

Validated by:



**Rainforest
Alliance**

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:
United States Regional Office
801 Highway 3 North
Suite 200 Northfield, MN 55057
Tel: (507) 663-1115
Fax: (507) 663-7771
Contact person: Foster Dickard
Email: fdickard@ra.org



**Rainforest
Alliance**

Validation
Assessment
Report for:

Carbonfund.org Foundation, Inc.
"Tensas River National Wildlife
Refuge Afforestation Project"
in
Tallulah, Louisiana, USA

Report Finalized: March 3, 2009
Audit Dates: Oct. 30-31, Nov. 3-5, 2008
Audit Team: Jeffrey Hayward, Manager,
Climate Initiative; Bryan
Foster, Technical Specialist,
Climate Initiative

Type of Validation: CCBA
Validation code: RA-VAL-CCB-010429
Validation issued: April 1, 2009

Report based on Standard(s): CCB Standards 1st Edition, May 2005

Organization Contact: Brian McFarland
Address: 1320 Fenwick Lane,
Suite 206, Silver Spring,
MD 20910

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2	AUDIT CONCLUSIONS.....	3
3	AUDIT PROCESS.....	11
Appendix A: COMPANY DETAILS		15
1	CONTACTS	15
2	SmartWood Website Customer Fact Sheet	15
3	Validation Scope	15
Appendix B: STANDARD CHECKLIST CCB STANDARDS.....		17
1	Evaluation of Project.....	17
2	Evaluation Details	17
3	Standard Checklist.....	18
Appendix C: STAKEHOLDER LISTS (CONFIDENTIAL)		44

1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to document conformance with the requirements of CCBA project design validation standards by Carbonfund.org, 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:

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

This is an afforestation project designed to produce mixed native species forest on 1,870 acres of agricultural lands within the boundaries of the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge located in Madison Parish in northeastern Louisiana. 1,100 acres were planted in February 2008. 770 acres are to be planted in February 2009. The project duration is 99 years. The proponents GHG assertions is that of 461,112 metric tons CO₂e.

The CCB standards validation was requested by the Carbonfund.org Foundation. There are three parties to the project, who have entered into a Memorandum of Agreement - Carbonfund.org, the

Trust For Public Lands, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service Tensas River Wildlife Refuge, (referred to as the “project proponents”). Carbonfund.org has rights to the carbon for 99 years. The project is being undertaken to restore bottomland hardwood forest habitat within the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge on lands owned and managed by the US FWS. These lands were conveyed to the Federal Government by the Trust For Public Lands.

The methodology used was AR-AM004 “Reforestation or Afforestation of Land Currently Under Agricultural Use”.

The review of the project description, supporting documentation and interviews has provided Rainforest Alliance with the evidence to determine fulfillment to the stated criteria with reasonable assurance. The project proponents corrected deficiencies identified in the draft validation audit report through submittal of a revised CCBA PDD of January 16, 2009.

Based upon the evidence presented the Rainforest Alliance validation conclusion is that the project is likely to achieve the estimated emission reductions with a total net sequestration over 99 years of 461,112 metric tons CO₂e.

The CCBA rules provide for three levels or tiers by which a project may be validated to the standards. These are:

- Approved: projects satisfying all fifteen mandatory criteria;
- Silver: projects that satisfy all fifteen mandatory criteria and receive at least 4 points with at least one point from optional criteria in each of the four sections (General, Climate, Community, and Biodiversity);
- Gold: projects that satisfy all fifteen mandatory criteria and receive at least 6 points, with at least one point from optional criteria in each of the four sections.

The Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge Afforestation project earned validation at the gold level and the following scorecard shows the level of compliance achieved by the project:

General Section

G1. Original Conditions at Project Site	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Required
G2. Baseline Projections	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Required
G3. Project Design & Goals	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Required
G4. Management Capacity	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Required
G5. Land Tenure	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Required
G6. Legal Status	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Required
G7. Adaptive Management for Sustainability	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Optional
G8. Knowledge Dissemination	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Optional

Conformance:

Climate Section

CL1. Net Positive Climate Impacts	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Required
CL2. Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Required
CL3. Climate Impact Monitoring	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Required
CL4. Adapting to Climate Change & Climate Variability	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Optional
CL5. Carbon Benefits Withheld from Regulatory Markets	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Optional

Conformance:

Community Section

CM1. Net Positive Community Impacts	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Required
CM2. Offsite Community Impacts	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Required
CM3. Community Impact Monitoring	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Required
CM4. Capacity Building	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Optional
CM5. Best Practices in Community Involvement	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Optional

Conformance:

Biodiversity Section

- B1. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts
- B2. Offsite Biodiversity Impacts
- B3. Biodiversity Impact Monitoring
- B4. Native Species Use
- B5. Water & Soil Resource Enhancement

Conformance:

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|----------|
| Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | Required |
| Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | Required |
| Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | Required |
| Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | Optional |
| Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | Optional |

CCBA Validation Level Attained:

- | | | |
|----------|---|--|
| Approved | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Silver | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Gold | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |

2.2 Auditor Recommendation

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

- Validation approved:*
No CARs for required criteria issued
- Validation not approved:*
Conformance with CAR(s) required

Additional comments:

After the client submitted objective evidence to the auditor demonstrating that the non-conformances were addressed, Rainforest Alliance evaluated the evidence and then updated this report on the status of the CARs and actions taken. The revised CCBA PDD of January 16, 2009 was submitted on that day to Rainforest Alliance and reviewed on January 23, 2009 and February 6, 2009. This report was updated and completed as all supporting documentation demonstrated that the CARs had been closed.

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.

CAR 01/08		Reference Standard & Requirement: G1.1, G3.3.
Non-conformance:		[Description of non-conformance]
Major	Minor X	The specific map provided in the PDD is of the planting sites for the 2008 planting, but there was not a map for the area included in the 2009 planting.
Corrective Action Request: The PDD shall include a project site map with the boundaries for all of the planting areas within the project scope.		
Timeline for conformance:		Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:		The project proponents provided a site map for the 2009 planting area with identified boundaries in the January 16, 2009 PDD (on page 9). This map is within the contract between Carbonfund.org and Environmental Synergies,

	which was presented to the auditors.
CAR Status:	CLOSED

CAR 02/08	Reference Standard & Requirement: G3.1	
Non-conformance:	[Description of non-conformance]	
Major	Minor X	Agreements pertaining to additional area not finalized at the time of the audit.
Corrective Action Request: The PDD shall reference the draft or final agreements and timelines for finalization.		
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation	
Evidence to close CAR:	The project proponents stated in the PDD of January 16, 2009 (on page 22) the dates that Carbonfund.org entered into the three party agreement for the additional 770 acres. This agreement between Carbonfund.org, Trust for Public Land, and US Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as the contract between Carbonfund.org and Environmental Synergies Inc for the additional 770 acres was presented to the auditors.	
CAR Status:	CLOSED	

CAR 03/08	Reference Standard & Requirement: G3.2, G3.5, G7.4	
Non-conformance:	[Description of non-conformance]	
Major	Minor X	Not an adequate explanation of the planned management activities over time. The project activity of biodiversity and community monitoring is not described.
Corrective Action Request: The PDD shall provide more detail on the management activities and responsibilities related to the maintenance of the planted stands, especially as related to mitigation of potential risks, and provide explanation on plans for monitoring the community and biodiversity impacts.		
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation	
Evidence to close CAR:	The project proponents revised the PDD of January 16, 2009 to describe more completely the anticipated stand management and monitoring activities for the duration of the project (on pages 24-25, 58-60, 64-65 & 74).	
CAR Status:	CLOSED	

CAR 04/08	Reference Standard & Requirement: G3.4	
Non-conformance:	[Description of non-conformance]	
Major	Minor X	Not consistent or entirely clear about the exact project start date, duration, or credit period.
Corrective Action Request: The PDD shall state a clear and definitive project start date, project duration, and project crediting period.		
Timeline for conformance:	Prior to validation	
Evidence to close CAR:	The project proponents provided clear information for the project start date, project duration, and project credit period in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 (on pages 22 and 26).	
CAR Status:	CLOSED	

CAR 05/08		Reference Standard & Requirement: G3.6
Non-conformance:		[Description of non-conformance]
Major	Minor X	Does not document how stakeholders will be defined or a mechanism for consultation.
<p>Corrective Action Request: The PDD shall define or identify stakeholders and describe a mechanism for communicating project information to and receiving on-going comments from stakeholders.</p>		
Timeline for conformance:		Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:		The project proponents provided description in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 of their process to identify stakeholders and maintain on-going communication and input from potential stakeholders (on pages 28-29 and 59-61). The PDD included an updated list of stakeholders (in Appendix D).
CAR Status:		CLOSED

CAR 06/08		Reference Standard & Requirement: G4.4, G7.4
Non-conformance:		[Description of non-conformance]
Major	Minor X	No indication of the costs or budget for this project to demonstrate the viability as related to the expenditures of the project.
<p>Corrective Action Request: The PDD shall demonstrate the operating costs of the project relative to the organizations financial resources.</p>		
Timeline for conformance:		Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:		The project proponents submitted a budget to Rainforest Alliance, although the information is not included in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009, because it included some confidential information. The PDD describes how significant payments have been made or will be completed by March 2009 demonstrating organizations' financial capacity (on pages 32-33).
CAR Status:		CLOSED

CAR 07/08		Reference Standard & Requirement: G7.3
Non-conformance:		[Description of non-conformance]
Major	Minor X	Does not describe the process the project will use to adjust the activities.
<p>Corrective Action Request: The PDD shall define the process to adjust project activities to potential changes.</p>		
Timeline for conformance:		Not required for validation
Evidence to close CAR:		The project proponents described how activities may be adjusted due to changing circumstances and risks in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 (on pages 26-28 and 37-39).
CAR Status:		CLOSED

CAR 08/08		Reference Standard & Requirement: G8.1
Non-conformance:		[Description of non-conformance]
Major	Minor X	Did not describe a plan for documentation of lessons learned.
<p>Corrective Action Request: The PDD shall describe how the project will actively disseminate information on lessons learned through the project to encourage replication of successful practices.</p>		

Timeline for conformance:		Not required for validation
Evidence to close CAR:		The project proponents described in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 how knowledge dissemination will occur to encourage replication of successful practices (on pages 29 and 40-41).
CAR Status:		CLOSED

CAR 09/08		Reference Standard & Requirement: CL1.3
Non-conformance:		[Description of non-conformance]
Major	Minor X	The PDD does not address the CO2 emissions that will be increased by project activities, even though these are expected to be minimal.
Corrective Action Request: The PDD shall explain the monitoring of emissions of CO2 from fossil fuel combustion controlled by the project.		
Timeline for conformance:		Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:		The project proponents explained and calculated the GHG emissions attributable to project activities in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 (on pages 45-47).
CAR Status:		CLOSED

CAR 10/08		Reference Standard & Requirement: CM1.1
Non-conformance:		[Description of non-conformance]
Major	Minor X	The PDD does not reference or explain the regional studies that would quantify or support their estimates of the benefits as they would be measured.
Corrective Action Request: The PDD shall provide a more thorough rationale of the estimates of the impact of the project on the well-being of the Madison parish community.		
Timeline for conformance:		Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:		The project proponents provided in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 more complete description of the community benefits likely through the project (on pages 63-66).
CAR Status:		CLOSED

CAR 11/08		Reference Standard & Requirement: CM 1.2
Non-conformance:		[Description of non-conformance]
Major	Minor X	The PDD did not document stakeholder or community involvement.
Corrective Action Request: The PDD shall document the stakeholder consultation or involvement in the project.		
Timeline for conformance:		Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:		The project proponents more thoroughly described in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 the stakeholder and community involvement in the process of project development (on pages 58-66).
CAR Status:		CLOSED

CAR 12/08		Reference Standard & Requirement: CM1.3
Non-conformance:		[Description of non-conformance]
Major	Minor X	The PDD does not explain the process to be used to respond to or hear grievances.
Corrective Action Request: The project proponents shall develop a grievance and dispute resolution procedure.		
Timeline for conformance:		Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:		The project proponents described the grievance and dispute resolution procedure in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 (on pages 60-61).
CAR Status:		CLOSED

CAR 13/08		Reference Standard & Requirement: CM2.2
Non-conformance:		[Description of non-conformance]
Major	Minor X	The PDD did not have a plan to mitigate any negative impacts to farmers, if substantiated.
Corrective Action Request: The PDD shall describe plans to mitigate any negative impacts established.		
Timeline for conformance:		Prior to validation
Evidence to close CAR:		The project proponents documented their process to mitigate the negative impacts to farmers, although accepting that impacts would be temporary and limited, in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 (on page 62).
CAR Status:		CLOSED

CAR 14/08		Reference Standard & Requirement: CM4
Non-conformance:		[Description of non-conformance]
Major	Minor X	Multiple indicators for this criterion were not addressed.
Corrective Action Request: The PDD shall address the indicators of this criterion for consideration of the optional point.		
Timeline for conformance:		Prior to the first CCB verification
Evidence to close CAR:		The project proponents provided additional discussion in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 concerning involvement, non-elites, and women and community participation (on page 66). The depth of the consideration within the project design is still limited.
CAR Status:		OPEN

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.

In the revised PDD of January 16, 2009, the project proponents made revisions respective of all of the following observations. Since these observations were non-mandatory and indications of potential for improvement, this report retains the observations as stated. The auditors did not evaluate measures taken by the project proponents to respond to observations.

OBS 01/08	Reference Standard & Requirement: G1.5
[Description of findings leading to observation] The description of the Carbonfund.org project area is not well-distinguished as a sub-set of the broader 11,030 acre acquisition of property used for afforestation by Carbonfund.org and other groups within the TRNWR.	
Observation: The PDD should clearly differentiate in written descriptions the area that is unique to the Carbonfund.org plantings apart from the total area acquired.	

OBS 02/08	Reference Standard & Requirement: G2.3
[Description of findings leading to observation] Assumption of the “without project” scenario is briefly stated.	
Observation: The PDD should expand upon the without project scenario to reflect some of the broader community trends and conditions that reflect the declining economic conditions in Madison Parish.	

OBS 03/08	Reference Standard & Requirement: G2.5, B5
[Description of findings leading to observation] Limited scientific support provided for reasons that are likely well-documented.	
Observation: The PDD should describe in more detail the affects of continued agricultural land use on soil and water, as substantiated through the scientific literature or regional studies.	

OBS 04/08	Reference Standard & Requirement: G4.1
[Description of findings leading to observation] Limited description of role or capacity of the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge management team.	
Observation: The PDD should be enhanced with description of the specific experience and capacity of the TRNWR managers and technicians.	

OBS 05/08	Reference Standard & Requirement: CL1.3
[Description of findings leading to observation] Potential emissions from soil disking and ripping as well as fossil fuel combustion during planting preparation and processes are not quantified.	
Observation: The PDD should substantiate quantitatively that site preparation methods do not cause significant long-term net decreases in carbon stocks.	

OBS 06/08	Reference Standard & Requirement: CM2.1
[Description of findings leading to observation] Description in PDD not supported with relevant studies or data.	
Observation: The PDD should substantiate the project claim that tenant farmers have the same cost options for moving their farming operations to other leased lands.	

2.4 Actions Taken by Company Prior to Report Finalization

The first draft of the validation audit report was submitted to the client on 19 December 2008. Carbonfund.org responded to the CARs on 16 January 2009 with a revised PDD.

Rainforest Alliance evaluated all of the CARs issued in the first draft of the validation audit and found that all of the mandatory CCB criteria had been met as described in section 2.3.1 above. The corrective actions taken by Carbonfund.org are indicated within the findings sections below.

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)
Delta National Forest Office – Opening meeting with Carbonfund.org	October 29, 2008	1 hour	Jeff Hayward, Bryan Foster
Delta National Forest – Interviewing stakeholders	October 29, 2008	3 hours	Jeff Hayward, Bryan Foster
Delta National Forest - hardwood forest stands sampled for proxy forest measurements	October 29, 2008	3 hours	Jeff Hayward, Bryan Foster
Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge Office – Opening meeting	October 30, 2008	1.5 hours	Jeff Hayward, Bryan Foster
Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge – Planting Areas	October 30, 2008	2.5 hours	Jeff Hayward, Bryan Foster
Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge – Office – Document review, interviews, stakeholder consultation	October 30, 2008	3 hours	Jeff Hayward, Bryan Foster
Tallulah, Louisiana – Discussions with foresters and forest ecosystem researchers	October 31, 2008	2 hours	Bryan Foster
Phone calls to interviewees and stakeholders	October 31, 2008	2 hours	Jeff Hayward
Phone calls to interviewees	November 3, 2008	1 hour	Jeff Hayward
Phone calls to interviewees	November 5, 2008	1 hour	Jeff Hayward
Carbonfund.org Office – Closing meeting	November 5, 2008	1.5 hours	Jeff Hayward
Phone calls to interviewees	November 7, 2008	1 hour	Jeff Hayward
Richmond, Virginia – Meeting with TerraCarbon Inc.	November 12, 2008	1.5 hours	Jeff Hayward
Phone calls to various stakeholders	November 12 – 13, 2008	4 hours	Jeff Hayward

3.2 Description of Audit Process

Rainforest Alliance submitted a proposal to Carbonfund.org on July 16, 2008 that outlined a CCB Standards validation audit process that would be done concurrently with a validation/verification audit to the Voluntary Carbon Standard (VCS). The proposal was accepted on August 20, 2008. Carbonfund.org submitted the PDD to Rainforest Alliance on September 23, 2008 so that a desk review of the PDD and supporting documents could take place to screen the project before the on-site audit dates were finalized and prior to posting the PDD to the CCBA website. This pre-validation desk review resulted in a brief report on September 29, 2008 to Carbonfund.org.org that indicated observations of gaps related to conformance with the standards identified in the PDD. A revised PDD was submitted to Rainforest Alliance on October 2, 2008 and submitted by Carbonfund.org to the CCBA for posting on October 3, 2008. The PDD was actually posted on October 10, 2008.

A validation audit plan was sent to Carbonfund.org on October 22, 2008 and accepted by the project proponents. The plan was used for both the CCBA and VCS validation audits. The validation audit plan outlined the necessary meetings, individuals to meet with, locations and sites to inspect, indication of the physical and documentary evidence sought, and a schedule for these to occur. This schedule is listed in 3.1 above and intended to permit the collection of data and information required to cover the evaluation scope as described above.

The on-site audit process consisted of the following:

- An initial briefing meeting between project staff, project managers, and auditors.
- Visitation to proxy forests utilized to develop the calculation of a carbon estimation model.
- Direct on-site field visits to the landowner afforestation areas to inspect management practices and quality control procedures.
- Consultation with local or regional stakeholders, such as conservation organizations, extension foresters, research scientists, government agencies, etc.
- Interviews with project staff and participants from all the organizations involved in the project.
- Review of all relevant project documents (and any updates).
- Closing meetings that reported upon the initial findings of the audit.

3.3 Documents reviewed

The validation process entailed substantial review of documents prepared by the project proponents and/or documents from other research bodies, institutions, or professionals that were supported the project design of the project proponents. Documents were requested by Rainforest Alliance prior to the on-site validation audit. The primary evidence presented was the CCB Project Design Document (PDD) prepared to be compliant with the CCB standards.

Carbonfund.org was the responsible party for the project who provided the auditors with those documents prepared by the project proponents. Most of these documents were provided to Rainforest Alliance before the on-site audit and were reviewed at the auditors' offices in advance of the visit. Some documents were collected during the audit, such as the research papers, proxy forest measurement sheets, and maps, etc., provided by the US Fish and Wildlife Service Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge, Environmental Synergy, Inc or TerraCarbon, Inc. Carbonfund.org provided some documentation to the audit team immediately after the on-site visit in response to auditors' requests during the audit.

All project documents and data were checked for completeness, consistency, accuracy, transparency, relevance, and conservativeness. Much of the documentation was reviewed to assess these attributes as they pertained to the information contained within the CCB PDD.

Date	Document title and version reviewed
January 16, 2009	Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge Afforestation Project CCB Project Design Document (PDD) prepared by Carbonfund.org with contributions by: Jordan, C., Shoch, D., Morrow, D. Clough, K., and Aycock R.
October 8, 2008	Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge Afforestation Project CCB Project Design Document (PDD) prepared by Carbonfund.org with contributions by: Jordan, C., Shoch, D., Morrow, D. Clough, K., and Aycock R.
October 8, 2008	Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge Afforestation Project VCS Project Design Document (PDD) prepared by Carbonfund.org with contributions by: Jordan, C., Shoch, D., Morrow, D. Clough, K., and Aycock R.
October 2008	ESI Standards and Procedures For Seedling and Planting Vendors.
March 2008	David T. Shoch, Gary Kaster, Aaron Hohl and Ray Souter, Carbon sequestration potential of bottomland hardwood afforestation in the Lower Mississippi Valley, U.S.A.
March 13, 2008	General Warranty Deed conveying project area land title to the US government.
January 7, 2008	Memorandum of Agreement among US Fish and Wildlife Service and the Trust for Public Lands and the Carbonfund.org Foundation.
November 2007	Contract Services Agreement between Carbonfund.org and Environmental Synergy, Inc. for the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge Carbon Offset Project
November 2007	ESI Quality Standards For Seedling And Planting Vendors (Exhibit B to CF-ESI Services Agreement).
November 2007	ESI Overview of Monitoring Protocol (Exhibit C to CF-ESI Services Agreement).
November 2007 February 2008	Biomass plot data sheets from stands on Delta National Forest. Winrock/TerraCarbon
February 2008	ESI Seedlings Planted Report - 1100 acres Carbonfund.
February 2008	USFWS – 2008 1100 acre afforestation sites map with boundaries over satellite image.
February 2008	USFWS – Planting quality and survival survey tally sheets.

February 25, 2008	USFWS - Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge Letter to ESI on Seedling Planting Survival and Quality.
April 2002	Carbon Measurement and Monitoring Plan for Bottomland Hardwood Plantings in the Mississippi Valley Region <i>Prepared for: Environmental Synergy, Incorporated by Winrock International, Sandra Brown, Matt Delaney, David Shoch.</i>
December 2001	Winrock International 2001, Appendix 6 - Standard Operating Procedures for Measuring and Monitoring Carbon.
October 2008	Carbonfund.org staff resumes
2002 - 2007	Biodiversity (bird and mammal at least) monitoring plans from USFWS, Louisiana Natural Heritage Program or others

3.4 Stakeholder consultation process (if applicable)

The CCBA requirements for stakeholder consultation are that the project design document(s) describing how the project meets CCB criteria must be posted on the CCBA website 21 days prior to the on-site field visit. Carbonfund.org prepared a project design document, which was submitted to the CCBA on October 3, but due to an error in the email address was not initially received, so it was re-submitted on October 10 and posted on October 13, 2008. The CCBA invited comment on the PDD through emails sent to the Climate Change Info Mailing List. The consultation period was open until November 3, 2008. Most of the audit team stakeholder consultation therefore took place after November 4, 2008

In the stakeholder comment period, there was only one comment received. This comment was very supportive of afforestation in the Mississippi Alluvial Valley.

During the validation process, the audit team met or spoke to different stakeholders, including community members, workers, landowners, municipal officials, researchers, and government agencies.

4 Appendix A: COMPANY DETAILS

1 CONTACTS

1.1 Primary Contact for Coordination with SmartWood

Primary Contact, Position:	Brian McFarland, Climate Change Specialist
Address:	1320 Fenwick Lane, Ste 206, Silver Spring, MD 20910
Tel/Fax/Email:	Tel/Fax/Email: 240-247-0630 / 240-638-9110 / BMcFarland@carbonfund.org

1.2 Billing Contact

Contact, Position:	Eric Carlson, Executive Director
Address:	1320 Fenwick Lane, Ste 206, Silver Spring, MD 20910
Tel/Fax/Email:	Tel/Fax/Email: (240) 247-0630 / 240-638-9110 / ecarlson@carbonfund.org

2 Rainforest Alliance 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)	Eric Carlson, Executive Director	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Address:	1320 Fenwick Lane, Ste 206, Silver Spring, MD 20910	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tel/Fax/Email/Website:	Tel/Fax/Email: (240) 247-0630 / 240-638-9110 / ecarlson@carbonfund.org	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Products/Descriptions:	Carbon offsets	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3 Validation Scope

3.1 Scope Definition:

This is a carbon project design validation for the intended afforestation of 1,870 acres of agricultural lands within the boundaries of the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge in Madison Parish in Northeastern Louisiana. 1,100 acres were planted in February 2008. 770 acres are to be planted in February 2009. The project will have a duration of 100 years. The project intends to sequester the net amount of approximately 450,000 tCO_{2e} from the atmosphere over 100 years. There are three parties to the project, who have entered into a Memorandum of Agreement, which are Carbonfund.org, The Trust For Public Lands, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service Tensas River Wildlife Refuge, (collectively referred to within this document as the “project proponents”). The project is being undertaken to restore bottomland hardwood forest habitat within the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge, on lands that are owned and managed by the US FWS. These

lands were conveyed to the Federal Government by the Trust For Public Lands. The rights to the carbon have been leased to Carbonfund.org for 99 years in order to decrease atmospheric greenhouse gases through biological sequestration. The validation was requested by the Carbonfund.org Foundation.

3.2 Type of Legal Entity: Carbonfund.org is a not for profit corporation

3.3 Jurisdiction: Silver Spring, Maryland, USA

Appendix B: STANDARD CHECKLIST CCB STANDARDS

1 Evaluation of Project

Project Name:	Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge Afforestation Project
Contact for Validation:	Brian McFarland, Climate Change Specialist
Address:	1320 Fenwick Lane, Ste 206, Silver Spring, MD 20910
Tel/Fax/Email:	Tel/Fax/Email: 240-247-0630 / 240-638-9110 / BMcFarland@carbonfund.org

2 Evaluation Details

Auditor(s), Qualifications:	<p>Jeff Hayward, Manager, Climate Initiative</p> <p>Jeff is based in Washington, DC, though his work has a worldwide focus, especially in Asia, Africa, Latin America, leading development of a cross-program initiative including carbon verification, best practices and standards for climate mitigation and adaptation, climate-oriented capacity building, and facilitation of carbon forestry and agroforestry projects. For nearly six years he managed the Rainforest Alliance forest certification programs in the Asia-Pacific region from Jakarta, Indonesia. In forest certification and carbon verification, he has conducted over 25 forest management assessments and/or audits and over 60 chain-of-custody assessments and/or audits. He has led forest certification awareness training courses in Malaysia, Indonesia, Japan, Fiji, and China. Prior to working for the Rainforest Alliance, he conducted silviculture and ecology research for the British Columbia Ministry of Forests and for the University of British Columbia's Alex Fraser Research Forest in Canada. In Oregon, he worked for the U.S. Bureau of Land Management in forest inventory and timber sale administration. For three years he was with the U.S. Peace Corps serving as a community forester in Guatemala in an agroforestry and conservation of natural resources program. Jeff earned an MSc in forestry, (Univ. of British Columbia, Canada); and a B.A. in Latin American development with a specialization on forestry (Univ. of Washington, USA).</p> <p>Bryan Foster, Climate Change Technical Specialist</p> <p>Bryan has specific expertise in forest ecology and carbon storage. He has worked as an inventory forester, greenhouse gas footprinting consultant, and silviculture/stand dynamics lecturer and has nearly five years of professional experience. Bryan has successfully completed ANSI RAB accredited ISO 14001 EMS lead auditor and ISO 14064-3 greenhouse gas verifier training. He graduated with a Ph.D from University of Vermont (UVM), Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources. In addition, he has a MSci from Yale University, School of Forestry and Environmental Studies and a BA in Environmental Studies from Carleton College.</p>
Sites Visited:	See audit plan from section 3.1 above

People Interviewed, Titles:	Brian McFarland, Carbonfund.org, Climate Specialist Erkin Ozberk, Carbonfund.org, Climate Specialist Eric Carlson, Carbonfund.org, Executive Director Ralph Pearce, Delta National Forest, District Forester Pat Sullivan, Farm Manager for Trust For Public Lands, Farmer Yancy McGee, US FWS, Tensa River National Wildlife Refuge Forester; Carol Jordan, President, Environmental Synergy, Inc. Don Seay, Forester, Environmental Synergy, Inc. Harry Cooke, Forester, Environmental Synergy, Inc. Don Anderson, Owner, Delta Wildlife Consulting Services Don Morrow, Senior Project Manager, Trust for Public Lands Ray Aycock, Field Supervisor, US FWS, Jackson Mississippi Office
-----------------------------	---

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 PDD clearly describes the location of the project and the project parameters. The PDD provides maps that demonstrate the overall location of the site and the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge. Actual locations were field checked against GPS coordinates during the on-site audit and found to be accurate. The specific map provided in the PDD is of the planting sites for the 2008 planting, but there was not a map for the area included in the 2009 planting. <i>The project proponents provided a site map for the 2009 planting area with identified boundaries in the January 16, 2009 PDD (on page 9). This map is within the contract between Carbonfund.org and Environmental Synergies, which was presented to the auditors.</i>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	CAR 01/08: The PDD shall include a project site map with the boundaries for all of the planting areas within the project scope. This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.		

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

Findings	The PDD provides detailed description of the vegetation types at the project site, including the current site conditions, surrounding vegetation cover, future intended floristic composition of the planting areas, and general summary of the landscape. The condition of the project site was evaluated during the field visit and was consistent with the PDD. The planting areas were evidently ex-agriculture lands, which even had signs of having had been under cultivation in the past year.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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	<p>The chosen baseline and monitoring methodology that is to be applied in the project follows AR-AM0004, “Reforestation or Afforestation of Land Currently Under Agricultural Use”. As per this methodology, the project proponents have fulfilled and justified the steps for determination of the applicability of the baseline scenario. The project conditions are applicable for these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the land within the project boundary is currently in a degraded, low carbon state; 2. the carbon stocks in the soil will decrease through further cultivation and soil erosion as per the baseline scenario, 3. the project will not use irrigation by flooding 4. the project will not use soil drainage or other significant disturbances; 5. the project is not planting significant amounts of nitrogen-fixing species; 6. a conservative baseline scenario for the LMAV, demonstrates that afforestation/reforestation activities are not likely without this type of project; 7. the project is uniformly agricultural land rather than pasture or shrub-land in a previous state. <p>This project uses historical data for baseline establishment, with the methodology assuming that a carbon stock with baseline scenario is zero for the stratified project areas without growing trees or shrubs prior to project inception. As there was no measurable above-ground biomass on the planting sites, the carbon stocks are correctly stated as zero.</p>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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 provides a limited socio-economic demographic for Madison Parish and Tallulah, Louisiana. The PDD draws upon Census Bureau data and median household statistics to portray the basic socio-economic conditions of the nearby residents to the planting location. The description is of a very poor Parish, whereby agriculture is declining in economic importance to communities which are far below the median income level for the rest of Louisiana. The thinly settled and declining population has a much higher rate of households living below the poverty line than elsewhere in the state. The audit confirmed that there are no residents living within or around the project area, which is wholly within the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

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

Findings	The description of current land use and land tenure is a brief paragraph. The description of the Carbonfund.org project area is not well-distinguished as a sub-set of the broader 11,030 acre acquisition of property used for afforestation by Carbonfund.org and other groups within the TRNWR. The auditors evaluated the contracts between the project proponents that details the agreements and representations of land use and land tenure.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	OBS 01/08: The PDD should clearly differentiate in written descriptions the area that is unique to the Carbonfund.org plantings apart from the total area acquired.		

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	The PDD provides succinct passages on the biodiversity within the project area. This is primarily a representation of the taxa that inhabit the ecosystems and habitat types represented by the bottomland hardwoods of the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley. The cultivated agricultural fields; planted for cotton, corn, rice, and soybeans, are not described as possessing any unique biodiversity. In addition, experts consulted during the audit indicated that the historic clearing of forest to create agricultural lands had impacted migratory and neo-tropical songbird populations and other wildlife. The threats to biodiversity as explained in the PDD rest solely with the negative impacts brought about through already cleared agricultural lands and agricultural practices, which contribute to soil erosion, sedimentation, and chemical residues in soil or water, which are offered in stark contrast to the positive benefits intended to be brought about through restoration of forest habitat in the wildlife refuge.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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	The PDD provides a short list of the IUCN Red List Species that may be present within the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge. These Red List species are not typically dependent on cleared agricultural lands for their survival though they may occasionally use such areas. As previously bare fields, the actual project planting area is not likely to host a more comprehensive list of species than that provided.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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	It is appropriate that the GHG emissions for the baseline scenario are zero and that this remains static (not increasing or decreasing) through the life of the project. The project has described the continual and expected use of land for agriculture in the absence of the project. The project has demonstrated that the activities are not legally required. From a financial perspective, it has not yet been demonstrated that the costs of investment in afforestation/reforestation are financially more viable than agricultural production. Afforestation is also not common practice, since the current bottomland hardwood area in the LMAV is about 5 million acres compared to an estimated 22 million acres of original forestland lost since the 1700s, so while agriculture is declining in economic importance it is still a far more common practice than investing in tree planting projects on agricultural lands.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

- 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 appropriate². If there is evidence that non-CO₂ greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions such as CH₄ or N₂O are more than 15% of the baseline GHG fluxes at the project site (in terms of CO₂ equivalents), they must be estimated.

Findings	It is appropriate that the GHG emissions for the baseline scenario are zero and that this remains static (not increasing or decreasing) through the life of the project. This projection is based on the without project scenario described in the PDD as one of continual and expected use of the land for agriculture. There was not evidence that there would be non-CO ₂ emissions that would be greater than 15% of the baseline. (See CL1 for more discussion).		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

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

Findings	The discussion of the "without project" scenario is briefly stated as one whereby local communities would pursue the business-as-usual case of leasing land holdings for cultivation to row-crop agriculture. While the PDD was very succinct, the audit team determined it was justified based upon the consultations conducted, as individuals interviewed repeatedly supported the assertion that the landowners would not otherwise have planted trees. Considering the costs of afforestation for an acre of ground in Louisiana it is justifiable that the land would stay under cultivation moreso than it would be allocated to tree planting, and as described elsewhere a financial test of additionality would be justified for this project.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	OBS 02/08: The PDD should expand upon the without project scenario to reflect some of the broader community trends and conditions that reflect the declining economic conditions in Madison Parish.		

¹This 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.

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

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

Findings	The PDD describes the lack of biodiversity corresponding to the agricultural lands of the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley, which for many reasons stated within the PDD, would continue under a business as usual scenario. The PDD speaks broadly of bottomland hardwood forests and the positive effects of increasing the level of forest cover for recruitment of habitat and the likely affect that bringing back forest connectivity would enhance biodiversity. This project also makes the case for the importance of restoring an ecosystem that was significantly reduced in area over more than 200 years.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

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

Findings	This was not discussed in section G2 of the PDD. It was described somewhat in section B1 with respects to the net positive impacts the project could bring for improving soil and water quality. Project proponents explained to auditors that two significant negative impacts of agricultural practices in the absence of the project are heavy pesticide/chemical fertilizer application, which contaminates soil and water, as well as regular sediment erosion from plowed fields, particularly due to seasonal flooding.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	OBS 03/08: The PDD should describe in more detail the affects of continued agricultural land use on soil and water, as substantiated through the scientific literature or regional studies.		

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	<p>The scope of the validation conformed to the 1,870 acres of the defined project boundary as represented in the project design documentation. The validation was requested by the Carbonfund.org Foundation to cover these project boundaries. The Rainforest Alliance evaluated the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge Afforestation project, as it is named, which falls within the sectoral scope of forestry that includes afforestation and reforestation. The project planted 1,100 acres in February 2008. The project intends to include 770 acres for planting in February 2009, and for this to be included within the current project scope under validation.</p> <p>However, the agreements pertaining to this additional area had not been finalized at the time of the audit. Such agreements are the MOA between USFWS, TPL, and Carbonfund.org as well as the contract service agreement between Carbonfund.org and Environmental Synergy.</p> <p><i>The project proponents stated in the PDD of January 16, 2009 (on page 22) the dates that Carbonfund.org entered into the three party agreement for the additional 770</i></p>		
----------	---	--	--

	<i>acres. This agreement between Carbonfund.org, Trust for Public Land, and US Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as the contract between Carbonfund.org and Environmental Synergies Inc for the additional 770 acres was presented to the auditors.</i>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	CAR 02/08: The PDD shall reference the draft or final agreements and timelines for finalization. This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.		

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

Findings	<p>The PDD describes four major activities:</p> <p>(1) evaluate current conditions of carbon, (2) measure carbon stocks in reference forests, (3) site preparation and planting, (4) project monitoring.</p> <p>Within the PDD, activities 1 and 2 are generally well-described. While the auditors found in discussions with the project proponents that there is a plan for all 4 activities, there are elements that are not clearly described in the PDD itself.</p> <p>There is not an adequate explanation in the PDD of the planned stand-tending or maintenance activities over time, such as vegetation management, thinning, or fire and disease prevention or control.</p> <p>Project monitoring calls for a survival count in year 3 or 4 following planting, but does not indicated the acceptable survival rate or contingency plans for replanting should survival rates fall below the benchmark. The project proponents indicated to the auditors that the target is 302 trees planted per acre with survival of 85%.</p> <p>The monitoring plans provided in the PDD are for tree growth and survivorship, as well as soil carbon. The biodiversity and community monitoring is not mentioned as a part of the monitoring activity. This was mentioned elsewhere in the PDD.</p> <p><i>The project proponents revised the PDD of January 16, 2009 to describe more completely the anticipated stand management and monitoring activities for the duration of the project (on pages 24-25, 58-60, 64-65 & 74).</i></p>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	CAR 03/08: The PDD shall provide more detail on the management activities and responsibilities related to the maintenance of the planted stands, especially as related to mitigation of potential risks, and provide explanation on plans for monitoring the community and biodiversity impacts. This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.		

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	The PDD provides a map of the Tensas National Wildlife Refuge which is where all project activities will occur. The map with the geo-referenced boundaries of the project sites was only provided in the PDD for the February 2008 planting site. There was not a similar map for the planned 2009 planting site.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	See CAR 01/08, regarding the project site map. This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.		

- 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	<p>The Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge Afforestation Project is expected to have a project duration of 100 years. However, the PDD is not consistent or entirely clear about the exact project duration. PDD section G3(4) states that tree age at the end of the project is 70 years, while USFWS will manage the land for 99 years. The MOA states that the project areas/tracts will be maintained in accordance with the National Wildlife Refuge System regulations set forth in Subchapter C of Title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations for a 99-year period.</p> <p><i>The project proponents provided clear information for the project start date, project duration, and project credit period in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 (on pages 22 and 26).</i></p>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	<p>CAR 04/08: The PDD shall state a clear and definitive project start date, project duration, and project crediting period.</p> <p>This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.</p>		

- 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	<p>The PDD includes a short discussion of identified risks to satisfactory seedling survival and growth (i.e., carbon sequestration), which may be due to weather (drought/flooding), fire, pests or disease and biodiversity. If the growth and development of the afforestation sites were to underperform, these risks may also impact the community and biodiversity benefits. There was limited discussion in the PDD concerning the risk to communities, which may be in this case of tenant farmers who previously cultivated the Chicago Mill and Lumber lands.</p>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	<p>See CAR 03/08, regarding the mitigation of risks and monitoring of community and biodiversity impacts.</p> <p>This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.</p>		

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

Findings	<p>The PDD has described the project proponents, Carbonfund.org, The Trust For Public Land, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service as the primary stakeholders. This does not document how other local stakeholders will be defined.</p> <p><i>The project proponents provided description in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 of their process to identify stakeholders and maintain on-going communication and input from potential stakeholders (on pages 28-29 and 59-61). The PDD included an updated list of stakeholders (in Appendix D).</i></p>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	<p>CAR 05/08: The PDD shall define or identify stakeholders and describe a mechanism for communicating project information to and receiving on-going comments from stakeholders.</p> <p>This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.</p>		

- 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 has been made available on the CCBA website. The project proponents indicated in the audit that they intend to put the project materials on the Carbonfund.org website, as well. The AR/AM00004 methodology is available on the website of the UNFCCC. The estimation of potential future carbon storage in the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley prepared by Shoch et al will be in publication soon. The PDD does have hypertext web-links to many of the reference documents. The PDD was not available at the Tensas National Wildlife Refuge.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	See CAR 05/08, regarding communicating project information. This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.		

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 project proponents involved have all been involved in land management. The USFWS has by far the most experience and depth, which is made clear in the PDD in describing the agency's national scope, although less is said about the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge management team. The PDD clearly states where relevant experience is lacking on the part of Carbonfund.org for technical afforestation and management that these activities will be undertaken by other partners.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	OBS 04/08: The PDD should be enhanced with description of the specific experience and capacity of the TRNWR managers and technicians.		

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

Findings	Due to the small scale of this project (under 2,000 acres) and its location well-within the boundaries of the TRNWR with good accessibility and nearby management team of the National Wildlife Refuge, the capacity to manage the project is of appropriate scale to be sufficient.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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	<p>The project proponents and integrants have clearly defined roles and responsibilities within the project and for afforestation activities. These are enshrined within the Memorandum of Agreement, which stipulates the legal and contractual responsibilities of the USFWS, the Trust for Public Land, and Carbonfund.org for 1,100 acres of land.</p> <p>USFWS purchased the land from TPL and agreed to manage the new forest for the benefit of enhanced wildlife habitat and connectivity within the refuge. USFWS will monitor and assess the seedling survival over the first 5 years and will notify Carbonfund.org if survival falls below 70%. Also, contingent on funding, USFWS may implement thinning or other management techniques to enhance forest health.</p>		
----------	--	--	--

	<p>The Trust for Public lands facilitated the transaction, making it possible for relatively large tracts of land to be purchased and conveyed to the US government for inclusion within the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge.</p> <p>Additional agreements exist between Carbonfund.org and Environmental Synergy for services related to planting, measuring, and monitoring the trees; between Environmental Synergy and Delta Wildlife Services for planting of trees; and other sub-contractors and vendors.</p> <p>All current and relevant contracts defining roles and responsibilities were reviewed during the audits. The auditor's interviews with staff and principals for each of the project proponent organizations confirmed consistent understanding of these roles and responsibilities. There were no reported conflicts or disputes. A similar opinion was expressed by each that the business relationships were functioning well, clearly understood, respectful, and reaching common objectives.</p>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

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

Findings	<p>Within the MOA, Carbonfund.org agreed to pay for a significant contribution of the land acquisition and also the reforestation efforts and management activities in exchange for relinquishing to Carbonfund.org the unrestricted carbon rights until 2106. The MOA and other contracts demonstrate other financial commitments made of the project proponents. The PDD does not provide any indication of the costs or budget for this project to demonstrate the financial position of Carbonfund.org as related to the necessary expenditures of running the project.</p> <p><i>The project proponents submitted a budget to Rainforest Alliance, although the information is not included in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009, because it included some confidential information. The PDD describes how significant payments have been made or will be completed by March 2009 demonstrating organizations' financial capacity (on pages 32-33).</i></p>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	<p>CAR 06/08: The PDD shall demonstrate the operating costs of the project relative to the organizations financial resources.</p> <p>This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.</p>		

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	<p>The project is taking place entirely within the legal boundary of the Tensas National Wildlife Reserve on lands that are legally owned by the US government. The project is</p>		
----------	--	--	--

	confined to these lands. The PDD states how the the proof of title to the land and also the carbon rights was documented. The MOA includes the exhibits that pertain to the sale of private land from the Chicago Mill and Lumber Company to The Trust for Public Land and then for the conveyance of this land to the USFWS, such that the “lands involved in the Tensas River Reforestation Project are legally owned by the United States of America and are under the stewardship of the USFWS within the Tensas River National Wildlife Reserve.” The auditors evaluated the copies of deeds and title and checked the boundaries of the properties.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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 project is not relocating people. There was no prior residential occupation of the lands. There were farmers who would lease lands on a yearly basis under one-year contracts to cultivate the lands of the Chicago Mill and Lumber Company. Their rights under those contracts were respected during the audit the Trust for Public Lands explained that the farm manager worked with tenant farmers to inform them of the land sales, plans for re-planting, and honoring their contracts until they were completed.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

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

Findings	The lands are well within the boundary of the USFWS Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge, which is a well-regulated land management area without occurrence of in-migration or land colonization or occupation.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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	All of the project proponents are legal entities working under legally binding contracts. The land tenure is secure and the land manager is the USFWS, which would be expected to demonstrate adherence to local, state, and federal laws.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

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

Findings	The project proponents work through a legally binding agreement with the USFWS, which would be the appropriate authority. The MOA states that the USFWS "hereby acknowledges that as a condition of the funding Carbonfund is providing in support of the acquisition, planting and management of the Phase IID Reforestation Tract, Carbonfund has reserved and retained the right to report any Carbon Credits which may derive from Carbonfund's reforestation efforts."		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

G7. Adaptive 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

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	The PDD describes how monitoring plans will be used to report upon and provide feedback to the carbon estimations and outcomes. This is primarily aimed at the above-ground biomass pools and soil carbon. The discussion in the PDD concerning adaptive management for biodiversity and communities was less well developed.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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 PDD describes a process for the management planning of Region 4 of the USFWS. It is not evident how this afforestation project would be carried forward and documented within that planning process. The project does have a plan to maintain records of the results and decisions taken.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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 only refers to the planned contingency of re-planting seedlings should the need arise. The PDD does not describe the process the project will use to adjust the activities in other regards or circumstances. <i>The project proponents described how activities may be adjusted due to changing</i>		
----------	---	--	--

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

	<i>circumstances and risks in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 (on pages 26-28 and 37-39).</i>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	CAR 07/08: The PDD shall define the process to adjust project activities to potential changes. This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.		

- 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	The project is designed for the funding from Carbonfund.org to cover monitoring and management for a period of ten years. There is an expectation that longer-term management needs, such as for thinning or fire prevention or other maintenance to be provided by the USFWS would be subject to available funding.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	See CAR 03/08 and 06/08, related to future management and operating costs of the project. These CARs were closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.		

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	The PDD did not describe a complete plan for documentation of lessons learned with the exception of posting the PDD on the CCBA website and the publication of the carbon estimation model in the Journal of Wetlands. <i>The project proponents described in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 how knowledge dissemination will occur to encourage replication of successful practices (on pages 29 and 40-41).</i>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	CAR 08/08: The PDD shall describe how the project will actively disseminate information on lessons learned through the project to encourage replication of successful practices. This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.		

- 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	The PDD refers to the posting of documents or availability of these documents on websites. These are primarily passive methods of sharing documents and do not meet the indicator, which requests more proactive strategies for sharing information.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	See CAR 08/08 This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.		

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 defensible assumptions about how project activities will alter carbon stocks and non-CO₂ GHG emissions over the duration of the project or the project accounting period.

Findings	<p>The project used an approved CDM methodology and a peer-reviewed research publication to estimate the net change in carbon stocks expected as a result of the project. The pools selected to measure for net climate benefits are the above-ground biomass and below-ground biomass. While soil carbon will be monitored, it has not been included under this methodology.</p> <p>The methodology applied was AR-AM0004 "Reforestation or Afforestation of Land Currently Under Agricultural Use" which is appropriate due to low carbon stocks prior to tree planting, lack of fire use, and no fertilization or nitrogenous species used during planting.</p> <p>The model adopted to estimate the expected potential carbon storage over the life of the project has been described in the paper by Shoch, D., Kaster, G., Hohl, A., Souter, R., "Carbon Storage of bottomland hardwood afforestation in the Lower Mississippi Valley", U.S.A., 2008. During the audit, it was verified that the model had been accepted for publication.</p> <p>This model was developed to demonstrate the potential for biomass and carbon storage/accumulation through afforestation projects in the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley. It should be considered a conservative and reasonable projection, because it is the most representative use of empirical data conducted to date for the purpose of modeling growth of the types of species and conditions facing the project.</p> <p>The model was developed through a rigorous scientific process, including independent and confidential peer review by experts. The auditors reviewed the publication explaining the model, spoke to the writers/researchers involved, and compared the publication/model to other research and industry standards. Other studies, both unpublished and published have lead to some more aggressive projections and also more conservative.</p> <p>The project proponents indicated that this model is simply an estimation and that actual net carbon benefits will be determined through the measurement and monitoring plan.</p>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

- 2) Factor in the non-CO₂ gases CH₄ and N₂O to the net change calculations (above) if they are likely to account for more than 15% (in terms of CO₂ equivalents) of the project's overall GHG impact.

Findings	The project estimated that non-CO ₂ gases should not pass the 15% significance threshold. Emissions that are often associated with afforestation projects, such as GHG from burning slash as a means of site preparation or N ₂ O emissions from nitrogen fertilization are correctly not included, because such practices will not be followed.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

- 3) Demonstrate that the net climate impact of the project (including changes in carbon stocks, and non-CO₂ gases where appropriate) will give a positive result in terms of overall GHG benefits delivered.

Findings	<p>The use of the model described above demonstrate the potential for net carbon storage to be very positive overall. Aboveground live tree and derived belowground measurements made on reference, proxy forests for preparation of the model demonstrate positive net climate benefits estimated at the lower band of the 95% confidence interval.</p> <p>The PDD does not address the CO₂ emissions that will be increased by project activities, even though these are expected to be minimal, such as CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion caused in site preparation, planting operations, monitoring visits, and other forestry operations.</p> <p>Materiality (whether 5% or greater) of potential emissions from soil disking and ripping as well as fossil fuel combustion during planting preparation and processes are not quantified.</p> <p><i>The project proponents explained and calculated the GHG emissions attributable to project activities in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 (on pages 45-47).</i></p>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	<p>CAR 09/08: The PDD shall explain the monitoring of emissions of CO₂ from fossil fuel combustion controlled by the project.</p> <p>This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.</p> <p>OBS 05/08: The PDD should substantiate quantitatively that site preparation methods do not cause significant long-term net decreases in carbon stocks.</p>		

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-CO₂ 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	The PDD explains a general trend of declining agricultural land use in the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley. The opportunities for farming on other lands are sufficient to absorb demand that exists. The PDD also indicates that the Farm Bill of 1985 and
----------	---

	legislative provisions do not permit clearing of existing forestland to create new agricultural lands, so the potential for displacement from the project would be very limited. These rationale were supported by other resource experts the audit team spoke to during the evaluation.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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 describes that the project does not estimate any negative offsite impacts and would not expect these to be material to the point of mitigation for the occasional, minor occurrence. These would be addressed by being contained within a buffer reserve, which is set at 20% to begin with and may be revised through time to conform to requirements of the VCS.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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	As above, this will be moderated, if ever needed, by the retention of a 20% buffer.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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-CO₂ 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-CO₂ 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-CO₂ gases must be monitored if they account for more than 15% of the project's net climate impact expressed in terms of CO₂ equivalents.

Findings	The monitoring plan adopted by the project was prepared by institutions with competency in carbon measurement, as Winrock International did this for Environmental Synergy, who is the responsible party for implementing the monitoring. The plan was designed to meet locally-specific situations for the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley. The personnel who will implement the monitoring plan demonstrated sufficient technical experience and understanding of survey methods, and have already executed monitoring for the initial planting (i.e., an experienced forester from Environmental Synergy accompanied the tree planters at establishment and USFWS foresters also		
----------	--	--	--

	<p>monitors the planting, establishes monitoring plots, and develops his own monitoring plans).</p> <p>The project used well-defined standard operating procedures, such as those produced by Environmental Synergy ESI Overview of Monitoring Protocol 2008 and Winrock International Appendix 6 - Standard Operating Procedures for Measuring and Monitoring Carbon 2001. The allometric equations to be used (by Jenkins et al., 2004) are applicable for trees > 2.5 cm dbh, which can be achieved by age five in bottomland hardwood stands. Monitoring by ESI will produce for Carbonfund project-specific results and also analysis from measurements of cohorts through the wider range of similar projects in the LMAV.</p> <p>Carbon stocks will be measured by ESI in years 5 and 10 for the required carbon pool measurements for AR-AM0004, aboveground live tree and derived belowground pools.</p> <p>The monitoring plan does not address the CO2 emissions that will be increased by project activities. Specifically, the plan does not describe the measurement of CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion caused in site preparation, planting operations, monitoring visits, and other forestry operations.</p>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	<p>See CAR 09/08, regarding emissions from fossil fuel combustion.</p> <p>This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.</p>		

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	The PDD identifies the possible impacts from climate variability, such as increased growing season temperature, but most importantly severe storms and inundations. Temperature, precipitation, and hurricane intensity data are presented.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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	The project anticipates that to confront the unpredictable and uncertainty of future severe storm impacts the practice of mixed native species plantings that can develop into more resilient ecosystems is recommended as an appropriate measure.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

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 project⁴ 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	The PDD indicates that the project will sell the carbon benefits from the project only into the voluntary markets.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

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 defensible 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 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	<p>The PDD provides general discussion concerning the positive impact of the project on the Madison Parish community primarily from enhanced recreational opportunities associated with hunting and forest use.</p> <p>As suggested in the PDD, it is planned that there would be positive benefits arising from enhanced recreational zones. In addition, afforestation does generate some additional local employment in the nursery business.</p> <p>The decline of the importance of farming is emphasized, although the project doesn't clearly address the impacts upon the tenant farmers.</p> <p>The PDD does not reference or explain the regional studies that would quantify or</p>
----------	--

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).

	<p>support their estimates of the benefits as they would be measured. The PDD does not adequately address the community aspects of the project. However, during the audit, project proponents and stakeholders consulted all expressed the expectation that an increase in forest habitat will increase the recreational tourism of the area, which is predicted to be a driver in the local economy.</p> <p>There is not much explanation in the PDD as to how the project would interact with the community of Madison Parish or determine the effects on the socio-economic well-being of its inhabitants using a more systematic methodology.</p> <p><i>The project proponents provided in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 more complete description of the community benefits likely through the project (on pages 63-66).</i></p>
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	<p>CAR 10/08: The PDD shall provide a more thorough rationale of the estimates of the impact of the project on the well-being of the Madison parish community.</p> <p>This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.</p>

- 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	<p>The PDD identifies the three project proponents, Carbonfund.org, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Trust for Public Land as the stakeholders. There are not other local residents (such as farmers whose leases were ended) or local resource persons or institutions identified as stakeholders. Thus, the PDD does not document what stakeholder and broader community consultation has occurred or will take place. PDD shall include a discussion of this dialogue and how it has revised the project plan.</p> <p><i>The project proponents more thoroughly described in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 the stakeholder and community involvement in the process of project development (on pages 58-66).</i></p>
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	<p>CAR 11/08: The PDD shall document the stakeholder consultation or involvement in the project.</p> <p>This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.</p>

- 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	<p>There was no evidence that there existed any unresolved conflicts or grievances. The stakeholders contacted were consistently supportive of the afforestation project.</p>
----------	---

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).

	The PDD does not explain the process to be used to respond to or hear grievances. <i>The project proponents described the grievance and dispute resolution procedure in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 (on pages 60-61).</i>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	CAR 12/08: The project proponents shall develop a grievance and dispute resolution procedure. This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.		

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	The PDD describes the only potential negative community impact as that limited to transient farmers who would have held short term leases for cultivation of the agricultural lands prior to the project. It was described in the PDD and by resource experts who the auditors interviewed that the availability of farming options permit such farmers to readily shift their operations to other farms elsewhere if so desired. This short-term effect of the project is identified, however it is not supported in the PDD.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	OBS 06/08: The PDD should substantiate the project claim that tenant farmers have the same cost options for moving their farming operations to other leased lands.		

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

Findings	The PDD states that the Trust for Public Lands has employed a farm manager to represent the interests of the farmers, which were considered to be the only affected group potentially burdened by negative social and economic impacts. The project did not have records to demonstrate how representative or complete was the farmers' participation. <i>The project proponents documented their process to mitigate the negative impacts to farmers, although accepting that impacts would be temporary and limited, in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 (on page 62).</i>		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	CAR 13/08: The PDD shall describe plans to mitigate any negative impacts established. This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.		

- 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	The PDD describes social and economic benefits from enhanced wildlife habitat and recreation opportunities within and beyond the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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	The PDD suggests that the community impact monitoring for the project will rely on US Census Bureau data, and state and local government monitoring of economic metrics. The US Fish and Wildlife Service are to actively and passively monitor enhanced recreational opportunities. The PDD does not discuss a plan for selecting and monitoring specific community impact variables.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	See CAR 03/08 This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.		

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	This was not discussed in the PDD.
----------	------------------------------------

Conformance	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	See CAR 14/08 <i>The project proponents provided additional discussion in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 concerning involvement, non-elites, and women and community participation (on page 66). The depth of the consideration within the project design is still limited, therefore this CAR remains open.</i>		

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

Findings	This was not discussed in the PDD.		
Conformance	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	See CAR 14/08 <i>The project proponents provided additional discussion in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 concerning involvement, non-elites, and women and community participation (on page 66). The depth of the consideration within the project design is still limited.</i>		

3) Targeted to women to increase their participation; and

Findings	This was not discussed in the PDD.		
Conformance	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	See CAR 14/08 <i>The project proponents provided additional discussion in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 concerning involvement, non-elites, and women and community participation (on page 66). The depth of the consideration within the project design is still limited.</i>		

4) Aimed to increase community participation in project implementation.

Findings	This was not discussed in the PDD.		
Conformance	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	See CAR 14/08 <i>The project proponents provided additional discussion in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 concerning involvement, non-elites, and women and community participation (on page 66). The depth of the consideration within the project design is still limited.</i>		

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	The project proponents demonstrated a long history of professional and personal understanding of the people, places, and traditions of the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley. The primary implementers in the field of the project, USFWS and Environmental Synergy, all possess significant experience in undertaking similar projects throughout the southeastern United States over many decades. Stakeholders with other
----------	--

	organizations were supportive and spoke highly of the project proponents.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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	This was not discussed in the original PDD. The project proponents provided additional discussion in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 concerning involvement, non-elites, and women and community participation (on page 66). The depth of the consideration within the project design is still limited, but acceptable.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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	This was not discussed in the original PDD. The project proponents provided additional discussion in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 concerning involvement, non-elites, and women and community participation (on page 66). The depth of the consideration within the project design is still limited, but acceptable.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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	This was not discussed in the original PDD. The project proponents provided additional discussion in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 concerning involvement, non-elites, and women and community participation (on page 66). The depth of the consideration within the project design is still limited, but acceptable.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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 defensible 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 PDD provides ample discussion of the net positive biodiversity impacts. It does not make a direct comparison to the “without project” scenario as the assumption is that the restoration of natural forest ecosystems would result in a net positive biodiversity impact as compared to continued cultivation of corn or cotton.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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 project is only using native species for afforestation.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 has provided a list of the potential IUCN Red List species that may be found within the project boundary. As mentioned earlier, it is not expected that such species could be maintained on cleared agricultural lands, so the enhancements by the project are intended to create conditions suitable for such species as opposed to current conditions which are devoid of them.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

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

Findings	The PDD provides a list of the afforestation species that will be used in the project areas. During the audit the team reviewed the planted sites and the planting reports to confirm that only native species and certainly no known invasive species were being used.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

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

Findings	The PDD affirms that no genetically modified organism will be used in the project.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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 perceived negative offsite biodiversity impacts from ecosystem restoration within the national wildlife refuge.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS			

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

Findings	No negative offsite biodiversity impacts are anticipated. About the only possible negative impact from tree planting could be where islands or refugia are created that become traps for certain invasive wildlife species, i.e., certain birds. The planting areas are large in size and their layout is configured to add connectivity to existing forest, thus it is not envisioned that such traps would occur in this case.		
Conformance	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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	The biodiversity impacts within the project boundary are expected to be significant and positive due to the restorative function performed and also that these parcels are part of a wider program of afforestation across a large tract of land.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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 references US Fish and Wildlife Service research and monitoring work in conjunction with the Habitat Management Plan. The PDD does not discuss the specific details or relevant variables of biodiversity that will be monitored or how this will be linked to the actual project sites.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	See CAR 03/08, regarding biodiversity monitoring. This CAR was closed by actions of Carbonfund.org evidenced in the revised PDD of January 16, 2009 and explained in the findings above.		

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	The project will only use native species in the afforestation.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
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	The reduction of agriculture from within the Tensas River National Wildlife refuge will reduce chemicals in the soil and water and will also reduce the soil sedimentation and erosion brought about by repeated tilling for agriculture. Restoring bottomland hardwood cover will enhance water filtration, storage, and quality.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>

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	The project proponents made credible arguments for the improvement to water and soil resources during the audit, although relevant studies have not been used to support their assumptions.		
Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
CAR/OBS	See OBS 03/08		

Appendix C: STAKEHOLDER LISTS (CONFIDENTIAL)

List of Project Proponent Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Contact	Type of Participation
Brian McFarland	Carbonfund.org; Climate Specialist	240-595-6883	In-person, phone
Erkin Ozberk	Carbonfund.org; Climate Specialist	240-247-0629	In-person, phone
Eric Carlson	Carbonfund.org; Executive Director	240-247-0630	In-person, phone
Yancy McGee	USFWS, Tensa River National Wildlife Refuge; Forester	318-574-2664	In-person
Don Morrow, Senior Project Manager	Trust for Public Lands	850-591-7645	Phone

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Organization	Contact	Type of Participation
Ralph Pearce, District Forester	Delta National Forest	662-873-6256	In-person
Pat Sullivan, Farm Manager	Trust For Public Lands	662-822-7937	Phone
Don Anderson, Owner	Delta Wildlife Consulting Services	318-282-0418	Phone
David Shock, Vice President	Terracarbon LLC	434-326-1144	In person
Carol Jordan, President	Environmental Synergy, Inc.	770-447-4638	Phone
Don Seay, Forester	Environmental Synergy, Inc.	“	Phone
Harry Cooke, Forester	Environmental Synergy, Inc.	“	Phone
Ray Aycock, Field Supervisor	USFWS, Jackson, Mississippi Office	601-321-1122	Phone
Danial Twedt, Conservation Biologist	USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center Vicksburg, Mississippi Office	601-629-6605	Phone