

## Verification Statement

for

### Mikoko Pamoja

<b>Project Title</b>	Mikoko Pamoja
<b>Monitoring Period</b>	01/01/2014 to 31/12/2018 (first and last day included)
<b>Project Coordinator(s)</b>	Association of Coastal Ecosystem Service (ACES), Mark Huxham, School of Life, Sport and Social Sciences, Edinburgh Napier University
<b>Project Location</b>	Gazi Bay, Kenya (4° 25'S and 39° 50'E)
<b>Date of Verification</b>	25/02/2019 to 27/02/2019
<b>Validation and Verification Opinion</b>	<p>The verification opinion is provided as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPIC validation confirms that Mikoko Pamoja is a community-led mangrove conservation and restoration project in Gazi Bay, Kenya. It (40 25'S and 390 50'E) protects 107 ha of natural mangrove forest and 10 hectares of plantation as well as planting an additional 4,000 trees annually, over a period of 20 years meets the validation requirement as per PV Standard 2013.</li> <li>• The verification team confirms that the project has been implemented in accordance to its validated project description and the referred Technical Specification.</li> <li>• The verification team confirms that the project and the annual reports meet the verification requirements of the PV Standard 2013 to which the project was validated.</li> <li>• For 01/01/2014 to 31/12/2018 monitoring period the verification assessment covered, the project has calculated, and the audit team has verified, a total ex-post net carbon benefit of 12,500 tCO<sub>2e</sub>, which totals 10,625 tCO<sub>2e</sub> after deducting the 15% risk buffer (1875 tCO<sub>2e</sub>), and the verification team further confirms that the project has achieved the results stated in the annual reports. Based on desk reviews, visual observations, the Terms of Reference for Project Verification (v.12/2013) / Terms of Reference for Project Validation (v.2.0) and interviews with the project beneficiaries and the project staff during the field audit, it is accurate to state that the ecosystem services provided by the project are indeed still additional. To date, there are no government or private projects similar in scope or scale in the region. As a result, the project was verified to be on track to achieving the ex-ante estimated net carbon</li> </ul>

benefit over the project's 20-year lifetime. The GHG emission reductions and/or removals achieved during the monitoring period were evaluated to a reasonable level of assurance.

- The validity of this statement is contingent upon the project's continued implementation of the Plan Vivo Standard 2013 and as further defined in the EPIC Validation and Verification Audit Report dated 28 June 2019

### Attestation

Validation/Verification Body Representative:

Title: Director and Head of operations

Signature:

---

Date: 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020

Contact Information:

**EPIC SUSTAINABILITY SERVICES PRIVATE LIMITED**

No.41, Anugraha, First Cross Road, Sundar Nagar, Near BEL Circle,  
Bengaluru-560054, India.

Contact No. +91- 9590929935, +91- 9482759072

e-mail:

[sudheendra@epicsustainability.com](mailto:sudheendra@epicsustainability.com)

[operations@epicsustainability.com](mailto:operations@epicsustainability.com)

[epicsustainability@gmail.com](mailto:epicsustainability@gmail.com)

# MIKOKO PAMOJA

DOCUMENT PREPARED BY

EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited



<b>Project Title</b>	Mikoko Pamoja
<b>Report Title</b>	Mikoko Pamoja
<b>Version</b>	01
<b>Report ID</b>	ESSPL/PV/2019/04
<b>Verification Period</b>	01/01/2014 to 31/12/2018 (first and last day included)
<b>Client</b>	Association of Coastal Ecosystem Service (ACES), Mark Huxham, School of Life, Sport and Social Sciences, Edinburgh Napier University
<b>Pages</b>	26
<b>Date of Issue</b>	28/06/2019
<b>Prepared By</b>	EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited (E-0062)
<b>Contact</b>	EPIC Sustainability Services Pvt. Ltd. No. 41, Anugraha, 1st Cross Road, Sundarnagar, Near BEL Circle, Gokula Extension, Bengaluru - 560 054, Karnataka State, India.
<b>Approved By</b>	K. Sudheendra, Director and Head Operations
<b>Work Carried Out By</b>	Dr.D.Siddaramu (Lead Auditor)

Name of Verifier(s)	Date of Review
Dr.D.Siddaramu (Lead Auditor)	On-site field inspection: 25/02/2019 to 27/02/2019 Draft Report: 18 April 2019 Final Report: 28 June 2019

### Project Description

Mikoko Pamoja is a community-led mangrove conservation and restoration project in Gazi Bay, Kenya. It (4° 25'S and 39° 50'E) protects 107 ha of natural mangrove forest and 10 hectares of plantation as well as planting an additional 4,000 trees annually, over a period of 20 years.

It involves both the prevention of deforestation of the local mangrove forest, as well community-based reforestation. The project also supports community development projects such as provision of school books, construction of school buildings and the provision of clean drinking water.

Mangroves provide a wide range of services and benefits to both the environment and the surrounding community. These include coastal protection, nursery habitat for fish including many species fished by the surrounding communities, water purification, improving biodiversity and sequestering large amounts of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. By raising income from forest resources, including carbon credits and other income-generating activities such as beekeeping and ecotourism, the project safeguards these benefits for the local community and for future generations.

The project is managed by three groups: The Mikoko Pamoja Community Organization (MPCO) consists of representatives of Gazi Bay, specifically Gazi and Makongeni villages; The Mikoko Pamoja Steering Group (MPSG) which provides technical support to the MPCO; and the project coordinator, The Association for Coastal Ecosystem Services (ACES), a charity registered in Scotland.

The implementation of Mikoko Pamoja will reduce or eliminate the illegal extraction of wood from all the areas (since there will be community vigilance around extraction). Fishing activity will not be affected (other than benefiting in the long term from better ecosystem quality).

The natural *Rhizophora* dominated forest and *Rhizophora* plantation, will become inaccessible for legal cutting and the legal quota will be reduced to reflect this. Trees replanted on beach area, with time, help protect the adjacent agricultural land against shoreline erosion.

Project interventions focus on *Rhizophora mucronata* forest protection, *Rhizophora mucronata* plantation protection and *Sonneratia alba* plantations. The project's monitoring activities have not reported any negative environmental impacts. The species selected by the project are all native or naturalized and non-invasive (i.e., *Rhizophora mucronata* and *Sonneratia alba*). In practice, the MPCO members collect the seedlings that had already germinated and keep in the nursery. This sourcing of native seedlings promotes genetic diversity and a resilient ecosystem.

Document	Outstanding Corrective action	Activity against CAR
e.g. latest annual report	CAR 02/06 – increased community consultation	Increased frequency of community meetings.

**Description of field visits (including list of sites visited and individuals/groups interviewed)**

A site visit was carried out from 25/02/2019 to 27/02/2019. During the site visit physical inspection of the project components followed by interviews with the on-site personnel was carried out to verify the project details. A follow-up meeting was also conducted with the project representatives. The following persons were interviewed.

SI No	Date	Person's interviewed	Designation / Company	Topic discussed
01	26/02/2019	Dr. James Kairo	Director KMFRI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Design</li> <li>Project Implementation status</li> <li>Baseline Scenario</li> <li>Management, Monitoring, documentation and reporting system</li> <li>Roles and responsibility</li> </ul>
02	25/02/2019	Mr. Josphat Mwamba Mtwana	Co-ordinator Mikoko Pamoja Community Based Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Design</li> <li>Roles and responsibility</li> <li>Daily Operations</li> <li>Project Implementation status</li> <li>Baseline Scenario</li> <li>Monitoring, documentation and reporting system</li> </ul>
03	25/02/2019	Ms. Anne Wanjiru	Mikoko Pamoja Community Based Organization	
04	24/02/2019	Mr. Ali Salim Shufa	Chairman, MPCO	
05	26/02/2019	Mr. Blessington C. Maghanga	Forester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Design</li> <li>Project Implementation status</li> </ul>
06	27/02/2019	Ms. Mwanakombo Omari	County Govt of Kwale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Design</li> <li>Project Implementation status</li> </ul>

The list of community persons/stakeholders interviewed is attached as Appendix 1.3

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

Theme	Major CARs	Minor CARs	Observations	Status
<b>Project's Eligibility</b>	CAR01	-	-	Compliance
<b>Ecosystem Benefits</b>	-	CAR02	CL01	Compliance
<b>Project Coordination and Management</b>	-	CAR03	CL02, CL03 and CL04	Compliance
<b>Participatory design</b>	CAR04	-	-	Compliance
<b>Quantifying and Monitoring Ecosystem Services</b>	CAR06	CAR05	-	Compliance

<b>Risk Management</b>	CAR07	-	-	Compliance
<b>Livelihoods Impacts</b>	-	-	-	In compliance
<b>PES Agreement</b>	-	CAR07	-	Compliance

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

Theme	Conformance of Draft Report	Conformance of Final Report
<b>Project's Eligibility</b>	<del>Yes</del> /No	Yes/ <del>No</del>
<b>Ecosystem Benefits</b>	<del>Yes</del> /No	Yes/ <del>No</del>
<b>Project Coordination and Management</b>	<del>Yes</del> /No	Yes/ <del>No</del>
<b>Participatory design</b>	<del>Yes</del> /No	Yes/ <del>No</del>
<b>Quantifying and Monitoring Ecosystem Services</b>	<del>Yes</del> /No	Yes/ <del>No</del>
<b>Risk Management</b>	Yes/No	Yes/ <del>No</del>
<b>Livelihoods impacts</b>	Yes/No	Yes/ <del>No</del>
<b>PES Agreement</b>	<del>Yes</del> /No	Yes/ <del>No</del>

<b>PROJECT'S ELIGIBILITY</b>	
<b>Requirement: Project directly engage and benefit community groups</b>	
<b>Verification Question: 1 and 2</b>	
<p><b>1.1</b> Project interventions are still taking on land where smallholders and/or community groups have clear land tenure <b>(1.1)</b></p> <p><b>1.2</b> Land that is not owned by or subject to use rights has included in the project area because <b>(1.2)</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It represents less than a third of the project areas at all times</li> <li>• No part of the area was acquired by a third party from smallholders or community groups for the purpose of inclusion in the project</li> <li>• Its inclusion will have clear benefits to the project by creating landscape level ecosystem benefits such as biodiversity corridors.</li> <li>• There is an executed agreement between owners/mangers of such land and participants regarding the management of the area consistent with these requirements</li> </ul>	
<b>A. Findings (describe)</b>	1.1) A community-led project in Gazi Bay, Kenya (4° 25'S and 39° 50'E) protects 107 ha of natural mangrove forest and 10 hectares of plantation. The PDD says that the project plans to plant an additional 4,000 trees annually, over a period of 20 years. However, the planting activity seems not have been implemented as planned. Carbon benefits are conservatively estimated at 2,500 tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> yr-1,

	<p>derived from avoided deforestation, prevented forest degradation and new planting. Because mangroves provide a wide range of other ecosystem services, including coastal protection, nursery habitat for fish and water purification, preserving and restoring these forests will have multiple additional benefits that are not accounted for here. The verification team has visited the residents of the Gazi Bay area (i.e., Gazi and Makongeni two largest villages in the area involving the project) and the project area as part of the on-site visit. These community representatives are also representing the people in the administrative areas surrounding the villages. The combined population of the two villages is approximately 5,400 persons; with Gazi village having 60% of this total. Mangrove forests in Kenya are owned by the government. Responsibility to manage forests in Kenya is bestowed to the KFS through the Community Forest Association; the Gazi community has signed a user agreement with KFS, allowing the community to utilize designated mangrove areas for MPCO. This was verified during interaction with the Gazi community members, Forest and local Government official. It was evident that they are aware of the user agreement and the vested powers given by the user agreement.</p> <p>1.2) The entirety of the mangroves is subject to the authority MPCO, a Government recognized authority. Hence, the land within the project area is bound by rules and restrictions adopted and imposed by the MPCO, (i.e., implementation and management plans). In other words, there is no land included in the project that is not owned or subject to rights of smallholders that are not under an agreement with the heads of each MPCO to participate in the project. The project is compliant with the PV standard requirement.</p>		
<b>B. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	<p><u>Major CAR01</u></p> <p>As indicated in PDD "...10 hectares of plantation as well as planting an additional 4000 trees annually, over a period of 20 years...". Justify why</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The target is not met</li> <li>2. Criteria for selecting the area for plantation</li> <li>3. Reason for less plantation/death of seedlings</li> </ol>		
<b>D. ACES Response</b>	<p>As explained in the relevant Annual reports, we have failed to meet our planting targets for area 3 in the past four years. This is because collecting and nurturing sufficient numbers of seedlings in a protected nursery area, before transplanting them, has proved more difficult than anticipated. This could be because of changing weather patterns, since it has become harder to anticipate the fruiting season. Increasing</p>		

rates of sedimentation, swamping nursery areas we have used in the past, are also making this difficult; we suspect that the large new 410ha titanium mine, located 8km inland (west) and upstream of the mangrove forest, which is discharging into the Bay has caused or exacerbated this situation.

The area for plantation (area 3) was chosen because it is in need of ecological restoration; it is an eroding beach site without natural recruitment of seedlings (see the descriptions in the PDD and Technical Specification). Hence it was chosen in the knowledge that it is a challenging site and we have anticipated relatively slow growth and high mortality for trees planted there. This makes ecological sense – there is no point in planting in areas that will recover naturally. However it means that our activities in area 3 were always expected to make a very small contribution to total carbon sequestration and were rather for ecological benefits, as explained below.

The annual reports state the following:

Year	Status	C credits lost (not claimed)
2018	Red – target missed	212.5 (250 – 15% risk buffer)
2017	Red – target missed	212.5
2016	Red – target missed	212.5
2015	Amber – 50% met	106
2014	Green - Target exceeded by >2000	0

Hence as a result of failing to meet our targets we have missed out on 743.5 credits, equivalent to ~ 8179 USD.

According to the carbon calculations in our Technical Specification, achieving the planting target provides the equivalent of 1.9% (46.7/2500) of our annual carbon target. However we allocated a very conservative penalty of 10% if our credits when this target is missed.

Hence failure to meet these targets has led to a loss of credits (and income) of around 8% in the past three years in excess of the reduction in carbon captured. Our total cumulative carbon benefits, over twenty years, calculated in the Technical Specifications assuming planting targets are all met was 933. If we continue to miss the target for the next 15 years, and with no change to the PDD, we stand to lose 3,931 credits in total.

Hence there is no case that missing planting targets has compromised the integrity of the credits we have sold. Rather our approach is much too conservative, given the difficulties we have encountered with our nursery sites, and we intend to alter this in the next revision of the PDD.

In future years, we intend to explore opportunities to plant in



	alternative areas to the area 3 (planting area) in order to achieve the planting target of 4,000 seedlings. This will need to include a feasibility study of sites to ensure that we do not encounter the same issues as have been encountered in area 3, whilst ensuring that we are not planting in an area that has a high likelihood of being recolonised naturally.
<b>E. Status</b>	<i>CLOSED</i>

<b>ECOSYSTEM BENEFITS</b>	
<b>Requirement:</b> Project generates ecosystem service benefits and maintains or enhances biodiversity.	
<b>Verification Questions: 1, 3 and 5</b>	
<p>2.1 Project interventions are maintaining or enhancing biodiversity (2.2)</p> <p>2.2 Project interventions have not led to any negative environmental impacts (2.3)</p> <p>2.3 Any trees being planted to generate ecosystem services are native or naturalised species and are not invasive (2.4)</p>	
<b>A. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>2.1) The main current uses of the large natural mangrove forest area are for fishing, extraction of fuel wood, and tree harvesting for building (both legal and illegal). The Mikoko Pamoja project will enhance the value of the fisheries grounds. It excludes legal cutting from the protected areas and enforces protection from illegal cutting whilst providing woodlots for fast growing trees to prevent leakage. The degraded beach area (activity area 3) is used for subsistence foraging for seafood; the original idea behind planting trees here as to increase productivity and help to protect the adjacent agricultural land from erosion. The verification team noted that the “activity area 3” i.e., degraded beach area plantation target is not achieved in the last five years. This is reported as threat to the project activity.</p> <p>2.2) Project interventions focus on <i>Rhizophora mucronata</i> forest protection, <i>Rhizophora mucronata</i> plantation protection and <i>Sonneratia alba</i> plantations. The project’s monitoring activities have not reported any negative environmental impacts. Stakeholders interviewed during the site visit did not report any negative environmental impacts attributable to project interventions. In general, the verification team also did not observe any negative environmental impacts due to project activities.</p> <p>2.3) The species selected by the project are all native or naturalized and non-invasive (i.e., <i>Rhizophora mucronata</i> and <i>Sonneratia alba</i>). This is described in project documentation, and was confirmed by the verification team during discussion with MPCO, ACES and KFS personnel. In practice, the MPCO members collect the seedlings that had already germinated and keep in the nursery. This sourcing of</p>

	native seedlings promotes genetic diversity and a resilient ecosystem.		
<b>B. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	<p><u>Minor CAR02</u> PP to submit</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Carbon calculation sheet/s for review</li> <li>2. Training records of the monitoring staff</li> <li>3. Filled in site Data collection sheets</li> </ol> <p><u>Observation-CL01</u> PP has to clear delineate and protect the nursery area identified for the project with information of the species, collection date, etc.</p>		
<b>D. ACES Response</b>	<p><u>Minor CAR02:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The carbon calculation methodology and calculated figures can be found in section 4. Carbon baseline (without-project scenario) of the published Technical Specifications. This includes an allometric equations for estimating below- and above-ground biomass (see p. 9-11).</li> </ol> <p>Additional information has been supplied in "01 November 2018 Monitoring data" and "02 summary permanent plot data"</p> <p><del>2.</del> Please see attached document '01 Mikoko Pamoja Community Training Report', providing details of training that was undertaken last year. Please see also a summary of training that was undertaken in 2017: <a href="https://medium.com/100-days-of-learning/mangroves-and-people-community-based-conservation-and-restoration-of-mangroves-for-poverty-699bd9c183d1">https://medium.com/100-days-of-learning/mangroves-and-people-community-based-conservation-and-restoration-of-mangroves-for-poverty-699bd9c183d1</a>.</p> <p>Please also see attached documents 05-01, 05-02 and 05-03 Community training attendance sheets.</p> <p>3. The site data collection sheets have been attached alongside this document. Please see attached document: '02 November 2018 forest monitoring data'.</p> <p>Please see attached document "03 Original planting or forest inventory data collection sheets".</p> <p><u>Observation CL01:</u></p> <p>As discussed in response to Major CAR01 (missed planting targets), the project has encountered challenges caused by environmental conditions (specifically sedimentation and changes in the region's</p>		

	<p>rainy season) which has led to high seedling mortality and low numbers of trees in the nursery site.</p> <p>Given the challenges encountered in planting mangroves in this nursery area, we intend to revise the PDD to remove the planting target, thereby removing the nursery area from the PDD. This revision of interventions will require review by the Plan Vivo Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and will therefore involve a longer review period by Plan Vivo than is practical for the review of this verification report. We will therefore submit the attached revised PDD soon, and conduct a second revision later in 2019 encompassing the revised planting target.</p> <p>Given these upcoming changes to the PDD relating to tree planting, it would not be time or cost effective to delineate and protect the nursery area as advised in Observation CL01, given the minor role in the project that the nursery will play in the near future.</p> <p>FAR02: The updated PDD has been submitted to Plan Vivo for review.</p>
<b>E. Status</b>	<i>CLOSED</i>

<b>PROJECT COORDINATION AND MANAGEMENT</b>	
<b>Requirement: Project is managed with transparency and accountability, engagement of relevant stakeholders and in compliance with the law of the Host Country.</b>	
<b>Verification Questions: 1, 2 and 6</b>	
<p><b>3.1</b> 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 <b>(3.4)</b></p> <p><b>3.2</b> 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 <b>(3.5)</b></p> <p><b>3.3</b> 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. <b>(3.9)</b></p> <p><b>3.4</b> 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 <b>(3.10; 3.11)</b></p>	
<b>A. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>3.1) Association for Coastal Ecosystem Services (ACES), is the Project Coordinator Organisation, responsible for selling Plan Vivo Certificates, overseeing the transfer of funds to the Mikoko Pamoja Community Organization (MPCO) and reporting to the Plan Vivo Foundation. ACES</p>

	<p>is a charity registered in Scotland that can hold an independent and transparent account from which payments for carbon credits can be transferred to MPCO upon meeting annual targets.</p> <p>MPCO is a Government registered community organization that coordinates community engagement, routine project activities and benefit sharing. It is governed by volunteer office members who are village representatives from the project area. The office members have the responsibilities of community administration and implementation of project work plans. Project technical work is coordinated by a paid Project Coordinator who plays a key role in the office of the MPCO and provides a link with the Mikoko Pamoja Steering Group (MPSG).</p> <p>MPSG provides the necessary technical expertise in biological (carbon accounting) and social (socioeconomic monitoring) areas. Steering group members are unpaid volunteers.</p> <p>The MPCO shall work closely with the KFS and the established Gogoni Gazi Community Forest Association. A detailed description of the Project organization is given in figure C1 and in Table C1 of the published PDD.</p> <p>The verification team has reviewed the CONTRACT AGREEMENT signed between ACES and MPCO for the conformance.</p> <p>The verification team during discussion with the community people (i.e., project beneficiaries) confirmed that they were taken into confidence in the participatory project design process, and in its implementation. The team further reviewed the agreement copies, interviewed the village heads, local Government official and the beneficiaries for the conformance and the project meets the PV standard's criteria.</p> <p>3.2) and 3.3) ACES and MPCO personnel confirmed that to date the project is in compliance with applicable laws and annual reports of the project are submitted to the Plan Vivo Foundation annually. The project has demonstrated that it has the legal and administrative capacity to enter into PES Agreements with participants and to manage the disbursement of payments for ecosystem services</p> <p>After the project was registered with Plan Vivo, the project has been generating carbon revenues through the sale of CO<sub>2</sub> certificates (PVC). The PVC sale is managed by the ACES and Funds for spending on community benefit will be held by the MPCO. Expenditure from these funds will be determined during an annual community benefit consultation process. This will consist of four steps:</p> <p>a) MPCO members collect ideas for expenditure from their</p>
--	---

	<p>communities.</p> <p>b) A full MPCO meeting determines their preferred priorities and ranks the suggested expenditures.</p> <p>c) The ranked priorities are made public, displayed in the villages and on the website, with one month for further representation from any local resident.</p> <p>d) A confirmation meeting of the MPCO is held to determine final priorities for expenditure.</p> <p>e) Annual audit is done at the end of the financial year to determine how the funds were spent.</p> <p>However, direct payments of cash as 'dividends' to individuals are not permitted (this does not preclude the payment of fees and stipends, such as school and college fees, nor the payment of salaries or cash for work conducted on behalf of MPCO). Full accounts for Mikoko Pamoja are publicly available, on the website and posted on village notice-boards as well as tabled at the annual MPCO confirmation meeting. All members of MPCO and MPSG have collective responsibility for ensuring good governance and financial probity. Accounts will be prepared by the MPCO treasurer with assistance from the MP coordinator. Annual accounts for ACES will be publicly available according to Scottish law.</p> <p>5% of funds will go to running expenses for MPSG and MPCO. Plan Vivo Standard requires at least 60% of income to be allocated to communities. In this project, 26% of income is allocated for spending on community projects, as determined through the annual prioritization process. A further 36% goes to employing the local work teams and individuals – hence 62% is allocated to community benefit or community employment. The anticipated financial flows for the project are given in Fig C2. Of PDD.</p> <p>3.4) The project has regularly submitted annual reports to the Plan Vivo Foundation, describing progress, milestones, and challenges the project faces. As required, the reports detail sales of CO<sub>2</sub> certificates, and describe the use of funds for community benefit.</p>		
<b>B. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	<p><u>Minor CAR03</u></p> <p>The weblink (<a href="http://www.eafpes.org">www.eafpes.org</a>) provided on page no.37 of the PDD is leading to other site, the said information is not available. Please check</p> <p><u>Observation CL02</u></p> <p>As indicated in "Table B2: Project timeline" on page no.10 of the PDD, please provide the details of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Annual reporting of monitoring indicators. Report from</li> </ol>		

	<p>MPCO to MPSG and ACES” - June 2014</p> <p>2. “Harvesting and sale of first commercial timber from woodlot” in July 2016</p> <p><u>Observation CL03</u> As indicated in “Table G.2. Methods of measurement of expected socio-economic impacts” on page no.22 of the PDD, please provide monitored details</p> <p><u>Observation CL04</u> As indicated in “Table E1. Methods of monitoring environmental impacts of proposed activities” on page no.25 of the PDD, please provide details for</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regular monitoring of forest structure and growth, including recruitment of new trees. Three yearly monitoring of fauna especially crabs in protected areas</li> <li>2. Monitoring sedimentation rates and surface elevation in protected area and degraded beach plots</li> </ol>
<b>D. ACES Response</b>	<p><u>Minor CAR03:</u></p> <p>This website was previously used to host the management plan amongst other information and documents, however the EAFPES website is no longer active. The management plan is now hosted on the ACES website at <a href="http://www.aces-org.co.uk/mikoko-pamoja-project/">http://www.aces-org.co.uk/mikoko-pamoja-project/</a>. A reference to this revised location is included in the attached updated PDD.</p> <p><u>Observation CL02:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Annual monitoring is reported to ACES and MPSG through the production and circulation of annual reports. Monitoring results of ecosystem services, environmental and biodiversity, and socio-economic modelling are available in Section E of each Mikoko Pamoja annual report, accepted by Plan Vivo.</li> <li>2. Details of harvesting of the Gazi and Makongeni commercial woodlots are available in the 2016 Annual Report (see pages 14-16). This report includes data on the number and size of poles harvested and sold.</li> </ol> <p><u>Observation CL03:</u></p> <p>Please see the attached documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) ‘03 Socio-economic impacts of Mikoko Pamoja’. This document provides a summary of the socio-economic</li> </ol>

	<p>monitoring.</p> <p>(ii) '04 Social survey report - Jan 2017'. This document provides the results of a social survey conducted in January 2017 by the Mikoko Pamoja Community Organisation social impact officer.</p> <p><u>Observation CL04:</u></p> <p>The requested data has been attached alongside this document in the following files:</p> <p>(i) Monitoring of forest structure and growth: please see attached document: '02 November 2018 forest monitoring data'.</p> <p>(ii) Monitoring of fauna: please see attached document: '05 Mikoko Pamoja Faunal Survey summary results'.</p> <p>2. Sedimentation monitoring data have been attached alongside this document. Please see attached document: '06 Surface elevation change (sedimentation), Gazi'. Please also see attached document "04 Mikoko Pamoja Sedimentation Monitoring".</p>
<b>E. Status</b>	<i>CLOSED</i>

<b>PARTICIPATORY DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN VIVO</b>	
<b>Requirement:</b> the project has demonstrated community ownership: communities participate meaningfully through the design and implementation of plan vivos that address local needs and priorities.	
<b>Verification Questions: 1, 2 and 6</b>	
<p><b>4.1</b> A voluntary and participatory planning that address local needs and inform the development of technical specification is taking place (<b>4.1; 4.6; 7.1</b>). Barriers to participation are being identified and measures taken to encourage participation (<b>4.3</b>)</p> <p><b>4.2</b> 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 (<b>4.2</b>)</p> <p><b>4.3</b> The project is not undermining the livelihood needs and priorities or reduce the food security of the participants (<b>4.7; 7.1; 7.5</b>)</p> <p><b>4.4</b> There exist a system for accurately recording and verifying location, boundary and size of each plan vivo (<b>4.8</b>). Participants have access to their <i>plan vivos</i> in an appropriate language and format (<b>4.9</b>)</p> <p><b>4.5</b> Participants are being 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 (<b>4.12</b>). A robust grievance redressal system is in place (<b>4.14</b>)</p>	
<b>A. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>4.1) Participatory planning process by the stakeholders is already detailed in section 3.1 of "PROJECT COORDINATION AND MANAGEMENT". The audit team has reviewed the local government letters, records of community meetings, and through the interview of</p>

	<p>the stakeholders/community members confirm that the participation in the planning process exists and it is voluntary. Through the entire audit trail, barriers to participation or discrimination of any nature in the participation have not surfaced.</p> <p>4.2) The verification team hereby confirms by its observation and discussion/interviews with community/stakeholders that there is no discrimination or otherwise exclusion from participation in the project on the basis of gender, age, income or social status, ethnicity or religion, or any other discriminatory basis</p> <p>4.3) The verification team hereby confirms by its observation and discussion/interviews with community/stakeholders that the project has recorded significant progress since inception and subsequent validation to improve community livelihoods without undermining their needs, priorities or food security.</p> <p>4.4) The verification team hereby confirms through a community meeting that the participants have access to their Plan Vivos, Plan Vivo project areas are clearly mapped and known to the community/stakeholders. During the on-site visit, it is observed that the land use plan maps are displayed at KMFRI office, and it is also confirmed that they are the same as that depicted in the project PDD. Legal documents are kept in possession MPCO. Plan Vivos boundaries are demarcated through beacons and sign posts. Interestingly the locals understood what the boundaries are. Plan vivo copies also exist in the language commonly understood by the community.</p> <p>4.5) The validated PDD is silent on Grievance mechanism, hence the team could not verify its compliance against the standard, it is raised as corrective action CAR 04 Major.</p>		
<b>B. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	<p><u>Major CAR04</u></p> <p>Many sections of the validated PDD is not as per the PDD template and Grievance mechanism of the project is not described in the PDD (refer to Plan vivo standard 4.13 &amp; 4.14).</p>		
<b>D. ACES Response</b>	<p><u>Major CAR04:</u></p> <p>The PDD currently conforms to the 2008 template, however it is recognised that this should be updated to the 2013 template. This update has been completed and the revised PDD is attached with this response (please see attached document '07 Mikoko Pamoja revised</p>		



	<p>PDD May 2019'. This has been submitted to Plan Vivo for review.</p> <p>The grievance mechanism (previously outlined in the Mikoko Pamoja CBO constitution, provided in Annex 4 of the published PDD) has been included in section E3. Project Level Governance of the revised PDD. It is referred to here as 'dispute resolution'.</p> <p>The Complaints Committee is not a constituted body as such; a framework for this committee in the event of grievances being raised is outlined in the PDD in accordance with the Plan Vivo standard 4.12, 4.13 and 4.14. The individual representatives will change as elected community members and staff rotate, but the committee would be expected to consist of the Chair of ACES, the MPCO Project Coordinator, and elected representatives of both Gazi and Makongeni villages as appropriate, including the MPCO Chair.</p> <p>No grievances have been received by the Project Coordinator.</p>
<b>E. Status</b>	<i>CLOSED</i>

<b>QUANTIFYING AND MONITORING ECOSYSTEM SERVICES</b>	
<b>Requirement:</b> project generates real and additional ecosystem service benefits that are demonstrated with credible quantification and monitoring	
<b>Verification Questions:</b> 2, 3 and 4	
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)
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)
5.3	A clear and consistent Standard Operating Procedure (SOP), or equivalent, for remote sensing analysis has been elaborated by the project coordinator.
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.
5.5	Ecosystem services forming the basis of the Plan Vivo project are still additional (5.4).
5.6	To avoid double counting of ecosystem services, the project interventions are not being used for any other project or initiative (5.14)
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): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corrective actions and contingency plans are described when performance targets have not been met</li> <li>• The validity and assumptions of the technical specifications have been correctly tested</li> <li>• Communities have been actively participating in monitoring activities</li> <li>• Monitoring has been regularly shared and discussed it with the participants</li> </ul>
<b>A. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>Carbon accounting methodologies used are as specified in the Technical Specification approved by the Plan Vivo Technical Advisory Committee for calculating the carbon benefit resulting from the project. The accounting system for carbon stocks uses two approaches:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Field measurements - A combination of scientific measurements from the field (including tree diameter and weights of trees and roots), and peer-recognised methodologies. Field measurements were used to derive allometric equations for above and below ground carbon, which were then used to calculate carbon stocks. Findings were subject to scientific scrutiny within the MP team and partners. Expected impacts of unlicensed cutting (prevailing deforestation rates) were estimated from peer-reviewed evidence, aerial photographs and evidence from the field.</li> <li>2. Ecosystem services benefits, Socio-economic impacts and Environmental and biodiversity impacts are monitored by PP in the project. Monitoring is arranged and recorded by the MPCO, under the direct supervision and with technical assistance from the MPSG. Annual monitoring is conducted to assess the level of degradation while carbon sequestration rates is assessed every three years. Annual reports contains sufficient information on the activity based monitoring. Stakeholder meeting serves as feedback to have the contingency plan and mitigation action. Activity based monitoring is done on continuous basis as part of daily work and is compiles into reports, during the onsite audit the verification team has reviewed the data sheet filled by the MPCO/MPSG for the conformance. They are verified to be having sufficient knowledge on the monitoring process and its implications on the project; since the members are from the village/community the effective participation is ensured.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• for calculations of carbon gain due to avoided deforestation and degradation: i) a low deforestation rate is assumed and ii) it is assumed there would be no degradation in the absence of the project (as degradation estimates are unreliable)</li> <li>• mangroves deposit large stocks of below ground carbon through live and dead roots, and which, over time, create a large carbon sink as peat and soil. MP has allocated below ground carbon stocks to only the first 60cm of soil. Peat deposits extend far below this</li> </ul> <p>A baseline was calculated for each of the three project activities. In</p>

	<p>each case, peer reviewed methodologies were used with published data, supported by direct measurement.</p> <p>Annual reports contain sufficient information on the activity based monitoring. Activity based monitoring is done on continuous basis as part of daily work and is compiled into monthly reports, during the onsite audit the verification team has reviewed the data sheet for the conformance. They are verified to be having sufficient knowledge on the monitoring process and its implications on the project, since the members are from the village/community the effective participation is ensured.</p>		
<b>B. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	<p><u>Minor CAR05</u> PP is requested to submit records/documents/evidence for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for monitoring i.e., conducting ground-truthing activities to collect real data and field measurements from the project sites that are used in quantification of climate benefits (Refer section 5.3 of PV standard)</li> <li>b. System adopted to avoid double counting of ecosystem services (Refer section 5.14 of PV standard)</li> <li>c. A monitoring plan being implemented is correct and a system for checking its robustness is in place (Refer section 5.9; 7.2.; 7.3 of PV standard):</li> </ul> <p><u>Major CAR06</u> PP is requested to submit the monitored data/records for the monitored Ecosystem services as indicated in page no.25 of the PDD.</p>		
<b>D. ACES Response</b>	<p><u>Minor CAR05:</u></p> <p>(a) SOPs for permanent plot monitoring have been attached alongside this document. Please see attached file: '08 Permanent Plot monitoring SoP'.</p> <p>(b) MPCO, ACES and KMFRI are familiar with current Kenyan climate policy including NDCs and local government and community environmental initiatives. Section G2 (Additionality and Environmental Integrity) of the revised Project design Document expands on national and sub-national-level policies and initiatives in Kenya. These, and emerging policies and initiatives, are monitored. To date, no overlap has emerged between Mikoko Pamoja's activities and those of governmental or other bodies which would lead to double counting of ecosystem services.</p> <p>MPCO, ACES and KMFRI representatives regularly attend</p>		

	<p>environmental and climate-focussed conferences, workshops and other activities at which overlapping activities and policies would be evident.</p> <p>(c) The monitoring plan is included in the technical specifications (refer to existing technical specifications section 9; p29 and published PDD section G). This has been accepted by Plan Vivo as sufficiently robust on approval of the PDD, and recent consultation with Plan Vivo has confirmed that the monitoring plan is sufficient to be considered correct and robust.</p> <p>FAR03: Any change in project activities relating to seagrass will be submitted to Plan Vivo by way of a revised PDD. This is not expected until late in 2019 and will so is not part of the revised PDD submitted concurrent to this verification. No project activities relating to seagrass monitoring will be carried out until the revised PDD has been accepted by Plan Vivo.</p> <p><u>Major CAR06:</u></p> <p>Ecosystem service monitoring data have been attached alongside this document as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Biodiversity impacts: please see attached document '05 Mikoko Pamoja Faunal Survey summary results'</li> <li>(ii) Water availability impacts: please see attached document '09 Water availability monitoring'</li> <li>(iii) Soil conservation impacts: please see attached document '06 Surface elevation change (sedimentation), Gazi'</li> </ul> <p>FAR04: The requested documents (remote sensing SOPs and remote sensing results) reflecting remote sensing conducted as part of monitoring will be submitted to the verifier in the next verification.</p>
<b>E. Status</b>	<i>CLOSED</i>

<b>RISK MANAGEMENT</b>
<b>Requirement:</b> The project manages risks effectively throughout its design and implementation.
<b>Verification Questions: 2 and 4</b>
<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</p>

<p>and is a minimum of 10% of climate services expected <b>(6.3)</b></p> <p><b>6.3</b> 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? <b>(6.3)</b></p>			
<p><b>A. Findings (describe)</b></p>	<p>6.1 Leakage can be defined as net changes of anthropogenic emissions by GHG sources that occur outside the project or program boundary, but are attributable to the project or program due to being displaced by project activities. The project acknowledges that it faces serious threat of deforestation legal and illegal cutting. One of the mitigation measure proposed by is "Establishments of <i>Casuarina</i> woodlots to provide long-term sources of fuel wood and building poles for local people as part of the leakage mitigation strategy for MP". It is envisaged they will also provide income for the project. They are not part of the carbon benefit activities and will not be used for issuing carbon certificates. But the list of such measures initiated and its effectiveness verified by the PP is not evident for this monitoring period (raised as a Major CAR 07).</p>		
	<p>6.2 The project is applying a 15% risk buffer (non-permanence) against the climate benefit claimed. Since this approach was used in the validated project documents, which the project achieved during initial registration, the Verification team is convinced that the validated approach used for the verification is appropriate and hence accepted. i.e., An equivalent proportion of carbon credits will not be sold each year. Anticipated carbon credits generated are approximately 2,500 tCO<sub>2</sub> per annum. 15% of these will be deducted as a risk buffer, giving saleable credits of approximately 2,125 tCO<sub>2</sub> per annum.</p>		
	<p>6.3 The project maintains a buffer account to which 15% of total credits are allocated by the project</p>		
<p><b>B. Conformance</b></p>	<p>Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>C. Corrective Actions (describe)</b></p>	<p><u>Major CAR07</u> Leakage mitigation measures initiated and its effectiveness verified by the PP is not evident for this monitoring period</p>		
<p><b>D. ACES Response</b></p>	<p><u>Major CAR07:</u>  Leakage is addressed by the project by maintenance of the <i>Casuarina</i> woodlots to provide long-term sources of fuel wood and building poles for local people. This resource has been utilised by harvesting by the community members for timber and firewood at affordable prices determined by the community through consultative meetings.  The importance of verifying the effectiveness of leakage mitigation</p>		

	<p>measures is recognised, although monitoring this by indicators of forest health and social surveys is widely recognised among PES programs to be challenging due to social and technical barriers. However at present, it is assumed that the Casuarina woodlots, planted in numbers considered sufficient to compensate for the previous level of logging in the mangroves, are effective.</p> <p>ACES, as project coordinators, monitor advances and novel use of technology that could potentially be used in a leakage monitoring scheme and may in the future initiate an interdisciplinary monitoring program to assess leakage and the effectiveness of leakage mitigation measures.</p> <p>In addition, a recent study on cutting rates in the forest surrounding the activity areas has not found concerning levels of cutting, suggesting that leakage is not occurring in the immediate forest area.</p>
<b>E. Status</b>	<i>CLOSED</i>

<b>PES AGREEMENT AND BENEFIT SHARING</b>	
<b>Requirement:</b> project shares benefits equitably and transact ecosystem services benefits through clear PES Agreements with performance-based incentives.	
<b>Verification Questions: 1, 2 and 6</b>	
<p>7.1. Procedures for entering into a PES Agreement with participants are being applied correctly <b>(8.2)</b></p> <p>7.2. Participant s are entering into PES agreement voluntarily and according to the principle of free, prior, informed consent, in an appropriate language and format <b>(8.3)</b></p> <p>7.3. PES Agreements are not removing, diminishing or threatening participant’s land tenure <b>(8.4)</b></p> <p>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 <b>(8.8; 8.9; 8.10)</b></p> <p>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 <b>(8.12)</b></p>	
<b>A. Findings (describe)</b>	<p>7.1 The Plan Vivo 2013 Standard specifies that PES agreements signed between the project coordinator and project participants should address the following points: the quantity and type of ecosystem services transacted, interventions to be implemented, the plan vivo the PES agreement relates to and its date of approval and implementation, performance targets and monitoring schedule, amount of payment or benefit to be received, consequences if performance targets not met, PES period, impacts of the PES agreement on participant rights to resource usage, the deduction of a</p>

	<p>risk buffer, and a grievance mechanism.</p> <p>7.2 Based on interviews conducted during the on-site visit, the audit team can confirm that the project participants are entering in to the PES agreement voluntarily with the informed consent of MPCO and local Government.</p> <p>7.3 The project's PES agreements are not removing, diminishing or threatening participants' rights, in fact the members know their rights and have their land tenure is secured – it is as per the standard and it is in compliance</p> <p>7.4 It is evident that fair and equitable sharing mechanism is in place by way of written agreement among the parties involved. The project does not involve cash disbursal; instead the amount is deposited in an account managed by the beneficiaries without the intervention of Project Coordinator (ACES). Checks and balances are in place for the fund to reach the end beneficiary, during on-site interview with the PP/stakeholders it is observed that no dispute/complaint related to fund management has surfaced.</p> <p>7.5 The PP to demonstrate how the committed delivery percentage (62%) of the proceeds of sales of PVC is continuously met (raised as Minor CAR 07).</p>		
<b>B. Conformance</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>C. Corrective Actions (describe)</b>	<p><u>Minor CAR07</u></p> <p>The PP to demonstrate how the committed delivery percentage (i.e., 62%) of the proceed of sales of PVC is continuously met.</p>		
<b>D. ACES Response</b>	<p><u>Minor CAR07:</u></p> <p>Evidence of spending by Mikoko Pamoja Community organisation is reported in the annual reports in section I. Allocation of Costs. This details a breakdown of spending towards community development projects, labour, project workers' salary and expenses. Receipts for expenditure are also provided in Annex II of each annual report.</p>		
<b>E. Status</b>	<i>CLOSED</i>		

## Audit Plan

### Day 1

Time	Activity	Responsibility
10.00- 10:15	Opening meeting	Lead Auditor
10:15-1:00	Documentation Review	Lead Auditor and technical expert
1:00-1:30	Lunch	-
1:30-18:00	Onsite visit to sample plots, conservation area and stakeholder consultation and visit the project area to verify project boundaries with a handheld GPS, confirm baseline conditions, assess tree health and planting locations, and gather supporting evidence through stakeholder interviews	Lead Auditor and technical expert

### Day 2 and Day 3

Time	Activity	Responsibility
9.00-1:00	Onsite visit to sample plots, conservation area and stakeholder consultation and visit the project area to verify project boundaries with a handheld GPS, confirm baseline conditions, assess tree health and planting locations, and gather supporting evidence through stakeholder interviews	Lead Auditor and technical expert
1:00 -1:30	Lunch	-
1:30 -16:30	Onsite visit and stakeholder consultation - continue	Lead Auditor and technical expert
16:30 - 17:00	Closing meeting	Lead Auditor and technical expert



**ANNEX 1****VALIDATION TABLE****Description of Area to be validated:** Not applicable**Date of Validation:** Not applicable**Technical Specification:** Not applicable**Validation Findings:** Not applicable**F. Findings  
(describe)**

Not applicable

**G. Conformance**

Yes

☐

No

☐

N/A

☒**H. Corrective  
Actions  
(describe)**

Not applicable

**I. (Insert Project  
Coordinator's  
Name)  
Response**

Not applicable

**J. Status**

Not applicable

**The Verifier: (Name in Capital Letters)****Signature: Dr.D.SIDDARAMU (Lead Auditor)**  
**Dr.R.MADHUKAR (Auditor)****Date: 28/06/2019**

## APPENDIX

### 1. Photographs











## 2. Documents list

Document	Description
1. Maps of project area with GPS location of plots under management	GPS maps as indicated in Requirements 4.8 and 4.11 of Plan Vivo Standard (2013), page 15.
2. Map of leakage buffer area (where applicable)	Satellite images, spatial map, Google Earth maps
3. Proof of Land Tenure Ownership	Written Land Purchase Agreements or equivalent
4. Memorandum of Understanding between Project Coordinator and other coordinating entities where applicable	Written Agreement as Described in Requirement 3.2 of Plan Vivo Standard (2013), page 11.
5. Forest inventory or Farm Standard Operating Procedures	Forest Management Plan, Harvesting or Farm Management Manual
6. Original planting or forest inventory data collection sheets	Excel Spreadsheet or equivalent
7. Payment Of Ecosystem Services (PES) Agreement	Written agreement between the Project Coordinator and Participating Communities
8. Records of PES Payments	Handwritten receipts, bank statements, disbursement forms or equivalent
9. Biodiversity Database where applicable	List of sightings of flora and fauna (bird species, insects included)
10. Documentation of community acceptance and approval of existing Benefit Sharing Agreements where applicable	Written agreement between the Project Coordinator and the Participating Communities. This might be included in the PES Agreement (see above)
11. Documentation of free, prior, and informed consent from identified stakeholder groups	Written statement by the Participating Communities or Smallholders. This might accompany the minutes of community or stakeholder meetings. Alternatively, it might be included in the PES Agreement (see above)
12. Records of community participatory design activities	Written records of community or stakeholder participation in awareness-raising or training meetings. Photos, videos.
13. Where applicable, documentation of agreement with local or national authorities demonstrating their involvement in the development of the project	Memorandum of Understanding with the local forest agency, Designated National Authority, Ministry of Environment or equivalent
14. Carbon calculations model	Excel Spreadsheet or equivalent

<b>15. Project's Database</b>	Access Files, Excel Spreadsheet or equivalent
<b>16. Records of Grievance Mechanism</b>	Handwritten minutes, letters or complains, text messages, database entries or equivalent
<b>17. Records of Project's Financial Accounts</b>	Financial statements, bank statements and budgets
<b>18. Monitoring Manual</b>	Written guide to monitoring activities and/or equivalent documents for training purposes
<b>19. Socio-economic baseline scenario where applicable (for projects verifying under the 2013 Version of the Standard)</b>	Survey results, written report, socio-economic data analysis
<b>20. All documents referenced in the Project Design Document (PDD) or Technical Specifications</b>	Hard copies or electronic versions
<b>21. Legal Documents</b>	Evidence that the project is still in compliance with the laws and regulations of the Host Country.



### 3. Attendance list Showing community persons/stakeholders interviewed

EPIC Sustainability

#### ATTENDANCE LIST

Title of the project: *Mikoko Pamoja*  
 Name of the client: *Association for Coastal Ecosystem Services (ACES)*  
 Date of visit: *24/02/2019*

	Name	Designation /Company	Signature	
			Opening	Closing
1	Dr D. Siddaramu	auditor, EPIC	<i>D. Siddaramu</i>	
2	Joseph M. Wanjau	MPCO	<i>Joseph M. Wanjau</i>	
3	Riziki M. MABWA	MPCO	<i>Riziki M. MABWA</i>	
4	Anne Wanjau	Social impacts officer MPCO	<i>Anne Wanjau</i>	
5	Fatuma Mwakundi	MPCO	<i>Fatuma Mwakundi</i>	
6	HAESA M. ZUGA	MPCO Secretary	<i>HAESA M. ZUGA</i>	
7	MWANAKWISI BAKARI	MPCO	<i>MWANAKWISI BAKARI</i>	
8	ZAIRAB KHOMU	MPCO	<i>ZAIRAB KHOMU</i>	
9	ZUBEN DZIKO	MPCO	<i>ZUBEN DZIKO</i>	
10	ALI ROMAN	MPCO	<i>ALI ROMAN</i>	
11	UJHMAN RADIK	MPCO	<i>UJHMAN RADIK</i>	
12	ALI SALIM SHUFA	CHAIRMAN MPCO	<i>ALI SALIM SHUFA</i>	
13	MWANAKOMBO BAKARI	MPCO	<i>MWANAKOMBO BAKARI</i>	
14	MWINGI IDI	MPCO	<i>MWINGI IDI</i>	
15	HASSAN B. MALICHU	MPCO	<i>HASSAN B. MALICHU</i>	

## EPIC Sustainability

## ATTENDANCE LIST

Title of the project: *Mukoko Panjoja*Name of the client: *ACES*Date of visit: *25/02/2019 - 27/02/2019*

	Name	Designation / Company	Signature	
			Opening	Closing
1.	<i>Dr D. Siddaramu</i>	<i>Assistant EPIC</i>	<i>D. S.</i>	
2.	<i>Anne Nangini</i>	<i>MPCO</i>	<i>Anne</i>	
3.	<i>Joseph Mwakima</i>	<i>MPCO</i>	<i>Joseph</i>	
4.	<i>Mwanakombi Rishid</i>		<i>Mwanakombi</i>	
5.	<i>Ramadhani M. Mwangi</i>	<i>Community</i>	<i>R. M.</i>	
6.	<i>Uthman Jadir</i>	<i>MPCO</i>	<i>Uthman</i>	
7.	<i>KILALO RAMADHAN</i>	<i>GAZI</i>	<i>Kilalo</i>	
8.	<i>ALI SALIM</i>	<i>GAZI</i>	<i>Ali</i>	
9.	<i>Salim Abdalla</i>	<i>Makongeni</i>	<i>Salim</i>	
10.	<i>Masa Mwanika</i>	<i>Makongeni</i>	<i>Masa</i>	
11.	<i>Lucy Mwangi</i>	<i>HTA MAKONGENI</i>	<i>Lucy</i>	
12.	<i>Bersingone C. Machinga</i>	<i>FORESTER</i>	<i>Bersingone</i>	
13.	<i>KALBOIG</i>	<i>KMPR</i>	<i>Kalboig</i>	
14.	<i>Mwanakombi Dina</i>	<i>County Govt of Kiwile</i>	<i>Mwanakombi</i>	
15.	<i>Mwambi Mwanakombi</i>	<i>TECHNICAL EXPERT</i>	<i>Mwambi</i>	



Date of visit: 25/02/2019 - 27/02/2019

[illegible]