assess the stand density improvement as a result of measures implemented to protect and promote the project regeneration. The monitoring data will be used to assess the overlap of *ex ante* and *ex post* forest growth projections. The strata 1 to 4 represent native species stand model.

2. Plantation stand model: In areas without regeneration, naturalized species, *Eucalyptus globulus* and *Grevillea robusta* are planted. The monitoring data on plantation growth will be used to make the *ex post* biomass projection. The stratum 5 represents planted area involving mixtures of *Eucalyptus globulus* and *Grevillea robusta*.

| Year | Stratum 1 | Stratum 2 | Stratum 3 | Stratum 4 | Stratum 5 | Total |
|--------------|------------|------------|-------------|-----------|------------|--------------|
| 2006-07 | 23420 | 631589 | 16991324 | 11495 | 5311 | 2689281 |
| 2007-08 | | | | | 22164 | 16422 |
| 2008-09 | | | | | 1467 | 1467 |
| 2009-10 | | | | | 4140 | 1404 |
| 2010-11 | | | | | 6 | 6 |
| 2015-15 | | | -4.07 | | | -4 |
| Total | 220 | 589 | 1324 | 95 | 500 | 27248 |

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Data to be collected in order to monitor the verifiable changes in carbon stock in the carbon pools within the project boundary resulting from the proposed A/R CDM project activity:

Step-wise procedures (BEF method) and equation (66) - (81) in Section III.5.1 of the approved baseline and monitoring methodology (AR-AM0003/version will be followed to monitor the verifiable carbon stock changes in the above-ground and below-ground living biomass within the project boundary.

Table B-4: Data to be collected and archived for actual net GHG removals by sinks

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | A |
| Data Unit | Hectares |
| Description | Total size of all strata (A) , e.g. the total project area |
| Source of data | GIS or/and GPS |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | GIS & GPS |
| Monitoring frequency | Before the start of the project and adjusted thereafter every 5-year |

³⁴ <http://www.fao.org/docrep/004/ac121e/ac121e04.htm#bm04.3>

³⁵ <http://www.fao.org/docrep/s4550e/s4550e0b.htm>

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Data/Parameter | <i>A P</i> |
| Data Unit | m ² |
| Description | Sample plot area |
| Source of data | Field measurement |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | GIS & GPS |
| Monitoring frequency | 5-year |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | <i>A B, i k t</i> |
| Data Unit | Hectares |
| Description | Area of slash and burn in stratum i, species j, at time t |
| Source of data | Measurement |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | GIS & GPS |
| Monitoring frequency | yearly |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | Measured for different strata and stands |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | <i>A i k t</i> |
| Data Unit | Hectares |
| Description | Area if stratum i, stand model k, at time t |
| Source of data | GIS or/and GPS |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | GIS & GPS |
| Monitoring frequency | Before the start of the project and adjusted thereafter every 5-year |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | Measured for different strata and stands |

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | <i>CSP diesel t</i> |
| Data Unit | liter (l) |
| Description | Amount of diesel consumption for year t |
| Source of data | Measurement |
| Value(s) applied | |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | yearly |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | Measuring either diesel consumption per unit area for site preparation, or per unit volume logged or thinned |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | <i>CSPg a s o l i n e t</i> |
| Data Unit | liter (l) |
| Description | Amount of gasoline consumption for year t |
| Source of data | Measurement |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | yearly |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | Measuring either gasoline consumption per unit area for site preparation, or per unit volume logged or thinned |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | <i>D B H</i> |
| Data Unit | cm (living/dead) |
| Description | Diameter at breast height of living and standing dead trees |
| Source of data | Plot measurement |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | 5-year |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | Measuring at each monitoring time per sampling method |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | <i>D j</i> |
| Data Unit | t d.m. m ⁻³ |
| Description | Wood density of species j |
| Source of data | Local-derived, national inventory, IPCC GPG LULUCF |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | 5-year |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | Local-derived and species-specific value have the priority |

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | EF 1 |
| Data Unit | tonnes N ₂ O-N (tonnes N input) ⁻¹ |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Description | Emission factor for emission from N input |
| Source of data | GPG 2000, GPG LULUCF, IPCC Guidelines, National inventory |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Before start of monitoring, once per crediting period |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | IPCC default value (1.25 %) is used if no more appropriate data |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | EF _{diesel} |
| Data Unit | kg CO ₂ l ⁻¹ |
| Description | Emission factor for diesel |
| Source of data | GPG 2000, GPG LULUCF, IPCC Guidelines, National inventory |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At beginning of the project |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | National inventory value should have priority |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | EF _{gasoline} |
| Data Unit | kg CO ₂ l ⁻¹ |
| Description | Emission factor for gasoline |
| Source of data | GPG 2000, GPG LULUCF, IPCC Guidelines, National inventory |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At beginning of the project |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | National inventory value should have priority |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | ER _{N2O} |
| Data Unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Emission ratio for N ₂ O |
| Source of data | Literature |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Yearly |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | (IPCC default = 0.007) |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | ERC H 4 |
| Data Unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Emission ratio for CH ₄ |
| Source of data | Literature |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Yearly |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | (IPCC default = 0.012) |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | <i>F_i (DBH, H)</i> |
| Data unit | Kg tree - 1 |
| Description | Allometric equation for species <i>j</i> linking above-ground tree biomass (kg tree-1) to diameter at breast height (<i>DBH</i>) and possibly tree height (<i>H</i>) measured in plots for stratum <i>i</i> species <i>j</i> , time <i>t</i> using a published equation applicable to the project. |
| Source of data | Literature or field measurements |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comment | Use local/global equations validated for local conditions |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | <i>G W P N 2 O</i> |
| Data Unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Global Warming Potential for N ₂ O |
| Source of data | IPCC literature - EB decisions |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Once per commitment period |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | (IPCC default = 310) |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | <i>i</i> ID |
| Data unit | Alpha numeric |
| Description | Stratum ID (1, 2, 3, ... m SP project scenario (ex-post) strata) |
| Source of data | Stand Map, GIS |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Actual net removals |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Additional comment | Each stand has a particular year to be planted under each stratum |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | <i>ID ikt</i> |
| Data unit | Alpha numeric |
| Description | Stand ID |
| Source of data | Stand Map, GIS |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comment | Each stand has a particular year to be planted under each stratum |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Data/Parameter | <i>j</i> |
| Data Unit | |
| Description | Tree species |
| Source of data | Project list |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | 5 years |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | Arranged in PDD |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | <i>k ID</i> |
| Data unit | Alpha numeric |
| Description | Stand model ID (1, 2, 3, ... i ...S PS) |
| Source of data | AR-CDM-PDD |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | 5 years |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comment | May require <i>ex - post</i> adjustments |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | <i>Lat/long</i> |
| Data Unit | |
| Description | Plot location |
| Source of data | Project and plot map and GPS Locating, GIS |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | 5 years |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | Using GPS to locate before start of the project and at time of each field measurement |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | <i>n</i> |
| Data Unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Sample size (total number of sample plots required) in the project area |
| Source of data | Calculations |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | 5 years |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | N |
| Data unit | Numeric |
| Description | Maximum possible number of sample plots in the project area |
| Source of data | Calculations |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comment | (Eq. 59) |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | N_i |
| Data unit | Numeric |
| Description | Maximum possible number of sample plots in stratum i |
| Source of data | Calculations |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comment | (Eq. 59) |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | n_i |
| Data Unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Sample size for stratum i |
| Source of data | Calculations |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Before the project start; adjusted thereafter every 5-year |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | 61 or Eq. 63) Calculated for each stratum |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | n_{TRPLkt} |
| Data Unit | Number |
| Description | Number of trees in the sample plot |
| Source of data | Plot measurement |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | 5 years |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Additional comments | Counted in plot measurement |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | <i>PBB_{i k t}</i> |
| Data Unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Proportion of biomass burnt |
| Source of data | Measured after slash and burn |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Annually |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | Sampling survey after slash and burn |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | <i>PBB_{i k t}</i> |
| Data Unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Average proportion of biomass burnt for stratum i, stand model k, time t |
| Source of data | Field estimates or literature |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Before burning |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | Used for estimating numbers of sample plots of each stratum and stand, as necessary |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | <i>PLID</i> |
| Data Unit | Alpha numeric |
| Description | Sample plot ID (1, 2, 3, ... pl,...) |
| Source of data | Project and plot map, GIS |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Before the start of the project |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | Numeric series ID will be assigned to each permanent sample plot |

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | <i>PL_{ik}</i> |
| Data Unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Total number of plots in stratum i, stand model k |
| Source of data | |
| Value(s) applied | Field measurement |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | 5-year |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | st_i |
| Data Unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Standard deviation for each stratum i |
| Source of data | |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At each monitoring event |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | Used for estimating numbers of sample plots of each stratum and stand, as necessary |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | t / D |
| Data Unit | Year |
| Description | Age of plantation (1, 2... years) |
| Source of data | GIS |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | At stand establishment |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | Counted since the planted year |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | $t r / D$ |
| Data Unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Tree ID (1, 2, 3, ... tr ... TR = total number of trees in plot) |
| Source of data | Field measurement |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | 5-year |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Actual net removals |
| Additional comments | |

e) Leakage monitoring:

Emissions associated with activity displacement will be monitored as part of leakage. No leakage is expected from the use of the wood posts for fencing. Moreover, as per EB42, monitoring of leakage associated with the use of fencing posts is not required as it is considered insignificant.

For the AR CDM project, activity displacement will be estimated as follows:

$$LK_{ActivityDisplacement} = LK_{grazing} + LK_{fuelwood}$$

$LK_{ActivityDisplacement}$ = Leakage due to activity displacement; tonnes CO₂-e.

$LK_{conversion}$ = Leakage due to conversion of non-grassland to grassland; tonnes CO₂-e

$LK_{fuelwood}$ = Leakage due to the displacement of fuelwood collection; tonnes CO₂-e

Leakage due to conversion of land to grazing land

The project will include the exclusion of grazing activities from the sites through physical and social fencing, which will provide opportunities for the existent vegetation to establish. There is anticipated to be no net leakage due to the relocation of animals from the project area in the 5-year period, as there are significant cleared land area available are under the control of the project participants.

Leakage due to conversion of land to grazing land is not attributable to the AR-CDM project activity if the conversion of land to grazing land occurs 5 years after the last measure taken to reduce animal populations in the project area. Monitoring of leakage due to the conversion of land to grazing land is therefore necessary only up to the fifth year after the last measure taken to reduce animal populations in the project area.

As per section III.7.1.1 of the AR-AM0003 methodology, leakage due to conversion of land to grazing land is not attributable to the AR-CDM project activity if the conversion of land to grazing land occurs 5 years after the last measure taken to reduce animal populations in the project area. Monitoring of leakage due to the conversion of land to grazing land is therefore necessary only up to the fifth year after the last measure taken to reduce animal populations in the project area.

Considering that leakage is not likely to occur as the existing grazing land is larger than the grazing need, there is no need to monitor the grazing activity outside the project border. For the implementation phase (first five years) the year and the proportion of the displaced animals will be recorded. This monitoring activity will be conducted through interviews of random sample of households. For the purpose, sample of 10% of households or up to a maximum of 100 random landowners are surveyed to inquire about the conversion of land outside the project area to grazing land.

Step 1: Monitor the grazing control measures specified in the AR-CDM-PDD. This is necessary to establish the actual date of the last measure taken to control animal grazing. Monitoring of leakage due to conversion of land to grazing land will not be necessary 5 years after this date because any conversion of land to grazing land would not be reasonably attributable to the A/R CDM project activity.

Step 2: The data on the average animal population at the start of the project is assessed and used to assess the number of animals displaced outside the project boundary.

Step 3: The average animal population, if any, displaced in the EGL areas is assessed by surveying project area and interviewing 10% of land/animal owners.

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

Considering the adequate availability of EGL, the animal population is not expected to displace to NGL areas and XGL. Therefore, steps related to animal displacement to NGL and XGL are **not** relevant.

Leakage due to fuelwood collection

The activity displacement due to fuelwood collection is not expected to occur as the amount of fuelwood produced from the project through pruning and thinning is expected to exceed the fuelwood collected from the sites under the baseline scenario. It is expected that the project will generate more than adequate fuel wood compared to the baseline, initially through pruning of existing vegetation to assist natural regeneration and later from planted woodlots, to satisfy the pre-project fuel wood collection.

As there is no leakage from fuelwood collection as a result of implementation of the project, the monitoring of fuelwood collection is **not** required in this project.

The data for monitoring of leakage assessment is outlined below.

Table B-5: Data to be collected and archived for leakage

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | $dNa_{EGL} t$ |
| Data Unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Number of animals displaced in EGL areas at time t ($dNa_{EGL} t$) |
| Source of data | Calculation |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | The project proposes to monitor activities that cause leakage as described in the monitoring plan (Appendix 4) |
| Monitoring frequency | Yearly/once in 5 years |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comments | 10% of the land/animal owners surveyed on number of displaced animals by year. For the early start projects once in 5-year survey is sufficient as year displacement is known through survey. |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | $Na_{EGL} t$ |
| Data Unit | Dimensionless |
| Description | Number of animals present in the sampled <i>EGL</i> areas at time t |
| Source of data | Field and household surveys |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | The project proposes to monitor activities that cause leakage as described in the monitoring plan (Appendix 4) |
| Monitoring frequency | Yearly/once in 5 years |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comments | Not applicable |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | NaBL |
| Data unit | Numeric |
| Description | Ex ante estimated pre-project number of animals from the different livestock groups that would be grazing under the baseline scenario |
| Source of data | Estimated at project start |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | The project proposes to monitor activities that cause leakage as described in the monitoring plan (Appendix 4) |
| Monitoring frequency | Yearly/once in 5 years |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage Emissions |
| Additional comment | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | Bijt |
| Data unit | Tonnes Dry matter per Hectare |
| Description | Average above ground biomass stock before burning for stratum i, species j, time t |
| Source of data | Field measurement |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comment | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Data/Parameter | CE |
| Data Unit | dimensionless |
| Description | Average biomass combustion efficiency |
| Source of data | GPG LULUCF, National inventory |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | GIS & GPS |
| Monitoring frequency | Before the start of the project |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comments | IPCC default value (0.5) is used if no appropriate value |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Data/Parameter | CF |
| Data Unit | tonnes C (tonne d.m.)-1 |
| Description | Carbon fraction of biomass burnt |
| Source of data | Local, national, IPCC |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Monitoring frequency | Once per crediting period |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comments | Local-derived and species-specific value have the priority (IPCC default = 0.5) |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | <i>Hijt</i> |
| Data Unit | m ³ |
| Description | Annually harvested volume and fuel wood for stratum i, species j, at time t |
| Source of data | Harvesting statistics |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Annually |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comments | Annually recorded |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Data/Parameter | <i>A_{N, i k t}</i> |
| Data unit | Hectares |
| Description | Area of with N applied in stratum i, stand model k, at time t |
| Source of data | Monitoring activity |
| Value(s) applied | |
| Monitoring methods and procedures | |
| Monitoring frequency | Yearly |
| QA/QC procedures | |
| Purpose of data | Leakage emissions |
| Additional comment | For different tree species or management intensity |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

The quality control procedures to be implemented to address the uncertainty of monitored data are summarized in the table B-6 below.

Table B-6: QA/QC procedures

| Data (Indicate ID number) | Uncertainty level of data (High/Medium/Low) | Explain QA/QC procedures planned for these data, or why such procedures are not necessary. |
|--|---|--|
| 3.3.1.17 Plot location | Low | Random plot verification using GPS to ensure the consistent measuring and monitoring of the carbon stock change over time |
| 3.2.06 Plot Area | Low | Random verification over the project area to ensure the area of each plot is correctly measured |
| 3.3.1.20 Number of trees | Low | Random plot verification |
| 3.3.1.21 Diameter at breast height (DBH) | Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Field staff will be trained in advance - Data checked by a qualified person in cooperation with the field team - To re-measure independently every 8-10 plots, and to compare the measurements to check for errors; any errors found should be resolved, corrected and recorded. The re-measurement of permanent plots is to verify that measurement procedures were conducted properly. - ca. 10% of the sample plots are checked after field work |
| 3.3.1.23 Tree height | Low | Random plot verification |
| 3.2.11 Root-shoot ratio | Low | Data that divert significantly from IPCC default value shall be verified |
| 4.1.7 Number of travelling vehicles | Low | The trip data are available in the project records and can be verified. |
| 4.1.9 Kilometres travelled by vehicles | Low | Project record shall be available and verified |
| 4.1.4 Number of animals | Low | Random verification by plot or village |
| 4.1.5 Number of months | Low | Random verification |

B.7.2. Sampling plan

>> The sampling procedures used in this project are described in AR-AM0003, section III 2.1 & 2.2.

a) Sampling Design

The project will establish nested plots in accordance with the guidelines of AR-AM0003

i) Type of plots

In order to monitor the project through time, permanent-sampling plots will be established and maintained. These will be managed in an identical way to the rest of the project, and will permit the most cost and labor effective form of forest monitoring.

ii) Shape and Size

Circular nested plots have been determined to be the most appropriate shape and type of plot for this type of project. Circular nested plots of 1m, 4m, 14m, and 20m in diameter will be established using distance measuring equipment and a fixed central point. Clinometer and relevant correction factor will be used for measurements of sloping lands.

iii) Number of Plots

The sample size (number of plots) will depend on the species variation within the stratified areas, however given that this is a biodiverse forest of mixed ages variation will be high. Precision has been predetermined at $\pm 5\%$. Preliminary data will be collected to evaluate variance, and following this the number of plots required per strata will be determined using equations 53 - 57 of AR-AM0003 version 04.

iv) Location of sampling plots

In order to avoid bias with regard to plot locations, permanent sample plots will be being located systematically with a random start. The geographical position (GPS coordinate), location, stratum and sub-stratum series number of each plot is recorded and archived. It is to be ensured that the sampling plots are distributed randomly, and as evenly spread as possible.

v) Monitoring frequency

Forest establishment will be conducted from 2006 to 2009. Permanent plots will be monitored every five years to assess actual above and below ground biomass accumulation.

vi) Measuring and estimating carbon stock changes over time

Carbon stock changes in above- and below-ground biomass on each plot are estimated using Biomass Expansion Factors (BEF) method. The below-ground biomass is estimated using root/shoot ratio read from Table 3A1.8 of the GPG LULUCF.

b) Stratification of the project area

Stratification is undertaken as prescribed in section II.3 of the approved methodology AR-AM0003 version 04.

Step 1: Stratification according to pre-existing conditions and baseline projections.

- a) Factors which could possibly influence carbon stock changes in the baseline scenario were identified. These included soil type, soil depth, rainfall, aspect, landform, erosion intensity, and level of anthropogenic pressure. Primary strata base was vegetation cover. To complement, soil samples were taken from major three strata and analysed at regional soil laboratory for its major nutrients and organic matter proportion (appendix 15)



Photo B-7 Soil pit used to assess soil type.

- b) Site classification information was collected and collated. This included information and maps on topographical, soil erosion, rainfall, aerial photography, vegetation, population, land management aspects and testimonies of village elders.
- c) Information on the pre-project distribution of ruminant animals was collected, and this indicated that there were 3998 ruminant animals on site, a mixture of oxen, bulls, cows and goats.
- d) A preliminary stratification showed that the anthropogenic pressure was a major factor influencing the baseline scenario, the details of which presented in section Appendix 10, page 16. The information confirming anthropogenic pressure as a major factor influencing the baseline scenario in the preliminary stratification included:
 - a. Preliminary measurements of pre-existing biomass on the project site. These demonstrated that the project area was in a low carbon state, and activities such as charcoal burning indicated that this carbon state was slowly decreasing.
 - b. Discussions with elderly residents of the area to determine previous land use, and the extent to which anthropogenic pressures have fluctuated. The PRA confirmed unsustainable use as the single factor determining the baseline scenario (Appendix 10).
 - c. Historical records to determine changes in land tenure and legal aspects of land use. The area has been „communal land“ since 1972 reflecting the large anthropogenic pressure and absence of rational land use.
 - d. Events that had in the past led to deforestation. The overthrow of the emperor Haile Selassie and transition to a communist government saw a shift in land management in 1972 which has continued to the inception of this project.
 - e. For final baseline stratification, information collected from the above sources was analyzed. The project team considered the legal and political changes that occurred between 1972 and 1975 and the deforestation caused in the project area, and the land tenure system contributed to the significant anthropogenic pressure. Based on the information collated in the baseline stratification analysis

Anthropogenic pressure has been identified as the only major factor that has significant impact on the baseline scenario. Other factors such as terrain and slope also influence the areas. The

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

anthropogenic pressure affects all land within the project sites and as a result, the baseline scenario is uniform across project sites, and the baseline scenario of degrading lands and the consequent loss of carbon is applicable to all project sites.

Based on the terrain, elevation, slope and location of the sites, we categorize the baseline into **four strata**.

Stratum 1: Southernmost part of the project with few scattered trees. This area is the closest to Lake Abaya, and is at lower in elevation than the rest of the project strata.

Stratum 2: It is in two sites, a small site to the north of the project with the major part of the stratum lies between stratum 1 and stratum 3. It has scattered trees and grass cover and is the least undulating of the project strata.

Stratum 3: It has the largest area and accounts for about 40% of the project area. It has shrub growth and encompasses the southern sloping aspects.

Stratum 4: It is the northern most part of the project and has shrub vegetation on rocky hillsides, with a northerly aspect.

Table B-7 Mean carbon density of the baseline

| | Stratum 1 | Stratum 2 | Stratum 3 | Stratum 4 | Total |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Area (ha) | 233.88 | 745.16 | 1653.9 | 95.14 | 2728.08 |
| Mean carbon density (tC/ha) | 8.850 | 3.503 | 8.727 | 7.09 | |

From the table C-1 it is clear that mean carbon density is very low or insignificant. Therefore, in the absence of the project, the project sites will see a continuing net decrease in carbon stored in the above and below ground biomass. Therefore, baseline of declining carbon stock will be relevant to all strata. Analysis of the project sites determined that there is no possibility for establishment of natural regeneration in the baseline scenario due to anthropogenic pressure. As a consequence, baseline carbon stock change for all the sites in the baseline is assumed to be **zero**.

Step 2: Stratification according to the planned AR CDM project activity:

For the purpose of the project, the *four* strata that are used to outline the baseline are used as a basis for stratifying into *five* (5) strata. The protection and management to promote natural regeneration of indigenous species is supported in **stratum 1 to stratum 4** and planting of naturalized species such as Grevillea and Eucalyptus implemented in areas that do not natural vegetation is identified as **stratum 5**.

Stratum 1: Southernmost part of the project with few scattered trees. This area is the closest to Lake Abaya, and is at lower in elevation than the rest of the project strata.

Stratum 2: It is in two sites, a small site to the north of the project with the major part of the stratum lies between stratum 1 and stratum 3. It has scattered trees and grass cover and is the least undulating of the project strata.

Stratum 3: It has the largest area and accounts for about 40% of the project area. It has shrub growth and encompasses the southern sloping aspects.

Stratum 4: It is the northern most part of the project and has shrub vegetation on rocky hillsides, with a northerly aspect.

Stratum 5: This stratum represents planting of mixed naturalized species – Eucalyptus and Grevillea on 50.79 ha of land that is identified as part of the baseline stratum 3 which has no pre-existing sprouts for natural regeneration.

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

In the project scenario, there are two stand models. The first stand model of assisted natural regeneration. is implemented on **project strata 1, 2, 3 and 4** described above. The second stand model, a mixed Eucalyptus and Grevillea plantation is implemented on **stratum 5**. The characteristic features of stand models are defined in Table B-8 and the species proposed in each stand model are outlined in Table B-9. For the second stand model, the decision to use Eucalyptus and Grevillea in an interplanted manner was made by the communities in order to secure diversified production. Both species are well known in the region and have an established demand.

Table B-8: Characteristic features of stand models in the project scenario.

| Strata Name | Species planted | Date of establishment | Area | Geographical location | Fertilizer application | Thin | Harvest | Coppicing | Replanting |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------|-----------------------|------------------------|------|----------|-----------|------------|
| Humbo 1 | See table C-3 | Jan-June 07 | 220 | See Map C-1 | None | None | None | Ongoing | None |
| Humbo 2 | See table C-3 | Jan-June 07 | 589 | See Map C-1 | None | None | None | Ongoing | None |
| Humbo 3 | See table C-3 | Jan-June 07 | 1324 | See Map C-1 | None | None | None | Ongoing | None |
| Humbo 4 | See table C-3 | Jan-June 07 | 95 | See Map C-1 | None | None | None | Ongoing | None |
| Humbo 5 | See table C-3 | Jan-June 07 | 500 | See Map C-1 | None | None | 10 years | Ongoing | None |

Table B-9: Species expected from natural regeneration (Column 1-4) and proposed (column – 5) for planting in the stand models of the project.

| Humbo 1 | Humbo 2 | Humbo 3 | Humbo 4 | Humbo 5 |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Pygeum africanum</i> | | <i>Pygeum africanum</i> | <i>Pygeum africanum</i> | <i>Shinus molle</i> |
| | | | <i>Hagenia abyssinica</i> | <i>Eucalyptus camaldulensis</i> |
| <i>Syzygium guineense</i> | | <i>Syzygium guineense</i> | <i>Syzygium guineense</i> | <i>Acacia saligna</i> |
| <i>Cordia africana</i> | | <i>Cordia africana</i> | <i>Cordia africana</i> | <i>Moringa stenopetala</i> |
| <i>Olea africana</i> | <i>Bauhinia tomentosa</i> | <i>Olea africana</i> | <i>Olea africana</i> | |
| | <i>Acacia nilotica</i> | <i>Albizia gummifera</i> | <i>Albizia gummifera</i> | <i>Acacia nilotica</i> |
| <i>Phytolacca dodecandra</i> | <i>Pakinsonia aculeata</i> | <i>Phytolacca dodecandra</i> | <i>Phytolacca dodecandra</i> | |
| <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> | <i>Podocarpus falcatus</i> | <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> | <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> | |
| <i>Crotalaria anchnocarpoides</i> | | <i>Crotalaria anchnocarpoides</i> | <i>Crotalaria anchnocarpoides</i> | <i>Mellia azadiracta</i> |
| <i>Rosa abyssinica</i> | | <i>Rosa abyssinica</i> | <i>Rosa abyssinica</i> | <i>Acacia saligna</i> |
| <i>Erythrina brucei</i> | | <i>Erythrina brucei</i> | <i>Erythrina brucei</i> | |
| | <i>Psidium guajava</i> | <i>Rubus apetalus</i> | <i>Rubus apetalus</i> | |
| <i>Ficus spp.</i> | | <i>Ficus spp.</i> | <i>Ficus spp.</i> | <i>Grevillea robusta</i> |
| <i>Croton macrostachys</i> | <i>Morus alba</i> | <i>Croton macrostachys</i> | <i>Croton macrostachys</i> | |
| | <i>Delonix regia</i> | <i>Carisa edulis</i> | <i>Carisa edulis</i> | |
| <i>Maytenus ovatus,</i> | <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> | <i>Maytenus ovatus,</i> | <i>Maytenus ovatus,</i> | |
| <i>Acacia abyssinica</i> | <i>Juglans regia</i> | <i>Acacia abyssinica</i> | <i>Acacia abyssinica</i> | |
| | <i>Hibiscus rosa</i> | | | |
| Live Fence | <i>Pygeum africanu</i> | Live Fence | Live Fence | |
| <i>Euphorbia abyssinica</i> | | <i>Euphorbia abyssinica</i> | <i>Euphorbia abyssinica</i> | |
| <i>Euphorbia tirucalli</i> | | <i>Euphorbia tirucalli</i> | <i>Euphorbia tirucalli</i> | |
| <i>Agave americana</i> | <i>Cordia africana</i> | <i>Agave americana</i> | <i>Agave americana</i> | <i>Cordia africana</i> |
| | <i>Olea africana</i> | 1324 | <i>Aloe abyssinica</i> | <i>Olea africana</i> |
| <i>Euphorbia scoparia</i> | <i>Albizia gummifera</i> | <i>Euphorbia scoparia</i> | <i>Euphorbia scoparia</i> | |
| <i>Euphorbia candelabrum</i> | <i>Phytolacca dodecandra</i> | <i>Euphorbia candelabrum</i> | <i>Euphorbia candelabrum</i> | |
| | <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> | <i>Aningeria adolfifericii</i> | <i>Aningeria adolfifericii</i> | |
| <i>Erthrina spp</i> | <i>Crotalaria anchnocarpoides</i> | <i>Erthrina spp</i> | <i>Erthrina spp</i> | <i>Crotalaria anchnocarpoides</i> |
| | <i>Rosa abyssinica</i> | | | |
| | <i>Erythrina brucei</i> | | | |
| | <i>Rubus apetalus</i> | | | |
| | <i>Ficus spp.</i> | | | |
| | <i>Croton macrostachys</i> | | | |
| | | | | |
| | <i>Maytenus ovatus,</i> | | | |
| | <i>Acacia abyssinica</i> | | | |


CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|
| | <i>Aningeria adolfiifericii</i> | | | |
| | <i>Erithrina spp</i> | | | |
| | Live Fence | | | Live Fence |
| | <i>Euphorbia abyssinica</i> | | | <i>Euphorbia abyssinica</i> |
| | <i>Euphorbia tirucalli</i> | | | <i>Euphorbia tirucalli</i> |
| | <i>Agave americana</i> | | | <i>Agave americana</i> |
| | <i>Euphorbia scoparia</i> | | | <i>Euphorbia scoparia</i> |
| | <i>Euphorbia candelabrum</i> | | | <i>Euphorbia candelabrum</i> |

Note: Species described under Humbo 5 are plantations over gap areas of strata 1, 2 & 3. While the other columns are species expected to regenerate naturally and already done so.

Step 3: Final ex-ante stratification:

The information presented in step 2 outlines the features of the five project strata, and the map representing the project strata is presented as the Map B-1 below.



Map B-1: Humbo ex-ante stratification (project stratum 5 is the sub-division of baseline stratum 3).

c) Sample size

Considering that the regeneration improvements expected in the project are dependent upon the state of pre-project vegetation, the project stratification takes into account the stratification used in the baseline scenario.

A total of *five* project strata are identified for the project scenario. The four strata identified in the baseline scenario were also adopted in the project scenario and the regeneration measures implemented in each of the four strata as part of the project scenario are considered as the project interventions. An additional stratum (stratum 5) is adopted for planting naturalized species in the bare areas under the project.

The steps and equations of AR AM0003 are used to calculate the sample size. The number of sample plots for each stratum is estimated as per the required accuracy. The costs of establishing sample plots across the strata were assumed to remain constant; therefore, these were not taken into account the sample size calculations.

For the purpose of stratification, the equations 54 to 57 are applied to calculating the sample size. The sample size calculation also corresponds to the method of samples drawn without

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

replacement under method I of the tool for calculation of number of sample plots for measurements within A/R CDM project activities, version 02(EB 46, Annex 19).

The average carbon stock in the region, expert judgment and literature information on the mean and standard deviation of the carbon stock under conditions similar to those expected under the project are used to calculate the sample size. For the purpose of sample size calculation of native species strata, a mean carbon stock of 114 tonnes/ha was used and a 33% standard deviation was assumed considering the likelihood of variability in the native species vegetation growth.

For Eucalyptus and Grevillea mixture, a mean carbon stock of 42 tonnes/ha and considering the mixture of species, the standard deviation of 33%, applied to native species context was used.

Based on the calculations, a sample size of 89 plots is estimated for the project. The allocation of plots to the strata is presented below.

| S.No | Stratum | No. of sample plots |
|------|--|---------------------|
| 1 | Project stratum-1 (regeneration improvement of native species) | 9 |
| 2 | Project stratum-2 (regeneration improvement of native species) | 27 |
| 3 | Project stratum-3 (regeneration improvement of native species) | 42 |
| 4 | Project stratum-4 (regeneration improvement of native species) | 4 |
| 5 | Project stratum-5 (planting of naturalized species) | 7 |
| | Total number of sample plots | 89 |

The adequacy of number of plots are assessed based on the growth measurements of the project scenario and the sample size is revised accordingly in order to calculate the carbon stock changes as per the targeted precision and within 95% confidence interval.

B.7.3. Other elements of monitoring plan

>>

Operational and management structure(s) that the project operator will implement in order to monitor actual GHG removals by sinks and any leakage generated by the proposed A/R CDM project activity

The proposed A/R CDM project activity will be implemented within the larger umbrella of the World Vision Humbo Area Development Program (ADP). Resources for the implementation of this project will be provided through World Vision Australia. Other programs within the Humbo ADP include HIV/AIDS prevention, food security, agricultural development, health and education.

The project management is based on community forestry association models used elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa³⁶, and will be based on the seven community cooperative societies which will be established. This type of associations is non-governmental, consisting of members of the public that are using and benefiting from the forest resources as well as government representatives and World Vision. The main role of the cooperatives is to manage the communal forests in close cooperation with the Ethiopian Agricultural, Rural Development & Forestry Coordination Office (ARDFCO) (woreda and kebele level government forestry staff), World Vision Ethiopia and World Vision Australia.

³⁶ For example the Dodolla community managed forest (www.fao.org/DOCREP/ARTICLE/WFC/XII/0145-C2.HTM), and TIST (<http://www.tist.org/>)

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

The community cooperatives will utilize the Southern National Nationalities and Peoples Region Rural Land Administration and Utilization Proclamation No 53/2003. This legislation allows for community groups such as these to manage and benefit from the forest resources, including „the making of local laws issued by the group, which are not in contravention with the proclamation" and "being responsible for natural and artificial resources found on the communally possessed land".

World Vision through the cooperatives will be responsible for the establishment and management of the trees, facilitating and supervising the implementation of the proposed A/R CDM project activity, and organizing and coordinating the measuring and monitoring of the actual GHG removals by sinks and leakage associated with the proposed A/R CDM project activity. All monitoring and measurement data will be archived in electronic and paper formats.

The ARDFCO and its district forestry offices will provide technical instruction on reforestation and forest management, and help to conduct the specific supervision of the implementation of the proposed A/R CDM project activity.

An expert team will be established to assist if any technical issues arise and also conducting verification of measured and monitored data.

SOPs and quality control/quality assurance (QA/QC) procedures applied

To ensure the net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks to be measured and monitored precisely, credibly, verifiably and transparently, a quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) procedure will be implemented,

a) Reliable field measurements

To ensure the reliable field measurements:

Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for each step of the field measurements, including the field measurements are followed.

Training programs on the field data collection and data analyses will be held for persons involving in the field measurement works. The training programs will ensure that each field-team member is fully aware of all procedures and the importance of collecting data as accurately as possible. To achieve this, both classroom examination and field examination will be conducted.

b) Verification of field data collection

To verify that plots have been installed and the measurements taken correctly:

- Randomly selected plots will be re-measured by teams other than those involved in the prior plot measurements
- Key re-measurement elements include the location of plots, DBH, and tree height.
- The re-measurement data will be compared with the original measurement data. Errors assessed in the prior measurements will be corrected and recorded and would be used to calculate the measurement error.

c) Verification of data entry and analysis

To minimize the possible errors in the process of data entry, the entry of field data and laboratory data will be reviewed by an independent team. Direct communication between all personnel involved in measuring and analyzing data will be used to resolve any apparent anomalies before the final analysis of the monitoring data is completed.

d) Data maintenance and archiving

Data archiving will take both electronic and paper forms, and copies of all data will be provided to each project participant for two years post the final verification. All electronic data and reports will

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

also be copied on durable media such as CDs and copies of the CDs are stored in multiple locations. The archives include:

- Copies of all original field measurement data, laboratory data, and data analysis spreadsheet;
- Estimates of the carbon stock changes in all pools and non-CO₂ GHG and corresponding calculation spreadsheets;
- Copies of the measurement and monitoring reports.

Proposed measures to be implemented to minimize potential leakage

To minimize the potential leakage in the form of fuel wood collection this project will establish some fuel wood plantations to offset potential project leakage, however these are a small proportion of the project area, and will be used for the communities' fuel wood supply rather than commercial purposes.

During project implementation, grazing activity will be discontinued and it will need to be minimized in areas where pruning and tending of existing root material is practiced. Landholders will still have access to the forest to „cut and carry“ the fodder which grows under the trees. The existing beneficiaries of grazing access in these areas have been included in discussion regarding the proposed changes in the management of the land resources, and their agreement to the process of area closure/restricted access will be required. At the project design stage, a reasonable sub-sample was contacted and they expressed strong support for the reforestation to proceed. The users understand the environmental impacts caused by the deforestation and see the importance of re-establishing the forest vegetation.

Additionally, leakage is also prevented by implementing following measures.

- The project will seek to identify alternate community grazing areas for the individuals impacted for the period of exclusion. The large contiguous nature of sites will make monitoring of grazing restrictions easier to manage.
- User rights will be granted to individuals, groups of families, or communities. This is expected to help reduce over-exploitation and encourage management of forest and fodder resources.
- There will be opportunities for long-term employment to some of the existing beneficiaries in the planting, tending and protection roles required for forest management.
- There will be an opportunity to protect the forest from excessive grazing and over exploitation once a certificate of ownership is delivered to a definite number of peasant associations.
- Training will be imparted to community members on livestock management as well as general forest management through the network of the seven community cooperatives.

The project proposes to monitor activities that cause leakage as described in the monitoring plan (Appendix 4).

Names of person(s)/entity(ies) applying the monitoring plan

| Name | Institution | Contact |
|---|---|---|
| <u>Rob Kelly</u> <u>Joseph Kamara</u> | World Vision Australia | <u>rob.kellyjoseph.kamara@worldvision.com.au</u> |
| <u>Assefa Tofu</u> <u>Chofore</u> <u>Kebede Regassa</u> | World Vision Ethiopia | <u>KebedeAssefa_Regassatofu@wvi.org</u> |
| <u>Hailu Tefera</u> <u>Ayele</u> <u>Tesfahun Eyoel</u> | World Vision Ethiopia | <u>TefahunHailu_EyoelTefera@wvi.org</u> |
| <u>Mr. Paul Dettmann</u> <u>Dean Thomson</u> | <u>Consultant</u> <u>World Vision Australia</u> | <u>paul.dettmann@bigpond.com</u> <u>dean.thomson@worldvision.com.au</u> |

SECTION C. Start date, crediting period type and duration**C.1. Start date of project activity**

>>

01/12/2006 is the starting date of the AR CDM project activity⁷ and is the beginning of the first crediting period.

C.2. Expected operational lifetime of project activity

>>

60 years

C.3. Crediting period of project activity**C.3.1. Type of crediting period**

>>

Fixed crediting period

C.3.2. Start date of crediting period

>>

01/12/2006

C.3.3. Duration of crediting period

>>

30 years

SECTION D. Environmental impacts**D.1. Analysis of environmental impacts**

>>

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

Upon investigation of the possible impacts of this project (January 2006), the project team considered the need to undertake a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment. As Ethiopian law does not require such an assessment for forestry projects, the project team undertook a preliminary Environmental assessment to determine if any negative environmental impacts were likely as a result of this project.

This environmental assessment report was produced in February 2006 (available upon request) which found no negative environmental impacts likely as a result of this project. A complete Environmental Impact Assessment was therefore deemed unnecessary⁷ and was not undertaken.

Summary of Environmental Assessment

The Humbo region has 1% of its original forest cover, and Ethiopia nationally only 2.7% of the high forests. Consequently, any large areas of native endemic vegetation are of high significance. Ethiopia has the fifth largest floral diversity of tropical Africa. It is estimated that Ethiopia is home to between 6500 and 7000 species of higher plants, of which about 12 per cent are endemic, therefore the potential biodiversity of this project is extremely significant.

The project area is approximately 20 km upstream from Lake Abaya, one of the biggest Rift Valley lakes, known for its crocodile, hippopotamus and fish resources. The lake ecosystem is in danger of sedimentation due to the high levels of eroded soil entering it each year. There is concern that, if large areas of steeper country are not revegetated, Lake Abaya may follow the same progression as Lake Alemaya in eastern Ethiopia, which has become completely depleted due to sedimentation.

Biodiversity

This region contains threatened species included in the IUCN red list associated with the temperate and tropical mountain forest habitats. Species identified within this region and belonging to this habitat include:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <i>Afrivalus enseticola</i> | Ethiopian Banana Frog (E) |
| <i>Caprimulgus solala</i> | Nechisar Nightjar (E) |
| <i>Grammomys minnae</i> | Ethiopian Thicket Rat (E) |
| <i>Heteromira fra sidamoensis</i> | Sidamo Bushlark |
| <i>Hipposideros megalotis</i> | Ethiopian Large-Eared Roundleaf Bat (E) |
| <i>Kerivoula eriophora</i> | Ethiopian Woolly Bat (E) |
| <i>Lycaon pictus</i> | African Wild Dog |
| <i>Panthera leo</i> | African Lion |
| <i>Vulpes pallida</i> | African Sand Fox |
| <i>Phoenicopterus minor</i> | Lesser Flamingo |

The project activities will enable the following biodiversity outcomes:

- The Humbo forest will provide habitat for birds, mammals and other native animals as well as species identified on the IUCN red list. The forest will provide a strategic corridor link between the Nechisar National Park, Lake Abaya and Lake Chomo. The Nechisar National Park has some 73 species of mammals and 342 species of birds including two endemic birds.
- Forest restoration and enrichment planting will directly increase the health and diversity of flora while improved habitat will result in breeding opportunities for fauna. Valuable tree species which are threatened will be targeted for enrichment planting. The areas that are bare lands and vulnerable to erosion will be re-vegetated through enrichment planting.

Soil protection

The project activities will enable the following soil protection outcomes:

- Revegetation will act as an anti-erosion mechanism and will help protect Lake Abaya and its natural habitat through reduction in soil erosion and improvement in water filtration. There will be fewer surges of water carrying heavy sediment loads into the lake.
- Reduced flash flooding and consequent deepening of erosion gullies will result in reduced loss of life and damage to property and to more stable agricultural production. This in turn will increase household income and reduce poverty levels. As poverty is reduced, there will be less pressure on community members to undertake activities that cause result in damage to forest lands.

Hydrology

The project activities will enable the following hydrological outcomes:

- Greater infiltration of water and build-up of topsoil will enhance forest growth.
- Greater infiltration of water will enhance water table re-charge thus ensuring continued potable water supplies for over 65,000 inhabitants downstream from the forest.
- As water supply becomes more stable for longer periods of year, wildlife will remain in the area for longer periods.
- The project activities will result in reduced flooding and landslide risks.

Building incentives to people to invest in sustainable land use

The project will model sustainable land management techniques, and will introduce incentive for communities to proactively manage forest resources for carbon outcomes, that will lead to other environmental benefits.

The project will enhance land management and contribute to ecosystem improvement throughout Ethiopia through demonstration and extension of project experience to other areas.

Risk analysis and countermeasures:

- ☐ **Species:** The use of native and naturalized species in mixed and mosaic planting patterns enable in promoting species that are suitable to the project site.
- ☐ **Fire and pest risk:** The risk of burning is a threat to the forests. This can be alleviated through technical and awareness raising programs to local farmers/communities, strengthening patrolling and monitoring, as well as maintaining a fire belt/break around the forest areas.
- ☐ **Site preparation:** Site preparation will disturb soil in the planting sites. The main technical measures to be employed in mitigating the impacts are to plant the trees with low density (1250-2500 trees per hectare), minimum site preparation cover the planting dimensions (40 cm X 50 cm in diameter or 0.2 m²), retaining the existing vegetation as much as possible (see section A.4.8). As a result, the surface area disturbed by site preparation is estimated to account for 2-5% of the total land surface. The hole will be dug along the landform contour in triangle form to reduce the soil loss. Therefore, the site and soil preparation will have minor negative impacts on original soil and vegetation.

None of these risks and/or negative impacts is considered significant to the long-term GHG removal potential of the proposed project.

D.2. Environmental impact assessment

>>

No significant negative environmental impacts which will occur as a result of this project have been identified.

No anticipated negative environmental impacts outside the project boundary have been identified as a result of this project, however a component of the monitoring plan (Appendix 4) will be established to capture negative environmental impacts to ensure that if problems do arise they can be dealt with.

Community members formed into user groups will meet fortnightly to discuss problems and share experiences, as a function of their cooperative management. Each month user group representatives will meet with local government and World Vision Ethiopia staff, who will prepare quarterly financial and narrative reports. Within this framework, if negative environmental outcomes do eventuate, these will be identified and remedial measures will be undertaken.

SECTION E. Socio-economic impacts**E.1. Analysis of socio-economic impacts**

>>

Agriculture is the main source of income for local communities in the project area. However, due to severe soil erosion, agricultural production has been negatively impacted. The mean annual

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

income per capita in the region is US\$ 81, with 68% of this coming from the agricultural sector. The population impacted by the project for site is 48,893.

In order to maximize the community benefits of the project, a participatory approach -involving community development specialist, sociologist, legal specialist and economist was implemented. Participatory rural appraisal (PRA) methods were adopted in interviewing and consulting with farmer households in the project areas to understand the local farmers/communities' preferences, wishes and concerns, so that the proposed A/R CDM project activity would better respond to their desires for livelihood development. Farmers have significant impact to the contractual agreement they enter into, including the legal nature of the organization actually selling the emissions reductions. Local farmers will participate in the reforestation activities such as site preparation, planting, weeding, pruning, thinning, harvesting, coppicing etc.

I. Positive Socio-economic impacts

It is expected that 8 kebeles will benefit from the proposed project directly. The main socio-economic benefits of the project include:

(1) Income generation:

All the communities will benefit either directly or indirectly from the project. The total income anticipated from the projects is approximately US\$ 1.5 million in CER revenue within the crediting period. The revenue from the sale of CERs will be used to meet the costs of project management, operations, maintenance and building the capacity of local community. The project will increase the availability of wood resources in the project area with the establishment of fast-growing naturalized species such as Eucalyptus and the improved productivity of the existing natural forest. It is anticipated that some 160,000 dollars of fuelwood will be harvested from the project over the crediting period.

(2) Benefit sharing.

As indicated above, nearly all kebeles, except Kokate, indicated that their communal land should not be subdivided into their respective sub-kebeles. Accordingly, all kebeles believe that the benefit accrued from the closed area should be shared by all members of the kebele. They also indicated that the benefits from the project should be spent on community priority development areas amongst which, water, both for drinking and irrigation, was the most suggested priority area by most kebeles. Flour mill, school (higher grades), road, health facilities (clinics, health officers and drugs) maintenance and control of gully formation are also the other priority areas suggested.

(3) Creating employment:

The proposed A/R CDM project activity will create approximately 9000 person-days of temporary employment in planting, weeding, and harvesting and resin collection activities. It will also create 12 long-term job positions during the crediting period. Most employment opportunities will be taken by the local farmers/communities involved in the proposed A/R CDM project activity.

(4) Sustainable fuelwood supply:

The local communities depend on fuelwood for cooking and heating. The proposed A/R CDM activity, especially the fast-growing naturalized species, will provide a more sustainable fuel source for local farmers.

(5) Technical capacity building:

Training on the application of the FMNR technique will occur during project establishment. This technique is a useful and cost-effective means of re-establishing vegetation on farmlands. The

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

project will serve as a demonstration of the potential for the root systems of existing natural vegetation to assist landholders in meeting their fuelwood needs.

(6) Community ownership:

The ability for this project to be replicated throughout other areas of Ethiopia will be influenced in large part by the legal structure upon which it rests. The concept of community forestry, with forest user rights is not new to Ethiopia: the GTZ project at Dodolla is one example of forest restoration following the incorporation of a community management group. However, examples of successful implementation are limited. This project will serve as a model to other communities on the inception of appropriate legal mechanisms which benefit both the community and the environment.

II. Potential socio-economic risks and countermeasures

(1) Cultural resources

There are no cultural relics and/or cultural reserve that have been identified in the project area, and consequently, no damage to non-replicable cultural property will occur under the proposed A/R CDM project activity. The project does not involve any sites for local social gatherings or spiritual activities, thus the project activities will not impact the normal local gatherings and religious activities. The protection and reestablishment of natural forest has widespread support from all the communities visited in the community consultation, and does not conflict with any significant cultural practices or sites.

(2) Economic risk

The only significant economic risk will be inability of the project to realize its full potential and loss or potential income to the community from the project and failure to realize the projected CERs. This risk will be mitigated through technical assistance and training to communities, sound project management and capacity building activities of World Vision. Coordination with local forestry agencies, forestry research and design institutions, as well as by the extension network of the forestry sector will assist in realizing the full potential of the project as sustainable natural resources management, climate mitigation and community development project.

III. Impacts outside the project boundary

No negative socio-economic impacts outside the project boundary have been identified as a result of this project, however the social mitigation monitoring plan (Appendix 4) is designed to identify negative socio-economic impacts to ensure that if problems do arise they can be dealt with.

E.2. Socio-economic impact assessment

>>

Not applicable

SECTION F. Local stakeholder consultation

F.1. Modalities for local stakeholder consultation

>>

A consultative workshop was held at Soddo during April 10-12, 2006. During this workshop, policymakers from Federal Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), Regional Bureau of Agriculture and rural development (BoARD), Cooperatives, Bureau of Forestry (BoFPD) and from Zonal and Woreda level various GO staff including Justice, Women Affairs and farmers' representative from 15 kebeles. In addition, people from WVA, WVE and WB Consultants presented their findings. A list of stakeholders endorsing the project is attached as Appendix 6. In

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

addition, a participatory rural appraisal (PRA) was conducted in 2008, in which communities were given the opportunity to comment on the project design and implementation so far, as well as identifying needs and suggesting ways of improving project design and implementation. The PRA is attached in Appendix 10.

F.2. Summary of comments received

>>

One of the main issues that came up during workshop discussion was the need for formation of farmers groups in to Cooperatives, and the importance of this task. Following all workshops, government staff agreed to play a role as active stakeholders during the preparation and implementation of the project. A further important commitment was the local Government agreeing to take the initiative to involve negatively impacted minority in the safety net program.

F.3. Consideration of comments received

>>

In responding to the comments and conclusions from the stakeholder consultations a Social Mitigation Action plan was prepared (included in Appendix 11). The main objectives of the Social Mitigation Action Plan are to:

- Ensure that the project fully benefits the local communities and is culturally appropriate and acceptable to the participating communities and other concerned stakeholders.
- Undertake adequate consultations with the communities living around the project area in order to ensure that the project is undertaken with their full consent and active participation.
- Identify and carry out full consultations with all members of the community that would be disproportionately affected by restricted access.
- Create appropriate mechanisms to avoid, minimize or mitigate the potential adverse impacts on the vulnerable members of the communities as a result of restricted access to the project area.
- Ensure that the members of the community that are affected by restricted access to the natural resources in the project area themselves define and propose activities as mitigation measures.

With the support of local government formation of the community cooperative societies was completed.

Papers on Federal Environment Policy, Regional Land Use Policy and Strategy, Climate Change and Global response, the respective Woreda Natural Resource Conservation strategy, the experience of Niger Regeneration Project, CDM, and WB Forestry, Community Development and Legal consultants' findings were presented. A group discussion/plenary presentation followed, with participants being invited to comment on the project. At the conclusion of the workshop all attendees endorsed and applauded the project.

SECTION G. Approval and authorization

>>

Letters of Approval from all parties who wish to be involved in the project activity have been provided and are enclosed separately.

Appendix 1. Contact information of project participants

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Organization name | BioCarbon Fund, The World Bank |
| Country | USA |
| Address | 1818H Street, NW, Washington DC 20433 |
| Telephone | 202-458-1873 |
| Fax | 202-522-7432 |
| E-mail | jchassard@worldbank.org |
| Website | www.carbonfinance.org |
| Contact person | Ms Joelle Chassard |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Organization name | World Vision Ethiopia |
| Country | Ethiopia |
| Address | AMCE-Bole Road, Bole Sub-City (PO Box 3330), Addis Ababa |
| Telephone | 251-116-29 10 78 |
| Fax | 251-116-29 33 46 |
| E-mail | Info_et@wvi.org |
| Website | www.wvi.org/ethiopia |
| Contact person | Mr Kebede Regassa |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Organization name | Government of Canada |
| Country | Canada |
| Address | 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2 |
| Telephone | 1-613-944-3010 |
| Fax | 1-613-944-0064 |
| E-mail | Tara.Preston@international.gc.ca |
| Website | |
| Contact person | Ms Tara Preston |

Appendix 2. Affirmation regarding public funding

No funding for the project is coming from Official Development Assistance.

Appendix 3. Applicability of methodologies and standardized baselines

Humbo Site Baseline Stratification

Introduction:

During forest biomass assessment forestland is stratified so that the heterogeneous forest will be divided into homogeneous areas in order to reduce variation and increase accuracy and precision between sample plots.

Objectives:

1. To stratify the project sites into homogenous group(s)
2. To increase accuracy and precision of the biomass stock estimate

Procedure:

The procedure followed for stratification is attached below. The major parameter used for stratification is vegetation cover (number of trees per hectare). Additionally, expert judgment for crown cover is applied to clearly differentiate one stratum from the other.

Steps followed:

1. Map of the desired site with defined boundary is obtained
2. Project site was stratified into four strata using the parameters indicated in the procedure specified for the stratification. Accordingly, four strata were identified. These are:
 - a) **Stratum 1:** - It is located at the South end of the site in a kebele known as Abela Gefeta. Number of trees per ha in this area is 207.
 - b) **Stratum 2:** - is an area with scattered tree/vegetation and open land dominated with grass. Number of trees per ha is 127. There are two separate areas with similar vegetation under the same stratum. The first part is adjacent to stratum 1 and geographically located at its North position while the other part is to the extreme North-West end of stratum 3. This second part has high potential for enrichment planting.
 - c) **Stratum 3:** - is covered with bushes and shrub on hillsides in a kebele named as Abela Longena. Number of trees per hectare is estimated to be 183. It is located between the two separate parts of stratum 2.
 - d) **Stratum 4:** - is situated extreme north, on opposite hillside of stratum 3 that is separated by Bolla Wanche Kebele administration. The stratum is characterized by scattered vegetation grown on a very rocky area that is difficult for planting. The number of tree per hectare is 95.
3. **Carbon pool determination:** - For the preliminary sample assessment, it was agreed to consider the aboveground live tree pool because the assessment is simply to determine the sample size for the baseline data collection.
4. **Shape and size of plots:** - To calculate the required number of sample size for the baseline survey, nested plots containing sub units of different sizes (1m; 4m; 14m and 20m radius) were used because of the presence of trees with changing diameter and stem density. In practice, the circle with radius 20m is not used because there was no trees with diameter >50cm at those plots.
5. **Preliminary sample plots:** - to determine the number of base line sample plots that are going to be used for monitoring purpose of the carbon stock changes throughout the project life time, 24 sample plots (6 from each stratum) were taken according to the source book for LULUCF page 15-16: see the data collected from 24 sample plots (Annex3-Table 1). The mean density and standard deviation per each stratum was calculated. Sample plots were systematically distributed in the respective stratum according to the following procedure:
 - a) Systematic sampling method is applied to locate the sample plots. To this end, a stratum is selected one after the other and the first plot is randomly located after crossing the forest boundary and moving 500 meter into the forest and the same distance is used between successive plots. Distance between plots is measured by fiberglass tape and compass is used for bearing.
 - b) Nested circular sample plots are used (the smallest circle with 1m; the second 4m, the third 14m and the fourth 20m radius). Since there was no trees found in diameter class >50 cm, the fourth circle was practically omitted.
 - c) In the first circle, diameter of trees at breast height (DBH) <5 cm; in the second 5 - 20 cm and in the third, outer circle 20 - 50cm were measured using caliper and diameter tape.

Table 1. Preliminary data collected on the baseline vegetation

| Strata | Diameter class | Diameter of stems (cm) at each plot | | | | | |
|--------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------|
| | | Plot1 | Plot 2 | Plot 3 | Plot 4 | Plot 5 | Plot 6 |
| 1 | <5cm | 1.7 | 2.8, 1, 2 | 3.1 | 1.8 | 2, 3.2, 2.9 | NA |
| | 5 – 20 cm | 5, 6 | 20, 11.5, 14.7 | 6.8, 6.5 | 5.1, 5.9 | 14.2, 12 | 6.6 |
| | 20 – 50cm | 24.6 | 20 | 30 | 22 | NA | NA |
| 2 | <5cm | NA | NA | 1, 1 | 3, 2.4, 2.1 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| | 5 – 20 cm | 5 | NA | NA | 5.2, 5 | 5.1 | NA |
| | 20 – 50cm | 27.6 | 26.8 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 3 | <5cm | 3 | 1.8, 2.9, 2.5 | 2.3, 2.7, 1.9, 2 | 2.3, 1.2, 3.2, 4.1 | 4.9 | 2.5, 2.2 |
| | 5 – 20 cm | NA | 5 | 5.3, 5, 5 | 7 | 6, 5.1, 6.1, 5.1 | 6, 10, 5.8 |
| | 20 – 50cm | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 4 | <5cm | 1.5, 1.6, 1.4, 1.6, 0.5, 0.5 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 3.1, 1.2, 1.8 | 2 | 2 |
| | 5 – 20 cm | NA | 5.2, 5.1, 5.2 | NA | NA | NA | 12, 10, 5.8 |
| | 20 – 50cm | 20 | NA | NA | 20.1 | NA | NA |

- 6. Mean Carbon density estimation:** - Based on the preliminary data collected from 24 plots mean carbon density was calculated using this formula ($\text{Biomass} = 0.2035 \times \text{dbh}^{2.3196}$) for dry lands from page 43 of the Sourcebook for Land Use, Land Use Change, and Forestry Projects (Timothy Pearson, Sarah Walker, and Sandra Brown, Winrock 2005).

Table-2. Mean carbon stock of the baseline strata

| | Stratum 1 | Stratum 2 | Stratum 3 | Stratum 4 | Total |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Area (ha) | 233.88 | 745.16 | 1,653.9 | 95.14 | 2,728.08 |
| Mean carbon stock (tC/ha) | 8.850 | 3.503 | 8.727 | 7.09 | |
| Standard deviation of carbon stock (tC/ha) | 8.560 | 2.75 | 3.53 | 5.44 | |

As the mean carbon stock of the baseline strata is very low and in the range of 3.5 to 8.8 tC/ha and because of the anthropogenic pressure it is degrading further. Therefore, the baseline scenario of all the four strata are assumed as **zero**.

7. Materials used during data collection:

1. GPS
2. Diameter tape
3. Calliper
4. Compass

5. Fiberglass tape
6. Clinometer
7. Digital measuring device (DME)
8. Scientific calculator

Appendix 4. Further background information on ex ante calculation of net anthropogenic removals

Intentionally left blank.

Appendix 5. Further background information on monitoring plan

1. Monitoring of the baseline net GHG removals

According to the methodology, the baseline carbon stock changes do not need to be monitored because the accepted baseline approach 22(a) assumes continuation of existing changes in carbon stock resulting in its further loss of regeneration ability. The proposed project activity proposes a fixed 30-year crediting period.

2. Monitoring of the proposed A/R CDM project activity

a) Monitoring of the actual project boundary

The procedures for monitoring of the project boundary are reflected in section B.7.1.

b) Monitoring of forest establishment

- Information on planting and area closure schedule, location, area and species planted will be recorded in plot journals and archived in the project database
- Information on area planted and closed for assisted natural regeneration each year in each stratum is confirmed through field surveys.
- Information on species composition and characteristics of planted species as well as pre-existing vegetation are recorded;
- The characteristics of stand models are recorded in the project database;
- The area and location of supplemental plantings undertaken to fill the gaps is recorded in the project database and identified on the strata maps;

Monitoring of post-planting activities to demonstrate the forest establishment

- Information on drainage, drought, and other climatic extremes that can impact stand establishment and stand growth will be recorded; Surveys are conducted annually for first 3- years to evaluate the survival rates and to fill the gaps and survival rates of planted stock should be established by undertaking surveys during the initial establishment period.
- Final survival check is conducted in the permanent sample plots at the end of third year of plantation and survival percent estimated from surveys conducted at the end of 3rd year is recorded in the project database. The survival percent at the end of the 3rd year will be reported for verification purposes.
- The number and periodicity of weeding, pruning, coppicing, and tending practices and frequency of the herbicide use will be monitored and recorded.
- Information pertaining to droughts and floods and other emergencies will be monitored and recorded and the area affected by them will be taken into account the ex post calculations

of the carbon stock changes.

- In case of fires, the causes, area affected, season, and duration of fire occurrence shall be also recorded and the emissions associated with the burning of biomass shall be calculated and accounted as part of project emissions. As per the fire management plan (see Appendix 10) a fuel inventory shall be maintained, and regular monitoring of fire risk indicators, fire risk mapping, fire-weather prediction carried out.

c) Monitoring of forest management

- Information on silvicultural management activities such as thinning, tending, pruning, harvesting, and other operations that influence the GHG removals by sinks will be monitored and the information recorded in the project database.
- Quantity of fossil fuels used in silvicultural operations, transport of equipment and personnel and other management activities carried out in the project boundary will be monitored and recorded and the quantity of fossil fuels used in the operations will be calculated and archived;
- As the project does not use fertilizer, GHG emissions fertilizer application will not be monitored and the emissions from this source are treated as zero in the project database.
- Information on the occurrence of natural fires or other natural or human induced disturbances and the area and the biomass affected shall be recorded and reported;
- Deviations, if any, in the forest management activities from those outlined in the project design document and the nursery and plantation establishment guidelines will be monitored and the reasons for such deviations will be recorded.

3. Monitoring the actual net GHG removals by sinks data

a) Stratification

Post stratification will be conducted to address the possible changes in project boundary and planting scheme in comparison to the project design. The post-stratification will address the changes in carbon stocks in comparison to the details outlined in the project design. Strata or substrata could be aggregated if they represent similar carbon stock changes. Otherwise, new strata could be defined.

b) Sampling frame and sample size

Considering that the regeneration improvements expected in the project are dependent upon the state of pre-project vegetation, the project stratification takes into account the stratification used in the baseline scenario.

A total of five project strata are identified for the project scenario. The four strata identified in the baseline scenario were also adopted in the project scenario and the regeneration measures implemented in each of the four strata as part of the project scenario are considered as the project interventions. An additional stratum (stratum 5) is adopted for planting naturalized species in the bare areas under the project.

The average carbon stock in the region, expert judgment and literature information on the mean and standard deviation of the carbon stock under conditions similar to those expected under the project are used to calculate the sample size.

The steps and equations of AR AM0003 are used to calculate the sample size. The number of sample plots for each stratum is estimated as per the required accuracy. The costs of establishing sample plots across the strata were assumed to remain constant; therefore, these were not taken into account the sample size calculations.

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

A sample size of 89 plots is estimated for the project. The allocation of plots to the strata is presented below.

| S.No | Stratum | No. of sample plots |
|------|---|---------------------|
| 1 | Project stratum–1 (regeneration improvement of native species | 9 |
| 2 | Project stratum–2 (regeneration improvement of native species | 27 |
| 3 | Project stratum–3 (regeneration improvement of native species | 42 |
| 4 | Project stratum–4 (regeneration improvement of native species | 4 |
| 5 | Project stratum–5 (planting of naturalized species | 7 |
| | Total number of sample plots | 89 |

The adequacy of number of plots are assessed based on the growth measurements of the project scenario and the sample size is revised accordingly in order to calculate the carbon stock changes as per the targeted precision and within 95% confidence interval.

c) Location of sampling plots

The permanent sample plots will be located systematically with a random start, which is considered good practice in GPG-LULUCF. This can be accomplished with the help of a GPS in the field. The geographical position (GPS coordinate), administrative location, stratum and sub-stratum series number of each plots will be recorded and archived. The sampling plots will be distributed randomly and evenly.

d) Plot size and shape

The following procedure will be followed:

- Systematic sampling method is applied to locate the preliminary sample plots. To this end, a stratum is selected one after the other and the first plot is randomly located after crossing the forest boundary and moving 500 meter into the forest and the same distance is used between successive plots. Distance between plots is measured by tape and compass is used for bearing.
- The circular sample plots are proposed for monitoring and measurement.
- Slope in percent of each plot will be used to estimate the actual plots using conversion factor is needed to adjust the plot dimensions.

The centers of the circular permanent sample plots are marked to facilitate the measurement of trees located on the plot at each inventory and subsequent inventories. The location of plots is recorded as they would need to be identified at the subsequent verification.

e) Frequency of monitoring

Permanent plots will be monitored every five years to assess actual above and below ground biomass accumulation.

f) Procedures for measurements of tree biomass

Tree diameter

The tree diameter is the diameter of a tree stem measured at breast height (1.3 m). (See Figure 1)

- ☐ The diameter is measured with a caliper. In cases of irregular stem forms or diameters above 80 cm the circumference is measured with the distance tape.
- ☐ The caliper is held perpendicular to the stem axis with the axis of the caliper pointing towards the plot center.
- ☐ The measurement is rounded down to full centimetres.
- ☐ The minimum diameter to be measured is 4 cm.

Trees with inclined stem axis are skipped if the measurement point at 1.3 m is outside the plot. Trees with inclined stem are measured if the bottom of the stem is outside but the measurement point of dbh is inside the plot.

Special cases of tree diameter measurement

1. Branch or knot at 1.3 m: One diameter measurement is done above and one below the disturbance, calculating the diameter as average of the two measurements.
2. Forked tree/twin stem above 1.3 m: It is considered as one single tree.
3. Forked tree/twin stem below 1.3 m: It is considered as two trees. Each stem is measured separately (and gets its own tree number).
4. Bifurcation at 1.3 m: In this case the measurement is taken below the bifurcation.
5. Measurement impossible: The diameter at breast height gets the value „0" and the reason is given as remark in Figure below.




Figure 1: Examples of diameter measurements.

Tree height

For each site, the yield class will be determined by measuring minimum three tree heights. If the tree heights of several trees are the same, one measurement can be used for several trees.

g) Procedures for the maintenance of equipment used in vegetation measurement

The procedures for maintenance of equipment used in vegetation measurement are outlined below. In case no ready guidance on the procedures is available, the recommendations of local forest management agency will be followed.

- ☐ When compass is used in the field, it is calibrated to compensate for the local difference between magnetic and true north (magnetic declination) and adjustment is completed in order to facilitate the recording of accurate bearing.
- ☐ It is recommended to use DBH tapes made of steel or aluminum, and cloth tapes should be avoided considering their propensity for wear and tear that could result in measurement inaccuracies.
- ☐ Pacing can be useful to establish the relationship between map and photo information with the measurements on the ground. One step represents half of a pace and two steps equal one pace. Therefore, crew should be trained in pacing on

flat ground.

Field recording of vegetation measurement data

The formats outlined below illustrate the details that would be collected during plot measurements. In addition, information specific to each stratum would also be collected as relevant.

Plot data form

| | | | |
|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|
| Stand /Plot ID | / | Overstory | / |
| Starting point | | Type class | / |
| Date | / / | Understorey | / / |
| Aspect/Slope | / | Groundcover | / / |
| Crew initials | | Weather | 1 2 3 4 |

Plot tree summary

| SNo | Spp | Crown class | DBH | Ht | Remarks |
|-----|-----|-------------|-----|----|---------|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

h) Calculation of volume

The pre-existing trees are common to the baseline scenario and the project scenario. Therefore, their volumes are expected to be similar. The volume of pre-existing trees will be measured in the subsequent inventories together with the new growing trees and subtracted from the measured volumes of the periodic inventories.

As the carbon stock in the baseline is in degraded state and survey results from participatory rural appraisal results indicate that the vegetation in the baseline is expected to degrade further under unsustainable use, the net baseline GHG removals by sinks are expected to be zero.

i) Measuring and estimating carbon stock change over time.

Step-wise procedures (BEF method) and equation (66)-(73) in Section III.5.1 of the approved baseline and monitoring methodology (AR-AM0003/version 03) will be followed to monitor the verifiable carbon stock changes in the above-ground and below-ground living biomass within the project boundary.

4. Monitoring GHG emissions by sources as the results of the A/R CDM project activity

There are no emission sources within the project boundary as there will be no clearing of vegetation for fencing material; rather live fences will be utilized.

Procedures for emergency preparedness for cases where emergencies could cause unintended emissions are adopted to address the fire risk.

The project will implement a fire management plan (see Appendix 10). The management plan includes guidelines on community participation in fire protection; fire prevention (e.g., fuel management, fire breaks.); fire pre-suppression (e.g. collection of fire intelligence); detection and early warning and reporting system, fuel assessment, equipment, communications, water supplies

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

and training of fire fighters; law enforcement and incentive systems; training, extension and public awareness programs

The area subjected to biomass burning would be assessed through field survey methods and recorded in the project database. The amount of non-CO2 emissions is assessed based on the CO2 emissions from biomass burning, to the estimation of non-CO2 emissions.

The data on combustion efficiencies adopted from the Tables 3A.1.12, 3A.1.14 GPG-LULUCF) and data on emission factors of non-CO2 gases adopted from Tables 3.A.15 and 3.A.16 of GPG-LULUCF will be used to estimate the emissions. The mean emission factors of CH₄ (0.012) and N₂O (0.007) released from biomass burning will be used in assessing the emissions from natural fires.

5. Monitoring the leakage

a) Leakage due to activity displacement

There is anticipated to be no net leakage due to the relocation of animals from the project area in the initial 5-year period, as there are significant areas of land which have already been cleared and are under the control of the project participants. The displacement of grazing is only expected to occur to EGL areas.

Displacement of fuelwood collection is not expected under the project. In addition, the amount of surplus land available for grazing and fodder collection and lower biomass density prevalent in the project boundary minimize the risk of grazing. Nevertheless, the project management would monitor the factors influencing the economic activities in the vicinity of the project in order to account the emissions.

Leakage due to fuelwood collection will be monitored in the first two years through field sampling. After the first two years of project implementation the project will generate enough fuel wood within the project area, initially through pruning of existing vegetation to assist natural regeneration and later from planted woodlots, to satisfy the pre-project fuel wood collection. $FG_{outside,t} - FG_{NGL,t} = 0$.

Leakage from the displacement of pre-project harvesting of fuel wood (including charcoal production) is calculated using equations 50 and 51 in the approved methodology AR-AM0003.

$$LK_{fuelwood} = \sum_{t=1}^{t^*} FG_t \cdot D \cdot BEF_2 \cdot CF \cdot \frac{44}{12}$$
$$FG_t = FG_{outside,t} - FG_{NGL,t}$$

where:

$LK_{fuelwood}$ = leakage due to displacement of fuelwood collection up to year t^* ; tonnes CO₂-e.

FG_t = volume of fuelwood gathering displaced in unidentified areas; m³ yr⁻¹

$FG_{outside,t}$ = volume of fuelwood gathering displaced outside the project area at year t ; m³ yr⁻¹

$FG_{NGL,t}$ = volume of fuelwood gathering in *NGL* areas and supplied to pre-project fuelwood collectors or charcoal producers; m³ yr⁻¹

D = basic wood density; tonnes d.m. m⁻³ (see IPCC GPG-LULUCF, Table 3A.1.9)

BEF_2 = biomass expansion factor for converting volumes of extracted round wood to total above-ground biomass (including bark); dimensionless Table 3A.1.10

CF = carbon fraction of dry matter (default = 0.5); tonnes C (tonnes d.m.)⁻¹

(pre-project fuel wood collection in the project areas has been estimated based on community consultations during project preparation and the baseline survey)

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| Variable | Data Type | Unit | Source |
|---|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Biomass Expansion Factor | Absolute number | ratio | From GPG tables |
| Basic Wood density | Absolute number | ratio | From GPG tables |
| Volume of fuelwood collection displaced to alternative location | Absolute number | Cubic meters | Measurement |

6. Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC)

To ensure the net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks to be measured and monitored precisely, credibly, verifiably and transparently, a quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) procedure will be implemented.

a) Reliable field measurements

To ensure the reliable field measurements,

- Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for each step of the field measurements, including all detail phases of the field measurements and provisions for documentation for verification purposes are proposed in this document and they will be adjusted periodically.
- Training courses on the field data collection and data analyses will be held for persons involving in the field measurement works. The training courses will ensure that each field-team member is fully aware of all procedures and the importance of collecting data as accurately as possible.

b) Verification of field data

To verify that plots have been installed and the measurements taken correctly,

- Randomly selected plots will be re-measured by teams other than those involved in the prior plot measurements
- Key re-measurement elements include the location of plots, DBH and tree height.
- The re-measurement data will be compared with the original measurement data. Errors assessed in the prior measurements will be corrected and recorded and would be used to calculate the measurement error.

c) Verification of data entry and analysis

To minimize the possible errors in the process of data entry, the entry of both field data and laboratory data will be reviewed by an independent expert team and compared with independent data to ensure that the data are realistic. Communication between all personnel involved in measuring and analyzing data will be used to resolve any apparent anomalies before the final analysis of the monitoring data is completed.

d) Data maintenance and archiving

Data archiving will take both electronic and paper forms, and copies of all data will be provided to each project participant. All electronic data and reports will also be copied on durable media such as CDs and copies of the CDs are stored in multiple locations. The archives include:

- Copies of all original field measurement data, laboratory data, data analysis spreadsheet;

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

- Estimates of the carbon stock changes in all pools and non-CO₂ GHG and corresponding calculation spreadsheets;
- GIS products;
- Copies of the measuring and monitoring reports.

7. Monitoring of environmental impacts outside the project boundary

Given the significant environmental benefits anticipated from this project, it is difficult to conceive negative environmental impacts outside the project boundary. In order to monitor these, the project manager will communicate the importance of recognising previously unforeseen negative environmental impacts outside the boundary. The project manager will establish a reporting process for community and cooperative members who manage the day-to-day aspects of the project. There will be an annual discussion with each cooperative to consider environmental impacts outside the project boundary.

8. Monitoring of socioeconomic issues

A Social Mitigation Action Plan has been developed (see Appendix 11) and monitoring and evaluation of the actual implementation of the mitigation action plan will be done in a participatory manner with the active involvement of the beneficiary communities. Such participatory monitoring and evaluation will be incorporated in each project implementation phase throughout the implementation period. This will help to generate feedback on the on-going activities and to take timely corrective actions where necessary. Relevant and measurable monitoring indicators will be put in place to effectively monitor actual results and identify possible gaps of social mitigation action plan.

Training schedule for field staff

The Project will employ an estimated 5 additional staff on site who will implement the project monitoring for net carbon sequestration from the project areas. Table 1 below identifies the specific staff training activities that will take place.

Table 1: Staff training activities for the implementation of the AR activity

| Activity | Trainer | Individuals Involved |
|---|--|---|
| GPS training | Ayele Admassu (World Vision Ethiopia GIS specialist) | Humbo ADP staff connected to the project |
| General Training on AR aspects of the Kyoto Protocol | Paul Dettmann (via power point presentations) | Assefa Tofu, Tesafaye Bekele, Asfaw Mariame |
| Training on monitoring and the requirements of the CDM, and project inception | Paul Dettmann / Bernhard Schlamadinger | Existing and new project staff |
| Farmer training on implementation techniques | World Vision Staff | Farmers and other community members |
| Leakage, due diligence, FMNR and project | Paul Dettmann, Tony Rinuado and Assefa Tofu | Project staff, ADP management and Program |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| | | |
|----------------------|--|-------------------|
| management | | Office Management |
| CDM Seminar/workshop | World Bank Carbon Finance Unit at Washington | Assefa Tofu |

Appendix 6. Summary report of comments received from local stakeholders

Enclosed as separate document.

Appendix 7. Summary of post-registration changes

The CDM Project Standard V1 paragraph 243 has been used to assess and report on the impacts of the proposed or actual changes to the registered CDM project activity using the following criteria:

- The applicability and application of the applied methodologies and, where applicable, the applied standardized baselines, with which the project activity has been registered;
- The compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodologies and, where applicable, the applied standardized baselines;
- The level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan;
- The additionality of the project activity;
- The scale of the project activity.

PRC 1 - Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan in relation to the parameter "weeding" which is no longer monitoredDescription of the PRC

The monitoring plan in the PDD currently specifies that weeding efficacy is to be monitored Quarterly in year 1(3-months after planting), then annually. However, planting finished in 2012 and weeding efficacy during the second monitoring period was no longer necessary to undertake once the trees became established. Therefore, the project proponent is requesting to make a permanent change to the monitoring frequency changing the protocol to Quarterly in year 1(3-months after planting), then annually up to 1 year after the last planting date. This change has been made to Table B-2 Data for monitoring forest establishment in Section B.7.1.

Assessment against Paragraph 243 of the CDM Project Standard V1

- The change to the monitoring frequency of weeding efficacy has no impact on the applicability or application of the applied methodologies and standardized baselines.
- The requested change is due to a non-compliance with the monitoring plan. However as weeding efficacy has no material impact on GHG reduction calculations, the proposed change in monitoring frequency will have no material impact on monitoring GHG sequestration across the project area.
- There is no impact on the level of accuracy on GHG reductions as weeding efficacy is not included in the estimation of GHG reduction calculations.
- The change to the monitoring frequency of weeding efficacy has no impact on the additionality of the project activity as the activities stay the same.

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

- e) The scale of the project impact is not impacted by the change in monitoring frequency of weeding efficacy.

PRC 2 - A request for a permanent change to the project area where afforestation and reforestation project activities have been impacted by road construction decreasing the project area.

Description of the PRC

In 2015 a road was built through strata 3. A road impact report on carbon sequestration was undertaken and is provided as supplementary documentation to the second monitoring report. Overall the road reduced the project area by 4.07 hectares which has been deducted from strata 3 project area. Therefore, the request is for a permanent change in the total area of the project area from 2,728 ha to 2,724 ha. The PDD has been changed to reflect the change in total project area and change to the ex-ante calculations. The ex-ante estimation has been updated including both changes to the strata which occurred during monitoring period 1 and the reduction in strata 3 due to construction of the road in monitoring period 2. The ex-ante calculation has reduced from 880,296 tCO₂-e in the original PDD to 863,183 tCO₂-e in the revised PDD. An overall reduction of 17,113 tCO₂-e.

Sections of the report that have been changed include:

- Section A.1
- Section A.2
- Section B.6
- Section B.7

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Assessment against Paragraph 243 of the CDM Project Standard V1

- a) The change to the project area has no impact on the applicability or application of the applied methodologies and standardized baselines.
- b) The requested change is due to a reduction in the size of the project area compared to the registered PDD. The reduction in the size of the project does not prevent the application of the applied methodologies or standardised baselines.
- c) There is no impact on the level of accuracy on GHG reductions as the reduction in the project area has not impacted any of the sample plots and the overall reduction in size of the project area is less than 0.15%.
- d) The change to the size of the project area has no impact on the additionality of the project activity as the activities stay the same.
- e) The scale of the project impact is not materially impacted by the change in the project area size. The overall reduction in the size of the project equals less than 0.15% of the total project area.

Appendix 8. Declaration on small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activity

Intentionally left blank

Appendix 9. Legal and institutional analysis

Enclosed as a separate document

Appendix 10. Participatory rural appraisal

Enclosed as a separate document

Appendix 11. Social mitigation action plan

Enclosed as a separate document

Appendix 12. Project Coordinates

Enclosed as a separate document

Appendix 13. Fire management plan

Enclosed as a separate document

Appendix 14. Additional information on leakage

Enclosed as a separate document

Appendix 15. Additional information on additionality

Enclosed as a separate document

Appendix 16. Additional information on forest and plantation growth

Enclosed as a separate document

Appendix 17. Environmental analysis

Enclosed as a separate document

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

Document information

| <i>Version</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Description</i> |
|----------------|---------------|---|
| 10.0 | 28 June 2017 | Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure consistency with the “CDM project standard for project activities” (CDM-EB93-A04-STAN) (version 01.0); • Incorporate the “Project design document form for small-scale afforestation and reforestation CDM project activities” (CDM-SSC-AR-PDD-FORM); • Make editorial improvement. |
| 09.0 | 15 April 2016 | Revision to ensure consistency with the “Standard: Applicability of sectoral scopes” (CDM-EB88-A04-STAN) (version 01.0). |
| 08.0 | 9 March 2015 | Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include provisions related to statement on erroneous inclusion of a CPA; • Include provisions related to delayed submission of a monitoring plan; • Provisions related to local stakeholder consultation; • Provisions related to the Host Party; • Make editorial improvement. |
| 07.0 | 25 June 2014 | Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include the Attachment: Instructions for filling out the project design document form for afforestation and reforestation CDM project activities (these instructions supersede the “Guidelines for completing the project design document form for afforestation and reforestation CDM project activities ” (Version 01.1)); • Include provisions related to standardized baselines; • Add contact information on a responsible person(s)/ entity(ies) for the application of the methodology (ies) to the project activity in B.8.4 and Appendix 1; • Change the reference number from F-CDM-AR-PDD to CDM-AR-PDD-FORM; • Make editorial improvement. |
| 06.0 | 13 March 2012 | EB 66, Annex 10 Revision required to ensure consistency with the “Guidelines for completing the project design document form for afforestation and reforestation CDM project activities”. |
| 05.0 | 30 July 2010 | EB 55, Annex 22 Restructuring to reflect changes applied in the design of approved A/R CDM baseline and monitoring methodologies. Due to the overall modification of the document, no highlights of the changes are provided. |

CDM-AR-PDD-FORM

| <i>Version</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Description</i> |
|----------------|-------------------|--|
| 04.0 | 19 October 2007 | EB 35, Annex 20 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Restructuring of section A;• Section "Monitoring of forest establishment and management" replaces sections: "Monitoring of the project boundary", and "Monitoring of forest management";• Introduced a new section allowing for explicit description of SOPs and quality control/quality assurance (QA/QC) procedures if required by the selected approved methodology;• Change in design of the section "Monitoring of the baseline net GHG removals by sinks" allowing for more efficient presentation of data. |
| 03.0 | 29 September 2006 | EB 26, Annex 19 Revisions in different sections to reflect equivalent forms used by the Meth Panel and facilitating the transparent selection of an approved methodology for the proposed A/R CDM project activity. |
| 02.0 | 24 February 2006 | EB 23, Annex 15a Inclusion of a section on the assessment of the eligibility of land and the Sampling design and stratification during monitoring. |
| 01.0 | 03 September 2004 | EB15, Annex 6 Initial adoption. |

Decision Class: Regulatory

Document Type: Form

Business Function: Registration

Keywords: afforestation reforestation, project design document