Validated by:

65 Millet St. Suite 201
Richmond, VT 05477 USA
Tel: 802-434-5491
Fax: 802-434-3116
www.smartwood.org

Carbon Forestry Validation Audit
Managed by:
Asia-Pacific Regional Office
Jl. Ciung Wanara No. 1X, Renon,
Denpasar, Bali 80225,
Indonesia
Tel: 62-361-224-356
Fax: 62-361-235-875
Contact person: Christian Sloth
Email: csloth@ra.org

Validation **Assessment** Report for:

Prakash Industries Ltd. in Ring Road No.2, New Industrial area, Gogaon, Raipur, Chattisgrah, India

Report Finalized:	June 23, 2009
Audit Dates:	16-19 March 2009
Audit Team:	Pramod Gupta and Christian Sloth
Type of Validation:	CCBA
Validation code:	RA-VAL-CCB-010935
Validation issued:	June 23, 2009

Report based on Standard(s): Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, First Edition, May 2005

Organization Contact: Manoj Sharma
Address: Ring Road No.2, New Industrial area, Gogaon, Raipur, Chattisgrah, India

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to document conformance with the requirements of CCBA project design validation standards by Prakash Industries Limited (PIL), who are the project proponents, hereafter referred to as "Company". The report presents the findings of SmartWood auditors who have evaluated company systems and performance against the applicable standard(s). Section 2 below provides the audit conclusions and any necessary follow-up actions by the company through corrective action requests.

This evaluation follows Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards, First Edition, May 2005. These were not developed by Rainforest Alliance, but by the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance, CCBA. SmartWood CCBA evaluation reports are kept confidential in the draft stage. When finalized and successfully approved, the report is posted on SmartWood's website and that of the CCBA.

The Rainforest Alliance's certification program, SmartWood, was founded in 1989 to certify responsible forestry practices and now focuses on providing a variety of certification and auditing services. In 2005, Rainforest Alliance extended our role as a forest assessor/auditor to standards and services that included verification of forest carbon projects. Rainforest Alliance has the following status with the listed climate related standards and systems:

- Chicago Climate Exchange - we are an *associate member* and an approved *verifier*
- Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance – we are a *member* and an approved *verifier*
- Voluntary Carbon Standard – we are a *verifier*
- Plan Vivo – we are a *verifier*

The CCB Standards are primarily project design standards and demonstrated conformance to the standard in this audit related to the planning, development, and design of the project in the inception or start-up phase. Conformance related to systems, design, and proposed activities in the process of development by the project. The standards were not used to measure project implementation, thus conformance to the standard was not meant to evaluate any delivery of emissions reductions, community or biodiversity benefits, or other results hoped to be achieved through future performance of the project. The CCB Standards were designed to be a tool to demonstrate high-quality project design that should lead to multiple-benefits in addition to carbon sequestration and emissions reductions. Use of the standards may increase confidence in forestry carbon projects.

Dispute resolution: If SmartWood clients encounter organizations or individuals having concerns or comments about Rainforest Alliance / SmartWood and our services, these parties are strongly encouraged to contact SmartWood Headquarters directly. Formal complaints or concerns should be sent in writing.

2 AUDIT CONCLUSIONS

2.1 Summary of Conformance to CCB Standards

General Section	Conformance:		
G1. Original Conditions at Project Site	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
G2. Baseline Projections	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
G3. Project Design & Goals	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
G4. Management Capacity	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
G5. Land Tenure	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
G6. Legal Status	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
G7. Adaptive Management for Sustainability	Yes ☒	No ☐	Optional
G8. Knowledge Dissemination	Yes ☒	No ☐	Optional

Climate Section	Conformance:		
CL1. Net Positive Climate Impacts	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
CL2. Offsite Climate Impacts ("Leakage")	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
CL3. Climate Impact Monitoring	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
CL4. Adapting to Climate Change & Climate Variability	Yes ☒	No ☐	Optional
CL5. Carbon Benefits Withheld from Regulatory Markets	Yes ☒	No ☐	Optional

Community Section	Conformance:		
CM1. Net Positive Community Impacts	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
CM2. Offsite Community Impacts	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
CM3. Community Impact Monitoring	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
CM4. Capacity Building	Yes ☒	No ☐	Optional
CM5. Best Practices in Community Involvement	Yes ☒	No ☐	Optional

Biodiversity Section	Conformance:		
B1. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
B2. Offsite Biodiversity Impacts	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
B3. Biodiversity Impact Monitoring	Yes ☒	No ☐	Required
B4. Native Species Use	Yes ☒	No ☐	Optional
B5. Water & Soil Resource Enhancement	Yes ☒	No ☐	Optional

CCBA Validation Level Attained:		
Approved	Yes ☒	No ☐
Silver	Yes ☐	No ☐
Gold	Yes ☒	No ☐

2.2 Auditor Recommendation

Based on Company's conformance with CCBA requirements, the auditor makes the following recommendation:

☒ *Validation approved:*

No CARs issued

☐ *Validation not approved:*

Conformance with CAR(s) required

Additional comments:

2.3 Corrective Action Requests

2.3.1 Corrective Action Requests (CARs)

Note: CARs describe required actions or improvements that address COMPANY non-conformances identified during audits. CARs include defined timelines for completion. CARs

issued during assessments /reassessments shall be closed prior to issuance of Validation. CARs issued during audits shall be closed within timeline or result in suspension.

2.3.2 Observations

Note: Observations are issued for areas that the auditor sees the potential for improvement in implementing standard requirements or in the quality system; observations may lead to direct non-conformances if not addressed.

OBS 14/09	Reference Standard & Requirement: CL1.3
The company did not state within the PDD their range of statistical error in the carbon stock calculations. However, companies should be able to put an error estimate on the values they calculate for carbon sequestered.	
Observation: The company should include statistical error in their carbon calculations and develop a conservative method for including such error in their carbon stock calculations.	

2.4 Actions Taken by Company Prior to Report Finalization

Prakash Industries Limited has revised its PDD (Version 1.0 of dated 15/07/2007) on the basis of the observations raised in the pre validaton report. The current version which the final validation is based carries the file name: PIL_AR_CCB_PDD_CLEAN_LCD_070409

3 AUDIT PROCESS

3.1 Audit Overview

Note: The table below provides an overview of the audit scope. See standard checklist appendix for specific details on auditor qualifications, staff interviewed, and audit findings per facility audited.

Location/Facility	Date(s)	Length of Audit	Auditor(s)
Rano Site	16 March 09	6 hours	Pramod Gupta and Christian Sloth
Pearawan Site	16 March 09	3 hours	Pramod Gupta and Christian Sloth
Rano II Site	17th March 09	3 Hours	Pramod Gupta and Christian Sloth
Saleh Site	17th March 09	3 Hours	Pramod Gupta and Christian Sloth
Lara Site	18th March 09	7 Hours	Pramod Gupta and Christian Sloth
Lara Site	19th March 09	3 Hours	Pramod Gupta and Christian Sloth

3.2 Description of Audit Process

The audit commenced in the morning about 10 am at the Rano site on 16th March 2009. Started with an opening meeting with Vice President (Mr. Manoj Sharma) and the company staff. Visited Rano and Penddrawan site in the afternoon on 16th March. On 17th March at

8.30 am had formal discussion with the workers at Rano site. At 10.30 had the stakeholder consultation at the Chopal of Rano Village with the Village Secretary, *Punch* and several farmers. Visited the Rano II and Saleh site in the afternoon and had the stakeholder consultation with the *Sarpach* and farmers of *gram panchyat* Sales Kala. Also informal discussion with the workers of the Rano II and Saleh site. On 18th March visited the Lara site and seen the practical implementation of the rain water harvesting techniques. In the afternoon had the discussion with the workers of the Lara site. On 19th March visited the office of the PIL at Raipur and checked the land tenure related documents, Initial stake holder consultation documentation, MOU between all the project implementation companies etc.

3.3 Documents reviewed

List of the documents reviewed during site visit for validation

i) Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (M&E Plan) (Attached)
ii) Regarding the Sustainable water availability through rain water harvesting (Attached)
iii) Participatory Rural Apprisal (PRA Report) (Attached)
iv) Woker right and worker safety (Worker Manual) (Attached)
v) Host Country Approval (HCA Approval) (Attached)
vi) Annual Details of the area planted or to be planted (XL Sheet) (Attached)
vii) Environment Impact Statement (EIA) (Attached)
viii) Detail Project Report (DPR) (Attached)
ix) Bio Diversity Survey Report (Attached)
x) Land Details (list of land at all the site in XL sheet) (Attached)
xi) Soil Test Report (Attached)
xii) Initial Stake holder consultation (Attached)
xiii) List of Awards given to the PIL project
xiv) Notification of Govt. of India (EIA not required)
xv) List of events/community participation by PIL
xvi) Copy of MOU between all group companies

3.4 Stakeholder consultation process (if applicable)

Villagers, farmers, workers in (Informal interview with the villagers, secreatry, panch etc).

Appendix A: COMPANY DETAILS

1 CONTACTS

1.1 Primary Contact for Coordination with SmartWood

Primary Contact, Position:	Mr. Manoj Sharma (Vice President, Plantation & Development)
Address:	Ring Road No.2, New Industrial Area, Gogaon, Raipur, Chhattisgrah. PIN-493221. INDIA
Tel/Fax/Email:	+91-771-2327598, +91-771-2327588, +91-9826902468, manoj0664@yahoo.com

1.2 Billing Contact

Contact, Position:	Mr. Sanjay Jain
Address:	Srivan, Najafgrah, Bijawasan Road, Bijwasan, New Delhi-61
Tel/Fax/Email:	+91-11-28062119

2 SmartWood Website Customer Fact Sheet

Note: upon Validation, the SmartWood website posts and maintains Customer Fact Sheets for companies with the information in the table below at http://www.ra-smartwood.org/

Field	Text for Customer Fact Sheet	Has this Info Changed?
Contact, Title: (Sales & Marketing)	Mr. Manoj Sharma (Vice President, Plantation & Development)	Yes ☐ No ☒
Address:	Ring Road No.2, New Industrial Area, Gogaon, Raipur, Chhattisgrah. PIN-493221. INDIA	Yes ☐ No ☒
Tel/Fax/Email/Website:	+91-771-2327598, +91-771-2327588, +91-9826902468, manoj0664@yahoo.com, www.prakash.com	Yes ☐ No ☒
Products/Descriptions:	*Gmelina arborea* logs. *Albizzia lebbeck* logs	Yes ☐ No ☒

3 Validation Scope

3.1 Scope Definition:

Reforestation of degraded land of Prakash Industries Limited. Plantation sites in Rano, Rano II, Pendravan, Saleh and Lara, district of Durg, Rajnandgaon and Raigrah of Chattisgrah state. The plantation species planted by project proponent are Gmelina arborea and Albizia lebbek.

3.2 Type of Legal Entity: Limited Liability

3.3 Jurisdiction: India

Appendix B: STANDARD CHECKLIST CCB STANDARDS

1 Evaluation of Project

Project Name:	Reforestation of Degraded land in Chattisgrah, India
Contact for Validation:	Mr. Manoj Sharma (Vice President, Plantation & Development)
Address:	Ring Road No.2, New Industrial Area, Gogaon, Raipur, Chhattisgrah. PIN-493221. INDIA
Tel/Fax/Email:	+91-771-2327598, +91-771-2327588, +91-9826902468, manoj0664@yahoo.com

2 Evaluation Details

Auditor(s), Qualifications:	Pramod Gupta: Lead auditor for ISO 9000, 14000 & FSC CoC and Trainee Auditor for FSC FM and Carbon Verification. Christian Sloth: MSc. Forestry. Rainforest Alliance Lead auditor for FM, COC and Verification.
Sites Visited:	Rano, Durg, Chattisgrah Pendrawan, Durg, Chattisgrah Rano II, Durg, Chattisgrah Saleh, Rajnandgaon, Chattisgrah Lara, Raigrah, Chattisgrah
People Interviewed, Titles:	Mr. Manoj Sharma (Vice President) Mr. Subash Hardaha (Project Manager) Mr. S. K. Srivastava (Sr. Rev. Officer) Mr. Kamal Jain (Dy. Manager (Com) Mr. Ram Nanadan Yadav (Farm Manager, Durg sites) Mr. Ashok Kr. Jaiswal (Farm Manager, Raigarh Sites) Mr. Ashok Kumar Soni (Site In charge, Pendravan) Mr. Y P Sharma (Site In charge, Rano) Mr. P M Sahu (Site In charge, Durg sites) Mr. Nohar Singh (Site In charge, Rano) Mr. Durgesh Patel Site In charge, Saleh Mr. Pramod Chaudhary (Supervisor, Lara) Mr. Suresh Kumar (Supervisor, Rano) Mr. Taran Singh (Watchman Rano Site) Mr. Jagdeo (Watchman Rano site)

3 Standard Checklist

Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards
First Edition, May 2005

G1. Original Conditions at Project Site - Required

Concept
The original conditions at the project site before the project commences must be described. This description, along with projections (G2), will help determine the likely impacts of the project

Indicators
The original conditions at the project site before the project commences must be described. This description, along with projections (**G2**), will help determine the likely impacts of the project:

General Information

1) The location of the project and basic physical parameters (e.g. soil, geology, climate).

Findings	The location of the project and other required (Soil, Geology and climate) data has been provided by the project proponent in PDD.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

2) The types and condition of vegetation at the project site.

Findings	The PDD clearly describes the vegetation condition at the project site. Virtually no natural forest cover was found within the boundaries of the project area at the time of project starting.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

Climate Information

3) Current carbon stocks at the Project site(s), using methodologies from the Intergovernmental on Panel on Climate Change´s Good Practice Guidance (IPCC GPG) or other internationally-approved methodologies (e.g. from the CDM Executive Board).

Findings	The Internationally-approved methodology from the CDM Executive Board (AR-AM 0001) has been used, thus meeting the requirement of the indicator. CDM AR-AM0001 methodology applies due to (1) no anticipated shift in pre-project activities outside of project boundary due to relatively low-intensity use currently, and fuel/fodder program for local communities; (2) degraded forest conditions, including lack of forest cover on Dec., 31, 1989 with photographic and land record evidence; (3) insufficient encroachment of natural forest vegetation due to high soil iron quantities, high soil erosion rates, and low soil water holding capacity; (4) direct planting and seeding will be done with minimal soil disturbance; (5) Rotation length is greater than 20 years for Gmelina arborea and 30 years for Albizia lebbeck; (6) Bhata lands will have decreasing carbon stocks in absence of project activity; (7) Grazing will not occur in project boundary by means of fencing.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

Community Information

4) A description of communities located in and around the project area, including basic socio-economic information (using appropriate methodologies such as the livelihoods framework).

Findings	The PDD contains basic information such as communities, population, caste donimation and livelihood.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

5) A description of current land use and land tenure at the project site. (See also **G5**).

Findings	The PDD describe the current land use and tenure at project site.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

Biodiversity Information

6) A description of current biodiversity in the project area and threats to that biodiversity, using appropriate methodologies (e.g., key species habitat analysis, connectivity analysis), substantiated where possible with appropriate reference material

Findings	In the PDD the project proponent has described the current biodiversity and threats within the project area. In August 2008 they conducted a biodiversity survey (Biodiversity Survey Report).		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

7) A list of all IUCN Red List threatened species (which encompasses endangered and vulnerable species) and species on nationally recognized list (where applicable) found within the project boundary. (See also **B1**).

Findings	In the PDD the project proponent describe that no protected or endangered species are found in the project area, as per IUCN red list.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

G2. Baseline Projections

Concept

An analysis of projected land-use trends is necessary to predict likely on-site changes without implementation of a project. This "without-project" future land-use scenario enables comparison of the project's likely impacts with what would otherwise have occurred.

Indicators

The project proponents must develop a defensible and well-documented "without-project" future land-use scenario and baseline projections.

1) Description of the most likely land-use scenario in the absence of the project, identifying whether the scenario assumes that existing laws or regulations would have required that project activities be undertaken anyway.[1]

Findings	Three alternative land uses are described including: 1. Land reforested without Carbon credits 2. Agricultural farming

[1]This is important for justifying whether the benefits being claimed by the project are truly "additional", i.e., the climate, community, and biodiversity impacts that would not be likely to occur without the project. For example, actions implemented by the project must not be required by law, or project proponents must make a compelling case demonstrating that the pertinent laws are not being enforced. The project proponents must provide credible and well-documented analyses (poverty assessments, farming knowledge assessments, remote sensing analysis, etc) showing that without the project, improved land-use practices would be unlikely to materialize.

	3. Land degradation as *status quo* The PDD contains an analysis of the different land use scenarios and barriers to each of these and it is reasonably argued that none of these activities would likely happen on the degraded land that the Project is established on.
Conformance CAR/OBS	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

2) A projection of future carbon stock changes in the absence of the project, based on the land-use scenario described above. The timeframe for this analysis can be either the project lifetime (see G3) or the project accounting period, whichever is more appropriate[2]. If there is evidence that non-CO_2 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions such as CH_4 or N_2O are more than 15% of the baseline GHG fluxes at the project site (in terms of CO_2 equivalents), they must be estimated.

Findings	The changes in the carbon stock of the baseline is assumed to be "0." The baseline is partially justified by fact that Pendravan site is slightly susceptible to erosion, Rano sites are moderately susceptible to erosion and Saleh and Lara sites are severely susceptible to erosion, thus vegetative carbon stocks will continue to deteriorate at sites without intervention. The non-C02 GHGs emission are negligible as this project has described to use organic manure instead of chemical fertilizer which would have released non-CO2 GHGs.
Conformance CAR/OBS	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

3) Description of how the "without-project" scenario would affect local communities in the project area.

Findings	The PDD describes that the without-project scenario would affect local communities' livelihoods and in such ways that their livelihood would be worse than the with-project scenario.
Conformance CAR/OBS	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

4) Description of how the "without-project" land-use scenario would affect biodiversity in the project area.

Findings	The PDD describes the without-project scenario sufficiently.
Conformance CAR/OBS	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

5) Description of how the "without-project" land-use scenario would affect water and soil resources. (See also **B5**).

Findings	The PDD describes the without-project scenario sufficiently.
Conformance CAR/OBS	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

[2] In some cases, the project lifetime and the project accounting period may be different.

G3. Project Design & Goals - **Required**

Concept
The project must be described in sufficient detail so that a third-party can adequately evaluate it. Projects that operate in a transparent manner enable stakeholders and outside parties to contribute more effectively to the project.

Indicators
The Project proponents must:

1) Provide a description of the scope of the project and a summary of the major climate, community and biodiversity goals.

Findings	The scope of the project and a short summary of major goals is given in the PDD and are as follows: Enhancing the carbon sink through reforestation Reclaim the degraded land in sustainable manner Reduce pressure on natural forest in the region Upliftment of social economic of status of rural people. Company have kept records of all employment provided to local community workers on their "Labour Deployment Chart". This documentation clearly shows a significant involvement of local labour force. Company is also meeting the local minimum requirements for salary. Company maintain a volume and weight chart of fuelwood and firewood removed for local consumption from the plantations. This could easily be converted to carbon equivalents and used during VCS verification.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

2) Describe each major project activity (if more than one) and its relevance to achieving the project's goals.

Findings	The PDD describes each project activity and how these will work to achieve the project goals. These include: 1. Reforestation 2. Irrigation systems 3. Use of organic manure 4. Mulching techniques 5. Nursery establishment and management 6. Rainwater harvesting system and aquifer re-charging
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

3) Provide a map identifying the project location, where the major project activities will occur, and geo-referenced boundaries of the project site(s).

Findings	In the PDD project location (GPS location) and an outline map of project site are described clearly including Pendrawan site.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

4) Provide a timeframe for the project's duration and the rationale used for determining the project lifetime. If the accounting period for carbon credits differs from the project lifetime, explain.

Findings	The project duration and accounting period has been set at 20 years. The major technological initiatives taken by the project participant are as Drip irrigation system, use of organic manure, water and soil resource enhancement.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

5) Identify likely risks to climate, community and biodiversity benefits during the project lifetime. Outline measures that the project plans to undertake to mitigate these risks.

Findings	Species specific biotic risks to planted trees are documented along with mechanical and chemical measures to mitigate risks. Fire danger and mitigation are briefly described.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

6) Document and defend how local stakeholders have been or will be defined.

Findings	The PDD defines the local stakeholders as follows; Local people of near by villages around the project. Projects staff working on/off site Local government officials Local village governing bodies.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

7) Demonstrate transparency by: making all project documentation publicly accessible at, or near, the project site; only withholding information when the need for confidentiality is clearly justified; informing local stakeholders how they can access the project documentation; and by making key project documents available in local or regional languages, where applicable.

Findings	The PDD clearly states that the project documentation is publicly available or accessible. They convey this information to stake holders in weekly meetings. The company is found to have very close relations and frequent communications with adjacent communities and there was found to be a good local knowledge of the project. This is also a result of the fact that the land on which the project is based has been purchased from local communities.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

G4. Management Capacity - **Required**

Concept
The success of a Project depends upon the competent of the implementing management team.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Document the management team's experience implementing land management projects. If relevant experience is lacking, the proponents must demonstrate how other organizations will be partnered with to support the project.

Findings	The PDD briefly describes the management experience of the project head (Mr. Manoj Sharma M.Sc forestry) who have extensive experience of arround 15 years of plantation managemnt in the region. The other site staff also experienced in plantation.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐

CAR/OBS	

2) Demonstrate that management capacity is appropriate to the scale of the project.

Findings	The PDD describes the requirements through their organisation chart, which is approriate. They also outline the responsibilities of each management position.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

3) Document key technical skills that will be required to successfully implement the project and identify members of the management team or project partners who possess the appropriate skills.

Findings	The PDD defines the requirements in detail through the responsibilities and authorities defined in organisation chart. Checked and verified at site through interview of site staff.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

4) Document the financial health of the implementing organization(s).

Findings	The project proponent is a leading company in the steel market and have listing in BSE and NSE. The financial data of the company are publicly available as per the listing requirements. Company has also included the turnover and EBIT data in the revised and current version of the PDD.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

G5. Land Tenure - **Required**

Concept
There should be no significant land tenure disputes in the project area, or the project should fundamentally help to resolve these tenure issues.

Indicators
Based on information about current land tenure provided in **G3**, the project proponents must:

1) Guarantee that the project will not encroach uninvited on private property, community property, or government property.

Findings	The Project states that it will not encroach uninvited on private property. There is no mention of any landownership / tenure conflicts. The land is owned by project promoters (A group of seven companies).		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

2) Guarantee that the project does not require the relocation of people, or any relocation is 100% voluntary and fundamentally helps resolve land tenure problems in the area.

Findings	The PDD clearly describes that the relocation of people will not take place. Further, due to reforestation employment will be generated to local communities, thus it will help in decreasing migration from the project areas.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

3) Describe potential “in-migration” of people from surrounding areas, if relevant, and explain how the project will respond.

Findings	The updated PDD includes a clarification of this and project proponent expects no risk of “in-migration” of people to the project management areas. The plantatons are all

	estalished on well-defined land areas bought from local people and is all under intensive management. However if case of in-migration, the little risk exist to the integrity of the plantations as land title are secured and clear. There is well managed security structure in place at all the sites.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

G6. Legal Status - **Required**

Concept
The project must be based on a solid legal framework (e.g., appropriate contracts are likely to be in place) and the project must seek to satisfy applicable planning and regulatory requirements.

During the project design phase, the project proponents should communicate early on with relevant local, regional and national authorities and allow adequate time to earn necessary approvals. The project design should be flexible to accommodate potential modifications that may arise to secure regulatory approval.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Guarantee that no laws will be broken by the project.

Findings	The PDD states that the project will abide by all applicable laws in the host country. Project has received the HCA approval from govt. of India Ministry of Env & forest through F.No.4/20/2007-ccc dated 27th January 2007 by director (CC) (Mr. R.K.Sethi). EIA is not required for this type of project as notified through SO1533 (Published in Gazette of India) extra ordinary part-1 and section3, subsection (ii) by ministry of Environment and Forest, Govt. of India, dated 14th Sept 2006). HCA approval has been received and notification regarding waiver of the EIA requirement was received by company.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

2) Document that the project has, or expects to secure, approval from the appropriate authorities.

Findings	Approval for HCA has been received and notification that the EIA was not required was checked by the auditors. (See reference in findings in G6.1).
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

G7. Adaptative Management for Sustainability - 1 **Point, Optional**

Concept
Adaptive management is a formal, systematic, and rigorous approach to learning from the outcomes of management actions, accommodating change and improving management. It involves synthesizing existing knowledge, exploring alternative actions and making forecasts about their outcomes. [3]

[3] The definition of Adaptive Management and several of the indicators were based on Nyberg (1999). *An Introductory Guide to Adaptive Management.*

Adaptive management is based upon the premise that ecosystems and social systems are complex and inherently unpredictable. Adaptive management views land management actions as learning opportunities and as potential experiments for systematically testing assumptions and identifying adjustments that could benefit the project. It enables a project to evolve to meet changing or unanticipated needs, and can help ensure that the project realizes its goals over the long term.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Demonstrate how management actions and monitoring programs are designed to generate reliable feedback that is used to improve project outcomes.

Findings	They do it by way of monitoring of survival rate, thinned biomass, harvested biomass, fertilizer applied etc. The data is analysed and management strategies revised to reflect any needed change to improve growth of trees or other issues.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

2) Have a management plan for documenting decisions, actions and outcomes and sharing this information with others within the project team, so experience is passed on rather than being lost when individuals leave the project.

Findings	The Company also maintain the monitoring and evaluation plan on annual basis. Also keeps files of meetings and other records for further use or reference.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

3) Demonstrate how the project design is sufficiently flexible to accommodate potential changes and that the project has a defined process in place to adjust project activities as needed.

Findings	The PDD describes how the project design will be amended in case changes occur that affect the project.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

4) Demonstrate an early commitment to the long-term sustainability of project benefits once initial project funding expires. Potential activities may include: designing a new project that builds on initial project outcomes; securing payments for ecosystem services; promoting micro-enterprise; and establishing alliances with organizations or companies to continue sustainable land management.

Findings	They have developed a detailed Project Report for the project before starting the project. The land is owned by the project proponent with a clear commitment to sustain the project for a longer period.
	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

G8. Knowledge Dissemination - 1 Point, Optional

Concept
Field-based knowledge can be of value to other projects. If actively disseminated, this information can accelerate the adoption of innovative practices that bring benefits both globally and locally.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Describe how they will document the relevant or applicable lessons learned.

Findings	They are implementing this by way of noting in field books and if important than will

	become the part of project monitoring report.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

2) Describe how they will disseminate this information in order to encourage replication of successful practices. Examples include: undertaking and disseminating research that has wide-reaching applications; holding training workshops for community members from other locales; promoting "farmer to farmer" knowledge-transfer activities; linking to regional databases; and working with interested academic, corporate, governmental or non-governmental organizations to replicate successful project activities.

Findings	Practically their staff assisted in plantation for the Government in nearby sites, taking up consultancy activities on honorary basis in the nearby area (for Lunia Farms, Jain Farms). The Company also trains the local communities for the knowledge enhancement. The project also collects data and will publish the results of the project.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

CL1. Net Positive Climate Impacts - **Required**

Concept
The project must generate net positive impacts on atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHGs) within the project boundaries and over the project lifetime.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Use the methodologies of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Good Practice Guidance (IPCC GPG) to estimate the net change in carbon stocks due to the project activities. The net change is equal to carbon stock changes *with* the project minus carbon stock changes *without* the project (the latter having been estimated in **G2**). Alternatively, any methodology approved by the CDM Executive Board may be used. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defendable assumptions about how project activities will alter carbon stocks and non-CO_2 GHG emissions over the duration of the project or the project accounting period.

Findings	Methodology AR-AM0001 is used, which is approved by CDM executive board to estimate carbon stock change has been used and the assumptions used seem reasonable.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

2) Factor in the non-CO_2 gases CH_4 and N_2O to the net change calculations (above) if they are likely to account for more than 15% (in terms of CO_2 equivalents) of the project's overall GHG impact.

Findings	Emissions due to biomass burning, fossil fuel burning from machinery using and fertilizer use have been taken into account for ex ante estimation. The Company has calculated the emissions of non-CO2 gasses. No biomass burning takes place either during site preparation or management. All surplus biomass produced is collected by local communities for fuelwood or fodder.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

3) Demonstrate that the net climate impact of the project (including changes in carbon stocks, and non-CO_2 gases where appropriate) will give a positive result in terms of overall GHG benefits delivered.

Findings	Net change in carbon stocks is quantified from 2002-2023, subtracting losses from coppice and harvest removals as well as leakage from internal vehicle traffic.

	The company has not included account for statistical error in their carbon stock calculations.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	OBS 14/09: The company should include statistical error in their carbon calculations and develop a conservative method for including such error in their carbon stock calculations.

CL2. Offsite Climate Impacts ("Leakage") - **Required**

Concept

The project proponents must quantify and mitigate likely negative offsite climate impacts; namely, decreased carbon stocks or increased emissions of non-CO_2 GHGs outside the project boundary, resulting from project activities (referred to as "leakage" in climate change policy).

Indicators

The project proponents must:

1) Estimate potential offsite decreases in carbon stocks (increases in emissions or decreases in sequestration) due to project activities.

Findings	There is no offsite decrease in carbon stock or (leakage) anticipated due to proposed project activity.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

2) Document how negative offsite impacts resulting from project activities will be mitigated, and estimate the extent to which such impacts will be reduced.

Findings	The PDD described that as local people are provided with fuel and fodder they will not go beyond the project boundary to collect these resources and emissions during the project by vehicles are already considered while calculating the emissions. There are no negative offsite effects. There is no possible leakage associated (apart from vehicle emissions) with the projects distribution of fuel and fodder since these are all related to using branches cut from the plantation trees. Earlier, people were using cow dung as fuel. Now the dung is being used as fertilizer in agriculture.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

3) Subtract any likely project-related unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts from the climate benefits being claimed by the project. The total net effect, equal to the net increase in onsite carbon stocks (calculated in the third indicator in **CL1**) minus negative offsite climate impacts, must be positive.

Findings	Net climate impact is positive. No negative offsite climate impacts are identified.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

CL3. Climate Impact Monitoring - **Required**

Concept

Before a project begins, the project proponents must have an initial monitoring plan in place to quantify and document changes in project-related carbon pools, and non-CO_2 GHG emissions if appropriate, (within and outside the project boundaries). The monitoring plan should state which measurements will be taken and which sampling strategy will be used.

Since developing a full carbon-monitoring plan can be costly, it is accepted that some of the plan details may not be fully defined at the design stage, when projects are being evaluated by the CCB Standards. This will be especially true for small-scale projects.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Have an initial plan for how they will select carbon pools and non-CO_2 GHGs to be monitored, and the frequency of monitoring. Potential pools include aboveground biomass, litter, dead wood, belowground biomass and soil carbon. Pools to monitor must include any pools expected to decrease as a result of project activities. Relevant non-CO_2 gases must be monitored if they account for more than 15% of the project's net climate impact expressed in terms of CO_2 equivalents.

Findings	The PDD describes the initial plan for i) selection of carbon pools and non CO2 GHGs, ii) Leakage monitoring and iii) measurement and sampling strategy. So the requirements of the criterion are met by the project proponent.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

CL4. Adapting to Climate Change and Climate Variability - **Required**

Concept
Projects designed to anticipate and adapt to probable impacts of climate change and climate variability are more likely to sustain the benefits generated by the project over the long term.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Identify likely regional climate change and climate variability impacts, using available studies.

Findings	All likely regional climate change and climate variability impacts, using available studies have been identified. PIL has conducted the sustainable water availability through rainwater harvesting.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

2) Demonstrate that the project has anticipated such potential impacts and that appropriate measures will be taken to minimize these negative impacts.

Findings	Measures to improve efficiency of fertilizer use and transportation are provided, however these are not related to the mitigation of the *impacts* of climate change. The Company keeps detailed records for all sites on monthly precipitation. The Company is applying a number of water conserving and harvesting activities: 1. Sub-surface dikes 2. Bunding across contours 3. Soil treatment (plowing to increase infiltration capacity) 4. Mulching of soil 5. Direct re-charge of aquifers via reverse pumping into the ground. The Company is currently monitoring growth data and evaluating possible measures to

	mitigate negative effects of changes on climate. However this procedure now has been described specifically in the current PDD.
Conformance CAR/OBS	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

CL5. Carbon Benefits Withheld from Regulatory Markets - 1 Point, Optional

Concept
When some carbon benefits generated by a project are not sold to satisfy regulatory requirements, additional mitigation action will be required elsewhere to meet these requirements. Therefore, withholding a portion of the project's carbon benefits from being used in capped markets will result in greater overall climate change mitigation.

Moreover, projects that do not sell all their carbon benefits in regulated regimes have the opportunity to experiment with climate change mitigation activities other than the ones eligible under these regimes (such as avoided deforestation, which is not currently creditable under the Clean Development Mechanism). Such experimentation may generate new knowledge that is of value to carbon rule makers and other project developers.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1. Not sell at least 10% of the total carbon benefits generated by the project[4] into regulated GHG markets (e.g., CDM, New South Wales GHG Abatement Scheme, Oregon Standard). Projects can sell these carbon benefits in a voluntary market or retire them.

Findings	In the PDD they have clearly declared that they will not sell 10% of the total carbon Benefits generated by project in to regulated GHG market. The Project can sell these carbon benefits in Voluntary markets or retire them.
Conformance CAR/OBS	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

CM1. Net Positive Community Impacts - Required

Concept
The project must generate net positive impacts on the social and economic wellbeing of communities within the project boundaries and within the project lifetime. In addition, local communities and other stakeholders should be engaged early on so that the project design can be revised based on their input. Finally, projects should ensure that stakeholders can express concerns and grievances to project proponents and that these concerns are responded to in a timely manner.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Use appropriate methodologies (e.g. the livelihoods framework) to estimate the net benefits to communities resulting from planned project activities. A credible estimate of net benefits must include changes in community wellbeing given project activities. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defendable assumptions about how project activities will alter social and economic wellbeing over the duration of the project. The "with project" scenario must then be compared with the

[4] Total carbon benefits generated by the project can include those coming from activities that are currently not eligible for crediting under existing regulatory regimes (e.g., avoided deforestation).

baseline scenario of social and economic wellbeing in the absence of the project (completed in **G2**). The difference (i.e., the net community benefit) must be positive.

Findings	The PDD describes analysis in relation to social and economic impacts of the project and also net benefit changes in community. During site visit the auditors verified the Participatory Rual Apprisal (PRA study/ report).
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

2) Document local stakeholder participation in the project's planning. If the project occurs in an area with significant local stakeholders, the project must engage a diversity of stakeholders, including appropriate sub-groups, underrepresented groups and women living in the project vicinity. Stakeholders in the project's area of influence must have an opportunity before the project design is finalized, to raise concerns about potential negative impacts, express desired outcomes and provide input on the project design. Project developers must document stakeholder dialogues and indicate if and how the project proposal was revised based on such input.[5]

Findings	i) Initial stakeholder consultation has been done (Auditors checked the meeting documents originating from the purchasing of land) ii) Local stakeholders consultation in CDM frame work - letter for this from local self governance authorities to all villages, iii) Rural Apprisal study has been conducted by independent agencies iv) Advertisements in the local newspapers.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

3) Formalize a clear process for handling unresolved conflicts and grievances that arise during project planning and implementation. The project design must include a process for hearing, responding to and resolving community grievances within a reasonable time period. This grievance process must be publicized to local stakeholders. Project management must attempt to resolve all reasonable grievances raised, and provide a written response to grievances within 30 days. Grievances and project responses must be documented.

Findings	The updated PDD defines the process for handling unresolved conflicts and grievances that arise during project planning and implementation between the parties (Internal, external).
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

CM2. Offsite Community Impacts - **Required**

Concept

The project proponents must quantify and mitigate likely negative social and economic offsite impacts; namely, the decreased social and economic wellbeing of communities or people living outside the project boundary, resulting from project activities.

Indicators

The project proponents must:

1) Identify potential negative offsite community impacts that the project is likely to cause.

Findings	No negative offsite impacts are identified via PRA and Environment Impact Assessment (EIA). However as per the notification of Govt. of India, PIL does not need to conduct the EIA for this type of project.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

[5] In cases where it is unclear whether a project will be implemented or not, it is acceptable to start with a preliminary community consultation, provided there are plans for a full engagement once the project is funded. (Such a cautious approach is warranted when there is evidence that raising community expectations prematurely could lead to frustration).

CAR/OBS	

2) Describe how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite social and economic impacts.

Findings	No negative impact from the project is expected to take place off site so there is plan to mitigate. During the discussion with the villagers and workers verified and found no negative offiste social impact from this project.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

3) Evaluate likely unmitigated negative offsite social and economic impacts against the social and economic benefits of the project within the project boundaries. Justify and demonstrate that the net social and economic effect of the project is positive.

Findings	There are no likely negative offsite community aspects so evaluation was not done.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

CM3. Community Impact Monitoring - **Required**

Concept

The project proponents must have an initial monitoring plan to quantify and document changes in social and economic wellbeing resulting from the project activities (within and outside the project boundaries). The monitoring plan should indicate which measurements will likely be taken and which sampling strategy will be used to determine how the project affects social and economic wellbeing.

Since developing a full community-monitoring plan can be costly, it is accepted that some of the plan details may not be fully defined at the design stage, when projects are being evaluated by the CCB Standards. This will especially be true for small-scale projects.

Indicators

The project proponents must:

1) Have an initial plan for how they will select community variables to be monitored, and the frequency of monitoring. Potential variables include income, health, roads, schools, food security, education and inequality. Community variables at risk of being negatively impacted by project activities should be monitored.

Findings	In the PDD an outline of areas (Life expetancy, communicable diseases, water borne diseases, religiously important location, house structure, women self depedance, power consumtion, transportation facility, livelihood opportunities, arable land, forest land etc) to be included in monitoring are given.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

CM4. Capacity Building - 1 Point, Optional

Concept
Projects that include a significant capacity-building (training, skill building, etc) component are more likely to sustain the positive outcomes generated by the project and have them replicated elsewhere. The project proponents must include a plan to provide orientation and training for the project's employees and relevant community members with an eye to building locally relevant skills and knowledge over time.

Indicators
The project proponents must show that capacity building is:

1) Structured to accommodate the needs of communities, not only of the project;

Findings	They are helping the near by villages by way to sponsorship of school teachers, participating in Durga Puja, sponsorship of football and cricket matches between near by villages etc..		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

2) Targeted to a wide range of groups, not just elites;

Findings	The auditors verified that they employed all types of community members in the project capacity building activities including women.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

3) Targeted to women to increase their participation; and

Findings	They encourage women to participate and work in the project and now it's seen that Rano and Lara site mainly women are working in the project site.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

4) Aimed to increase community participation in project implementation.

Findings	In Prakash they do this by way of increasing the number of man days in the project for near-by village workers, participation in the local rituals, participation in local festivals etc.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

CM5. Best Practices in Community Involvement - 1 Point, Optional

Concept
Projects that use best practices for community involvement are more likely to benefit communities. Best practices include: respect for local customs, local stakeholder employment, worker rights and worker safety.

Indicators
Project proponents must:

1) Demonstrate that the project was developed with a strong knowledge of local customs and that, where relevant, project activities are compatible with local customs.

Findings	In the PDD they described that project is developed with local customs. Checked and verified that they actively participate in all regional rituals (Yagya), local festivals, sponsorship of public communication equipment for their local rituals etc.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

2) Show that local stakeholders will fill all employment positions (including management) if the job requirements are met. Project proponents must explain how stakeholders will be selected for positions and where relevant, must indicate how traditionally underrepresented stakeholders and women, will be given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained.

Findings	In the PDD they described that they have appointed local people at various levels. Auditors verified that Mr. Ashok Jaiswal as Farm Manager, Raigrah site (Lara), Mr. Durgesh Patel, Site In charge at Saleh were from the near by villages. Also all workers were from the nearby villages.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

3) Show that the project will inform workers about their rights, and that the project complies with international rules on worker rights.

Findings	In the PDD they described that they had communicated to the workers about their rights. They had done this upon hiring and introduced them to the worker manual. It was verified from workers at site (Mr. Moti Ram Chauhan, Mr. Saroj Seth at Lara Site and Mrs. Leela Wati, Mr. Manoj Sahoo at Rano Site).
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

4) Comprehensively assess situations and occupations that pose a substantial risk to worker safety. A plan must be in place to inform workers of risks and to explain how to minimize such risks. Where worker safety cannot be guaranteed, project proponents must show how the risks will be minimized using best work practices.

Findings	In case of Prakash they have identified the risk for workers safety. The main risk is that while workers apply chemicals in the plantation they can get infection, etc. For this Prakash has given the training to their workers and provided personal protective equipment, such as gloves, mask and goggles.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

B1. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts - **Required**

Concept

The project must generate net positive impacts on biodiversity within the project boundaries and within the project lifetime, measured against the baseline conditions.

Projects should have no negative effects on species included in the IUCN Red List of threatened species (which encompasses endangered and vulnerable species) or species on a nationally recognized list (where applicable). Invasive species must not be planted by the project.

Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs), as a relatively new form of technology, raise a host of ethical, scientific and socio-economic issues. Some GMO attributes may result in invasive genes or species. In

the future, certain GMOs may be proven safe. However, given the currently unresolved issues surrounding GMOs, projects cannot use genetically modified organisms to generate carbon credits.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Use appropriate methodologies (e.g., key species habitat analysis, connectivity analysis) to estimate changes in biodiversity as a result of the project. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defendable assumptions. The "with project" scenario should then be compared with the baseline "without project" biodiversity scenario completed in **G2**. The difference (i.e., the net biodiversity benefit) must be positive.

Findings	The project proponent has done the impact analysis on the basis of connectivity analysis, which meets the requirements of the standard. Checked and verified the document biodiversity survey report recently conducted by PIL.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

2) Describe possible adverse effects of non-native species on the area's environment, including impacts on native species and disease introduction or facilitation. If these impacts have a substantial bearing on biodiversity or other environmental outcomes, the project proponents must justify the necessity of using non-native species over native species.

Findings	The PDD defines that no non native species will be used in the project. In the project they used Gmelina arborea and Albizia lebbeck, which are native species.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

3) Identify all IUCN Red List threatened species and species deemed threatened on nationally recognized lists that may be found within the project boundary. Project proponents must document how project activities will not be detrimental in any way to these species.

Findings	The project site is found on degraded land and IUCN red listed species are not found within the project site, so this meets the requirement of the indicatior.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

4) Identify all species to be used by the project and show that no known invasive species will be used.

Findings	At the project site all native (Gmelina arborea and Albizia lebbeck, East Indian Walnut, Neem, Bamboo, mango, Indian Gooseberry) species are planted, meets the requirement of indicator.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

5) Guarantee that no genetically modified organisms will be used to generate carbon credits.

Findings	At the project site no Genetically Modified Organisms will be used.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

B2. Offsite Biodiversity Impacts - **Required**

Concept
The project proponents must quantify and mitigate likely negative offsite biodiversity impacts; namely, decreased biodiversity outside the project boundary resulting from project activities.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Identify potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts that the project is likely to cause.

Findings	There are no negative offsite biodiversity impacts identified. At the time of beginning of the project there was no biodiversity present at the sites selected for reforestation. Basically the land selected for plantaton development was all barren land.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

2) Describe how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite biodiversity impacts.

Findings	Since no negative offsite biodervisity impacts exists no mitigation plan is needed.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

3) Evaluate likely unmitigated negative offsite biodiversity impacts against the biodiversity benefits of the project within the project boundaries. Justify and demonstrate that the net effect of the project on biodiversity is positive.

Findings	No negative offsite impacts to biodiversity are identified.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

B3. Biodiversity Impact Monitoring - Required

Concept
The project proponents must have an initial monitoring plan to quantify and document the changes in biodiversity resulting from the project activities (within and outside the project boundaries). The monitoring plan should state which measurements will likely be taken and which sampling strategy used.

Since developing a full biodiversity-monitoring plan can be costly, it is accepted that some of the plan details may not be fully defined at the design stage, when projects are being evaluated by the CCB Standards. This will especially be true for small-scale projects.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Have an initial plan for how they will select biodiversity variables to be monitored, and the frequency of monitoring. Potential variables include species abundance and diversity, landscape connectivity, forest fragmentation, habitat area and diversity, etc. Biodiversity variables at risk of being negatively impacted by project activities should be monitored.

Findings	The PDD includes a short description of which variables to include in monitoring of biodiversity throughout the project life. Recently PIL conducted a biodiversity survey which shows the positive impact of the biodiversity increase.
Conformance	Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐
CAR/OBS	

B4. Native Species Use - 1 Point, Optional

Concept
In most cases, species that are native to a region will have a higher biodiversity benefit than non-native species. In other cases, non-native species can be more effective than native species for rehabilitating degraded areas or providing fast growing biomass, timber, fruits and other beneficial products. For instance a project may need to use non-native species on severely degraded land to achieve ecological restoration before native species can be reintroduced.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

- Show that the project will only use species that are native to the region.

Or

- Justify that any non-native species used by the project are superior to native species for generating concrete biodiversity benefits (e.g., for rehabilitating degraded areas unlikely to support natives, or for producing fuel wood that reduces logging pressure on intact ecosystems)

Findings	Prakash use only native species in the project and which are Gmelina arborea (Gamhar / Khamara) and Albizia lebbeck (Kala Siris)		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

B5. Water and Soil Resource Enhancement - 1 Point, Optional

Concept
Climate change and other factors may stress and degrade water and soil resources at the project site over time. Projects should enhance the quality and quantity of water and soil resources.

Indicators
The project proponents must:

1) Identify project activities that are likely to enhance water and soil resources

Findings	Prakash are able to do so by the way of direct and indirect recharging of bores, plugging of small ravines, construction of drainage at the slopes of the sites. Checked also the practical impact of water harvesting in the site area. Overall it was found that PIL applies a very active approach to rainwater harvesting and soild protection andreahblitation.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

2) Credibly demonstrate that these activities are likely to improve water and soil resource compared to the baseline, using justifiable assumptions about cause and effect, and relevant studies.

Findings	They are achieving the objective through ground water recharging, mulching and rain water harvesting system.		
Conformance	Yes ☒	No ☐	N/A ☐
CAR/OBS			

Appendix C: STAKEHOLDER LISTS (CONFIDENTIAL)

List of Project Proponent Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Contact	Type of Participation
Mr. Manoj Sharma	Vice President	+91-771-2327598	Active
Mr. Subash Hardaha	Project Manager	As above	Active
Mr. S. K. Srivastava	Sr. Rev. Officer	As above	Active
Mr.Kamal Jain	Dy. Manager (Com)	As above	Active
Mr.Ram Nanadan Yadav	Farm Manager, Durg sites		Active
Mr. Ashok Kr. Jaiswal	Farm Manager, Raigarh Sites		Active
Mr. Ashok Kumar Soni	Site In charge, Pendravan		Active
Mr. Y P Sharma	Site In charge, Rano		Active
Mr. P M Sahu	Site In charge, Durg sites		Active
Mr. Nohar Singh	Site In charge, Rano		Active
Mr. Durgesh Patel	Site In charge, Saleh		Active
Mr. Parmod Chaudhary	Supervisor, Lara		Active
Mr. Suresh Kumar	Supervisor, Rano		Active
Mr. Taran Singh	Watchman Rano Site		Active

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact	Type of Participation
Mr. Raj Kumar	Secretary of Village Rano Employment Gurantee Scheme (Govt of Chattisgrah)		Interviewed in village Rano on 17th March 2009
Mr. Agno	Panch of ward 07 of the Gram Panchayat Rano		Interviewed in village Rano on 17th March 2009
Mr. Jagdish	Panch of ward 06 of the Gram Panchayat Rano		Interviewed in village Rano on 17th March 2009
Mr. Anik Das	Person of Villager Rano		Interviewed in village Rano on 17th March 2009
Ms. Somvati	Lady of Village Rano		Interviewed in village Rano on 17th March 2009
Mr. Shankar	Person of Villager Rano		Interviewed in village Rano on 17th March 2009
Mr. Bhuvneshwar Sahoo	Sarpanch of Village Salhe Kale		Interviewed in village Rano on 17th March 2009
Mr. Munna sa	Person of lara Village		Interviewed in village Lara on 18th March 2009