

2017

# NANGA LAUK VILLAGE FOREST

Plan Vivo Validation Report

*Rimbak Pakai Pengidup* - Forest for Life  
Sustainable Forest and Biodiversity Management in  
Nanga Lauk Village, Kapuas Hulu, West Kalimantan,  
Indonesia

Wahyu F. Riva | IDEAS



**Name of Reviewers:**

Wahyu F Riva, Independent Assessor & Consultant of IDEAS Consultancy Services, Bogor, Indonesia.

**Date of Review:**

Desk-based review: 22 – 29 September 2017

Field visit and field validation: 07 – 12 November 2017

Reporting: 20 – 24 November 2017

**Project Name:**

*Rimbak Pakai Pengidup* - Forest for Life: Sustainable Forest and Biodiversity Management in Nanga Lauk Village, Kapuas Hulu, West Kalimantan, Indonesia

**Project Description:**

The Nanga Lauk Village Forest (NLVF) covers a total area of 1,430 ha, 58% of which is covered by peat swamp forest and riparian forest (the rest being occupied by lakes). Nanga Lauk village land also includes 8,618 ha of peat swamp and riparian forest that is currently classified as *Hutan Produksi Terbatas* or Limited Production Forest (Nanga Lauk Limited Production Forest; NLHPT). NLVF and NLHPT support the livelihoods of the 197 households in Nanga Lauk Village, and provide habitat for a diverse assemblage of plant and animal species. The management rights for NLVF have been assigned to the Nanga Lauk Community by establishment of a Village Forest (*Hutan Desa*). The Nanga Lauk community wish to extend these rights to include NLHPT, part of which will be managed as protection forest and included along with the NLVF as a Plan Vivo project area. There is a current application for the concession license for NLHPT, which the Nanga Lauk Community aim to prevent and are instead applying to have the area included in their village forest.

In Kapuas Hulu District between 2005 and 2016, around 3% of the forest types present in NLVF and NLHPT were deforested and around 1.5% were degraded. If they are not effectively protected, a similar proportion of deforestation and degradation is expected in Nanga Lauk forest, as it is exposed to the drivers of deforestation and degradation that have affected similar forest types in the District of Kapuas Hulu over the last 10 years. Under this baseline scenario, emissions from loss of above- and below-ground biomass in the next 5 years are estimated at 8,844 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> for NLVF and 82,403 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> for NLHPT.

Over the last two years, the Nanga Lauk Community have worked with PRCF-Indonesia to develop a suite of activities that will enable them to address the drivers of deforestation expected to affect the NLVF and NLHPT, and prevent deforestation and forest degradation. Key to the success of these activities in NLHPT is formal recognition of the area as village forest, and the Nanga Lauk community have started the process required for its recognition as *Hutan Desa*. The community will continue to pursue this recognition, and the development of management plans for NLHPT, with support from PRCF-Indonesia and the Plan Vivo project.

The Nanga Lauk communities depend on the forest for their livelihood activities, and

through the project they will continue to develop and diversify these activities by improving processing and marketing of rattan, bamboo and forest honey, planting species used as timber and non-timber forest productions, and exploring potential for ecotourism. These activities, supported by the Plan Vivo project, will help to ensure the Nanga Lauk community maximizing the benefits they receive from forest protection, and develop a foundation for long-term management after the end of the Plan Vivo project.

After accounting for the expected effectiveness of project activities, potential for leakage, and the risk buffer; during the first 5-year project period, production of saleable Plan Vivo certificates, for 1,308 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions per year are expected from NLVF. Management plans for NLHPT will be finalized during the first year of the project, and expected climate benefits will be estimated according to the area of each forest type included in the Plan Vivo project area. Expected production of saleable Plan Vivo certificates from the forest types present within NLHPT range from 0.6 to 7.5 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> per hectare per year. Since much of the Nanga Lauk forest is on peat-land, and emissions from peat drying are not included in climate benefit estimates, actual emission reductions achieved should be considerably greater than those for which certificates are claimed.

Source: PDD Nanga Lauk Village Forest, 2017

#### List of documents reviewed:

1. Project Design Document. *Rimbak Pakai Pengidup* - Forest for Life: Sustainable Forest and Biodiversity Management in Nanga Lauk Village, Kapuas Hulu, West Kalimantan, Indonesia. Submitted to the Plan Vivo Foundation by PRCF Indonesia. Version 0.2, 8 November 2017.
2. Land-cover change assessment (PDD – Annex 1).
3. Forest management plan (5 years) of “LPHD LAUK BERSATU”. May 2017 (PDD – Annex 2).
4. Evidence of community participation (PDD – Annex 3).
5. Plan Vivo Agreement (PDD - Annex 4).
6. Training curriculum (PDD - Annex 5).
7. GIS Map (PDD - Annex 6).
8. Estimation of climate benefits from REDD in community managed forest: Climate benefit estimation approach for Plan Vivo projects. Approved Approach. Version 1.0, 4 Aug 2017 (PDD – Annex 7).
9. Parameter, Baseline and Benefit of the Carbon Calculation (PDD – Annex 8).
10. Key people in the participating community, Project Coordinator organisation, and technical support team (PDD – Annex 9).
11. Permits and legal documentation (PDD – Annex 10).
12. Project Database Template (PDD – Annex 11).
13. Annual report template (PDD – Annex 12).
14. Land Cover Situation and Land-Use Change in the Districts of West Kalimantan and East Kalimantan, Indonesia. Assessment of District and Forest Management Unit Wide. Historical Emission Levels. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH FORCLIME Forests and Climate Change Programme. May, 2013.

15. Sustainable Forest and Biodiversity Management in Borneo: Livelihood and Socioeconomic Survey. Nanga Lauk Village, Embaloh Hilir Sub-District, Kapuas Hulu District, West Kalimantan Province, Indonesia. Ellyn K. Damayanti & Nicholas J. Berry. LTS International & Daemeter. October, 2016.
16. Sustainable Forest and Biodiversity Management in Borneo: Problem Tree Analysis for Deforestation/Degradation. Nanga Lauk Village, Embaloh Hilir Sub-District, Kapuas Hulu District, West Kalimantan Province, Indonesia. Ellyn K. Damayanti & Nicholas J. Berry. LTS International & Daemeter. October, 2016.
17. Conservation of Forest in Nanga Lauk Village, Kapuas Hulu, West Kalimantan, Indonesia. Project Idea Note. Submitted to the Plan Vivo Foundation by LTS International and Daemeter Consulting on behalf of PRCF Indonesia. Version 1.1, 13 Jun 2017.
18. Training on Community livelihood development plan, PRCF Indonesia, October 2016
19. Training report on The potential and survey rattan at Nanga Lauk village, May 2017
20. Training report on Rattan survey and business at Nanga Lauk village, PRCF Indonesia, May 2017
21. Training report on Rattan development at Nanga Lauk village, PRCF Indonesia, July 2017
22. Training report on Exchange learning by visiting Tanjung Village (Rubber village), PRCF Indonesia, July 2017
23. Training report on Facilitation and development vegetable, PRCF Indonesia, July 2017
24. Training report on Rubber development at Nanga Lauk village, PRCF Indonesia, August 2017
25. Training report on Composting at Nanga Lauk village, PRCF Indonesia, August 2017
26. Profile of People, Resources, and Conservation, Foundation – Indonesia (Yayasan PRCF-Indonesia), January 2017

#### Visited sites:

The project will be implemented in one village: Nanga Lauk village, Embaloh Hilir sub district, Kapuas Hulu district, West Kalimantan, Indonesia. From Putussibau (the capital of Kapuas Hulu district, approximately 800 km from Pontianak, West Kalimantan provincial capital), this village is accessible by using 2 modes of transportation: one-hour drive to Nanga Nyabau village, then continued by boat through river about 1.5 hours. The village of Nanga Lauk is located at the mouth of the Lauk river adjoining a bigger river, the Palin river. The community housing are on either side of the Palin river.

There are 197 households in Nanga Lauk village. The village has a population of 706 people. Nevertheless, at least 79 households are registered as very poor or poor according to the Government standard and receive basic support from the Government. The main livelihood activities in Nanga Lauk are fishing, honey production, and rubber cultivation. All households have multiple income sources, and are normally engaged in more than one of the main livelihood activities. Fishing has the highest total income but households with income from businesses received more from these activities than from fishing. Honey was the fourth most important source of household income, but the range of income per honey

producing household varies considerably. Other sources of income include selling surplus vegetables and crops (if any), honey business (middleman), selling NTFPs, and labour (Source: PDD and has confirmed by the community).

The Nanga Lauk Village Forest (NLVF) covers a total area of 1,430 ha, 58% of which is covered by peat swamp forest and riparian forest (the rest being occupied by lakes). The Nanga Lauk communities depend on the forest for their livelihood activities, especially for honey production and fish, and through the project they will continue to develop and diversify these activities by improving processing and marketing of rattan, bamboo and forest honey, planting species used as timber and non-timber forest productions, and exploring potential for ecotourism (Source: PDD and has confirmed by the community).

For details of list individuals and/or group interviewed and consulted is presented on **Annex 01**.

#### **Description of field visit:**

The field visit was conducted on 07 - 12 November 2017. The field visit started with the opening meeting with Project Coordinator and as Head of Betung Kerihun and Danau Sentarum National Park on 06 November 2015. On 07 November 2017, discussions with district government such, Staffs of Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA) of Kapuas Hulu District, Staff of Environmental Service of Kapuas Hulu District and Staff of Kapuas Hulu Utara Forest Management Unit were conducted. The field visit to project site, Nanga Lauk village, was conducted on 09 - 11 November 2017 with community consultations and forest area observation. A closing meeting with the technical support team on initial findings from site visit was conducted on 12 November 2017.

For details of field visit or site visit itinerary at Nanga Lauk village is presented on **Annex 02**.

#### **Validation Opinion:**

Validator confirms that the project complies with the requirements of the Plan Vivo. PRCF Indonesia as Project Coordinator, with technical assistance from LTS International and Daemeter Consulting, has provided excellent Project Design Document (PDD) through the Sustainable Forest and Biodiversity Management in Borneo project, funded by the Asian Development Bank.

The validator confirms that Project Coordinator and staff have been able to demonstrate that they are aware of the detailed project technical specifications contained in the management plan and monitoring plan. Participatory methods undertaken by the Project Coordinator are through appraisal, from need assessment, planning, implementation or community assistance, to monitoring and evaluation of the program. Validator confirms that the community was well-informed about Plan Vivo System. They have also aware and understood the nature of carbon and ecosystem service mechanisms. The communities have also understood that they must maintain and protect forests as part of community commitment in conserving the natural resources, social capital and cultural capital that has been recognized and applied by community. The validator also confirms that all the processes of developing management and monitoring of forest management have involved the community actively and participatory.

The Project Design Document (PDD) provides an accurate and excellent description. It also has a detailed description on the planned activities and systems to monitor the project. The PRCF Indonesia has a lot of experiences with various programs undertaken involving the community. They have been accustomed to making activity reports of the projects. This becomes a great capital for PRCF Indonesia to be able to run and managed the Plan Vivo Project.

In the opinion of the validator, Nanga Lauk Village Forest Project **should be awarded certification** to the Plan Vivo Standard, with agreement on a timetable to address Forward Action Request (FAR).

*Table 1. Summary of major and minor Corrective Actions (CAR changed to Forward Action Request/FAR)*

Theme	Major CARs	Minor CARs changed to Forward Action Request (FAR)	Observations
Governance	0	<p><b>FAR#01.</b> PRCF Indonesia does not have a bank account specifically opened for Plan Vivo Project. PRCF Indonesia should establish a separate bank account for receiving funds for the Plan Vivo project, to ensure that any payment or funding due to the participating community is kept separately from the Project Coordinator's organizational finances.</p> <p><b>PRCF Response to FAR#01:</b> PRCF commit to opening the required bank account when funding is secured.</p> <p><b>Status to FAR#01:</b> <i>Closed.</i> Project Coordinator has agreed and commit to opening the required</p>	<p><b>OBS#01.</b> The Project Coordinator needs to develop written procedure for addressing any conflicts that may arise. This procedure is required as a mutually agreed written guideline in the event of a conflict between the Project Coordinator and community.</p> <p><b>PRCF Response to OBS#01:</b> Ammendments have been made to the draft PDD (Section J1) and Plan Vivo Agreement template to add futher description of grievance redressal mechanisms to be employed by the project, we believe these provide a sufficient description of the mechanisms for addressing</p>

		<p>bank account when funding is secured. The project coordinator will resolve this FAR in a timeframe of 6 months and inform the Plan Vivo Foundation of the status at the next annual reporting stage. The Plan Vivo Foundation reserves the right to withhold issuance if FARs haven't been sufficiently addressed</p>	<p>conflicts that may arise.</p> <p><b>Status to OBS#01:</b> <b><i>Closed.</i></b> Based on the reviewed documents (Ammendments to PDD, Section J.1 and Plan Vivo Agreement template), the Validator states that the procedures listed in the documents have met the requirements and are sufficient to manage the conflict.</p> <p><b>OBS#02.</b> The Project Coordinator together with the community needs to develop written procedures on conflict management and resolution. This written procedure is important for creating effective mechanism for addressing and resolving conflicts, guiding efforts for mediation processes and designing third-party engagement strategies to eliminate the fundamental causes of conflict.</p> <p><b>PRCF Response to OBS#02:</b> Ammendments have been made to the draft PDD (Section</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>J1) and Plan Vivo Agreement template to add further description of grievance redressal mechanisms to be employed by the project, we believe these provide a sufficient description of the mechanisms for addressing conflicts that may arise.</p> <p><b>Status to OBS#02: <i>Closed</i>.</b> Based on the reviewed documents (Ammendments to PDD, Section J.1 and Plan Vivo Agreement template), the Validator states that the procedures listed in the documents have met the requirements and are sufficient to manage the conflict.</p>
Carbon	0	0	0
Ecosystem	0	0	0
Livelihoods	0	0	0

**Table 2 - Report Conformance**

Theme	Conformance of Draft Report	Conformance of Final Report
<b>Governance</b>	Yes	Yes
<b>Carbon</b>	Yes	Yes
<b>Ecosystem</b>	Yes	Yes
<b>Livelihoods</b>	Yes	Yes



Theme	1. Effective and Transparent Project Governance
<i>Ensuring that the project meets requirements 3.1-3.16 of the Plan Vivo Standard (2013)</i>	
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>1.1 Administrative capabilities</b></p> <p>Is there a legal and organizational framework in place that has the sufficient capacity and a range of skills to implement all the administrative requirements of the project? Aspects of this framework may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1.1 A legal entity (Project Coordinator) that is able to enter into sale agreements with multiple producers or producer groups for carbon services</li> <li>1.1.2 Standard sale agreement templates for the provision of carbon services</li> <li>1.1.3 Systems for maintaining transparent and audited financial accounts able to the secure receipt, holding and disbursement of payments to producers</li> <li>1.1.4 All necessary legal permissions to carry out the intended project activities</li> <li>1.1.5 Mechanisms for participants to discuss issues associated with the design and running of the project</li> <li>1.1.6 Procedures for addressing any conflicts that may arise</li> <li>1.1.7 Ability to produce reports required by Plan Vivo on a regular basis and communicate regularly with Plan Vivo</li> </ul>
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Organizational and administrative capacity may be demonstrated through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A record of managing other projects - especially those involving the receipt, safeguarding and management of funds and disbursement of these to smallholders/community groups</li> <li>• Project staff who can explain the legal status of the organisation and its management and financial structure i.e. how funds will be held and transferred – backed up by evidence of setting up bank accounts and record-keeping systems etc.</li> <li>• The views of others who have worked with the organisation in the past (such as government, other project partners or other NGOs)</li> <li>• A visibly efficient and functioning office with all necessary staff</li> </ul>
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>The PRCF Indonesia has legal entity that is able to enter into sale agreements with multiple producers or producer groups for carbon services. PRCF has a document of Notary Deed as the foundation of establishment of organization. Notarial Deed No. 93 dated October 21, 2000 was issued by Notary Eddy Dwi Pribadi, S.H and was registered to the Pontianak District Court No. 08/44 Pend/2001 dated January 31, 2001, for the first time. In 2001, the PRCF amended the Notary Deed No 93 dated 21 October 2000 to become Notary Deed No. 90 dated July 24, 2001 issued by Notary Eddy Dwi Pribadi, S.H and has been registered to the Pontianak District Court. 03/44 PTOB/2001 dated July 25, 2001 due to changes to the PRCF board. For the third time, the PRCF amended the Notary Deed in 2002 (Notary Deed No. 55 dated November 20, 2002) on the grounds of a change of institution to PRCF - Indonesia Foundation (Yayasan PRCF Indonesia). At the time of validation, PRCF still uses Notary Deed No. 55 dated November 20, 2002 and there has</p>

	<p>been no change. In addition to the Notary Deed, the PRCF also has a number of other legalities, namely the Domicile Letter of the Organization (No. 200/2/SJ/2013 dated May 22, 2013) issued by Head of Sungaijawi Village, Pontianak City, West Kalimantan and Taxpayer Identification Number (NPWP) No. 1.858 .891.3-701 issued by the Tax Office of Pontianak, Directorate General of Taxation, Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia.</p> <p>The PDD has submitted to the Plan Vivo Foundation by PRCF Indonesia and prepared with technical assistance from LTS International and Daemeter Consulting provided through the Sustainable Forest and Biodiversity Management in Borneo project, funded by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and implemented by the Republic of Indonesia, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Directorate of Ecosystem Services on Conservation Areas (DESCA). PRCF Indonesia has been partner of the LTS International and Daemeter Consulting in the ADB project since January 2016 and it is likely that the support will finish at December 2017.</p> <p>Sale agreement template (Plan Vivo Agreement) has provided in PDD, Annex 4. This draft agreement provides agreement between Project Coordinator and participant community related to the sale of ecosystem services under the Plan Vivo Project.</p> <p>In the sale agreement template mentions that during the project period, the participant community will implement all activities described in the management plan, conduct monitoring activities; implement corrective actions if activity-based indicator thresholds described in the monitoring plan are not met; deposit of their calculated carbon benefit in a risk buffer, refrain from entering into any ecosystem service/carbon sale agreement with other party; and inform the Project Coordinator of any circumstances arising which prevent them from continuing with any of the activities in their management plan or monitoring plan.</p> <p>Meanwhile, in the sale agreement template also mentions that during the project period, the Project Coordinator will support monitoring activities; provide the training; inform the participant community of the results of the annual report review and any corrective actions required as described in the monitoring plan; to maintain a register of Plan Vivo Certificates issued to the project on the Markit registry and ensure that the project remains in compliance with the requirements of the Plan Vivo Standard; coordinate the verification of benefits from the Plan Vivo Project; and inform the participant community of any circumstances arising which prevent them from continuing their role as Project Coordinator.</p> <p>The sale agreement template included the management plans, monitoring plans, and benefit sharing agreement. Base on interview and focused group discussion (FGD) with Project Coordinator and</p>
--	---

	<p>community members confirmed that they are aware that they need to sign an agreement if funds are secured in the future.</p> <p>Project Coordinator confirmed that the management plan, monitoring plan and benefit sharing agreement have been evaluated and approved by the Project Coordinator for implementation under the Plan Vivo Project.</p> <p>The PRCF Indonesia has a financial reporting procedure published in 2013. The procedure contains financial procedures, budgeting and advance application, recording and reporting procedures, administrative and financial policies and internal audit scope and procedures. This procedure also contains 19 attachments.</p> <p>This procedure is structured with the aim of being used as a guide for recording financial transactions and preparing reports for the PRCF Indonesia. For staff, this procedure serves as a guideline to be able to properly perform financial records, make budget well, make requests for quarterly payments appropriately and make financial reports correctly and on time.</p> <p>This procedure also contains an internal audit conducted by the auditor team of funding/donors aimed at reviewing, auditing and recommending it to the implementation of the project in accordance with the standards, policies and regulations set by the funder and mutually agreed upon as outlined in the cooperation agreement and the instructions of the Program Implementation.</p> <p>At the time of validation, PRCF Indonesia does not have a bank account specifically opened for Plan Vivo Project. PRCF Indonesia should establish a separate bank account for receiving funds for the Plan Vivo project, to ensure that any payment or funding due to the participating community is kept separately from the Project Coordinator's organizational finances. Project funds should be held in a stable currency to reduce the chance that losses due to currency fluctuations. PRCF Indonesia has committed to open a bank account when funding is secured (<b>FAR#01</b>).</p> <p>Project Coordinator has complied the national and regional regulations and legislation relevant to the proposed project activities. The project will act in compliance with these, and other relevant regulations. Nanga Lauk community has obtained management rights for Nanga Lauk Village Forest by Ministerial Decree No. SK 685/MNLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/2/2017 on Granting the Right of Village Forest Management to the <i>Lembaga Pengelola Hutan Desa (LPHD) Lauk Bersatu</i> covering <math>\pm</math> 1.430 hectares in the Protected Forest Area in Nanga Lauk Village, Embaloh Hilir Sub-district, Kapuas Hulu District, West Kalimantan Province.</p>
--	--

	<p>The project was designed in collaboration with the Directorate of Ecosystem Services on Conservation Areas (DESCA), which is a Government agency under the Indonesian Ministry of Environment and Forestry (<i>Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan</i>). DESCA is the implementing agency for the ADB funded project that is supporting the development of a Plan Vivo Project in Nanga Lauk Village. When Nanga Lauk was selected as a Plan Vivo project site, DESCA circulated a letter of notification to all relevant regulatory bodies and NGOs active in the area, including national and district authorities and, local and international organisations. The validator has reviewed all legal permission documents and has been confirmed to the Project Coordinator and the community.</p> <p>The PRCF Indonesia with the community has mechanisms for conducting discussions related to this project. If there is a meeting, LPHD will invite representatives from village government, member of LPHD, community leaders, religious leaders, youth leaders, and women leaders. The representation to attend the meeting is determined based on the issues or materials to be discussed. All participants are given the opportunity and freedom to express their opinions. The mechanism has been agreed and approved by the community. PRCF Indonesia has also conducted regular meetings with the community, at least once a month.</p> <p>The Project Coordinator needs developed written procedure for addressing any conflicts that may arise. This procedure is required as a mutually agreed written guideline in the event of a conflict between the Project Coordinator and community. The procedure provides basis for conflict resolution in case stipulations of the contract are being violated. The procedure will need to clarify the conflict resolution mechanisms between community and PRCF Indonesia as Project Coordinator in the project and include also the role and responsibilities of the government it will eventually serve the needs of all three parties in case of need for conflict resolution (<b>OBS#01</b>).</p> <p>The PRCF Indonesia has a lot of experiences with various programs undertaken involving the community. These activities are funded by international donors, such as TCFA, ADB, MCA-I, Ford Foundation, etc. They have been accustomed to making activity reports every month, every three months and every year. This becomes a great capital for PRCF Indonesia to be able to run Plan Vivo Project.</p> <p>Annual report template has provided in PDD, Annex 12. Annual report template provided of project update, project activities, Plan Vivo Certificate issuance submission, sale of Plan Vivo Certificates, monitoring results, impacts, payment of ecosystem services, on-going participation, and project operating costs. The Annual Report provides a summary of activity-based monitoring indicators; financial transactions, and financial audit; capacity building activities; and changes to project design.</p>
--	---

	Based on interviews with PRCF Indonesia, they will send reports on a regular basis and will always communicate with Plan Vivo intensively if there are things that need to be consulted. The reporting process will also involve communities involved in management and protection forest activities.		
<b>D. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	<p><b>FAR#01.</b> PRCF Indonesia does not have a bank account specifically opened for Plan Vivo Project. PRCF Indonesia should establish a separate bank account for receiving funds for the Plan Vivo project, to ensure that any payment or funding due to the participating community is kept separately from the Project Coordinator's organizational finances.</p> <p><b>OBS#01.</b> The Project Coordinator needs developed written procedure for addressing any conflicts that may arise. This procedure is required as a mutually agreed written guideline in the event of a conflict between the Project Coordinator and community. The procedure provides basis for conflict resolution in case stipulations of the contract are being violated.</p>		
<b>F. PRCF Response</b>	<p><b>Response to FAR#01:</b> PRCF commit to opening the required bank account when funding is secured</p> <p><b>Response to OBS#01:</b> Ammendments have been made to the draft PDD (Section J1) and Plan Vivo Agreement template to add futher description of grievance redressal mechanisms to be employed by the project, we believe these provide a sufficient description of the mechanisms for addressing conflicts that may arise.</p>		
<b>G. Status</b>	<p><b>Status to FAR#01: <i>Closed.</i></b> Project Coordinator has agreed and commit to opening the required bank account when funding is secured. The project coordinator will resolve this FAR in a timeframe of 6 months and inform the Plan Vivo Foundation of the status at the next annual reporting stage. The Plan Vivo Foundation reserves the right to withhold issuance if FARs haven't been sufficiently addressed.</p> <p><b>Status to OBS#01: <i>Closed.</i></b> Based on the reviewed documents (Ammendments to PDD, Section J.1 and Plan Vivo Agreement template), the Validator states that the procedures listed in the documents have met the requirements and are sufficient to manage the conflict.</p>		
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>1.2 Technical capabilities</b></p> <p>Is the project through its staff or partners able to provide timely and good quality technical assistance to producers and/or communities in</p>		

	planning and implementing the productive, sustainable and economically viable forest management, silvicultural and agroforestry actions proposed for the project and for any additional livelihoods activities that are also planned?
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Technical capabilities may be determined through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussions with project staff who should be able to define clearly who is responsible for the provision of technical support</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff to demonstrate that they are familiar with the content of project technical specifications e.g. species to be planted, spacing requirements, management systems and any potential issues</li> <li>• Feedback from farmers/communities who have been supported in the past</li> <li>• On-site evidence of project activities (possibly from other projects) that have benefited from technical support</li> </ul>
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>PRCF Indonesia has a lot of experience related to the program of assistance with the community. Based on review documents, including the PDD and confirmed by Project Coordinator, PRCF Indonesia has conducted at least 26 projects in West Kalimantan under four programmes, since its establishment in 2000, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women Empowerment and Strengthening Community Cultural Identity Programme (1999-present)</li> <li>• Democracy and Peace Building Programme (2003-2010)</li> <li>• Habitat and Endangered Species Conservation Programme (2004-present)</li> <li>• Community Based Forest Management, Non-Timber Forest Management and Environment Services Development Programme (2010-present)</li> </ul> <p>PRCF-Indonesia are currently implementing four other projects, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village Forest Development to Support Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of NTFP in Kapuas Hulu District, West Kalimantan. Running from June 2014 – May 2016, funded by Tropical Forest Conservation Act – Kalimantan, No. 003/01/02/1237/TFCA2/CYC.1/IV/2014</li> <li>• Strengthening Community-based Forest Management through Village Forest (<i>Hutan Desa</i>) for reducing deforestation and land degradation in West Kalimantan. Running from Oct 2015 to Oct 2016, and funded by The Asia Foundation</li> <li>• Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) of hand woven textiles (<i>Songket, Ulos, Lurik, Abaca, Ikat</i>): Female Entrepreneurship in Indonesia and Philippines. Running from May 2013 – Apr 2017, and funded by <i>Asosiasi Pendamping Perempuan Usaha Kecil</i> (ASPPUK), HIVOS, and European Union (EU)</li> <li>• Village Forest Development through Sustainable Utilization of NTFP and Ecosystem Services in Kapuas Hulu District, West Kalimantan; In collaboration with Aliansi Organisme Indonesia (AOI),</li> </ul>



	<p>Lembaga Energi Hijau (LEH), Rumpun Bambu Nusantara (RBN), Koperasi Produsen Buah Sidi Easi, and Koperasi Produsen Unyap Bina Usaha; Running from August 2016 – December 2017, funded by Millennium Challenge Account-Indonesia Green Prosperity Project, Window-2 of CBNRM, Grant No: 2016/Grant/055.</p> <p>PRCF Indonesia also has a reliable and competent key human resources to run and managed this project: Imanul Huda as Director, expertise in Program management; Community Based Forest Management; Biodiversity conservation; and Community Development; M. Syamsuri as Program Coordinator, expertise in Community Based Forest Management, NTFPs and Capacity Building; Fifiyati as Program Coordinator, expertise in Women Entrepreneurship, Traditional weaving development, and Education; Amaliatun Hasanah as Financial Manager; Janiarto Paradise Pawa as GIS Specialist, expertise in GIS and landscape architecture, Biodiversity Conservation; Aloysius Kahariyadi as NTFP specialist, expertise in NTFPs development; Agus Dwi Wahyudi as Agriculture Specialist, expertise in Sustainable Agriculture; Rio Afiat as Rural Economic Development Specialist, expertise in Institutional Economy; and Edi Waluyo Slamet as Rural Economic Development Specialist, expertise in Production &amp; Marketing.</p> <p>The roles and responsibilities of the staff managing the project are clear. Meanwhile, based on interviews and FGD with community confirmed that PRCF Indonesia has provided very satisfied with the support and technical assistance to community.</p> <p>Based on interviews and discussions with Project Coordinators and staffs, they have been able to clearly demonstrate who is responsible for providing technical support to the community.</p> <p>Interviews with the Project Coordinator also confirm that project staff have been able to demonstrate that they are aware of the detailed project technical specifications contained in the management plan and monitoring plan, such as patrol activities, species to be planted, forest management systems, forest security and protection, development of community livelihoods, and other potential issues.</p> <p>The community also felt greatly helped by the support provided by PRCF Indonesia. The community considers the staff of PRCF Indonesia to have the dedication and integrity to run and managed the Plan Vivo project on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 1.2.</p>						
D. Conformance	<table><tr><td>Yes</td><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>No</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>N/A</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr></table>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>		

<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>1.3 Social capabilities</b></p> <p>Is the project, through its staff or partners able to demonstrate an understanding of the social conditions of the target groups/communities and likely implications of the project for these? This might include:</p> <p>1.3.1 A demonstrated ability to select appropriate target groups through stakeholder analysis and to understand the implications of the project for specific groups e.g. poor, women, socially disadvantaged etc.</p> <p>1.3.2 Groups/communities that are well-informed about the Plan Vivo System and the nature of carbon and ecosystem services</p> <p>1.3.3 Local groups/communities that can demonstrate effective self-governance and decision-making</p> <p>1.3.4 Well-established and effective participatory relationships between producers and the Project Coordinator</p> <p>1.3.5 Demonstrated ability to establish land-tenure rights through engaging with producers/communities and other relevant organisations</p> <p>1.3.6 Ability to consult with and interact with producers/communities on a sustained basis through participatory 'tools' and methods</p> <p>1.3.7 Established system for conflict resolution</p>
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Social capabilities may be determined through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records/minutes/photographs of community meetings and training workshops etc.</li> <li>• Project staff able to explain (in line with PDD) how land tenure is checked by the project</li> <li>• Project staff and communities able to explain how communities/target groups were selected and involved in the development of the project and in the choice of activities</li> <li>• Project staff able to demonstrate that they are familiar with the communities/target groups and able to interact with them easily through meetings facilitated during the validation</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings held with specific target groups e.g. women, socially disadvantaged etc.</li> </ul>
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>Based on document reviewed (PDD, page 67 - 69, Table 29, and Figure 10), Project Coordinator has identified target groups with potential to influence of be affected by the project, five types of stakeholder were considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Groups within the community that may be affected by the project in different ways (for example: farmers, timber harvesters, honey collectors, women, youth etc.)</li> <li>• Government ministries and departments involved in natural resource management</li> <li>• Local administrative bodies</li> <li>• Local or national organisations and donors working on natural resource management</li> <li>• Private sector organisations, especially those involved in agriculture, forestry and extractive industries</li> </ul> <p>Twenty-six potential stakeholders (institutions and individuals) were identified. Each stakeholder was assessed to determine whether they are likely to be positively or negatively impacted by the project and scores were assigned.</p> <p>Project Coordinator can explain well and clearly about how to identify target group and stakeholder analysis. Based on interviews with the Project Coordinator and confirmed by the community, they have identified stakeholder target groups and stakeholder analysis in a participatory method.</p> <p>Based on interviews and FGDs with the community, they are well-informed about Plan Vivo System. They have also aware and understood the nature of carbon and ecosystem service mechanisms.</p> <p>The community stated that they have gained a lot of knowledge and experience with the assistance of PRCF Indonesia for the Plan Vivo project. Various communities has been conducted some trainings to support ecosystem services and livelihood, such as: training on Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool (SMART) patrols for forest security and protection; training on rattan development, training on rubber development, training on compost development, training on ecotourism services, training on land rehabilitation, and training on livelihood program.</p> <p>The communities have also understood that they must maintain and protect forests as part of community commitment in conserving the natural resources, social capital and cultural capital that has been recognized and applied by community.</p>

	<p>Based on interviews and FGDs with community, they are able to demonstrate effective self-governance and decision making in managing human and natural resources. This can be evidenced by the effective organizational structure of LPHD created, namely the establishment of the Institutional Strengthening Section and Human Resources; Forest Protection and Monitoring Section; as well as Forest Utilization Section and Business Development. The Forest Protection and Control Section supervise the Patrol Group and the Land Rehabilitation Group. Forest Utilization Section and Business Development supervise Rattan and Bamboo Group, Ecotourism Group, Honey Business Group, and Rubber Cultivation Group. This organizational structure has been in accordance with the community needs.</p> <p>Interview with Chairpersons and members of each section explained that they can carry out activities in accordance with their duties and functions. All sections within this organizational structure understand their duties and functions well and have been active and effective.</p> <p>If the meeting is held by LPHD, the meeting is chaired by the Chairman of LPHD and all agreements and decisions are made by deliberation and by using participatory methods.</p> <p>In the meantime, when there are issues related to village development, the meetings and discussions are led by the Village Head with all village apparatus, RT officials and hamlets, representatives of community leaders, religious leaders and youth leaders, as well as women leaders. All agreements and decisions are made by deliberation and by using participatory methods.</p> <p>PRCF and communities in Nanga Lauk village have long established cooperative and partnership relationships. In particular, assistance to obtain Village Forest recognition and permits has been conducted since 2016. Since then, assistance has been intensified to obtain Village Forest permits. The Project Coordinator always communicates and consults actively to provide up-date information to the community related to the development of Village Forest permits. Regular meetings between PRCF Indonesia and the community are conducted at least once a month in Nanga Lauk village. Advisory activities undertaken by the PRCF Indonesia are also conducted based on community needs. PRCF Indonesia provides advocacy and technical assistance related to forest management and community economic development.</p> <p>Community development programs in the form of assistance and training have been conducted by PRCF Indonesia regularly in Nanga Lauk village. The training materials and forms have been tailored to the community needs.</p> <p>The PRCF Indonesia has assisted the community in the process of licensing the Village Forest starting in 2016. Prior to this, the assistance</p>
--	--

	<p>to obtain this Village Forest permit received support from GIZ (international funding from Germany) until 2014. In 2016, PRCF Indonesia strives to help the Nanga Lauk village community to obtain Village Forest permits. In early 2016, the community has been receiving intensive assistance by the PRCF Indonesia. The PRCF Indonesia has also assisted the community in making regulations, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nanga Lauk Village Regulation (<i>Peraturan Desa</i>) No. 140/03/PMD-NL-2016 on Establishment of Village Forest Management Institution (LPHD) in Nanga Lauk Village.</li> <li>• Nanga Lauk Village Head Decree (<i>SK Kepala Desa</i>) No. 140/02/PMD-NL-2016 on Composition of Management Board of Village Forest Management Institution (LPHD) in Nanga Lauk Village.</li> </ul> <p>The PRCF Indonesia also assists communities to determine the area of managed forests, make general plans for forest management, create maps of forest areas on a scale of 1: 50,000, and prepare village cover letters to obtain recommendations of the Head of District to be sent to the Ministry of Environmental and Forestry.</p> <p>Finally, on February 23, 2017, Ministerial Decree No. SK 685/MNLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/2/2017 on Granting the Right of Village Forest Management covering <math>\pm</math> 1.430 hectares in Protected Forest Area in Nanga Lauk village, Embaloh Hilir sub district, Kapuas Hulu district, West Kalimantan province. This Village Forest Permit has become the legal basis for the people of Nanga Lauk village to be able to manage their forests for the next 35 years.</p> <p>Participatory methods undertaken by the Project Coordinator are through appraisal, from need assessment, planning, implementation or community assistance, to monitoring and evaluation of the program. These activities are integrated into the overall cycle of sustainable community development programs.</p> <p>In the Plan Vivo Agreement template (PDD, Annex 04) it is explained that ‘Engage with any process to resolve grievances or conflicts required by the Village Head, District authorities or Forest Management Unit’. Meanwhile, in the PDD (page 33, E.3.2) explains that ‘Grievances that cannot be settled directly will be referred to the village head, and addressed through existing methods for conflict resolution within the village. All grievances will be detailed in an annual report to Plan Vivo, along with actions taken to settle the grievance. Conflicts and grievances arising with parties outside the implementing community. PRCF Indonesia will maintain contact with these authorities to ensure they are aware of any conflicts or grievances that arise, and will engage with any required conflict resolution processes deemed necessary by the district or FMU authorities’.</p>
--	--

	<p>Based on interviews and FGDs with the community, there were no major conflicts involving many parties and occurred over a long period of time. Some examples of potential conflicts include honey theft, catch fish using stun equipment, and village boundaries with other villages.</p> <p>However, the Validator recommends to the Project Coordinator together with the community to develop written procedures on conflict management and resolution. This written procedure is important for creating effective mechanism for addressing and resolving conflicts in which there are efforts to develop mediation processes and designing third-party engagement strategies to eliminate the fundamental causes of conflict (<b>OBS#02</b>).</p>		
<b>D. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe) changed to Forward Action Request (FAR)</b>	<p><b>OBS#02.</b></p> <p>The Project Coordinator together with the community needs develop written procedures on conflict management and resolution. This written procedure is important for creating effective mechanism for addressing and resolving conflicts in which there are efforts to develop mediation processes and designing third-party engagement strategies to eliminate the fundamental causes of conflict.</p>		
<b>F. PRCF Response</b>	<p>Response to <b>OBS#02</b>: We believe that the description of grievance mechanisms in Section J1 of the PDD and Plan Vivo Agreement Template provide sufficient description of the mechanisms for addressing and resolving conflicts, since these rely on existing mechanisms within the village and at district level and the project will not introduce new mechanisms for conflict management.</p>		
<b>G. Status</b>	<p>Status to <b>OBS#02</b>: <b>Closed</b>. Based on the reviewed documents (Amendments to PDD, Section J.1 and Plan Vivo Agreement template), the Validator states that the procedures listed in the documents have met the requirements and are sufficient to manage the conflict.</p>		
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>1.4 Monitoring and Reporting capabilities</b></p> <p>Does the project have an effective monitoring and reporting system in place that can regularly monitor progress and provide annual reports to the Plan Vivo Foundation according to the reporting schedule outlined in the PDD?</p> <p>1.4.1 Accurately report progress, achievements and problems experienced</p> <p>1.4.2 Transparently report sales figures and demonstrate resource allocation in the interest of target groups</p>		

<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Monitoring and reporting systems and capabilities may be determined through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff and participating communities able to explain the monitoring system (how each of the indicators in the PDD will be monitored)</li> <li>• Records of any monitoring already undertaken e.g. baselines or other information</li> <li>• Project staff showing an understanding of the importance of annual reporting to Plan Vivo as a requirement for issuance of certificates</li> <li>• Demonstrated ability to produce simple reports (e.g. for other projects)</li> </ul>
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>The project will employ two types of climate benefit monitoring: (a) activity-based indicators that will be tracked throughout the project period to demonstrate that activities are being carried out as planned; and (b) land cover change assessment to verify climate benefits and update technical specifications at the end of each project period. The aim of activity-based indicators is to provide evidence that management plans are being carried out as described. Since these management plans are reviewed and determined to be appropriate to deliver the expected climate benefits; issuance of Plan Vivo certificates for the climate benefits will be requested if all activity-based indicator thresholds are met (PDD, page 83, Section K.1.1). Indicators for each of the main activities in the management plan, including threshold values and corrective actions required if thresholds are not met (PDD, page 83 -85, Section K.1.1, Table 33).</p> <p>Community members from the relevant activity groups will be responsible for collecting the information needed to assess activity-based indicator values, and reporting these to the Project Coordinator. The Project Coordinator will compile this information and inform the community groups if any corrective actions are required to ensure that thresholds are met for the reporting period. At the end of each annual reporting period, all monitoring results will be discussed in a community meeting, and the consequences for issuance of certificates and receipt of performance based support will be explained (PDD, page 86, Section K.1.2, and has confirmed by the community).</p> <p>The PRCF Indonesia has experience in managing funds from donor agencies, such as MCA-I, ADB, TFCA, TIFA, and Ford Foundation, so it has no problem with monitoring and reporting system. PRCF Indonesia has been accustomed to reporting activities every month, every three months and every year. This becomes a great capital for PRCF Indonesia to be able to implement monitoring and reporting system in running Plan Vivo Project.</p> <p>Based on interviews with the Project Coordinator and the community, they have understood the monitoring and reporting system to run and managed the Plan Vivo project. Implementation of monitoring and reporting system will be conducted in a participatory manner between the Project Coordinator and the community, in-line with the PDD.</p>

	<p>At the time of validation, the Project Coordinator has not made a monitoring report and annual report. Monitoring activities will begin in January 2018 and will make regular reports, both for monitoring reports and annual reports.</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 1.4.</p>		
<b>D. Conformance</b>	<p>Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None		
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A		
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A		

Theme	2. Carbon Benefits
<i>Ensuring that the project meets requirements 5.1-5.20 of the Plan Vivo Standard (2013)</i>	
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<b>2.1 Accounting methodology</b>  Have the carbon benefits been calculated using recognized carbon accounting methodologies and/or approved approaches and are the estimates of carbon uptake/storage conservative enough to take into account risks of leakage and reversibility?
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	Check the carbon accounting methodology used including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The level of understanding of the methodology used amongst technical project staff</li> <li>• Whether all references and sources of information are available (include copies with the validation report if possible)</li> <li>• Whether the carbon accounting models are clear and transparent i.e. are the spread sheets available and readily understandable? Can project staff answer and explain any technical questions about these?</li> <li>• Are local experts able to comment on the accounting methodology and on the sources of information used?</li> </ul>
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>The climate benefits are estimated according to the requirements of the Plan Vivo Standard, and the Approved Approach for estimation of climate benefits from REDD in community managed forest. The Project Coordinator has a document of carbon accounting method (PDD, Annex 07). A document entitled 'Estimation of climate benefits from REDD in community managed forest: Climate benefit estimation approach for Plan Vivo projects, Approved Approach'. This document submitted to the Plan Vivo Foundation by LTS International and Daemeter Consulting, version 1.0, 4 Aug 2017. This document explains about the estimation of climate benefits from Plan Vivo projects aiming to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in community managed forests. There is no geographical restriction on the use of this approach. It includes four components which can be applied independently or used in combination. The components included are (a) Estimation of baseline scenario emissions; (b) Estimation of project scenario emissions; (c) Estimation of leakage emissions; and (d) Estimation of expected climate benefits. For each of these components approaches are described for estimating expected emissions or climate benefits at the start of a project period, and for verification of emissions or climate benefits at the end of the project period.</p> <p>The approaches for estimation and verification of baseline scenario emissions, project scenario emissions, leakage emissions and climate benefits can be used independently or in combination by all projects that meet the applicability criteria, provided data and parameters applied meet the requirements. Full details of all calculations, data and parameters has included in the PDD (page 55-57, Section G.5).</p> <p>The carbon accounting models are clear and transparent and the spread sheets available and readily understandable. Based on the interview,</p>



	<p>the Project Coordinator has understood the carbon accounting method. Project Coordinator also could answer and explain any technical questions about these.</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 2.1.</p>		
<b>D. Conformance</b>	<p>Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None		
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A		
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A		
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>2.2 Baseline</b></p> <p>Are the carbon benefits of the project measured against a clear and credible carbon baseline (for each project intervention)?</p>		
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Check the baseline scenario in the technical specifications of the PDD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Check that baseline measurements have been carried out and information properly recorded</li> <li>• Check that the information from the baseline matches that in the PDD/Technical specifications and corresponds to the situation on the ground (by discussing with local experts and others)</li> </ul>		
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>The baseline scenario is defined according to the requirements of the Plan Vivo Standard, and the Approved Approach for Estimation of climate benefits from REDD in community managed forest (PDD, Annex 7). The document also described the methodology for estimating baseline emissions. The baseline scenario is a continuation of land use activities occurring within the project area immediately prior to the project start date. The consequences of these activities are described in PDD (page 13-14, Section B.3.2). As well as exposure to degradation and deforestation as a result of current unsustainable land use practices, this scenario also involves exposures to the drivers of degradation described in PDD (page 14, Section B.4.1).</p> <p>Expected baseline emissions are estimated using the equations (PDD, Annex 7, page 5, Section 3.1.1) and the parameters (PDD, page 48-53, Section G.4.3). Expected baseline emissions for the first project period are 1,769 Mg CO<sub>2</sub> per year for NLVF. Baseline emissions from NLHPT will depend on the area of each forest type that is protected. Expected baseline emissions, project scenario emissions, leakage emissions, and climate benefit, during the project period per hectare of NLHPT in the</p>		



	<p>project area are described in PDD (page 55, Table 23).</p> <p>Based on review all the documents above and confirmed by Project Coordinator, the baseline measurements have been carried out and information properly recorded. The carbon benefits of the project measured has clear and credible carbon baseline.</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 2.2.</p>		
<b>D. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None		
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A		
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A		
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>2.3 Additionality</b></p> <p>Are the carbon benefits additional?</p> <p>Would they be generated in the absence of the project?</p> <p>Will activities supported by the project happen without the availability of carbon finance?</p>		
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Assess whether the project simply owes its existence to legislative decrees or to commercial land-use initiatives that are likely to be economically viable in their own right i.e. without payments for ecosystem services.</p> <p>Also, assess whether without project funding there are social, cultural, technical, ecological or institutional barriers that would prevent project activities from taking place.</p>		
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>The legal designation NLVF and NLHPT have different legal designations: (a) NLHPT is Limited production forest (<i>Hutan Produksi Terbatas</i>); and (b) NLVF is Protection forest (<i>Hutan Lindung</i>). Although designation as <i>Hutan Lindung</i> confers a regulatory requirement for forest protection, that this legal designation alone is not sufficient to prevent all deforestation and forest degradation. Limited production forest is typically used for timber extraction and does not have any regulatory requirement for forest protection. To take account of any potential impact of legal designation, baseline rates of deforestation and forest degradation in Kapuas Hulu district are stratified according to the legal classification as well as vegetation type.</p>		

	<p>Using these stratified rates to estimate the climate benefits of the project, should therefore help ensure that the estimated climate benefits are additional to those that would be achieved from forest governed under comparable regulatory conditions (PDD, page 43, Section G.2.1, and has confirmed by district government such as BAPPEDA and DLH).</p> <p>Despite a strong commitment to protecting forest in their village area, the Nanga Lauk community faces significant political, financial, technical, institutional, social, and cultural barriers to developing and implementing effective forest management plans. A summary of these barriers, and how project activities will enable the community to overcome them, is provided in PDD, page 43, Table 14.</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 2.3.</p>			
<b>D. Conformance</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>No <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>N/A <input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None			
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A			
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A			
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>2.4 Permanence</b></p> <p>Are potential risks to the permanence of carbon stocks identified in the project technical specifications and are effective and feasible mitigation measures included in the project design?</p>			
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Assess whether members of the community/producers are aware that they will enter into formal sale agreements with the Project Coordinator and that they therefore need to comply with the monitoring and mitigation requirements of the project.</p> <p>Check whether the risk buffer proposed in the PDD and technical specifications for each intervention (that will be deducted from the saleable carbon of each producer) conforms to the recommended percentages in the Plan Vivo Standard or other Plan Vivo documentation. Check with Plan Vivo if this is unclear.</p>			
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>Based on interviews and FGDs with the community, it was confirmed that they have been actively involved in carbon measurement in the Village Forest area. They also understand about carbon sales and its mechanism. The forests that they manage are protected forests that can</p>			

	<p>be utilized to meet basic needs and can improve the economy through community-based conservation area development.</p> <p>Interviews with community also states that they understand that the disbursement of funds will depend on performance. These activities require timely monitoring and good quality reporting. In the use of these performance-based funds, the PRCF Indonesia has a plan to prepare a report every 3 months to be agreed upon and approved by the LPHD.</p> <p>To help ensure the environmental integrity of emission reductions achieved by the project, for which Plan Vivo certificates are issued, a proportion of certificates will be held in a risk buffer. The proportion of certificates in the risk buffer is determined by consideration of two types of risk: (a) the risk that project activities will not result in the expected climate benefits; and (b) that climate benefits achieved during a project period will be reversed after the project period. Risk buffer certificates will be retired at the end of the project period if verified climate benefits fall below the benefits estimated at the start of the project period; thereby insuring against under-delivery during the project period and reversals of climate benefits achieved in previous project periods (PDD, page 62, Section H, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator).</p> <p>The risk buffer percentage was calculated using the approach and risk analysis. The risk values for the different risk factors identified. The risk buffer percentage for the project period is 13.5%. For NLHPT a risk buffer of 25.5% will be applied until the management rights for the area are formally recognized (PDD, page 65-66, Section H.2.1). The Plan Vivo Standard states “The level of risk buffer must be determined using an approved approach and be a minimum of 10% of climate services expected.” The Project Coordinator and technical assistance stated that the only existing approved approach for determining a risk buffer provides a table for risk buffers that suggests community REDD projects with credits that are issued ex-post, and that have a medium level of risk, should have a risk buffer in the range of 10-20%. A buffer of 15.5% for this project therefore seems to be in compliance with Plan Vivo requirements and guidance. The PDD provides a risk assessment methodology and justification for the risk buffer percentage (PDD, page 62-66, Section H.1, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator).</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 2.4.</p>		
<b>D. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>

<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>2.5 Leakage</b></p> <p>Have potential sources of leakage been identified and are effective and feasible mitigation measures in place for implementation</p>
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Check the sources of leakage and the effectiveness of mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By discussions with local experts, the Project Coordinator and others.</li> <li>• Assess whether there is a good understanding of the importance of addressing leakage amongst project participants</li> <li>• Assess whether the mitigation measures proposed are really effective and likely to be implemented. Have they already started?</li> </ul>
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>The methodology for estimating expected leakage emissions is described in PDD, Annex 7 (page 9-10, Section 3.3.1). Following this approach, expected leakage emissions are estimated for the first project period as a proportion of the difference between baseline scenario and project scenario emissions. A conservative estimate for the proportion of leakage expected is determined based on an assessment of potential for displacement of activities that are expected to cause deforestation and forest degradation in the project area under the baseline scenario (PDD, page 57, Section G.6.1, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator).</p> <p>Potential drivers of leakage include all natural resource use activities, with the potential to cause deforestation or forest degradation, that will be reduced within the project area as a result of project activities and that have potential to be displaced. Potential for displacement also depends on the agents of deforestation and degradation linked to specific drivers (PDD, page 57, Section G.6.1, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator).</p> <p>Since there is little potential for leakage from the major drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, an expected leakage emissions proportion of 5% will be adopted for the first project period. At the end of the project period, analysis of remote sensing data will be used to estimate the actual emissions from leakage in an area within which leakage could occur, which will be defined by the boundary of Nanga</p>

	<p>Lauk village, since it is unlikely that the activities of the Nanga Lauk community would be displaced beyond this. For subsequent project periods, a value of leakage emissions proportion will be adopted to reflect the leakage observed in previous project periods using the leakage area approach (PDD, Annex 7, page 12, Section 3.3.2b, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator).</p> <p>Potential leakage emissions are estimated using the equation in PDD, Annex 7 (page 10-11, Section 3.3.1b) and the parameters described in PDD (page 57, Section G.6.1). The calculations are provided in PDD, Annex 8. Potential leakage emissions for the first project period are 80 Mg CO<sub>2</sub> per year for NLVF. Climate benefits from NLHPT will depend on the area of each forest type that is protected.</p> <p>Based on interview with Project Coordinator, he has a good understanding of the importance of addressing leakage amongst project participants. He also explained about the mitigation measures proposed are really effective and likely to be implemented.</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 2.5.</p>			
<b>D. Conformance</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>No <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>N/A <input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None			
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A			
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A			
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>2.6 Traceability and double-counting</b></p> <p>Are carbon sales from the project traceable and recorded in a database?</p> <p>Are the project intervention areas covered by any other projects or initiatives (including regional or national initiatives)?</p> <p>Are there formal mechanisms in place to avoid double counting?</p>			
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Check the possibility of double counting and whether the carbon sales are traceable by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By discussions with local experts, the Project Coordinator and other projects (including any national or regional level GHG coordination unit)</li> </ul>			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding the project system for maintaining records of carbon sales and keeping records and determining whether this is sufficiently robust and transparent (through discussions with project staff and local participants)</li> </ul>			
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>The Project Coordinator has identified the potential source of double counting. Three potential sources of double counting have been considered in the design of the project (PDD, page 45, Section G.2.4):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>within the project – if finance raised for biodiversity conservation or other types of ecosystem service payments were used to fund protection of the same area for which Plan Vivo certificates had been sold;</li> <li>with other carbon projects – if the community, or other parties, entered into agreements for the sale of emission reduction credits as part of a project or jurisdictional programme that covered the Plan Vivo project area; and</li> <li>if Plan Vivo certificates are used to offset emissions from parties outside Indonesia, and the Government of Indonesia use those same emissions reductions to meet their Nationally Determined Contributions to the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).</li> </ol> <p>A range of other outcomes are also possible and the Project Coordinator will monitor the development of relevant national and international legislation and maintain a dialogue with the Plan Vivo Foundation, to ensure that any changes required to way that certificates are registered are implemented, to ensure that the project remains in compliance with all relevant legislation put in place to prevent this type of double counting (PDD, page 46, Section G.2.4, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator).</p> <p>Discussion with Project Coordinator reveals that good understanding the project system for maintaining records of carbon sales and keeping records and determining whether this is sufficiently robust and transparent. However, during validation, there is no selling carbon in the area.</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 2.6.</p>			
<b>D. Conformance</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>No <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>N/A <input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None			
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator'</b>	N/A			

<b>s Name) Response</b>	
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>2.7 Monitoring</b></p> <p>Does the project have a monitoring plan in place?</p> <p>Is it being implemented and does it seem to be an effective system for monitoring the continued delivery of the ecosystem services?</p> <p>Does the Project Coordinator prescribe and record corrective actions where monitoring targets are not met and are these effectively followed up in subsequent monitoring?</p>
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Check whether the monitoring plan is effective and likely to be fully implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess the level of understanding of project staff and participating communities of the monitoring system and ensure that there are responsibilities for monitoring are matched by sufficient capacity</li> <li>• Are the selected indicators (covering all aspects of monitoring) SMART? I.e. Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound?</li> <li>• Do the selected indicators properly measure impacts of the project or are they only able to measure inputs/activities?</li> <li>• Are communities effectively involved in monitoring and do they understand their role?</li> </ul>
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>The Project Coordinator will work with participant communities to monitor the project activities that are expected to deliver climate benefits throughout the project period. At the end of each project period, a technical partner will be contracted to verify the benefits achieved by conducting an analysis of land cover change that occurred during the project period. Drivers of deforestation and forest degradation will also monitored by forest patrol teams (PDD, page 83, Section K.1, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator).</p> <p>The project will employ two types of climate benefit monitoring: (a) activity-based indicators that will be tracked throughout the project period to demonstrate that activities are being carried out as planned; and (b) land cover change assessment to verify climate benefits and update technical specifications at the end of each project period (PDD, page 83, Section K.1.1, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator).</p> <p>The aim of activity-based indicators is to provide evidence that management plans are being carried out as described. Since these management plans are reviewed and determined to be appropriate to deliver the expected climate benefits; issuance of Plan Vivo certificates for the climate benefits will be requested if all activity-based indicator thresholds are met. Indicators for each of the main activities in the management plan, including threshold values and corrective actions required if thresholds are not met is describes in PDD, page 83, Table</p>



	<p>33, Section K.1.1. The indicator are (1) Securing rights; (2) Forest management institution functioning; (3) Village regulations; (4) Boundary marking; (5) Forest patrol and monitoring; (6) Rattan and bamboo; (7) Forest honey; (8) Ecotourism; (9) Forest rehabilitation; and (10) Rubber product development. The monitoring plan also describes in Management Plan of LPHD Lauk Bersatu (PDD, Annex 02, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator).</p> <p>Based on interviews and FGDs with the community and Project Coordinator, they have good understanding on forest monitoring. They have also received training for forest patrol using SMART patrol. This shows that they have been aware and have good understanding about forest monitoring to maintain and protect the forest. This is also evidenced in forest visits, they have been able to demonstrate how well forest monitoring is conducted.</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 2.7.</p>			
<b>D. Conformance</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>No <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>N/A <input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None			
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A			
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A			
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>2.8 Plan Vivos</b></p> <p>Are the <i>plan vivos</i> (or land management plans) clear, appropriate and consistent with approved technical specifications for the project?</p> <p>Will the implementation of the plans cause producers' overall agricultural production or revenue potential to become unsustainable or unviable?</p>			
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Where small-holder farmers have prepared individual <i>plan vivos</i>, check a sample of these on the ground (in the company of the farmer) to determine whether they have really been prepared by the farmer and what the farmer expects to be the results of implementation.</p> <p>For community-projects managing a common (forest) resource, check the management plan for the forest area and assess the extent to which target groups within the community have been involved in preparing it (especially women and disadvantaged groups) and the extent to which its future impacts have been discussed and agreed.</p>			



<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>The project has been developed with the Nanga Lauk community, starting from the use of participatory approaches to gather information and understand local drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, progressing through the development and design of activities and management plans to address those drivers, and finally in the development of benefit sharing mechanisms, monitoring plans and Plan Vivo agreements that will govern the disbursement finance generated through the sale of Plan Vivo certificates. Throughout the two-year development process there has been regular contact between the Project Coordinator and the Nanga Lauk community. Evidence of community involvement in these activities is provided in the activity reports and PDD, Annex 3. (PDD, page 29, Section E.1.1, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator and the community).</p> <p>The development of management plans was led by the Nanga Lauk community and facilitated by the Project Coordinator. Throughout this process, forest management experts from the technical support organisations of LTS International and Daemeter Consulting were involved to review plans and provide suggestions to improve effectiveness and efficiency. The development of management plans therefore followed an iterative process and the final plans were agreed by all parties involved (PDD, page 32, Section E.2.1, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator and the community).</p> <p>Based on documents reviewed (PDD and Management Plan in PDD Annex 02), the documents has clear, appropriate and consistent with approved technical specifications for the project. The Project Coordinator and the community states that the implementation of the plans cause the community overall forest production or revenue potential to become sustainable because the forest is the source of the livelihood of the community so far.</p> <p>Based on interviews and FGDs with the community, it is confirmed that the management plan for the forest area and assess the extent to which target groups within the community have been involved in preparing it (especially women and disadvantaged groups) and the extent to which its future impacts have been discussed and agreed. The community also stated that they are aware of a good understanding of forest management, particularly on management and monitoring plans.</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 2.8.</p>		
<b>D. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None		

<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A
<b>Theme</b>	<b>3. Ecosystem benefits</b>
<i>Ensuring that the project meets requirements 2.1-2.4 of the Plan Vivo Standard (2013)</i>	
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>3.1 Planting native and naturalised species</b></p> <p>Are the planting activities of the project restricted to native and naturalized species?</p> <p>If naturalized species are being used are they invasive and what effects will they have on biodiversity?</p> <p>Have the species been selected because they will have clear livelihoods benefits?</p>
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Check this using a number of sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visual observations of local tree-growing practices</li> <li>• Discussions with communities and project staff</li> <li>• Discussions with local experts (forestry and biodiversity experts)</li> <li>• Published information (refer to this in the validation report if used)</li> </ul>
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>Forest within the NLVF and NLHPT supports a diverse assemblage of plants and wildlife species that are important not only for local community livelihoods but also for the global community. Four tree species that occur within NLVF and NLHPT are listed as vulnerable by the IUCN – Borneo Ironwood (<i>Eusideroxylon zwageri</i>), Light Red Meranti (<i>Shorea macrophylla</i>), Agarwood (<i>Aquilaria malaccensis</i>), and Ramin (<i>Gonystylus bancanus</i>), and a further 5 tree species are categorised as Lower Risk/Least Concern (PDD, page 10, Section B.2.2).</p> <p>NLVF and NLHPT are relatively intact expanses of swamp and riparian forest that support diverse assemblages of plant and animal species many of which are endangered or threatened. The project aims to protect this forest and prevent deforestation and forest degradation that would reduce the quantity and quality of forest habitat reducing the availability of plants and animals for local use, and driving threatened species closer to extinction. The biodiversity benefits of the project are therefore expected to be significant at both a local and international levels, and the occurrence of keystone species will be tracked throughout the project (PDD, page 27-28, Section D.3.1, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator and the community).</p> <p>Forest within NLVF and NLHPT provides a broad range of ecosystem services that support the livelihoods of local communities and that benefit regional and global communities. Among these are the provisioning, regulating listed below:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provisioning services – forests are the main, and for many households the only, source of livelihoods providing food, fuel, water, medicine, and building materials;</li> <li>• Regulating services – including climate regulation, local cooling effects, flood prevention, and maintenance of water supplies.</li> </ul> <p>All of these services depend on the maintenance of relatively intact areas of forest. By preventing deforestation and forest degradation the project will therefore help to safeguard the ecosystem services that local and international populations depend upon (PDD, page 28, Section D.3.2, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator and the community).</p> <p>Based on interviews and FGDs with the community, they stated that they would only plant the indigenous species of West Kalimantan. Some of the plants that are planned to be planted are (some of local name): <i>Kawi</i>, <i>Medang</i>, <i>Tembesu</i>, <i>Tengkawang</i>, <i>Belian</i>, <i>Meranti</i>, Rattan, Bamboo, as well as some types of plants for bee feed, such as Iron wood (<i>Eusideroxylon zwageri</i>), <i>Taon</i>, and <i>Rengas</i>. Village Forest Management Plan period 2018 – 2022 (PDD, Annex 02) stated that the LPHD plans to organize training on nursery management and forest planting. LPHD also plans on making nurseries by providing 30,000 seeds. Planting activities in the degraded areas are planned to cover an area of up to 100 hectares.</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 3.1.</p>						
<b>D. Conformance</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes</td><td><input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>No</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>N/A</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None						
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A						
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A						
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>3.2 Ecological impacts</b></p> <p>Have the wider ecological impacts of the project been identified and considered including impacts on local and regional biodiversity and impacts on watersheds?</p>						
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Check this using a number of sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visual observations of the environment in the project area</li> <li>• Discussions with communities and project staff</li> <li>• Discussions with local experts (environmental experts)</li> <li>• Published information (refer to this in the validation report if used)</li> </ul>						

**C. Findings  
(describe)**

Many positive impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services are expected as a result of the project, as described in table below. Since the project aims to prevent deforestation and degradation of the forest ecosystem that supports this biodiversity and provides the ecosystem services, and project activities have been developed that will also enhance rather than diminish these values. If project activities displace deforestation or forest degradation to areas outside the project area, this could have a negative impact on biodiversity and ecosystem services in those areas. (PDD, page 38, Section F.3.2, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator and the community).

Biodiversity and ecosystem service impacts are linked to the maintenance of forest cover and habitat quality by preventing deforestation and forest degradation. The approaches used to estimate and verify climate benefits therefore provide a good proxy for benefits to biodiversity and other ecosystem services. Additional monitoring of high conservation value species and threats to biodiversity will also be carried out by forest patrol teams (PDD, page 88-89, Section K.3, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator and the community).

Expected benefits to biodiversity and ecosystem services presented in the following table.

	<b>Initial situation</b>	<b>Expected benefit</b>
<b>Biodiversity</b>	NLVF and NLHPT support a diverse assemblage of plant and animal species	Biodiversity value is maintained to the benefit of local and global communities.
<b>Water/Watersheds</b>	Forest in NLVF and NLHPT provides a clean source of water for Nanga Lauk and other downstream communities.	Quality and quantity of water supply is maintained.
<b>Soil productivity/conservation</b>	Forest in NLHPT prevents soil erosion and helps maintain productivity in agricultural areas.	Soil erosion is prevented and agricultural productivity is maintained or improved.
<b>Other ecosystem services</b>	Forest in NLVF and NLHPT provides a broad range of ecosystem services	Supply of ecosystem services is maintained.

Source: PDD, page 38, Section F.3.1, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator and the community

Based on interviews and FGDs with the community and the Project Coordinator, they stated that the ecological impacts of forest management include being able to utilize non-timber forest products (NTFPs), such as fish in lakes, forest honey, rattan, rubber, and ecotourism services. The community also stated that they have participated in several trainings, such as training on rattan management; training on forest security and protection; training on the identification of flora and fauna; training on use of GPS, and reporting; training on SMART patrol; and training on ecotourism management.

	<p>Field visits to the forest also confirmed that community has benefits from forest management in the use of NTFPs, such as rattan, rubber, honey and fish. Utilization of NTFPs can improve the economy and livelihoods of community, through the security and protection of forests managed by community.</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 3.2.</p>		
<b>D. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None		
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A		
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A		

<b>Theme</b>	<b>4. Livelihood Benefits</b>
<i>Ensuring that the project meets requirements 4.1-4.14, 7.1-7.5 and 8.1-8.10 of the Plan Vivo Standard (2013)</i>	
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>4.1 Community-led planning</b></p> <p>Has the project has undergone a producer/community-led planning process aimed at identifying and defining sustainable land-use activities that serve the community's needs and priorities?</p>
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Assess this by discussions with project staff and communities and by looking at any records of the planning process. It may be useful to conduct a time-line exercise with communities to understand the planning process that has taken place.</p>
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>The scoping phase of the project involved three visits to the proposed project site, by the Project Coordinator and technical partners. During these visits, the following activities were carried out: identification of project site, problem tree analysis, village survey, and project activity scoping. Meanwhile, during the project development phase, the Project Coordinator and technical partners made frequent visits to Nanga Lauk to work with the community on the following activities: participatory land-use mapping, project activity planning, monitoring plan development, and development of draft Plan Vivo agreement. To enable the Nanga Lauk community to develop a full understanding of the concepts involved in a Plan Vivo project, and enter into Plan Vivo agreements under conditions required for Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), the Project Coordinator conducted the following capacity building activities with community members (PDD, page 29-31, Section E.1.1, and has confirmed by the community).</p> <p>The development of management plans was led by the Nanga Lauk community and facilitated by the Project Coordinator. Throughout this process, forest management experts from the technical support organization of LTS International and Daemeter Consulting were involved to review plans and provide suggestions to improve effectiveness and efficiency. The development of management plans therefore followed an iterative process and the final plans were agreed by all parties involved (PDD, page 32, Section E.2.1, and has confirmed by the community).</p> <p>Interviews and FGDs with communities confirm that all the process of developing management and monitoring of forest management has involved the community actively and participatory. The Project Coordinator, with technical assistance from LTS and Daemeter, has provided good facilitation and technical assistance in accordance with community needs.</p>

	Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 4.1.								
<b>D. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>						
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None								
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A								
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A								
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<b>4.2 Socio-economic impact assessment/monitoring plan</b>  Is there a robust socio-economic impact assessment and monitoring plan in place that can measure changes against the baseline scenario?								
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	Discuss with project staff and communities to understand how the baseline assessment was conducted and how the socio-economic monitoring plan developed out of this. Assess in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the livelihoods indicators can effectively monitoring socio-economic changes taking place</li> <li>• The extent to which women, disadvantaged people and other social groups have been involved project processes and whether the selected indicators will enable impacts on them to be determined</li> <li>• Whether any groups in the community are likely to be adversely affected by the project and whether there are any mitigation measures in place to address this</li> </ul>								
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	The Project Coordinator with community has conducted a robust socio-economic impact assessment and monitoring plan in place that can measure changes against the baseline scenario. The benefits to the livelihoods of members of Nanga Lauk community that are expected to result from project activities are summarized in table below. <table border="1" data-bbox="486 1742 1423 2033"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Expected benefit</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Food and agricultural production</b></td><td>Continued availability of fishing and NTFPs.</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Financial assets and incomes</b></td><td>Individuals participating in forest patrol activities will receive payments for their activities. Individuals in rattan and bamboo, honey production, forest rehabilitation, rubber cultivation, and ecotourism groups will also receive additional income from these activities.</td></tr> </tbody> </table>				Expected benefit	<b>Food and agricultural production</b>	Continued availability of fishing and NTFPs.	<b>Financial assets and incomes</b>	Individuals participating in forest patrol activities will receive payments for their activities. Individuals in rattan and bamboo, honey production, forest rehabilitation, rubber cultivation, and ecotourism groups will also receive additional income from these activities.
	Expected benefit								
<b>Food and agricultural production</b>	Continued availability of fishing and NTFPs.								
<b>Financial assets and incomes</b>	Individuals participating in forest patrol activities will receive payments for their activities. Individuals in rattan and bamboo, honey production, forest rehabilitation, rubber cultivation, and ecotourism groups will also receive additional income from these activities.								



<b>Environmental services (water, soil, etc.)</b>	Supply of provisioning and regulatory services provided by relatively intact forest is maintained.
<b>Energy</b>	Supply of fuel wood is maintained.
<b>Timber &amp; non-timber forest products (incl. forest food)</b>	A sustainable supply of NTFPs, and wood for building materials and <i>tikung</i> construction is maintained.
<b>Land and tenure security</b>	Nanga Lauk community will maintain management rights to NLVF and obtain the rights to NLHPT.
<b>Use-rights to natural resources</b>	Nanga Lauk community will receive licenses to utilize ecosystem services derived from NLVF and NLHPT for a renewable period of 35 years.
<b>Social and cultural assets</b>	The project is not expected to significantly benefit the social and cultural assets of Nanga Lauk community

Source: PDD, page 35-36, Table 11, Section F.2.1, and has confirmed by the community.

Since some of the project activities involve introducing controls on the utilisation of forest resources to ensure their exploitation is sustainable and does not contribute to deforestation and forest degradation, and project activities could require financial investment and time away from other livelihood activities, some negative impacts are also possible. The potential negative impacts, and mitigation measures the project will put in place to address them, are summarised in table below.

	<b>Potential negative impact</b>	<b>Mitigation measures</b>
<b>Food and agricultural production</b>	Expansion of agricultural areas within NLHPT will be prevented limiting potential to increase agricultural productivity by clearing new areas of forest.	Nanga Lauk community members will be encouraged to diversify and intensify production within existing agricultural areas outside NLHPT that are currently designated for agricultural production so productivity can be increased without expanding the agricultural zone.
<b>Financial assets and incomes</b>	Village and individual funds could be invested in equipment and infrastructure, or devote time away from other livelihood activities, to carry out project activities required to access finance from the sale of Plan Vivo certificates. These investments could be at risk if expected certificate sales are not realised.	Plan Vivo agreements will only be signed for periods for which required finance has been secured. The first year of project activities will be supported with donor finance unlinked to the sale of Plan Vivo certificates and in subsequent years activities will be supported from the sale of ex-post certificates issued for emission reductions achieved in previous years.
<b>Environmental services (water, soil, etc.)</b>	None – environmental services are expected to benefit from project activities.	NA
<b>Energy</b>	None – supply of fuel wood is not expected to be reduced.	NA
<b>Timber &amp; non-timber forest</b>	Controls of timber for building materials and	Nanga Lauk community will be encouraged to plant and maintain



	<b>products (incl. forest food)</b>	<i>tikung</i> construction to ensure these are maintained at sustainable levels could reduce the short-term availability of these materials.	trees required for <i>tikung</i> construction within NLHPT so that demand for materials can be maintained without exceeding levels for sustainable extraction. Requirements for building materials that exceed those which can be provided within sustainable extraction levels will be met by procuring timber from sustainable sources outside NLHPT.
	<b>Land and tenure security</b>	None	NA
	<b>Use-rights to natural resources</b>	None	NA
	<b>Social and cultural assets</b>	None	NA
<p>Source: PDD, page 36-37, Table 12, Section F.2.2, and has confirmed by the community.</p> <p>Socio-economic impacts of the project will be tracked with activity-based monitoring during the project period, and verified with participatory wellbeing assessment at the end of each project period. The activity-based indicators will be used to assess whether the project is on track to achieving the expected socio-economic benefits. Since the management plans are reviewed and determined to be appropriate to deliver the expected socio-economic benefits, it can be assumed that if all activity-based indicator targets are met then the project is on track to delivering the expected socio-economic benefits. In addition to the annual reporting of activity-based indicators, each year the Project Coordinator will conduct a participatory well-being assessment with a stratified random sample of 65 households. The same households will be assessed each year to determine the proportion of households whose well-being has improved or declined (PDD, page 87, Section K.2.1, and has confirmed by the community).</p> <p>Based on interviews and FGDs with community and Project Coordinator, they have good understanding on how the baseline assessment was conducted and how the socio-economic monitoring plan developed out of this. The livelihoods indicators can effectively monitoring socio-economic changes takeing place. Women, disadvantaged people and other social groups have been involved in the project development processes and the selected indicators enable impacts on them to be determined. The groups in the community are likely to be adversely affected by the project and there are mitigation measures in place to addres this.</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 4.2.</p>			

<b>D. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None		
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A		
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A		
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>4.3 Sale agreements and payments</b></p> <p>Does the project have clear procedures for entering into sale agreements with producers/communities based on saleable carbon from <i>plan vivos</i>?</p> <p>Does the project have an effective and transparent process for the timely administration and recording of payments to producers?</p>		
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Check the systems that are being proposed by the project and make an assessment of whether these are fully functional already or whether they can be made functional when required? Are communities/producers aware of the system and do they understand it? Are documents and materials readily available to producers/communities?</p>		
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>A Plan Vivo agreement was drafted during the project development phase (PDD, Annex 04). This agreement includes details of project activities to be carried out by different activity groups, activity-based indicators that will be monitored and thresholds that must be met to receive the support described in the agreed benefit sharing mechanism. Representatives of all project activity groups were involved in drafting this agreement, and the agreed version has the support of the community (PDD, page 80, Section J.1.1, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator and the community).</p> <p>Plan Vivo agreements will only be signed when sufficient finance has been secured. If finance for the whole project period is not available, then the period covered by the agreement will be adjusted, so that it only covers the period for which funding is available. When additional finance is secured the agreement will then be extended up to the length of the full project period. To help ensure that the finance available is sufficient to support the project activities, financial plans will be reviewed regularly and updated as required. When adjustments are made, the pricing strategy for Plan Vivo certificates and other types of support will be updated accordingly (PDD, page 80, Section J.1.2, and</p>		

	<p>has confirmed by Project Coordinator and the community).</p> <p>There are two main sources of risk associated with the Plan Vivo agreements: (a) the risk that community groups will not meet their obligations for carrying out project activities; (b) that the Project Coordinator will not be able to provide the support agreed in the benefit sharing mechanism. These risks will be mitigated through activity-based monitoring and by securing required finance before entering into Plan Vivo agreements, and tracking costs and updating financial plans and pricing strategy throughout the project period. Activity-based indicators will be tracked by the Project Coordinator on a quarterly basis, and reported each year in an annual report to the Plan Vivo Foundation. If monitoring of activity-based indicators suggests that annual thresholds will not be met, the Project Coordinator will provide the support needed to ensure that activities are carried out as described in the management plan (PDD, page 80, Section J.1.2, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator.).</p> <p>Based on documents reviewed, the project has clear procedures for entering into sale agreements with communities based on saleable carbon from <i>plan vivos</i>. Based on interviews and FGDs with community, they are aware and good understanding it. The document and materials readily available to communities in place.</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 4.3.</p>		
<b>D. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None		
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A		
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A		
<b>A. Requirement</b>	<p><b>4.4 Benefit sharing and equity</b></p> <p>Will the project have livelihoods benefits for the local community? Are these benefits likely to accrue to all community members and/or are benefits targeted at particular groups within the community?</p> <p>What other actions is the project taking to ensure that disadvantaged</p>		

	groups e.g. women, landless households, poor people will benefit from sales of Plan Vivo certificates?																						
<b>B. Guidance Notes for Validators</b>	<p>Whilst there may be livelihoods benefits resulting from the project aspects of benefit sharing are critical to ensure that benefits are equitably shared. This can be assessed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Checking whether a local stakeholder/well-being analysis has been conducted to identify socio-economic groupings in the communities</li> <li>• Assessing the level of governance of local groups (are issues of equity and benefit sharing discussed during meetings?)</li> <li>• Discuss with a small sample of households from different socio-economic groups to determine their level of understanding of the benefits they are likely to get from the project.</li> </ul>																						
<b>C. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>The Project Coordinator has developed benefit sharing mechanism and performance-based payments in the project. All mechanism has included in PDD.</p> <p>After the first year of project implementation, all support received by the community groups will be performance-based. A combination of training, in-kind support, and cash payments will be made to each group, based on their requirements for completing the activities in the management plan. Part of the finance raise for the project through the sale of Plan Vivo certificates, and other means of support, will also be used to cover the costs incurred by the Project Coordinator and technical partners. Any finance raise in addition to that required to cover project implementation and management costs will be held in a fund managed by the LPHD, with the oversight of PRCF-Indonesia, to be used to support long-term forest protection and village development activities. The final benefit sharing mechanism will be agreed by the Project Coordinator and community groups at the time when Plan Vivo agreements are signed. An indicative allocation of finance and support among the different activity groups and the Project Coordinator, based on the costs of project management and implementation. Approximate allocation of project implementation and management costs describes in table below (PDD, page 81, Section J.2.1, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator and the community).</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Proportion of total cost</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Community Groups</b></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>LPHD</td><td>10%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Forest patrol group</td><td>15%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Forest honey group</td><td>5%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Rattan and bamboo group</td><td>5%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Forest rehabilitation group</td><td>15%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Ecotourism group</td><td>5%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Rubber group</td><td>5%</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Project Coordinator</b></td><td>40%</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>TOTAL</b></td><td>100%</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Source: PDD, page 81, Section J.2.1</p>		Proportion of total cost	<b>Community Groups</b>		LPHD	10%	Forest patrol group	15%	Forest honey group	5%	Rattan and bamboo group	5%	Forest rehabilitation group	15%	Ecotourism group	5%	Rubber group	5%	<b>Project Coordinator</b>	40%	<b>TOTAL</b>	100%
	Proportion of total cost																						
<b>Community Groups</b>																							
LPHD	10%																						
Forest patrol group	15%																						
Forest honey group	5%																						
Rattan and bamboo group	5%																						
Forest rehabilitation group	15%																						
Ecotourism group	5%																						
Rubber group	5%																						
<b>Project Coordinator</b>	40%																						
<b>TOTAL</b>	100%																						

	<p>After the first year of project implementation, all support received by community groups will be performance-based and will be dependent upon meeting threshold values for activity-based indicators. Indicator values will be reported on an annual basis through submission of an annual report to the Plan Vivo Foundation. If all thresholds are met, a full issuance will be requested. If indicator values fall below the thresholds for one or more activity-based indicators, the participating communities will be required to implement the identified corrective actions. If any activity-based forest protection indicator value falls below the threshold for two or more consecutive monitoring periods, then a proportion of the certificate issuance will be withheld until it can be demonstrated that the indicator threshold has been met. The proportion withheld will be agreed between the Project Coordinator and the Plan Vivo Foundation, and should be proportional to the level of underperformance and the likely impact this will have on climate benefits. If any activity-based livelihood activity indicator value falls below the threshold for two or more consecutive monitoring periods, then the Project Coordinator will withhold a proportion of the support to that group until it can be demonstrated that the indicator threshold has been met. The proportion withheld will be agreed between the Project Coordinator and the LPHD, and should be proportional to the level of underperformance (PDD, page 82, Section J.2.2, and has confirmed by Project Coordinator and the community).</p> <p>Based on interviews and FGDs with community, they are states that the draft benefit sharing mechanism and performance-based payment was discussed and refined with input from community members. Community also confirm that they have good understanding of the benefits they are likely to get from the project.</p> <p>Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the project has met the requirement 4.4.</p>		
<b>D. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>E. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	None		
<b>F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response</b>	N/A		
<b>G. Status</b>	N/A		

**The Validator: Wahyu F Riva**



**Signature:**

**Date: 21 December 2017**

**Annex 01.** List of individuals and/or groups interviews and discussions.

No	Name	Position/Institutional	Numbers of people			Type of Participation	
			Men	Women	Total	Interview	FGD
1	Abang Hamzah	Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA), Kapuas Hulu District	•			•	
2	Hasnul Shabri	Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA), Kapuas Hulu District	•			•	
3	Dwi Kusharyono	Environmental Service (DLH), Kapuas Hulu District	•			•	
4	Reider Siahaan	Forest Management Unit/KPH, North Kapuas Hulu	•			•	
5	Arief Mahmud	Betung Karihun – Danau Sentarum National Park	•			•	
6	Imanul Huda	PRCF Indonesia/Project Coordinator	•			•	•
7	Nicholas Berry	LTS International	•			•	•
8	Yudi Hidayatulloh	LTS International	•			•	•
9	Ellyn K Damayanti	Daemeter Consulting		•		•	•
10	Hamdi	Head of LPHD	•			•	•
11	Basarudin	Member of LPHD	•			•	•
12	Rusman	Head of Village	•			•	•
13	Sukiman	Member of LPHD	•				•
14	Daut	Member of LPHD	•				•
15	Dahlan	Member of LPHD	•				•
16	Hery yanto	Member of LPHD	•			•	
17	Saparudin	Member of LPHD	•				•
18	Junaidin	Member of LPHD	•				•
19	Ibrahim	Member of LPHD	•				•
20	Hamsah	Member of LPHD	•				•
21	Wawan Sunardi	Member of LPHD	•				•
22	Nong Sabril	Member of LPHD	•			•	•
23	Nina Susanti	Member of LPHD		•		•	•
24	Sariatun	Member of LPHD		•		•	•
25	Suasa	Member of LPHD		•			•
26	Erna	Member of LPHD		•			•
27	Rosliyani	Member of LPHD		•			•
28	Norsah	Member of LPHD		•			•
29	Rosliyani	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•			•
30	Endang	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•			•
31	Zaitun	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•			•
32	Herlina	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•			•
33	Wati	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•		•	•
34	Massitah	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•			•
35	Omoi	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•			•
36	Erniwati	Member of Family Welfare		•			•



No	Name	Position/Institutional	Numbers of people			Type of Participation	
			Men	Women	Total	Interview	FGD
		Development (PKK)					
37	Nak Baiti	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•			•
38	Ayuni	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•			•
39	Lena	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•			•
40	Erni Wati Iwan	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•			•
41	Emi	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•			•
42	Julia Citra	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•			•
43	Lisa Sari	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•			•
44	Laila	Member of Family Welfare Development (PKK)		•		•	•
<b>Total number of people has consulted or interviewed</b>			<b>21</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>39</b>

## Annex 02. Site visit itinerary.

Date	Time	Activity
05-11-2017	08.00 – 10.30	Travel from Malinau to Tarakan by boat
	12.55 – 14.00	Travel from Tarakan to Balikpapan by Lion Air JT 675 (overnight stay at Balikpapan)
06-11-2017	06.20 – 08.30	Travel from Balikpapan to Pontianak by Garuda Indonesia Airline GA 7522
	11.30 – 12.40	Travel from Pontianak to Putussibau (Kapuas Hulu) by Garuda Indonesia Airline GA 7524
	13.00 – 13.30	Check in at Sanjaya Hotel, Putussibau city
	15.00 – 16.00	Opening meeting with Project Coordinator <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of the validation with Project Coordinator</li> <li>• Discussion about schedule of validation (stakeholder meeting and site visit)</li> <li>• Documents reviewed of the project</li> </ul>
	16.30 – 18.00	Stakeholder meeting: Discussion with Arif Mahmud, Head of Betung Karihun – Danau Sentaru National Park, as Project Implementation Unit (PIU) of ADB Project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of the validation</li> <li>• Project brief</li> <li>• Discussion about governance and management of the project</li> <li>• Discussion about potential and mechanism of PES</li> <li>• Discussion about draft local regulation of PES</li> <li>• Discussion about evaluation of the project</li> <li>• Discussion about the Nanga Lauk village project</li> <li>• Confirmation and clarification from desk-based document reviewed</li> </ul>
	18.00 -	Overnight stay at Sanjaya Hotel, Putussibau city
07-11-2017	08.20 – 09.20	Stakeholder meeting: Discussion with Reider Siahaan, Head of Administration, Forest Management Unit ( <i>Kesatuan Pengelolaan Hutan/KPH</i> ), North Kapuas Hulu <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of the validation</li> <li>• Project brief</li> <li>• Discussion about governance and management of the KPH</li> <li>• Discussion about potential and mechanism of PES</li> <li>• Discussion about draft local regulation of PES</li> <li>• Discussion about the Nanga Lauk village project</li> <li>• Confirmation and clarification from desk-based document reviewed</li> </ul>
	09.30 – 10.00	Stakeholder meeting: Discussion with Dwi Kusharyono, Head of Environmental Maintenance, Environmental Service ( <i>Dinas Lingkungan Hidup/DLH</i> ), Kapuas Hulu District: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of the validation</li> <li>• Project brief</li> <li>• Discussion about governance and management of the DLH</li> <li>• Discussion about potential and mechanism of PES</li> <li>• Discussion about draft local regulation of PES</li> <li>• Discussion about the Nanga Lauk village project</li> <li>• Confirmation and clarification from desk-based document reviewed</li> </ul>
	10.30 – 13.00	Discussion with Imanul Huda, Project Coordinator, PRCF Indonesia: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of the validation</li> <li>• Project brief</li> <li>• Discussion about governance of the PRCF Indonesia</li> <li>• Confirmation and clarification from desk-based document reviewed</li> </ul>

Date	Time	Activity
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion about Theme 1 (Effective and Transparent Project Governance)</li> <li>• Discussion about Theme 2 (Carbon Benefit)</li> <li>• Discussion about Theme 3 (Ecosystem Benefit)</li> <li>• Discussion about Theme 4 (Livelihood Benefit)</li> </ul>
	14.35 – 16.35	Stakeholder meeting: Discussion with Abang Hamzah and Hasnul Sabri, Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of the validation</li> <li>• Project brief</li> <li>• Discussion about governance and management of the BAPPEDA</li> <li>• Discussion about planning development of Kapuas Hulu District</li> <li>• Discussion about potential and mechanism of PES</li> <li>• Discussion about draft local regulation of PES</li> <li>• Discussion about the Nanga Lauk village project</li> <li>• Confirmation and clarification from desk-based document reviewed</li> </ul>
	17.00 -	Overnight stay at Sanjaya Hotel, Putussibau city
08-11-2017	08.00 – 09.00	Travel from Putussibau city to Nyabau village by car
	09.00 – 10.30	Travel from Nyabau village to Nanga Lauk village by small boat
	13.00 – 14.00	Opening meeting with Head of Village Forest Management Institutional (LPHD) Lauk Bersatu, Nanga Lauk village: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of the validation with Head of LPHD</li> <li>• Discussion about schedule of validation (stakeholder meeting and site visit)</li> <li>• Documents reviewed of the project</li> </ul>
	15.00 – 17.00	Field observation in the village and around the village
	20.00 – 22.00	Stakeholder meeting: Focused group discussion (FGD) with project coordinator, LPHD, village government, community leader, youth leader, and women leader, at Nanga Lauk village (Participants: 13 male, 6 female): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of the validation</li> <li>• Project brief</li> <li>• Confirmation and clarification from desk-based document reviewed</li> <li>• Discussion about Theme 1 (Effective and Transparent Project Governance)</li> <li>• Discussion about Theme 2 (Carbon Benefit)</li> <li>• Discussion about Theme 3 (Ecosystem Benefit)</li> <li>• Discussion about Theme 4 (Livelihood Benefit)</li> </ul>
09-11-2017	09.00 – 11.00	Field visit to Nanga Lauk Village Forest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field observation at natural forest</li> <li>• Field observation at forest honey area</li> <li>• Field observation at Kematian lake and Tunggal lake</li> <li>• Discussion with communities at the forest (Hamdi, Alamsyah, Eneng, and Basarudin)</li> </ul>
	14.30 – 17.00	Discussion with Hamdi (Head of LPHD), Basarudin (member of LPHD), and Nong Syahril (member of LPHD): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion about governance and management of the LPHD</li> <li>• Discussion about management and monitoring plan of the Village Forest</li> <li>• Discussion about implementation of management and monitoring of the Village Forest</li> </ul>
	20.00 – 22.00	Stakeholder meeting: Focused group discussion (FGD) with women group (Participants: 20 female):

Date	Time	Activity
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of the validation</li> <li>• Project brief</li> <li>• Confirmation and clarification from desk-based document reviewed</li> <li>• Discussion about Theme 1 (Effective and Transparent Project Governance)</li> <li>• Discussion about Theme 2 (Carbon Benefit)</li> <li>• Discussion about Theme 3 (Ecosystem Benefit)</li> <li>• Discussion about Theme 4 (Livelihood Benefit)</li> </ul>
10-11-2017	09.00 - 11.00	Discussion with Imanul Huda (Project Coordinator), Hamdi (Head of LPHD), Basarudin (member of LPHD), and Nong Syahril (member of LPHD): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion about harvesting honey at forest area</li> <li>• Discussion about rattan and rubber development</li> <li>• Discussion about village development, include making rice fields and ecotourism</li> <li>• Discussion about forest security and protection</li> <li>• Closing meeting (summary of field visit and discussion about initial finding)</li> </ul>
	11.30 – 13.30	Friday prayer
	14.00 – 15.30	Travel from Nanga Lauk village to Nyabau village by small boat
	15.30 – 16.30	Travel from Nyabau village to Putussibau city by car
	16.30 -	Check in at Sanjaya Hotel
11-11-2017	09.00- 17.00	Drafting report at Putussibau
12-11-2017	09.00- 17.00	Drafting report at Putussibau
13-11-2017	09.00- 17.00	Drafting report at Putussibau
14-11-2017	13.10 – 14.20	Travel from Putussibau to Pontianak by Garuda Indonesia Airline GA7525
	15.15 – 16.50	Travel from Pontianak to Jakarta by Garuda Indonesia Airline GA0507

**Annex 03. Pictures**

***Nanga Lauk Village situation***



**Figure 01.** Nanga Lauk village situation on 08 -10 November 2017 (Photographer by Wahyu F Riva/IDEAS)



*Stakeholder meeting at district government level*



**Figure 02.** Stakeholder meeting with district government level on 06 – 07 November 2017: (a) Discussion with Head of Betung Karihun – Danua Sentarum National Park; (b) Discussion with Head of Administration, FMU/KPH North Kapuas Hulu; (c) & (d) Discussion with Staff of Environmental Service (DLH), Kapuas Hulu District; (e) Discussion with Staffs of Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA), Kapuas Hulu District; and (f) Discussion with Project Coordinator – PRCF Indonesia (Photo credit by Wahyu F Riva/IDEAS).

*Interviews and FGDs with community*



**Figure 03.** Stakeholder meeting with community on 08 – 10 November 2017: (a)-(b) FGD with community on 08 November 2017 at Nanga Lauk village, participants: 13 male, 6 female; (c) Discussion with project coordinator and community (harvester of forest honey) on 09 November 2017 at the forest area, participants: 3 male, 1 female; (d) Discussion with project coordinator and LPHD on 10 November 2017, participants: 4 male; (e)-(f) FGD with women groups on 10 November 2017: participants: 20 male (Photographer and photo credit by Wahyu F Riva/IDEAS)





*Field visit to the Nanga Lauk Village Forest - natural forest*



**Figure 04.** Field visit to natural forest at Nanga Lauk Village Forest on 09 November 2017 (Photographer by Wahyu F Riva/IDEAS)



*Field visit to the Nanga Lauk Village Forest - big trees*



**Figure 05.** Big trees in the Nanga Lauk Village Forest on 09 November 2017 (Photographer: Wahyu F Riva/IDEAS)



*Field visit to the Nanga Lauk Village Forest – harvesting forest honey*



**Figure 06.** Harvesting forest honey at Nanga Lauk Village Forest on 09 November 2017 (Photographer: Wahyu F Riva/IDEAS)