VCS VERIFICATION REPORT

THE KASIGAU CORRIDOR REDD+ PROJECT

PHASE I – RUKINGA SANCTUARY

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

ANSI ACCREDITED PROGRAM
GREENHOUSE GAS
VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION
0800

Document Prepared By: Environmental Services, Inc.
Project/Report Number (ID): VO12103.00ver

Project Title	The Kasigau Corridor REDD+ Project Phase I- Rukinga Sanctuary
Version	Report Version 02
Report ID	VO12103.00_Phase1_ver(v02)

Report Title	VCS Verification Report The Kasigau corridor REDD+ Project Phase I- Rukinga Sanctuary
Client	Wildlife Works Carbon LLC 242 Redwood Highway Mill Valley, CA 94941 (415) 331 - 4610 www.wildlifeworks.com

Pages	30
Date of Issue	22 May 2013
Prepared By	Environmental Services, Inc. – Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division
Contact	7220 Financial Way, Suite 100, Jacksonville, Florida 32256 – USA Phone: 904-470-2200 Fax: 904-470-2112 www.esicarbon.com
Approved By	Shawn McMahon (Lead Verifier) / Janice McMahon (Regional Technical Manager)
Work Carried Out By	Shawn McMahon – Lead Verifier, Caitlin Sellers – Verification Team Member, Stewart McMorrow – Verification Team Member, Rich Scharf – Verification Team Member, James Moody – Verification Team Member, Terese Walters – Verification Team Member, Jonathan Pomp – Verification Trainee, Chris DeRolph – Verification Team Member/GIS Analyst, and Janice McMahon – QA/QC

Summary:

Environmental Services, Inc., (ESI) was contracted by Wildlife Works Carbon LLC on 07 December 2012 to conduct the project verification of the The Kasigau Corridor Phase I – Rukinga Sanctuary REDD+ Project [Project Description (PD) dated 31 January 2011].

The Kasigau Corridor Phase I – Rukinga Sanctuary REDD+ Project is a REDD+ (Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation) project estimated to avoid the emission of over 6 million metric tonnes of CO2e that would have been emitted due to slash and burn deforestation. This project will achieve this emission reduction through a combination of dryland forest protection and extraordinary community sustainable development activities. This is an average of approximately 210,000 metric tonnes per year across the carbon pools of above and belowground biomass (forest carbon), and soil carbon.

The Kasigau Corridor Phase I – Rukinga Sanctuary REDD+ Project is implemented by a private land owner in the South East area of Kenya. The project is located in the Rukinga sanctuary Marungu Sublocation, Voi Division, Taita Taveta District, Coast Province of Kenya.

The project is monitored each year. These annual monitoring events assess forest growth, changes to project area and leakage. Each year 20% of biomass plots (tree and shrub carbon pools) are sampled, so that 100% of plots are sampled every five years. Changes in the carbon stock are calculated through modeling and extrapolation. Every five years soil carbon plots will be resampled in addition to the tree and shrub plots.

The verification objective included an assessment of compliance with VCS Version 3 and all associated updates, and the likelihood that implementation of the planned GHG project

resulted in the GHG emission removal enhancements as stated by the project developer (ISO 14064-3:2006). The scope of the verification included the GHG project and baseline scenarios; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHG's; and time periods covered. The geographic verification scope was defined by the project boundary, the carbon reservoir types, management activities, growth and yield models, inventory program, and contract periods.

The criteria will follow the verification guidance documents provided by VCS located at http://www.v-c-s.org.
These documents include the following:

- *VCS Program Guide (v3.4, October 2012)*
- *VCS Standard (v3.3,October 2012)*
- *Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Requirements (v3.3, October 2012)*
- *Program Definitions (v 3.4, October 2012)*
- *AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (v3.2, October 2012)*
- *VM0009 Methodology for Avoided Mosaic Deforestation of Tropical Forests Version 1.1*

A summary of all findings is included in Appendix A. There are no restrictions of uncertainty.

ESI confirms all verification activities, including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance, monitoring and project documentation adherence to the VCS Version 3, as documented in this report are complete. ESI concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that The Kasigau Corridor Phase I – Rukinga Sanctuary REDD+ Project meets the requirements of the VCS Version 3.

The GHG assertion provided by Wildlife Works Carbon LLC and verified by ESI has resulted in the GHG emissions reduction or removal of 244,944 tCO2 equivalents by the project during the verification period/reporting period (1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012). As permitted by the methodology, baseline emissions are reported as zero. This does not include the 15% buffer withholding.

Table of Contents

Contents

Table of Contents 4

1 Introduction 6

1.1 Objective 6

1.2 Scope and Criteria 6

1.3 Level of assurance 7

1.4 Summary Description of the Project 7

2 Validation Process, Findings and Conclusion 7

2.1 Validation Process 7

2.2 Validation Findings 8

2.2.1 Gap Validation 8

2.2.2 Methodology Deviations 8

2.2.3 Project Description Deviations 8

2.2.4 New Project Activity Instances 8

2.3 Validation Conclusion 8

3 Verification Process 8

3.1 Method and Criteria 8

3.2 Document Review 9

3.3 Interviews 9

3.4 Site Inspections 11

3.5 Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy 11

4 Verification Findings 13

4.1 Project Implementation Status 13

4.2 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations 13

4.3 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals 13

4.4 Management and Operational System 14

5 Verification conclusion 14

APPENDIX A – NCR/CL/OFI SUMMARY 16

APPENDIX B – DOCUMENTS RECEIVED / REVIEWED 28

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The verification objective included an assessment of compliance with Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) (Version 3 and associated updates) criteria, the selected methodology (VM0009 Methodology for Avoided Mosaic Deforestation of Tropical Forests Version 1.1), and the validated Project Description (PD): The Kasigau Corridor Phase I – Rukinga Sanctuary REDD+ Project (dated 31 January 2011). This verification assessed the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emission removals through an Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) project – specifically, REDD.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The scope of the verification, including the GHG project and baseline scenarios; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHG's; and time periods covered were described in the previously validated PD provided by the client on 07 January 2013. The geographic verification scope is defined by the project boundary, the carbon reservoir types, management activities, growth and yield models, inventory program, and contract periods as outlined by the project developer in the PD.

Baseline Scenario	Mosaic deforestation, conversion of forest to cropland for annual crops, illegal charcoal production
Activities/Technologies/Processes	Providing jobs and improved opportunities for livelihoods, reforestation projects, nursery establishment, improved agriculture, biodiversity monitoring, ecotourism job creation, employment of forest rangers, school construction and bursary scheme,
Sources/sinks/Reservoirs	Above and below ground biomass, soil carbon, long lived wood products
GHG Type	CO2e
Time Period	Crediting period-1 January 2005 to 31 December 2035 Third monitoring period 1 January 2012 – 31 December 2012
Project Boundary	The project is located in the Rukinga sanctuary Marungu Sublocation, Voi Division, Taita Taveta District, Coast Province (Kenya) 74,516 acres (30,168.66 ha)

Verification Criteria:

The criteria will follow the verification guidance documents provided by VCS located at http://www.v-c-s.org.

These documents include the following:

- *VCS Program Guide (v3.4, October 2012)*
- *VCS Standard (v3.3,October 2012)*
- *Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Requirements (v3.3, October 2012)*
- *Program Definitions (v 3.4, October 2012)*
- *AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (v3.2, October 2012)*
- *VM0009 Methodology for Avoided Mosaic Deforestation of Tropical Forests Version 1.1*

1.3 Level of assurance

The level of assurance is used to determine the depth of detail that the verifier places in the verification sampling plan to determine if there are any errors, omissions, or misrepresentations (ISO 14064-3:2006). For VCS verifications, ESI will assess the project (general principles, data, sampling descriptions, documentation, calculations, etc.) to provide reasonable assurance to meet the Project Level requirements of the VCS Program (VCS Standard v3.3, Section 5). The amount of evidence necessary to achieve a reasonable level of assurance is specified in the following sections.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The Kasigau Corridor Phase I – Rukinga Sanctuary REDD+ Project *(hereby referred to as "the Project")* is estimated to avoid the emission of over 6 million metric tonnes of CO_2e that would have been emitted due to slash and burn deforestation. This project will achieve this emission reduction through a combination of dryland forest protection and extraordinary community sustainable development activities. This is an average of approximately 210,000 metric tonnes per year across the carbon pools of above and belowground biomass (forest carbon), and soil carbon.

2 VALIDATION PROCESS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

2.1 Validation Process

The Project PD entitled "The Kasigau corridor REDD+ Project Phase I- Rukinga Sanctuary" dated January 31, 2011 was previously validated by another validation entity. The original validation report is available on the VCS website.

2.2 Validation Findings

2.2.1 Gap Validation

Not Applicable

2.2.2 Methodology Deviations

The Project PD entitled "The Kasigau corridor REDD+ Project Phase I- Rukinga Sanctuary" dated January 31, 2011 was previously validated by another validation entity. The original validation report is available on the VCS website.

2.2.3 Project Description Deviations

This project was previously validated and as such, no deviations to the project description were identified.

2.2.4 New Project Activity Instances

This is not applicable as this is not a grouped project.

2.3 Validation Conclusion

The Project PD entitled "The Kasigau corridor REDD+ Project Phase I- Rukinga Sanctuary" dated January 31, 2011 was previously validated by another validation entity. The original validation report is available on the VCS website.

3 VERIFICATION PROCESS

3.1 Method and Criteria

The verification process closely followed ISO 14064-3, ISO 14065, and ESI's procedures for VCS verifications outlined within our Management System Manual. In addition, the verification process was detailed in a separate Verification and Sampling Plan, which was approved by the Project Proponent on 16 January 2013. As defined by ISO 14064-3:2006 (E), "verification is the systematic, independent and documented process for the evaluation of a greenhouse gas assertion against agreed verification criteria verification criteria".

For this verification, the sample size for the desktop portion of the verification included a complete review of the PD and supporting documents. For the field portion of the verification, the sample size for biomass plots was 15% of the project proponents measured plots, and 5% of the project proponents total leakage plots. See section 3.4 for more info.

The criteria followed the verification guidance documents provided by VCS located at http://www.v-c-s.org.
These documents include the following:

- VCS Program Guide (v3.4, October 2012)
- VCS Standard (v3.3, October 2012)

- Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Requirements (v3.3, October 2012)
- Program Definitions (v 3.4, October 2012)
- AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (v3.2, October 2012)
- VM0009 Methodology for Avoided Mosaic Deforestation of Tropical Forests Version 1.1

The Verification and Sampling Plan methodology was derived from all items in our verification process stated above. Specifically, the sampling plan utilized the VCS guidance documents and ISO 14064-3. For this verification, a site visit was conducted. A desk top review was also completed on all aspects of the project and calculations were reviewed and replicated in order for verifiers to achieve a reasonable level of assurance.

3.2 Document Review

A detailed review of all project documentation was conducted to ensure consistency with, and identify any deviation from, VCS program requirements, the methodology (VM0009 Methodology for Avoided Mosaic Deforestation of Tropical Forests, Version 1.1), and the validated PD. Initial review focused on the validated PD and monitoring report and included an examination of the project details, implementation status, data and parameters, and quantification of GHG emission reductions and removals. Along with a review of the monitoring report, documentation for the selected sample was requested, provided and subsequently reviewed for consistency, accuracy, and appropriateness with regard to VCS program requirements, methodological requirements, and the PD. Documents reviewed include land ownership documentation, carbon rights contracts, property boundaries, maps and aerials, data from monitoring, biomass and carbon calculation spread sheets, and responses to previous corrective action/clarification requests.

AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool (v3.2 October 2012) was used by the project proponent to assess overall project risk. The final score was calculated to be 15%. The information in this report was evaluated by verifiers and found to have been conducted appropriately and in compliance with VCS Version 3. No discrepancies were found in the evaluation of the elements of the Risk Analysis.

The verification included a review of the validated Project Description and monitoring report. All calculations were reviewed and replicated by verifiers for compliance with the methodology and for correctness. Any discrepancies from the review of 2012 monitoring period were corrected by the project proponent.

3.3 Interviews

During the site visit, from 27 January to 3 February 2013, ESI conducted various interviews at the Wildlife Works Carbon LLC's headquarters in Rukinga and at the Rukinga Sanctuary. Interviews were conducted with project management staff in order to identify if any significant changes had occurred with the project. Interviews were

conducted with nearby residents and project participants. It was clear from these interviews that no significant changes have occurred to the project or to the overall management of the project.

Individuals interviewed included:

- Jeremy Freund – VP Carbon Development
- Simon Bird – Carbon Development Associate
- Rob Dodson - VP African Field Operations
- Christina Ender - Strategic REDD+ Policy Advisor
- Cara Braund - Conservation Office Manager
- Eric Sagwe - Head Wildlife Ranger
- Jamie Hendriksen - Carbon Operations Manager
- Dr. Mwangi Githiru - Director of Biodiversity and Social Monitoring
- Joel Mwadigha - Plot Team leader
- Mattias Kakoi - Plot team operations
- Joshua Kitiro - Plot team operations
- Paschal Mulonzya, Wildlife Works Accountant
- Daniel Munyao, Sewing Factory Manager
- Lenjo Laurian, Wildlife Works Office Manager, Community Relations and Personnel
- Joseph Mwanganda, Agricultural Extension Agent.
- "Leesel" (did not get last name) Print Shop Manager.
- Lobakite Lekarikei, a Wildlife Works ranger
- George (last name withheld by ranger) a Kenya Wildlife Service ranger.
- Steve Mwaisaka, (Kasigau Development Trust) CBO manager
- Chief Pascal Kizaka, Chief of the Kasigau location.
- Doreen Getti, Project coordinator of Meringa Hills Conservancey (a CBO)
- Elija Mnjau, former headmaster of Marungu Secondary School.
- Esther Mbau, bursary representative.
- Nicholas Nyambu Mwandime, Board of Directors of Rakinga Ranch and Area Counselor of Mwand Kishamba.
- Reuben Mwaluma, Chairman of the Board of Directors for Maungu Ranch.
- Harry Njai Mwanjari, Treasurer and member of the Board of Directors of Kambanga Ranch.
- Anderson Mombo, Chairman of the Board of Directors of Kambanga Ranch.
- Renson Dio, Taita Ranch Director.
- Allan Kiplrmo, printing shop employee.
- Paul Makau, workshop employee.
- Alfred Mwachaka, workshop employee.

- Catherine Mazenge, clothing factory employee
- Constance (did not give last name) clothing factory employee
- Mwuachofi Antony, organic greenhouse employee.
- Eunic Habibu, organic greenhouse employee.

3.4 Site Inspections

The field verification included an onsite review of a sample of biomass and leakage monitoring plots, within and outside of the Project geographic boundary, review and observation of project activities, interviews with project management staff, and confirmation of application of SOPs. GPS was used to confirm project location and boundaries. A risk-based approach was used to select the plots across a wide geographic range of sites sufficient to provide the necessary sample size to meet a reasonable level of assurance, as directed by the professional judgment of the Lead Verifier.

The project includes 115 biomass sample plots, of which 20% or twenty one (21) total plots were measured in this monitoring period. Three (3) plots were selected for field verification during the site visit. These plots represented 13% of the total plots that were measured by the project proponent in this monitoring period. This exceeded our established minimum field verification sampling threshold of 5% of the stated number of plots measured by the project developer in the PD. Each plot was visited, remeasured and photographed to ensure the accuracy of the reported volume as stated in the PD. The project proponent's team performed the remeasurements so that verifiers could assess the competency, accuracy and compliance with the project SOP for plot measurement. A paired T test using a 95% confidence limit was applied to compare the results and the outcome was favorable with a P value of .699 against an alpha of .05.

The project includes thirty eight (38) total leakage monitoring plots. Two (2) plots were remeasured while on the site visit. These plots represented 5% of the total plots established and measured in the 2012 monitoring period. This effort met our established minimum field verification sampling threshold of 5%. Each plot was visited, measurements observed, site photographed and the results were compared. In both plots the results matched the previously stated results exactly.

The results of the leakage monitoring effort were calculated by the project proponent and reviewed for accuracy by verifiers. This calculation resulted in no net deduction of VCU's for leakage in this monitoring period due to the final leakage factor generated being lower or below the figure generated by the leakage model.

3.5 Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy

When potential material discrepancies/non-conformities were identified during the verification process, a non-conformance request (NCR) or request for clarification (CL)

was issued. Wildlife Works Carbon LLC was given up to 30 days to respond to the NCR or CL list. The ESI verification team identified 14 NCRs. All NCR's were addressed satisfactorily by Wildlife Works Carbon LLC during the project verification process. These NCRs provided necessary clarity to ensure the project was in compliance with VCS program requirements for GHG projects and the validated PD's. All issues and their resolutions are attached (Appendix A).

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

The project activities and Monitoring Plan, as described in the validated PD, has been fully implemented. There are no remaining issues from the previous validation. This is the third verification for this project.

4.2 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations

ESI conducted an intensive review of all input data, parameters, formulas, connections, conversions, statistics and resulting uncertainties and output data to ensure consistency with VCS, the project PD and the methodology. Further, ESI reproduced calculations for selected samples to ensure accuracy of the results. All data, conversion factors, formulas, and calculations were provided by the project proponent in spreadsheet format to ensure all formulas were accessible for review. The project proponent also provided a step-by-step overview of calculations to ensure ESI understood the approach and could confirm its consistency with the methodology and PD.

ESI also conducted a comprehensive assessment of all data collection and storage procedures to ensure all opportunities for error in transposition of data between data were minimized.

Uncertainty was assessed as required. ESI recalculated the statistics independently to confirm the accuracy of the reported precision.

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

4.3 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals

During ESI's verification the evidence provided by the project proponent was more than sufficient in both quantity and quality to support the determination of GHG emission removals reported by the project. Throughout the verification, Wildlife Works Carbon LLC demonstrated a strong commitment toward conservativeness and took all measures appropriate to ensure the reliability of all evidence provided. Interviews conducted (oral evidence) are outlined in Section 3.3, and the final documents received from Wildlife Works Carbon LLC are outlined in Appendix B.

4.4 Management and Operational System

The management system employed by Wildlife Works Carbon LLC utilizes appropriate field measurement methods (systematic, appropriate measurement tools and techniques), high quality data collection and management techniques (web-based, controlled data entry system; clearly identified responsibilities for data accuracy; appropriate data quality control), and data analysis (web-based calculation system). Staff is thoroughly familiar with their responsibilities and is appropriately trained for these responsibilities. Accordingly, in the process of the verification, ESI confirmed the suitability and appropriateness of Wildlife Works LLC's management system for monitoring and reporting.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

After review of all project information, procedures, calculations, and supporting documentation and selected site visits, ESI confirms that the monitoring conducted by Wildlife Works Carbon LLC, along with the supporting Monitoring Report, are accurate and consistent with all aforementioned VCS criteria, the validated PD, and the selected methodology. ESI confirms that The Kasigau corridor REDD+ Project Phase I- Rukinga Sanctuary has been implemented in accordance with the validated PD.

ESI confirms all verification activities, including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance, monitoring and project documentation adherence to the VCS Standard Version 3 (and associated updates), as documented in this report are complete. ESI concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that The Kasigau corridor REDD+ Project Phase I- Rukinga Sanctuary has been implemented in accordance with the validated PD, dated 31 January 2011 and meets the requirements of VCS Version 3 and all associated updates.

The GHG assertion provided by Wildlife Works Carbon LLC and verified by ESI has resulted in the GHG emissions reduction or removal of 244,944 tCO2 equivalents by the project during the verification/reporting period (01 January 2012 to 31 December 2012). As permitted by the methodology, emissions are reported as zero. This does not include the 15% buffer withholding.

GHG Emission Reductions or Removals	tCO_2e
Baseline Emissions	244,944
Project Emissions	0
Leakage	0
Net GHG emission reductions or removals	**244,944**

Report Submitted to:	Voluntary Carbon Standard Association 1730 Rhode Island Ave. NW Suite 803, Washington, D.C. 20036 Wildlife Works Carbon LLC 242 Redwood Highway Mill Valley, CA 94941 (415)637-7853 www.wildlifeworks.com
Report Submitted by:	Environmental Services, Inc. -Corporate Office 7220 Financial Way, Suite 100 Jacksonville, Florida 32257
ESI Lead Verifier Name and Signature	 Shawn McMahon Lead Verifier
ESI Division Regional Technical Manager Name and Signature	 Janice McMahon Vice President and Forestry, Carbon and GHG Division Regional Technical Manager
Date:	22 May 2013

SPM /SMM/rmb//VO12103 VCS Verification Report Phase I-Rukinga Sanctuary-final-v02.doc
K: PF5/22/13f

APPENDIX A – NCR/CL/OFI SUMMARY

Project Verification - Non-Conformity Reports (NCR) / Clarification (CL) Requests

1. Non-Conformity Report (Kasigau Phase I, Round 1, line 4)

VCS Criteria: VCS Standard 3.3, 3.6 Project Description Deviations - 1) Where the deviation impacts the applicability of the methodology, additionality or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario, the deviation shall be described and justified in a revised version of the project description. This shall include a description of when the changes occurred, the reasons for the changes and how the changes impact the applicability of the methodology, additionality and/or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario. An example of such a deviation is a change in project capacity where a different baseline scenario would be more plausible, the applied methodology would no longer be applicable, or there would be a significant impact on the investment analysis used by the project to demonstrate additionality. Other examples include changes to the project that might have similar impacts such as the addition of new carbon pools or new types of project activities.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: PDD, Monitoring Report for Phases 1 and 2.	
Findings: 2010 measurements have been modified to both match the Phase II 2010 measurements, thus insuring that the leakage lag factors are identical for both Phases (0.4211). Per our discussion, we believe this is the most valid way to address the fact that the CAR issued by DNV resulted in the modification of plots 5-9 was originally only issued for Phase II, and not Phase I. However, these "new" plots were measured for years 2011 and 2012, and will be measured for the remainder of the project. We understand that this technically represents a deviation that must be documented in the final monitoring report.	
Non-conformity report (NCR): In the monitoring report please provide a description of the deviation related to the leakage lag factor adjustment.	
Date issued:	21 February 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date: NCR Accepted and Implemented. Wildlife Works has added to the MR/PIR a description of the deviation related to recalculation of the leakage lag factor. This recalculation was due to the fact that 5 of the leakage plot locations were changed prior to the first verification of the project, but the old plot location factors were inadvertently used.	
Evidence used to close NCR: The movement of the leakage plots was a result of the previous verification effort. The monitoring report offers a brief description of this change. The leakage model was updated accordingly and the resulting factors corrected. This issue is addressed.	
Date closed:	14 March 2013

2. Non-Conformity Report (Kasigau Phase I, Round 1, line 7)

VCS Criteria: VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v3.2, Table 2 Financial Viability - Project cash flow breakeven point is less than 4 years from the current risk assessment	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: Project risk analysis document and site visit	

Findings: A spreadsheet of the company's financials was provided which show the project currently exceeds break even. As required by the VCS Non-permanence Risk Tool, please demonstrate that funding has been secured through, for example, financial statements, bank records, executed commodity purchase agreements, executed emission reduction purchase agreements, or other signed contractual agreements.
Non-conformity report (NCR): A spreadsheet of the company's financials was provided which show the project currently exceeds break even. As required by the VCS Non-permanence Risk Tool, please demonstrate that funding has been secured through, for example, financial statements, bank records, executed commodity purchase agreements, executed emission reduction purchase agreements, or other signed contractual agreements.

Date issued:	21 February 2013

Project proponent response/actions and date: NCR Accepted and Implemented. As noted by the auditor, the project has already reached the breakeven point as demonstrated by the financial data provided. To demonstrate that funding has been secured we have additionally provided to the auditor screenshots of our Markit registry account. This document demonstrates the carbon credit sales that were made in 2012, providing Wildlife Works with the funding needed to reach the breakeven point. This document supports the financial spreadsheets that have already been provided to the auditor.
Evidence used to close NCR: Data on sales transactions was provided along with the contract amount for each sale. This information shows that the project has the funding needed to satisfy this requirement. Issue is addressed.

Date closed:	14 March 2013

3. Non-Conformity Report (Kasigau Phase I, Round 1, line 8)

VCS Criteria: VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v3.2, Table 2 Financial Viability - Project has secured 80% or more of funding needed to cover the total cash out before the project reaches breakeven
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: Project risk analysis document and site visit
Findings: A spreadsheet of the company's financials was provided which show the project currently exceeds break even. As required by the VCS Non-permanence Risk Tool, please demonstrate that funding has been secured through, for example, financial statements, bank records, executed commodity purchase agreements, executed emission reduction purchase agreements, or other signed contractual agreements.
Non-conformity report (NCR): A spreadsheet of the company's financials was provided which show the project currently exceeds break even. As required by the VCS Non-permanence Risk Tool, please demonstrate that funding has been secured through, for example, financial statements, bank records, executed commodity purchase agreements, executed emission reduction purchase agreements, or other signed contractual agreements.

Date issued:	21 February 2013

Project proponent response/actions and date: NCR Accepted and Implemented As noted by the Auditor, the project has already reached the breakeven point as demonstrated

by the financial data provided. As stated in the VCS guidance for the Non-permanence Risk Tool "Projects has secured 80% or more of funding needed to cover total cash out BEFORE the project reaches breakeven." Since, as noted by the Auditor, the Project has already reached the Breakeven point, we don't believe there is a further requirement to demonstrate that this funding has been secured. However, the documentation provided for the above NCR will also provide the information desired for this NCR.
Evidence used to close NCR: Data on sales transactions was provided along with the contract amount for each sale. This information shows that the project has the funding needed to satisfy this requirement. Issue is addressed.

Date closed:	14 March 2013

4. Non-Conformity Report (Kasigau Phase I, Round 1, line 9)

VCS Criteria: VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v3.2, Table 2 Financial Viability - Mitigation: Project has available as callable financial resources at least 50% of total cash out before project reaches breakeven
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: Project risk analysis document and site visit
Findings: A spreadsheet of the company's financials was provided which show the project currently exceeds break even. As required by the VCS Non-permanence Risk Tool, please demonstrate that funding has been secured through, for example, financial statements, bank records, executed commodity purchase agreements, executed emission reduction purchase agreements, or other signed contractual agreements.
Non-conformity report (NCR): A spreadsheet of the company's financials was provided which show the project currently exceeds break even. As required by the VCS Non-permanence Risk Tool, please demonstrate that funding has been secured through, for example, financial statements, bank records, executed commodity purchase agreements, executed emission reduction purchase agreements, or other signed contractual agreements.

Date issued:	21 February 2013

Project proponent response/actions and date: NCR Accepted and Implemented As noted by the Auditor, the project has already reached the breakeven point as demonstrated by the financial data provided. As stated in the VCS guidance for the Non-permanence Risk Tool "Project has available as callable financial resources at least 50% of total cash out BEFORE project reaches breakeven." Since, as noted by the Auditor, the Project has already reached the Breakeven point, we don't believe there is a further requirement to demonstrate that this funding has been secured. However, the documentation provided for the above NCR will also provide the information desired for this NCR.
Evidence used to close NCR: Data on sales transactions was provided along with the contract amount for each sale. This information shows that the project has the funding needed to satisfy this requirement. Issue is addressed.

Date closed:	14 March 2013

5. Non-Conformity Report (Kasigau Phase I, Round 1, line 11)

VCS Criteria: VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool, v3.2, Table 7 Community Engagement - Mitigation: The project generates net positive impacts on the social and economic well-being of the local communities who derive livelihoods from the project area

Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: Project Risk analysis, PD and site visit	
Findings: While the project has successfully achieved verified CCBA status for this project, the project has not achieved Gold Level status for Community Benefits specifically. This item is considered acceptable for positive community benefits, but the Gold Level status reference needs to be removed.	
Non-conformity report (NCR): Please remove the reference to Gold Level Status for this indicator since the project has not achieved Gold Level status for Community benefits specifically and that is misleading given the subject matter for this indicator is community engagement. Please simply indicate that the project has achieved verified status with the CCBA.	
Date issued:	21 February 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date: NCR Accepted and Implemented. The reference in Table 7 to CCB Gold Level status has been removed. The Table now references that the project has received CCB validation/verification demonstrating its exceptional community benefit. This is in-line with the guidance from the VCS Non-permanence Risk tool.	
Evidence used to close NCR: Change confirmed in Risk Report. Issue is addressed.	
Date closed:	14 March 2013

6. Non-Conformity Report (Kasigau Phase I, Round 1, line 14)

VCS Criteria: VCS VM0009, v1.1, 9 Project Emissions - Project emissions for any monitoring period are estimated by the events of woody biomass consumption.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: Monitoring Report, section 6.2, site visit and previously validated PDD	
Findings: The monitoring report indicates that project emissions are under the de minimus limit as described in the methodology. No evidence is provided of this finding.	
Non-conformity report (NCR): Please provide evidence of this statement.	
Date issued:	21 February 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date: NCR Accepted and Implemented Wildlife Works has a robust disturbance monitoring system in place for the Kasigau Phase I and Phase II projects that includes daily patrols of the project area by rangers and a biodiversity monitoring team. Additionally, aerial patrols of the project area are conducted regularly. When any potential events are discovered, the procedures outlined in the Disturbance Monitoring SOP are used to determine if the event constitutes a significant event, or is deemed to be de minimis. If the event is found to be significant, its carbon emission is quantified and included in the carbon accounting as a project emission. This emission will then also be documented in the MR/PIR report for that monitoring period. Events that are found to be de minimis will not be included as a project emission or documented in the MR/PIR report.	
Evidence used to close NCR: This explanation describes the process used to determine if an event can be considered to be significant or de minimus. This process seems reasonable. Since this NCR was not in response to a specific item, this description is deemed adequate	

and this issue is addressed.	
Date closed:	14 March 2013

7. Non-Conformity Report (Kasigau Phase I, Round 1, line 15)

VCS Criteria: VCS VM0009, v1.1, 9 Project Emissions - Emissions from forest fires within the project area are inherently captured by the monitoring of forest carbon stocks. Nevertheless, maps of significant fire events are necessary to aid verification of carbon stock estimates but no additional accounting is required. However, the project area may need to be re-stratified per section 13.2.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: Monitoring Report, section 6.2, site visit and previously validated PDD	
Findings: Monitoring report indicates there were no major fires. No evidence of fires was observed or mentioned during the site visit; however the monitoring report indicates a fire in 2012.	
Non-conformity report (NCR): Please provide a map of the fire in 2012.	
Date issued:	21 February 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date: The fire that was documented in the MR/PIR report was included in the Biodiversity indicators section; this is separate and distinctly different than the Project Emissions section. Therefore, the events and items listed in this table do not necessarily meet the threshold at which they would be deemed to be a significant emission under the Disturbance Monitoring SOP, and therefore documented and quantified in the MR/PIR report. The fire in question was a patch of burnt ground that the biodiversity team encountered on their regular patrol. It is thought that it is the result of a charcoal kiln that may have burned slightly out of control. The area of the fire is 3.8 ha, and the potential carbon emission is very low, since no trees were killed in this fire, and the areas small size. This fire event failed the test to determine whether an event is significant, as documented in the Disturbance Monitoring SOP, and is therefore found to be de minimis.	
Evidence used to close NCR: The SOP for disturbance monitoring indicates that any disturbance shall be at least 250 Ha or be subject to an analysis as described here. b) The disturbance results in a decrease in carbon stock estimates (tCO2e/ha) of greater than 5%. The magnitude of the change in carbon stocks shall be determined by comparing the carbon stock estimates of the disturbed area's stratum prior to disturbance with the results of a pilot sample of approximately 5 plots in the disturbed area. Since this aspect was previously verified and validated and this disturbance was less than 4 ha, this issue is considered addressed.	
Date closed:	14 March 2013

8. Non-Conformity Report (Kasigau Phase I, Round 1, line 17)

VCS Criteria: VCS VM0009, v1.1, PD Requirements: Forest Fires
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: Monitoring Report, section 6.2, site visit and previously validated PDD
Findings: Monitoring report indicates there were no major fires. No evidence of fires was observed or mentioned during the site visit; however the monitoring report indicates a fire in 2012.
Non-conformity report (NCR): Please provide information regarding the fire in 2012 as

indicated in the Monitoring plan.	
Date issued:	21 February 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date: NCR Accepted and Implemented The fire questioned in this NCR was a patch of burnt ground that the biodiversity team encountered on their regular patrol. It is thought that it is the result of a charcoal kiln that may have burned slightly out of control. The area of the fire is 3.8 ha, and the potential carbon emission is very low, since no trees were killed in this fire. This fire event failed the significance test, as documented in the Disturbance Monitoring SOP, and is therefore found to be de minimis and not eligible for documentation in the MR/PIR. It should be noted that the fire in question was included in the Section 5.3 'Data and Parameters Monitored', sub-section 'Biodiversity Indicators'. Events in this section should be distinguished from those in the 'Project Emissions' section. Events and items listed in the table 'Overall Project Incidents' in this section do not automatically meet the threshold at which they would be deemed to be a "significant" emission as determined by the Disturbance Monitoring SOP, and therefore are not automatically documented and quantified in the MR/PIR report.	
Evidence used to close NCR: The SOP for disturbance monitoring indicates that any disturbance shall be at least 250 Ha or be subject to an analysis as described here. b) The disturbance results in a decrease in carbon stock estimates (tCO2e/ha) of greater than 5%. The magnitude of the change in carbon stocks shall be determined by comparing the carbon stock estimates of the disturbed area's stratum prior to disturbance with the results of a pilot sample of approximately 5 plots in the disturbed area. Since this aspect was previously verified and validated and this disturbance was less than 4 ha, this issue is considered addressed**.**	
Date closed:	14 March 2013

9. Non-Conformity Report (Kasigau Phase I, Round 1, line 19)

VCS Criteria: VCS VM0009, v1.1, PD Requirements: Forest Fires, 9.1 Emissions from Burning - Emissions from the burning of woody biomass as a result of project activities in the project area should be recorded as the weight (in tonnes) of woody biomass consumed during each burning event. If the production of sustainable charcoal occurs within the project area, then it must be accounted for under emissions from burning. Emissions from the controlled burning of woody biomass is the sum of all burning events during the monitoring period as defined by [31] where is the carbon fraction of wood for a species.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: Kasigau Corridor Phase 1 Monitoring Report, Section 6.3	
Findings: Monitoring report states, "Burning of woody biomass (see VM0009, section 9 Project Emissions) in the project area falls below the de minimis threshold for this monitoring period (m3)." No evidence of this is presented.	
Non-conformity report (NCR): Please provide evidence of this statement.	
Date issued:	21 February 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date: NCR Accepted and Implemented	

There was no burning of woody biomass as a result of any project activities. The EcoCharcoal project utilizes woody biomass that is sustainably harvested from outside of the project area, and is therefore not considered to be a project emission. Additionally, this biomass from this project is harvested in a sustainable manner that does not inhibit the growth of the tree or carbon stocks of the area from which the biomass is acquired.
Evidence used to close NCR: Verifiers were introduced to the EcoCharcoal project area and process while on site. This area is indeed outside of the project area and is harvested in a very minimal process that involves clipping small branches form several trees, as well as using dead material. Following the site visit and observations gained while on site. No evidence of any biomass burning was observed and the EcoCharcoal project is only in its infancy in terms of the scale of that aspect. Verifiers confirm that his issue is addressed.

Date closed:	14 March 2013

VCS Criteria: VM0009, v1.1, 10.3 The Leakage Model, 10.3.2 Sampling Degradation and Deforestation in the Leakage Area - Uncertainty in measurement should be reduced as much as possible by developing a field protocol for sampling forest degradation. Training should be provided to collection teams.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: Leakage models, on site field visit
Findings: SOP and field training is provided to field crews, however during the field visit, two leakage plots were reviewed. Upon review of the leakage data for the entire project, it was evident that there are inconsistencies in the flow of leakage factors over time. For instance, a given leakage factor may be .6 in the previous monitoring cycle, but then shift down to .4 in the subsequent period.
Non-conformity report (NCR): Please describe in the monitoring report how the results of the cumulative leakage monitoring program can produce results that show a decrease in leakage degradation across one monitoring event to the next. This was discussed on several occasions with the project managers and this issue deserves to be described in the monitoring plan. Further, please describe how this situation is dealt with from a training and quality control perspective.

Date issued:	21 February 2013

Project proponent response/actions and date: NCR Accepted and Implemented. The requested changes to the Kasigau Phase II MR/PIR have been made. A new section of text has been added to Section 5.1, page 61 to address the issues that the auditor has raised.
Evidence used to close NCR: Measurement of the leakage plots appears to involve a certain amount of subjective judgment. When measuring the sample leakage plots, the results were exactly the same between both measurements. The measurement of the plots includes a discussion between the team members who decide on a final estimation of the leakage amount or % for a given plot. When the verification measurement was performed, the team did not have advance knowledge of the plot to measure and thus the remeasurement was not biased. The description of the variability of the repeated measurements is considered plausible given

the type of monitoring being done. In fact, the increase and decrease of a given plot is probable across two different years. The reasons are outlined in the monitoring report as are the QA/QC and what triggers a remeasurement. This verification included an independent remeasurement of 6 plots. Upon review of the findings for all plots, verifiers found that some plots had changed dramatically between the 2011 and 2012 monitoring period. As a result verifiers requested that the project remeasure several leakage plots. Project proponents agreed that they had not had a chance to conduct their internal quality control and agreed to the remeasurement of the requested plots. These plots were subsequently remeasured and the results reviewed by verifiers. The final results for the 2012 leakage plots were deemed to be acceptable. Issue is addressed.	
Date closed:	14 March 2013

10. Non-Conformity Report (Kasigau Phase I, Round 1, line 21)

VCS Criteria: VCS VM0009, v1.1, PD Requirements: Estimating the Leakage Factor and Emissions From Leakage - The project description must include the following: 1. The estimated cumulative degradation and deforestation predicted by the leakage model, 2. The estimated cumulative deforestation and a degradation in the leakage area, 3. The leakage factor, 4. The estimated emissions from leakage	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: Kasigau Corridor Phase 1 Monitoring Report, Section 6.3	
Findings: The Monitoring Report indicates "For this monitoring period,t is measured as the estimate of cumulative deforestation and degradation in the leakage plots: δ3= -0.699" This figure is incorrect.	
Non-conformity report (NCR): The Monitoring Report indicates "For this monitoring period,t is measured as the estimate of cumulative deforestation and degradation in the leakage plots: δ3= -0.699" This figure is incorrect. The figure from the Phase 1 leakage model is .6435. Please correct this reference.	
Date issued:	21 February 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date: NCR Accepted and Implemented. The value for δ3 in the Phase I leakage model is now calculated as -0.6875. The MR/PIR has been updated to reflect this new value. This recalculation was due to the fact that 5 of the leakage plot locations were changed prior to the first verification of the project, but the old plot location factors were inadvertently used.	
Evidence used to close NCR: Change confirmed in monitoring report and in Leakage model. Issue is addressed.	
Date closed:	14 March 2013

11. Clarification (Kasigau Phase I, Round 1, line 23)

VCS Criteria: VCS VM0009, v1.1, 13.4 Estimating Total Carbon Stocks - Estimate carbon stocks for selected carbon pools using the strata, plots within each stratum and measurements within each plot where each measurement is. For example, a measurement might apply to a soil sample or a prediction of biomass from an allometric equation. (Refer to Page 75)	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: Rukinga Carbon Model and NERs M=3, v1.0. Biomass Calculator, NER, and Allometry, and plot tabs. Sampled plots T09R Tree and T10R Trees for AGLT, AGST, BG, and SD class 1 and 2 decay carbon pools. Kasigau Phase II Carbon Monitoring M=3 v3, plot, allometry, and NER tabs, Amaka Ranch and Mushumbu Ranch Carbon Modeling V2.	
Findings: Total carbon stocks are calculated correctly for each carbon pool and stratum based on plots. Leakage % and buffer % have not been included in the calculation of total project net NERs.	
Clarification (CL): Please remove any data and parameters in the biomass calculators that are not required for monitoring period calculations. Please include the uncertainty in the calculation of NER's, even if it is 0.	
Date issued:	21 February 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date: CL Response The requested changes to the Rukinga carbon model have been made.	
Evidence used to close CL: Changes made. Issue is addressed.	
Date closed:	14 March 2013

12. Non-Conformity Report (Kasigau Phase I, Round 1, line 25)

VCS Criteria: VCS VM0009, v1.1, To estimate the total carbon stock in the standing dead pool	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: Rukinga Carbon Model and NERs M=3, v1.0. Biomass Calculator, NER, and Allometry, and plot tabs. Sampled plots T09R Tree and T10R Trees for AGLT, AGST, BG, and SD class 1 and 2 decay carbon pools. Kasigau Phase II Carbon Monitoring M=3 v3, plot, allometry, and NER tabs, Amaka Ranch and Mushumbu Ranch Carbon Modeling V2.	
Findings: total carbon stocks for the standing dead tree carbon pool are calculated correctly. In the Error Analysis tab of the Rukinga Carbon Model m=3, Values in cells G78:G85 are incorrect. They use only a portion of the standing dead biomass (not the total). "Mean" Standing Dead biomass is correct, variance is not.	
Non-conformity report (NCR): Please review and correct the variance calculations of "standing dead biomoass – ENVI Strata" section on the "Error Analysis" tab within the Rukinga Carbon Model and NERS_M=3_v1.0.xlsm spreadsheet.	
Date issued:	21 February 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date: NCR Accepted and Implemented. The requested changes to the Rukinga carbon model have been made. Due to an oversight, the standing dead variance calculation contained an incorrect cell reference. The standing	

dead variance is now calculated from the AG decay class I and II and BG of decay class I biomass.	
Evidence used to close NCR: Calculations are corrected. Issue is addressed.	
Date closed:	14 March 2013

13. Non-Conformity Report (Kasigau Phase I, Round 1, line 27)

VCS Criteria: VCS VM0009, v1.1, 13.12 Estimating Uncertainty in Total Carbon Stocks - Estimate the standard error of the total carbon stock for the project area,ˆ by combining the standard errors of the required and selected optional pools using equation [63]. Calculate the percent uncertainty in the total carbon stock as equation [67].	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: Error Analysis Tab (Rukinga Carbon Model and NERS_M=3_v1.0.xlsm	
Findings: The Total Carbon Stock (Cell C102) includes BG portion of standing dead, herbaceous, and shrub components. However the SE of the total does not include them (Cell G107).	
Non-conformity report (NCR): Please correct the calculation of SE Total carbon stocks (cell E107) to include the BG portion of standing dead, shrub, and herbaceous components.	
Date issued:	21 February 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date: NCR Accepted and Implemented. The requested changes to the Rukinga carbon model have been made. All AG and BG pools are now included in the calculation of standard error. The standing dead BG was previously included.	
Evidence used to close NCR: Calculations are corrected. Issue is addressed.	
Date closed:	14 March 2013

14. Clarification (Kasigau Phase I, Round 1, line 29)

VCS Criteria: VCS VM0009, v1.1, 13.12 Estimating Uncertainty in Total Carbon Stocks - 1. Summary of sampling procedures, with a copy of detailed sampling methods included as an appendix. 2. Documentation of training provided to field crews. 3. Documentation of data quality assessment such as the results from a check cruise. 4. Map showing strata boundaries and plot locations. 5. List of plot coordinates. 6. Description of the plot size and plot layout used for each carbon pool. 7. Documentation of the source of all parameters and allometric equations. 8. If allometric equations are developed, a detailed description of the development process including model fitting and selection. 9. The estimated total carbon stock, standard error of the total, and sample size for each stratum and selected carbon pool in the project area. 10. The estimated total carbon stock and standard error of the total for the entire project area.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance: Monitoring Report Section 6.4, Carbon Model Carbon Calculators.	
Findings: The Monitoring report includes many of these items in section 6.4; however there are several of these items that area captured in supplement documents and calculations. Since the	

methodology is indicating that these items be listed in the PDD that is interpreted by verifiers to mean the Monitoring Report, since the PDD does not change at each monitoring period.	
Clarification (CL): Given the possibility for some of these figures to change and the need to have at listings of these items or references to the calculations sheets that contain these items, please reference where in the Monitoring Report each of these items can be found. It is recommended that the various calculations sheets that contain items such as monitoring point coordinates and other specific data be included in the monitoring report as an appendix and referenced as such.	
Date issued:	21 February 2013
Project proponent response/actions and date: 1. The procedures and processes used for biomass, soil and leakage plot sampling are described in the MR/PIR document in Section 5.1 and the baseline model sampling is described in Section 6.1. Wildlife Works has developed SOPs that document the methods, procedures and processes for sampling of all carbon pools in this project. These documents have all been provided to the Auditor. Wildlife Works views these documents as our intellectual property, and cannot not make them available to the public. 2. The field training process is documented in the MR/PIR document in Section 5.1. 3. Wildlife Works has developed quality control and quality assurance procedures to ensure that all data collected meets our high standards. These QA/QC procedures are described in the MR/PIR document in Section 5.1, and detailed more fully in the SOP 'Quality Control Procedure v1.6.pdf,' which has been supplied to the Auditor. The data from this Monitoring Period passed all QA/QC tests, and this information and data have been provided to the Auditor. Wildlife Works does not include this data in the MR/PIR, or make it public. 4. Maps displaying the Project area, strata boundaries within the project area, Biomass plot locations and leakage plot locations are located in the MR/PIR report in Section 5.1. 5. The coordinates of the biomass sample plots that were sampled in this Monitoring Period are included on the Plot location map in Section 5.1 of the MR/PIR document. Wildlife Works does not publish a comprehensive list of all plot coordinates as we feel it is essential that the plot locations not be available to the general public. This is to reduce the chance of the plot being targeted or vandalized. 6. The size of the biomass sample plots are listed in the table' Data and Parameters Monitored', located in Section 5.3 of the MR/PIR document. 7. The value and source of all parameters are documented in Sections 5.2 Data and Parameters Available at Validation and Section 5.3 Data and Parameters Monitored. All Allometric equations are listed in more detail in Section 9.1. 8. The process used to develop allometric equations is documented in the MR/PIR document in Section 9.1 and in the file 'allometry_weighted_PhaseII.xlsx,' which has been provided to the auditor. 9. As the stratum is a component within the overall carbon calculation this information is contained in the carbon model, 'Rukinga Carbon Model and NERs_M=3_v3.xlxs', which has been provided to the auditors. We do not list this information in the MR/PIR document. 10. The total carbon stock and standard error are listed in the MR/PIR document within the table 'Data and Parameters Monitored' in Section 5.3, Section 6.1 and Section 6.4.	
Evidence used to close CL: 1. Location and information confirmed 2. Location and info confirmed.	

3. SOP located and confirmed. 4. Data and location confirmed. 5. confirmed in monitoring report 6. confirmed in mon. report 7. confirmed in mon. report 8. Data provided. 9. This data is confirmed to be provided. Other NCR's deal with the specifics. 10. Again, this data is confirmed and provided. Issue is addressed.	
Date closed:	14 March 2013

APPENDIX B – DOCUMENTS RECEIVED / REVIEWED

Documents received 28 November 2012

- The Kasigau Corridor Redd Project Phase I - Rukinga Sanctuary, 2nd Monitoring Report
- The Kasigau Corridor Redd Project Phase II - The Community Ranches, 2nd Monitoring Report
- VCS Verification Report/Verification Statement, Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase I – Rukinga Sanctuary
- VCS Verification Report/Verification Statement, Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches

Documents received 10 January 2013

- SOP Kasigau – Forest Inventory, v2.8
- SOP Kasigau – Leakage v1.0
- Map of phase II project area with plots

Documents received 17 January 2013

- Excel file "Kasigau M=3 Sampled Plots.xlsx"
- Google Earth KMZ files:
    - Leakage_Plots.kmz
    - PhaseI_Plots_m=3.kmz
    - PhaseI ProjectArea.kmz
    - PhaseII_Plots_m=3.kmz
    - PhaseII_ProjectArea.kmz

Documents received 22 January 2013

- Leakage_Plots.gpx
- PhaseI_Plots_m3.gpx
- PhaseI_ProjectArea.gpx
- PhaseII_Plots_m3.gpx
- PhaseII_ProjectArea.gpx

Documents received 24 January 2013

- Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase I – Rukinga Sanctuary 3rd Monitoring Report (M_3)
- Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches 3rd Monitoring Report (M_3)

Documents Received 13 February 2013

- The following Excel files:
    - Kasigau Corridor Phase I QC Test M3 v1.xlsx
    - Kasigau Corridor Phase II QC Test M3 v1.xlsx
    - Leakage_Model_Expanded_fixed_PhaseI_v2.xls
    - Phase II Leakage Model_v2.xls
- VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report Kasigau Phase I M_3 v1.
- VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report Kasigau Phase II M_3 v1.

Documents Received 14 February 2013

- Kasigau Corridor Carbon Model Check.docx
- The following Excel files:
    - Kasigau Phase II Carbon Monitoring M=3 v4.xlsx
    - Leakage_Model_Expanded_fixed_PhaseI_v2.xls
    - Phase II Leakage Model_v3.xls
    - Rukinga Carbon Model and NERs_M=3_v2.xlsm

Documents Received 20 February 2013

- Copy of conservation easement on Maungu Ranch
- The following Excel files:
    - Financials VCS Risk Analysis 2012 Kasigau.xlsx
    - Kasigau Project P&L M3.xls
    - Leakage_Model_Expanded_fixed_PhaseI_v2.xls
    - Phase II Leakage Model_v3.xls

Documents Received 14 March 2013

- Kasigau_Phase 1 and 2_CCB NCRs Round 1_WWC RESPONSE v2.docx
- VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report Kasigau I_M3.v2.doc
- Kasigau Corridor Phase I_VCS CCB Monitoring & Implementation Report _v2.docx
- Kasigau Corridor Phase I_VCS CCB Monitoring & Implementation Report _v2.pdf
- Phase I\Kasigau Phase I Verification - Round 1 NCR's WWC v2.xlsx
- Leakage_Model_Expanded_fixed_PhaseI_v2.xls
- Rukinga Carbon Model and NERs_M=3_v3.xlsm
- Allometry_weighted_PhaseII.xlsx
- Wildlife Works Market account_2013-02-27 at 11.42.12 AM.pdf
- Financials VCS Risk Analysis 2012 Kasigau with total sale amount added by ESI.xls
- VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report Kasigau II_M3.v2.docx
- Kasigau Corridor Phase II_VCS CCB Monitoring & Implementation Report v2.docx
- Kasigau Corridor Phase II_VCS CCB Monitoring & Implementation Report v2.pdf
- Kasigau Phase II Carbon Monitoring M=3 v5.xlsx
- Kasigau Phase II Verification-Round 1 NCRs WWC v2.xlsx
- Phase II Leakage Model_v4.xls
- Standard Operating Procedure Kasigau - Soil v1.0_5_24_2011.pdf
- Quality Control Procedure v1.6.pdf
- Standard Operating Procedure - Disturbance Monitoring - v1.0_2012-10-02.docx
- Standard Operating Procedure Kasigau - Forest Inventory v2.8_2012-11-12.pdf
- Standard Operating Procedure Kasigau - Leakage v1.0_01_01_2011.pdf

Documents Received 15 April 2013

- Phase 1 monitoring report v2.pdf
- Kasigau Corridor Phase II_VCS CCB Monitoring & Implementation Report v2.pdf
- Kasigau Phase II Carbon Monitoring M=3 v5.xlsx

Documents Received during site visit (27 January 2013 – 1 March 2013)

- Carbon Calculator

- Site visit field data
- Kasigau – Quality Control Procedure, v1.6
- Kasigau Leakage Plots Phase I.xls
- Kasigau Phase II Leakage Model plots to remeasure.xls
- Kasigau_T_test.xlsx

Documents Downloaded from CCB site

- Rukinga_CCB_PDD_Ver_2_0.pdf
- The_Kasigau_Corridor_REDD_PIR_Phase_I_2011_v2_1.pdf
- Kasigau_Corridor_Phase_II_CCB_PDD_v9.pdf
- The_Kasigau_Corridor_REDD_Project_PIR_Phase_II_m2_v2_1.pdf
- 4_WWC+Kasigau+PhaseII+2ndVer_CCB_For+Client_11292012_FINAL.pdf
- The+Kasigau+Corridor+REDD+Monitoring+Phase+II+FINAL+v2.pdf

Documents Downloaded from the VCS Website

- The Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase I – Rukinga Sanctuary, 2nd Monitoring Report (M_2)
- The Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase I – Rukinga Sanctuary, Project Document, V9
- The Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase I – Verification Report

Additional Documents Received From WWC

- Rukinga Carbon Model and NERs_M=3_v1.0.xlsm
- Rukinga Deep 1m Soil Analysis – RA v2.1.xlsx
- Rukinga M3 Raw carbon Data.xlsx