



Plan Vivo Validation Report
Document Prepared by Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc.

Project Name:	Yaeda-Eyasi Landscape REDD Project
Plan Vivo Project #	PV_2013_011
Aster Global Project Number:	20092.00
Report Issuance Date:	15 February 2022

Project Proponent	Carbon Tanzania
Contact Name:	David Beroff
Mailing Address	
Phone	+255 759 360 114
Email	projects@carbontanzania.com

Offset Validation/Verification Body:	
Name:	Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc.
Corporate Offices:	3800 Clermont Ave NW North Lawrence, Ohio 44666
Phone:	+01.330.294.1242

Name of Reviewers:

Name	Role	Email	Phone Number
Shawn McMahon	Lead Validator/Verifier	smcmahon@asterglobal.com	330-294-1242 Ext. 103
Richard Scharf	V/V Team Member	rscharf@asterglobal.com	330-294-1242, Ext. 104
Sandesh Shrestha	V/V Team Member	sshrestha@asterglobal.com	330-294-1242
Caitlin Sellers	V/V Team Member	csellers@asterglobal.com	330-294-1242, Ext. 107
Taek Joo Kim	V/V Team Member	tkim@asterglobal.com	330-294-1242 Ext. 110
Mansfield Fisher	V/V Team Member	mfisher@asterglobal.com	330-294-1242 Ext. 112
Matthew Perkowski	V/V Team Member	mperkowski@asterglobal.com	330-294-1242 Ext. 105
Caris Lyons	V/V Team Member	clyons@asterglobal.com	330-294-1242
Matthew Campbell	V/V Team Member	mcampbell@asterglobal.com	330-294-1242
Exaud	Translator	N/A	+255 785 678 166
Barbara Toole O'Neil	Senior Internal Reviewer	btooleoneil@asterglobal.com	330-294-1242 ext. 108
Janice McMahon	QA/QC	jmcMahon@asterglobal.com	330-294-1242 ext. 102

Date of Review: 30 August 2021 – 4 February 2022

Project Name: Yaeda-Eyasi Redd

Project Description: The Yaeda-Eyasi Landscape REDD project represents an extension of the previously validated and verified Yaeda REDD project under Plan Vivo. As a result of the extension, the project now includes 12 villages representing two distinct communities, the Hadzabe and Datooga communities. The Executive Summary in the PDD states “The aim of the Yaeda-Eyasi Landscape REDD project is to reduce emissions from deforestation whilst supporting local development and habitat conservation. This project and its associated carbon revenues support anti-poaching, monitoring, education and medical provision ensuring all members of the villages, hunter-gatherer Hadzabe and pastoralist Datooga communities in Domanga, Dumbachand, Endamaghan, Endanyawish, Endesh, Eshkesh, Jobaj, Mbuganyekundu, Mikocheni, Mongo wa Mono, Qangdend and Yaeda Chini villages receive benefits. By working in conjunction with traditional leaders, the elected village, ward and district governments and community members, Carbon Tanzania (CT) and Ujamaa Community Resource Team (UCRT) have created a unique community planned and operated Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) project across the Yaeda-Eyasi landscape. Successful avoided deforestation will be achieved through a series of interventions including reinforcing the implementation of the approved village land use

plans and associated village by-laws, improving forest conservation and management activities which address the primary driver of deforestation, shifting agriculture.

Participating communities will benefit from increased income stemming from the PES element of the project. Beyond the surplus revenue from the project's generation and sale of carbon offsets, there are significant, additional livelihood impacts. For these communities there is a very real and substantial overlap between environmental and socioeconomic impacts. As a population whose livelihood depends on the land, the Hadza will benefit from the improved habitat resulting from project activities. Preventing deforestation, thereby preserving the natural habitat on which the Hadza and Datooga communities depend, will result in a sustained supply of food, grazing and other essential items and ecosystem services. Additionally, project activities related to enforcing the land use plan will serve the purpose of protecting the watershed within the project area for the benefit of the people and wildlife."

List of Principal documents reviewed (including list of sites visited and individuals/groups interviewed): For a full list of documents received during the course of the validation please see Annex 2.

Visited sites: The Validation and Verification Body (VVB) visited both communities in the Yaeda and Eyasi Valleys. The communities visited include: Yaeda-Chini, Hadza Community at the Mongo wa Mono Camp, Mongo wa Mono, Domanga, Hadza Community in Domanga, Hadza Community in Endamaghan, Endesh, and Endamaghan. In addition to visiting various villages and communities, the VVB also traversed large sections of the project area.

List of individuals interviewed:

Individual	Affiliation	Role	Date
David Beroff	Carbon Tanzania	Project Operations Manager	9 September 2021 – 11 September 2021
Regina Safari	Carbon Tanzania	Hadzabe Community Coordinator	9 September 2021 – 10 September 2021
Isack Bryson	Carbon Tanzania	Yaeda Valley Community Coordinator	9 September 2021 – 11 September 2021
German Qaghay Sedoyeka	Carbon Tanzania	Eyasi Valley Community Coordinator	10 September 2021 – 11 September 2021
	Village Chairman of Yaeda Chini		9 September 2021
	Ward Officer – Yaeda Chini		9 September 2021
Moses Sigiligi	Hadza Community	VGS	9 September 2021
Loveness Aba	Hadza Community	Hadza Secretary	9 September 2021
Leocardia Kampala	Hadza Community	VGS Coordinator	9 September 2021

Samuel Musunya	Hadza Community	VGS	9 September 2021
Moshi Issa	Hadza Community	VGS	9 September 2021
Senero Mathias	Domanga Hadza	VGS	9 September 2021
Salim Mbogo	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Asman Magandula	Hadza Community	Educational Board	9 September 2021
Moi Asman	Hadza Community	Previous Hadza Chairman	9 September 2021
Milino Zephania	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Helena Kampala	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Eliwaza Stephano	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Maria Marico	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Elizabeth Mathias	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Eliwaza Alphonse	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Socki Issah	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Bertha Jumanne	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Neema Issah	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Bertha Jumapili	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Martha Issah	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Suliana Athuman	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Liliana Philipo	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Evaline Philipo	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Regina Salimu	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Stephano Gimbi	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Gimbi Stephano	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Kitanda Mathias	Hadza Community		9 September 2021

Alphonse Mahuzo	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Samuel Myungu	Hadza Community	VGS	9 September 2021
Baraka Robala	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Athuman Maweshi	Hadza Community	VGS	9 September 2021
Salim Mgunga	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Adanow Marti	Hadza Community	VGS	9 September 2021
Simon Moses	Hadza Community	VGS	9 September 2021
Mathayo Ruben	Hadza Community	VGS	9 September 2021
Zakayo Martii	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Rajabu Issa	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Mahisa Gineyi	Hadza Community	VGS	9 September 2021
Kenedy Moshi	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Gimbi Saidi	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Joveni Paulo	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Iyilo Sillo	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Aroni Mkalanya	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Harmis Lokola	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Joel Mosses	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Bumanne Makunya	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Shabani	Hadza Community	VGS	9 September 2021
Eliya John	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Jakaya Mussa	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Maloba Masany	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Kizale Kampala	Hadza Community		9 September 2021

Thomas Simon	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Sindamo Davidi	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Emmanuel Moshi	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Adam Diphonce	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Josephat Joseph	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Jones Moshi	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Joshua Onerro	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Magadula Juma	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Thomas Madulu	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Magadula Kiral	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Salimu Ugunga	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Amori	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Zephara Moshi	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Joseph Yaeda	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Issack Mogombe	Hadza Community	VGS	9 September 2021
Yaeda Ahofa	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Ramadhani Waien	Hadza Community		9 September 2021
Ezekial	Domanga Hadza	VGS/Education Board Chairman	10 September 2021
Emanuel	Domanga Hadza	Student supported by Education Funds	10 September 2021
Pili	Domanga Hadza	Community Coordinator/VGS Coordinator	10 September 2021
Gidabuger	Endesh Village	VGS	10 September 2021 – 11 September 2021
Lazaro Tluway	Endesh Village	Teacher in Endesh Village	10 September 2021
Samwel Yohani	Endesh Village	Teacher in Endesh Village	10 September 2021
Gidongurri	Endesh Village	Member of Village Government	10 September 2021

Geweye	Endesh Village	Village Chairman/Traditional Elder	10 September 2021
Fred	Endesh Village	Member of Village Government/Acting Village Officer/Headmaster of School	10 September 2021
Malombo	Endesh Village	Youth VGS	10 September 2021
Joseph Marco	Endamaghan		11 September 2021
Hadija L. Kaiza	Endamaghan		11 September 2021
Shimba Isaya	Endamaghan		11 September 2021
Dalali Julias	Endamaghan		11 September 2021
Bernardo Murus	Endamaghan		11 September 2021
Emanuel Bura	Endamaghan		11 September 2021
Martin Ciadiye	Endamaghan		11 September 2021
Martha Reginald	Endamaghan		11 September 2021
Juliana Lawi	Endamaghan		11 September 2021
Paulo Oambanyega	Endamaghan		11 September 2021
Dalldi Ero	Endamaghan		11 September 2021

All the names presented above were collected during formal, structured interviews. However, the VVB also conducted informal, unstructured interviews in all communities visited, in which some interviewee names were not collected.

Description of field visit: The site visit was conducted from 9 September to 11 September of 2021. Two Aster Global Environmental Solutions Inc., herein referred to as Aster Global, staff visited the project site. As this is a project expansion the VVB visited both communities that were included in the original project and the new communities that are being added during this revalidation. The VVB met and conducted interviews with village governments, community members, Village Game Scouts (VGS), and Carbon Tanzania staff throughout the site visit. The VVB conducted interviews with community members in groups and individually. Additionally, to ensure an open dialogue with community members the VVB conducted interviews in mixed groups of youth, men, and women but also separated groups by gender, age, leadership position. During the 3 days of the site visit, the VVB collected primary evidence of the importance of the protected forest areas as we saw numerous Datooga grazing cattle throughout the project area and Hadzabe community members demonstrated many of their traditional livelihood activities such as honey collection,

hunting, and food gathering activities.

Validation Opinion: After completion of a site visit and review of all project information, procedures, calculations, and supporting documentation, Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc., confirms the Project is accurate, consistent, and complies with all Plan Vivo Standard 2013 criteria. Aster Global confirms the *Yaeda-Eyasi Landscape PDD* has been implemented in accordance with Plan Vivo Standard 2013 criteria.

Table 1. Summary of draft report major and minor Corrective Actions

Theme	Major CARs	Minor CARs	Observations
Governance	13	0	0
Carbon	6	0	0
Ecosystem	0	0	0
Livelihoods	6	0	0

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

Theme	Conformance of Draft Report	Conformance of Final Report or Forward Actions Required
Governance	Yes	Yes
Carbon	Yes	Yes
Ecosystem	Yes	Yes
Livelihoods	Yes	Yes

Table 3– Summary of open Forward Actions (if any)

Forward Action Requirement (FAR)	Description	Process to Resolve	Time Frame to be Closed By
1 FAR has been issued by the VVB related to updating the Revenue Division between villages in the PES Agreement.	<i>As a result of the validation in which the VVB reviewed the accuracy of the Revenue Division between communities, the VVB found discrepancies between the updated Revenue Division in the PDD and the signed PES agreement.</i>	<i>To resolve this FAR, Carbon Tanzania is required to implement a process to update the PES agreement, specifically the revenue division in the PES agreement. The process must satisfy all FPIC requirements within the Plan Vivo Standard, 2013 and Carbon Tanzania must ensure that a participatory process is used. In order to close this FAR, a new PES agreement with the participating villages must be signed and the process of doing this must be participatory and comply with all FPIC principles. The closing of this FAR will be completed by Plan Vivo.</i>	<i>This FAR must be closed prior to the issuance of any PVCs from Plan Vivo.</i>

Theme	1. Effective and Transparent Project Governance
<i>Ensuring that the project meets requirements 3.1-3.16 of the Plan Vivo Standard (2013)</i>	
A. Requirement	<p>1.1 Administrative capabilities</p> <p>Is there a legal and organisational framework in place that has the sufficient capacity and a range of skills to implement all the administrative requirements of the project? Aspects of this framework may include:</p> <p>1.1.1 A legal entity (project coordinator) that is able to enter into sale agreements with multiple producers or producer groups for carbon services</p> <p>1.1.2 Standard sale agreement templates for the provision of carbon services</p> <p>1.1.3 Systems for maintaining transparent and audited financial accounts able to the secure receipt, holding and disbursement of payments to producers</p> <p>1.1.4 All necessary legal permissions to carry out the intended project activities</p> <p>1.1.5 Mechanisms for participants to discuss issues associated with the design and running of the project</p> <p>1.1.6 Procedures for addressing any conflicts that may arise</p> <p>1.1.7 Ability to produce reports required by Plan Vivo on a regular basis and communicate regularly with Plan Vivo</p>
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	<p>Organizational and administrative capacity may be demonstrated through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A record of managing other projects - especially those involving the receipt, safeguarding and management of funds and disbursement of these to smallholders/community groups • Project staff who can explain the legal status of the organisation and its management and financial structure i.e. how funds will be held and transferred – backed up by evidence of setting up bank accounts and record-keeping systems etc. • The views of others who have worked with the organisation in the past (such as government, other project partners or other NGOs) • A visibly efficient and functioning office with all necessary staff
C. Findings (describe)	<p><i>1.1.1 As described in Sections C3 and I1 of the PDD, Carbon Tanzania is a legal entity within Tanzania and was the original Project Coordinator for the pre-expanded project which was validated and verified under Plan Vivo. Additionally, Carbon Tanzania has the legal authority through contracts and MOUs with each participating village to enter into sale agreements for the GHG emission reductions achieved through the implementation of the project intervention.</i></p> <p><i>1.1.2 Standardized PES Agreements have been used for each village within the project.</i></p> <p><i>1.1.3 Throughout the course of the joint validation and verification the VVB requested transparent and audited financial records to ensure the project was in compliance with the signed PES agreements and Plan</i></p>

	<p><i>Vivo Standard, 2013. The VVB found no evidence that the project coordinator does not have a transparent and auditable system for maintaining financial accounts. Additionally, Carbon Tanzania manages multiple carbon projects for various registries/programs and has dedicated staff to ensuring transparent financial accounting systems are maintained.</i></p> <p><i>1.1.4 As previously stated Carbon Tanzania is a legally registered Tanzanian company, headquartered in Arusha, Tanzania. Carbon Tanzania works closely with the ward and district level governments to ensure the government is aware of their work. Through the signed PES Agreements with each village/community, Carbon Tanzania has the legal right to the GHG emission reductions generated through the implementation of the project intervention.</i></p> <p><i>1.1.5 During the site visit, the VVB interviewed numerous project participants to better understand their relationship with Carbon Tanzania. It was clear that the communities have a good working relationship with Carbon Tanzania and that it is a relationship built on trust. The VVB confirms that through three Carbon Tanzania staff who live and work in the participating communities, project participants have an informal channel to access project information and discuss issues associated with the design and running of the project. More formal channels also exist and are described in the PES Agreement. Carbon Tanzania is required by the PES Agreement to provide bi-annual reports to the project communities and hold bi-annual meetings to discuss ongoing needs of the communities, seek feedback on the ongoing project implementation, ensure the participatory process continues, and address any grievances.</i></p> <p><i>1.1.6 As described in 1.1.5 there are both formal and informal channels to address conflicts or grievances with the project implementation. In addition, the signed PES Agreements describe the formal grievance mechanism.</i></p> <p><i>1.1.7 The VVB reviewed multiple Annual Reports submitted by Carbon Tanzania for the pre-expanded project and also interviewed David Beroff regarding Carbon Tanzania's capacity. Furthermore, Carbon Tanzania manages two other large VCS-CCB projects and is able to meet all reporting requirements of these other standards. The VVB is reasonably assured that the Carbon Tanzania has the capacity to regularly produce the reports required by Plan Vivo and communicate effectively.</i></p>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>

E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<i>None</i>		
H. Status	<i>All CARs are closed.</i>		
A. Requirement	1.2 Technical capabilities Is the project through its staff or partners able to provide timely and good quality technical assistance to producers and/or communities in planning and implementing the productive, sustainable and economically viable forest management, silvicultural and agroforestry actions proposed for the project and for any additional livelihoods activities that are also planned?		
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	Technical capabilities may be determined through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions with project staff who should be able to define clearly who is responsible for the provision of technical support • Interviews with project staff to demonstrate that they are familiar with the content of project technical specifications e.g. species to be planted, spacing requirements, management systems and any potential issues • Feedback from farmers/communities who have been supported in the past • On-site evidence of project activities (possibly from other projects) that have benefited from technical support 		
C. Findings (describe)	<i>1.2 During the site visit the VVB spoke at length with Carbon Tanzania staff regarding their technical capacity. Additionally, the VVB met with the staff responsible for implementing the technical components of the PDD. It is important to note that as a REDD project the vast majority of the mapping and technical calculations is confirmed at validation and remains unchanged through the lifetime of the project. Importantly, the VVB confirmed that the Carbon Tanzania staff understand the Activity Based Monitoring System (ABMS) and are fully capable of ensuring the ABMS system is implemented as stated in the PDD. The VVB found no evidence during the site visit or desktop review that suggested the project coordinator would be unable to provide the technical assistance required for this project.</i>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			

G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<i>None</i>
H. Status	<i>All CARs are closed.</i>
A. Requirement	<p>1.3 Social capabilities</p> <p>Is the project, through its staff or partners able to demonstrate an understanding of the social conditions of the target groups/communities and likely implications of the project for these? This might include:</p> <p>1.3.1 A demonstrated ability to select appropriate target groups through stakeholder analysis and to understand the implications of the project for specific groups e.g. poor, women, socially disadvantaged etc.</p> <p>1.3.2 Groups/communities that are well-informed about the Plan Vivo System and the nature of carbon and ecosystem services</p> <p>1.3.3 Local groups/communities that can demonstrate effective self-governance and decision-making</p> <p>1.3.4 Well-established and effective participatory relationships between producers and the project coordinator</p> <p>1.3.5 Demonstrated ability to establish land-tenure rights through engaging with producers/communities and other relevant organisations</p> <p>1.3.6 Ability to consult with and interact with producers/communities on a sustained basis through participatory 'tools' and methods</p> <p>1.3.7 Established system for conflict resolution</p>
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	<p>Social capabilities may be determined through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Records/minutes/photographs of community meetings and training workshops etc. • Project staff able to explain (in line with PDD) how land tenure is checked by the project • Project staff and communities able to explain how communities/target groups were selected and involved in the development of the project and in the choice of activities • Project staff able to demonstrate that they are familiar with the communities/target groups and able to interact with them easily through meetings facilitated during the validation • Meetings held with specific target groups e.g. women, socially disadvantaged etc.
C. Findings (describe)	<p><i>1.3.1 During the site visit the audit interviewed multiple communities included in the project and found that Carbon Tanzania has utilized the traditional village governance structures that already existed in Tanzania prior to the implementation of the project. From interviews with the new communities included in the project expansion it was evident that it was the express wish of the new communities to join the project. Additionally, through interviews with Carbon Tanzania and participating communities the VVB is reasonably assured that the project understands the social conditions in the participating communities and appropriately target groups through stakeholder analysis. Carbon Tanzania is aided by a partnership with the Ujamaa Community Resource Team (UCRT), a non-profit organization with</i></p>

	<p><i>extensive experience working with villages and community groups. As a result of the formal partnership with UCRT, Carbon Tanzania is better able to understand local contexts and stakeholders.</i></p> <p><i>1.3.2 During the site visit the VVB conducted interviews in villages that were initially included in the original project and the villages that are part of the project expansion. In both sets of villages it was clear that the community members and leaders understood their responsibilities under the the signed PES agreements. Fundamentally, the communities understood that in order to receive payments under the Plan Vivo Standard they are required to ensure that their community forests (forest reserves and grazing areas) are not to be deforested. Additionally, they understood that it was there responsibility to prevent deforestation and that these actions are directly tied to PES payments.</i></p> <p><i>1.3.3 During the site visit and desktop review the VVB confirmed that the project has utilized the traditional local governance structures of Tanzania that are well understood and familiar for the communities. As a result of these traditional structures, the VVB is reasonably assured assured that these communities can effectively self-govern as they have been historically.</i></p> <p><i>1.3.4 The VVB conducted interviews with multiple Carbon Tanzania staff. Mr. Beroff is ultimately responsible for ensuring effective participatory relationships with the communities and the VVB witnessed numerous interactions with many different community members (village leaders, traditional leaders, and community members) that demonstrated a fair, respectful, and participatory relationship. Furthermore, Carbon Tanzania has hired three staff who are from the participating villages and live within the participating communities to assist the communities in understanding the project, implementing the project, and planning on how to use the revenue from the project. Isack Bryson is the Community Coordinator for the Yaeda Valley, German Oaghay Sedoyeka is the Community Coordinator for the Eyasi Valley and Regina Safari is the Community Coordinator for the Hadzabe (which has community members located throughout the project area). During the community interviews it was clear that the communities are comfortable with the local Carbon Tanzania staff and felt they had an open and participatory relationship with these staff members. The VVB condcuted lengthy interviews with Carbon Tanzania project staff in which the project staff all demonstrated a high level of understanding regarding the historical and cultural context of the project communities. Based on witnessed interactions between the project coordinator and participating communities and interviews with local communities, the VVB is reasonably assured that there is an effective participatory relationship between the participating communities and the project coordinator.</i></p>
--	--

	<p><i>1.3.5 As explained in Section C3 of the PDD, described by the project coordinator in interviews with the VVB, and described by the participating communities in interviews the VVB, the Village Land Use Plans were developed prior to the start of the carbon project. The VVB confirmed that the Village Land Use Plans (VLUPs) form the basis of land ownership in Tanzania and are effectively a title of ownership to the respective village. The Ujaama Community Resource Team (UCRT) is a project partner of the Carbon Tanzania and led the effort to work with the participating villages to develop the VLUPs that codify the participating villages land ownership. Based on the totality of this evidence the VVB is reasonably assured that the point 1.3.5 is satisfied.</i></p> <p><i>1.3.6 The PDD describes the participatory tools and methods that are used to interact and consult with participating communities and villages. Importantly, Carbon Tanzania has partnered with UCRT (described previously) who has significant experience working with villages and communities in Tanzania. UCRT has aided Carbon Tanzania in developing an in-depth understanding of the local context and social norms. Bi-annual meetings are held with each village and community to ensure a continued participatory relationship with the project. During the site visit, it was clear that beyond the formal channels there exist informal channels for the continued effective participation of communities with the project.</i></p> <p><i>1.3.7 The PES Agreements signed by each village, describe the formal grievance system and system for conflict resolution. Furthermore, the PDD describes a system for conflict resolution prior to the establishment of a formal grievance resulting in the application of the formal grievance process.</i></p>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<i>None</i>		
H. Status	<i>All CARs are closed.</i>		

A. Requirement	1.4 Monitoring and Reporting capabilities Does the project have an effective monitoring and reporting system in place that can regularly monitor progress and provide annual reports to the Plan Vivo Foundation according to the reporting schedule outlined in the PDD? 1.4.1 Accurately report progress, achievements and problems experienced 1.4.2 Transparently report sales figures and demonstrate resource allocation in the interest of target groups		
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	Monitoring and reporting systems and capabilities may be determined through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff and participating communities able to explain the monitoring system (how each of the indicators in the PDD will be monitored) • Records of any monitoring already undertaken e.g. baselines or other information • Project staff showing an understanding of the importance of annual reporting to Plan Vivo as a requirement for issuance of certificates • Demonstrated ability to produce simple reports (e.g. for other projects) 		
C. Findings (describe)	<p><i>1.4.1 As described in the PDD section G and Annex 2 of the PES Agreements, the ABMS system is the same system used in the previously validated project prior to the project expansion. The VVB jointly conducted the last verification of the project prior to the project expansion and confirmed that Carbon Tanzania has the capacity to accurately report progress, achievements, and problems experienced during the project implementation.</i></p> <p><i>1.4.2 During the site visit the VVB interviewed Mr. Beroff regarding the financial reporting capabilities of Carbon Tanzania and confirmed that Carbon Tanzania has staff dedicated to this task. Additionally as part of the verification of the pre-expanded project, the VVB reviewed the sales figures, receipts, and Annual Reports and confirmed that revenue transfers to the local communities and sales figures are accurately reported.</i></p>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<i>None</i>		
H. Status	<i>All CARs are closed.</i>		

Theme	2. Carbon Benefits
--------------	---------------------------

Ensuring that the project meets requirements 5.1-5.20 of the Plan Vivo Standard (2013)			
A. Requirement	2.1 Accounting methodology Have the carbon benefits been calculated using recognised carbon accounting methodologies and/or approved approaches and are the estimates of carbon uptake/storage conservative enough to take into account risks of leakage and reversibility?		
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	Check the carbon accounting methodology used including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of understanding of the methodology used amongst technical project staff • Whether all references and sources of information are available (include copies with the validation report if possible) • Whether the carbon accounting models are clear and transparent i.e. are the spreadsheets available and readily understandable? Can project staff answer and explain any technical questions about these? • Are local experts able to comment on the accounting methodology and on the sources of information used? 		
C. Findings (describe)	<i>Large parts of the carbon accounting methodology were deemed to be out of scope of the VVB as the carbon accounting methodology was already determined to be appropriate by Plan Vivo. However, Plan Vivo asked the VVB to confirm that the application of the forest inventory plots from the pre-expanded project were applicable to the larger, expanded project. Carbon Tanzania provided the VVB data from Global Forest Watch demonstrating that the entire project area falls within the same terrestrial eco-region, Southern Acacia-Commiphora bushland and thickets. Prior to the site visit the VVB used remotely sensed data to help determine the homogeneity of the project area. During the site visit the VVB traversed portions of the project area to aid the VVB in reaching reasonable assurance regarding the appropriateness the forest inventory plots for the entire project area. As a result of independent observations and third-party eco-region data the VVB is reasonably assured that the forest inventory plots are representative of the entire project area.</i>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<i>None</i>		
H. Status	<i>All CARs are closed.</i>		

A. Requirement	2.2 Baseline Are the carbon benefits of the project measured against a clear and credible carbon baseline (for each project intervention)?		
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	Check the baseline scenario in the technical specifications of the PDD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check that baseline measurements have been carried out and information properly recorded • Check that the information from the baseline matches that in the PDD/Technical specifications and corresponds to the situation on the ground (by discussing with local experts and others) 		
C. Findings (describe)	<i>Plan Vivo determined that review of the baseline was completely out of the scope of the validation and verification conducted by the VVB.</i>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<i>None</i>		
H. Status	<i>All CARs are closed.</i>		
A. Requirement	2.3 Additionality Are the carbon benefits additional? Would they be generated in the absence of the project? Will activities supported by the project happen without the availability of carbon finance?		
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	Assess whether the project simply owes its existence to legislative decrees or to commercial land-use initiatives that are likely to be economically viable in their own right i.e. without payments for ecosystem services. Also, assess whether without project funding there are social, cultural, technical, ecological or institutional barriers that would prevent project activities from taking place.		
C. Findings (describe)	<i>Plan Vivo determined that review of additionality was completely out of the scope of the validation and verification conducted by the VVB.</i>		
2. Conformance	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Corrective	<i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i>		

Actions (describe)				
4. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response				
5. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<i>None</i>			
6. Status	<i>All CARs are closed.</i>			
A. Requirement	2.4 Permanence Are potential risks to the permanence of carbon stocks identified in the project technical specifications and are effective and feasible mitigation measures included in the project design?			
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	Assess whether members of the community/producers are aware that they will enter into formal sale agreements with the project coordinator and that they therefore need to comply with the monitoring and mitigation requirements of the project. Check whether the risk buffer proposed in the PDD and technical specifications for each intervention (that will be deducted from the saleable carbon of each producer) conforms to the recommended percentages in the Plan Vivo Standard or other Plan Vivo documentation. Check with Plan Vivo if this is unclear.			
C. Findings (describe)	<i>Plan Vivo determined that the technical specifications were completely out of the scope of the validation and verification conducted by the VVB.</i>			
D. Conformance	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>No <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i>			
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response				
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<i>None</i>			
H. Status	<i>All CARs are closed.</i>			
A. Requirement	2.5 Leakage Have potential sources of leakage been identified and are effective and feasible mitigation measures in place for implementation			

B. Guidance Notes for Validators	Check the sources of leakage and the effectiveness of mitigation measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By discussions with local experts, the project coordinator and others. • Assess whether there is a good understanding of the importance of addressing leakage amongst project participants • Assess whether the mitigation measures proposed are really effective and likely to be implemented. Have they already started? 		
C. Findings (describe)	<i>Plan Vivo determined that the technical specifications were completely out of the scope of the validation and verification conducted by the VVB.</i>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<i>None</i>		
H. Status	<i>All CARs are closed.</i>		
A. Requirement	2.6 Traceability and double-counting Are carbon sales from the project traceable and recorded in a database? Are the project intervention areas covered by any other projects or initiatives (including regional or national initiatives)? Are there formal mechanisms in place to avoid double counting?		
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	Check the possibility of double counting and whether the carbon sales are traceable by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By discussions with local experts, the project coordinator and other projects (including any national or regional level GHG coordination unit) • Understanding the project system for maintaining records of carbon sales and keeping records and determining whether this is sufficiently robust and transparent (through discussions with project staff and local participants) 		
C. Findings (describe)	<i>The PDD states "There are no PES-based projects in the area or the region, and Tanzania does not have a national GHG emission scheme or formal nested agreement on REDD. The Yaeda-Eyasi REDD project does not seek to generate any other form of environmental or social credit. Double counting under national emission trading programs will be avoided as the developer maintains contact with all relevant local authorities and national coordinators though Tanzania yet has no national emission trading program or policy."</i> <i>Additionally, the VVB conducted an independent search of other</i>		

	<p><i>program registries to ensure that double counting is not occurring. Furthermore, Carbon Tanzania has registered this project with the IHS Markit, an online registry that ensures traceability of the PVCs. The VVB is reasonably assured that double counting is not occurring and that there are systems in place to ensure PVC's are traceable and will not be double counted in the future.</i></p>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<p><i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i></p>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<p><i>None</i></p>		
H. Status	<p><i>All CARs are closed.</i></p>		
A. Requirement	<p>2.7 Monitoring Does the project have a monitoring plan in place? Is it being implemented and does it seem to be an effective system for monitoring the continued delivery of the ecosystem services? Does the project coordinator prescribe and record corrective actions where monitoring targets are not met and are these effectively followed up in subsequent monitoring?</p>		
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	<p>Check whether the monitoring plan is effective and likely to be fully implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess the level of understanding of project staff and participating communities of the monitoring system and ensure that there are responsibilities for monitoring are matched by sufficient capacity • Are the selected indicators (covering all aspects of monitoring) SMART? I.e. Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound? • Do the selected indicators properly measure impacts of the project or are they only able to measure inputs/activities? • Are communities effectively involved in monitoring and do they understand their role? 		
C. Findings (describe)	<p><i>Part K of the PDD describes the monitoring system used for the project. The VVB reviewed the monitoring plan and confirms that a robust plan is in place. Throughout the joint validation and verification, the VVB interviewed Carbon Tanzania staff on multiple occasions to determine their level of understanding of the monitoring system. The VVB is reasonably assured that Carbon Tanzania staff clearly understand the monitoring system as described in the PDD and PES Agreements. Additionally, during the site visit the VVB interviewed multiple communities about their responsibilities to the project and specifically about the indicators that are directly tied to PES payments.</i></p>		

	<p><i>Furthermore, all communities understand and have access to the PES Agreements where the indicators are also described. The VVB is reasonably assured that the participating communities understand the monitoring system and their responsibilities. The indicators described in Table K1a of the PDD are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time bound. The VVB is reasonably that the indicators are directly related to the project intervention and ultimately GHG emission reductions.</i></p>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<p><i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i></p>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator' Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<p><i>None</i></p>		
H. Status	<p><i>All CARs are closed.</i></p>		
A. Requirement	<p>2.8 Plan Vivos Are the <i>plan vivos</i> (or land management plans) clear, appropriate and consistent with approved technical specifications for the project? Will the implementation of the plans cause producers' overall agricultural production or revenue potential to become unsustainable or unviable?</p>		
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	<p>Where small-holder farmers have prepared individual <i>plan vivos</i>, check a sample of these on the ground (in the company of the farmer) to determine whether they have really been prepared by the farmer and what the farmer expects to be the results of implementation. For community-projects managing a common (forest) resource, check the management plan for the forest area and assess the extent to which target groups within the community have been involved in preparing it (especially women and disadvantaged groups) and the extent to which its future impacts have been discussed and agreed.</p>		
C. Findings (describe)	<p><i>As previously stated, the plan vivos, in this case the Village Land Use Plans (VLUPs), were developed prior to the implementation of the project. The development of the VLUPs was an independent process that was community led and did not include Carbon Tanzania. This is important because the land use planning process was independent of the project ensuring that the community takes into account all factors that could affect the villages livelihoods. After interviews with the participating communities and villages it is clear that the communities believe the VLUPs properly account for potential increases in population and development within their communities. Additionally, the VVB found that the communities/villages clearly understand the land use planning</i></p>		

	<i>process, the specific VLUP for their village, and the mapping of different use areas.</i>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<i>None</i>		
H. Status	<i>All CARs are closed.</i>		

Theme	3. Ecosystem benefits		
<i>Ensuring that the project meets requirements 2.1-2.4 of the Plan Vivo Standard (2013)</i>			
A. Requirement	3.1 Planting native and naturalised species Are the planting activities of the project restricted to native and naturalised species? If naturalised species are being used are they invasive and what effects will they have on biodiversity? Have the species been selected because they will have clear livelihoods benefits?		
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	Check this using a number of sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual observations of local tree-growing practices • Discussions with communities and project staff • Discussions with local experts (forestry and biodiversity experts) • Published information (refer to this in the validation report if used) 		
C. Findings (describe)	<i>3.1 This project does not include a project activity that involves afforestation. This criteria is not applicable for this REDD project.</i>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<i>None</i>		
H. Status	<i>All CARs are closed.</i>		
A. Requirement	3.2 Ecological impacts Have the wider ecological impacts of the project been identified and considered including impacts on local and regional biodiversity and impacts on watersheds?		
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	Check this using a number of sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual observations of the environment in the project area • Discussions with communities and project staff • Discussions with local experts (environmental experts) • Published information (refer to this in the validation report if used) 		
C. Findings (describe)	<i>3.2 The project activity is the protection of community forests (forest reserves and grazing areas); therefore, the project activity is protecting habit to sustain local biodiversity and watersheds. During the site visit the VVB saw evidence of important biodiversity (elephant, giraffe, kudu, etc. and saw no evidence that the project activity is negatively affecting biodiversity or watersheds in the project area. Additionally, the VVB interviewed communities that were involved in the project prior to the project expansion and all interviewees indicated that the project is</i>		

	<i>positively impacting biodiversity in the project area. Communities that are part of the project expansion indicated that they expected the project to enhance biodiversity in the new project area because the project will protect important habitat. The VVB is reasonably assured that the project has considered the impacts of the project activity on biodiversity and watersheds in the project area and will have a positive effect.</i>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<i>None</i>		
H. Status	<i>All CARs are closed.</i>		

Theme	4. Livelihood Benefits
<i>Ensuring that the project meets requirements 4.1-4.14, 7.1-7.5 and 8.1-8.10 of the Plan Vivo Standard (2013)</i>	
A. Requirement	4.1 Community-led planning Has the project has undergone a producer/community-led planning process aimed at identifying and defining sustainable land-use activities that serve the community's needs and priorities?
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	Assess this by discussions with project staff and communities and by looking at any records of the planning process. It may be useful to conduct a time-line exercise with communities to understand the planning process that has taken place.
C. Findings (describe)	<i>4.1 As described in the PDD, the VLUPs were developed by the community (with the assistance of UCRT) in a community led process to strategically assess their land and allocate it to address the current and future land use needs of the communities. However, based on interviews with Carbon Tanzania staff, government officials, and community members it was clear that although the VLUPs provided title to the village land, without the project the communities would not have the resources necessary to enforce the VLUPs and protect it from outside land encroachment and conversion. Additionally, multiple meetings</i>

	<p>were held by Carbon Tanzania to discuss the project implementation and whether it was the will of the community to implement the project on the village/community held lands. The VVB is reasonably assured that the project has undergone a community-led planning process.</p> <p>4.1.1 – 4.1.5 During the site visit the audit confirmed via interviews that a voluntary and participatory planning process was used to design the project as the project intervention is based on the enforcement of the community developed VLUPs in which the community owned land is allocated to different uses. Importantly, the project will protect the local livelihoods, local customs, and land tenure of the participating groups by strengthening the enforcement of the VLUPs. The Hadzabe and Datooga tribes are two of the most important communities in the project area and their livelihoods are directly tied to the preservation of the forest protected through the project. The Datooga are traditional pastoralists which use the the protected areas for grazing. These forests (primarily Acacia Commifora-Beobob) have an extensive grass understory that sustains the Datooga’s traditional livelihood. As discussed prior, the Hadzabe are primarily hunters and gatherers and rely on large, contiguous forest preserves to maintain their traditional customs and food security. The remaining community members come from different tribal groups but are generally agriculturalists. Each village’s VLUP has set side land for agriculture expansion (not included in the project area) that considers future population growth. In interviews with the village members and leaders, the VVB found no evidence that the project would negatively impact local livelihood needs, local customs, land availability, food security, or land tenure.</p> <p>4.1.6. As previously stated, the basis for the project is the protection of the land and their uses that the pariticipating villages allocated through the development of their VLUPs and as a result this was a fully led community output based on local needs. The VVB found no evidence that marginalized groups are being excluded from the project.</p> <p>4.1.7 The project activity does not included the planting of trees, this criteria is not applicable.</p> <p>4.2 Through visual observations, interviews with community members, and interviews with Carbon Tanzania staff the VVB is reasonably assured that no community groups have been excluded from participation in the project on a discriminatory basis.</p> <p>4.3 Barriers to the participation in the project are identified throughout the PDD and are consistent with what was learned by the VVB on the site visit.</p>
--	---

	<p>4.4 The project uses the traditional village governance structure common in Tanzania. Based on the interviews with both the participating villages and Carbon Tanzania this is a democratic and participatory process. Considering the participating villages developed their VLUPs prior to joining the project they clearly have the capacity to develop these plans. Carbon Tanzania conducted two meetings in each participating village to educate community members about the project and discuss their potential responsibilities upon entering the project. After these meetings the villages used their traditional village governance structures to determine whether they wanted to participate in the project. Throughout the site visit the VVB had in-depth discussions with the participating villages about how the decision was made to join the project. As a result of the community interviews, the VVB is reasonably assured that all the villages have the capacity to make decisions regarding the PES agreements and to participate in the project.</p> <p>4.5 There was no need for the project coordinator to assist the participating the villages in the development of their VLUPs because this was a separate endeavour undertaken by each village to secure the title of their community land.</p> <p>4.6 The VVB reviewed the the PES Agreements and PDD and confirms that they satisfy criterion 4.6 of the Plan Vivo Standard. Additionally, during the site visit it was clear that communities understand their responsibilities as described in the signed PES payments.</p> <p>4.7 Throughout the site visit the VVB discussed how the project could affect the livelihoods of the participating communities and it was evident that the communities feel this project will not negatively affect their local livelihoods but will enhance their local livelihoods because it will provide protection to the land that sustains their livelihoods.</p> <p>4.8 Carbon Tanzania provided the VVB shapefiles showing the project area and larger VLUPs areas. There are slight discrepancies between the documented VLUPs and shapefiles as these are provided by the Tanzanian government, ultimately the discrepancies are small and unable to be corrected by Carbon Tanzania as these are government documents. Importantly, the GHG accounting area has been approved by Plan Vivo as it is part of the technical specifications. The discrepancies in the files provided by Tanzanian government have no affect on the actual GHG emission reductions generated by the project.</p> <p>4.9 During the site visit the VVB saw multiple VLUPs which were in the possession of the participating villages and were in Swahili. Furthermore the VLUPs were developed prior to the implementation of the project and for a separate purpose (to obtain a title for the village land) these documents were</p>
--	--

	<p>developed and written in Swahili and available to the local communities. During the desktop review the VVB reviewed all the VLUPs from each participating community and confirmed they are written in Swahili.</p> <p>4.10 As discussed prior, the VLUPs were developed by the villages in order to obtain a title for their village land in-line with Tanzania law. Carbon Tanzania played no role in developing these VLUPs and the communities were never promised that as a result of developing the VLUPs there was the ability to join the carbon project. However, the VVB confirmed during interviews with the participating communities that their traditional village governance structure was utilized in determining the details of the VLUPs such as boundaries of specific land use areas, by-laws that govern the VLUPs, etc. Because Carbon Tanzania played no roll in the development of the VLUPs, the VVB believes this criteria is not applicable; however, the VVB is reasonably assured that the communities utilized a participatory process to develop their VLUPS.</p> <p>4.11 Carbon Tanzania provided spatially explicit files demonstrating the areas of the VLUPs and their land uses. Additionally, the VVB received spatially explicit files that demonstrated which portions of the individual VLUPs are included in the GHG accounting area. The VVB confirms this criteria is satisfied.</p> <p>4.12 As described in the PDD and confirmed via interviews, bi-annual meetings are held with communities to ensure there is a forum available to discuss the project implementation and ensure a participatory process throughout the lifetime of the project. As noted previously in this report, there are informal channels that are regularly used to communicate with Carbon Tanzania staff and these channels are regularly used by community participants.</p> <p>4.13 As project participation is at the village level, all members of the village are included in the project; therefore, anyone who is a member of the participating villages is included in the project. The VVB found no evidence that community members would be excluded from recieveing project benefits. Because the project uses the traditional village governance structures common to Tanzania, all community members are represented through the project design. The VVB is reasonably assured that this criteria is satisfied.</p> <p>4.14 Throughout the interview process with community members and leaders, the VVB focused substantial effort on questions related to grievance redressal systems and whether previously participating communities felt they were able to voice grievances related to the project. For the communities previously participating in the project (villages in the project pre-project</p>
--	--

	<p><i>expansion) it was clear they felt they could speak with Isack Bryson (Yaeda Valley Project Manager) or Regina Safari (Hadzabe Community Coordinator) who are both employed by Carbon Tanzania. The VVB witnessed Carbon Tanzania staff members interact with communities in an open and honest way. Additionally, many community members indicated that if they had a grievance with the project their first step would be to contact their local leaders prior to reaching out to Carbon Tanzania staff. In interviewing village and community leaders all felt they had open lines of communication with Carbon Tanzania staff and could speak with them openly about any issue regarding the project. When the VVB asked questions about the the grievance redressal system, the most common response began with “first off there are no grievances or problems with the project.”</i></p> <p><i>The VVB also spoke with community members and leaders of the newly added communities for the project expansion and it was clear that they if they had an issue with the project they would be able to speak openly with German Qaghay Sedoyeka (Eyasi Valley Community Coordinator). It is important to note that Carbon Tanzania has employed Mr. Bryson, Ms. Safari, and Mr. Sedoyeka as community coordinators and all three of these staff members are from the local communities. It was clear to the VVB that these are integrated members of these communities who have a close relationship with the leadership in the participating villages and are trusted by the communities. The VVB is reasonably assured based on interviews with the community members and leaders and a review of the formal grievance redressal system that project participants are able to raise grievances with the project coordinator at any given point within the project cycle.</i></p> <p><i>7.1 As stated in the PDD and the PES Agreement, Carbon Tanzania will allocate 60% of all revenue to the participating communities and it will be up to the communities to decide how to best use the revenue to meet their local needs. During the site visit, the VVB interviewed community members about how funds from the project would be used. Some of the responses included improvements to village infrastructure such as village offices, police stations, revolving funds for hospital care, pharmacies, and schools; funds will also be set aside to pay for childrens school fees and uniforms; funds may be used to purchase food during lean times for the communities. The VVB is reasonably assured that the revenue transfers from Carbon Tanzania represent a clear plan to benefit participants livelihoods.</i></p> <p><i>7.2 Part K of the PDD describes the socioeconomic baseline scenario. Based on the review of the PDD and data collected during the site</i></p>
--	---

	<p>visit via interviews the VVB is reasonably assured that the socioeconomic baseline is described in line with the Plan Vivo Standard, 2013.</p> <p>7.3 The PDD describes the expected socioeconomic impacts of the project. Based on the review of the PDD and data collected during the site visit via interviews the VVB is reasonably assured that the expected socioeconomic impacts are described in line with the Plan Vivo Standard, 2013.</p> <p>7.4 -7.5 As part of the interview process with both previously participating communities and new communities that are part of the project expansion the VVB asked numerous questions regarding the possibility of negative socioeconomic impacts on the participating communities. No project participants (new or old) indicated that there have been negative socioeconomic impacts to them or their community as a result of the project. The community members feel their traditional livelihoods (hunter and gathering for the Hadzabe tribe and pastoralism for the Datooga) were behind enhance by participating in the project. During the desktop review the VVB found no evidence that negative socioeconomic impacts were likely. The VVB is reasonably assured that the project has successfully designed the project to avoid negative impacts on participants. Additionally, Section K2 of the PDD describes the socioeconomic impact assessment. Through interviews with both Carbon Tanzania and project participants, the VVB is reasonably assured that these were developed in a participatory manner.</p> <p>8.1 As part of the desktop review of the validation process the VVB reviewed the signed PES agreements from each community. Additionally, during the site visit the VVB confirmed with community members and leaders that the PES Agreements have been signed and agreed upon utilizing the traditional village governance structures of the participating communities. The VVB asked questions to better understand if the participating villages understood the commitments they were making in the PES Agreements and confirmed that the communities understood that their ability to receive payments as stated in the PES agreement they needed to ensure the protection of their community forests.</p> <p>8.2 As part of the desktop review of the validation process the VVB reviewed the signed PES agreements and confirms that they comply with the requirements of the Plan Vivo Standard, 2013.</p> <p>8.3 As stated in Section E2 the PDD two days of meetings were held with each village in the project to explain the concept of the project and the potential benefits of the project. Additionally,</p>
--	--

	<p>leaders of the villages that were part of the project expansion met with village leaders from villages that were a part of the old project to discuss the project, its potential benefits, and to address any concerns the new villages might have had. Based on interviews conducted by the VVB with the both the villages that are part of the project expansion and the villages that were participating in the project pre-expansion it was clear to the VVB that there was no coercion by Carbon Tanzania and these villages were eager to participate in the project. The meetings held by Carbon Tanzania were held in Swahili and also translated to Hadzabe and this was confirmed by the VVB during th site visit. The VVB is reasonably assured that the project participants entered into the PES Agreements voluntarily and according to the principle of FPIC.</p> <p>8.4 Based on discussions with the participating communities they do not believe that the project will diminish or threaten their land tenure but rather strengthen it as the project will provide vital revenue that can support enforcement mechanisms. Additionally, during the desk review of the PES Agreements the VVB found no evidence that the project will diminish or threaten the land tenure of the participating communities. The VVB is reasonably assured that point 8.4 of the Plan Vivo Standard is satisfied.</p> <p>8.5 To date Carbon Tanzania has succeeded in providing the revenue required by the PES Agreement to the communities participating in the project pre-project expansion. Additionally, Carbon Tanzania has successfully sold over 2 million Verified Carbon Units (VCUs) through the Verra Registry. Based on Carbon Tanzania's record of being able to successfully sell all carbon credits issued to the projects that they manage, the VVB is reasonably assured that project coordinator has the capacity to meet their payment obligations as specified in the PES Agreements.</p> <p>8.6 As explained to the VVB by staff of Carbon Tanzania, to date there has been no exclusion of communities from participating in the project. In fact the expansion of the project was largely because neighboring communities were very interested in participating. An important precursor to being about to participate in the project is that the village has a legal VLUP developed. The VVB found no evidence that a greater number of communities wish to enter into PES agreements than the project coordinator can engage.</p> <p>8.7 The VVB reviewed the PES Agreements and confirmed that the PES Agreements adress the risk of non-payment and this was communicated to the participants.</p>
--	---


	<p><i>8.8 As stated in the PES Agreements and PDD, revenue sharing between communities from the sale of PVCs is based on the size of the land contributed to the project.</i></p> <p><i>8.9 Details regarding the benefit-sharing mechanism are described in the PES Agreements, which were presented to the communities in Swahili.</i></p> <p><i>8.10 The VVB found no evidence that PES payments have been delivered in the form of services or another form of in kind payment. The VVB spoke directly to Carbon Tanzania staff regarding this issue and it clear that the communities/villages have full control over their revenue share.</i></p>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<p><i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i></p>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<p><i>None</i></p>		
H. Status	<p><i>All CARs are closed.</i></p>		
A. Requirement	<p>7.5 Socio-economic impact assessment/monitoring plan</p> <p>Is there a robust socio-economic impact assessment and monitoring plan in place that can measure changes against the baseline scenario?</p>		
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	<p>Discuss with project staff and communities to understand how the baseline assessment was conducted and how the socio-economic monitoring plan developed out of this. Assess in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the livelihoods indicators can effectively monitoring socio-economic changes takeing place • The extent to which women, disadvantaged people and other social groups have been involved project processes and whether the selected indicators will enable impacts on them to be determined • Whether any groups in the community are likely to be adversely affected by the project and whether there are any mitigation measures in place to addres this 		

C. Findings (describe)	<p><i>Through interviews during the site visit, the VVB confirmed that the robust socio-economic impact assessment and monitoring plan were developed through a participatory process. Importantly, because this project uses traditional local governance mechanisms it ensures there is a participatory process that respects the local customs and norms of the each unique village/community group. The PDD appropriately describes the socio-economic impact assessment and monitoring plan that can measure changes against the baseline scenario. Importantly, project participants feel that the project is not only allowing them to safeguard their land tenure and continue their traditional livelihoods but they will have access to capital take on projects that would have been previously out of reach for their communities.</i></p>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<p><i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i></p>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<p><i>None</i></p>		
H. Status	<p><i>All CARs are closed.</i></p>		
A. Requirement	<p>7.6 Sale agreements and payments</p> <p>Does the project have clear procedures for entering into sale agreements with producers/communities based on saleable carbon from <i>plan vivos</i>? Does the project have an effective and transparent process for the timely administration and recording of payments to producers?</p>		
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	<p>Check the systems that are being proposed by the project and make an assessment of whether these are fully functional already or whether they can be made functional when required? Are communities/producers aware of the system and do they understand it? Are documents and materials readily available to producers/communities?</p>		
C. Findings (describe)	<p><i>Through interviews on the site visit it was clear that the project participants felt there had been an effective and transparent process for entering into the PES Agreements. Carbon Tanzania facilitated a "learning visit" where village leaders from the newly expanded project</i></p>		

	<p><i>met with village leaders from the original project to learn about the project, discuss benefits and costs, and learn more about the project. The VVB reviewed the revenue from the sale of PVCs and distributions of payments to communities along with documented evidence to support these figures. The VVB is reasonably assured that the project has an effective and transparent process for the timely administration and recording of payments to communities.</i></p>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<p><i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i></p>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<p><i>None</i></p>		
H. Status	<p><i>All CARS are closed.</i></p>		
A. Requirement	<p>7.7 Benefit sharing and equity</p> <p>Will the project have livelihoods benefits for the local community? Are these benefits likely to accrue to all community members and/or are benefits targeted at particular groups within the community? What other actions is the project taking to ensure that disadvantaged groups e.g. women, landless households, poor people will benefit from sales of Plan Vivo certificates?</p>		
B. Guidance Notes for Validators	<p>Whilst there may be livelihoods benefits resulting from the project aspects of benefit sharing are critical to ensure that benefits are equitably shared. This can be assessed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checking whether a local stakeholder/well-being analysis has been conducted to identify socio-economic groupings in the communities • Assessing the level of governance of local groups (are issues of equity and benefit sharing discussed during meetings?) • Discuss with a small sample of households from different socio-economic groups to determine their level of understanding of the benefits they are likely to get from the project. 		
C. Findings (describe)	<p><i>During the validation the VVB interviewed participating communities (both previously participating communities and new project communities) about the livelihood benefits they have either already received from the project or believe they will receive from the project. Both the Datooga and Hadzabe communities rely on the on the natural habitats that exist throughout the project area. Datooga are</i></p>		

	<p><i>pastoralists who rely on the protected forest area as grazing area for their cows. The Hadzabe are traditional hunter gatherers who rely on the protected forest to support their traditional livelihood. Both of these communities throughout all the villages visited consistently stated that the protection of their community forests is the primary livelihood benefit generated by the project. Without the project both communities stated that they would continue to see increased incursions into their legally titled land resulting in increased deforestation, a major threat to their traditional livelihoods. Additionally, both communities indicated that the PES revenue will go to support various community projects that are needed in their communities. For example, in interviews with the Hadzabe they have used previous PES payments to start and education fund to support pay for children's school. The VVB spoke with multiple young people who were either in university or had completed university, which would not have been possible without the education fund available from PES revenues. The project utilizes the traditional village system, a democratic and well understood system in Tanzania, as the primary structure of determining how revenue will be used within each village. The VVB interviewed numerous community members in various villages to understand if they felt this was a functional and equitable structure. As a result of the primary evidence collected during the site visit and documentation provided throughout the validation, the VVB is reasonably assured that there are livelihood benefits that will accrue to all community members through the protection of their traditional livelihoods and through the community project implemented with PES revenue.</i></p>		
D. Conformance	Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
E. Corrective Actions (describe)	<i>A log of all Corrective Actions is provided in Annex 1.</i>		
F. (Insert Project Coordinator's Name) Response			
G. Forward Actions (describe, if applicable)	<i>None</i>		
H. Status	<i>All CARS are closed.</i>		

The Validator: (Shawn McMahon)

Signature: 

Date: 15 February 2022

Annex 1: Corrective Action Requests and Responses

Finding Number	1
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	3.9. A transparent mechanism and procedures for the receipt, holding and disbursement of PES funds must be defined and applied, with funds intended for PES earmarked and managed through an account established for this sole purpose, separate to the project coordinator's general operational finances.
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	I5 of the PDD
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	<p>Each of the 12 participating villages has their own PES agreement that has been signed by the Village leadership and CT.</p> <p>The PDD states "The PES contracts, which are signed with each of these 12 villages, and ratified by the respective District Government authorities, require that each village hold biannual payment and grievance meetings during which questions can be raised about the project, its activities and impacts, and about the use of funds derived from the sale of PVCs from the project. One or more Carbon Tanzania representatives attend the meeting (the Project Manager(s) and the finance manager, plus any other company representative who may need to attend) and these representatives provide detailed information to the assembled members regarding the amount of revenue available for distribution in that village, based on sales of PVCs in the preceding six-month period."</p> <p>However, the audit team was unable to confirm that a separate fund is established in line with this criteria.</p>
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please provide verifiable evidence that an account has been established that satisfies this requirement.
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	The project maintains an account (Yaeda Project Account - 0102014910801) established for the sole purpose of holding and disbursement of PES funds, separate to the project coordinator's general operational finances. Verifiable evidence (Yaeda Project Account - Bank Statement and Transaction Report) is provided that an account that satisfies this requirement exists.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	The audit team reviewed the bank statements provided for Account and confirms that the project has established a separate account for maintaining and distributing PES funds. This finding is closed.

Finding Number	2
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	3.10. A project budget and financial plan must be developed by the project coordinator and updated at least every three months, including documentation of operational costs and PES disbursed, and funding received, demonstrating how adequate funds to sustain the project have been or will be secured.
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	Table 15 in PDD

Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	A project budget and financial plan is developed and included in Table 15 of the PDD. However for the verification, the audit team was unable to locate "A project budget and financial plan must be developed by the project coordinator and update"
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please clarify how this criteria is satisfied and provide verifiable evidence to demonstrate this.
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	Provided is project budget and financial plan developed by the project coordinator and updated every three months, including operational costs, PES disbursed, and funding received, demonstrating how adequate funds to sustain the project are secured.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	The audit team reviewed the budget and financial plan titled: "Project Budget_Financial Plan 2017-2020.pdf" but notes it is updated annually and not every three months as required.
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 2 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please provide a budget and financial plan that is updated at least every three months.
Round 2 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	Project budget and financial plan updated every three months provided
Aster Global Round 3 Findings	The project proponents have provide a budget that clearly shows the projects budget is appropriately updated every quarter. This criteria is satisfied, no further action is needed.

Finding Number	3
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	3.13. Community members, including women and members of marginalised groups, must be given an equal opportunity to fill employment positions in the project where job requirements are met or for roles where they can be cost-effectively trained.
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	Section I3 of PDD
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	The audit team confirms that all community members are given equal opportunity of employment for positions funded by CT such as project managers and Community Managers. However, it is unclear how this criteria is satisfied in relation to the hiring of VGS. During the site visit the audit team interviewed numerous VGS, non of which were women.
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please clarify how this criteria is satisfied in relationship to the employment of the VGS.

Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	While it is true that the majority of, though not all VGS, are men, this is a result of very few women applying to be VGS, which is in turn a result of the cultural operating environment. VGS are chosen and employed by the communities themselves in a democratic process where everyone is encouraged to apply if they desire. Other community chosen and supported positions like community coordinators, who coordinate the VGS, are all female, also a result of underlying circumstances and not bias. Furthermore, to ensure youth and continuity in the patrol teams both Hadzabe communities in Domanga and Mongo wa Mono have an apprenticeship program where every 6 months a youth VGS is added to the team, they also require that at least half added yearly are female. Carbon Tanzania has company and project policies to ensure that when unequal outcomes arise they are not the result of unequal opportunity. Language added in PDD I3 to clarify that policies apply to projects and project generated employment as well.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	Thank you for the clarification. The audit team understands that women tend to not apply for VGS positions. Additionally, during the site visit it was clear in all the communities that were visited that there tended to be a cultural division of labor between men and women. As additional evidence to this, the audit team met with community coordinators in different communities who tended to the women. The audit team also confirmed that youth are actively employed in this project. The VVB is reasonably assured this criterion is satisfied.

Finding Number	4
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	4.8. There must be a system for accurately recording and verifying the location, boundary and size of each plan vivo using GPS, where boundary coordinates are recorded for all plan vivos above 5 hectares, and at least a central point coordinate recorded for plan vivos under 5 hectares.
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	PDD, Shapefiles
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	<p>The audit team reviewed the shapefiles provided by the project proponent and confirms that each boundary and size of each plan vivo is included in the shapefile. However, the audit team found discrepancies in the size of some of the VLUPS.</p> <p>Also, during the site visit Mr. Beroff indicated that the VLUPs and associated shapefiles are registered with the Tanzanian government. If this is the case, please also provide documentation showing the size of each VLUP registered with the Tanzanian government.</p>
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	<p>MCAR: Please clarify for the audit team what projection is used for the shapefiles.</p> <p>MCAR: Please clarify which areas in the shapefiles from the VLUPs are included in the project area.</p>

Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	<p>The projection used for the shapefiles is WGS84 (in R: +proj=longlat +datum=WGS84 +no_defs +ellps=WGS84 +towgs84=0,0,0).</p> <p>The discrepancies may be because the project area shapefile is not consistent with the village land use shapefiles, as it follows the actual forest area within the designated conserved areas of the land use plans of the 12 villages and not the land use designation boundaries themselves. Though the land-use plan and associated maps are legally recognized in Tanzania (and provided as evidence) it was prudent to use the forest boundary within those areas as the project area boundary. The project area is made of all forest area within the recognized grazing areas and Hadzabe traditional use areas within the 12 villages' land use plans.</p> <p>As requested here is a chart showing the size of each Village Land Use Plan registered with the Tanzanian government. Figures come from the official Land Use Plan documents (provided as evidence) and may not be consistent with figures from the shape files used to make the official maps (provided as evidence), due to error in the official government process.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Village</th><th>Size of Village in VLUP Document (Ha)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Endanyawish</td><td>17029</td></tr> <tr> <td>Endesh</td><td>40,237</td></tr> <tr> <td>Endamaghan</td><td>6631.048</td></tr> <tr> <td>Mbuga Nyekundu</td><td>4551</td></tr> <tr> <td>Qangdend</td><td>15,505</td></tr> <tr> <td>Eshkesh</td><td>17,541</td></tr> <tr> <td>Jobaj</td><td>4110</td></tr> <tr> <td>Dumbechand</td><td>37,742.25</td></tr> <tr> <td>Yaeda Chini</td><td>24,530</td></tr> <tr> <td>Domanga</td><td>17,880</td></tr> <tr> <td>Mikocheni</td><td>5926.394</td></tr> <tr> <td>Mongo wa Mono</td><td>47,070</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Village	Size of Village in VLUP Document (Ha)	Endanyawish	17029	Endesh	40,237	Endamaghan	6631.048	Mbuga Nyekundu	4551	Qangdend	15,505	Eshkesh	17,541	Jobaj	4110	Dumbechand	37,742.25	Yaeda Chini	24,530	Domanga	17,880	Mikocheni	5926.394	Mongo wa Mono	47,070
Village	Size of Village in VLUP Document (Ha)																										
Endanyawish	17029																										
Endesh	40,237																										
Endamaghan	6631.048																										
Mbuga Nyekundu	4551																										
Qangdend	15,505																										
Eshkesh	17,541																										
Jobaj	4110																										
Dumbechand	37,742.25																										
Yaeda Chini	24,530																										
Domanga	17,880																										
Mikocheni	5926.394																										
Mongo wa Mono	47,070																										
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	<p>The audit team reviewed the Domanga VLUP and according to the table at the bottom of page and found that the Hifadhi na Malisho ya Mifugo area is 16,645.78 hectares, whereas the shapefile is 18018, and according to the PP's response 17,880. Although the VVB translated the VLUPs, there may still be confusion as to where the size of the is listed in this document. The VVB is requesting this finding be discussed with Carbon Tanzania via a phone call.</p>																										
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 2 (DD Month YYYY)	<p>MCAR: Please clarify where hectare totals are in the the respective VLUPs and clarify the difference between the three sources cited in the the finding.</p>																										
Round 2 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	<p>As discussed there is often inconsistency between 1.official shape files (due to human error and or surveys using straight lines etc) 2. Figures in official documents (due to same) 3. Actual areas as understood by the community or by environmental condition. To be transparent CT provides these shape files and to respect government processes cites figures as found in official land use documents. However, for actual emission reduction calculations the project is much more conservative using only the forested area (as determined from remote sensing) found within those village boundaries. The official figure for the size of Domanga village is 17,880 as per previous response. This is found on page 3 (provided) of the Domanga Land use plan document under basic village information.</p>																										

Aster Global Round 3 Findings	<p>Thank you for the clarification. The audit team confirms that the project area is a forested area subset of the total area from each VLUP that has been set aside to remain forest, generally either Hadzabe General Use area, Forest Reserves, or grazing areas. As the analysis of forest area that makes up the actual GHG accounting area is included in the Tech Specs, which has already been determined to be outside the scope of the VVB this item is closed.</p> <p>However, Table J2 of the PDD shows the areas included in the project area for each village based on land use for a total of 99,312 ha. The sum of the areas in Table J2 (99,312 ha) does not match the project area of 105,970 ha stated in section B2.1. Additionally, we were unable to confirm these areas based on the shapefiles provided.</p> <p>Additionally, Section B2.1 of the PDD states that the project villages occupy 208,768 ha, however, we calculated the sum of the areas from the VLUPs to be 238,531.59 ha. Additionally, the areas calculated using the shapefiles provided do not match either of these totals.</p> <p>The audit team has provided an excel workbook to complement these findings and has sent this excel workbook to the Project team.</p>
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 3 (DD Month YYYY)	<p>MCAR: Please clearly describe how the area for each village in Table J2 is determined and specifically which set of shapefiles is necessary to confirm this acreage.</p> <p>MCAR: Please clearly describe how the amount of land described in Section B2.1 of the PDD was determined. Additionally, please clarify why the sum of the areas of the VLUPs does not match this section.</p>
Round 3 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	<p>Project area for each village in Table J2 has been changed to reflect the contributed amounts of eligible areas (110,526.54) on the CCROs (title deeds). The Shp files for this are the village boundaries and PLU set (with caveat about PLU Domanga and small discrepancies especially that areas considered reserve that fall on swamp land are not considered part of the project area). An outer project boundary shp file has also been provided for clarity. The Amount of village land (238,752.44 ha) is quoted directly from the official village land use plan documents and the PDD now reflects this.</p>
Aster Global Round 3 Findings	<p>The audit team reviewed the updated PDD and shapefiles. Although there are small discrepancies in the shapefiles and CCROs it is clear that the VVB that the CCROs are a government files that are unable to be changed and have been confirmed to not be perfectly accurate. The audit team also noted that the PES agreement revenue share table no longer matches the Table J2 of the PDD (the revenue table). The audit team is concerned this will cause confusion throughout the lifetime of the project as it is unclear which table will be used to allocate the revenue share.</p>

Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 3 (DD Month YYYY)	<p>FAR: The VVB is issuing a FAR in regards to this discrepancy.</p> <p>As a result of the validation in which the VVB reviewed the accuracy of the Revenue Division between communities, the VVB found discrepancies between the updated Revenue Division in the PDD and the signed PES agreement.</p> <p>To resolve this FAR, Carbon Tanzania is required to implement a process to update the PES agreement, specifically the revenue division in the PES agreement. The process must satisfy all FPIC requirements within the Plan Vivo Standard, 2013 and Carbon Tanzania must ensure that a participatory process is used. In order to close this FAR, a new PES agreement with the participating villages must be signed and the process of doing this must be participatory and comply with all FPIC principles. The closing of this FAR will be completed by Plan Vivo.</p> <p>This FAR must be closed prior to the issuance of any PVCs from Plan Vivo.</p>
--	---

Finding Number	5
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	4.14. A robust grievance redressal system should be part of project design, and should ensure that participants are able to raise grievances with the project coordinator at any given point within the project cycle, and that these grievances are dealt with in a transparent, fair, and timely manner. A summary of grievances received, the manner in which these are dealt with, and details of outstanding grievances must be reported to the Plan Vivo Foundation through the periodic reporting process.
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	It is unclear to the audit team where the grievance redressal system is described in the PDD.
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please clarify for the audit team where the grievance redressal system is described in the PDD.

Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	<p>I5 states that biannual finance and grievance meetings will be held throughout the project lifetime and are stipulated in the PES Agreement. In these meetings a recurring item agenda is a formal inquiry to the community and leadership if there are any grievances.</p> <p>F2 also mentions the existence of a grievance mechanism.</p> <p>Section 2.3 of the PES agreement which is an annex to the PDD describes the mechanism for conflict resolution which is somewhat analogous to a grievance mechanism.</p> <p>Annex 3 of the PES agreement states "Address any specific grievance logged directly with CT through relevant company and contract mechanisms. The CT company grievance is provided for reference.</p> <p>No grievances have been logged throughout the previous project stages and development process.</p>
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	<p>The audit team reviewed the updates made to the PDD and notes multiple statements that a clear grievance mechanism exists. The document "CT Grievance Policy" was provided and demonstrates that there are structures in place to deal with grievances as they are recieved. This criteria is satisfied.</p>

Finding Number	6
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	5.2. Sources of data used to quantify ecosystem services, including all assumptions and default factors, must be specified and as up-to-date as possible, with a justification for why they are appropriate.
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	PDD Part G
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	<p>The project technical specifications are described in Part G of the PDD. These have already been approved Plan Vivo and in an email from Caroline Stillman of Plan Vivo on the October 7th 2021 the only part of the Technical Specifications that is within the scope of the VVB is whether the inventory plots are representative of the newly expanded project area.</p> <p>In section G4 the PD States "Whilst the original sample plots were randomly chosen from the Yaeda I project area, which is representative of the complete project area due to the homogenous nature of the forest. All plots and representative non-forest areas that did not meet the forest criteria defined by this project (see section G4) were removed to provide a more accurate initial carbon stock estimate for forest within the project area (see G4b). The result of this is a sample size of 40 plots (shown in Figure G4a)."</p> <p>The audit team was unable to find verifiable evidence that the plots from Yaeda I are representative of the expanded (new) project area.</p> <p>Additionally, considering only forest plots were used for the carbon quantification, it is unclear to the audit team how it is appropriate to included non-forested area in the project area.</p>

Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	<p>MCAR: Please provide verifiable evidence that the plots from Yaeda I are representative of the new, expanded, project area.</p> <p>MCAR: Please clarify why it is appropriate to include non-forest area in the project area when the non-forest area was excluded from the inventory measurements.</p>
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	<p>Plan Vivo's policy on data sources (https://www.planvivo.org/faqs/data-sources) states the following:</p> <p>"Approved approaches require the use of data and assumptions to estimate emissions and removals from the baseline scenario and project interventions.</p> <p>Potential data sources include:</p> <p>Surveys or research conducted within the project area or other representative areas Analysis of maps and remote sensing data Published and unpublished papers and reports from the region Default values from national or global studies. Data sources used must contribute to a credible and conservative estimation of climate benefits, and projects are encouraged to make use of available sources of information where possible, to reduce the cost of data collection, and increase the speed of approval.</p> <p>Where appropriate data is not available, or the cost of data collection is prohibitive, conservative assumptions can be used."</p> <p>In "Plan Vivo Guidance Document for Reducing Locally-Driven Deforestation (2015)" Global Forest Watch is mentioned at a recognized data source.</p> <p>According the Global Forest Watch all plots from Yaeda I are in the terrestrial ecoregion "Southern Acacia-Commiphora bushland and thickets" likewise the entire expanded area is within the "Southern Acacia-Commiphora bushland and thickets" terrestrial ecoregion.</p> <p>In this context where national data and unpublished papers are potentially acceptable, using plot data from a validated plan vivo project, which is contiguous to the expanded area and is classified as within the same terrestrial ecoregion (named for the dominant 2 genus of tree species in the landscape is reasonably representative. Language added in PDD section G4 to adress this.</p> <p>The representative and relevant nature of the original Yaeda plot data was implied at multiple points during the process of Carbon Tanzania seeking guidance from Plan Vivo on how to potentially expand the Yaeda project to the Eyasi Landscape.</p> <p>Non-forest area was not included in any of the quantification of emissions reductions in the project area. Within the shapefile there are indeed small patches of less-dense tree cover dispersed amongst the forest. It would not have been reasonable to exclude these areas from project activities and the project area outline shapefile, however they are excluded from the quantification of emissions reductions. The script that deals with this is the 'ChangeDetection.R' script. From row 109, it calculates how much of the larger project area is actually forest in the most recent forest classification image. It retrieves ~52k hectares out of the ~95k hectare area. These figures are then reflected in the 'Yaeda Deforestation Calculations'</p>

	spreadsheet.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	The audit team referenced the Global Forest Watch terrestrial ecoregion map and confirms that the Yaeda project boundaries are within the “Southern Acacia-Commiphora bushland and thickets” terrestrial ecoregion. This item is addressed.

Finding Number	7
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	5.9.2. Monitoring approaches (methods)
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	PDD, Smart Data
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	The monitoring approaches are accurately described in the PDD. However, the audit team was unable to find the SMART/Cybertracker data for the verification spanning the period 2017-2020.
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1	MCAR: Please provide the Cybertracker data from the previous monitoring period.

(DD Month YYYY)	
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	Evidence provided in folder "Yaeda SMART 2020 Shp & CSV"
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	The audit team confirmed that the SMART data tracking system is being used via a review of the SMART data. It is clear based on discussions with rangers and CT staff that the system is not perfect; however, the VVB is reasonably assured that the SMART system is working to verify community monitoring reports. This item is closed.

Finding Number	8
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	5.9.4. Duration of monitoring
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	The audit team understands that the monitoring is required every 1 for the entire crediting period. However, in Review of the PDD and PES Agreement it is unclear where this is clearly stated.
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please clarify the duration of monitoring for the ABMS and monitoring plan. Additionally, please clarify where this is stated within the monitoring plan.

Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	<p>The duration of the monitoring for the ABMS and monitoring plan is once yearly for the entire crediting period/project lifetime.</p> <p>In the PDD</p> <p>F1 states; “Annual issuance of PVCs is based on annual activity-based monitoring”</p> <p>K1 states “The monitoring plan uses activity-based monitoring indicators to trigger annual issuance of PVCs and deforestation analysis to verify the project on a 5-year basis. Activity-based monitoring is used to demonstrate whether the project is on course to achieve the expected climate benefits and non-carbon benefits outlined in Part G. Each indicator has annual performance thresholds throughout the monitoring period (see Table K1).”</p> <p>The PES Agreement states, “All parties shall commit to monitoring how much carbon has been stored or lost within the project area” and “All parties shall commit to monitoring the socioeconomic changes in The Village/Community and surrounding areas as a result of the initiative.” and commits to this for the project lifetime of 20 years which is outlined in the PES.</p> <p>The PES in “Annex 1: Forest Management Activity Timeline” breaks downs some of the activities that are collated at a sub-annual level for annual reporting. In Annex 3 the PES again refers to the annual nature of the reporting structure.</p> <p>Language has been added to the PDD in K1 to clarify explicitly “Monitoring frameworks work on an annual schedule, in line with annual reporting to Plan Vivo, and are expected to function through the entire crediting period of the project.”</p>
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	<p>Thank you for clarifying the during of monitoring. The PDD has been updated and now clearly states that monitoring occurs annually. This item is addressed.</p>

Finding Number	9
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	5.9.8. How results of monitoring will be shared and discussed with participants
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y

Aster Global Round 1 Findings	<p>Section E3 of the PDD states "To ensure an ongoing iterative process throughout the implementation of the project, the contract stipulates that all community members are to be provided with the opportunity to participate in the project and that Carbon Tanzania must provide reports every six months on the development of the project through the relevant committees and meetings."</p> <p>Additionally, Section I5 of the PDD states "The PES contracts, which are signed with each of these 12 villages, and ratified by the respective District Government authorities, require that each village hold biannual payment and grievance meetings during which questions can be raised about the project, its activities and impacts, and about the use of funds derived from the sale of PVCs from the project. One or more Carbon Tanzania representatives attend the meeting (the Project Manager(s) and the finance manager, plus any other company representative who may need to attend) and these representatives provide detailed information to the assembled members regarding the amount of revenue available for distribution in that village, based on sales of PVCs in the preceding six-month period."</p> <p>Although it is no explicitly stated the audit team understands based on previous discussions with the project coordinator that the monitoring results will be shared with the communities during these Biannual meetings and reports.</p>
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please clarify for the audit team how results of the monitoring will be shared and discussed with participants. Additionally, please clearly state in the PDD how the monitoring results will be shared, if this clear language is not already within the PDD>
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	<p>The results of the monitoring will primarily be shared and discussed with participants through the forum of the biannual finance and grievance meeting which also has a recurring agenda around project updates and monitoring results. These meetings are convened by the democratically elected and geographically representative leadership of the community, who are broadly mandated to be an information conduit for the community across a range of governance and development spheres.</p> <p>The project manager and community coordinators also make frequent visit to community dwelling areas and hold informal discussions around project updates, benefits, developments, and monitoring results. This is likewise true for the community leadership and representatives.</p> <p>Language has been added in E3 and I5 of the PDD to explicitly state that the monitoring results will be shared with the communities during these previously referenced biannual meetings and reports.</p>
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	Thank you for clarifying how results of the monitoring will be shared with project participants. The PDD has been updated and now clearly states that results of monitoring will be shared and discussed during the biannual meetings and reports. This item is addressed.
Finding Number	10
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	5.10. Where participants are involved in monitoring, a system for checking the robustness of monitoring results must be in place, e.g. checking a random sample of monitoring results by the project coordinator.

Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	PDD, Smart Data
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	Table K1a of the PDD describes the means of verification for each indicator in the ABMS system. The audit team is requesting the SMART/CyberTracker data for the verification period to ensure this data is robust enough to provide a means to verify VGS coverage and ensure that the coverage reported during the verification period is accurate.
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please provide the Cybertracker data from the previous monitoring period.
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	Evidence provided in folder "Yaeda SMART 2020 Shp & CSV"
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	The audit team confirmed that the SMART data tracking system is being used via a review of the SMART data. It is clear based on discussions with rangers and CT staff that the system is not perfect; however, the VVB is reasonably assured that the SMART system is working to verify community monitoring reports. This item is closed.

Finding Number	11
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	7.2.1. Demographics and population groups
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	PDD C1 and C2
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	The demographics and population of the project participants is described in the PDD; however, there is no description of "how these conditions are likely to continue or change in the absence of the project"
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please add additional language to the PDD to describe how the demographics and population groups might change in the absence of the project in line with criterion 7.2 of the Plan Vivo Standard.
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	Language added in Section F2 of PDD to describe how the demographics and population groups might change in the absence of the project in line with criterion 7.2 of the Plan Vivo Standard.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	The PDD has been updated to describe how the demographics and population groups might change in the absence of the project. This criteria is satisfied.

Finding Number	12
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	7.2.6. Local governance structures and decision-making mechanisms

Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	Table F2, C1, C2 and F2 of the PDD
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	The local governance structures and decision -making mechanisms of the project participants is described in the PDD; however, there is no description of "how these conditions are likely to continue or change in the absence of the project"
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please add additional language to the PDD to describe how the local governance structures and decision -making mechanisms might change in the absence of the project in line with criterion 7.2 of the Plan Vivo Standard.
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	Language added in Section F2 of PDD to describe how the local governance structures and decision -making mechanisms might change in the absence of the project in line with criterion 7.2 of the Plan Vivo Standard.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	The PDD has been updated to describe how local governance structures and decision-making mechanisms might change in the absence of the project. This criteria is satisfied.

Finding Number	13
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	7.2.7. Cultural, religious and ethnic groups present
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	Table F2, C1, C2 and F2 of the PDD
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	The cultural, religious and ethnic groups present is described in the PDD; however, there is no description of "how these conditions are likely to continue or change in the absence of the project"
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please add additional language to the PDD to describe how the cultural, religious and ethnic groups might change in the absence of the project in line with criterion 7.2 of the Plan Vivo Standard.
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	Language added in Section F2 to describe how the cultural, religious and ethnic groups might change in the absence of the project in line with criterion 7.2 of the Plan Vivo Standard.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	The PDD has been updated to describe how cultural, religious, and ethnic groups might change in the absence of the project. This criteria is satisfied.

Finding Number	14
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	7.2.8. Gender and age equity
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	Table F2, C1, C2 and F2 of the PDD
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y

Aster Global Round 1 Findings	The gender and age equity of the project participants is described in the PDD; however, there is no description of "how these conditions are likely to continue or change in the absence of the project"
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please add additional language to the PDD to describe how the gender and age equity might change in the absence of the project in line with criterion 7.2 of the Plan Vivo Standard.
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	Language added in Section F2 of PDD to describe how the gender and age equity might change in the absence of the project in line with criterion 7.2 of the Plan Vivo Standard.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	The PDD has been updated to describe how the gender and age equity might change in the absence of the project. This criteria is satisfied.

Finding Number	15
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	7.3. The expected socioeconomic impacts of the project must be described in comparison with the socioeconomic baseline scenario, including consideration of expected impacts on participants, and consideration of any likely 'knock-on effects' on nonparticipating communities living in surrounding areas.
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	Table F2, C1, C2 and F2 of the PDD
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	The audit team was unable to find a description of the impact of the project on 1. Demographics and population groups, 2. Local governance structures and decision-making mechanisms, 3. Cultural, religious and ethnic groups present, and 4. Gender and age equity in line with criterion 7.3 of the PV Standard.
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please add additional language to the PDD to describe how each item in the socioeconomic baseline is expected to change as a result of the project.
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	Language added in Section F2 of PDD to describe how each item in the socioeconomic baseline is expected to change as a result of the project.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	The PDD has been updated to describe how the socioeconomic baseline is expected to change as a result of the project. This criteria is satisfied.

Finding Number	16
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	7.4. A socioeconomic impact assessment/monitoring plan must be developed in a participatory manner to measure advances against the baseline scenario, within one year of the project validation, that:
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	Section K2 of the PDD
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	The audit team confirms that a monitoring plan of socio-economic impacts is described in the PDD. However, it is unclear to the audit team how this monitoring plan was developed in a participatory manner.

Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please clarify for the audit team and provide verifiable evidence that the socio-economic monitoring plan was developed in a participatory manner.
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	The standard says the project must have a participatory socioeconomic impact plan to measure advances against the baseline scenario. The projects socioeconomic impact plan is comprised of 3 parts, all of which came from the process of FPIC and PES agreement meetings with the community. All 3 aspects are community centered and generated assessments. During the community meetings it was made clear that the community's priority from the project was 1. Understanding and Awareness 2. Financial Gain 3. Improved Community Capacity and Opportunity. The plan was built from these priorities raised during the various rounds of community meetings. The request for the anonymous nature of some community level data and the explicit encouragement of community questions around revenue included directly in the plan come from and evidence the participatory process that resulted in the project's socioeconomic monitoring plan and procedures. (FPIC meetings minutes provided as evidence). Language added in PDD section K2.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	Section K2 of the PDD states that socioeconomic monitoring plans were developed in a participatory manner and FPIC meeting meetings were provided as evidence. This criteria is satisfied.

Finding Number	17
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	8.2.8. Any impacts of the agreement on rights to harvest food, fuel, timber or other products
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	PES Agreement
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	It is unclear where the impacts of the agreement on rights to harvest food, fuel, timber or other products is stated in the PES Agreement.
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please clarify how this criteria is satisfied.
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	The PES agreement has no direct impact on rights to harvest food, fuel, timber or other products, the agreement instead makes repeated references to the Village Land Use Plan and its associated by-laws. The Village Land Use Plan is a participatory and legally recognized document, independent to the project, which in fact enshrines the communities' rights and land use desires on their land. The PES agreement itself imposes no restrictions on the communities and only allows them to transact on the emissions reductions potentially generated by the successful implementation of these participatorily created legal land use frameworks.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	The audit team reviewed the PES agreement and confirms that there are no direct impacts on rights to harvest food, fuel, timber, or other products included in the agreement. This item is addressed.

Finding Number	18
-----------------------	----

Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	8.2.9. Deduction of a risk buffer where applicable
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	PES Agreement
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	The PES agreement states that 20% of the eligible carbon credits will be held in a risk buffer; however, at another point it states that 15% will be held within the risk buffer. Based on the PDD which states 20% will be held in the risk buffer however it is unclear to the audit team why two different risk buffer percentages are stated in the PES Agreement.
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please clarify in line with the finding. MCAR: Please provide copies of all the signed PES Agreements in both English and Swahili. To clarify the audit team understands that the English version may not be signed but we would like to review the full PES agreement in English.
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	The Risk Buffer is 20%. The 15% figure is a legacy typo found in the english draft version of the PES agreement that was used for context to the PES sign pages the PDD. In the signed and official PES agreement in Swahili this was corrected during the process however it seems it was left in the english draft translation. 20% is the appropriate risk buffer figure and is represented both in the PDD and PES, and is the community understanding and expectation for project risk buffer deduction. Scanned signed PES agreement (swahili) is provided for evidence as well as a Draft English Version, this is not signed nor regarded as an official document in Tanzania, however it is an accurate translation of the final signed PES agreement into the english language and serves as a reference.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	Thank you for clarifying that the risk buffer is 20%. This item is addressed. An English version of the full PES agreement as well as the signed Swahili agreement were provided and reviewed by the audit team. This item is addressed.

Finding Number	19
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	8.6. Where a greater number of smallholders or community groups wish to enter PES agreements than the project coordinator is able to engage, e.g. because of lack of resources, a fair process for selecting participants must be defined. The process should take into consideration the potential for tensions or disputes being created within or between communities.
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	The audit team understands that the new communities for the expanded project all wanted to participate in the project as evidenced in interviews with the communities that the VVB conducted. However, it is unclear to the audit team if there were other villages within the landscape that wanted to participate. If there were it is unclear what the process was to not select these communities.

Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please clarify in line with the finding.
Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	Carbon Tanzania is committed to allowing as many communities as possible to access climate finance for the important landscape work they do. In the case of the Yaeda-Eyasi project expansion there were no eligible communities identified in the landscape that were excluded from the project. While planning the expansion Carbon Tanzania worked with multiple stakeholders at various levels, foremost the district governments of both Mbulu and Karatu which encompass the project villages and have jurisdiction of upwards of 100 surrounding villages in the landscape. Ujamaa Community Resource Team, a preeminent community rights and land use organization in the landscape was also integral to the process that resulted in the eventual expansion to the new project villages. All the villages added also had independent participatory land planning process that conferred rights to the communities and allowed for the carbon project which is contingent on the implementation of these plans. All villages with legal status that expressed interest, when exposed to the project by their district governments and proximity to the original project, were successfully included in the expansion and no further process was required. Carbon Tanzania also does not work in areas with active land or rights conflicts; however, this did not prove to be a concern during this process.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	Based on the explanation provided, the audit team is reasonably assured that all communities that were eligible to participate in the project were able to do so. This item is addressed.

Finding Number	20
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	8.7. Where the project coordinator enters into PES Agreements in advance of securing the necessary buyers or resources to fund payments, any risk of non-payment must be communicated to, and agreed by, participants.
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	It is unclear to the audit team where this was communicated to the project participants.
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please clarify how this criteria is satisfied.

Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	<p>Risk of non-payment and all the financial structures and mechanisms around payments for ecosystem services were communicated discussed and agreed to by the communities during both the FPIC round of meetings and PES Agreement round of meetings. This was particularly pertinent during the discussions around the 60% revenue share in the PES. We acknowledge that the concept of percentage is not always understood by communities and community members at a local level and take time to thoroughly explain its meaning, including that if there are no sales and the project and company receive no revenue, then due to the percentage revenue-based agreement the communities will also see zero revenue. The communities who are aware of local agricultural businesses models and their risks, have a frame of reference to comprehend the joint venture they are being offered to partner in. The added communities are in close proximity to the original Yaeda project where in the early years revenue was extremely limited, and are aware of that situation, furthermore during the expansion process leadership from all villages were brought to Yaeda Chini village for a learning visit which included discussion and questions around the financial model with communities that had themselves experienced and engaged in the same structures. Lastly one of the major drivers of the project expansion was market interest, and prior to the PES agreement, a buyer had already agreed and signed to provide significant forward finance for project development and the purchase of project generated VERs, therefore in this case risk of non-payment is negligible.</p>
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	Based on the evidence provided, the audit team is reasonably assured that participants were aware of any risk of non-payment and that this risk is low for the project. This item is addressed.

Finding Number	21
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	8.8. A fair and equitable benefit-sharing mechanism must be applied that has been agreed with the participation of communities involved, identifying how PES funding will be distributed among participants and other stakeholders, including the project coordinator. This should include consideration of how benefit-sharing might change over time as the project progresses.
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	PDD Part J
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	<p>The audit team understands that 60% of the revenue will be distributed to the participating communities based on the size of the land their village/community has contributed to the project area. Each village/community will distribute 10% of their share is given to the district.</p> <p>However, the audit team was unable to find where in the PES agreement that it states that 10% of the revenue allocated to each village/community.</p>
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please clarify where in the PES agreement the participating communities/villages have agreed to distribute 10% of their revenue share to the district level government.

Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	<p>In Subsection F of Section 1.2 (Responsibilities of Carbon Tanzania) on page 3 of the signed Swahili PES agreement it reads:</p> <p>Kulipa Vijiji/Jamii 60% ya mapato kutokana na uuzaji wa kaboni, ikiwa Vijiji/Jamii vitafuata mipango yao ya matumizi ya ardhi ya kijiji na sheria hivyo kupunguza uharibifu wa miti. Kutoka hii 60% ya Vijiji/Jamii, Vijiji/Jamii vinakubali kukata 10% iende wilayani.</p> <p>This translates to: Pay The Villages/Communities 60% of total revenue from the sale of verified emission reductions, if The Villages/Communities follow their land use plans and village by laws thus reducing deforestation. From this 60% The Villages/Communities agree to pay 10% to the District.</p>
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	Thank you for clarifying where this statement is located in the PES agreement. This criteria is satisfied.

Finding Number	22
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	8.10. The project coordinator must provide justification for any payments for ecosystem services delivered in kind or in the form of equipment or resources other than money.
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	PDD
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	Although the audit team found no evidence that payments have been made in-kind in the form of equipment or resources. The audit team is requesting clarification from CT on this issue. For instance, was VGS training paid for by CT and then taken out of the villages allocation of revenue?
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please clarify in line with the finding.

Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	Communities are never asked, required, or expected to receive any payments for ecosystem services delivered in kind or in the form of equipment or resources other than money. The communities have full authority on the spending of at least 60% of project revenue, and decisions on this spending are done through the participatory annual finance and grievance meetings held with the community representative bodies twice a year. It should be noted that Carbon Tanzania, when instructed by the community, regularly disperses money, and makes purchases on their behalf. In the case of VGS training throughout the project history, trainings that were asked for by Carbon Tanzania were covered by Carbon Tanzania as a project cost. In other instances, for example the communities deciding to send VGS to the Pasiansi training center to level up on protection duties core to their carbon business, this was paid by Carbon Tanzania on the instruction of the communities with funds from their community revenue. Due to the practical and operating environment in the rural communities we work, the communities often ask us to perform financial tasks on their behalf, to lessen the administrative burden and cost and any safety risks associated with these processes. Other examples of this include payment of fees for community university students, payment for medical services at local health clinics, or auxiliary VGS gear. Again, communities are not required to use or accept any payments for ecosystem services delivered in kind or in the form of equipment or resources other than money. The PES agreement clearly outlines the terms for both parties including The Villages/Communities claim to 60% of total revenue from the sale of verified emission reductions.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	Thank you for providing clarification on this item. This criteria is satisfied.

Finding Number	23
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	8.12. Projects selling Plan Vivo Certificates should aim to deliver at least 60% of the proceeds of sales on average to communities as PES, meaning project coordinators should not draw on more than 40% of sales income for ongoing coordination, administration and monitoring costs. Where less than 60% is delivered projects must justify why this is not possible, why the benefits delivered to communities are fair and that they are able to effectively incentivise activities.
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	PDD
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	Both the PES Agreement and PDD clearly state that 60% of the revenue from the project will go to the villages. For the verification aspect of the review the audit team reviewed Annex 2 of the Annual Reports. However, from the information provided in the annual reports the audit team is unable to confirm this criteria. The audit team is requesting a detailed accounting of PVC sales revenue, revenue disbursements, and documents that support these figures.
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please provide a detailed accounting of the PVC sale revenue, revenue disbursements, and documents that support this accounting for the verification period.

Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	Provided is a detailed accounting of PVC sales revenue (Quickbook Ledger) and Revenue Disbursements (Quickbook Ledger). Any entry in the revenue ledger can be backed with a sales invoice and any entry in the revenue disbursement ledger can be backed with a bank transfer statement. A sample of these are provided for backing evidence. Also provided is a calculation sheet that shows the 60% of sales revenue which has been disbursed as PES. Any discrepancy is based on difference from financial year, annual reporting year, and verification/monitoring period.
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	The audit team reviewed the Calculataion sheet_2017-2020 workbook and noted that there is still money owed to the community in order to meet this 60% target. It is unclear why there is still money owed to the communities.
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 2 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please clarify in line with the finding.
Round 2 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	Inconsistency comes from differences in reporting, sales, and revenue transfer, schedules. Evidence provided showing subsequent financial transfers to the community exceeding the outstanding amount of \$24,960 cited in the previous evidence.
Aster Global Round 3 Findings	The audit team provided evidence that the pending disbursement noted in the finding has since been paid out to the project communities. The project proponent explained that the budget had not been updated to reflect the additional disbursements that occurred during the verification. This finding is closed, no further action is needed.

Finding Number	24
Plan Vivo Standard 2013 (Subsection and Description)	8.13. The process by which the benefit-sharing mechanism is decided must be recorded including a record of any concerns or objections raised.
Location in PDD or Supporting Documents	PDD
Requirement Met (Y, N, or NA)	Y
Aster Global Round 1 Findings	The audit team understands that the benefit-sharing mechanism is described in the PES agreement which was discussed with each village during meetings prior to the signing of the agreement. However, it is unclear to the audit team if objections were raised by community members and/or leaders.
Aster Global Requests CAR/FAR/OBS - Round 1 (DD Month YYYY)	MCAR: Please clarify for the audit team if there were objections raised during the process for deciding what the benefit-sharing mechanism would be and if there were objections please provide the record showing these objections.

Round 1 Response from Project Coordinator (DD Month YYYY)	<p>There were no objections raised during the process for deciding about the projects benefit-sharing mechanism. Discussions around benefit sharing were included in the FPIC round of meetings and PES Agreement round of meetings. Land and resource ownership in the project areas is very clearly assigned to the village government through the village land use plan and Tanzanian law. The village government is a democratically elected and geographically representative body legally entrusted to deliver on development outcomes and benefits for the community. The community were also aware of the project's proposed benefit sharing mechanism due to the proximity to and local influence of the existing project, this was compounded by the learning visit and interaction that was provided by the project for the leadership of the expanded villages to the existing project communities and leadership. The community had a clear understanding that no independent restrictions were being placed on them by entering into the PES agreement and understood the clear revenue sharing framework outlined in the agreement. As a result of this process and discussions there were not any objections raised around the project's proposed benefit sharing mechanism.</p>
Aster Global Round 2 Findings	<p>Thank you for the clarification. The audit team is reasonably assured that there were no objections raised about the benefit sharing mechanism. This criteria is satisfied.</p>

Annex 2: Documents Received and Reviewed by the VVB

Documents	Date Received
Yaeda-Eyasi PDD Submit.docx	August 14, 2021
Yaeda_Eyasi_Project Area Sept2020.kml.kmz	August 30, 2021
AGB waypoints.kmz	September 2, 2021
Change Detection Doc_Historical Maps.pdf	September 2, 2021
Dubachand Makazi - not project area.kml	September 2, 2021
Yaeda Deforestation Calculations.xlsx	September 2, 2021
Yaeda_Eyasi_Project Area Sept2020.kml	September 2, 2021
Domanga_boundary.cpg	September 2, 2021
Domanga_boundary.dbf	September 2, 2021
Domanga_boundary.prj	September 2, 2021
Domanga_boundary.sbn	September 2, 2021
Domanga_boundary.sbx	September 2, 2021
Domanga_boundary.shp	September 2, 2021
Domanga_boundary.shx	September 2, 2021
Domanga_LUP.dbf	September 2, 2021
Domanga_LUP.prj	September 2, 2021
Domanga_LUP.sbn	September 2, 2021
Domanga_LUP.sbx	September 2, 2021
Domanga_LUP.shp	September 2, 2021
Domanga_LUP.shx	September 2, 2021
Dumbe_village.cpg	September 2, 2021
Dumbe_village.dbf	September 2, 2021
Dumbe_village.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Dumbe_village.shx	September 2, 2021
Dumbe_villageCopy.CPG	September 2, 2021
Dumbe_villageCopy.dbf	September 2, 2021
Dumbe_villageCopy.prj	September 2, 2021
Dumbe_villageCopy.sbn	September 2, 2021
Dumbe_villageCopy.sbx	September 2, 2021
Dumbe_villageCopy.shp	September 2, 2021
Dumbe_villageCopy.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Dumbe_villageCopy.shx	September 2, 2021
Vill_boundary.cpg	September 2, 2021
Vill_boundary.dbf	September 2, 2021
Vill_boundary.prj	September 2, 2021
Vill_boundary.sbn	September 2, 2021
Vill_boundary.sbx	September 2, 2021
Vill_boundary.shp	September 2, 2021
Vill_boundary.shx	September 2, 2021

Barabara.CPG	September 2, 2021
Barabara.dbf	September 2, 2021
Barabara.prj	September 2, 2021
Barabara.sbn	September 2, 2021
Barabara.sbx	September 2, 2021
Barabara.shp	September 2, 2021
Barabara.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Barabara.shx	September 2, 2021
Endamaghang_PLU.CPG	September 2, 2021
Endamaghang_PLU.dbf	September 2, 2021
Endamaghang_PLU.prj	September 2, 2021
Endamaghang_PLU.sbn	September 2, 2021
Endamaghang_PLU.sbx	September 2, 2021
Endamaghang_PLU.shp	September 2, 2021
Endamaghang_PLU.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Endamaghang_PLU.shx	September 2, 2021
Palio.CPG	September 2, 2021
Palio.dbf	September 2, 2021
Palio.prj	September 2, 2021
Palio.sbn	September 2, 2021
Palio.sbx	September 2, 2021
Palio.shp	September 2, 2021
Palio.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Palio.shx	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.CPG	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.dbf	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.prj	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.sbn	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.sbx	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.shp	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.shx	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.CPG	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.dbf	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.prj	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.sbn	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.sbx	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.shp	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.shx	September 2, 2021
Endanyaeish.kmz	September 2, 2021
Endanyaeish_Boundaryr.CPG	September 2, 2021
Endanyaeish_Boundaryr.dbf	September 2, 2021
Endanyaeish_Boundaryr.prj	September 2, 2021

Endanyaeish_Boundaryr.sbn	September 2, 2021
Endanyaeish_Boundaryr.sbx	September 2, 2021
Endanyaeish_Boundaryr.shp	September 2, 2021
Endanyaeish_Boundaryr.shx	September 2, 2021
Endanyeish_PLU.CPG	September 2, 2021
Endanyeish_PLU.dbf	September 2, 2021
Endanyeish_PLU.prj	September 2, 2021
Endanyeish_PLU.sbn	September 2, 2021
Endanyeish_PLU.sbx	September 2, 2021
Endanyeish_PLU.shp	September 2, 2021
Endanyeish_PLU.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Endanyeish_PLU.shx	September 2, 2021
Endesh.mxd	September 2, 2021
Endesh.pdf	September 2, 2021
Endesh_boundary.CPG	September 2, 2021
Endesh_boundary.dbf	September 2, 2021
Endesh_boundary.prj	September 2, 2021
Endesh_boundary.sbn	September 2, 2021
Endesh_boundary.sbx	September 2, 2021
Endesh_boundary.shp	September 2, 2021
Endesh_boundary.shx	September 2, 2021
Endesh_PLU.CPG	September 2, 2021
Endesh_PLU.dbf	September 2, 2021
Endesh_PLU.prj	September 2, 2021
Endesh_PLU.sbn	September 2, 2021
Endesh_PLU.sbx	September 2, 2021
Endesh_PLU.shp	September 2, 2021
Endesh_PLU.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Endesh_PLU.shx	September 2, 2021
Matumizi_mengine.csv	September 2, 2021
Matumizi_mengine1.csv	September 2, 2021
Pario.cpg	September 2, 2021
Pario.csv	September 2, 2021
Pario.dbf	September 2, 2021
Pario.prj	September 2, 2021
Pario.sbn	September 2, 2021
Pario.sbx	September 2, 2021
Pario.shp	September 2, 2021
Pario.shx	September 2, 2021
Roads.CPG	September 2, 2021
Roads.dbf	September 2, 2021
Roads.prj	September 2, 2021
Roads.sbn	September 2, 2021
Roads.sbx	September 2, 2021

Roads.shp	September 2, 2021
Roads.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Roads.shx	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.cpg	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.dbf	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.prj	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.sbn	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.sbx	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.shp	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.shx	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine1.cpg	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine1.dbf	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine1.prj	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine1.sbn	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine1.sbx	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine1.shp	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine1.shx	September 2, 2021
XYPario.cpg	September 2, 2021
XYPario.dbf	September 2, 2021
XYPario.prj	September 2, 2021
XYPario.sbn	September 2, 2021
XYPario.sbx	September 2, 2021
XYPario.shp	September 2, 2021
XYPario.shx	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_boundary.CPG	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_boundary.dbf	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_boundary.prj	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_boundary.sbn	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_boundary.sbx	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_boundary.shp	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_boundary.shx	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_PLU.CPG	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_PLU.dbf	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_PLU.prj	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_PLU.sbn	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_PLU.sbx	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_PLU.shp	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_PLU.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Eshkesh_PLU.shx	September 2, 2021
Barabara.CPG	September 2, 2021
Barabara.dbf	September 2, 2021
Barabara.prj	September 2, 2021
Barabara.sbn	September 2, 2021
Barabara.sbx	September 2, 2021

Barabara.shp	September 2, 2021
Barabara.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Barabara.shx	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_PLU.CPG	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_PLU.dbf	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_PLU.prj	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_PLU.sbn	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_PLU.sbx	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_PLU.shp	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_PLU.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_PLU.shx	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_village_boundary.CPG	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_village_boundary.dbf	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_village_boundary.prj	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_village_boundary.sbn	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_village_boundary.sbx	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_village_boundary.shp	September 2, 2021
Jobaj_village_boundary.shx	September 2, 2021
Palio.CPG	September 2, 2021
Palio.dbf	September 2, 2021
Palio.prj	September 2, 2021
Palio.sbn	September 2, 2021
Palio.sbx	September 2, 2021
Palio.shp	September 2, 2021
Palio.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Palio.shx	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine_2.CPG	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine_2.dbf	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine_2.prj	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine_2.sbn	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine_2.sbx	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine_2.shp	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine_2.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine_2.shx	September 2, 2021
Barabara.CPG	September 2, 2021
Barabara.dbf	September 2, 2021
Barabara.prj	September 2, 2021
Barabara.shx	September 2, 2021
Mbuganekundu_boundary.CPG	September 2, 2021
Mbuganekundu_boundary.dbf	September 2, 2021
Mbuganekundu_boundary.prj	September 2, 2021
Mbuganekundu_boundary.sbn	September 2, 2021
Mbuganekundu_boundary.sbx	September 2, 2021
Mbuganekundu_boundary.shp	September 2, 2021

Mbuganyakundu_boundary.shx	September 2, 2021
Mbuganyakundu_PLU.CPG	September 2, 2021
Mbuganyakundu_PLU.dbf	September 2, 2021
Mbuganyakundu_PLU.prj	September 2, 2021
Mbuganyakundu_PLU.sbn	September 2, 2021
Mbuganyakundu_PLU.sbx	September 2, 2021
Mbuganyakundu_PLU.shp	September 2, 2021
Mbuganyakundu_PLU.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Mbuganyakundu_PLU.shx	September 2, 2021
Palio.CPG	September 2, 2021
Palio.dbf	September 2, 2021
Palio.prj	September 2, 2021
Palio.sbn	September 2, 2021
Palio.sbx	September 2, 2021
Palio.shp	September 2, 2021
Palio.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Palio.shx	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.CPG	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.dbf	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.prj	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.sbn	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.sbx	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.shp	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.shx	September 2, 2021
Barabara.CPG	September 2, 2021
Barabara.dbf	September 2, 2021
Barabara.prj	September 2, 2021
Barabara.sbn	September 2, 2021
Barabara.sbx	September 2, 2021
Barabara.shp	September 2, 2021
Barabara.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Barabara.shx	September 2, 2021
Mikocheni_PLU.CPG	September 2, 2021
Mikocheni_PLU.dbf	September 2, 2021
Mikocheni_PLU.prj	September 2, 2021
Mikocheni_PLU.sbn	September 2, 2021
Mikocheni_PLU.sbx	September 2, 2021
Mikocheni_PLU.shp	September 2, 2021
Mikocheni_PLU.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Mikocheni_PLU.shx	September 2, 2021
Mkocheni_boundary.CPG	September 2, 2021
Mkocheni_boundary.dbf	September 2, 2021
Mkocheni_boundary.prj	September 2, 2021

Mkocheni_boundary.sbn	September 2, 2021
Mkocheni_boundary.sbx	September 2, 2021
Mkocheni_boundary.shp	September 2, 2021
Mkocheni_boundary.shx	September 2, 2021
Palio.CPG	September 2, 2021
Palio.dbf	September 2, 2021
Palio.prj	September 2, 2021
Palio.sbn	September 2, 2021
Palio.sbx	September 2, 2021
Palio.shp	September 2, 2021
Palio.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Palio.shx	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.CPG	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.dbf	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.prj	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.sbn	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.sbx	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.shp	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.shx	September 2, 2021
Mongo_boundary.cpg	September 2, 2021
Mongo_boundary.dbf	September 2, 2021
Mongo_boundary.prj	September 2, 2021
Mongo_boundary.sbn	September 2, 2021
Mongo_boundary.sbx	September 2, 2021
Mongo_boundary.shp	September 2, 2021
Mongo_boundary.shx	September 2, 2021
Mongo_PLU.dbf	September 2, 2021
Mongo_PLU.prj	September 2, 2021
Mongo_PLU.sbn	September 2, 2021
Mongo_PLU.sbx	September 2, 2021
Mongo_PLU.shp	September 2, 2021
Mongo_PLU.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Mongo_PLU.shx	September 2, 2021
Barabara.CPG	September 2, 2021
Barabara.dbf	September 2, 2021
Barabara.prj	September 2, 2021
Barabara.sbn	September 2, 2021
Barabara.sbx	September 2, 2021
Barabara.shp	September 2, 2021
Barabara.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Barabara.shx	September 2, 2021
Palio.CPG	September 2, 2021
Palio.dbf	September 2, 2021

Palio.prj	September 2, 2021
Palio.sbn	September 2, 2021
Palio.sbx	September 2, 2021
Palio.shp	September 2, 2021
Palio.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Palio.shx	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_boundary.CPG	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_boundary.dbf	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_boundary.prj	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_boundary.sbn	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_boundary.sbx	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_boundary.shp	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_boundary.shx	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_PLU.CPG	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_PLU.dbf	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_PLU.prj	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_PLU.sbn	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_PLU.sbx	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_PLU.shp	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_PLU.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
Qangdend_PLU.shx	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.CPG	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.dbf	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.prj	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.sbn	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.sbx	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.shp	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.shp.xml	September 2, 2021
XYMatumizi_mengine.shx	September 2, 2021
farm.cpg	September 2, 2021
farm.dbf	September 2, 2021
farm.prj	September 2, 2021
farm.shp	September 2, 2021
farm.shx	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.cpg	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.dbf	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.prj	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.sbn	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.sbx	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.shp	September 2, 2021
Village_boundary.shx	September 2, 2021
Yaeda_PLU.dbf	September 2, 2021
Yaeda_PLU.prj	September 2, 2021
Yaeda_PLU.sbn	September 2, 2021

Yaeda_PLU.sbx	September 2, 2021
Yaeda_PLU.shp	September 2, 2021
Yaeda_PLU.shx	September 2, 2021
70 Plot AGB R Output.csv	September 2, 2021
70 Plot Carbon Content AGB & BGB with Coordinates - Copy.csv	September 2, 2021
70 Plot Carbon Content AGB & BGB with Coordinates - Copy.xls	September 2, 2021
70 Plot Carbon Content AGB & BGB with Coordinates.xls	September 2, 2021
Carbon stock reassessment.R	September 2, 2021
CarbonStocks.csv	September 2, 2021
ForestCarbonStocks.csv	September 2, 2021
1011Classification.txt	September 2, 2021
1516Classification.txt	September 2, 2021
1920Classification.txt	September 2, 2021
78Classification.txt	September 2, 2021
ChangeDetection.R	September 2, 2021
readme.txt	September 2, 2021
SamplePlots.txt	September 2, 2021
SamplePoints-Training.kml	September 2, 2021
SamplePoints-Training.shp	September 2, 2021
SamplePoints.csv	September 2, 2021
SamplePointsWbuff.dbf	September 2, 2021
SamplePointsWbuff.shx	September 2, 2021
Verification method.txt	September 2, 2021
Verification.txt	September 2, 2021
VerificationSamplePlots.R	September 2, 2021
ClassedImage1011.tif	September 2, 2021
ClassedImage1516.tif	September 2, 2021
ClassedImage1920.tif	September 2, 2021
ClassedImage78.tif	November 12, 2021
20092.00 Plan Vivo Yaeda REDD_Round 1 Responses Draft (Priorities).xlsx	November 12, 2021
20092.00 Plan Vivo Yaeda REDD_Round 1 Responses Draft.xlsx	November 12, 2021
CT Grievance Policy.pdf	November 12, 2021
Project Budget_Financial Plan 2017-2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
Yaeda Project Account - Bank Statement and Transaction Report.pdf	November 12, 2021
Yaeda-Eyasi PDD Post Findings Draft.pdf	November 12, 2021
Calculataion sheet_2017-2020.xlsx	November 12, 2021
Revenue Disbursment Ledger 2017-2020.xlsx	November 12, 2021
Sales Ledger 2017-2020.xlsx	November 12, 2021
African Environment_2017_Invoice # 4G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Asilia Lodges_2017_Invoice # 16G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Dorobo Tours Safaris_2017_Invoice # 12G.pdf	November 12, 2021
DUMA EXPLORER LTD_2017_Invoice # 1.pdf	November 12, 2021
Maps Edge_2017_Invoice # 11G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Native Energy_2017_Invoice # 7G.pdf	November 12, 2021

Nature Discovery_2017_Invoice # ND_01_2017.pdf	November 12, 2021
Sustainable Travel International_2017_Invoice # 47G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Zero Mission_2017_Invoice # 29G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Native Energy_2018_Invoice # 116G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Native Energy_2018_Invoice # 121G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Native Energy_2018_Invoice # 82G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Native Energy_2018_Invoice # 89G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Zero Misiion_2018_Invoice # 61G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Zero Misiion_2018_Invoice # 96G.pdf	November 12, 2021
African Environemnet_2019.pdf	November 12, 2021
African Environemnet_2019_Invoice # 176G.pdf	November 12, 2021
African Environemnet_2019_Invoice # 188G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Essential Destination_Invoice # 162G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Grumeti air_2019_Invoice # 173G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Nomad Tanzania_Invoice # 137G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Asilia Tanzania_Invoice # 210G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Asilia Tanzania_Invoice # 260G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Grumeti Air_Invoice # 218G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Grumeti Air_Invoice # 251G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Nature Discovery_Invoice # 238G.pdf	November 12, 2021
Serengeti Baloon Safari_Invoice # 226G.pdf	November 12, 2021
CollegeFeesEmanuel.pdf	November 12, 2021
Domanga Village Carbon payment May 2017.pdf	November 12, 2021
Domanga Village Nov 2017.pdf	November 12, 2021
DomangaWalNov17.pdf	November 12, 2021
Domange Jamii revenue Nov 2017.pdf	November 12, 2021
Haydom fund Nov 2017.pdf	November 12, 2021
Mongovillage Nov 2017.pdf	November 12, 2021
MwM Jamii revenue Nov 2017.pdf	November 12, 2021
Yaeda village Nov 2017.pdf	November 12, 2021
YC Carbon Payment May 17.pdf	November 12, 2021
CBCTCPocketMoneyMay18.pdf	November 12, 2021
CodeREDDConferenceMay18.pdf	November 12, 2021
DomangaJamiiMay2018.pdf	November 12, 2021
DomangaJamiiNov18.pdf	November 12, 2021
DomangaVillageNov18.pdf	November 12, 2021
DomangaVillRevMay18.pdf	November 12, 2021
DomangaWalinziMay18.pdf	November 12, 2021
DomangaWalNov2018.pdf	November 12, 2021
EmmaMusaCollege2Apr18.pdf	November 12, 2021
EmmaMusaCollegeFees2019.pdf	November 12, 2021
EPICFinalMay2018.pdf	November 12, 2021
EshkeshWardMayNov18.pdf	November 12, 2021
HaydomDebtMay2018.pdf	November 12, 2021

HaydomHealthNov18.pdf	November 12, 2021
MbuluMay18.pdf	November 12, 2021
MongoJamiiMay2018.pdf	November 12, 2021
MongoJamiiNov18.pdf	November 12, 2021
MongoVillageNov18.pdf	November 12, 2021
MongoVillageRevMay18.pdf	November 12, 2021
YaedaChiniRevNov2018.pdf	November 12, 2021
YaedaKataRevMay18.pdf	November 12, 2021
YaedaWardMongoshareNov18.pdf	November 12, 2021
YaedaWardYCSHareNov18.pdf	November 12, 2021
DomangaJamiiMay2019.pdf	November 12, 2021
DomangaJamiiSWIFT.pdf	November 12, 2021
DomangaVillMay2019.pdf	November 12, 2021
DomJamiiResendJune19.pdf	November 12, 2021
DomJamiiRevNov19.pdf	November 12, 2021
EmmaMusaFeesNov2019.pdf	November 12, 2021
EshkeshMay2019.pdf	November 12, 2021
HaydomMay2019.pdf	November 12, 2021
MbuluDCControlMay2019.pdf	November 12, 2021
MbuluDCReceiptJune2019.pdf	November 12, 2021
MbuluDCRevNov19.pdf	November 12, 2021
MongoJamiiMay2019.pdf	November 12, 2021
MongoJamiiRevNov19.pdf	November 12, 2021
MongoVillMay2019.pdf	November 12, 2021
MongoVillRevNov19.pdf	November 12, 2021
YaedaChVillRevNov19.pdf	November 12, 2021
YaedaVillMay2019.pdf	November 12, 2021
YaedaWardMay2019.pdf	November 12, 2021
YaedaWardRevNov19.pdf	November 12, 2021
DomEduJune2020 .pdf	November 12, 2021
DomJamCRevMay20 .pdf	November 12, 2021
DomVillMay2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
EshkeshNov2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
EshkWardMay2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
HaydomMay2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
MbuluDCMay2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
MbuluDCNov2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
MongoEduJune20.pdf	November 12, 2021
MongoJamiiNov20.pdf	November 12, 2021
MongoVilNov2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
MwMCRevMay2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
MwMVillMay2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
YaedaChiniNov20.pdf	November 12, 2021
YaedaWardMay2020.pdf	November 12, 2021

YaedaWardNov2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
YCVCRvMay2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
FPIC_Domanga_Sept2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
FPIC_Dumbechand_Sept2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
FPIC_Endanyawish_Sept2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
FPIC_Eshkesh_Sept2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
FPIC_Mbuganyekundu_Sept2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
FPIC_Mins_Endamagahan_7Sept2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
FPIC_Mins_Endesh_Sept2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
FPIC_Mins_Jobaj_8Sept2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
FPIC_Min_Mikocheni_Sept2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
FPIC_Mongo Wa Mono_Sept2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
FPIC_Qangdend_Sep2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
FPIC_Yaeda Chini_Sept2020.pdf	November 12, 2021
English DRAFT Y-E Contract.pdf	November 12, 2021
Y-E Mbulu Final PES Signed.pdf	November 12, 2021
Domanga- LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
DUMBECHAND LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
Endamaghan LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
Endanyawish LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
ENDESH LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
Eshkesh-LUP .pdf	November 12, 2021
JOBAJ LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
Mbuga Nyekundu LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
MIKOCHENI LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
Mongo wa Mono-LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
Qang'dend LUP .pdf	November 12, 2021
Yaeda Chini-LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
Domanga map and cordinates.docx	November 12, 2021
Dumbachand_VLUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
Endamaghan village LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
Endesh village LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
Eshkesh maps and cordinate.docx	November 12, 2021
Jobai village LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
Mbuganyekundu village LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
Mikocheni village LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
Mongo wamono map and cordinates.docx	November 12, 2021
Qangdend village LUP.pdf	November 12, 2021
Updated Endanyawish map.docx	November 12, 2021
Yaeda-Eyasi Land Use Map copy.jpg	November 12, 2021
Yaedachini map and coordinates.docx	November 12, 2021
SMART2020.dbf	November 12, 2021
SMART2020.fix	November 12, 2021
SMART2020.prj	November 12, 2021

SMART2020.shp	November 12, 2021
SMART2020.shx	November 12, 2021
Yaeda SMART data 2020.csv	November 12, 2021
20092.00 Plan Vivo Yaeda REDD_Round 1 Responses.xlsx	November 16, 2021
Yaeda-Eyasi PDD (Nov-16) _Final.pdf	November 16, 2021
CCROS Evidence.pdf	January 13, 2022
Remaing finding draft response.docx	January 13, 2022
Yaeda_Eyasi_Project Area Sept2020.kmz	January 13, 2022
20092.00 Plan Vivo Yaeda REDD_Round 3 Findings.xlsx	January 24, 2022
Yaeda-Eyasi PDD (Jan-24-22) _compressed.pdf	January 24, 2022
Yaeda-Eyasi PDD (Feb-4-22).pdf	February 4, 2022