



Verification Terms for reference



Babatana Rainforest Conservation Project

The Nakau Programme (Nakau) Pty Ltd


Plan Vivo Verification Report

Issued by PT Mutuagung Lestari Tbk (Mutu International)

Version 1.2 12 03 2026

Verification Report Template

All items in this report must be completed using Calibri 11, black and non-italic font. Please, do not modify the format of this template. The numbers in brackets (e.g. 1.2) refer directly to the requirements in the Plan Vivo Standard (v.12/2013) that they describe. If, at the time of verification, the auditor has also been instructed to conduct the validation of a new project activity to be annexed into an existing Plan Vivo project, then the validation table on page 14 (ANNEX 1) must be completed.

Name of Verifier(s)		Date of Review
Dinar Dara TP Purbasari	: Lead Verifier	Desk Review : 14 - 21 May 2025
Karina Restu Panggalih	: Verifier	Hybrid interview by verifier : 21 - 30 June 2025
Awwalunisa Aliya K	: Verifier in Trainee	
Aditya Kurniawan	: Verifier in Trainee	Field Visit by local expert : 11 - 20 July 2025
Gideon Bourou	: Local Expert	
Signature: Lead Verifier		
		
Date: 12 March 2026		

Project Description
<p>Sirebe Project, part of the Babatana Rainforest Conservation Project was officially commenced on 1 January 2015. This report presents the findings of the second verification for the project which were conducted and assessed in compliance with the provisions and requirements of Plan Vivo Version 4. The monitoring plan, developed by Nakau and NRDF has been implemented to track progress on carbon, livelihoods, and ecosystem indicators in line with the Plan Vivo Standard. The project works closely with the Sirebe Tribe Association, the traditional/indigenous landowners, who actively participate in monitoring and forest protection activities.</p> <p>The financial plan has been applied through NRDF's management of the annual budget to support project operations. During implementation, project activities have focused on protecting the forest, preventing logging, and maintaining the area as a Protected Forest.</p> <p>The baseline assessment indicated a risk of logging in Choiseul Province, the community, with support from NRDF and Nakau, took concrete steps to safeguard the forest. As a result of the project, the forest remains intact and the carbon rights continuously belong to the Sirebe Tribe Association.</p>

Document	Outstanding Corrective action	Activity against CAR
N/A	<i>There are no outstanding corrective actions.</i>	N/A

Description of field visits (including list of sites visited and individuals/groups interviewed)
<p>The verification covered the monitoring period from 1 January 2020 to 31 December 2022. The Sirebe Forest Carbon Project area is a forest conservation initiative implemented by the Sirebe Tribe community in Choiseul Province, Solomon Islands. The main objective of this project is to prevent illegal logging activities and preserve rainforest forest areas through a community-based approach.</p> <p>Due to travel issues when the team arrived in Honiara, Solomon Islands. Flight to Choiseul Province was delayed for the next 5 days with uncertainty of the weather. This situation was discussed between the verification team and the project coordinator to Plan Vivo, and agreed that the team conducted face to face meetings with related Ministries in Honiara and online interviews with project coordinator</p>

NRDF, community including rangers and village committee. The determination of the number of interview samples was carried out as follows:

- a. The Sirebe community consists of 27 primary lines and 46 secondary lines; therefore, the number of community interview samples was determined based on the square root of the total number of community lines.
- b. There are 28 rangers, and the number of ranger interview samples was determined based on the square root of the total number of rangers.

Below is the list of interview participants selected to represent the community and field personnel (rangers):

No	Name of Participant	Gender	Role/Profession	Method of interview
1	Agretha	F	MECDM	Face to face
	Richard	M	Permanent Secretary of MoFR	Face to face
2	Ikawi P	M	Head Ranger	Online meeting
3	Godie Vego	M	Ranger	Online meeting
4	Hansoul P	M	Ranger	Online meeting
5	Ismael N	M	Ranger	Online meeting
6	Yvonne B	F	Chair Lady (Women Saving Club)	Online meeting
7	Lina Zazataru	F	Secretary (Women Saving Club)	Online meeting
8	Christina P	F	Member (Women Saving Club)	Online meeting
9	Alina Qila	F	Member (Asa Female Line)	Online meeting
10	Nicxon K	M	Member (Asa Female Line)	Online meeting
11	Mathew P	M	Barobose Family Representative	Online meeting
12	Elijah Q	M	Bedley Family Representative	Online meeting
13	Jenny Q	F	Bedley Family Representative	Online meeting
14	Alison Waflane	F	Warlen Family Representative	Online meeting
15	Rocklugharam M	M	Barobose Family Representative	Online meeting
16	MelaniePahk	F	Qilakomala Family Representative	Online meeting
17	Wilson Kere	M	Rata Family Representative	Online meeting
18	Karah Qalo	F	Pitakoe Family Representative	Online meeting
19	Washugton Ruku	M	Asa Family Representative	Online meeting
20	Thompson Poloso	M	Chairman Sirebe Tribal Association (STA) Representative	Online meeting
21	Linford J Pitatomoro	M	Project Manager Sirebe Tribal Association (STA) Representative	Online meeting

While the forest site visit was conducted by the local expert with the guidance from the verification team. Field visit was conducted from 11–20 July 2025. The field activities included on-site observation of the following:

- a. EFA Boundary
- b. Monitoring tracks
- c. Biodiversity (Flora and Fauna)
- d. Cultural site
- e. Infrastructure (ranger station, water tank)

In addition to the site visit, the verification team also conducted a desk review by reviewing various documents provided by the project coordinator. Therefore, the documentations reviewed as bellow:

1. Sirebe Annual Report 2020-2022 version 1.2 07/02/2026
2. Sirebe Carbon Accounting July 2023 Update

3. Appendix 1- Financial Result
4. Appendix 3 Final Report Babatana Forest Change Assessment
5. Appendix 4 - Monitoring Activity Report 2022 Final
6. Appendix 5 Forest Carbon Project 2022 - Household Survey
7. Sirebe Forest Monitoring data 2022
8. Annual monitoring & Project Management workshop & Annual General Meeting
9. Sirebe Tribal Association Project Account Bank Statement 2021-2024
10. Sirebe CashFlow 2022
11. Financial August - December 2023 SICCL
12. MOU's Neighbouring tribes Sirebe
13. Certificate of registration Sirebe Forest Conservation Area as a designated Protected Area under the protected area act 2010

Table 1. Summary of major and minor Corrective Actions (Insert CAR Text)

Theme	Major CARs	Minor CARs	Observations	Status
Project's Eligibility	-	-	-	-
Ecosystem Benefits	-	-	Observation 01: The Rangers are capable of monitoring their assigned areas. However, the rangers could conduct a more comprehensive biodiversity survey to further strengthen the monitoring process in the future.	Open
Project Coordination and Management	-	-	-	-
Participatory design	-	-	-	-
Quantifying and Monitoring Ecosystem Services	-	-	-	-
Risk Management	Major 01: Inconsistencies in the information related to PVCs sold, between financial spreadsheet and	-	-	Closed

	annual report document.			
Livelihoods Impacts	-	-	-	-
PES Agreement	-	-	<p>Observation 02: The distribution of funds from carbon sales is consistent with the amounts stated in the <i>Sirebe Financial Result</i> document. However, a currency discrepancy remains between the figures presented in the <i>Sirebe Financial Result</i> document and those recorded in the Sirebe bank account e-statement. In the future, Nakau should ensure the clarity of information and currency at the Sirebe financial result document to prevent misunderstanding.</p>	Open

Table 2 - Report Conformance (Delete Yes/No as appropriate)

Theme	Conformance of Draft Report	Conformance of Final Report
Project's Eligibility	Yes	Yes
Ecosystem Benefits	Yes	Yes
Project Coordination and Management	Yes	Yes
Participatory design	Yes	Yes

Quantifying and Monitoring Ecosystem Services	Yes	Yes
Risk Management	No	Yes
Livelihoods impacts	Yes	Yes
PES Agreement	Yes	Yes

PROJECT'S ELIGIBILITY	
Requirement: Project directly engage and benefit community groups	
Verification Question: 1 and 2	
<p>1.1 Project interventions are still taking on land where smallholders and/or community groups have clear land tenure (1.1)</p> <p>1.2 Land that is not owned by or subject to use rights has included in the project area because (1.2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It represents less than a third of the project areas at all times ● No part of the area was acquired by a third party from smallholders or community groups for the purpose of inclusion in the project ● Its inclusion will have clear benefits to the project by creating landscape level ecosystem benefits such as biodiversity corridors. ● There is an executed agreement between owners/managers of such land and participants regarding the management of the area consistent with these requirements 	
A. Findings (describe)	<p>Based on the Sirebe Annual Report for the period 2020–2022, no land-related disputes have been reported. The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed in 2017 between the neighboring tribes around the Sirebe area, namely Sikipozo Land, Miquшава Land, and Padezaka Land, has remained valid without any disagreements up to the time of verification. Confirmation with members of the Sirebe Tribe was conducted, and it was informed that the land boundaries are clearly recognized and no disputes have occurred. Based on this confirmation, the verification team concluded that there were no land-related issues within the Sirebe area.</p> <p>During the site visit, an interview with the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management, and Meteorology (MECDM) representative was done. Based on the interview, it was explained that NRDF has been working with the communities in Babatana since around 2012. The Protected Area establishment process was done in accordance with the Protected Area Toolkit (Step by step guide to creating protected area in Solomon Island 2013). The whole process of Sirebe Protected Area establishment was assisted by the NRDF. The protected area certificate was issued by the MECDM on 19 October 2019, officially designated the Sirebe Forest Conservation Area as a Protected Area under the Protected Areas Act 2010. The verification team confirmed that the certificate was implemented by the community and the community members were aware of and continued to support the designation of their customary land as a Protected Area up to the time of project period.</p> <p>The verification team assessed the documentation is sufficient. Based on the interview with the MECDM and Ministry of Forestry representative, it was explained the landownership of the communities</p>

	<p>in Solomon Island. The verification team understands that in Babatana Forest, each community has their own land. Thus, the project area is customary land owned by the indigenous community, specifically in this project area is owned by the Sirebe community.</p> <p>Based on all available information, the verification team concluded that land tenure within the Sirebe project area remains clear and well-defined.</p>		
B. Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
C. Corrective Actions (describe)	None		
D. Project Coordinator's Response	None		
E. Status	None		

ECOSYSTEM BENEFITS	
Requirement: Project generates ecosystem service benefits and maintains or enhances biodiversity.	
Verification Questions: 1, 3 and 5	
2.1 Project interventions are maintaining or enhancing biodiversity (2.2) 2.2 Project interventions have not led to any negative environmental impacts (2.3) 2.3 Any trees being planted to generate ecosystem services are native or naturalised species and are not invasive (2.4)	
A. Findings (describe)	<p>The Sirebe project area has generated ecosystem service benefits through the intervention of Improved Forest Management – Logged to Protected Forest (IFM-LtPF). This intervention reduces greenhouse gas emissions by preventing logging for timber extraction within the Sirebe Tribal Association land area. Based on document review and community confirmation, the project has helped improve biodiversity.</p> <p>The project activity is to ensure that no timber harvesting or logging occurs in the forest protected area. From the annual report and monitoring documents, the verification team concluded that the project interventions have:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintained biodiversity: Monitoring activities reported in 2022 confirm the continued presence of various flora and fauna species, as shown in the monitoring records.

	<p>2. No negative environmental impacts: The project’s activities are consistent with its goal of reducing emissions through forest protection, and the annual report confirms that no risk buffer is applied within the project’s carbon area.</p> <p>During the on-site visit, the local expert recorded observations of both fauna (e.g., Rhyticeros plicatus) and flora (e.g., Camptosperma brevipetiolata). By the interview during the site visit, the local expert confirmed that the Rangers are capable of monitoring their assigned areas. However, there is an improvement opportunity that the rangers could conduct a more comprehensive biodiversity survey to further strengthen the monitoring process. Such a survey would help to identify broader ecosystem services for fauna such as nesting and resting sites and migration patterns, thereby enhancing the biodiversity baseline information.</p> <p>Based on the document review and supporting evidence, the verification team concludes that the ecosystem service benefits delivered by the Sirebe project area are maintained and/or enhance biodiversity.</p>		
B. Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
C. Corrective Actions (describe)	None		
D. Project Coordinator’s Response	None		
E. Status	None		

PROJECT COORDINATION AND MANAGEMENT
Requirement: Project is managed with transparency and accountability, engagement of relevant stakeholders and in compliance with the law of the Host Country.
Verification Questions: 1, 2 and 6
<p>3.1 The project coordinator still has the capacity to support participants in the design of the project interventions, select appropriate participants for inclusion in the project, and develop effective participatory relationships including providing on-going support to sustain the project (3.4)</p> <p>3.2 The project coordinator still has the legal and administrative capacity to enter into PES Agreements with participants and to manage the disbursement of payments for ecosystem services (3.5)</p> <p>3.3 A transparent mechanism and procedures for the receipt, holding and disbursement of PES funds is applied, with funds intended for PES earmarked and managed through an account established for this sole purpose, separate to the project coordinator’s operational finances. (3.9)</p>

<p>3.4 The project coordinator has accurately described the progress, achievements and problems encountered by the project in the Annual Reports. The Annual Reports transparently report sales figures and demonstrate resource allocation in the interest of target groups (3.10; 3.11)</p>			
<p>A. Findings (describe)</p>	<p>Regarding institutional administration, NRDF, as the Project Coordinator, remains legally registered under the Charitable Trusts Act since 28 July 2004. With this legal status, NRDF possesses the capacity to implement the PES Agreement and to manage the disbursement of payments for ecosystem services. Furthermore, NRDF is considered to have the capability to support participants in designing project interventions, selecting appropriate participants to be involved, and fostering participatory relationships with the community. Based on the evaluation conducted by Nakau, NRDF is deemed to still meet the required capacity criteria.</p> <p>The benefit-sharing mechanism outlined in the PDD has been developed in accordance with the Plan Vivo Standard requirements and has been approved by the community through the FPIC (Free, Prior, and Informed Consent) process. The verification team assesses that the mechanism and procedures for benefit sharing have been implemented in compliance with the requirements. Funds designated for PES have been specifically allocated and managed through a separate bank account held by the project coordinator. Supporting evidence, including the Sirebe Tribal Association bank account, financial reports, and interview findings with the community, substantiate this conclusion.</p> <p>In addition, NRDF has accurately described the progress, achievements, and challenges faced by the project in the Annual Report (AR). Information on activity progress and achievements is clearly presented in the monitoring report section, while project challenges are elaborated in the Environmental and Social Safeguards (ENS) section, particularly under the subsection “Issues.” The statements contained in the AR have been verified through interviews with community members and rangers directly involved in project implementation. Furthermore, the financial reports presented in the AR, including the financial plan, remain consistent with the information contained in the Project Design Document (PDD). The report also transparently includes information related to PES payments.</p> <p>Based on the assessment conducted, the verifiers conclude that the project is managed with transparency, accountability, participation, and in accordance with the laws of the host country.</p>		
<p>B. Conformance</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>C. Corrective Actions (describe)</p>	<p>None</p>		

D. Project Coordinator's Response	None
E. Status	None

PARTICIPATORY DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN VIVO	
Requirement: the project has demonstrated community ownership: communities participate meaningfully through the design and implementation of plan vivos that address local needs and priorities.	
Verification Questions: 1, 2 and 6	
<p>4.1 A voluntary and participatory planning that addresses local needs and informs the development of technical specification is taking place (4.1; 4.6; 7.1.). Barriers to participation are being identified and measures taken to encourage participation (4.3)</p> <p>4.2 Smallholders or communities are not being excluded from participation in the project on the basis of gender, age, income or social status, ethnicity or religion, or any other discriminatory basis (4.2)</p> <p>4.3 The project is not undermining the livelihood needs and priorities or reduce the food security of the participants (4.7; 7.1; 7.5)</p> <p>4.4 There exists a system for accurately recording and verifying location, boundary and size of each plan vivo (4.8). Participants have access to their <i>plan vivos</i> in an appropriate language and format (4.9)</p> <p>4.5 Participants are provided with a forum to periodically discuss the design and running of the project with other participants and raise any issuance or grievances with the project coordinator (4.12). A robust grievance redressal system is in place (4.14)</p>	
A. Findings (describe)	<p>The PDD document establishes that the project must be developed and implemented through a participatory and voluntary approach. The Annual Report (AR) states that all decision-making activities are conducted through the FPIC process. Based on interviews with community members, they confirmed that they are consistently involved in decision-making processes. The community also emphasized that the project was initiated by the community itself, without any pressure or coercion from external parties. Furthermore, interview results indicate that no community groups are excluded from participating in the project based on gender, age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, or religion. However, participation in project activities tends to be dominated by one gender, primarily due to prevailing social norms and traditions within the community.</p> <p>In accordance with the Plan Vivo Standard, the project is required to identify barriers to community participation and to develop adequate measures to address them. Based on the 2023 Annual Report, challenges were identified related to the low participation rate of women in project activities. Nakau and NRDF have acknowledged this issue and have begun integrating the principles of Gender Equality, Disability, and Social Inclusion (GEDSI) into project development to promote balance and gender equality.</p>

	<p>This finding was confirmed through interviews with the community and project team. Interviews with the project coordinator revealed that the project implemented in Sirebe supports the Women Development Program through the establishment of the Women Saving Club. This program receives 5% of the benefit-sharing allocation distributed to the Sirebe Community. The fund aims to promote the implementation of GEDSI principles in community economic and social activities. Verification interviews with members of the Women Saving Club confirmed that they have experienced positive impacts from the carbon project developed by Nakau and NRDF through the 5% funding support allocated to their organization. This initiative has encouraged women's empowerment by helping them enhance their skills and capabilities through training programs supported by NRDF, both financially and through knowledge sharing as the project coordinator.</p> <p>The standard also requires that the project must not negatively affect the main livelihoods or food security of the community. Based on interview results, community members stated that the project has been beneficial and has not disrupted their primary occupations or access to food.</p> <p>Regarding project boundaries, the Plan Vivo Standard requires an accurate system to record and verify the location, boundaries, and area of each Plan Vivo. Field assessments conducted by technical experts confirmed that the project area has been spatially well mapped. This is further supported by community statements affirming that they are aware of and understand the physical boundary markers of the project area.</p> <p>Plan Vivo also requires that participants have access to their Plan Vivos documents (land management plans) in a language and format that is easily understood. Based on interviews, the community is aware that the documents are available in English. In addition, they possess simplified versions of the Plan Vivo documents, such as maps of inter-tribal land boundaries, records of the boundary-setting process between tribes, and the agreements made regarding those boundaries.</p> <p>Furthermore, the grievance mechanism has been established under the PES Agreement signed by the Sirebe Tribal Association, Nakau, and NRDF. The verification team reviewed documentary evidence confirming the existence of this mechanism. In accordance with the Plan Vivo Standard, the project has also provided regular communication forums to discuss project implementation and to raise grievances with the project coordinator.</p> <p>The Project Coordinator (NRDF) has established a monitoring plan for project implementation through coordination forums and training activities. Based on interviews with NRDF, several periodic meetings are held, including the Annual General Meeting, Committee Member Meetings (every six months), and Quarterly Meetings (four times a</p>
--	---

	<p>year). A review of supporting records indicates that from the project development stage up to 2024, various activities have been conducted, including: Sirebe Tribal meeting (2020), Sirebe tribal Association Meeting (2020, 2021, 2022), Sirebe tribal Association General Meeting (2021), dan Sirebe Community Company Meeting (2022).</p> <p>Based on the information obtained, the verification team concludes that the information related to participation design and Plan Vivo development is adequate and in full compliance with the Plan Vivo Standard requirements.</p>		
B. Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
C. Corrective Actions (describe)	None		
D. Project Coordinator's Response	None		
E. Status	None		

QUANTIFYING AND MONITORING ECOSYSTEM SERVICES
Requirement: project generates real and additional ecosystem service benefits that are demonstrated with credible quantification and monitoring
Verification Questions: 2, 3 and 4
<p>5.1 Sources of data used to quantify ecosystem services, including all assumptions and default factors, have been specified and updated when possible, with a justification why they are appropriate (5.1; 5.2)</p> <p>5.2 The project coordinator has been conducting ground-truthing activities in order to collect real data and field measurements from the project sites that have been or will be used to update the project's PDD and technical specifications, including the quantification of climate benefits (5.3)</p> <p>5.3 A clear and consistent Standard Operating Procedure (SOP), or equivalent, for remote sensing analysis has been elaborated by the project coordinator.</p> <p>5.4 The results of the remote sensing analysis are not in stark conflict with the results of Activity-Based Monitoring and there is a high level of correlation between the two monitoring methods. Reasons for any discrepancy have been accurately justified.</p> <p>5.5 Ecosystem services forming the basis of the Plan Vivo project are still additional (5.4).</p> <p>5.6 To avoid double counting of ecosystem services, the project interventions are not being used for any other project or initiative (5.14)</p> <p>5.7 A monitoring plan has been correctly implemented and a system for checking its robustness is in place, where (5.9; 7.2.; 7.3):</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Activity-Based Monitoring indicators and performance targets directly or indirectly linked to the delivery of ecosystem services. ABM provides sufficient evidence that the project is on track to deliver the expected impacts and to reduce the drivers of deforestation. ● Corrective actions and contingency plans are described when performance targets have not been met ● The validity and assumptions of the technical specifications have been correctly tested ● Communities have been actively participating in monitoring activities ● Monitoring has been regularly shared and discussed it with the participants (ST aware for monitoring result, NRDF back up in the GDRIVE and the communities can access in the office) 	
<p>A. Findings (describe)</p>	<p>During the 2015–2019 crediting period, the project coordinator applied the calculation method based on the Nakau Approved Approach. For the 2020–2022 crediting period, based on the 2020–2022 Sirebe Annual Report, Nakau shifted to using the methodology described in Nakau Approved Approach.</p> <p>The verification team reviewed and assessed several changes, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Forest inventory: The project used 100 sample plots, but the Sirebe protected area was not included in the sampling. Based on Nakau’s explanation, this was because forests in Choiseul Province have similar tree compositions. The local expert confirmed that the forest structure and species composition in the Sirebe area are indeed comparable to those in other sites within the Babatana Cluster. Based on the available forest inventory data and the confirmation from the local expert, the verification team assessed that the justification was reasonable, and overall, the change was acceptable. This was also proved by the field visits in Sirebe that observed the similar tree species found in both locations, such as <i>Pometia pinnata</i>, <i>Vitex cofassus</i> and <i>Camposperma brevipetiolata</i>. 2. Monitoring method: Monitoring of the protected area was initially conducted using the Inspection form and was replaced with the use of the AVENZA Maps application for protected area monitoring. The verification team assessed that the use of an electronic-based monitoring system reduced potential bias during transect activities and improved the accuracy of the data. Therefore, this change in the monitoring system was considered acceptable. 3. Inclusion of deadwood carbon pool as baseline emissions: Based on the justification provided in the Methodological Deviation to Carbon Accounting of the Sirebe project area, the inclusion of deadwood in the baseline is relevant as it accounts for harvest residues (such as crown branches and roots of felled trees) left to decay in the forest, as well as emissions from logging damage and related infrastructure. The verification team assessed that this justification was reasonable and aligned with baseline emissions.

	<p>4. Harvest rotation percentage: In the previous verification, R2 was stated to represent 25% of R1 in the carbon accounting. However, for the 2020–2022 crediting period, it was adjusted to a 70% re-harvest rate of the future commercial stock, as described in the Methodological Deviation to Carbon Accounting of the Sirebe project area . Based on the local expert’s assessment, the measurement of trees with a diameter of 50 cm and above determined the 50% harvest volume in the first 15 years, as there were relatively fewer trees within that diameter range. Field observations also confirmed that the number of potential crop trees with diameters between 30 cm and 49 cm was greater than those above 50 cm, supporting the justification for a higher second-harvest rate. Based on the available data and confirmation from the local expert, the verification team concluded that this change in the harvest rotation assumption was acceptable.</p> <p>Overall, the baseline emissions calculated for this period were higher than in the previous crediting period. However, due to the change in the harvest rotation percentage, the net carbon benefit was more conservative, resulting in a lower outcome. Based on the Annual Report of the Sirebe project area , the Project Verification Certificates (PVCs) to be issued for the 1 January 2020 to 31 December 2022 carbon crediting period claim a total climate benefit of 36,426 tCO₂e.</p> <p>According to the 2020-2022 annual report, no illegal logging activities were recorded or documented within the Sirebe area. This was confirmed by the project coordinator through satellite imagery (remote sensing) analysis, which indicated no sign of illegal logging activities. Based on the remote sensing report provided, the verification team assessed that the methods and techniques used were consistent with the approved monitoring plan. No spatial evidence of forest loss, bare soil exposure, or expansion of settlement areas was observed. Field observations conducted by rangers confirmed, no indications of logging activities were detected along the transect routes. Given the absence of logging activities within the Sirebe project area, the verification team concluded the project coordinator’s assumption, indicating no reduction of the Eligible Forest Area (EFA). The verification team assessed the remote sensing analysis as consistent with the field visit monitoring, demonstrating a high level of correlation between the two monitoring methods.</p> <p>According to the field visit conducted by the local expert, the Sirebe plot was well maintained, with coloured tapes still visible on the trees and clear numbering labels. In one location near the Paruru Waterfall in the Sirebe project area, minor landslips were observed. These were considered insignificant, as similar occurrences have been noted in the past, possibly due to exposed impervious surface rock. The verification team noted that no forest damage or tree loss was observed. Based on confirmation from the local expert, the landslip scars were assessed as</p>
--	---

	<p>minor and not posing any potential threat or contributing to carbon loss.</p> <p>The verification team assessed that the ecosystem services forming the basis of the Plan Vivo project remain additional, as detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Investment barriers: Lack of access to credit. This was confirmed through interviews with Sirebe tribal members, who stated that their income so far has mainly come from farming and selling fish. b. Technological barriers: The Sirebe customary landowners lack the technological capacity and knowledge to implement improved forest management. This is demonstrated in the 2021–2022 Sirebe project area Annual Report, which notes that financial training was conducted on 25 October 2022. This was also confirmed by a Sirebe tribal member having received this training. c. Barriers related to social conditions: There is a lack of organised local community structures. To address these social challenges, Nakau has supported the community in establishing a project governance system, including a fair and transparent benefit-sharing mechanism. This was confirmed by Sirebe tribal members, they were able to explain the specific benefit-sharing percentages. d. Barriers due to prevailing practice: There are no other voluntary forest carbon projects in the Solomon Islands under any standard. This was confirmed by NRDF, who stated that no other carbon projects exist apart from the Plan Vivo carbon project. A review conducted by the verification team on the website of the Solomon Islands Ministry of Environment confirmed that there are no registered carbon projects in Choiseul Province. <p>The verification team concludes that the Sirebe project area climate benefit claim of 36,426 tCO₂e for the 2020–2022 period is valid. No evidence of illegal logging or forest loss was found. Therefore, the project generates real and additional ecosystem service benefits that are demonstrated with credible quantification and monitoring.</p>		
B. Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
C. Corrective Actions (describe)	None		
D. Project Coordinator's Response	None		
E. Status	None		

RISK MANAGEMENT

<p>Requirement: The project manages risks effectively throughout its design and implementation.</p>	
<p>Verification Questions: 2 and 4</p>	
<p>6.1 Where leakage is likely to be significant, i.e. likely to reduce climate services by more than 5%, an approved approach has been used to monitor leakage and subtract actual leakage from climate services claimed, or as a minimum, a conservative estimation of likely leakage has been made and subsequently deducted from the climate services claimed (6.1; 6.2)</p> <p>6.2 The level of risk buffer that has determined using an approved approach is adequate and is a minimum of 10% of climate services expected (6.3)</p> <p>6.3 Does the project maintain a buffer account and is the cumulative total of credits deposited in the account equal to the total reported in the latest annual report? (6.3)</p>	
<p>A. Findings (describe)</p>	<p>Based on the PDD document, two types of potential leakage risks have been identified for the Sirebe project area :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Total Activity Shifting Leakage 2. Total Market Leakage <p>Regarding the local expert assessment, no persons with primary rights from any of the three tribes were involved in logging activities on other related lands. However, the local expert found that one person with secondary rights might have been involved in some kind of logging activity on land outside the project area. During interviews, the verification team discussed with the communities from the secondary line of the Sirebe tribe regarding those activities that might potentially be leakage. Members confirmed that the mother belongs to the secondary line, while the father belongs to another land outside the Sirebe area. Therefore, as the father carried out logging for his own tribe land, which has no connection to Sirebe lands. Therefore, the verification team concluded that this is not a potential leakage.</p> <p>Referring to the Plan Vivo Approved Approach: Assessing Risk and Setting the Risk Buffer, for community-based REDD projects, particularly those aiming to reduce locally driven deforestation, the overall risk is classified as medium. The main associated risk is non-permanence, as reductions in deforestation may be temporary and cannot be guaranteed in the long term. In such cases, the minimum ex-post buffer required is 10%. The verification team assessed that the 20% risk buffer set by the project coordinator is conservative and in line with the Plan Vivo Approved Approach, and considered adequate. Furthermore, based on the review of the carbon calculation spreadsheet, the verification team assessed that the amount of carbon to be issued/claimed by the project coordinator has already been calculated after applying the 20% deduction from the buffer account. The verification team concluded that the total carbon credits presented in the annual report are accurate and consistent with the applied buffer deduction. The PVC issuance details are described in the table below. The total PVCs will be issued from 2020 -2022 around 36,426 Units.</p>

	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>PVC</th> <th>2020</th> <th>2021</th> <th>2022</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Carbon Benefit Verified (tCO₂e)</td> <td>15,178</td> <td>15,178</td> <td>15,178</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PVC Claimed</td> <td>15,178</td> <td>15,178</td> <td>15,178</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PVC Risk Buffer</td> <td>3,036</td> <td>3,036</td> <td>3,036</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>12,142</td> <td>12,142</td> <td>12,142</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Referring to the first verification report (2015–2019), it is noted that the carbon that could be issued amounted to 87,115 units as PVCs. In addition, based on the annual monitoring and project management workshop held on 30 August 2023, and according to the presentation delivered by the project coordinator, it was reported that the total carbon credits sold in 2021–2022 amounted to 81,647 units. However, in the 2021–2022 annual report, the summary section states that the PVCs issued was 87,117 units, with PVCs sold amounting to 78,312 units. In contrast, the financial results file in the spreadsheet indicates that the total PVC sold was 77,794 units. This is illustrated in the table below. Although the carbon sold vintage is still included in the carbon that would be issued, due to these inconsistencies between one document and another, the verification team was unable to determine the carbon vintage (2015–2019). Therefore, the verification team concluded this issue was raised to CAR Major.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Document</th> <th>Total PVC Sold</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Annual monitoring and project management workshop</td> <td>81,647</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Annual report (2021-2022) carbon issued</td> <td>78,312</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Financial result carbon issued</td> <td>77,794</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Based on the above, although the leakage and maintained buffer account were assessed as valid, the verification team identified inconsistencies between the latest annual report and the financial spreadsheet. Therefore, a CAR Major was issued, which must be closed by the project coordinator prior to the release of the final report.</p>	PVC	2020	2021	2022	Carbon Benefit Verified (tCO ₂ e)	15,178	15,178	15,178	PVC Claimed	15,178	15,178	15,178	PVC Risk Buffer	3,036	3,036	3,036	TOTAL	12,142	12,142	12,142	Document	Total PVC Sold	Annual monitoring and project management workshop	81,647	Annual report (2021-2022) carbon issued	78,312	Financial result carbon issued	77,794
PVC	2020	2021	2022																										
Carbon Benefit Verified (tCO ₂ e)	15,178	15,178	15,178																										
PVC Claimed	15,178	15,178	15,178																										
PVC Risk Buffer	3,036	3,036	3,036																										
TOTAL	12,142	12,142	12,142																										
Document	Total PVC Sold																												
Annual monitoring and project management workshop	81,647																												
Annual report (2021-2022) carbon issued	78,312																												
Financial result carbon issued	77,794																												
B. Conformance	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>N/A <input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>																									
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>																											

<p>C. Corrective Actions (describe)</p>	<p>CAR Major: In the first verification report (2015–2019), it is noted that the carbon that could be issued amounted to 87,115 units as PVCs. In addition, based on the annual monitoring and project management workshop held on 30 August 2023, and according to the presentation delivered by the project coordinator, the total carbon credits sold in 2021–2022 was reported as 81,647 units. However, in the 2021–2022 annual report, the summary section states that PVCs issued amounted to 87,117 units, with PVCs sold totaling 78,312 units. In contrast, the financial results spreadsheet indicates that the total PVCs sold was 77,794 units.</p>																						
<p>D. Project Coordinator’s Response</p>	<p>Nakau conducted a full reconciliation of internal sales and external registry records. As a result, we discovered a reporting inconsistency and some minor errors in the internal sales spreadsheet which have been corrected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2021–2022 annual report should not have been provided, as it was never finalised and the period is covered by the Sirebe Annual Report 2020–2022, currently under review. The 2021–2022 report will be removed from the information platform. • The actual number of credits sold to 31 December 2022 was 67,498, while 19,617 credits remain unsold, totaling 87,115 credits. Higher totals previously reported incorrectly included sales made after this date. Appendix 1: Sirebe Financial Report has been updated to reflect the accurate sales information. • The 2020–2022 Annual report has been updated to reflect the reconciled totals. (Total sum held in trust for future PES Payments updated to \$364,069.48) 																						
<p>E. Status</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="453 1368 595 1435">CAR ID</th> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="595 1368 1161 1435">VVB Assessment</th> <th data-bbox="1161 1368 1307 1435">Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="453 1435 595 1733">Major</td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="595 1435 1161 1733"> The verification team assessed that consistency had been achieved between the annual report and the financial report. Accordingly, the request for the issuance of PVCs for the 2020–2022 reporting period was confirmed at 36,426 PVCs, as below: </td> <td data-bbox="1161 1435 1307 1733">Closed</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="453 1733 595 1964"></td> <td data-bbox="595 1733 746 1800">PVC</td> <td data-bbox="746 1733 879 1800">2020</td> <td data-bbox="879 1733 1013 1800">2021</td> <td data-bbox="1013 1733 1161 1800">2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="453 1800 595 1964"></td> <td data-bbox="595 1800 746 1964">Carbon Benefit Verified (tCO2e)</td> <td data-bbox="746 1800 879 1964">15,178</td> <td data-bbox="879 1800 1013 1964">15,178</td> <td data-bbox="1013 1800 1161 1964">15,178</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			CAR ID	VVB Assessment			Status	Major	The verification team assessed that consistency had been achieved between the annual report and the financial report. Accordingly, the request for the issuance of PVCs for the 2020–2022 reporting period was confirmed at 36,426 PVCs, as below:			Closed		PVC	2020	2021	2022		Carbon Benefit Verified (tCO2e)	15,178	15,178	15,178
CAR ID	VVB Assessment			Status																			
Major	The verification team assessed that consistency had been achieved between the annual report and the financial report. Accordingly, the request for the issuance of PVCs for the 2020–2022 reporting period was confirmed at 36,426 PVCs, as below:			Closed																			
	PVC	2020	2021	2022																			
	Carbon Benefit Verified (tCO2e)	15,178	15,178	15,178																			

		PVC Claimed	15,178	15,178	15,178
		PVC Risk Buffer	3,036	3,036	3,036
		TOTAL	12,142	12,142	12,142

PES AGREEMENT AND BENEFIT SHARING

Requirement: project shares benefits equitably and transact ecosystem services benefits through clear PES Agreements with performance-based incentives.

Verification Questions: 1, 2 and 6

- 7.1. Procedures for entering into a PES Agreement with participants are being applied correctly **(8.2)**
- 7.2. Participants are entering into PES agreement voluntarily and according to the principle of free, prior, informed consent, in an appropriate language and format **(8.3)**
- 7.3. PES Agreements are not removing, diminishing or threatening participant’s land tenure **(8.4)**
- 7.4. A fair and equitable benefit-sharing mechanism is in place and has been agreed with the participation of communities involved, identifying how PES funding will be distributed among participants **(8.8; 8.9; 8.10)**
- 7.5. The project has committed to deliver at least 60% on average of the proceeds of the sales of Plan Vivo Certificates. Where less than 60% has been delivered, the project has justified why this was not possible **(8.12)**

A. Findings (describe)

In accordance with the Plan Vivo Standard, the PDD describes that the signing procedures of the PES Agreement and the Benefit Sharing Mechanism between Nakau, NRDF, and the Sirebe Tribal Association were conducted under the principles of FPIC. The verification team has confirmed the existence of meeting minutes documenting the signing process of the PES Agreement. Based on interviews with community members, they stated that the signing was conducted voluntarily, with a sufficient understanding of the agreement’s content, and without coercion or pressure. The community also confirmed that there were no issues or objections related to the PES Agreement that could threaten their tenure rights over the land.

The Plan Vivo Standard also requires that the project must commit to allocating at least 60% of the proceeds from the sale of Plan Vivo Certificates to the community. The verification team has reviewed the signed Benefit Sharing Plan, which states that 60% of the revenue will be distributed to the community. Regarding the previously identified inconsistencies in carbon benefits, it was noted that this directly affects the nominal amount of funds received by the Sirebe Tribal Association (STA). As a follow-up, the verification team requested clarification from Nakau concerning the total distribution of funds received by the STA.

	<p>Based on Nakau’s explanation, the total amount stated in the <i>Sirebe Financial Result</i> document is consistent with the data shown in the Sirebe bank account e-statement. However, a currency discrepancy remains between the figures presented in the <i>Sirebe Financial Result</i> document and those recorded in the Sirebe bank e-statement.</p> <p>Interviews with the beneficiaries from the four main lineages—Pitakaji, Asa, Pitatamae, and Pitakoe—indicated that they have received financial assistance utilized for infrastructure development, the field review conducted by the technical expert further confirmed the existence of tangible benefits such as water tanks, sanitation projects, and other facilities resulting from the project.</p> <p>Based on the assessment results, the verification team concluded that the project has developed a fair benefit distribution plan and has clearly outlined the ecosystem service benefit transactions through the PES Agreement. The distribution of funds from carbon sales is consistent with the amounts stated in the <i>Sirebe Financial Result</i> document. However, a currency discrepancy remains between the figures presented in the <i>Sirebe Financial Result</i> document and those recorded in the Sirebe bank account e-statement. Therefore, the verification team raised this issue as an Observation.</p>		
B. Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
C. Corrective Actions (describe)	None		
D. Project Coordinator’s Response	None		
E. Status	None		

Itinerary

Date	Activity	Project Participants
Saturday 21/06/25	Travel Jakarta - Brisbane Jakarta (CGK) - Brisbane (BNE)	
Sunday, 22/06/25	Stay in Brisbane, flight Brisbane – Honiara cancellation due to bad weather	
Monday 23/06/25	Travel Brisbane to Honiara Brisbane (BNE) - Honiara (HIR)	
	Receive email of Flight Honiara – Sasamuga Cancellation to the next week	Nakau
	Coordination with Nakau and Plan Vivo for hybrid audit mechanism	Nakau
Tuesday 24/06/25	Stakeholder interviews Honiara (face to face interview with ministries level)	Nakau
	Internal Meeting / Briefing with the Local Expert	
Wednesday 25/06/25	Meeting/Interviews with Sirebe tribal association members (online meeting)	Sirebe TA, NRDF
	Lunch	All
	Meeting/Interviews with Sirebe members	Sirebe members
	Meeting/Interviews with NRDF staff and rangers	NRDF staff, rangers
	Dinner	
	Overnight in Honiara	
Sunday, 29/06/2025	Travel Honiara to Brisbane Honiara (HIR) - Brisbane (BNE) : 11.20 - 13.35 (IE 706 Solomon Airlines) Brisbane (BNE) - Jakarta (CGK) : 18.10 - 07.00 (30 Juni) (SQ-266 Singapore Airlines)	
Monday 30/06/25	Arrival in Jakarta	

Itinerary – Local Expert Field Visit

Date	Location	Activity
11/07/2025 - 12/07/2025	Honiara	Traveling time (Honiara - Sasamunga)
13/07/2025	Sasamunga	Arrival with <i>Pelican Express</i> , review of documents and data, study of plot locations, and planning of field activities.
14/07/2025	Sirebe	Assessment of Sirebe tribe beneficiaries.
18/07/2025	Sirebe Hill	Visit to Sirebe Hill and cultural tabu site; assessment of Plot 6 on the ridge.
19/07/2025 - 20/07/2025	Sasamunga	Traveling time (Sasamunga- Honiara)

Appendix 1 (photos, lists of participants, scanned copies of receipts, etc.)



Photo of Sirebe Tribe members and rangers who participated in the interview with the verification team.



Photo of the shared benefits provided to the Sirebe Tribe

Appendix 2. New information requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests (validation & verification activities)

A. CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR)

No	Reference	Findings	Category	Corrections and Corrective Action	VVB Assessment
4.	Plan vivo standard (2013) section 8.8	<p><u>Section:</u> Sirebe Forest Carbon Project verification report v4 section risk management</p> <p>Regarding the reference stating that a fair and equitable benefit-sharing mechanism must be applied and agreed upon with the participation of the communities involved, the verification team noted inconsistencies in the information related to PVCs sold.</p> <p>From the first verification report (2015–2019), it is noted that the carbon that could be issued amounted to 87,115 units as PVCs. In addition, based on the annual monitoring and project management workshop held on 30 August 2023, and according to the presentation delivered by the project coordinator, the total carbon credits sold in 2021–2022 was reported as 81,647 units. However, in the 2021–2022 annual report, the summary section states that PVCs issued amounted to 87,117 units, with PVCs sold totaling 78,312 units. In</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major	<p>We have conducted a full reconciliation of internal sales and external registry records. As a result, we discovered a reporting inconsistency and some minor errors in the internal sales spreadsheet which have been corrected:</p> <p>A. The 2021–22 annual report should not have been provided, as it was never finalised and the period is covered by the Sirebe Annual Report 2020–2022, currently under review. The 2021-22 report will be removed from the information platform.</p> <p>B. The actual number of credits sold to 31 December 2022 was 67,498, while 19,617 credits remain unsold, totaling 87,115 credits. Higher totals previously reported incorrectly included sales made after this date.</p> <p>Appendix 1: Sirebe Financial Report has been updated to reflect the accurate sales information.</p>	<p><u>Review Date:</u> 29/09/2025</p> <p><u>Review:</u></p> <p>The Sirebe Financial Report and the Sirebe Annual Reports 2020–2022 have been updated by Nakau, and the figures related to benefit sharing are now consistent.</p> <p><u>Status:</u> Closed</p>

	contrast, the financial results spreadsheet indicates that the total PVCs sold was 77,794 units. The inconsistencies shall be explained and revised, this finding categorized as a Major CAR that shall be resolved and closed before the Verification report finalization.		C. The 2020-2022 Annual report has been updated to reflect the reconciled totals. (Total sum held in trust for future PES Payments updated to \$364,069.48)	
--	--	--	---	--

B. Forward Action Request

No.	FAR
1.	-

C. Observation/ Recommendation

No.	Observation
1.	<p>The Rangers are capable of monitoring their assigned areas. However, the rangers could conduct a more comprehensive biodiversity survey to further strengthen the monitoring process in the future. Such a survey would help to identify ecosystem services, nesting and resting sites, and migration patterns, thereby enhancing biodiversity baseline information.</p> <p>Nakau response (5/11/2025): We are aware of the limitations of our current ecosystem monitoring system, and are planning to contract expertise to improve our ecosystem survey methodology and indicators, to allow for a more meaningful analysis of indicator species populations and populational changes. We welcome your suggestion to include additional ecosystem values, such as nesting and resting sites. We would like to point out however, that due to capacity constraints, we may not be able to include more complex analyses such as research on potential migration patterns. Further, such research doesn't seem to be required by the Plan Vivo Standard (see Plan Vivo Project Requirements 5.4, sections 4.4).</p> <p>Response Verification team 7/11/2025 : Clarification is accepted. However, this observation acts as recommendation as stated on PV Guidance for VVB and IE Version 4.0 : <i>"Observations may also include recommendations for improvement. Projects are not required to take corrective actions to address Observations"</i></p>
2.	<p>29/10/2025</p> <p>A clarification request was made by the verification team to Nakau regarding the total distribution of funds received by the Sirebe Tribal Association (STA). Nakau explained that the total amount stated in the <i>Sirebe Financial Result</i> document is aligned with the data recorded in the Sirebe bank account e-statement. However, since the figures presented in the <i>Sirebe Financial Result</i> document and those</p>

recorded in the Sirebe bank e-statement are expressed in different currencies, the verification team raised this issue as an Observation. Nakau should ensure the clarity of information and currency at the Sirebe financial result document to prevent misunderstanding.

Nakau response 6/11/2025

The Nakau business manager has responded to this request and has provided clarifications on the numbers in the Sirebe financial results by email

Response Verification team 7/11/2025 :

Clarification accepted. However, it is still a recommendation for future as mentioned on the Observation above.